

A BIOGRAPHY OF ULPIAN FULWELL AND A
CRITICAL EDITION OF
THE ART OF FLATTERY (1576)

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Shakespeare Institute,
the Faculty of Arts
Birmingham University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Roberta Buchanan
1980



1210,3330

1825338

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

The thesis consists of a biography of Ulpian Fulwell (1546-1586) and a critical edition of The Art of Flattery (1576). The biography contains new material derived from documents at the Public Record Office and the Gloucester Diocesan Registry, giving new information on Fulwell's family background and his career as a clergyman. It is argued that the conflict between the townspeople of Wells and the Cathedral clergy provides the background and impetus for Fulwell's satire in The Art of Flattery.

The critical edition of The Art of Flattery outlines the printing history of the book and discusses the variants between the first and second editions, and between the two copies of the first edition. The identification of the Archdeacon of Wells attacked in the Fifth Dialogue is attempted. The Literary Introduction sets Fulwell's satirical dialogues in the context of Lucian, the colloquies of Erasmus, and the English Renaissance dialogues of More, Elyot and Ascham. A critical analysis of the work traces its form to the bipartite structure of classical verse satire, with its confrontation between Author and Adversarius.

VOLUME I

BIOGRAPHY

LITERARY INTRODUCTION

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

Themistocles said there was no musicke soe
sweete unto him as to heare his owne prayses.

Diary of John Manningham, edited by R.P.

Sorlien (Hanover, New Hampshire: 1976), p.61.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments	1
 BIOGRAPHY	
Former biographical notices	1
Fulwell's Family Background	9
John Goodman	11
 THE LAWSUITS OVER THE SUBCHANTER'S LANDS	
Lawsuit 1: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman	19
Lawsuit 2: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman	23
Lawsuit 3: Bucher vs. Stephins et al.	33
The Turner Letters	35
Lawsuit 4: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman et al	38
Lawsuit 5: Christabel Fulwell vs. Bartholomew Haggatt	44
Lawsuit 6: Dr William Turner vs. Christabel Fulwell	47
Lawsuit 7: James and Christabel Foster vs. Bartholomew Haggatt	51
Lawsuit 8: John and Christabel Rushall vs. George Upton and Others	54
Lawsuit 9: William and Mary Hancock vs. George Upton and George Fulwell	59
Ulpian Fulwell's Life and Career	71

	Page
Edmund Harman	81
Appendix I: List of Lawsuits	110
Appendix II: Fulwell Family Tree	112
LITERARY INTRODUCTION	
Fulwell's Earlier Works	
i. <u>Like Will to Like</u>	ii
ii. <u>The Flower of Fame</u>	vii
<u>The Art of Flattery</u> : Satura	xiv
The Satiric Dialogue: Lucian	xxi
The Renaissance Dialogue: Erasmus	xxvii
Lucian, Erasmus, and Fulwell	xxxi
The English Dialogue before Fulwell	xxxv
<u>The Art of Flattery</u> : a Critical Analysis .	liv
Structure	lvii
The Persona of the Satirist	lxix
The Adversarius	lxxviii
Philosophy: 'Some Particular Vision of the World'	xcii
Style	c
Critical Comments on <u>The Art of Flattery</u> .	cx
TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION	
1. Editorial Principles	cxiii
2. Treatment of the Text	cxix
3. Stationers' Register Entries	cxxiv
4. Bibliographical Descriptions	
Q1, 1576	cxxv

	Page
Press Variants, Q1	cxxxi
Q2, 1579	cxxxii
Press Variants, Q2	cxliii
5. Relationship between the Variant States	
of Q1	cxliv
Punctuation Variants, Q1, Gathering A	clxix
Running-Titles, Compositorial Analysis,	
and Evidence of Type-Page Measurements,	
Q1	clxxii
Table of Running-Titles	clxxvi
Compositorial Analysis	clxxxiv
Evidence from the Printer's Measure. .	clxxxvii
Q2: 1579	clxxxix
Relationship between Q1 and Q2	cxcii
Conclusion	cxcix
TEXT: <u>THE ART OF FLATTERY</u>	
Plate 1: Title-page, Q1	
Plate 2: Title-page, Q2, 1579	
Plate 3: Title-page, Q2, n.d.	
A dialogue betwene the Author and his Muse	1
Dedication to Lady Mildred Burghleigh	5
To the friendly Reader	8
Printer to reader (verse)	11
A description of the seuen liberall	
Sciences	12

	Page
The first Dialogue betweene the Author and the printer	16
The second Dialogue betweene the Author and Lady Fortune	29
The third Dialogue betweene the Author and a Frier	39
The fourth Dialogue betweene the Author, and Fortunatus	60
The fifth dialogue betweene Syr Symon and the Author	68
The sixt dialogue betweene Pierce Pickthank, dronken Dickon, dame Annat the alewife, and the Author	88
The seauenth dialogue betweene Diogenes, and Vlpianus	99
The eyghth dialogue betweene Tom Tapster, Miles makeshift, Wat Wyly, and the Author	118
A short Dialogue, betweene the Authour and his booke	143
Emendation of accidentals	147
COMMENTARY	153

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the kind encouragement of the late Director of the Shakespeare Institute, Professor T.J.B. Spencer, and my supervisor Dr Stanley Wells. Many people have helped me in the course of the thesis: Rev. Leonard P. Mills, Rector of Naunton and vicar of Guiting Power, allowed me to inspect the parish register of Naunton, still kept in the church; Mr Douglas M. Cursley, town clerk of Wells, made available the Wells Court Book; Dr R.D. Reid showed me the subchanter's house, once occupied by Robert Goodman, and also probably by Fulwell's father, in East Wells; Dr Robert Peters, author of Oculus Episcopi, patiently answered queries on Elizabethan church history. Barry Webb and Susan Shatto kindly provided transportation to Lapworth and Naunton. Dr Gildas Roberts helped with the translations of Fulwell's Latin. Memorial University of Newfoundland encouraged my work in a tangible way by several Vice-President's Research Grants.

I am also indebted to two friends: Sharon Dean, who typed a difficult manuscript without losing patience; and Michael Calcott who helped with the proof-reading.

Roberta Buchanan

November, 1980.

BIOGRAPHY OF ULPIAN FULWELL, 1546-1586

There are several biographical notices of Ulpian Fulwell, starting in the late seventeenth century with Anthony à Wood's Athenae Oxoniensis; but most of them have errors, and all have omissions. Irving Ribner made the most important contribution to the understanding of Fulwell's family background and the object of his satire in The Art of Flattery in his two articles in Notes and Queries in 1950 and 1951, based on the discovery of a series of lawsuits in the Public Record Office by Ribner and C.J. Sisson. However, none of the former biographers of Fulwell consulted the Gloucester Diocesan Registry for information on Fulwell's career as a clergyman; and there are lawsuits concerning the Fulwell family in the Public Record Office which Ribner did not find. This biographical sketch will contain new material, and will correct minor errors of earlier biographers.

FORMER BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES

Anthony à Wood's pioneer effort in 1691, although boasting to be 'An exact history of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their education in the most ancient and famous University of Oxford... Representing the birth, fortune, preferment, and death of all those Authors and Prelates, the great accidents of their lives, and the fate and character of their writings',¹ was based on very slender

1. Athenae Oxonienses, Vol. I (1691; Wing W3382), title page.

information - the matriculation register of Oxford; two out of Fulwell's three works; Speed's reference to him in his Chronicle; and, most interestingly, oral history: that 'he was esteemed a person of ingenuity by his contemporaries' at Oxford (Athenae Oxonienses, edited by Philip Bliss, 4 vols (London, 1813-1820), I, 540). Wood mistakenly states Fulwell's age on matriculation to be thirty-two instead of thirty-three, as stated in the register (below p. 9) - the first of a series of minor errors that dog his biography. Wood knew of only later editions of two of Fulwell's works, and his chronology is consequently confused: he states that while Fulwell was resident at St Mary's Hall, his Oxford college, 'he partly wrote' The Art of Flattery, printed in 1579. Fulwell may indeed while at Oxford have revised this book for the second edition (1579), but the first edition was published in 1576. 'Afterwards, having learned the art of poetry among the academicians,' Wood continues, Fulwell then 'wrote and published' his interlude, Like Will to Like; Wood was unaware of the first edition of 1568, written well before Fulwell went up to Oxford in 1579. Wood realized that Fulwell must have written something else, for his 'name...stands quoted by Jo. Speed in his life of K. Ed. 6, in his Chronicle; and therefore I suppose he hath other things printed, for I cannot conceive that Joh. Speed should quote him for any thing out of the two former books' (ibid., I, 540). The missing work that Speed refers to is The Flower of Fame, as Bliss pointed out in his additions to Wood in the early

nineteenth century (ibid., I, 540-542).

The second biographical notice was by Thomas Tanner in his Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica (1748), a biographical dictionary in Latin of English, Scottish and Irish writers. This followed Wood, but Tanner was the first to add information about The Flower of Fame, which he states is cited by Holinshed (not Speed). He also added the fact that Fulwell was rector of Naunton in Gloucestershire, citing as his source Sir Robert Atkyns's book on Gloucestershire.² Tanner

2. Tanner, Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica (London, 1748), p. 302; Atkyns, The Ancient and Present State of Glostershire (London, 1712), p. 565.

was followed by David Erskine Baker's Companion to the Play-House, a popular compendium of biographies of dramatists first published in 1764. It was revised and updated by Isaac Reed in 1782, under the new title of Biographia Dramatica, and again by Reed and Stephen Jones in 1812. Baker based his short biography entirely on Wood, wrongly stating, however, that Fulwell 'was born in 1556, and, at the age of thirty years' matriculated at Oxford. The later editions added the date of the first edition of Like Will to Like (1568), which had not been in either Wood or Tanner, and also gave details of its entry in the Stationers' Register.³

3. Baker, Reed, and Jones, Biographia Dramatica, third edition, 3 vols. (London, 1812), I, 258; II, 372.

Octavius Gilchrist's article on Fulwell in Brydges's Censura Literaria (1805-1809); Robert Bell in Lives of the Most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of Great Britain. English Poets (1839); and Thomas Corser, in Collectanea Anglo-Poetica (1877) add nothing new to Fulwell's biography.⁴

4. Censura Literaria. Containing Titles, Abstracts, and Opinions of Old English Books, with Original Disquisitions, Articles of Biography, and Other Literary Antiquities, edited by Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges, 10 vols (London, 1805-1809), V, 164-168; article signed 'O.G.'; Robert Bell, Lives of the Most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of Great Britain. English Poets, Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia, 2 vols (London, 1839), II, 102-105; Thomas Corser, Collectanea Anglo-Poetica: or, a Bibliographical and Descriptive Catalogue of a Portion of a Collection of Early English Poetry, With Occasional Extracts and Remarks Biographical and Critical, Part VI, Chetham Society (Manchester, 1877), C, 382-396.
-

The Dictionary of National Biography article by Gordon Goodwin, published at the end of the nineteenth century, is still used as the major reference source for information on Fulwell. Goodwin begins by stating that Fulwell 'fl. 1586' (actually the year of his death), and then by quoting Wood, That he was 'a Somersetshire man born, and a gentleman's son'.⁵

5. DNB, edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, second edition, 22 vols (London, 1921-1922), VII, 768.
-

Goodwin then makes his first blunder. Quoting from the Fifth Dialogue, he asserts that Fulwell

says of himself: 'When I was in the flower of my youth I was well regarded of many men, as well for

my prompte wit in scoffing and taunting, as also for the comlynnesse of my personage, being of very tall stature and active in many thinges, by meanes whereof I became a servitour.' (VII, 768; *my italics*)

But Fulwell does not say this of himself; the words are spoken in the dialogue by Sir Simon, who is certainly not a persona of Fulwell but is bitterly attacked by him. Goodwin's mistake was pointed out by Edward C. Wright in 'A Note on the Life of Ulpian Fulwell', Notes and Queries, N.S., 18 (1971), 213-214. Wright was unaware that Goodwin derived his information at second hand from John Payne Collier's Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language. Goodwin must have misread Collier's ambiguous or unclear sentence:

One of his amusing Dialogues is between himself and 'Sir Symon the parson of Poll Jobham,' in which Fulwell says 'Thou knowest that when I was in the flower of my youth....' [etc.] (ibid., 2 vols (London, 1865), I, 299)

Goodwin misinterpreted Collier and added the clarificatory but erroneous phrase 'says of himself' without checking the text of the dialogue.

Goodwin gives as his source for his statement that Fulwell was rector of Naunton not Atkyns but Ralph Bigland's book on Gloucestershire.⁶ After giving an account

6. Historical, Monumental, and Genealogical Collections relative to the County of Gloucester, 2 vols (London, 1791-1792), II, 236.

of Fulwell's works, Goodwin includes for the first time evidence from the parish register of Naunton, which he claims

in his bibliography at the end of the article to be 'information from the rector of Naunton':

In 1572 he married at Naunton a lady whose baptismal name was Eleanor, and thenceforward for some years his signature occurs frequently in the register of that parish, chiefly in reference to the christening of his various children. (DNB, VII, 769)

This is the only new biographical information in Goodwin's article, and even this is incomplete and incorrect. The parish register still preserved at Naunton shows that Fulwell married Eleanor Warde on 8 May 1572, but Fulwell's signature does not occur in the register.⁷

-
7. Ernest F. Eales, a former rector of Naunton, states that 'The entries from 1540 to 1586 are copied from an older book which has perished', so it could not possibly contain Fulwell's signature (Eales, Naunton upon Cotswold (Oxford, 1928), p.70; Chapter 9: 'The Old Register'). Eales was rector of Naunton from 1902 to 1926.
-

Irving Ribner was the first to publish information on five lawsuits which shed an important light on Fulwell's family background and the satirical intention and reception of The Art of Flattery. His first article, 'Ulpian Fulwell and his Family',⁸ summarised four lawsuits brought by or against

-
8. Notes and Queries, 195 (1950), 444-448; hereafter referred to as 'Ribner I'.
-

members of Fulwell's family - his father, mother, and daughter - concerning lands which they leased from the subchanter (and later dean) of Wells Cathedral. These lawsuits are discussed in more detail below. His second article, 'Ulpian Fulwell and

the Court of High Commission',⁹ brought to light the public

9. Notes and Queries, 196 (1951), 268-270; hereafter referred to as 'Ribner II'.

recantation that Fulwell was forced to make because of his attack on Gilbert Berkeley, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, 'and others', in The Art of Flattery. Ribner supplemented these discoveries by information from the records of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, the Wells municipal records, and the Naunton parish register. Ribner's discoveries led him to perceive the local application of the satire in the Fifth Dialogue of The Art of Flattery to the archdeacon of Wells in Somerset, spelt backwards 'Slew' and 'Tesremos' in the first edition (Ribner II, p.269).

The most recent attempt to deal with Fulwell's biographical background is in Edward C. Wright's 'The English Works of Ulpian Fulwell' (unpublished dissertation, Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1970). In his preface Wright states that his General Introduction 'attempts as complete a biographical sketch of Fulwell as existing documents in the University of Illinois Library can make it' (p.iii). Unfortunately Wright was unaware of Ribner's important articles which throw such a vital light on Fulwell's family and the satire of The Art of Flattery. He bases his edition of this work on the second revised, but also expurgated, edition, and has not done a full collation of the two editions. There are no lists of variants for the Fifth Dialogue (the

Eighth Dialogue in his edition, following the order of the second edition of 1579), and he therefore misses the specific hint of location in the Fifth Dialogue: 'Slew' and 'Tesremos', altered to the neutral 'N.' and 'M.' in the second edition. Wright asks in all innocence:

In the Eighth Dialogue between Sir Symon the Parson of Poll Iobbam, do the names of places, N. and M. refer to livings near Fulwell's own rectory of Naunton in Gloucestershire, and is there some historical figure behind this corrupt gentleman-priest; or is he just the conventional portrait of the avaricious clergyman? (Wright, p.283)

Sir Simon is indeed based on an 'historical figure'. Ribner attempted to identify him (Ribner II, p.269), and I have corrected and amplified his suggestions in the commentary to the Fifth Dialogue.

Wright also blunders in his attempted identification of Edmund Harman, Fulwell's patron, as possibly John Veysey, Bishop of Exeter, 'who preferred to be known by the pseudonym of John Harman', although Wright candidly admits that:

The principal argument against this engaging theory is that Veysey died in 1554, although Fulwell's Harman was apparently alive and active in the 1570's when Flower of Fame and Ars Adulandi were being written. (Wright, pp. 305-306)

Wright misinterpreted DNB's 'John Veysey, alias Harman' as a pseudonym, whereas in fact Veysey's original surname was Harman, and he changed it to Veysey as the article in DNB explains:

After leaving Oxford he adopted the patronymic of Veysey or Voysey. Anthony à Wood asserts that he had been educated in infancy by one of that name. (DNB, XX, 296)

The identity of Edmund Harman is discussed below.

FULWELL'S FAMILY BACKGROUND

Ulpian Fulwell was born in Wells, Somerset, in 1546. The baptismal register of his parish church, St. Cuthbert, does not survive for this period and there is no record of his baptism; but his date of birth may be calculated from the matriculation register of the University of Oxford, since he was aged thirty-three at matriculation in 1579.¹⁰

-
10. Register of the University of Oxford, edited by Andrew Clark, 2 vols (Oxford, 1885-1889), II, Part 2, 86.
-

Wells retains much the same features today as it did in the sixteenth century, dominated by the magnificent cathedral which has on its façade half the surviving medieval sculptures¹¹ in England; by the bishop's moated palace next to

-
11. Pamela Tudor-Craig, One Half of our Noblest Art: a Study of the Sculptures of Wells West Front (Wells, 1976), no pagination.
-

it; and by the market square close beside. The fortified palace and the deanery with its high protective wall still give an impression both of the wealth of the church and its defensive posture against the surrounding townspeople. Ulpian's father was involved in both spheres, ecclesiastical and secular, cathedral and market-place, since he was the kinsman and bailiff of the subchanter of Wells Cathedral, John Goodman, and later become a linen-draper in the town.

Thomas Fulwell's career from servant to merchant may be

traced in the records of Wells and in his lawsuits against Goodman. In the earliest lawsuit to survive, Goodman states that Fulwell was in service with him and received 'his meate drynk and apparell' (lawsuit 1).¹²

12. A chronological list of the lawsuits is given in Appendix I, pp. 110-111.

His duties included accompanying Goodman when he 'dyd ryde' and 'wayt[ing] on hym euery holyday' (lawsuit 1). Fulwell states that he had done 'good ser[vice]...by the space of xiiij yeres or therabowtes with owt any maner of wages takyn' (lawsuit 2). Thomas's situation bears a startling resemblance to that described by his son in The Art of Flattery, in which tenants are forced to wait upon their landlord and provide a 'train' without pay:

When as it shall expected bee,
that you a traine must bring,
Your tenaunts are good handsome hines,
when badged blew cotes on....
And he poore swad, wil willingly
on cote bestow the cost:
His best cart horse wil make good shift,
to ride with you in post. (Eighth Dialogue, pp.132-133)

In return for his long service, Goodman promised him a lease of the subchanter's lands. The lawsuits, which will be discussed in detail later, reveal that Goodman did indeed lease the rich and extensive subchanter's lands to Thomas Fulwell on a long ninety-year lease. These lands must have been the basis of the family's prosperity, but they proved to be a mixed blessing.

JOHN GOODMAN

Fulwell's cousin (or kinsman) John Goodman, who had a great and often destructive influence on Thomas Fulwell's life and that of his family, plays a shady if minor role in the troubled period of the Reformation in England. His date of birth is not known; Venn (Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1922-1927), II, 206) thinks he may have been vicar of Caldecot, Cambridgeshire, until 1517. The earliest record of him in Somerset is 3 November 1518, in the register of Thomas Wolsey, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, when 'John Godeman, chaplain' among others prayed Master Richard Wolman to undertake the duties of vicar general of the diocese.¹³

13. The Registers of Thomas Wolsey, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1518-1523, John Clerke..., William Knyght..., and Gilbert Bourne, edited by Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte, Somerset Record Society, 55 (1940), p.1; hereafter referred to as Bishops' Registers.

On 4 April 1519 the new vicar general instituted him into the vicarage of Westeharptre, in a ceremony performed in the cathedral (Bishops' Registers, p.5.17). Goodman seems to have been involved in a certain amount of trafficking back and forth of benefices, for on or before 20 July 1519 he resigned from his vicarage of Brumpton Regis, where he is described in the bishop's register as 'proctor [i.e. deputy?] of Sir Thomas Byrde, the last incumbent'; Richard Wolman, the vicar general, was instituted in his place, by the same commissioner that he had employed to find a 'suitable person' for the benefice

(Bishops' Registers, p.7.26 and 27). Goodman was reinstituted to this same vicarage (by Wolman) a year later on 12 May 1520, Wolman having resigned (Bishops' Registers, p.13.63). Goodman resigned it again in 1531 (*ibid.*, p.63.405) - probably to avoid the regulations against pluralities.

In 1521 he became a bachelor of canon law at Cambridge, having paid a 'grace' of 13s. 4d. 'pro non legendo', for not attending the required readings.¹⁴ In 1525, according to Venn,

14. Cambridge University, Grace Book B, Part II, 1511-1544, edited by Mary Bateson (Cambridge, 1905), pp.95, 93.

he became the principal of St Paul's Hostel, his hall in Cambridge (Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I, II, 206). On 19 July 1535 he paid the large sum of eight pounds for a dispensation to hold a benefice 'not with cure or incompatible' with the two he already held in the diocese of Bath and Wells: the rectory of Carleton and the vicarage of West Harptree.¹⁵

15. Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549, edited by D.S. Chambers (Oxford, 1966), p.40.

It must have been about this time, in the early 1530s, that Thomas Fulwell became his servant, for Fulwell states in his bill of complaint to lawsuit 2 (dated 1547) that he had then served him for 'the space of xiiij yeres or thereabowtes'. Some time before 1535, when the Valor Ecclesiasticus was compiled, Goodman was appointed to the lucrative post of subchanter of Wells Cathedral, with its rich supporting endowment of lands, and its own manor house in East Wells, the

street east of the cathedral.¹⁶ The subchanter, or succentor,

16. East Wells is now called St Thomas Street, but may be seen on William Simes's map of Wells of 1735 (reproduced in Wells City Charters, Somerset Record Society, vol. 46 (Frome and London, 1932)); the subchantry with its stone-walled garden can still be seen in Wells.

was the precentor's deputy; he is the chanter who takes up the chant after the precentor, or who presides over the left choir (OED 'succentor' 1.a). At Wells, he also had to teach plainsong in the song school of the cathedral.¹⁷ According to

17. Victoria County History of Somerset, Vol.2, edited by William Page (London, 1911), p.436.

the Valor Ecclesiasticus, Goodman in 1535 was prebend of Cory (Curry) with an income of twenty shillings, and his income from the subchantership, after expenses were deducted, was nine pounds and sixteen pence clear. Thomas Fulwell is listed as his bailiff, at a fee of ten shillings, in a summary of the income and expenses of the subchantry:

The subchantry of WELLS is by the yere in rents of the customarye tenants & demeane lands xiiij^{li} xiijs^s iiijd^d perquisits of the courts vjs^s viijd^d and rents resolut to the duke of Somerset for lands in Wotton xiijs^s iiijd^d rentt of the hundred of Frome ijs^s iiijli^{li} yerely to the vicars chorall of the sayd subchauntor & xiijs^s iiijd^d for the fee of Rychard Palmer steward & audytor of the sayd lands & xs for the fee of. Thomas Fulwell baylyf there & so reste clere---&ix -s. xvj d. (Valor Ecclesiasticus, 6 vols [London] 1810-1834, I, 130; also 127, 134, 135)

Besides this, Goodman also acquired 'the nominacion of the Chanter[ship?]called the morowe masse Chantery' in Wells

Cathedral (lawsuit 4), and on the feast of St Jerome 1545 there is a record of a priest being collated by him: 'At morrow mass, collated by the succentor'.¹⁸ In 1559, he was

18. H.M.C., Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, Vol. II (London, 1914), p.263.

also instituted to the rectory of Stoke under Hamdon on the presentation of Sir John Thinne (Bishops' Registers, p.152.899).

From these bald facts the impression emerges of a determined pluralist, who also exercised considerable influence on the patronage of benefices in Somerset: he presented no fewer than five clerics to benefices between 1554 and 1559 (Bishops' Registers, pp.132.755; 137.788; 151.887; 153.905; 155.916). The changes of religion from Catholic to Protestant under Henry VIII and Edward VI, back again to Catholic under Mary, to return to Protestant again under Elizabeth, do not seem to have bothered him unduly. In fact he exploited the situation under Edward VI to get himself appointed Dean of Wells by the king, an act which challenged the customary procedure of the time and led to legal complications over the deanery.

By 1535, then, Goodman was certainly in a position to reward his kinsman Fulwell for his long and faithful service to him. It seems that he decided to do this by leasing him some of the subchanter's lands and financing the costs of his marriage. On 14 February 1539, he leased Fulwell the whole, or a large portion, of the extensive subchanter's lands, on a long

lease of ninety-nine years, for the rent of £8 17s. per annum, and down payment of £30, which was paid by Thomas Fulwell and his father William (lawsuit 2). This lease was confirmed by the Bishop of Bath and Wells (then John Clerk) and the dean and chapter of Wells Cathedral 'by their sufficient Dedes sealed with their seales' (lawsuit 4).

It seems that Goodman did this less to benefit his kinsman than as a clever stroke which would alienate these church lands to the use of his own family for a very long period of time. He was probably, like many clergy at the time, made nervous by the compiling of the Valor Ecclesiasticus and the progressive spoliation of church lands by the crown which followed it. He was not the only cathedral clergyman to do so, as Phyllis Hembry has shown in her book on the diocese of Bath and Wells in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁹ No doubt Goodman thought that Thomas Fulwell,

19. Wolsey, for example, used his brief tenure of the bishopric 'to enrich his natural son, Thomas Winter, whom he made, as a schoolboy, dean of Wells' (Hembry, The Bishops of Bath and Wells, 1540-1640: Social and Economic Problems (London, 1967), p.52. Hembry gives numerous examples of the alienation of church lands through leases to relatives.

owing his prosperity to his patron, would prove a serviceable and pliant tool. But the deal went sour, and Thomas Fulwell unexpectedly rebelled against the control of his master. One way in which this rebellion was expressed was in his marriage to Christabel James, a marriage which was not approved or sanctioned by Goodman. Goodman complains in his answer to

Fulwell's bill of complaint in lawsuit 1 that Fulwell had 'married hym self with owte the mynde and assent' of Goodman. Goodman agreed to pay 'for the dyner & other charges of hys marriage' (ibid.), but in return, he wanted Fulwell to renounce the lease of the subchanter's lands. Fulwell refused. Goodman was not a man to be trifled with; in spite of the fact that Fulwell was legally in possession of the lands, Goodman entered them and tried to intimidate Fulwell by the use of physical violence. Fulwell had no alternative but to take the case to law to protect his interests, and even, perhaps, his life. So started the costly series of lawsuits, which were to continue at intervals until 1598, long after the death of the original combatants.

Fulwell's estrangement from his former master, and his new financial independence through the farming and sub-letting of the lands, must have led him to his new career: that of linen-draper. (We learn this from a reference in lawsuit 8.) The growing of flax and manufacture of linen was an important industry in Somerset at this time: every farmstead had its 'vlex-pit' and its 'vlex-shop'- pits in which the flax was steeped, and outhouses where it was 'hackled' and dressed (Victoria County History of Somerset, II, 423). Wells was noted for its cloth manufacturies; the public linen hall for the sale of linen was rebuilt in 1551. Leland noted that 'The streates have streamlettes of springes almost yn

every one running, and occupied in making of Cloth,²⁰ In

20. Quoted by Thomas Serel, A Lecture on the History of Wells (Wells, 1858; rptd. Wells Archaeological and Natural History Society, n.d.), pp.36, 55.

1554 Fulwell became a freeman of the city.²¹ There is one

21. Wells City Charters, edited by Dorothy O. Shilton and Richard Holworthy, Somerset Record Society, 46 (1932), p.179; the manuscript volumes, in Latin, of the Acts of the Corporation of Wells 1553-1623 are still preserved in the Town Hall; Fulwell's institution is in Vol. II, fo.3v.

further record of Thomas Fulwell: on 27 July 1557 he witnessed the will of a widow, Isabel Cole, of St. Cuthbert's parish, perhaps one of his neighbours in Wells.²² By this time he must

22. Somerset Medieval Wills (Third Series) 1531-1558, edited by F.W. Weaver, Somerset Record Society, 21 (1905), p.200.

have been comfortably off, a solid citizen of Wells.

Probably in the early 1540s he married Christabel James, the sister of Robert James of Wrington (lawsuit 9). As far as is known, they had only two children, Ulpian (born 1546), and George (born 1549).²³ Perhaps influenced by the

23. Calculated from the fact that George's age at matriculation at Oxford on 2 April 1579 was thirty (Clark, Register of the University of Oxford, II, i, 391); Appendix II, Fulwell Family Tree.

ecclesiastical atmosphere of Wells and hoping to benefit one of

his sons in the future by being able to give him a secure job and income, Thomas Fulwell acquired the advowson of Wedmore from George Payne, gentleman: on 8 October 1556 he presented Sir John Caselighe, clerk, to the benefice. He is described in Bishop Bourne's register as a merchant (Bishops' Registers, p.145.841). However, his patronage of the benefice was challenged a few years later by Goodman, in March 1559, when Goodman presented 'Sir Thomas Suarvon, clerk' to the vicarage of Wedmore; but the entry was cancelled, suggesting that Goodman's claim was doubtful (Bishops' Registers, p.155.916).

A more detailed picture of the relationship between Thomas Fulwell and his wife and John Goodman emerges from the lawsuits. They are long, repetitious, and often contradictory, but from them it is possible to get some insight into the characters as well as the social circumstances of the Fulwell family, and into the turbulent and violent times in which they lived. They also provide the background for Fulwell's attack on officials of Wells Cathedral in The Art of Flattery.

THE LAWSUITS OVER THE SUBCHANTER'S LANDS

Lawsuit 1: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman

The earliest lawsuit²⁴ in the series is unfortunately

24. Public Record Office, C 1/1121/41-44; indexed in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes Vol. LIV, List of Early Chancery Proceedings Vol. IX 1544-1553 (1933), p.46.

badly mutilated. It consists of four pieces: Thomas Fulwell's bill of complaint; John Goodman's answer; Thomas Fulwell's replication to the answer; and John Goodman's rejoinder to the replication. The parchment of the bill of complaint is rubbed, with the heading and the first five lines illegible, and it is also torn and stained, particularly on the right hand side affecting the endings of the lines; the other three pieces are also damaged on the right hand side, affecting a large portion of the text, and there are some large holes in the parchment. Because the heading of the bill of complaint is illegible, it is difficult to date the document with absolute certainty. The bill of complaint states that 'John goodman abowte vj yeres past or ther apon' leased the subchanter's lands to Fulwell for the term of ninety years; this lease was dated 14 February 1539 (lawsuit 2), so the date of the bill of complaint is about 1545.²⁵

25. This dating is roughly confirmed by the second lawsuit, which refers to lawsuit 1 as being directed to the then Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas Wriothesley, 'now Earl of Southampton'. Wriothesley was made keeper of the great seal during Sir Thomas Audley's illness on

22 April 1544, and succeeded him as lord chancellor after his death, on 3 May 1544; he was not created Earl of Southampton until 16 February 1547.

(Wriothesley, DNB, XXI, 1065; Handbook of British Chronology, edited by F.M. Powicke et al. (London, 1939), p.70).

Although the lawsuit is fragmentary, a rough chronology emerges which reveals the existence of a former chancery lawsuit about the subchanter's lands. According to Goodman's answer to the bill of complaint, Fulwell was 'in seruice' with Goodman and received 'his meate drynk & apparell'. When Goodman became subchanter, he intended to reward his service, and to that end 'causid a draught of a lesse to be drawen' of the subchanter's lands, or a portion of them, 'vnsealed vnsigned safly to be kept vnto suche tyme he knew whether...' - the rest of the sentence is tantalizingly missing, but it appears to have something to do with Fulwell's marriage, for the next line complains that Fulwell 'married hym self wt owt the mynde & assent' of Goodman. Even though he disapproved of the marriage, Goodman generously paid 'for the dyner & other charges of hys mariage'.

Goodman never admits to having leased the whole of the subchanter's lands; but he does state that he leased Fulwell 'land & [a] close by portwey And...[a] close called farthyng...lyenge by portwey' containing three acres. A close is an enclosed field; Portway is a street in Wells, and just such enclosed fields may be seen on each side of it in Sime's map of 1735. Fulwell occupied this property for one year and duly paid rent. Goodman refers to a former chancery suit

about the lands: that persons (in the plural) pretending 'to have a lesse of the premisses' complained to the Lord Chancellor; he also mentions an injunction, but this part of his answer is damaged. The 'persons' he mentions may be the tenants to whom Fulwell sub-let portions of the lands, for they too were forced to go to law to protect themselves and their tenancies (below, lawsuit 3). After the lawsuit and injunction, 'a commynycation was had' between Goodman and Fulwell. It seems that Goodman tried to pressure Fulwell into giving up his right in the premises: '[the] Compleynant shuld delyuer & geve his right that he had yn the same'; he would also remain in Goodman's service and attend him when he 'dyd ryde & shuld wayt on hym euery holyday'. In return, Goodman would pay him the large sum of forty pounds, and Fulwell would have 'a Close conteynyng iiij acre lyeng by portwey for terme of his lyff', paying rent the details of which are missing. Goodman denies that Fulwell gave him thirty pounds for the lease of all the subchanter's lands, or that the lease was 'lawfully ratified & confyrmyd'. He also denies that he entered into the premises, or that he threatened Fulwell and 'seid that it shuld cost hym a C^{ld}, - i.e. a hundred pounds, presumably meaning that he would make it very expensive in legal costs if Fulwell dared to cross him.

Fulwell's replication to Goodman's answer fills in some of the details missing through the defects of the manuscript, although, as mentioned, it too has gaps. He states that Goodman 'grauntyd and to fferme lett...vij mesys [messuages? i.e. dwellings] CCCC Acre of land with ther Appurtenances'.

This lease was ratified and confirmed by the dean and chapter of Wells Cathedral. But Goodman got 'in to his possession moste vntrewly the said lease and expulsed therof the complaynant wherupon he was forced' to obtain 'the kinges writt of Iniuncyon dyrectyd to the said John Goodman commaundyng hym therby to suffer the compleynant' to occupy the premises in peace. In spite of this Goodman, being a very obstinate man, and holding the king's 'proces or lawes in greatt contempt dothe kepe the possession of the premysses manassyng and threatnyng' him, and does not allow him to 'occupye and enyoy the said premisses [according] to the tenor of the said wrett' (of injunction). Fulwell claims that Goodman caused one Doctor Cretyng, an archdeacon of the cathedral,²⁶ to intervene and negotiate a deal (this must be

26. Walter Cretyng was Archdeacon of Bath from 1536 to 1555 (Pastis Ecclesiae Anglicanae, compiled by John le Neve and T. Duffus Hardy, 3 vols (Oxford, 1854), I, 165).

the 'communication' that Goodman referred to); and he 'offeryd to gyve the complaynant xl^{ld} for his said interest'.

Fulwell denies Goodman's contention that he (Goodman) only drew up a draft of a lease, not the final product, and gave it 'to one Smythe clerk of the chapter safely to be kept' for certain considerations. Meanwhile Goodman has got the lease into his hands, and Fulwell 'hathe demanded and cleymed' it 'dyuerse and often tymes and the said deff. most vntreuwly and craftely somtyme hath promysed the same...at

other tyme manassed & threatened yor orator to vndoo hym if he demaunded it', and has put him off with 'sutche delayes & triflynge'. He denies that he has given up his right in the premises.

In his rejoinder to the replication, Goodman again asserts that he gave only a draft of the lease to Smythe, 'vnseald & Onsygned', and that 'yff eny suche surmysed lease wer sygned & sealed yt was don by the seyde Smythe'. In other words, he implies that the clerk of the chapter had forged the lease! He denies that Fulwell and his father ever paid thirty pounds 'in the maner of a fyne for the premysses or eny parcell therof'. He also denies that he got the lease into his hands and expelled Fulwell, or that he keeps possession of the premises 'incontempte of the kyngs lawes' or that he 'dothe manasse or threten' Fulwell 'to vndoo him'. He also denies that, in the presence of Archdeacon Cretyng, he offered Fulwell forty pounds to renounce his rights in the premises. In short, he denies everything asserted by Fulwell.

Perhaps Dr Cretyng was questioned as to the truth of Fulwell's assertion that he witnessed Goodman's efforts to get Fulwell to give up his interest, but no interrogatories survive. Neither have I managed to find the judgement; but it must have been in Fulwell's favour, for he continued in possession of the subchanter's lands.

Lawsuit 2: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman

Fulwell was allowed to remain in peaceful possession for three years; then trouble erupted once more. This time, Goodman was not content with verbal threats, but instigated a violent attack on his cousin. This sorry episode is related

in the next surviving lawsuit, brought by Thomas Fulwell against John Goodman in 1547 in the court of Star Chamber.²⁷

-
27. P.R.O. Star Chamber Proceedings 3 (Edward VI) 5/50; indexed in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes Vol. XIII, List of Proceedings in the Court of Star Chamber Vol. I 1485-1558; and A.L. Humphreys, Somersetshire Parishes, 2 vols (London, 1906), II, 735; discussed in Ribner I, p.445.
-

This can be dated with some accuracy since it is directed to the Lord Chancellor Sir William Paulett, whose chancellorship lasted only from 7 March to 23 October 1547 (Powicke, Handbook of British Chronology, p.70). The lawsuit refers to an assault on Fulwell on 'Aboute the xijth day of July last past' (Fulwell's bill of complaint), which left him dangeroulsy ill for two weeks. Goodman's reply to the interrogatories addressed to him is dated 23 October 1547, so the lawsuit must have been filed between the end of July and October of 1547. It consists of six pieces: Thomas Fulwell's bill of complaint; Goodman's answer; Fulwell's replication; Goodman's rejoinder to the replication; Fulwell's interrogatories to Goodman; and Goodman's reply to the interrogatories.

In this second lawsuit more details are given concerning the extent and location of the subchanter's lands: they are referred to in Fulwell's bill of complaint as 'certen messuages landes ten[ement]es hereditamentes...in Wotton Wells & Walcombe in... Somersett called the over land of the old Astre ground'. Elworthy in his West Somerset Word-book (1886) defines 'overland' as 'land having no farm-house upon

it.... Any piece of land let without farm buildings is called 'a overland"' (quoted OED 'overland'). The four hundred acres specified in the previous lawsuit, then, consisted of extensive holdings, both with buildings (messuages, tenements) and without (overland). Walcombe is just to the north of Wells; perhaps Wotton Wells is the modern North Wootton, about three miles to the south east of Wells.

In his bill of complaint, Fulwell repeats some of the information given in the first lawsuit: that, in consideration 'as well of xxx^{ld} starling' paid by himself and his father William, '& also for the good s[er]vice that yor orator hath donn to hym by the space of xiiij yeres or therabowtes ^t w owt any maner of wages takyn', Goodman leased him the subchanter's lands for ninety years at 'the vsuall rent of old tymes accustomed to be payd', £8 17s. The lease was dated 14 February 30 Henry VIII (1539), and was 'ratyfyed and confirmed' by the Dean and Chapter of Wells Cathedral. But then Goodman 'most craftely and vntruly dyd geat the said leas in his custody & wold not delyuer the same to yor orator but entryd in to the premysses & the same wrongfully occupied contrarye to his sayd leas'. Fulwell complained to Sir Thomas Wriothesley, Lord Chancellor, for redress, and was granted a writ of injunction against Goodman 'commanding hem to suffer yor orator to haue & hold the sayd premysses without lett or disturbans of hym or of any other person or persons by his procurement or meanes'. Goodman ignored this injunction, and 'contempnyng the same contynued in possession' until Fulwell 'exhibited one other byll of complent' - i.e. the

chancery suit just discussed.²⁸ We now learn the judgement of

28. If lawsuit 1 is dated 1545, the previous lost lawsuit must have been some time after 3 May 1544 when Wriothesley was made Lord Chancellor.

lawsuit 1: Goodman was committed to the Fleet prison 'ther to remayn vnto souch tyme as he had fully satysfied & agreid w^t yor sayd orator for the sayd wronges vnto hem commyttyd'. Fulwell must have felt triumphant as his former master was incarcerated until he signed new indentures which 'dyd covenant that yor sayd orator should enioy and occupye the sayd premysses'. To make assurance doubly sure Goodman was 'bounden in one Recognisaunce knowledged in the kynges court of his Chauncerye...for the sure performans ther off', and he had to redeliver the indentures of the lease to Fulwell.

Goodman was temporarily chastened by this experience; he allowed Fulwell to remain in peaceful possession of the premises 'by the space of three yeres', but his resentment resurfaced and:

myndyng vtterly to vndoo yor sayd orator Aboute the xijth day of July last past caused his servantes t^t his weyn and his oxen to enter in to the premysses & ther to take & cary awaye ten lode of yor orators hay newly moen and hit caryed in to the house of the sayd Goodman & greuously bete & wounded yor sayd orator that he lay ij wekes in souch extreme daunger of dethe that all his surgeantes & phesycions vtterly despared his helth to his grete cost and utter vndoyng.

Goodman realised he had gone too far, and he and his servants

fearyng lest yor orator should haue dyed of his sayd woundes ffledd owt of the Country & hidd ther goodes in woodvynes & other straunge places that hit might not be seysed of the kynges officers.

The assault occurred between twelve and one o'clock at night. One can imagine Thomas Fulwell issuing out of doors in the middle of the night to investigate strange noises, the creaking of the wain and oxen, perhaps, as Richard Wennye (alias Venny or Wenham), Thomas Tayler and Richard Peers, servants of John Goodman, '& other by consent or procurement of the said John Goodman' (according to interrogatory 4) were loading up the hay. In interrogatory 6 a Christopher White is added to the band of assailants, which would make it four to one against Fulwell. The fourth interrogatory states that they 'toke and caryed aweye at seuerall tymes x lode of haye & grasse & hit dyd mengle to to gether with his [Goodman's] owne haye yn a Rycke'.

After his recovery from this vicious assault, Fulwell was again obliged to go to law: in his bill of complaint he requests that Goodman 'nowe being in the Citye of London' be summoned before the court of Star Chamber. Ribner deduces that Goodman fled to London to avoid the consequences of his actions (Ribner I, p.445). Fulwell meanwhile had been busy in Somerset, on the local level, for he wants Goodman to answer to

certen deposicions ageynst hem takyn in the sayd Countye of Somersett by certen Justices of peace therunto apoyntyd by the auctoryte of the hole benche att the last Cessions general holden w in the said Countye. Wch deposicions remayne in the custodie of Sir William Portesman knight one of the Kynges Justices of hys Benche. (bill of complaint)

(Sir William Portman. was appointed judge in 1547, and was knighted by Edward VI (DNB, XVI, 199-200).)

In Goodman's answer to the bill of complaint, he admits the 'covenant' referred to which he was forced to sign in prison, and gives its exact date: 28 June 37 Henry VIII (1545). In it he promised to allow Fulwell to enjoy and occupy the lands 'w^t owt lett interrupcion vexacion expulsyon or dysturbance', either by himself or others procured by him. He also acknowledges that he was bound in a recognisance in the court of Chancery. But he claims that in the former lease to Fulwell, presumably the original lease of 1539, there had been a proviso:

specyfyed in these wordes that is to saye provided
 Always that this lease or indenture of Any thyng
 therin expressed be nott preiudycyall to Any
 fformer lease or leases graunted to one Wylllyam
 ffullar Jerad Erryngton or to Any other butt that
 they shall contynewe in the same accordyng to
 suche tytles & int[er]este As they haue in the same.

Goodman further states that he had made a prior lease of parcel of the subchanter's lands to Robert Goodman (his brother?), by a pair of indentures dated 14 May 28 Henry VIII (1536). This would predate Fulwell's lease by three years. He had let to Robert Goodman 'All those his over londes w^t thappurtenances belongyng to the seid office'. Robert Goodman in turn, 'As he hathe harde ytt reported', made a lease of 'one parcell' of the lands to one Rychard Wenham, 'that is to saye of one Close called Wykemedede otherwyse called myllhames conteynyng by estymacion syxe Acres to hold at the wyll of the seid Robt Goodman'. This must be the Richard Wennye referred to by Fulwell as one of the band who attacked him. Goodman claims that Wenham 'by fforce of his seyde lease entred into the seide

Close called myllhame': implying that it was Fulwell who was in illegal occupation of the close, and Wenham was merely asserting his legal right to possession of the premises.

Goodman next had to explain how it was that Wenham came to use his (Goodman's) wain and oxen for removing Fulwell's hay. He claims that he had an 'Agrement & lease longe tyme before made' between himself and Wenham whereby Wenham would use the wain and oxen 'As Well to compaster [i.e. manure] & occupye his owne landes and Caryagys As also to tyll serteyne londes [of Goodman's]...And to Carye othere necessarye caryage of the seyde Deff[endant] ffor mayntenances of his house'. Goodman claims that he knows nothing about any affray made between Wenham and Fulwell 'Aboute the caryage of the seid haye'; he supposes that there was some 'stryffe' between them, but he was not privy to it and 'the same ought not to be layed to his charge'. Goodman denies that he caused his servants to enter the premises, take the hay, and assault Fulwell.

Fulwell, in his replication to Goodman's answer, denies the former leases to William Fuller, Jerrarde Erryngton or any other; he very emphatically denies the prior lease made to Robert Goodman:

And yf any suche Indenture doyth appeare he sayth that the same is voyd and craftely made with one antedate by subtile devyse of the said defendant to thentent that vnder the Colour therof the said defendant yn the name of the said Robert myght dystorbe the said Complaynant of his lawfull possessyon yn the premysses without yncurryng of the daunger of the said Recognysanc.

He denies that Goodman had an agreement allowing Wenham to use his wain and oxen; on the contrary, Goodman 'delyuered the sayd wayen and Oxen as his proper goodes to the sayd wenham as to his seruant comaundyng hym to carye away the said heye...owt of the premysses'.

Goodman's rejoinder to Fulwell's replication merely reaffirms what he has formerly said, and Fulwell had a set of interrogatories administered to him under oath, in an attempt to pin him down. He was successful to a certain extent, for Goodman is forced to reveal, suspiciously, that the lease made to 'Jered Erington' was made 'by worde of mouthe'. Goodman is noticeably vaguer, and he seems to change his mind in the course of his answer to interrogatory 3 - 'what leases he hadde made of the premisses or of any parte of the same before the said leas to the said ffullwell and to what persons'. He refers to the prior lease to Robert Goodman 'and an other lease to oone m^r Vernell' is crossed out. He denies that Richard Wenny (alias Wenham) is his servant, and says that he has heard that Wenny and Fulwell 'dyd lyrke together and made an affraye in the wiche they wer bothe hurte'. This makes the attack sound like a squabble between the two men, rather than an organised act of aggression by four or more men on the unsuspecting Fulwell in the middle of the night.

Fulwell also probes him in the first interrogatory as to why he was sent to the Fleet prison by the Lord Chancellor, but Goodman refuses to be drawn. According to Fulwell, it was because of Goodman's contempt of court in ignoring the

injunction commanding him to let Fulwell have the peaceful possession of the subchanter's lands. But Goodman merely suggests that it was because of his impatience at the law's delays: 'that the same matter hanging in the saide Courte of Chancery this deponent departyd his waye home'. He claims that it was not the Lord Chancellor himself who committed him to the Fleet, but only one of the commissioners in the court of Chancery. Goodman makes his imprisonment out to be something relatively unimportant.

Ribner states in his article that 'the replication, rejoinder and one deposition add nothing of further interest' (Ribner I, p.445), but he has overlooked some evidence in the interrogatories, and the answers to them, of Goodman's harassment of Fulwell on a more personal level. This emerges in Goodman's disapproval of Fulwell's marriage and his antagonism towrds his wife. Fulwell's insistence on marrying Christabel James seems to have started or at least exacerbated the conflict between them. This is Goodman's version of the events:

he confessith that he caused a Lease to be made in writing to the said p^t [plaintiff] of all his landes and [illegible word] belonging to his saide subchauntership for the terme of lxxxx. yeres...but saith that before the delyuerye of the saide Lease furthe of this deponents handes to the saide pl[aintiff] The said pl[aintiff] being then this deponents seruant and his kynsman desyred this deponent to haue his fauor and goodwyll to the mariage of his wife that now ys. Wiche this deponent denyed vnto him at the fyrst and was very Lothe therof myndinge to haue provided vnto him a muche more better mariage The said pl[aintiff] then persyvering styll in maryeinng this deponent [mistake for plaintiff?] to haue his favor therin sayde he was contentyd to renounce during the tyme of this deponents lyfe all such Lyving or other

things as this deponent had provided for him and to take what so euer this deponent wolde gyve him.... wherin...he percyving that the saide pl[aintiff] was so bent toward the same mariage dyd ther revoke his Lease so made and at the contemplacion of the vicar of mere the said playntyfes friende then ther present this deponent neuerthelesse was contentyd and promised to gyve vnto him a golde to Iewell [?] in wiche cost this deponent xiiij^ld and also to bear all the charges of his mariage in dyner and soper to the charges and cost of xxx^l as he saithe wherewith all the saide pl[aintiff] was very well contentyd / as he saithe so departyd.

(Goodman's answer to interrogatory 2)

It seems inherently improbable that Fulwell would have exchanged his valuable lease in the subchanter's lands, amounting to about four hundred acres and including houses which he could sublet, as well as 'closes' which he could profitably farm - as witness his haymaking activity - for a jewel worth fourteen pounds and a marriage celebration costing thirty pounds. Also this version of events still does not get around the lease of 14 February 1539 - a lease which Goodman is always vague about but which he tacitly admits existed, although he always claims that it had a proviso relating to other former leases to other individuals. Since Goodman had got both halves of the indenture into his hands, it can never be produced as evidence, so his statements can never be checked. But it was ratified and confirmed by the Dean and Chapter of Wells Cathedral, so there must have been independent evidence of its existence.

However, there is another piece of evidence of Goodman's antagonism to Fulwell's wife. This appears in an extra, unnumbered interrogatory which is scrawled in a different hand and added on at the end, as if by an afterthought:

Itm whether this deponent dyd not procure a warrant of Mr Maudlyn agenst cristobell fullwell for that she had corrected her seruant Margott.

Goodman replies that Fulwell's wife had 'ouer chastisyd a mayden seruant of hers being this deponents kynswoman and had very extremely beaten her'. He therefore 'sent to m^r maudelyn Justice of peas[?] ther desyring him to take some ord^r therin that his saide kynswoman myghte be honestely ordred'. One wonders what the truth of the matter was. Did Christabel Fulwell extremely beat her servant? Or is this a malicious slander? Fulwell perhaps felt that it was an unjustifiable interference in the running of his household, and another of Goodman's attempts to make trouble for him. On this sordid domestic note the lawsuit ends. No judgement survives: as Ribner points out, Star Chamber decrees were destroyed during the Commonwealth. But Fulwell was again successful, for among the accounts of the Communar of Wells Cathedral for 1547 to 1548 is the entry of a receipt for 2 13s. 4d. 'from Dean Goodman, for letters patent to Thomas Fulwell' (Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, II, 267; quoted Ribner I, 445).

Lawsuit 3: John Bucher vs. John Stephins et al.

Not only was Fulwell subjected to harassment aimed at evicting him from the subchanter's lands, but so were his tenants. This emerges in a hitherto unnoticed lawsuit between John Bucher and John Stephins, Robert Stephins, Jasper Swarthe, John Basing and John Horner, in the court of Star Chamber.²⁹

29. P.R.O. Star Chamber 3/Edward VI/5/31; indexed in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes No. XIII: Lists of Proceedings in the Court of Star Chamber Vol. I 1485-1558 (London, 1910), p.281; also in Humphreys, Somersetshire Parishes, p.735.

The lawsuit consists only of the bill of complaint, addressed to 'the kinges moost excellent maiestie'; the answer of the defendants does not survive, nor does the judgement. The bill reveals that John Bucher leased from Thomas Fulwell (also called 'Fulwood' in the bill) a tenement and fourteen acres of land, meadow and pasture 'with thappurtenances' in Barkley, Somerset, part of the subchanter's lands leased by Goodman to Fulwell on 14 February 1539. (Berkley is about twenty miles east of Wells near the Wiltshire border.) His lease was dated 25 March 1546, and was for twenty-one years. Bucher states that he has enjoyed the profits for six years. But on 5 October 1550:

Iohn Stephins Roberte Stephins and Iasper Swarthe with divers other riotuous and misruled parsons to yor said subiecte vnknownen to the numbere of viij persons at the leaste riotuuslie and in moost riotuous forcible and cruell manner beinge araied with swordes bucklers daggers staves billes and other weapons defensive assembled them selves at Barkeley afforesaid...And then and ther in suche riotuous forcible and cruell manner without collor or title entred into the said tenement and xiiij acres of lande vpon the possession of yor saide subiecte / And expulsed and put furthe yor said subiecte out of the same and the possession therof did detaine and kepe in suche riotuous and forcible maner.

They occupied the premises for five months, from 5 October 1550 to 1 March 1551, 'to the greate losse and hinderance' of Bucher.

It seems that Bucher must have somehow regained possession, although he does not explain how, for on 'the iiijth day of Octobre laste paste' [1551? or later?], Bucher was subjected to a second assault:

And not thus contented the said Iohn Stephins together with one Roger basinge gent Iohn horner and divers other riotuous and misruled parsons to yor said subiecte vnknownen to the numbere of .x. parsons at the least the iiijth day of Octobre laste paste riotuouslie and in moost riotuousli [sic] and forcible manner with force and armes that is to say with staves daggers swordes buckelers billis and other weapons defensive at Barkeley afforesaid did breke vp the doores and entred againe in to the said tenement and in to the said xiiij acres of lande and pasture putting yor said subiecte and his children in greate parill and feare.

Bucher requests the king to grant writs of subpoena to the assailants commanding them to appear in the court of Star Chamber to answer the charges against them. Unfortunately, we do not know the outcome of the suit: whether they were summoned before the court, and whether Bucher regained possession of the property.

It is tempting to see the hand of John Goodman behind this assault. Goodman was determined to get back the profitable subchanter's lands which he had so unwisely leased to his kinsman for ninety years. By the process of harassment over a period of years, both of Fulwell and his tenants, he hoped to do so. Although the lawsuit is undated, it must be between 4 October 1551 (the earliest date possible for the second assault) and 6 July 1553, when Edward VI died.

The Turner Letters

In the meantime, Goodman had managed to get himself promoted from subchanter to dean of Wells, on 7 January 1548. He did this, not through the normal procedure of bishop and chapter, but by letters patent from the king, Edward VI, from whom the chapter at Wells received a peremptory communication:

Mandate of King Edward VI for the installation of the dean. The late dean, [William] FitzWilliam, having made a complete surrender of the deanery and decanal dignity into his hands, the king now, by virtue of an act of the present parliament, reconstitutes the latter, and in exercise of his rights as patron confers it upon John Goodman, assigns to him the canonical house lately occupied by John Dakyn, and orders the chapter to install him.
(Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, II, 266)

Goodman did not relinquish the subchanter's lands, but had them transferred to the deanery. His manipulations aroused the resentment of the chapter and in November 1549 they petitioned the king, complaining

that the act of 1 Edw. VI was procured by the dean, John Goodman, and his friends, without the knowledge of the chapter; that...the deanery is endowed with the archdeaconry, the sub-chantership, the prebend of Curry and the provostship. (ibid., II, 269)

In his greed, Goodman overreached himself, and he was deprived from the deanery for pluralism: he 'has vacated office by taking the prebend of Wyveliscombe in addition to his other preferments' (ibid., II, 273).

Perhaps in an attempt to clean up the tarnished reputation of the deanery, the extreme protestant and famous herbalist William Turner was appointed dean in Goodman's place in 1551 (ibid., II, 273). A different picture of the relationship between Goodman and Fulwell is given in Turner's letters than that which emerges in the lawsuits. The lawsuits convey a conflict, exacerbated by a personal antagonism and malice on the part of Goodman; Turner's letters suggest a collusion between the two, to defraud the church and Goodman's successors in office of their rightful dues, traditional perquisites and income. Turner's letters were written

to Cecil in 1551, when Turner was attempting to take possession of the deanery. He complains that Goodman refuses to vacate the house or the land belonging to it (now including the subchanter's lands): 'I am dene here in Wellis, but i can nether get house nor one foot of lande.'³⁰ Goodman turned the

30. British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, No.2/63/139-140, fo. 139, Turner to Cecil, 23 April [1551]. Extracts from this letter were printed in B. Dayden Jackson's life of Turner (1877), reprinted in Turner's Libellus de Re Herbaria 1538, The Names of Herbes 1548, facsimiles edited by W.T. Stearn, Ray Society (London, 1965), p.19.

the deanery into a fortress; as in his dealings with Fulwell, his reaction to opposition was to resort to violence:

he causith ^eȝ hous to be kept ^tȝ all kynde of wepones and violence ^eȝ i shuld not entre ther into. I have not hearde ^eȝ a denery so great as thys was, shulde be so sore shavēn, that ^eȝ dene shulde not haue a house to hyde hys hede in? i preache euery sonday as well as i can. & teach ^eȝ peple obedience unto theyr rulers as myche as i am able, [this would appeal to Cecil] & i ryde sūm tyme abroad to preache: but where i shulde haue a dosen closes and medowes for my horses i can not get one; for Goodman whiche was of late dene here, the craftiest fox ^eȝ euer went ypon ij fete, let [off?] vnto hys cosin Fullwell all ^eȝ hole subchantorship in one lease; and afterwarde abrogatyng ^eȝ same, took into hys own handis all ^eȝ hole subchantre, sauyng v[?] closes and one ferme, & ^eȝ also by lease, where of we haue ^eȝ copy in our register: & ye may se now a copi if it please yow. in ^eȝ handes of thys bearer. But he now seying ^eȝ he must forgo ^eȝ subchantorship, hath gyuen unto hys cosin ^eȝ old lease agayn vncancelled & byddeth hym stik unto ^eȝ. What is your counsell in thys if ye haue any leysure.

Turner ends the letter pathetically by begging Cecil to help him to some kind of house, that 'i may ether haue ^eȝ olde denes howse or sum other, ^tȝ i may study in and haue sum place to lay my bookes in....a restyng place for me and my pore chylde' (ibid., fo.139-139^v).

A month later he wrote again, still homeless, and distracted from his studies by crying children. He again complains of Goodman's alienation of the subchanter's lands, and of the consequent lack of pasturage for his horses. (This gives an insight into why Goodman attacked Fulwell in June or July, at hay-making time, and tried to take his hay: it was an economic necessity for him to get fodder for his horses, as Turner's letters suggest). Turner writes to Cecil on 22 May 1551 that he is

penned vp in a chamber of my lorde of bathes w^t all my ho[ws] holde seruantes and children as shepe in a pyndfolde, i p[ray?] you if there be any remedy in thys mater y^e i may haue your spedy help for now i can not go to my booke for y^e crying of childer & noyse y^e is made in my chamber. Furthermore Where as i haue y^e subchantry landes by y^e reson of the deanry, i cannot entre into one foote of lande neth[er] one close to put an horse in. Where as y^e former dean occupied the last year xiiij closes. I can haue no help of any man here to set me in to my lande. and my lorde of summersettis chefe seruantis ar the greatest enemies that i haue here [?]. & noman manteynithe goodmannis frendes which holde me out of all possession.

(P.R.O. SP/10/13/19, fo.39-39^v; Calendar of State Papers Domestic Vol. I 1547-1580 (1856), p.33)

If Turner obtained the dean's house his triumph was short-lived, for on the accession of Mary in 1553 he fled from England and Goodman was reinstated as dean.

Lawsuit 4: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman et al.

Although Thomas Fulwell had now been to law three times (though only two cases have survived) over the subchanter's lands, he was subjected to yet a further assault from Goodman. This appears in another Star Chamber lawsuit

addressed to Philip and Mary and dated 1558.³¹ It consists

31. P.R.O., Star Chamber 4/Philip & Mary 8/ 24; indexed in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes XIII, Proceedings in the Court of Star Chamber Vol. I, 1485-1558, p.324. The date appears as an endorsement on the bill of complaint: 'tres mus[?] 1558'.

of a single sheet only, the bill of complaint of Fulwell directed against John Goodman, his nephew William Goodman, Paul Parker, Thomas Egill, William Davye and John Lewis. The document is damaged in the top right hand corner, affecting six lines of the text.

The first part of the lawsuit is devoted to a summary of events to date: that Goodman leased to Fulwell for ninety years 'all those his overlandes cotages tenementes Rentes of the Olde Aister grownd' excepting only 'all maner of ffynes of the olde Aister lande and herriottes...also the nominacion of the Chanter[ship?] called the morowe masse Chantery within the said Cathedrall Churche' of Wells. Fulwell was accordingly possessed of the premises until Goodman 'by a Craftie and vntrewe practise gatt the said [ded]e of Lees into his handes and then ymmediatly expulsed yo^r said Subiect owt of the same premisses with violence'. Fulwell then recounts his suit in chancery: how he had an injunction served on Goodman commanding him to allow Fulwell to occupy the premises peacefully and 'take the proffittes', and also ordering him to deliver the deed of lease to Fulwell. This Goodman refused:

not w^tstandinge the said John Goodman immediatly after interupted yo^r said Subiecte for the occupacion of the same and therupon...Goodman beinge therof founde false was sent to the fflete.

There follows the recognisance he was forced to enter into;

his redelivery of the lease to Fulwell, and then the physical assault when 'diuers riotous persons by his commandement... did beate yo^r saide Subiecte that he kept his bedde by the space of xiiij wekes by reason therof & was by no meanes able to remove owt of the same'; then follows the Star Chamber suit (lawsuit 2).

So far we already know these facts from the lawsuits discussed; but now Fulwell adds some new information which indicates the vexation and legal expense he was put to in order to defend himself against Goodman's attempts to 'undo' him:

the said John Goodman not beinge contented with all these vexacions & troubles vsid vnto yo^r said Subiecte aboute iiij yeres last past [i.e. 1555?] entrid into iiij Acres of Medowe parcell of the premisses and expulcid yo^r said Subiecte from his lafull and quyett possession of the same and therof toke the profittes to his owne vse whervpon yo^r said Subiect abowte three yeres laste past commenced an Accion of quare eiectione firme against the said John Goodman whervnto the said John Goodman pledid in Barre & Surrendre of the same iiij Acres parcell of the premisses...whervpon. they were at yssue and at the Last assyses holden at Chard in...Somerset yo^r said Subiect by nisiprius recouered the same iiij. Acres by verdict of xij men vpon the said Accion / And in Easter terme last past had Judgem^t to recouer the said iiij. Acres and had execucion therof.

The action of 'quare eiectione firme' is an 'action brought by lessee who had been ejected before the expiration of his term';³² by the writ of 'ejectio firmæ' (literally, ejectment

32. Definition of 'eiectione firme' given by W.J. Jones, The Elizabethan Court of Chancery (Oxford, 1967), p.501.

from farm) an action of trespass is brought (Blackstone, 1768; quoted in OED 'ejectment', 2). Goodman's counter-move seems

to have been designed to get the case dismissed: 'Barre is when the defendant in any action pleadeth a plea which is a sufficient answer, and that destroyeth the action of the plaintife for ever' (Termes de lā Ley, 1641, quoted in OED 'bar' sb.¹ II.18). Surrender, in its legal sense, can mean the giving up of a lease before its expiration (OED 'surrender' sb.¹.a.). Goodman's ploy failed; Fulwell countered with a writ of nisi prius, which confined the case to the justices of assize, i.e. the local, county court (Jones, Elizabethan Court of Chancery, p.502); and the Somerset jury brought down a verdict in his favour. (There is still a courtroom called the nisi prius court in Wells town hall.)

Fulwell once again repossessed the premises, and paid the half year's rent which was due, which, he notes, John Goodman received and pocketed. But Goodman, despite this new legal judgement, 'cotynewed [sic] his said malicious & lewde Disposicion' and he

entred into the premisses recouered and did cutt
downe the grasse growinge vpon the same iiij Acres
and made hit into Haye.

Another violent confrontation developed between Goodman's henchmen and Fulwell and his wife Cristabel. Fulwell

beinge vpon the said iiij Acres of Medowe the^{xxj}^{ti}
Daie of June last past in goddes peace and yo^r
highnesses and havinge his [i.e. Fulwell's] oxen &
wayne...redy to carry the same Hay awaye and beinge
Ladinge of the said Haye in his said wayne as lafull
was for him to doe/ one William Goodman Nephew to
the said John Goodman & powle parker al[lan?]
Phillippes John Everrert & Thomas Egell & diuerse
others Riotus malisious & exill Disposed persons
beinge Riotuously arrayed wth swordes Daggers Pikes
and other warlike weapons invasive & defensive by
the commaundement of the said John Goodman Clerke

entrid into the said iiij Acres of medowe...and
 their pricked the Oxen of yo^r said Subiecte w^{ch}
 yo^r highnesses [sic] said Subiect had there Redye
 for the carryenge awaye of the said Haye And then
 yo^r said Subiect required them to lett him his
 seruantes and Cattall to remayne there and quyetly
 to carry awaye his said Haye and the said Riotous
 persons Aunswered that yo^r highnesses said Subiect
 shuld carry no Haye from thens / And therupon in
 most spitefull wise pulled Downe all the Haye
 agayne that was loden & said they wold Cary the
 same awaye them selves.

Fulwell, remembering his past beating, prudently retreated:

by reason of w^{ch} cruell Demeno^r and for that yo^r
 said Subiect hath ben evill entreatid at their
 handes before this tyme was then presently
 threatened by the said Riotous persons yo^r Said
 Subiect Departid.

However, Christabel Fulwell stood her ground and rebuked
 Goodman's thugs, who included two Frenchmen, William Davye
 and John Lewis 'and other ffrenchemen' who were servants
 of Goodman, and who 'entrid forcibly & in Ryotous maner'
 into the meadow:

the wief of yo^r Highnesses said Subiecte and one
 other then beinge vpon the same grounde & yo^r
 highnesses subiect said wief required the said
 Ryotous persons to cease their vnlawfull Demeanor
 & then and there the said William Goodman strake
 the said wief...in the Brest in suche sorte as
 she fell to the grounde & then & there was put
 in great perill of her lief.

William Goodman and company then transported the hay to a
 meadow of John Goodman's adjoining that of Fulwell, and
 'myngyd' (mingled) it with Goodman's hay, 'in suche sorte',
 Fulwell complains, that he 'is not able to come to his
 owne Haye agayne'. The Goodman faction felt itself to be
 triumphant, as Fulwell bitterly reports:

the said Ryotous persons made a great Showte or

Crye as thoughe the said Ryotous persons had won
A great victory w^{ch} Crye was to the admir[ation?] of all those that hard the same.

Fulwell complains of these incessant 'Cruell vexacions', that he is not able 'without Daring of his lief & breache of yo^r Highnesses peace' to occupy this meadow, and that he is 'contynually vexed thorough the ontollerable charges... thorough the multitude of sewtes by him susteyned'. He fears that he 'shalbe Dreven to leve and geve ouer his laufull possession of & in the premysses to his vtter vndoinge'. Presumably this lawsuit too was successful - no judgement survives - although Fulwell's legal successes must have seemed like Pyrrhic victories over the incorrigible Goodman.

By 1559 the situation with regard to leases made by cathedral officials in Wells had become a public scandal, and an attempt was made to regulate the abuses by a Royal Injunction:

Whereas by examination it appeareth that there be divers leases which heretofore have disorderly passed the chapter seal of this church, being sealed in the presence of a small number of the chapter, much to the hindrance of this church, it is ordered and decreed that from henceforth there shall be no lease or other writing sealed with chapter seal or common seal of this church, but in the presence of the Dean for the time being, and three at least of the eldest canons who have the custody of the keys. And when there is no dean, then in the presence of the president of the chapter and three other of the eldest canons of this church at the least present.
(Royal Injunctions for Wells Cathedral, 1559, reprinted in Visitation Articles and Injunctions, edited by W.H. Frere, 3 vols, Alcuin Club XVI (London, 1910), III, 37)

This would not have been very effective with the corrupt Goodman as dean, but by this time he had again been deprived,

and the stricter Turner reinstated.

Lawsuit 5: Christabel Fulwell vs. Bartholomew Haggatt

Thomas Fulwell died in 1563; there is a record of his will at that date in a copy of a calendar made by the Society of Genealogists, but the will itself perished when the Exeter Probate Registry was destroyed by enemy action in 1942.³³ The leasehold of the subchanter's lands passed to

33. Somerset Wills from Exeter, edited by S.W. Rawlins and I. Fitzroy Jones, Somerset Record Society, 62 (1947), pp.vii-viii, 16.

Christabel Fulwell. Ulpian Fulwell must now have been about seventeen and his younger brother George fourteen.

It was not long before Christabel Fulwell also entered into litigation about the property. She sued one Bartholomew Haggatt³⁴ in the court of Chancery; her bill of complaint is

34. Hembry describes Haggatt as 'a gentleman of Wells' (Bishops of Bath and Wells 1540-1640, p.167); he was made a freeman of the city of Wells by patrimony in 1554, the same year as Thomas Fulwell, and one of his pledges was the same, John Gosesynghill (Wells City Charters, Somerset Record Society, 46 (1931), p.179). He was later involved in a lawsuit against Bishop Berkeley for lands leased from him (Hembry, pp.167-170). Haggatt was later, in 1579, elected communar of Wells Cathedral (Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, II, 310); he was involved in a scandal about the removal of stone out of the cathedral camery (ibid., II, 303, 309).

dated 13 October 1564.³⁵ Unfortunately the whole of the right

35. P.R.O., Chancery Proceedings 3/64/1; indexed in Humphreys, Somersetshire Parishes, p.736; Ribner I, pp.445-446.

hand portion of the bill of complaint is damaged, affecting every line of the text. Haggatt's answer to the bill of complaint is missing, and so is Christabel Fulwell's replication to the answer; but Haggatt's rejoinder to the replication survives.

The bill of complaint states that Thomas Fulwell 'one yere last past died'; before he died he made his will and appointed his wife his executrix and heir, since she 'entered into the saied premisses' - i.e., the subchanter's lands - and 'was therof lawfullie possessed accordinglie'. But Bartholomew Haggatt 'hath of late entered into Certen Closes called nepes closes' ('neep' is an old word for turnip), part of these lands, and claims to have a lease prior to Thomas Fulwell's lease; he also pretends to have rights 'within certen yr honors saied oratrix woddēs called Wilcockes Wodd[es?]', The text is fragmentary at this point, but it appears that the land that Haggatt claims is considerable: eighty acres, worth clearly by the year twenty marks. Christabel Fulwell tried to make a reasonable settlement with Haggatt by suggesting that he paid the customary rents for the land, but he not only refused, but 'impounded her Cattell' - presumably livestock which was grazing on the land which he claimed as his. Unfortunately Christabel does not have in her possession the original lease (of Goodman to Fulwell?), and she 'hath no Counterpaine of the saied pretended lease' of Haggatt; the leases are kept in some 'Cubbert locked or vnlocked Sealed or vnsealed', the location of which does not appear in the damaged document.

Although the two intervening documents are missing, Haggatt's

rejoinder summarises his defence. He claims that his interest in the lands was derived from one William Fuller, whose title to them was established 'longe tyme before the said John Goodman any thinge had in the said Subchauntrie'. As Ribner points out, this must be the same William Fuller mentioned by Goodman in lawsuit 2 as having a prior lease to Fulwell's (Ribner I, p.446). Apparently Christabel Fulwell had stated that William Fuller had conveyed over his interest in the premises to Goodman, but Haggatt denies this. Certain 'eairable' or 'earrable' lands must have also been mentioned, besides the 'close' and the woods, in the missing answer and replication, for Haggatt asserts that 'the said earrable landes tyme whereof no memorye of man is to the contrarye have bene demised graunted leassed occupiid & enjoyed togeather with the saide Close as appurtenante to the same Close' (i.e., Nepes Close). Christabel Fulwell must have stated that these arable lands and the close had been leased separately to several different persons, for Haggatt denies this:

the same Close & landes were neuer graunted nor leassed devidedly to seuerall or sundrie persones by severall Leasses or grauntes...the said Defend^t & those whose interest he hath in the premisses haue so occupied & enjoyed the same togeathers by the space of thirtie yeares now last past or more by force of the said Leasse.

The court must have felt that the tangled leases needed to be investigated further at a local level, for on 17 February 1564 (n.s. 1565) the court appointed a commission:

A Commission is awarded texamin wittnesses on both parties dir[ected] to John Homer John Cottrell George Rodney and Henry Clerke es[q] or thre of them...by assen[t] of thattornes Walrond and gryffith.

(P.R.O. Chancery Decrees and Orders, C.33/31, fo.105)³⁶

36. John Cotterel was archdeacon of Wells from 1554 to 1572, and may have been the archdeacon attacked by Fulwell in the Fifth Dialogue of The Art of Flattery, as discussed below, commentary to the Fifth Dialogue.
-

The commission must have duly examined the witnesses, for the next decree of 1 June 1565 states that:

Maundaye next is daie geven to the defft to shewe cause for the staie of pub[lication] orels pub[lication] is graunted.

(P.R.O. Chancery Decrees and Orders, C.33/31, fo. 209)

Jones defines publication as 'that stage in proceedings, before a hearing, when all depositions of witnesses on both sides in a Chancery suit were opened for perusal and copies by the parties' (Elizabethan Court of Chancery, p.503). 'This done, the case had reached issue and a hearing could be arranged' (Jones, p.15). The final judgement in the case does not survive, but it illustrates the constant aggravations and legal costs that the administrator of the subchanter's lands had to endure.

Lawsuit 6: Dr William Turner vs. Christabel Fulwell

Christabel Fulwell in her turn was sued by William Turner, now again Dean of Wells.³⁷ The lawsuit consists only of a bill

37. P.R.O. Chancery Proceedings 3/181/29; indexed in Humphreys, Somersetshire Parishes, II, 736; Ribner I, pp.446-447.
-

of complaint; the parchment is rubbed and has several holes in it and is in parts difficult to read. It is not dated, but Ribner has conjectured that it must be 'sometime earlier in

in the year 1566' when 'Christabel Fulwell conveyed the lands in order to avoid further legal difficulties' (Ribner I, p.447). (Although Turner was suspended for nonconformity in March 1564 and moved to London, he seems to have continued to receive the income from the deanery; he died in 1568 (Jackson's life of Turner, op. cit., p.23)).

Turner does not challenge the lease of the subchanter's lands to Thomas Fulwell; by now it is a fait accompli. He is concerned with the recovery of unpaid rent for his first period as dean. According to his bill of complaint, the rent of £8. 17s. was payable twice a year: at the feast of the annunciation (25 March), and that of St Michael the Archangel (29 September). He records that the 'offyce of Subchauntershypp and all the landes tenementes ryghtes & possessions therof by dewe forme of lawe weare vnyted convayed & annexed vnto the offyce & [corpus?] of the...deanery'. He himself by letters patent from Edward VI dated 24 March 5 Edward VI (1551) was 'lawfully made deane...by force wherof he was justly intytled vnto the sayd yerely rent'. But Thomas Fulwell fell behind with his rent, and did not pay it from the time that Turner was appointed dean on 24 March 1551 (the rent was due on the 25th) until the feast of St Michael the Archangel in the first year of Mary's reign (i.e. 29 September 1553), which, as Turner points out, 'was for the space of three hole yeres then ended'. The arrears amounted to £26 11s., and covered the period of Turner's first deanship, a significant fact which

Ribner points out.³⁸ Perhaps Fulwell decided to await the

-
38. Ribner I, p.446, note 12. Ribner gets his dates wrong, for he states that Fulwell had not paid from the period from 24 March, 1551/2, to 24 March, 1554/5. The lawsuit, however, uses regnal years and feastdays for dating, as noted above. I am following the regnal years as given in the Handbook of British Chronology, p.390, and its dating of saints' days and festivals, p.413. The date of Turner's letters patent is confirmed by DNB, although he was actually appointed to the deanery in November 1550 (DNB, XIX, 1291).
-

outcome of the conflict between Goodman and Turner before paying his rent.

Turner was restored to the deanery by a royal order on 18 June 1560, after bringing a lawsuit against Goodman (DNB, XIX, 1291), and he was determined to retrieve the rent which had been due to him. But Fulwell died without paying the arrears, leaving Christabel sole executrix and

leavyng also vnto her suffycyent Goodes cattales & the same lease w^{ch} were very well able to satysfye & paye bothe yo^r orator of hys sayd Rent so arrere & also all other dettes & legacyes by the same Thomas dewe & bequethed.

Christabel shared her husband's reluctance to pay the arrears; Turner complains that she 'wyll not paye vnto yo^r orator hys sayd arrerages nor yet aunswer hym for the fynes & herryottes to hym reservyd'. The fines and heriots were payments due to the landowner on a change of tenants; although Fulwell sublet portions of the subchanter's lands to various tenants, these fines and heriots were still 'reserved', as Turner points out, to the original lessor.

Christabel has also 'by sum vndew meanes...gotten into her handes...the possessyon of both partes of the sayd

indentures' of the original lease from Goodman to Fulwell, and

she vtterly refuseth to paye vnto yo^r orator the sayd Rent so to hym arrere as ys aforesayd nor yet wyll make vnto yo^r orator anie trewe accompte of the fynes & heriottes by her late husband of the [tenauntes?] of the premysses reservyd vnto yo^r orator.

Turner complains that without the counterpaine of the lease he cannot bring an action of debt against her for the arrearages. Not only is this 'agaynst all ryght & equitye', but, worse still,

the sayd Crystobell dothe so dayly wast & consume the sayd goodes & Catelles to her left by her sayd late husbond that wthout the spedy helpe of yo^r lordshypp & staye of her from further inordinate wastynge therof therwyll remayne very shortly but lytell to recompense & satysfye yo^r orator for the sayd rentes fynes & heryottes to hym dewe.

One gets the impression from this of Christabel as a flighty merry widow making the money fly with gay extravagance. No judgement on the case survives.

By October 1568 Christabel had remarried, her new husband being James Foster, as the next lawsuit shows. Little is known about him: he rented a manor from the castle of Dunster for some period between 1548 and 1558, but it does not sound like a particularly prosperous piece of land, judging from the records:

James Foster holdeth the mannor of Lullockesborow Eve, and yeldeth yerly xij.d.
(The Honour of Dunster, edited by H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, Somerset Record Society, 33 (1918), p.293)

Perhaps he took over Thomas Fulwell's linen-draping business, for in 1573 he petitioned to be made a freeman of the city of Wells, and was admitted because he had married the widow of

a former freeman.³⁹

39. City of Wells, Acts of the Corporation 1553-1623, Vol. III, fo.101^v; Wells City Charters, p.185.

Lawsuit 7: James and Christabel Foster vs. Bartholomew Haggatt

Christabel, now in conjunction with her new husband, for a second time sued Bartholomew Haggatt for his encroachments on the subchanter's lands. The lawsuit consists of three pieces: the bill of complaint of James and Christabel Foster, dated 15 October 1568; Haggatt's answer; and the Fosters' replication to the answer.⁴⁰ The top right corner of the bill

40. P.R.O. Chancery Proceedings C3/62/71; indexed in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, Vol.VII, Index of Chancery Proceedings (Series II), Vol. I, 1558-1579, p.144; and Humphreys, Somersetshire Parishes, II, 736.

of complaint is torn affecting five lines of text, and Haggatt's answer has a large piece torn out of the right hand side affecting about ten lines of the text.

The lands in dispute were part of the subchanter's lands originally leased to Thomas Fulwell: 'three parcelles of woods Callid walcambe woods and too closes Callid Rusheclose and Whitrock cont [sic] by estimacion Tenne Acres lienge and beinge in W[ells? The parchment is torn at this point.]'. The bill of complaint states that Christabel was her husband's executrix and that after his death she proved the will 'and dyd administer accordingly and was of the premysses possessyd', and that she then married James Foster. She claims that the lease made by Goodman to Fulwell

ys Casually Come to the handes and possession of one



Bartholomew haggat by Reason wherof the said Bartholome
 [sic] hath Contrived and fframed to him selfe diuers
 secrete and vntrue estates and Conveyans to yo^r orators
 vnknown of the said close and parcelles of woods
 Callid Rusheclosse and white Rocke to be made to him
 by...Thoms ffulwell and others.

By means of these untrue conveyances, about six years previously
 Haggatt occupied these lands and

dayly doth waste consume and dystroye the hedges
 fences and closuers lyenge betixte A Close now in
 the tenure of the said Bartholome Callyd neppes
 croftes and the said wods called Walcambe woods to
 the greate hurte damage and lose [sic] of your said
 orators.

They have asked him in vain to produce his lease, and have also
 requested that Haggatt should 'quietly...suffer' them to occupy
 these lands, 'and to fence hedge and dicke the closuer by him
 destroyed', but Haggatt has refused. Unfortunately they do
 not know the certain date of the lease, 'nor the hole quantitie
 of lande conteyned therein nor yt [yet] whether the said lease
 be in boxe or cheste locked or sealed', so they cannot apply
 to the common laws of the realm for redress. They therefore
 ask for a writ of subpoena directed to Haggatt.

One can understand from this why Christabel Fulwell's
 first lawsuit against Haggatt failed: Haggatt had a lease,
 but she does not know its contents, which would specify the
 extent of the lands that Haggatt could legally occupy.
 Haggatt in his answer to the bill of complaint claims that one
 Ryvett was subchanter of Wells Cathedral before John Goodman;
 that he leased 'certaine pasture grounde called or knowed by
 the name of Nepes closes conteyninge by estymacion fortye
 acres and also xxxvi^{ti} [sic] acres of arable lande vnto one
 William ffuller and to his assignes for the terme of diuers
 yeres yet endureinge'. The two closes in dispute, White Rock

and Rush Close, were part of these thirty-six acres of arable land. This lease from Ryvett to Fuller was ratified and confirmed by the Bishop of Bath and Wells and by the dean and chapter 'by theire seuerall wrytinges vnder theire commen seales as by the same wrytinges shall and maye more playnely appere'. Haggatt is willing to produce the documents. William Fuller then assigned the lands to Robert Goodman, who in his turn leased them to Haggatt. Haggatt denies that he has the deed of lease between John Goodman and Thomas Fulwell in his possession, or that he 'framed...vntrewe estates and conveyances' of the premises. He denies that he 'oughte of righte to fence hedge and diche the same closure'.

In their replication to the answer, the Fosters state that they 'will aver and prove that the sayd dead of Lease is come to the handes' of Haggatt, and they deny the existence of Ryvett's lease to Fuller, and the subsequent conveyance from Fuller to Robert Goodman. Unfortunately the lawsuit ends at this point, and no judgement to the case has been found.

There are two further surviving lawsuits in the series, both in Chancery thirty years later in 1598. By this time Christabel Fulwell/Foster was dead; her second husband James Foster and her eldest son Ulpian were also dead. (Foster died in 1581.)⁴¹ The two lawsuits were brought by two

41. His will is listed in Somerset Wills from Exeter, p.16.

of Christabel's granddaughters: Christabel, the daughter of George Fulwell, Ulpian's younger brother, now married to John

Rushall; and Mary, the eldest daughter of Ulpian, married to William Hancock of Banbury.

Lawsuit 8: John & Christabel Rushall vs. George Upton & Others

The first is a fragment of a lawsuit: it consists of a set of fifteen interrogatories administered to Robert James, the brother of Christabel Fulwell, 'of Wreniton in the Countye of Somerset gent', and his answers to them.⁴² They are dated

42. P.R.O., Chancery Town Depositions, C24/265/104; Ribner I, p.447; the 'others' being sued are not named in the interrogatories. Wrington is now remembered as the birthplace of the philosopher John Locke and the home of Hannah More.

15 November 1598, and are stated to be on the behalf of 'John Rushall and Christabell his wife Compl^t. Against George Vpton gent & others defend^{ts}'.⁴³ Robert James is stated to be 'aged

43. Ribner mistakenly infers that Christabel Rushall was the daughter of Ulpian Fulwell, but lawsuit 9 makes it clear that she is the daughter of his brother George. Was John Rushall the son of one of Thomas Fulwell's tenants? John Rushall alias Bucher leased lands from him in Berkley, and was the plaintiff in lawsuit 3. His alias is recorded in Somerset Wills from Exeter, p.37: 'Rushell otherwise Bucher, John; Week St Lawrence'; his will is undated but is probably late 1560s.

.75. yeares or therabouts'.

James is questioned about his sister's conveyancing of the subchanter's lands, particularly to her grandchildren rather than to her two sons Ulpian and George:

did the said Christable at anie tyme in her first or laste widowed imparte and make knowne vnto you anie desire or intent that she had to convaye the said lands and premisses [the subchanter's lands] vnto you and certaine other persons to such intent & purpose as that you should reconvaye the said Lands vnto the

said Christable for fforty yeeres if she lived so longe, wth a remainder of the yeeres then to come vnto her two sonns Vlpian ffullwell and George ffullwell, Or did you not rather knowe or belieue that shee had an intent and purpose rather to preferre their Childrene then them selves.
(interrogatory 3)

As mentioned above, Ribner suggests that Christabel Fulwell conveyed the lands 'in order to avoid further legal difficulties' after being sued by Turner (Ribner I, p.447). James replies:

That he remembreth that the sayd Christable duringe the tyme that she was the sayd ffulwells widowe [i.e. between 1563 and 1568(?)] moved this dep^t to be [an?] associate with others of her frends for the conveyance and assurance of the sayd landes to the benefitt of her children Vlpian and George, impartinge withall to this Dep^t that she had a meaninge to benefitt her sayd children, and their children also, but whether she then made any pretence of more or lesse love or affection or intent to prefer her sayd two children [crossed out] sonnes, or to their children / or what maner of Conveyance or reconveyance she moved this Dep^t to ioyne in with others for the benefitt of her sayd children he now remembreth not.

This is hardly surprising, since James was being questioned about events that happened 'about .30. and odd yeares since', as he points out.

James is then asked whether he was one of the trustees to whom the land was conveyed, on 17 September 1566, together with John Hipselye, George Rodney Esquire, and Geffrey Vpton gent.. Although it is not mentioned in the interrogatories - it was probably made clear in the lost bill of complaint - Geoffrey Upton was the father of George Upton, the defendant. He was keeper of the bishop's palace at Wells, 'and also of the prison within the palace, commonly called The Cowe-house' (by a grant dated 16 September 1546);⁴⁴ he was also bailiff of the

44. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, II, 262.

bishop's store at Wells (Hembry, p.44); keeper of the bishop's household, appointed for life with a fee of £14 (Hembry, p.135); and one of the keepers of the bishop's woods (ibid., p.152); so he was probably well known to Christabel. He died in 1583, making his son George the exucutor of his will, which was dated 14 January and proved 4 May 1583.⁴⁵ George must have

45. W.H. Upton, 'Upton. Abstracts of Wills and Records of Administration', Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica, Second Series, 2 (1888), p.319.

taken over his trusteeship of the subchanter's lands after his death. The records of the Dean and Chapter of Wells Cathedral contain numerous references to the Uptons, who leased lands from the cathedral; they also record that in 1594 George was excommunicated for assaulting a canon of the cathedral, Edmund Watts (Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, II, 330).

Robert James admits that Christabel 'made the mocion' to him to become a trustee, but that he 'refused to intermedle, or to have any dealinges or busines with her or for her, by reason of her ficklenes and inconstancy'. Hipselye, Rodney, and Geoffrey Upton agreed to become trustees for the lands. A few months later, on 12 December 1566, according to interrogatory 7, they reconveyed the lands back to Christabel

for the Terme of ffortye yeeres thence next ensuinge yf the said Christable should so Long live, the Remainder after the said ffortye yeeres expired or after the death of the said Christable within the said ffortye yeeres, to come and be vnto Vlpian ffullwell and George ffullwell...for the residue of the whole Terme and yeeres in the said first leas (made vnto the said Thomas ffullwell) Contained.

In answer to this, James says that, although he was not a party

to it, 'it is like enoughe and he beleeveth it to be true', for Hipseley, Rodney and Upton 'were well acquaynted with the sayd Christable, and were much trusted by her, and privy to her proceedinges'. George Rodney was one of the commissioners appointed in Christabel's suit against Haggatt (lawsuit 3), and may well have been chosen by her, since each party was allowed to choose an equal number of commissioners.⁴

46. Jones, Elizabethan Court of Chancery, p.240.

It seems that the volatile Christabel then fell out with her two sons, and was determined to disinherit them from the rich subchanter's lands and put the lands in trust for her grandchildren; interrogatory 9 asks:

did not the said Christable in her life tyme longe before her death & at the tyme of her death carry a full resolucion and determinacion to convaye & assine the said Lands and premisses vnto the Children of the said Vlpian ffullwell & George ffullwell, & that they onlie & none other should haue the full benefitt & profittes of the said Lands & premisses (all rentes thence ishueinge, & necessarie charges onely diducted[]).

According to interrogatory 10, Christabel made a pathetic appeal to her brother on her deathbed to see that this was done: 'two or three daies before her decesse Lyinge in her death bead' she begged that he 'would haue a care of the said Children' and see that the income of the subchanter's lands was bestowed 'for the Benefitt of the said Children, towardes their relieffe & educacion'. James's reply provides an insight into the Fulwell family life in Christabel's complaints to her brother about her two sons:

After the sayd Christable saw what untrifty [sic] courses her ~~children~~ [crossed out] sonnes...tooke, she often told this Dep^t that she greatly feared their vnthriftnes, and that she intended and was fully determined to convey and assure the sayd landes to their children, or in trust to their only benefitt, and within some day or two before her death he remembreth that she was very earnest in hand with this Dep^t /to^t deale with the estate of the sayd lands... but this Dep^t did then (as att all tymes before) refuse to have any dealinges with her or her estate. (Answer to interrogatories 9 and 10)

However, James did become involved after Christabel's death. He was moved by the plight of Ulpian's widow and children, and he admits that 'some.10. or twelve yeares since', i.e. 1586 - 1588 (Ulpian died in 1586), he

went vnto the sayd George Vpton one of the Def^{ts} and dealt very earnestly wth him on the behalfe of the sayd Vlpian ffulwells widowe and her children / that seinge the sayd lands were conveyed vnto him in trust to the benefitt of the sayd Vlpians children that he would give some yearly mayntenance towards the releaffe of the sayd Vlpians wife who was then greatly distressed, and to her children. (Answer to interrogatories 11 and 12)

Interrogatory 12 suggests that this was particularly for the relief of Edward, son of Ulpian, but James makes no mention of this in his reply. It seems that George Upton admitted to his obligation, and agreed to give four pounds per annum to Ulpian's wife and children: he paid James twenty shillings quarterly 'for a yeare or somewhat better...but afterwards did detayne the same & wold pay yt no longer'.

The fourteenth interrogatory implies that Upton is a rogue and a cheat who has persuaded James to turn a blind eye to his peculations:

hath not the said George Vpton...moued you for your favor and furtheraunce in the strenghninge [sic] and

vpholdinge of his intereste in the premisses, or for the conceallinge of anie parte of your knowledge of and concerninge these matters.

James denies this, and the interrogatories conclude with him saying

That he cannot now call to remembrance any thinge touchinge the Right or interest of the sayd children in or to the sayd lands or the profitts therof, other then as he hath before deposed, nor more sayeth in this matter.

It is tantalizing not to have the Rushalls' bill of complaint which would have given more information on George Fulwell and his children, as well as Ulpian's. Three of the decrees of the court survive in the Chancery Entry Books of Decrees and Orders. (These were overlooked by Ribner.) The first states that a commission 'ys awarded to examin witnesses on both parties', and that the defendant is to get fourteen days warning.⁴⁷ The other two both state that publication is granted

47. P.R.O. C33/98/745^V; Trinity Term, 42 Elizabeth, 1600.

between the two parties by the assent of their attorneys.⁴⁸

48. P.R.O. C33/99/124^V, and C33/100/119^V; both Michaelmas Term, 1600.

However, no final judgement has been found.

Lawsuit 9: William and Mary Hancock vs. George Upton & George Fulwell

This may be because of the other lawsuit brought concurrently by Ulpian's daughter Mary and her husband William Hancock.⁴⁹ The interrogatories of William James are

49. P.R.O. Chancery, C2/Elizabeth/H2/59; Humphreys, II, 735; mistakenly indexed as 'George Fulwood'.

dated, as we saw, 15 November 1598; the bill of complaint of William and Mary Hancock is dated 22 November 1598. Did the Hancocks get wind of the fact that the other granddaughter of Christabel Fulwell was trying to stake her claim in the subchanter's lands? Was there rivalry and ill-feeling between the two branches of the family, the children of Ulpian and those of George? If not, why did they not join forces against Upton, instead of suing separately? That Mary should be suing her uncle George suggests that there was ill-feeling. It almost seems as if the subchanter's lands, dishonestly transferred out of the church, carried some curse upon them which stirred up dissension - not only between the original lessor, John Goodman, and his cousin Thomas Fulwell, but between mother and sons, niece and uncle, perhaps also between the children's children, the granddaughters of Christabel.

This last lawsuit is complicated and confusing, and shows Ulpian Fulwell in an unfavourable light. It consists of two pieces: the bill of complaint dated 22 November 1598, and the answer of George Upton dated 8 February 1598 [n.s. 1599]. There is no answer from the co-defendant, George Fulwell. Upton's answer is damaged: the right hand side of the parchment is crumpled and dirty making it partially illegible at the ends of the lines.

The bill of complaint commences by recapitulating the now familiar leasing of the subchanter's lands by Goodman to Thomas Fulwell, who is described as 'Late of Wells...Lynnen draper nowe decessed'. This is the first and only mention of

Thomas Fulwell's trade. There is also more information about the extent of the lands; they are described as being situated in 'Wells, Estwells Walcom[be], Westhomes Lancherly and other places' in Somerset. Westholme is about three and a half miles south-east of Wells, and Launcherley just over a mile south of Wells. The bill of complaint recounts how Christabel Fulwell inherited the leasehold of the lands from her husband, and that she married James Foster 'who likewise entered into the said premisses & was therof in the Right of the said Christable Lawfully possessed', and together they 'made divers Leasses of of divers parcells of the said premisses in both their names vnto divers personns some for the terme of ffortye yeeres, and some for the terme of ffyfty yeeres'. In his answer Upton denies this joint right in the lands which Foster acquired through his marriage to Christabel, but we know that Upton is wrong in this because of lawsuit 7: James and Christabel Foster versus Bartholomew Haggatt.

The bill of complaint states that James Foster died in about February 1581, at Wells, and that Christabel was in sole control of the lands. At that time her two sons, Ulpian and George, each had two children: Ulpian had Edward and Mary, 'your Lordshipps nowe oratrix'; George had a son William and a daughter Christabel, 'sithence married vnto one John Rushall' (family tree, Appendix II, p.112).

As in the former lawsuit (lawsuit 8), Christabel Fulwell/Foster put the lands into the hands of trustees for the benefit of her grandchildren; no reason is given for her bypassing of her two sons:

Shée the said Christable ffullwell the Grandmother being desirous to Leave some maintenaunce and reliefe for and towards the educacion of her said Grandchildren, Caused a draught of an assignment to be made of the said Indenture and premisses and of all her Right and residue of yeeres then to Come in the premisses vnto one James Walround Esquire George Vpton Gentelman, Thomas Atwood gent and diverse others of trust and Confidence and to the onlie vse and [be]hooffe of her said Grandchildren...to and for their nessessary relife and maintenaunce.

In the Hancocks' list of trustees two are different from those mentioned in the Rushall interrogatories: James Walround (or Walrond) and Thomas Atwood replace John Hipselye and George Rodney. George Upton is the villain of the piece, scheming to gain control of the lands:

But before that the said draught of assignment was executed the said George Vpton by the meanes and perswasions of some other persones, [one wonders who this refers to] sett on and procured by the said George Upton for that purpose, Caused the said Christable ffullwell to relye and repose her wholle trust and Confidence in and vpon the said George Vpton and James Walrond onlye, excludinge all others whome she had first Chosen, And there vpon caused a newe convayaunce or Assignment of the premisses to be made vnto the said James Walround and George Vpton only to the same vse and behooffe, and vpon the same truste and Confidence (that ys to say) to the vse of her said Grandchildren as she had firste purposed.

In about June 1584 Christabel died, and Walrond and Upton accordingly took possession of the lands, 'Clayminge the same, and the yeerlye Rentes and profittes therof to the vse and behooffe of the said Children', and they 'kept certayne Courts in and vpon some parcell of the premisses, And thereby called the Coppy holders and vndertennauntes of all the said premisses together, pretendinge their wholle tittle from the said Christable for the vse of the said Children accordinglie'.

Then the crafty Upton made his next move:

George Vpton then carrying (as hath sithence fallen oute) a desire to intitile and interesse him selfe solly, to all the said premisses, to his owne vse onlye, And vtterly to exclude your Orratrix Mary and the said other Children from havinge anie benefitt vse or proffitt therby he... Contrary to the saide Truste and Confidence reposed in him delte and practised wth the said Vlpian ffullwell father to the said Marye....And for some smalle some of monye bought of him all such pretenced right and title as the said Vlpian then made shoue of in and to the premisses though in truth the said George Vpton knewe well that the same were nothinge, and likewise by that meanes gott from the said Vlpian all such deeds and writtings as concerned the said premises and namly as well the said Indenture of graund Lease made by...John Goodman vnto...Thomas ffullwell of the premisses as also the Counterpaine of the said Assignment of truste made by the said Christable vnto the said James [Walrond] and George [Upton] with all other writtings and evidences concerning the title and interist of the said Christable the Grandmother in and to the premises.

It seems shocking that Ulpian Fulwell should sell the inheritance of his own children 'for some smalle some of money'. If he had the counterpane of Christabel's deed of trust, why should he make show of a 'pretenced right and title'? It seems that Christabel was a poor businesswoman and could not manage the subchanter's estates. In the lawsuits she emerges as an impetuous and volatile personality, extravagant with money (at least according to William Turner's testimony). Perhaps she changed her mind more than once about the subchanter's lands, at one moment disinheriting her sons in favour of her grandchildren, at another reinstating them. Since her will does not survive, we cannot know whether, despite the trust she had set up for her grandchildren, she changed her mind once more and in her last testament gave Ulpian and George some 'right and title' to the premises.

This may have been the case, for Upton next had to get George Fulwell to renounce his interest in the subchanter's lands. The bill goes on to say that, even though Upton was now in possession of the premises 'and of the said deeds, Charters, and writtings concerning the same', he found that 'George ffullwell did ther with dislike and suspect his proceedings therin'. Accordingly, he bought off George too:

did ther vpon likewise deale and practise wth the said George ffullwell, and for some very smalle consideracion, Compounded wth [him] allso for all his pretended right and interiste in the premisses, w^{ch} in truth the said George Vpton also well knewe to be none at all, whervpon the said George Vpton gaue forth in speaches that the premisses duely belonged vnto the said George ffullwell and Vlpian ffullwell, and that the said Christable their mother had no power in her to mak anie such assignment to the vse of the said Children. And that therefore hee the said George Vpton had Compounded wth the said Vlpian and George ffullwell.

Upton's next move was to get rid of his partner in the lands, Walrond, 'to thende ther shoulde be none lefte to incounter him'. He compounded with Walrond and offered him ten pounds for a release of his right and interest in the premises. After this he

daylie took & receued the wholle proffittes & yearly revenues thereof to his owne vse only ever since the decesse of the said Christable, to the value of sixe hundred pounds all-redie levied and made[?] by him in fines and casualtyes as your Orators ar likewise informed besides the yeerly rente daylie improved & incressed without anie accounte or allowance, made to your Orrators or thother Children that haue no other certenty or staye of relieffe of maintenaunce to truste vnto.

The Hancocks say that they have often requested Upton to give a just account of the profits, and for the portion belonging to Mary, but he utterly refuses - 'and still doth' - to do so.

They accordingly request that Upton and George Fulwell should be 'produced vppon their corporall othes' in order 'to declare the truth of the said matters'.

George Upton's answer to the bill of complaint clarifies the conveyancing and re-conveyancing done by Christabel Fulwell, to the confusion of later generations, and the Fulwells' loss of the revenue from the subchanter's lands. According to Upton, after Thomas Fulwell's death Christabel by a deed dated 17 December 8 Elizabeth (i.e. 1565),

for dyuerse good Causes & Consideracions...did...gyve and graunt vnto her trustie and welbeloved frendes John Hippestlie and George Rodney esqr^s Jeffery Vpton gent & Robert James her brother all her whole terme right and interest

to the subchanter's lands. This in itself contradicts the testimony of Robert James in the former lawsuit (Rushall v. Upton), in which he emphatically denied that he was ever one of the trustees. Presumably Upton would be in a position to know; and Robert James in his seventies might be suffering from a hazy memory, to put the best interpretation on the contradiction. These trustees 'vpon reasonable request' were to make a 'suffycient estate & lease' of the premises to Christabel Fulwell for forty years, if she should so long live, and (presumably if she died before this) to give her two sons 'A suffycient and suer estate of <the> said premyses wth the Rentes reserved thervpon' for the remainder of the term of the forty unexpired years of the lease. The four trustees - Hippestley, Rodney, Jeffery Upton and Robert James - accordingly took possession of the lands.

Three days later, on 20 December 1565, the trustees 'by theire deede in wrytenge' reconveyed the lands back to Christabel, at her request, reserving to the trustees 'to the vse of... Vlpian and George ffullwell the yerely rent of ffortye shillinges to eyther of them xx.^s apeece'. This is hardly a princely income for her two sons. Christabel seems to have paid this sum through the four trustees, rather than directly. According to the deed, Christabel was also entitled to make 'leases & grauntes for xxj. yeres and not above and to take benefitt of the fynes Reserving the auncyent Rent and doinge noe Wast'. The forty years would extend to 1605. If Christabel died before this, the premises 'should whollye remaine & Come' to Ulpian and George for the remainder of the original ninety year lease by Goodman to Thomas Fulwell in 1539 (which would be in force up until 1629).

Christabel was re-possessioned of the premises, and married James Foster; but Upton denies that leases were ever made jointly by the Fosters 'in both theire names some for the terme of ffortye yeres and some for the terme of ffyftie yeres', which would be in contravention of Christabel's agreement not to make leases longer than twenty-one years.

Then, according to Upton, after Foster's death Christabel, 'without any perswasyon of this defend^t [or?] of any other to his knowledge' made a new conveyance, with himself and Walrond as trustees, 'of the whole interest of the said orygynall terme' to the uses of the children of Ulpian and George; disinheriting her sons in favour of her grandchildren. Perhaps

Christabel was pressured into this move, for Upton admits that, without his knowledge, she had executed a former conveyance to Ulpian and George of the residue of the lease. Upton says that he can produce this deed in the court.

It must have been a shock to Upton when, after Christabel's death, Ulpian and George moved in to claim the premises. But the validity of the lease was 'denyed and Called in questyon & put in suite by docto^r Dale nowe deceased then deane and Subchaunter of the said Cathedrall Church of Welles'.⁴⁹ It seems

49. Valentine Dale was made dean of Wells on 8 January 1574, although he was ambassador to France at the time: 'Grant for life to Valentine Dale, LL.D., now resident ambassador with the king of the French, of the Deanery of Wells Cathedral, void by the death of Robert Weston; as formerly held by Weston, William Turner or John Goodman...liberty to absent himself and receive all emoluments of the deanery, provided that he causes his customary sermons to be done' (Calendar of Patent Rolls, Elizabeth I, Vol.6, 1572-1575 (London, 1974), p.226, no.1207).

reasonable that Dale should feel irritated and outraged that the rich endowment of the subchanter, now belonging to the deanery, had been alienated from the church for almost a hundred years by one of his unscrupulous predecessors. The legal proceedings were extremely costly, 'much money beinge spent and dys[bursed]'. .

According to Upton, Ulpian and George Fulwell then tried to disengage themselves from the lands, which were proving to be a financial liability in lawsuits. (Unfortunately the lawsuit between Valentine Dale and Ulpian Fulwell has not been found.) Although, by Christabel's conveyance (or one of them) they were entitled to the lands, and the trusteeship of Upton and Walrond was 'merelie voyde', they begged Upton to buy out

their interest (according to Upton), and told him that if he did not buy it they would sell it to Walrond. Upton, 'beinge earnestlie dealt wth all to buy and purchase theire said estate and terme...did for good and valueable Consideracion buye and purchase thestate and interest of them', by a deed dated 23 February 27 Elizabeth (i.e. 1585, a year before Ulpian's death). By force of this deed Upton claims he is lawfully possessed of the premises and receives the profits 'to his owne vse by reason of the bargeyn & sale' of Ulpian and George 'as lawfull is for him to doe as he verelie beleeveth'.

Upton denies the Hancocks' statement that Christabel 'caused a draught of an assignement of the said Indenture and premyses' to himself, Walrond, Thomas Atwood 'and dyverse others' as trustees; or that before this draft was executed he set on and procured certain persons to persuade her 'to Relie & Repose her whole trust & Confydence' on himself and James Walrond only 'excluding all others whome she had first Chosen', causing a new conveyance to be made to himself & Walrond only for the use of her grandchildren. He denies the Hancocks' contention that he 'dealt and practyzed' with Ulpian and bought his pretended title for a small sum of money, thereby getting into his hands all the leases, deeds and writings concerning the lands. He also denies that George Fulwell did 'dyslyke or suspect' this proceeding, or that he bought him off 'for small Consideracion'. As to the release of the premises signed by his partner Walrond, giving Upton the sole control of the lands, he asserts

that the same was by the procurement of Vlpian ffullwell & George ffullwell or one of them without any Chardge of this defend^t att all but saieth that he paid the said

James Walrond x.^{li} or thereabouts for & in the behalf
and by the appoyntment of the said Vlpyan & George
ffullwell or one of them.

He also denies that he has received profits to the value of six hundred pounds already, or that any part of this is due to Mary Hancock. The premises are no longer 'chardged[?] with any trust & Confydence' for the benefit of the grandchildren of Christabel. As to the 'ffynes heryottes & Causualtyes of the coppyholdes' which the Hancocks claim are part of the profits, Upton points out that these 'apperteyne vnto m^r docto^r Harbert as Deane and Subchaunter of the said Cathedrall Church of Wells'; however he admits that he purchased these perquisites from Dr Herbert 'about six yeres last past for good and valuable Consideracion'. He refuses point blank 'to assigne and Convey the premyses or yeld an accompt theroff' to the plaintiffs, for he 'verily beleevethe they haue noe right or tytle therevnto but sayeth that he hath trulie bought and Iustlie payde for the same'.

Upton's account seems plausible, except for one suspicious point: he does not reply to the Hancocks' assertion that he and Walrond had called the copyholders together to tell them that they were entitled to hold courts (to collect rents etc. from the tenants) as Christabel's trustees on behalf of the grandchildren. Also the Hancocks strangely do not mention the fact admitted in the previous lawsuit (Rushall v. Upton): that Upton, at the urging of Robert James, had paid Ulpian's widow and children a 'yearly mayntenance' of four pounds out of the profits, 'seinge the sayd lands were conveyed vnto him in trust

to the benefitt of the sayd Vlpians children' (Rushall v. Upton, as quoted above).

What was the outcome of the lawsuit? Upton's answer to the bill of complaint is endorsed 'Mr Uptons ~~Answers~~ to be putt over'. Apparently it was 'putt over' from November 1599 until Trinity Term in 1602, when there was a decree registered in Chancery Decrees and Orders (P.R.O. C33/101/783). Unfortunately this decree book is in such a fragile condition that the Public Record Office states that it is 'unfit for production' and I was unable to see it. I would guess from the procedure observable in other lawsuits that it ordered a commission for the questioning of witnesses. There is another decree in the case in Michaelmas Term, 1602, on 12 November:

If the defend^t shewe no cause for stay of publicacion
by this day svenight then publ[ication] ys graunted.
(P.R.O., Chancery Decrees and Orders, C33/104/174)

I did not find the final judgement in the case, but it seems to have gone against the Hancocks. In George Upton's will, dated 23 January 1608 [n.s. 1609], he leaves to his executor Edward Bisse (the son of his wife's brother)

all my lands Tenements hereditaments reversions Rents
and Remynders in Wells and the parish of St Cuthberts
in Wells aforesayd Westhome Pilton Wootton Pennard
Clewre or ells where within the Realme of England
whersoever.
(P.R.O., Prob.11/113/fo. 158^v)

These sound suspiciously like portions of the subchanter's lands: those in Southover, Portway, and possibly also East Wells, would be in the parish of St Cuthbert's, the parish church of Wells; Westholme and Wootton Wells are mentioned in the lawsuits discussed above.

Upton's will shows that he died a wealthy man. He bequeathes numerous legacies to his relations, to the poor, and even twenty-four pounds a year to the father of his estranged wife, to be paid during her life, in spite of her 'neglect of duty' and the 'wrongs to me done' by her. He planned for an expensive funeral, with a cortège of ten poor men and ten poor women dressed in black gowns each made of six yards of black friese at two shillings the yard; mourning rings of one ounce of gold each engraved with his arms to his relatives. The grandchildren of Christabel Fulwell were not remembered.

ULPIAN FULWELL'S LIFE AND CAREER

Ulpian Fulwell was born seven years after his father acquired the 'graunde lease' of the subchanter's lands in 1539, which were to overshadow the whole of his life, from birth to death, with litigation, strife, aggravation and violence. Perhaps he was named Ulpian by his father after the famous Roman jurist, in the hope that he would become a lawyer. The lawsuits about the subchanter's lands and the events described in them must have had a great influence on his psychohistory, to use a term made popular by the psychologist/biographer Erik Erikson. When he was only one year old, his father was beaten up in the middle of the night and left for dead (lawsuit 2). When he was twelve, old enough to be helping his father with the haymaking, he may have been present at the second invasion by Goodman's henchmen, armed with swords, daggers, and pikes. He may have seen his father retreat in alarm, his mother courageously confronting the attackers; he may have witnessed her being struck

on the breast by Goodman's nephew, William Goodman, and heard their 'great Showte or Crye' of triumph, 'as thoughe the said Ryotous persons had won A great victory' (lawsuit 4). What effect did this brutal assault on his mother and the humiliation of his father have on the growing boy?

His father, if we accept the evidence of William Turner's letters (probably based on the gossip at Wells), was an opportunist who double-crossed his master Goodman once he had the lease of the subchanter's lands. Perhaps Thomas Fulwell felt he deserved some reward after his fourteen years of service without pay, especially to such a master - a brutal, unscrupulous, conniving bully, the worst kind of corrupt clergyman, who turned the deanery into an armed fortress when his self-interest was challenged by Turner. His father's marriage with Christabel James must have been a love-match, since in Goodman's opinion he could have made 'a mucche more better mariage' (lawsuit 2). His father died when Ulpian was seventeen, in 1563.

His mother Christabel must have been a strong personality - courageous, as her defiance of William Goodman shows, but at the same time volatile and changeable. She must have had a violent temper if she 'chastened' her maid to such an extent that the local magistrate had to be called in (lawsuit 2). She was probably extravagant and her difficulty in managing money and business matters led her into the fatal step of appointing trustees to do it for her. Even then she changed her mind. She seems to have had a love-hate relationship with her sons, at one moment disinheriting them and leaving

everything to her grandchildren, the next moment changing her mind and reinstating them, in conveyances and counter-conveyances which left her estate in a muddle when she died. Her own brother, Robert James, condemned her for her 'frivlenes and inconstancy' and said that he refused to have anything to do with her business affairs. He also noted his nephews' 'unthrifty courses' (lawsuit 8). Fulwell writes little about women in his works, except that they are susceptible to flattery and like to be 'accounted young': perhaps it was this fatal flaw in his mother which caused her to be swayed by George Upton, according to the view of her granddaughter Mary Hancock, so that she gave up the dominant control of the lands to him.

Growing up in the cathedral town of Wells, the most powerful and glamorous figures in Fulwell's world would be the clergy: the bishop with his moated palace and court, and the dean, archdeacons and canons of the cathedral. It was natural that Fulwell should choose to become a clergyman. He was ordained when he was twenty, on 15 September 1566.⁵⁰ It is not known

50. He presented his ordination papers bearing this date at the archiepiscopal visitation of 1576 in Gloucester diocese: Gloucester Diocesan Records (hereafter referred to as GDR) 39, Metropolitcal Visitations 1576-1580, p.54; Hockaday Abstracts: General, 1576-1577, Vol.47, p.57. The Gloucester Diocesan Records are now housed in the Gloucester City Library; F.S. Hockaday calendared, translated and indexed many of them, and his unpublished indexes may be consulted in the City Library.

where Fulwell was ordained, whether in his own diocese of Bath and Wells, or at Gloucester, or whether he had a benefice to

go to immediately on ordination.

Two years later, in 1568, he published Like Will to Like, an interlude designed to be played by a small professional troupe of actors. Was the young clergyman tempted by a dramatic career? The title-page demonstrates how the sixteen characters in the play may be divided among five actors - ideal for a small touring company. J.A.B. Somerset points to the evidence of one of the stage directions:

Nichol Newfangle must have a gittern or some other instrument (if it may be): but if he have not they must dance about the place all three, and sing this song that followeth - which must be done also although they have an instrument.

Somerset comments: 'The indefinite stage direction shows that the dramatist was not writing for a particular company, and that the copy-text for Q1 was not a theatrical prompt-copy' (Four Tudor Interludes, edited by J.A.B. Somerset (London, 1974), pp.133-134, 181). We do not know whether Fulwell himself ever produced the play or acted in it; but the text shows that he knew something about the technicalities of production.

Several historians of the theatre have suggested that Like Will to Like may have been performed at court. According to Fleay,

It was almost certainly produced at Court by a children's company soon after the revival of Roister Doister, in opposition to the boys who had given offence 31st December 1559....The only available Court entry under which to place it is that of the Paul's children, 1562-3.
(F.G. Fleay, A Chronicle History of the London Stage 1559-1642 (London, 1890), pp.59-60)

Fleay also thinks that Fulwell was one of the 'University writers' competing to have their plays produced by the boys'

companies:

Like will to like...was probably acted by the Paul's boys 1661 or 1662-3 [sic; for 1561 and 1562-3]....
 Fulwell is, I think, the Carisophus of Edwardes' Damon and Pythias. There was certainly a jealousy between these University writers for the Paul's and Chapel companies (the only boys' companies 1559-63), as well as between the choir actors.
(A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559-1642, 2vols (London, 1891), I, 235-236)

Since Fuwell did not go up to Oxford until 1579, he can hardly be described as a 'University writer' in the 1560s! Fleay ignores this inconsistency, and also the fact that Fulwell would have been only about fifteen years old in 1561. He goes on to construct a chronology of the performance of plays at court which includes Like Will to Like:

Misogonus, by R. Edwards, was acted 31st December 1559, by the Chapel boys, and gave offence. On 6th March 1561 Ralph Royster was revived in an enlarged form, by the Paul's boys; in 1562-3 they satirised the unsuccessful Edwards as Ralph Royster in Like Will to Like; in 1563-4 the inhibition on the Chapel boys was removed, and Edwards, who in 1561, during the interim, had been made Master of the Chapel children, retaliated by the personalities of Damon and Pythias.
(A Chronicle History of the London Stage, pp.60-61)

It would be nice to think that Fulwell was so excitingly involved in the drama of the early 1560's, but Fleay's evidence is insubstantial. For example, his 'proof' for his statement that Fulwell was satirised in Richard Edwards's Damon and Pythias:

Aristippus in the play is evidently Edwards, and Carisophus either Fulwell or Westcott. The allusions to Like Will to Like are numerous, the most remarkable being that to one who preached against large breeches 'of late; not far hence: in no pulpit, but in a waincart.' The breeches, 'as big as new barrels,' are claimed as the invention of the Vice in Fulwell's play, and this is clearly the preaching aimed at.
 (ibid., p.60)

Criticism of big breeches was a commonplace of social criticism of the extravagant dress of the time. E.K. Chambers summarises Fleay's conjectures without comment: he conjectures that Like Will to Like 'might be The Collier played at Court in 1576' (Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923), III, 317).

We are on firmer ground when we turn back to the Gloucester diocesan records, which throw considerable light on Fulwell's career, both as to its chronology, and his conduct as a clergyman. In 1570, four years after his ordination, he was presented to the rectory and parish church of Naunton by the Queen, ~~its~~ patroness, and also by the Lord Keeper, William Cecil Lord Burghley. Probably he acquired this benefice through the influence of his friend and patron, Edmund Harman, who must have known Cecil, and who will be mentioned later. The original letter of presentation from the Queen, dated 23 December 1570, is preserved in the diocesan records (GDR 27a Doc.9; Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton). A few days later, on 30 December, Fulwell was instituted into the rectory by the chancellor of the diocese, Thomas Powell (GDR 27a, 1570-1620, Liber Institutionum, p.10; Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton). Fulwell's institution bond, with his signature, also survives: in it he is bound for the sum of two hundred pounds 'to defend saue and kepe harmeles' the Bishop and his successor and officers (GDR 27a Doc.9, also dated 30 December 1570; Hockaday Abstracts 291). The witnesses to the bond were Hugh Evans, Davyd Williams, and William Mereddith. The Composition Books in the Exchequer record that Fulwell compounded for the first-

fruits of the rectory of Naunton on 7 February 1571, at £16 13s. 4d., with payments made on 10 July 1571 and 1572, and 10 January 1572 and 1573 (Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton; from P.R.O. Composition Books, Vol.8 fo.231). His sureties were John Hincksman of Naunton, yeoman, and William Hincksman of the parish of the Savoy, Middlesex, tailor.

Naunton is a small village in the Cotswolds on the river Windrush, fourteen miles north-east of Gloucester and four miles from Stow-on-the-Wold. In 1563 the population consisted of only eighteen families.⁵¹ Sir Robert Atkyns in his history of

51. Victoria County History of Gloucestershire, Vol. VI, edited by C.R. Elrington (London, 1965), p.77, quoting from Hockaday Abstracts 42, of the 1563 visitation.

Gloucestershire in 1712 described the church as 'handsome, with a beautiful Tower adorned with Battlements and Pinnacles' (The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire, p.565).

The rectory must have been prosperous: the glebe

in 1535 included 35½ acres of arable and one acre of meadow. In 1584 and during the 17th and 18th centuries the glebe consisted of two yardlands with 100 sheep-commons and 8 cow-commons and a house. (VCH Gloucestershire, VI, 84)

Sheep-farming was an important part of the local economy, and 'nearly half of the rector's tithes in 1535 came from wool' (ibid., VI, 82).

Some interesting information on Fulwell's administration of his parish is contained in records of the visitations made during his incumbency. The first, an episcopal visitation made in July 1572, shows that the church was in a bad state of repair and that there was some trouble over the paying of the parish

clerk's wages. Fulwell is listed as having appeared in person at the visitation (GDR 29, p.25). The Naunton presentment states that 'The chauncell wyndowes lacke glasinge & sclattinge' [slating], and that 'The churche lacks glasinge & sclattinge and the churche moundes in decay' (GDR 29, p.223).⁵² On 30

52. This is all the more reprehensible because roofing slates were quarried in the parish: the Victoria County History states that quarries in the parish 'may have been in use by the late 13th century'; Corpus Christi College in Oxford owned or leased a quarry there; the quarries were used 'especially for providing stone slates for roofing' (VCH Gloucestershire, VI, 83). E.F. Eales in his book on Naunton mentions the 'Naunton slats', and the 'slat quarries', and comments that 'millions of Naunton slats lie upon the college roofs of Oxford' (Naunton upon Cotswold, p.125).

October the 'farmer of the rectory' and the churchwardens appeared and were ordered to make the necessary repairs by a certain date. Four parishioners had refused to make the required payments for the parish clerk's wages: 'Ambros Hyett John Shethe Paule Wilkins Edward Russell doe denye the clerkes wages' (GDR 29, p.223; Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton). Such disputes were commonplace: Christopher Hill states that 'Disputes over the election of parish clerks and over their wages were perennial, the clerks running for support to the ecclesiastical courts or to the bishop' (Economic Problems of the Church, second edition (Oxford, 1968), p.172). Bishop Hooper's injunctions for Gloucester and Worcester dioceses for 1551-1552 had particularly stressed the parishioner's duty to pay the clerk's wages:

that all parishioners do duly and truly consent and pay

their clerks their wages, ...as well for his pains in keeping clean the church, ringing the bells, and serving the minister in his godly order.

(Visitation Articles and Injunctions, edited by W.H. Frere, II, 287)⁵³

53. Other examples of presentments for refusal to pay the clerk's wages are given in S.L. Ware, The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects (Baltimore, 1908), pp.41-42.

This particular dispute was settled, for by 30 October they had all paid up except Hyett (who, ironically, later, in 1584, became a churchwarden).

A few months before this visitation, Fulwell had married his first wife, Eleanor Warde, in his own church on 8 May 1572. Perhaps she was a local girl, but the parish register gives no details:

The vijth daie of May weare marryed Vlpian ffullwell and Elian^r Warde.

(The Regyster Booke of the parysh of Nawnton uppon Cottescull [sic], MS Parish Register still preserved at Naunton; also in W.P.W. Phillimore (ed.), Gloucestershire Parish Registers. Marriages, Vol.15 (London, 1909), p.92)

She was buried on 17 December, 1577, after five years of marriage,⁵⁴

54. Ribner mistakenly thought that the entry in the parish register of the burial of Eleanor Fulwell must refer to a daughter, because of subsequent baptisms of Ulpian's children; he was not aware of Fulwell's second marriage (Ribner I, p.447).

in Naunton. There is no record in the parish register of any children of this marriage; but there must have been at least one child, a son Edward, who is referred to in lawsuits 8 and 9, and who was to benefit from the subchanter's lands by a trust set up by his grandmother Christabel.

A few years after his marriage, Fulwell embarked upon his second literary endeavour: The Flower of Fame. Containing the bright Renowne and moste fortunate Raigne of King Henry the VIII. wherein is mentioned of Matters, by the rest of our Cronographers overpassed....Hereunto is annexed...a short Treatise of iii noble and vertuous Queenes: and a Discourse of the worthie Service that was done at Hadington in Scotlande, the seconde Yere of the Raigne of King Edward the Sixt.⁵⁵ It

55. STC 11475; reprinted in The Harleian Miscellany, edited by Thomas Park, 12 vols (London, 1808-1813; rptd. New York, 1965), IX, 337-375, p.337; future references are to this edition.

was published in 1575, and dedicated to Lord Burghley, who, with the Queen, was instrumental in presenting Fulwell to his benfice at Naunton, - perhaps out of gratitude for favours received as well as hope for future ones. R.L. Smallwood, in his discussion of Burghley as a literary patron, notes that 'Where Burghley's active patronage of a writer can be proved, it seems that the dedication was more often a recognition of assistance than a request for it.'⁵⁶ Fulwell must have had Burghley's permission

56. 'Lord Burghley as a Patron of Religious Literature' (unpublished M.A. thesis, Shakespeare Institute, Birmingham University, 1963), p.374.

to dedicate the book to him, because his coat of arms appears on the verso of the title-page.⁵⁷

57. Smallwood believes that Burghley lent his own woodcut block of his coat of arms to printers of works dedicated to him; that appearing in The Flower of Fame is 'Type C' and appears in other works of the 1570s (Smallwood, p.38).

How did Fulwell manage to secure the patronage of Burghley? He may have gained access to him through his friend and patron Edmund Harman, who is first mentioned in the dedication to

The Flower of Fame:

I was not onely emboldened my self, humbly to desyre your L. patronage, but also (as much as in mee laye) encouraged my Auchthour, Master Edmund Harman, to offer unto you the grosse fruites of this our labours. (p.338)

'Author' can mean 'he who authorizes or instigates; the prompter or mover', or 'the person on whose authority a statement is made; an authority, an informant' (OED sb.1.d; 4). Fulwell applies the word to Harman in both senses. Harman gave him information about historical events, and also seems to have instructed him on how to organize his narrative. For example, when he is discussing the meeting of Henry VIII with the king of France and the emperor in 1520:

yet, because my aucthor was not there to note anye thing more then is already mentioned by Halle, in his Cronicle, and was present at this that foloweth; I have used his enstruction herein, referring thee to the aforesayd Cronicle to reade of the other, whereas it is very well described. (p.358)

Edmund Harman

Fulwell tells us that Harman was 'brought up under' Sir Henry Norris, 'one of the kinge's henchemen', and 'by him preferred unto the king', Henry VIII (Flower of Fame, p.352). (A henchman was a post of honour at the court, 'a squire, or page of honour to a prince or great man, who walked or rode beside him in processions, marches' (OED 1.b).) Norris was one of the most intimate friends of Henry VIII (DNB, XIV, 567).

Fulwell tells us that he

grewe in suche favour and grace with the king, that he became to be the chiefe gentleman of his privie chamber, and also was master of the blacke rodd; which is an office to the noble order of the garter, which office hath a large prerogative. He was ryghtfullye termed, the father of the court nexte under the king....(Flower of Fame, p.352)

Fulwell is deliberately vague about Norris's death; he merely says that 'Envye, who alwaies pursueth Vertue, threw at him her spytefull and poysoned dartes, to his decaye' (p.352).

In fact, Norris was accused of having an affair with Anne Boleyn and beheaded in 1536. Historians feel there was no truth in the allegation; Fulwell implies that the king felt guilty about the trumped up charge, for, after Norris's death, 'the king to shewe his good will towardses him, shewed him selfe gracious lord unto as manye as were servauntes unto the sayd master Norace in his lyfe-tyme' (p.352).

This seems to fit in with what is known about Harman's career at court, which can be pieced together from references in the State Papers. These show that after Norris's death he became a groom of the privy chamber, then barber to Henry VIII; that he also had business interests in London, and acquired various properties which made him one of the landed gentry. The earliest reference to him shows him delivering certain parcels of valuables to the court in 1535.⁵⁸ After

58. 22 June 1535; Public Record Office, Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic. Henry VIII, VIII, Jan.-July, 1535, p.357, no.907.

Norris was arrested on 1 May 1536, Harman is mentioned

in connection with a 'remain' (inventory) of the 'garderobe stuff' of his master; this was later delivered into Harman's custody, and contained hangings, cushions, furniture, pictures and even kitchen stuff, some of it with Norris's initials on it or 'wrought with Mr. Norris' arms' (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic. Henry VIII, X, Jan.-June, 1536, p.335 (3 May 1536), and pp.517-518). Norris was beheaded on 17 May. In September Harman is described as 'a groom of the Privy Chamber, one of the packers of woollen and other cloths, leather, pewter, and other merchandise' in the city of London, and entitled to a certain scale of fees (ibid., XI, July-Dec., 1536, p.208, grant 519, no.7). This must have been a profitable concession. A year after Norris's execution, in June 1537, he was made 'keeper of the manor of Ioving alias Perlaune, Bucks, in the King's hands by the attainder of Hen. Norres' (ibid., XII, Part 2, June-Dec., 1537, p.80, no.18). In 1538 he was given a payment of fifty shillings as groom of the Privy Chamber (ibid., XIII, Part 2, Aug.-Dec., 1538, p.529).

More perquisites followed. In May 1538 he was given a grant 'to have the annual rent of 24^l. 13^s. 4^d., paid by the burgesses of Ludlowe, for the fee farm of the borough, and all lands, etc., in Ludlowe...and in Staunton Lacy, which used to be in the charge of the bailiffs of Ludlowe' (ibid., XIII, Part 1, Jan.-July, 1538, p.410, no.14). In June 1538 he was appointed steward 'of the lordships or manors of Langley Marrays, alias Langley Marishe, and Wirardysbury, and keeper of the park of Langley Marreys, Bucks.' (ibid., XIII, Part 1, p.487, no.37;

also confirmed in Feb. 1539, XIV, Part 1, p.165, no.71). This may have been another of Norris's offices, for Norris had been made keeper of Langley New Park, Buckinghamshire, in 1523, (DNB, XIV, 567). Harman was also granted the tithes of Loking, Berkshire, in May 1539 (Books of the Court of Augmentations, Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic. Henry VIII, XIV, Part 1, Jan.-July, 1539, p.606, no.62).

These grants show Harman steadily rising in the world after Norris's death. By 1540 he had come even closer to the person of the king by being appointed one of Henry VIII's barbers. The first mention of this is in October, 1540, in an order from the Privy Council:

Upon complaint of the French ambassador that certain lead of a merchant of Rouen was stayed in London for package money; Edm. Harman, one of the King's barbers, packer at London, was ordered to deliver the lead until the matter was tried, and not charge strangers with package money for lead until it was seen whether the treaties and the late proclamation in favour of strangers allowed it. (*ibid.*, XVI, Sept. 1540-Dec. 1541, p.56, no.109)

This was also the year in which Henry VIII had granted the barber-surgeons their charter, commemorated in a painting commissioned from Holbein by the company, which showed Henry VIII handing the charter to Thomas Vicary, with the other founding-father barber-surgeons kneeling at either side of his throne. Harman, a prosperous-looking handsome bearded figure, is kneeling fourth from the right from Henry.⁵⁹ That he was a medical man

59. The painting, belonging to the Worshipful Company of Barbers, is reproduced in Roy Strong's Holbein and Henry VIII (London, 1967), p.67, plate 55. Harman's name is written across his sleeve.

rather than merely a hair-trimmer is indicated by the fact that he was listed among the other medical attendants on Henry VIII: his two physicians, three surgeons, and apothecary. This is in a list compiled in 1545 of those receiving 'The bouch to the ordinary of th'household' - that is, the staff in regular attendance upon the king, who received an allowance of food (bouche) at court. He received a salary of twenty pounds (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic. Henry VIII, XX, Part 2, Aug.-Dec. 1545, pp.548, 549, 550).

Harman, like many other courtiers of the time, was quick to share in the spoils of the English Reformation: in 1543 he and his wife Agnes were granted the

House or hospital of St John the Evangelist in Burford, Oxon., with certain lands there and in Upton, Oxon.; the manor of Fifehide alias Fyfeld, Oxon., and lands in Wydford, Shereburn in Rysington, Little Baryngton, and Rysington Magna, Glouc., which belonged to the said house. (ibid., XVIII, Part 1, Jan.-July, 1543, p.547, no. 102b; confirmed 18 Nov. 1543, XVIII, Part 2, p.241, no.45)

He was a zealous protestant, and was accused of heresy, along with his wife Agnes, but pardoned on 31 August 1543, they had been

accused before the King's Council and before John Bp. of Sarum and other commissioners under the Six Articles in co.Berks., because, in the year 34 Hen.VIII, at New Windsor, they abetted, aided, favoured, counselled and consented with one Ant. Person, clk. there, lately condemned and burnt for heresies against the Sacrament of the Altar.
(ibid., XVIII, Part 2, p.140, no.6)

(A lively account of Anthony Pearson's opinions on the sacrament, and his trial and martyrdom is given in Foxe's Book of Martyrs.)

Harman acquired more windfalls from the dissolution of the

monasteries in the 1540s: in 1544 he was granted Harmondsworth manor and rectory in Middlesex, with certain farm stock from St Mary's College near Winchester (Books of the Court of Augmentations, in Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic, XIX, Part 1, p.648. no.39b.). He also had a license to alienate lands from the monastery of Bruern (XIX, Part 2, p.321, no.48). He paid over three hundred pounds for the manor, rectory and advowson of the vicarage of Thyrrefeld, Bucks., belonging to St Alban's monastery, and also acquired the advowson of Wydforde rectory, Gloucestershire; the rectory of Burforde and a chapel in Fulbroke, Oxon.; the advowson of Burforde vicarage, formerly part of Keynsham Priory in Somerset (ibid., XX, Part 1, p.424, no.85); he was later granted the reversion of the manor of Widforde in 1545 (XX, Part 1, p.426, grant 846/93). He retained the advowson of the rectory of Widford in the early 1580s, valued at £3 14s. 2d.⁶⁰ He consolidated his holdings in Burforde

60. Gloucester City Library, Hockaday Abstracts: General, 1581-1584, Vol.49, p.21; abstract of 'A Catalogue of the Clergie within the Diocese of Glocester with their Preferments abilities &c taken in the time of Dr Humfery, dean of Gloucester', Lambeth Chartae misc. 12, no.7. Widford is now in Oxfordshire, having been transferred from Gloucester diocese in 1844 (Isabel M. Kirby, Diocese of Gloucester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop and Archdeacons (Gloucester, 1968), p.206).

by acquiring two grain mills there, another in Upton, and also a fulling mill in Burforde (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic. Henry VIII, XX, Part 1, Jan.-July, 1545, p.662, grant 1335.25). (Fulling is the process of cleansing and thickening cloth by beating and washing.) He was granted a

licence to alienate the manor, rectory and advowson of the vicarage of Thyrrrefelde, Bucks., also in 1545 (XX, Part 2, pp. 123-124, grant 266.36).

Through Harman Fulwell got some of the inside gossip of the court, which he retails with some relish in The Flower of Fame. He describes how, before the siege of Bullogne, (in 1544) Henry VIII opened a packet of letters from the Duke of Norfolk to the master of the king's horse, Sir Anthony Browne:

And when he had reade it, hee sayde unto Master Edmund Harman, one of his privye chamber, who then was in presence with him, and none els: 'Lo (quoth hee) the Duke of Norfolk seemeth by this letter to thinke him selfe not well dealt withal, because hee is not made pryvye to our pretence in this voyage: I assure thee, Edmund, (quoth he) no mortall man in this worlde doth knowe the cause hereof, but onelye Sir Charles Brandon; and thou shalt bee the second unto whome I will reveale this matter. My purpose is (sayd the kyng) to lay siege unto Bouloigne; and I doubt not but to win it, by God's help.' 'May it please your Grace, (then sayde Maister Harman) it will bee a noble victorie to win; but it will bee more noble to hold it when it is wonne.' 'Well, (sayd the king) I nothyng doubt the holding of it, by God's grace if I may winne it.' (pp.361-362)

The phrase 'and none els' indicates the exclusive nature of Fulwell's information, a kind of sixteenth century 'scoop' on an important historical occasion. Harman himself must have been involved in the French campaigns, for in 1544 he is listed among 'the army against France' as providing four horsemen, six archers, six billmen or pikes, and some javelins (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic, XIX, Part 1, Jan.-July, 1544, pp.150, 160, 161, 162, 163).

In the year before Henry VIII's death, Harman seems to have been in great favour with the king, and there are several

references to offices and perquisites granted at his request: for example, in May, 1546, 'Miles of th'Ewrie' was given an office 'at the suit of Mr. Harman' (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic, XXI, Part 1, Jan.-Aug., 1546, p.473, 963.46); John Perkyns was to have the 'room' of yeoman waiter in the Tower when it became vacant, 'at the suit of Mr. Harman and Mr. Sympson, barbers' (ibid., p.474, 963.70); a Mrs. Aylesburie also obtained an unspecified 'office', 'preferred by Mr. Harman and Mr. Vyncent' (ibid., p.474, 963.77). Another successful suit was the granting of 'the moiety of divers forfeitures' to be divided among three officers of the 'Chaundrie' and Richard Lewes 'of th'Ewrye. At he suit of Mr. Seintbarbe and Mr. Harman' (ibid., p.476, 963.157). A few months later, Harman obtained the post of gentleman usher 'quarter waiter' for William Reskyner (ibid., p.568, 1165.91). He also obtained a passport for Christopher Carcano, milliner, and 'a discharge for the custom of 7,516 hackbuts which your Majesty bought of the same Christopher' - Carcano must have dealt in weaponry as well as millinery (ibid., p.759, 1536.63 & 64). He was given a gift by the king (unspecified) in November 1546, and in December obtained a post at court for his brother James;⁶¹ for

61. James was Keeper of the Standing Wardrobe at the Palace of Westminster under Elizabeth (Calendar of Patent Rolls. Elizabeth I, Vol.III, 1563-1566, p.387, no.2159).

himself he obtained the grant of the lordship and manor, rectory and advowson of the vicarage of Teynton, Oxfordshire, 'for his services' (Letters and Papers, Vol.XXI, Part 2, Sept. 1546-Jan. 1547, p.153, 331.58; p.227, 475.93; p.232, 476.27). When Henry

VIII died, Harman was one of the witnesses of his will, and was left a legacy of two hundred marks by the king (ibid., XXI, Part 2, Sept. 1546-Jan. 1547, p.323).

Under Edward VI he continued to consolidate and lease the lands he had acquired from the dissolution of the monasteries; in Martyn (not stated in which county); Barton, Berkshire; and Langborowe, Gloucestershire; he also had 'shops, cellars, solars [lofts?], curtilages [yards] and gardens...in Watlyngstrete' in London (Public Record Office, Calendar of Patent Rolls. Edward VI, I, 1547-1548, pp.52, 202, 213, 395; II, 1548-1549, pp.210, 406). He did not lose his position at court: on 20 September 1547 he was paid for duties as 'Gentilman Husshar' to the king (Acts of the Privy Council of England, New Series, II, 1547-1550, edited by J.R. Dasent (London, 1890), p.129). He was made justice of the peace for Oxfordshire on 26 May 1547, (Calendar of Patent Rolls. Edward VI, I, 88). In 1548 he conveyed extensive lands in Barton, Berkshire, 'late of Abingdon monastery' (ibid., II,88). The last reference I have found to Harman is in 1558, when he was one of the jury at the inquest held on a tailor accidentally shot at a military training exercise (Calendar of Assize Records, Sussex Indictments, Elizabeth I, edited by J.S. Cockburn (London, 1975), pp.215-216).

Fulwell ends The Flower of Fame by saying that his Muse brought him to Hermon Hill, where he wrote his book, presumably under the encouraging eye of his patron (p.375). There is a glowing panegyric on the virtues of Harman, his faithful friend, in The Art of Flattery.

There are other references to Fulwell's friends and acquaintances in The Flower of Fame. One of them was a fellow-clergyman in Gloucestershire, Richard Coppock, who wrote the Latin commendatory verses at the beginning of the book: 'In Ulpiani Fulwelli operis laudem Richardi Coppoci carmen' (pp. 340-341). Coppock was rector of Whittington in 1570, a village not very far from Naunton. He was educated at Hart Hall, Oxford, and received his B.A. degree in 1573 (Foster Alumni Oxonienses, ...1500-1714, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1891), I, 327).

After Fulwell had finished his 'treatise' of Henry VIII in The Flower of Fame, he met a group of captains who had fought in the Scottish wars, and he was inspired by them to add an account of the siege of Haddington in 1548, 'one of the most brilliant defences of the century', according to DNB (article on Sir James Wilford, XXI, 236). Fulwell does not give any details of how or where he met these captains, but it may have been through Harman who belonged to the same generation.

When I had ended this treatise of the moste famous King Henry the eyght, and readie to put the same in prynte, I chaunced into the company of certaine capitaines that had served in King Henrie's warres, and in King Edward's; and ever since, as often as they have bene called thereunto. And after talke ministred, they seemed greatly to lament that so noble a piece of servyce as was done at Haddington, shoulde so sleyghtlye passe thorough the handes of cronographers. Whereupon, I (being by them earnestly requested) have taken on mee to discourse therof, by the instruccions of these sayde gentlemen, who were theare present during all this worthie service, which well deserveth the name of noble and worthie. (pp.368-369)

Fulwell gives a list of the captains that were at Haddington, 'as neare as coulde be called to remembrance', and singles out

'Capitayne Dethick, woh was my cheefe instructor in this matter' (p.373). This must be Sir Gilbert Dethick, who was made Garter king-of-arms in 1550 and knighted in 1551 (DNB, V, 868). Another of the captains, Sir James Acroft, is named as being alive at the time of writing (1575). Fulwell does not claim acquaintance with him, however; he is

a valiant gentleman, whose worthie commendations I omitt; because he geing alyve, and in deserved estimation, I myght bee suspecte of flatterie. (p.372)

Acroft, or Croft, had been made governor of Haddington in 1549, and became controller of the Queen's household and a privy councillor in 1570. In spite of this, he was twice suspected of treason; the verdict of history is not as kind to him as Fulwell was: 'he was always playing a double game; private ends guided his political conduct' (DNB, article on Sir James Croft, V, 111). Fulwell's account of the siege of Haddington, based on eyewitness reports, is the liveliest part of The Flower of Fame. It is also valuable historically and has been cited by historians from Holinshed and Speed onwards.⁶²

62. Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, edited by Sir Henry Ellis, 6 vols (London, 1807-1808; rptd. New York, 1976), III, 890, and V, 560; John Speed, The History of Great Britaine (1611; STC 23045), Book 9, chapter 22, p.811. The writer of the article on Sir James Wilford, provost marshal of the English army in the Scottish campaign of 1547, also quotes Fulwell's assessment of Wilford in The Flower of Fame (DNB, XXI, 236).

The Flower of Fame also gives some insight into Fulwell's religious persuasions, as being staunchly anti-papist. His remarks on Henry VIII and the Reformation have a Calvinist

flavour to them, as he describes Henry as

elect and chosen of God, to be that Ezechias, that should sinsearly set forth his sacred lawes. Yea, he was the verye Hercules that was born to subdue the Romysh Hydra against whych many-hedded monster, neyther Kyng nor Keysar could prevayle, untill this puissant Hercules tooke the matter in hand; to the glorie of God, and his perpetuall fame. (p.342)

His later dedication of The Art of Flattery to Mildred Lady Burghley might confirm a protestant bias, since Mildred was a noted puritan.

The Flower of Fame, with its cloying adulation of the Tudor dynasty and in particular of Henry VIII, gives the impression that Fulwell was an ambitious man determined to attract the favourable attention of the court and of Burghley, the fountain of court patronage. As W.T. MacCaffrey pointed out, 'No one enjoyed the confidence of the sovereign in so large a measure as Burghley, and no one was so well placed to guide the flow of patronage.'⁶³ Perhaps he was after a more glittering prize

63. 'Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics', quoted by Smallwood, 'Lord Burghley as a Patron of Religious Literature', p.33.

than the country rectory in the Cotswolds. He may have spent some time at court, and his descriptions of court life in The Art of Flattery have a ring of truth about them. Alfred B. Gough believes that Fulwell visited the court in 1575-1576, between the publication of The Flower of Fame and The Art of Flattery. He quotes several passages from the latter about life at court, and comments:

Comparing these four versions of the same story, with their persistent note of personal annoyance, one is

naturally led to suppose that the author had suffered a rebuff at Elizabeth's court....One is tempted to connect the supposed incident with the publication by Fulwell in the previous year of The Flower of Fame, which contained fulsome eulogies of both Elizabeth's parents, a most difficult and delicate task, not too skilfully performed. Coming to court in the hope of a reward, he had perhaps gained nothing but thanks, and in a fit of irritaion had 'blazed bold speeches,' and 'compiled lewd poems,' the malicious verses of Ars Adulandi. ('Who Was Spenser's Bon Font?', Modern Language Review, 12 (1917), 140-145 (p.143))

Gough was not aware that Fulwell's benefice at Naunton was in the patronage of the crown, and that he was presented to the living by the Queen and Lord Burghley, which might suggest an earlier visit to the court. It seems quite likely that, as a suitor from the provinces, he may have been laughed at and mocked for his unfashionable clothing and unsophistication; although we need not take Fulwell's assertion that he was threadbare literally, since he was, after all, the son of a linen-draper. One thing that is known for certain between the publication of these two works is that he received his licence to preach on 14 November 1575 - whether as a consequence of the favourable reception of The Flower of Fame we cannot tell. This must have led to some increase in his income, for he would be paid a fee for preaching special sermons, such as funeral sermons.⁶⁴

64. Fulwell exhibited this licence to preach at the archiepiscopal visitation of 1576 (GDR 39, p.54; Hockaday Abstracts: General, 1576-1577, Vol.47, p.57).

The climax of Fulwell's literary career was reached with the publication of The Art of Flattery in 1576. This must have

been published before 7 July, when Fulwell was summoned before the Court of High Commission; but it may have been published before May, for a caveat as to the rectory of Naunton was entered in the General Act Book of Gloucester diocese on 2 May (GDR 27a, p.80; Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton). Unfortunately the Act Book gives no details of what the caveat was for - a blank space is left under the entry - but it seems reasonable to suppose that it may have been something to do with Fulwell's satire. It is interesting that, as a clergyman, Fulwell should have directed his most pungent and hard-hitting satire in The Art of Flattery against the abuses of the church and the corruption of the higher clergy, particularly those at Wells. He makes very little effort to disguise his attack on the Archdeacon of Wells Cathedral, merely reversing the spelling of the names to 'Slew' in 'Tesremos' (Somerset). I believe that the satire has a much more local application than has been hitherto realised (except by Ribner). Fulwell is expressing the hostility of the townspeople of Wells, the burghers and citizens from which he sprung, to the 'gownspeople', the ecclesiastical establishment of the cathedral.

The conflict between the bishop and the town was of long standing: as early as the fourteenth century the town had attempted to get a charter from the king. They were successful: Edward III granted them a charter in 1341, but this was 'cancelled after protracted litigation', and rioting broke out, 'the townsmen...banding themselves together to resist the bishop's extortions'. The bishop was awarded three thousand

pounds damages, a considerable sum at the time.⁶⁵ In the 1540s

65. Dorothy O. Shilton and Richard Holworthy, introduction to Wells City Charters, Somerset Record Society, 46 (1931), p.xv.

the Wells burghers complained about the bishop's economic stranglehold on the city: the tradesmen - bakers, brewers, fishers, butchers, innkeepers - all had to pay a yearly fee to the bishop. The annual fairs also had to pay dues to the bishops; Bishop Berkeley doubled his takings from the four annual fairs by diligent collection (Hembry, The Bishops of Bath and Wells 1540-1640, p.209). The bishop also had control of the common markets held every week in Wells on Wednesdays and Saturdays: he was entitled to one pint for every bushel of grain offered for sale in the market, whether sold or not - 'which is contrary to the liberties of the said town, for the town of Wells is a free borough for all burgesses to buy and sell, without paying any manner of toll or custom', as the burgesses complained (Hembry, pp.35, 36; Wells City Charters, pp.xviii-xix). Hembry comments in her economic analysis of the relationship between bishop and town that 'The economic grip of the bishop on the city was of long standing, but none the less resented for that' (Hembry, p.33).

The bishop asserted his authority in the town by holding a three-weeks court in Wells, in which the tradespeople and citizens were fined for various offences (Hembry, pp.37-38). In 1566 Bishop Berkeley tried to suppress the 'progressive tendencies' of the Wells citizens by forbidding them their

own three-weeks court for actions between burgess and burgess.⁶⁶

-
66. Thomas Scott Holmes, Wells and Glastonbury: a Historical and Topographical Account (London, 1903), pp.86-87; Hembry p.207.
-

One of the bishop's articles of complaint, entered in the city's minutes on 11 March 1566, may be relevant to Fulwell:

Item that my Lord Busshopp sayeth that we ought nott to take bande [i.e. bond] of the Taylers that are burgesses within this Towne for the reformacon of Apparell and makinge of great hoses accordinge to the tenure of the statute and proclamacon.
(Wells City Charters, p.xix)

It seems something of a coincidence that Fulwell satirised 'breeches as big as good barrels' in Like Will to Like, published two years later in 1568. Fulwell must have sided with the Wells burgesses in their attempts to reform apparel.

In 1574 and 1575, just before the publication of The Art of Flattery, the hostility between the bishop and the town reached a head. The bishop got wind of the town's attempt to get a charter, and wrote a flurry of letters to Lord Burghley in an attempt to stop it. The first letter, written on 7 February, claimed that the town was too poor to maintain a mayor, recorder, magistrates and other officials. According to Berkeley, the town was economically dependent on the cathedral:

the town was poor, and stood by handicraftsmen: which, if the bishop were not present, and the masters of the cathedral church, (for which causes there was great resort to the town,) they were not able to get their bread, much less to feed others.
(Strype, Annals of the Reformation, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1824; rptd. New York, 1964), II.I, p.505)

The power struggle between the town and the bishop intensified:

The bishop did also employ his lawyers to impeach this attempt of the townsmen; and was so successful at length, that they, finding they could not prevail by law, sought by all sinister means to molest him, and now took this course to obtain their purpose: to put up a supplication to the queen, for the having a new corporation, only to maintain the name of the mayor, recorder, and two justices; so that they might have four justices of the peace within the town. Which thing, as the said bishop in another letter [28 February] to the same lord informed, was never heard of in that town before. They also intended by a multitude (or, as we now say, a mob) to make an exclamation against the bishop, and to suborn such matter in malice as they possibly could, to discredit him.
(Strype, II,i, p.506)

Berkeley wrote again to Burghley, threatening that the townspeople 'should have small joy...of their evil doings' (Strype, II.i, p.506). Notwithstanding, the Wells citizens 'pursued their complaints against the bishop, as though, by virtue of his power, he had laid heavy burdens unjustly upon them' (Strype, II.i, p.506).

On 5 March 1574 the queen granted the town its long-desired charter, which would have given it some leverage against the encroachments of the bishop. The citizens' distrust of the bishop can be seen in the fact that they decided that if the bishop asked to see the charter, they would show him a copy only, and even then 'on no account leave it with him' (Wells City Charters, p.xx). The charter was challenged immediately by the bishop. A commission was appointed to inquire into the matter. Two of the bishop's bailiffs gave evidence: John Lane stated that he had been assaulted and imprisoned, put in the cage (the town prison, as opposed to the Cowhouse, the bishop's prison), and his gown torn; and John Quarre had been put in the

stocks by the irate townsfolk (Holmes, Wells and Glastonbury, pp. 28-29). In the subsequent lawsuit at the beginning of 1575, the burgesses lost their case, and the new charter was ordered to be returned and cancelled (Wells City Charters, p. xx; Hembry p. 203). One can imagine the feelings of the burgesses at this defeat. Fulwell's attack on the corruption and materialism of the Wells cathedral establishment in The Art of Flattery must be seen in this context. He was himself the son of a freeman of the city, and there is no doubt as to which side he was on. Added to the indignities and exactions suffered by the burgesses of Wells in general, was the aggravation that his own family had suffered at the hands of the subchanter and dean of Wells Cathedral in particular.

The bishop of Bath and Wells, Gilbert Berkeley, was not slow in reacting to Fulwell's attack. Fulwell was summoned before the Court of High Commission in London, and on 7 July 1576 he was ordered by the court to make a public recantation:

The forme of wordes followinge are appointed by the quenes ma^ts highe Commissioners appointed for causes ecclia^sticall [sic] to be said openlie, by Vlpian ffullwell clerck persone of Naunton in the Countie of Gloucester in such place and before such companie as the right reverend father the bisshop of Bathe and Wells shall appointe and that the said Vlpian shall present him self before the said Bisshop of Bathe and Wells before the last daie of August next cominge to accomlishe the same. And the same shall so accomlishe in Maner and forme followinge and at such place and tyme and before such companie as the said bishop shall appointe And to certifie this court of the doinge ther of by the hand wrytinge of the said right reverend father, the first court to be holden and kepte in Michelmas terme next by the said Comissioners in the Consistorie in powles.

Whereas I Vlpian ffullwell clerck of late very vndiscre tlie set furth a booke intytuled, the first parte of the viijth Liberall sciences, otherwise called Ars adulandi, or the arte of flatterie owt of w^{ch} booke it hath bin gathered that I shold write and meane vnreverentlie and sclaunde rouslie of you^u right reverend father in god my L. bisshop of Bathe and Wells and others . I ame vnfaynedlie sory that by my occacon anie such meaninge or collection owte of the said booke hath bin had towchinge yo^r L. for that I ment no matter ageinst the same . yet forasmuche as it hath bin so takin. It is my parte and Dutie to acknowledg my follie. And therfore I doe here most humblie and wth vnfayned repentaunce confesse my fault, and aske principallie god forgevenes, and yo^u my Lord, and all others, to whome by my doings, offence hath bin gevin./ And I do also constantlie promys, and by gods assistance will performe the same, that I ame and hereafter wilbe duringe my lief, an enemye vnto all Libells and libellers and setters furth of such infamous books, and will do my best endeavo^r for the suppressinge of all such attempts

per me Vlpianū

ffulwell

both by worde and wrytinge, to the vttermost of my power. And that I maie so doe I humblie desire yo^u all to praie for me.

per me Vlpianū

ffulwell

(P.R.O., Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, Ecclesiastical Documents, E135/9/5; discovered by C.J. Sisson and published in Ribner II, pp.268-269)

Unfortunately the records of the High Commission are incomplete, and there is no evidence that Fulwell made this public apology. He got off comparatively lightly: he could have been fined or imprisoned. No doubt he was protected by the fact that he had dedicated The Art of Flattery to Lady Burghley - this must have irritated Bishop Berkeley. Perhaps the Burghleys

protected him from more serious punishment. This would fit in with the conclusion of Smallwood's thesis on Burghley's patronage of religious writers: 'To writers of Puritan sympathies he frequently afforded protection from the ecclesiastical authorities, though to extremists he was not sympathetic' (Smallwood, p.374).

In the archiepiscopal visitation of 1576 Fulwell exhibited his institution papers, dated 30 December 1570; his licence to preach dated 14 November 1575; and his priest's orders of 15 September 1566 (GDR 39, p.54; Hockaday Abstracts General 1576-1577, vol.47, p.57). The churchwardens of Naunton, Henry Unter [Hunter] and William Woodwarde, made several presentments against him, and 18 January 1577 Fulwell was fined seventeen shillings in the consistory court because 'the curate hath not showed his licence to the churchward[en]' and because 'John Hinckesman hath receaued the frutes &c these v yeres' (GDR 40, Register of Presentments and Detection Causes 1576-1577; no pagination). John Hinckesman, (or Hanckesmen), a yeoman of Naunton, had stood surety for Fulwell in 1571 for the first fruits of the rectory, according to the Composition Books in the Exchequer (P.R.O. Composition Books, Vol.8, fo.231; Hockaday Abstracts 291; Naunton). He had been a churchwarden in 1572, according to the visitation records in that year (GDR 29, p.25). It is puzzling to know what the significance of these accusations are, but presumably the latter is an indication that Fulwell had been absent from his parish for some time.

The rest of the presentment suggests that this is a likely conjecture, for we find a sad state of affairs in the parish:

the masters & parents send not their children to
learne the cathechisme &c
the clerke cannot reade
they receave but once a yere
(GDR 40, Register of Presentments and Detection Causes,
18 January 1577)

It seems that the curate employed by Fulwell to perform his parochial duties was negligent. According to the Canons of 1571, parents had to send their children and apprentices regularly to learn the catechism.⁶⁷ W.P.M. Kennedy comments that:

67. Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical 1571, in Edward Cardwell, Synodalia (Oxford, 1842), I, 120; cited by S.L. Ware, The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects (Baltimore, 1908), p.36.

One of the parson's most important duties was to teach his flock. The usual time ordered for this teaching was an hour or half an hour before or after Evening Prayer. Special attention must be given to children, servants, and apprentices between the ages of six and twenty. The clergy divided the parishes into households, arranged the days and times for different groups, and read out the arrangement publicly in church, so that there could be no excuse. The churchwardens were ordered to take the names of absentees; and these, with those of negligent parents, guardians, or masters, were presented regularly every quarter to the ordinary. (Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, 3 vols, Alcuin Club (London, 1924), I, cx)

The parish clerk was required to read portions of the church services, and his literacy was usually inquired into at visitations: for example, Edmund Grindall's 1576 visitation as Archbishop of Canterbury inquired 'whether he be able and ready to read the first lesson, the epistle, and the psalms,

with answers to the suffrages, as is used' (Cardwell, Documentary Annals, I, 408; article 39).

'They receave but once a yere' refers to the receiving of the holy sacrament at communion. According to the Canons of 1571, 'all persons over fourteen had to receive communion at Easter, and at least on two other occasions during the year' (Ware, Elizabethan Parish, p.36; citing Cardwell, Synodalia, I, 120). This was the absolute minimum, however; the devout were supposed to receive communion more often. W.P.M. Kennedy comments that 'the ideal of a weekly celebration [of communion] soon lapsed, if ever it existed' (Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, I, cxiv).

Was Fulwell absent from his parish for most of the five years from 1572 to 1576? Perhaps he spent some time with Edmund Harman gathering the material for The Flower of Fame, and cultivating the acquaintance of the captains who had fought at the battle of Haddington. However, he must have written part of The Art of Flattery at Naunton, for the letter from Lady Hope to Lady Fortune is specifically addressed 'from my house at Naunton' (First Dialogue, p.18). Perhaps, too, he spent some time at court in the hope of preferment, as the Second Dialogue of The Art of Flattery implies. It seems ironical that Fulwell should be attacking the abuses of the church on the one hand, in The Art of Flattery, and neglecting his own parish on the other.

At the end of 1577 Fulwell's first wife died; the parish register at Naunton records that 'The xvijth daie of December

was buried Eliano^r ffullwell.' Four months later, on 14 April 1578, he married his second wife, Mary Whorwood, in Lapworth, Warwickshire:

Vlpian ffullwell of the parishe of Nawnton within the countie of Glocester and Marye whorewood of this parishe were married.

(Lapworth Parish Register, Vol.I, 1561-1749, p.22; now in the County Record Office, Warwick; also in Robert Hudson, Memorials of a Warwickshire Parish... Lapworth (London, 1904), p.141)

The Whorwoods were a Warwickshire family whose most illustrious member was Sir William Whorwood, Attorney General to Henry VIII. They owned mills in Birmingham, and property in Newbold Revel, Thelsford near Charlecote, Pillerton Hersey, the manor of Wasperton (originally part of the Priory of Coventry), and Shrewley near Hatton, and married into the local gentry: a Margaret Whorwood married Thomas Throckmorton of Coughton Court in the sixteenth century.⁶⁸ I have not found any mention of

68. Victoria County History of Warwickshire, III, 78; V, 38, 134, 188; VI, 175; VII, 59, 257, 266, 566-567.

Whorwoods in Lapworth, but Fulwell was marrying into a well-connected family. How did he meet Mary Whorwood? The answer is conjectural, but he may have done so while socializing with the captains who had fought at the battle of Haddington, when he was writing The Flower of Fame. There is a portrait of Sir James Wilford, provost-marshal of the English army in the Scottish campaign of 1547-1548, and governor of Haddington, in Coughton Court, just a few miles from Lapworth, the seat of the Throckmortons. The portrait had an inset of the walled town of

Haddington in the top right hand corner.⁶⁹

-
69. A similar portrait is reproduced as the frontispiece to Volume 4 of The Genealogist.
-

Almost exactly nine months after the wedding, their first child Mary was baptised, on 19 January 1579, as recorded in the Naunton parish register; a son Edmund, no doubt named after Fulwell's friend and patron, Edmund Harman, followed, his baptism recorded on 12 December 1580. A second son John was baptised on 29 July 1582, only to die less than a month later; he was buried on 14 August. Three other sons are mentioned in the parish register at Naunton: Thomas, baptised 11 September 1583; Ulpian, baptised 27 November 1584; and Whorwood, buried 18 October 1585 - there is no record of his baptism so he probably died soon after birth or was stillborn (Fulwell family tree, Appendix II).

Just two months after his daughter Mary was baptised at Naunton, when he was thirty-three years old, Fulwell went up to Oxford. On 27 March 1579 he matriculated at St Mary's Hall; the matriculation register gives his age, his place of birth (Somerset), and the fact that he was 'generosi filius', son of a gentleman.⁷⁰ His younger brother George was also in

-
70. Register of the University of Oxford, edited by Andrew Clark, 2 vols (Oxford, 1885-1889), II.ii, p.86.
-

Oxford; he is in the list of privileged persons, and is described as the servant of a Dr Cooke.⁷¹ St Mary's Hall had been graced

-
71. *ibid.*, II.i, p.391; 2 April 1579; George's age is given as thirty. He had matriculated at Queen's College Cambridge in 1566 (Venn, Alumni Cantabrigie, Part I, II, 186; also Venn, Cambridge Matriculations and Degrees (Cambridge, 1913), p.270).

earlier by the presence of Erasmus, and was closely affiliated to Oriel College, where Fulwell's more illustrious contemporary Sir Walter Raleigh had been a student in the early 1570s. Oriel had connections with Somerset and in particular with Wells. Anthony Blencowe, provost from 1574 to 1618, was a canon of Wells Cathedral. Previous provosts, Thomas Cornysh (provost 1493-1507) and John Belly or Bellay (1566-1574), were also from Somerset. Cornish was buried in Wells Cathedral and retired to Somerset when he resigned from Oriel; he is remembered as the person to whom Alexander Barclay dedicated his Ship of Fools. Perhaps Fulwell chose St Mary's Hall because of these Somerset connections.

By the time Fulwell went to Oxford, he had already published his three books, and the second edition of The Art of Flattery was coming out, published by Richard Jones, with the author's revisions and additions. Anthony à Wood says that while at St Mary's Hall Fulwell 'partly wrote' The Art of Flattery, but this of course is incorrect, unless he is referring to Fulwell's revisions (Athenae Oxoniensis, I, 540). While at Oxford, according to Wood, Fulwell 'was esteemed a person of ingenuity by his contemporaries'. Wood says that 'whether he took any degree among us, it appears not' (I, 540). There is no record of his graduation, but according to a list of Gloucester clergy, he had the degree of Master of Arts by May 1584.⁷²

72. 'A Catalogue of the Clergie within the Diocese of Glocester with their Preferments abilities &c taken in the time of Dr. Humfrey, dean of Gloucester', dated by Hockaday as after 29 May 1584 (Hockaday Abstracts: General 1581-1584, Vol. 49, p.21; from Lambeth Chartae misc. 12 no. 7). Laurence Humphrey was Dean of Gloucester from 1570 to 1584.

In this list he is described as 'rector. M.A. Not a preacher. No other benefice.' This is surprising, since Fulwell had been licensed to preach in 1575 (above, p.93). Perhaps this licence was taken away from him after his appearance before the Court of High Commission in 1576.

Fulwell was again in trouble at the episcopal visitation of May 1584. The presentment is in Latin and difficult to read, but it seems to be concerned with his curate, Humphrey Price, performing an illegal marriage without the proper banns being read (GDR 54; no pagination). In the next month, his mother died, and Valentine Dale, dean of Wells, proceeded to instigate a lawsuit against him to recover the subchanter's lands (as related in lawsuit 9). One can understand, in emotional terms, why Fulwell and his brother George were glad to sign the deed giving up their rights in the contentious subchanter's lands to George Upton. According to lawsuit 9, the deed was dated 23 February, 1585.

In October of the same year, his little son Whorwood died. He was not long to follow. The last diocesan records referring to Fulwell are dated 1586, and show that he died before 13 July in that year. These are a series of three caveats entered into the records of the Gloucester consistory court between 13 July and 18 July. They show that there was a dispute over the patronage of the advowson to the rectory of Naunton between William Forster or Foster of Upton super Hamam in the diocese of Lichfield, gentleman, and the Bishop of Worcester.⁷³

-
73. According to Eales, the right of presentation to the rectory usually belonged to the Bishop of Worcester; but whenever the see was vacant, it reverted to the crown. This is why Fulwell was presented by the Queen. (Naunton upon Cotswold, pp. 41, 42).
-

Foster claimed an interest through his wife Eleanor, the widow of one William Mason and executrix of Mason's will 'and for that reason patron for this time' (Hockaday Abstracts, vol. 291: Naunton; Hockaday's translation of GDR 27a, p.147). Apparently the dispute was settled in favour of the Bishop of Worcester, for in October 1586 the rectory of Naunton, vacant by reason of the death of Ulpian Fulwell, was filled. The institution was done in London, 'by reason of the double quarrel' (Hockaday Abstracts 291; translation of GDR 27a, p.149). The new rector was Joseph Hincksman, who compounded for the first fruits at £16 13s. 4d. on 29 October 1586 (Hockaday Abstracts 291: Naunton; from PRO Composition Books, Vol. 10, fo.135). One of his sureties was the same John Hincksman of Naunton, yeoman, who had been a surety for Fulwell on his institution to the benefice in 1571.

When Fulwell died in 1586, his widow Mary was left in desperate straits, 'greatly distressed' as lawsuit 8 puts it. As we saw, George Upton, the trustee appointed by Christabel Fulwell/Foster, would give only four pounds annually to her relief out of the revenues from the subchanter's lands; he paid this for just over a year, 'but afterwards would pay it no longer' (lawsuit 8). One wonders what happened to the destitute family: the widow left with four small children aged seven, six,

three and two respectively. There is no record of the burial of Ulpian or Mary in the Naunton parish register, which suggests that Ulpian died sesewhere, and that Mary moved away after his death, perhaps back to her relatives. His son Edmund seems to be the only member of the family who stayed on at Naunton: the parish register records his marriage to Cicely Hix on 30 May 1612.⁷⁴ Perhaps it was a shotgun marriage, for their daughter

74. Also in Gloucestershire Parish Registers. Marriages, edited by W.P.W. Phillimore, Vol.15 (London, 1909) p.93.

Margaret was baptised two months later on 26 July 1612. Margaret died shortly afterwards and was buried on 16 October 1613.

Edmund was a servant to a widow Crumpe at Naunton in 1608.⁷⁵

75. The Names and Surnames of all the Able and Sufficient Men in Body fit for His Majesty's Service in the Wars, within the County of Gloucester...in...August, 1608, compiled by John Smith (London, 1902), p.141.

The eldest daughter, Mary, married a William Hancock at Banbury when she was nineteen, on 15 May 1598.⁷⁶ She and her

76. The Marriage Register of Banbury, Part I, 1558-1724, transcribed by N. Fillmore and J. Pain, edited by J.S.W. Gibson, Banbury Historical Society (1960), p.28.

husband embarked on a lawsuit in chancery to try and retrieve their interest in the subchanter's lands on 22 November 1598 (lawsuit 9). The other two surviving children, Thomas (undoubtedly named after his successful paternal grandfather), and Ulpian Junior, have disappeared without trace.

Fulwell seems to have been a popular clergyman in his parish,

despite the evidence of the Gloucester diocesan records of his lapses in administration. This can be deduced from the fact that in the Naunton Parish register several children were baptised with Fulwell as their Christian name: Fulwell Edgerton on 5 October 1580; on 13 August 1582 'was baptised ffullwell the sonne of Jhon Bache'; on 2 September 1582 'ffullwell the sonne of Richard Smithe'. Three families in this small parish, numbering only sixteen families in 1563, thought enough of Fulwell to name their sons after him, and this at a period when he must have been commuting between Naunton and Oxford. It is an impressive and touching tribute to Fulwell's impact on his flock.

APPENDIX I: LAWSUITS CONCERNING THE SUBCHANTER'S LANDS

These are in the Public Record Office; page references are to Ribner's article, 'Ulpian Fulwell and his Family', Notes and Queries, 195 (1950), 444-448.

1. Chancery C1/1121/41-44: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman; undated, ca. 1545.
2. Star Chamber 3 (Edward VI) 5/50: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman; interrogatories dated 23 October 1547; Ribner I, p.445.
3. Star Chamber 3 (Edward VI) 5/31: John Bucher vs. John Stephins, Robert Stephins, Jasper Swarthe, John Basing and John Horner; undated, between 4 October 1551 and 6 July 1553.
4. Star Chamber 4 (Philip and Mary) 8/24: Thomas Fulwell vs. John Goodman, William Goodman, Paul Parker, Thomas Egill, William Davye and John Lewis; 1558.
5. Chancery C3/64/1: Christabel Fulwell vs. Bartholomew Haggatt; 13 October 1564; Ribner I, pp.445-446.
Chancery Decrees and Orders C33/32/105, and C33/31/209; 1565.
6. Chancery C3/181/29: William Turner vs. Christabel Fulwell; undated, ca. 1566; Ribner I, pp.446-447.
7. Chancery C3/62/71: James and Christabel Foster vs. Bartholomew Haggatt; 15 October 1568.

8. Chancery Town Depositions C24/265/104: John and Christabel Rushall vs. George Upton and others; interrogatories dated 15 November 1598; Ribner I, p.447.
Chancery Decrees and Orders C33/98/745^v; C33/99/124^v; and C33/100/119^v; all dated 1600.
9. Chancery C2/Elizabeth/H2/59: William and Mary Hancock vs. George Upton and George Fulwell; 22 November 1598.
Chancery Decrees and Orders C33/101/783; and C33/104/174; 1602.

APPENDIX II: FULWELL FAMILY TREE

William Fulwell
(alive 1539)

Thomas =
d. 1563

Christabel James
d. 1584
= (2) James Foster
d. 1581

Robert James
of Wrington
b. 1523? alive 1598

Ulpian
1546-1586

= (1) Eleanor Warde
m. 13 May 1572
d. 1577

George
b. 1549

Edward

William

Christabel
= John Rushall

→ = (2) Marie Whorewood
m. 14 April 1578

Mary
bapt. 19 Jan.
1579

= William
Hancock
m. 15 May 1598

Edmund
bapt. 12 Dec.
1580

= Cicely Hix
m. 30 May 1612

Margaret
bapt. 26 July 1612
buried 16 Oct. 1613

John
bapt. 19
July 1582
buried 14
Aug. 1582

Thomas
bapt. 11
Sept. 1583

Ulpian
bapt. 27
Nov. 1584

Whorwood
buried
18 Oct.
1585

LITERARY INTRODUCTION

The Art of Flattery has never received the critical attention it deserves. It is often assumed that a minor work which does not reach the pages of the standard histories of English literature is ipso facto a bad one and not worth reading. But is this really true of Fulwell's satire? Fulwell's other works have received more attention: his interlude Like Will to Like is always mentioned in discussions of drama of the early Tudor period, and has appeared in several modern editions.¹ His second work, The Flower of

-
1. A Select Collection of Old English Plays, edited by Robert Dodsley, fourth edition revised and enlarged by W.C. Hazlitt, 15 vols (London, 1874-1876), III, 303-359; The Dramatic Writings of Ulpian Fulwell, Comprising 'Like Will to Like', Note-Book and Word-List, edited by John S. Farmer (London, 1906; rptd. New York, 1966); Like Will to Like, 1587, Tudor Facsimile Texts (London, 1909; rptd. New York, 1970); Tudor Interludes, edited by Peter Happé, Penguin English Library (Harmondsworth, 1972); Four Tudor Interludes, edited by J.A.B. Somerset (London, 1974).
-

Fame (1575), has also been reprinted for its historical, rather than literary, interest.² But The Art of Flattery,

-
2. The Harleian Miscellany; a Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Tracts, edited by William Oldys, with additional notes by Thomas Park, 12 vols (London, 1808-1813; rptd. New York, 1965), IX, 337-375.
-

his last and perhaps best work, has never been reprinted. Perhaps its inaccessibility is one reason for its neglect.

Fulwell's Earlier Works: 'Like will to Like' and 'The Flower of Fame'

i. Like Will to Like

To appreciate Fulwell's artistic achievement in The Art of Flattery, it must be set in the context of his other works. His first published work was the interlude Like Will to Like Quoth the Devil to the Collier, printed by J. Allde in 1568. With its devil and its vice, it has been awarded a niche in the history of early Tudor drama as a typical example of the genre. Tucker Brooke says that it

is on several accounts one of the most striking of the later interludes, and would seem to be solely responsible for several generalizations of modern writers about the type. It shows the morality stuff already half absorbed in realistic comedy, and it attests in its author...a considerable skill in the production of stage effect.
(The Tudor Drama (Cambridge, Mass., 1911), p.108)

It is heavily didactic, as the title-page emphasizes:

Wherin is declared not onely what punishment followeth those that wil rather followe licentious liuing, then to esteem & followe good counsell; and what great benefits and commodities they receiue that apply them vnto vertuous liuing and good exercises.³

-
3. All quotations from the play are from J.A.B. Somerses's edition in Four Tudor Interludes.
-

As The Art of Flattery explores the 'eighth liberal science', the evil and corrupting 'science' of flattery, so the Vice in Like Will to Like learns 'all kind of sciences' from the devil, Lucifer, 'That unto the maintenance of pride might

best agree' (1.57) and 'Which are able to bring the world to naught' (1.102). Lucifer's grotesque appearance is a visual reminder of the ugliness of sin and the consequences of the Fall; he is animal-like, like 'some dancing bear' (1.72) with an 'ill face' (1.96) and bottle nose.

Lucifer declares that he 'cannot abide to see men that are vicious / Accompany themselves with such as be virtuous' (1.122), thus setting up the dichotomy of the play. He instructs Nichol to keep the two apart, and 'adjoin like to like alway' (1.125). This stark separation of virtue and vice proves to be the weakness of the play, for all the characters must be separated into one extreme or the other: good or evil, virtuous or vicious. There is no one in the middle with whom the audience can identify, as there was in the older morality plays in which the sins of Everyman or Mankind are shown, but also their repentance and salvation. As Bevington comments:

Instead of the alternating and progressive rise of the hero from fallen innocence to spiritual victory, we find...the progressive decline of the corrupted man to ultimate damnation.
(David M. Bevington, From 'Mankind' to Marlowe
(Cambridge, Mass., 1962), p.161)

Also the characterization of the two is in completely different modes. The virtuous characters are abstract allegorical personifications: Virtuous Life, Severity (a judge), Good Fame, Honour, and God's Promise. The 'vicious' characters are lively and realistic portrayals of petty thieves, gamblers, roisterers and drunks: Ton Tossplot, Tom Collier, Rafe Roister,

Hance, Philip Fleming, Pierce Pickpurse and Cutbert Cutpurse. They may represent types of vices (tossport, roister), or national stereotypes (drunken Fleming), but they are presented with realistic detail. This is particularly so in Fulwell's picture of the evils of drink in Hance. Like his friend Philip Fleming, he is 'ready to quass at all hours' (1.448). Once a scholar who used to help the priest say mass, he has degenerated into a stuttering oaf who cannot stand up or find his way home. His Latin has become a hazy memory: 'Omni po po po tenti, al the po po pot is empty' (1.473). Encouraged to dance by the Vice,

He danceth as evil-favoured as may be devised, and
in the dancing he falleth down, and when he riseth
he must groan. (1.495)

The disgusting physical consequences of excessive drinking are emphasized:

By the mass he hath berayed his breeches, methink
by the smell....
He grunts like a bear when he is a moaning;
Hark how his head aches, and how his pulses do beat.
I think he will be hanged, his belly is so great.
(1.499)

Hance ends up in a 'spital house' covered with lice and sick with the gout (1.1191).

Drunken Hance hurts only himself, but the other rogues lead others astray. Rafe Roister boasts that he entices 'young gentlemen all virtue to eschew / And to give themselves to riotousness' (1.420); he seduces servingmen so that 'all in bravery their minds are confused' and they resort to stealing. Tom Tossport encourages poor men and servants to spend the little they have on drink.

The pivot of the play is the encounter between the Vice, Nichol Newfangle, and Virtuous Living. Although Nichol tries to be friendly, Virtuous Living refuses to associate with him:

...all such company I do deny;
For thou art a companion for roisters and ruffians,
And not fit for any virtuous companions. (1.702)

He praises God, stresses the joys of the virtuous life and looks forward to 'eternal salvation at the latter day' (1.680). However, despite his harangues to the audience to 'Repent, repent, your sins shall be downtrodden' (1.825), he makes no attempt to convert Nichol or persuade him to abandon his wicked ways: like will not associate with unlike. The proverb of the title acquires the status of a categorical imperative. Nichol has no alternative but to return to his old acquaintance; he goes off to Hob Filcher's house with Pierce Pickpurse and Cutbert Cutpurse, where, as Cutbert says, they 'will be merry and quass carouse' and find 'Meet mates for us' (1.738). Virtuous Living emphasized that 'vice and virtue cannot together be united, / But the one the other hath always spited' (1.715). However, it is he who has rejected Nichol and his crew, not vice versa.

The downfall of the vicious characters is presented as a 'mirror' for the audience:

Wherefore I would all men my woeful case might see,
That I to them a mirror might be (1.1008)

warns Rafe Roister, as he is given a beggar's bag when he has become destitute through riotous living. Cutbert Cutpurse's punishment is harsher - hanging - and he specifically addresses the youth in the audience:

Oh all youth, take example by me;
Flee from evil company as from a serpent you
would flee,
For I to you all a mirror may be. (L.1137)

Fulwell the clergyman seems to speak through the admonition
of Virtuous Living:

So mark well the end of wickedness and vice -
Shame in this world and pain eternally;
Wherefore you that are here, learn to be wise,
And the end of the one with the other weigh
By that time you have heard the end of this play.
(1.785)

Such crude harangues, the lack of any Christian pity or sympathy for the rogues and sinners, the emphasis on punishment and damnation, and the inhumanity of the abstract allegorical virtuous characters, tend to arouse a perverse sympathy for the rogues. Fallen human nature being what it is, the jolly gathering of Nichol and rest at Hob Filcher's, tossing the black bowl, playing cards, and flaunting frivolous finery, seems more attractive than the pious platitudes of Virtuous Living, God's Promise, Honour and Good Fame, who remind us in a song that 'Life is but short, hope not therein / Virtue immortal seek for to win' (l.879). Although we are informed that God never failed to 'help the pitiful' (l.894), the emphasis falls squarely on punishment and retribution. Although Pierce Pickpurse is allowed to repent and call to God just before he is led out to be hanged -

For he heareth such as are ready to repent,
And desireth not that sinners should fall (1.1153) -

the final song stresses a 'God with vengeance, plagues and woe' and the eternal punishment of the vicious, 'To have their meed in endless pain' (pp.163-4, ll.3, 12). Although

redemption is mentioned, it is only for the virtuous, not for 'vicious minds'.

This gives the play a sombre cast. The emphasis falls finally upon sadness, not mirth: 'mirth for sadness is a sauce most sweet', as the Prologue states (l.35). J.A.B. Somerset comments that 'the stern social fable seems forbiddingly deterministic' (introduction, Four Tudor Interludes, p.21). The mixture of abstract morality allegory and concrete earthy realism seems uneasy. Nichol Newfangle's cheeky colloquialisms -

I would I had a pot, for now I am so hot
By the mass, I must go piss,....
Ginks do fill the bag; I would not pass a rag
To hit you on the snout (l.1186ff.) -

form a strong contrast to the pallid stilted religious rhetoric of Virtuous Living.

The play is lively, and has endeared itself to historians of the drama because it preserves some typical conventions of the interlude genre: the devil and the vice, the vice riding off to hell on the devil's back, his wooden dagger, and also instructions as to staging and music. But it must be admitted that it is flawed. Margeson, in considering Like Will to Like among other late moralities, comments that although 'there are gains in the direction of concreteness of setting, personality, plot development, and comic situation and dialogue', there is also 'a loss of concentration and a loss of emotional power' (The Origins of English Tragedy (Oxford, 1967), p.36).

ii. The Flower of Fame

If Like Will to Like is lively but imperfect, The Flower

of Fame must be considered Fulwell's least satisfactory production. It is neither history nor literature, but an uneasy combination of both; Park calls it an 'historical mélange'.⁴ The title-page indicates that the book falls into

4. Introduction to The Flower of Fame, in Harleian Miscellany, IX, 337. All subsequent references to The Flower of Fame are to this edition.

three parts: the reign of Henry VIII, promising the reader 'Matters, by the rest of our Cronographers overpassed' (p.337); a short treatise of three noble and virtuous queens (three of Henry VIII's six wives); and an account of the battle of Haddington in the reign of Edward VI. The dedication to Lord Burghley suggests a bid for the attention of a powerful patron; in the verses 'Ulpian Fulwell to his Booke', Fulwell asserts that his patron's name will guard and protect his book from 'every whiffing taunting wynde, / that flyes from scornefull tong' (p.340). Not only does he 'shrowde under his shielde' (a reference to Burghley's coat of arms on the verso of the title-page) but he imagines himself and his book both lying 'before [his] feete' in an unpleasant image of abasement.

The first part consists of fifteen sections in alternate prose and verse, opening with a 'description' of Henry's virtues in verse, followed by a prose encomium. After this opening, Fulwell backtracks to the union of the houses of Lancaster and York by Lady Concord (in verse), followed by a prose account of the civil war, the murder of the young princes in the Tower, and the battle of Bosworth with the defeat and death of Richard III. This is followed by Henry VIII's birth,

in verse, attended by the four virtues, Justice, Fortitude, Temperance and Prudence; and a brief prose account of his behaviour in his minority, when he refused to be

seduced by the wicked suggestions of faccious flatterers, that often tymes inveagled him to take uppon him the governaunce of this realme, his Father being alyve; as he him selfe hath reported, after he came to the crowne. (p.347)

Two verse passages about Henry's coronation follow. Fulwell then jumps to the victories of Turwin and Turnay, telling the reader to fill in the chronological gap by perusing Hall's Chronicle. So it goes on, Fulwell concentrating on a few highlights of Henry's reign - battles with France and Scotland, the meeting with Francis I in France - and ending with an epitaph on Henry, in verse.

Fulwell's style in The Flower of Fame is 'drab', to use C.S. Lewis's apt term (English Literature in the Sixteenth Century (Oxford, 1954), p.64). He seems to be aware that he is not rising to his subject: 'The matter meriteth the pen of the best writer, although it hath nowe happened to the handes of an uneloquent compyler' (Dedication, p.338). He apologizes for his 'rough and ragged style', 'respecting more the truthe of the woorkes then the eloquence of wordes' (p.338). In his epistle 'To the frindly Reader' he is defensive about the 'worthinesse' of his style:

For, I confesse I have not the gifte of flowing eloquence, neyther can I enterlace my phrase with Italian termes, nor powder my style with Frenche-Englishe, or inkhorne-rethoricke; neyther cowche my matter under a cloake of curious inventions, to feed the daintie eares of delicate yonkers. And, as I cannot, so if I could I woulde not. For I see that manye men are so affected with these premises, that manye good matters are obscured, the authors encombred, the woorkes but meanelly commended, and the reader deceived. For

while he coveteth to come to the purpose, he is lead, amasked, in the wylde desert of circumstance and digression; seeking farre and finding little, feeding his humor on pleasant woordes of slender wayght, guyded (or rather giddyed) with plaucible eloquence. (p.339)

Such disclaimers were, of course, conventional in prefatory epistles and dedications. Fulwell's use of assonance and alliteration - 'guyded (or rather giddyed)' - shows that he is not indifferent to rhetorical effects; and he is in fact not above using inkhorn terms: words such as 'recomforted', 'invicted', 'mestive' and 'intestive'. But the style of The Flower of Fame is dull, and lacks the liveliness and colloquial quality of either Like Will to Like on the one side or The Art of Flattery on the other. His subject-matter inhibits him. His verse is, as Marlowe might have said, 'jigging', as in his description of Henry VIII's virtues:

A Salomon, for godly witt;
A Solon, for his constant mynde,
A Sampson, when he list, to hit
The furye of his foes unkynde. (p.341)

His attempt at pathos in his epitaph of Henry VIII is sabotaged by its slobbering diction:

With bryndie blubbered teares
ye commons all lament,
Sende forth your sobbes from boyling breast,
let trynkling teares be spent. (p.363)

(Park suggests that 'bryndie' is a misprint for 'brynie'.)

This kind of diction is typical of A Mirror for Magistrates.

As in Like Will to Like Fulwell had presented characters who were 'mirrors' to the audience, so he does in The Flower of Fame; historical personages are seen in the light of 'examples' to the reader. The Scottish king, James, is an

example of the punishment of perjury. Fulwell tells of his 'shamefull ende', his corpse taken from the battlefield and paraded through the streets of London and then carried to Sheen: 'And theare this perjured carcas lyeth unto this day, unburied: a condign end and a meete sepulker for such a forsworn prince' (p.353). James is made 'to utter his complaynt' 'in forme of the "Mirror for Magistrates"'; his statement about his 'end' echoes the simplistic moral scheme of Like Will to Like:

A happie life by happie ende is tride;
A wretched race by wofull ende is known....

My wretched carcas then was brought in sight
Through London streets; wherat the Scottes repine:
The endeles shame of this mishap is myne.
Like butcher's ware, on horsbacke was I brought;
The King of kinges for me this end hath wrought.

Let princes all by me example take
What daunger tis to dally in such cace,
By perjurie their faythes for to forsake. (pp.353-354)

For good measure, Fulwell adds another lamentation by James's son, also in the style of the Mirror for Magistrates, 'that the just judgement of God against perjurie maye the playnelyer appeare: the notable example whereof, may bee a terror unto the large and careless conscience of man' (p.355). He comments on James's death:

Whereby wee may bee sure, that God strooke
the stroake; and whether it were that God
(who stryketh to 'the thirde and fourth
generation of them that hate him') did it for
his Father's offence, or for his owne; I may
not, nor will not judge. But, no doubt, his
Father's ungodly perjurie was heavily in his
mynde; since whose death the realme of Scotland
hath bene sore plaged, and have had little good
successe in any attemptes, and especially against
England. (p.356)

Fulwell reveals the gloomier, punitive side of his religion here, with a dash of patriotic satisfaction at the defeat and discomfort of England's enemies.

Fulwell's unhistorical one-sided portrait of Henry VIII, the elect of God, the exemplar of the four virtues, is nauseating to the modern reader, but fits in with his method of characterization in Like Will to Like in which people are presented as examples of either vice or virtue, who must come consquently to either a bad or a good end in this world. In the play, Virtuous Living is crowned by Honour and attended by Good Fame. God's Promise emphasizes that,

Then must they needs see
Honour in this world and at last a crown of glory.
(1.842; my italics)

Henry's bad qualities and deeds - his treatment of his wives, his impeachment of his friend Sir Henry Norris on a trumped-up charge of adultery with Anne Boleyn - are ignored. Fulwell insists that Henry's 'good fame' will never be tarnished:

And eke, the shyning sunne
shall cease his running race,
Before King Henries' worthie fame
shall suffer one deface. (p.363)

To modern taste, this allegorical treatment of Henry as an exemplar of Virtuous Living is not appropriate in an historical work. The mixture of two modes - apotheosis of a Tudor monarch and historical anecdote - is uneasy.

In the second part of The Flower of Fame, Fulwell drops the historical framework and simply writes a series of poems in praise of three of Henry's queens: Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, and Katherine Parr, in the tradition of 'noble ladyes'

worthie lyves' (p.364). He evades the delicate historical questions raised: Henry's divorce from Catherine of Aragon is not directly mentioned; Anne Boleyn is presented as a Protestant heroine:

O gracious Queene and lawfull spowse
 King Henry, lo! enjoyes,
 Who earst was helde from wedlocke's lawe
 by shewe of Romysh toyes. (p.364)

Like the characters in Like Will to Like, her virtues are to serve as 'mirrors' to other noble dames: 'Those vertues, that you then may viewe, / as mirrours to you all' (p.365). In his epitaph of Anne Boleyn, Fulwell ignores the circumstances of her death, although they may be discreetly hinted at in the lines:

[We] shewe our greefes with secret sighes,
 and langour of the breste,
 The floods of teares, shed for thy sake,
 declares our harts unrest. (p.365)

Fulwell seems to be uneasy, however, at this rather abstract and unhistorical treatment of only three of Henry's six queens, and feels that he will be criticized by the reader:

It will, happely, seeme somewhat straunge unto thee, gentle reader, that I have so sclenderly past over the treatise of these noble ladies before-mencioned, whose lyves and noble vertues I can at large descrybe: and, peradventure, I may bee deemed parciall, for mentioning of these, and omitting the names of King Henrye's other wyves. I confesse I have in my handes a treatise of all their lyves, so farre foorth as tendeth to the commendations of their princely vertues, worthie the immitation of all ladies and gentlewoemen. (p.368)

The proposed 'treatise', then, will be similarly circumscribed, limited only 'to the commendations of their princely vertues',

and as unhistorical and unrealistic as his treatment of Henry VIII. His appeal to the reader for encouragement to publish this 'treatise' evidently fell on deaf ears since no such work appeared.

The third part of The Flower of Fame is a more straightforward account of the battle of Haddington based on eyewitness reports. It is still used as a source by historians (as mentioned in the Biography, p.91). It is the liveliest and most interesting part of the book, for there is no confusion of the allegorical and historical modes, no clash between Tudor panegyric and cold fact.

THE ART OF FLATTERY: SATURA

In The Art of Flattery Fulwell at last found a congenial literary mode in which he could fuse his moral and stylistic preoccupations. The genre of satire allows him to expose and denounce exemplars of vice, and yet at the same time leaven moral earnestness with humour, and to use as his medium the slangy, colloquial style which is his forte in Like Will to Like and which was unfortunately inappropriate in The Flower of Fame.

Fulwell chose the satiric dialogue as the basic form for his satire; in this he was influenced by Erasmus and possibly Lucian, but also by the fact that the dialogue was an immensely popular form at the time of the Renaissance, widely used for expository, polemical, pedagogic as well as satiric, purposes. Fulwell refers to Erasmus in his Sixth Dialogue; he claims that he is following 'the vaine of Erasmus

of Roterodame',

who vsed to place pleasant pamphletes in the midst of serious and graue matters, as well for the recreation of his Reader, as also to display and therby to taunt the follies and trifling fantasies of al sorts of people. (p.94.20)

A closer examination of The Art of Flattery reveals that it contains within the dialogue form a variety of literary devices and modes - fable, mock encomium, allegory, complaint, sermonizing, Theophrastan character, dream vision; it is a Menippean mixture of prose and verse; it is, in short, satura.

Much theoretical discussion has taken place on the concept of satire in the Elizabethan period, influenced by two different derivations of the word: from the Latin satura and the Greek σατυρος. John Heath-Stubbs sums it up most succinctly:

The Latin word satura originally meant a miscellany. The derivation accepted by most scholars is from satura lanx. This was a ritual dish containing offerings of first-fruits of various kinds, which formed part of the celebrations of the ancient Roman harvest festival. From this the name was transferred to the scurrilous verses which... are frequently associated with such festivals in primitive cultures.

A false etymology, which became widely current in the Renaissance period, connected the word satire with the Greek saturos, a satyr. It...often influenced not only the spelling of the word in English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also the conception of the form itself. Since the mythical satyr, half man and half goat, was rough and shaggy, and uninhibited in his behaviour, it was thought proper that literary satire should be the same....This theory was also due to a confusion with the Greek satyr play.
(The Verse Satire (London, 1969), pp.1-2)⁵

5. This 'false etymology' and its effect on the satire of the Elizabethan period has been discussed in O.J. Campbell's Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's 'Troilus and Cressida' (San Marino, California, 1938, pp.27-30), and Robert C. Elliott's The Power of Satire (Princeton, 1960, pp.102-104), among others.

It has been claimed that it was not until Isaac Casaubon's De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Romanorum Satira (1605) that the false etymology of the 'supposed connection between satire and the satyrs of Greek mythology' was exploded (Campbell, Comicall Satyre, p.29; and John Peter, Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature (Oxford, 1956), p.303). But writers in the earlier sixteenth century were certainly aware of the 'satura' derivation. Thomas Drant gave both derivations as early as 1566 in a poem prefixed to his translation of Horace's satires:

...Satyra, of Satyrus, the mossye rude,
Vnciuile god: for those that will them write,
With taunting gyrdes, & glikes, & gibes must
vexe the lewde,
Strayne curtesy, ne recke of mortall spyte....

Or Satyra of Satur, th'authors must be ful
Of fostred arte, infarst in ballasde brest.
To teach the wordlings wyt, whose witched braines
are dul
The worst wyll pardie hearken to the best. 6

6. Quoted from the second edition, Horace his Arte of Poetrie, Pistles, and Satyrs Englished (1567), facsimile with introductions by Peter E. Medine (Delmar, New York, 1972), p.139; misprints corrected from text of first edition, as reprinted in John Peter, Complaint and Satire, Appendix A, p.301.

Drant, for good measure, gave two other derivations of the word: the Arabic word for sword (hence satire is cutting);

and Saturn, the 'waspish' planet.⁷

-
7. He is translating from 'Priscus Grammaticus', i.e. Diomedes the Grammarian (M.C. Randolph, 'Thomas Drant's Definition of Satire, 1566', Notes and Queries, 180 (1941), 416-418 (p.417); Peter, Complaint and Satire, p.302).
-

An even clearer definition of satura was given in a French satire which was inspired by Menippean satire: Satyre Menippée de la Vertu du Catholicon d'Espagne, by Pierre le Roy, canon of Rouen, and others, printed at Paris in 1593-1595 (British Museum Catalogue, vol. 158, p.7), and translated into English in 1595:

All they which haue bin brought vp in learning, knowe very well, that this word Satyre, doth not only signifie a poesie, containing euill speech in it, for the reprofte, either of publike vices, or of particular faults of some certaine persons, of which sort are those of Lucilius, Horace, Iuuenal, and Persius: but also all sortes of writings, replenished with sundry matters, and diuers argumentes, hauing prose and verse intermixed or mingled therewithall, as if it were powdred neats tongues interlarded. Varro saith, that in ancient times, men called by this name, a certaine sorte of pie or pudding, into which men put diuers kindes of hearbes, and of meates. (A Pleasant Satyre or Poesie, no translator given, (STC 15489, 1595), Aa4^v; quoted in Peter, Complaint and Satire, p.303)

Both Drant and Pierre le Roy are expressing ideas about satire which they believe are entirely conventional and traditional, and which any educated person would know - 'all they which haue bin brought up in learning', as le Roy puts it. However the concept of satyr-satire which became fashionable in the last two decades of the sixteenth century has dominated the attention of most twentieth-century critics, even though it does not apply to the earlier sixteenth-century satire.

O.J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre (1938), Alvin Kernan, The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance (New Haven, 1959), and, to a lesser extent, Louis Lecocq, La Satire en Angleterre de 1588 à 1603 (Paris, 1969), have been fascinated by the rough, shaggy, cynical, rude and powerful figure of the satyr-satirist. Other critics have concentrated exclusively on verse satire. As a consequence, prose satire of the period has been comparatively neglected, unless it falls into an easily identifiable category, such as the Theophrastan character, anti-puritan satire, or the Marprelate tracts.⁸

-
8. E.g., R.M. Alden, The Rise of Formal Satire in England under Classical Influence (Philadelphia, 1899); S.M. Tucker, Verse Satire in England Before the Renaissance (New York, 1908) - in spite of its title it deals with verse satire to 1550; and K.W. Gransden's anthology, Tudor Verse Satire (London, 1970); W.P. Holden, Anti-Puritan Satire 1572-1642 (New Haven, 1954); Benjamin Boyce, The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642 (Cambridge, Mass., 1947); Helen C. White, Social Criticism in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century (New York, 1944).
-

John Peter is one of the few critics who have attempted to tackle the theoretical problem posed by the body of satire in the early sixteenth century, before the emergence of the satyr-satirist and the composition of monometric verse satires modelled on those of Horace, Juvenal, and Persius. Peter links this earlier satire to the Christian medieval tradition of 'complaint'. He attempts to distinguish the two in his introductory chapter: complaint is often allegorical, impersonal and vague, 'concerned with the abuse rather than the abuser', and is 'corrective, and clearly does not despair of its power to correct'; whereas satire is concrete, personal,

'often so specific that it does...deal with an individual', and it often reflects 'only a token desire for reform' (Complaint and Satire, pp.9-10). It can be readily seen that The Art of Flattery falls more on the side of satire than complaint. Fulwell makes a personal attack on the Archdeacon of Wells, for example, in the Fifth Dialogue; he is concerned with the individual abuser as well as the abuse. On the other hand, Fulwell's tremendous Biblical denunciations with which he blasts the practitioners of flattery fit in with Peter's description of the 'standard or criterion' of criticism in complaint - the Bible: 'Complaint itself [is] simply a continuing estimate...of the discrepancy between biblical injunctions and contemporary practice' (Complaint and Satire, p.53).

Fulwell, as a clergyman, is imbued with the Christian homiletic tradition of complaint; the standard by which he measures backsliders is the Bible. But he is even more influenced, in constructing his literary work, by the satirical tradition derived from Roman satura. Peter's attempt to divide satire and complaint into two camps breaks down. A.R. Heiserman, considering Peter's terms in relation to Skelton's satire, feels they are not viable:

Peter's terms do not in fact distinguish two types of literary works. The adjectives in his paired definitions at best describe, and that very vaguely, some parts of some literary works of every period and variety.

(Skelton and Satire (Chicago, 1961), p.293)

Louis Lecocq both attacks and defends Peter's categories;

La notion de complaint telle que la définit John Peter - et le choix du mot lui-même, - paraissent contestables. Le mode ainsi caractérisé n'a évidemment pas été isolé par les écrivains du Moyen Age, et il est indéniable que les Anglais ont appelé complaints des poèmes d'inspirations très diverses. Peter a pourtant une justification. Il distingue en réalité trois modes différents, qu'il appelle complaint, satyre et satire, et cette distinction correspond à une nécessité.
 (La Satire en Angleterre de 1588 à 1603, pp.36-37)

Heiserman adheres to the satura concept of satire, as defined by Diomedes: 'a bowl of mixed fruits'. He contends that 'the mixture of conventions is itself an essential attribute of satire' (Skelton and Satire, p.302). Peter believes that Roman satire was rediscovered only at the end of the sixteenth century, ignoring the le Roys and Drants 'brought up in learning' of classical literature.

Fulwell in The Art of Flattery marries complaint, in the sense of homiletic exhortation, to the general structure of classical verse satire and puts it into dialogue form. According to Mary Claire Randolph's analysis, 'the precise pattern and plan of Latin satura' may be resolved into a bi-partite structure: Part A, in which 'some specific vice or folly, selected for attack, was turned about on all sides', and Part B, in which 'its opposing virtue was recommended' ('The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire', Philological Quarterly, 21 (1942), 368-384 (p.369)). In this kind of satura 'there is almost nothing that cannot appropriately be poured into its quasi-dramatic mould' (p.370) —

plebeian folk proverb, Oriental beast fable, dramatic vignette, chreia-like anecdote, rationalized myth, Socratic dialogue...[It is indebted to] the Theophrastian

character, the Bionean diatribe, the Socratic or Platonic dialogue, all 'frame' literature, and all gnomic or wisdom literature. (pp.369-370)
 ['A Chria is a short commemoration, aptly relating the speech or action of some person' (OED 'Chreia'.]

In short, a variety of literary devices is used in order to involve the reader in what Randolph calls 'a mode of dialectic' (p.369). The purpose of all these

miniature dramas, sententious proverbs and quotable maxims, compressed beast fables (often reduced to animal metaphors), brief sermons, sharp debates, series of vignettes, swiftly sketched but painstakingly built up satiric 'characters' or portraits, figure-processions, little fictions and apologues, visions, apostrophes and invocations to abstractions [is] to move his [the satirist's] audience to thought and perhaps to psychological action....the correction of folly and vice by persuasion to rational behaviour. (p.373)

Fulwell not only used this mixed bag of literary devices - this 'bowl of mixed fruits' in Diomedes' words - but also borrowed the bipartite structure for his dialogues. He utilized a typical pattern of interlocutors found in classical verse satire: the satirist confronting an 'adversarius' who embodies a vice or folly to be exposed, or who 'serves as whip and spur to the satirist' (Randolph, p.372). This will be discussed in more detail below.

THE SATIRIC DIALOGUE: LUCIAN

Fulwell was working in a tradition which included not only Roman verse satire and medieval homiletic satire (the 'complaint'), but also the genre of the satiric dialogue. The main exponent and self-proclaimed inventor of this genre in classical literature was Lucian, whose dialogues

were familiar to the Renaissance through school and university textbooks and in the Latin translations of Erasmus and More.⁹ Lucian was one of the top ten most

-
9. Foster Watson, The English Grammar Schools to 1660: their Curriculum and Practice (Cambridge, 1908; rptd. 1968), p.332; T.W. Baldwin, William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke (Urbana, 1944), I, 150, 335, 725, 732-733, 106; Joan Simon, Education and Society in Tudor England (Cambridge, 1966), p.83; Douglas Duncan, Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition (Cambridge, 1979), pp.26-27.
-

popular authors bought by students, according to the records of the leading university bookseller (Simon, p.86n.; Baldwin, I, 103), and Gabriel Harvey testified to his popularity at Cambridge in the 1570s (Duncan, p.84). Sir Thomas Elyot in outlining his programme of education in The Governor (1531) suggested that the pupil beginning Greek should read 'some quick and merry dialogues elect out of Lucian, which be without ribaldry or too much scorning', although he hastily added 'that it were better that a child should never read any part of Lucian than all Lucian' (The Book Named The Governor, edited by S.E. Lehmborg (London, 1962), Book I, ch. 10, pp.29-30). Erasmus in De Ratione Studii also recommended that Lucian be studied first among Greek prose-writers, because he provided 'such works as are not only sound models of style but are instructive by reason of their subject-matter' (Baldwin, I, 80). He praised Lucian in his Modus Conscribendi Epistolas for providing the kind of topics and arguments for compositions which 'would be not wholly idle but would have

something helpful for common life' (Baldwin, II, 240).

It is likely, then, that Fulwell had studied some of Lucian's dialogues at school and university. He may have read Elyot's translation of the Cynicus into English, A Dialogue between Lucian and Diogenes (nd., STC 16894), which was probably the earliest printed version of Lucian in English (S.E. Lehmborg, Sir Thomas Elyot, Tudor Humanist (Austin, Texas, 1960, p.18n.)). Fulwell's inspiration for the Seventh Dialogue in The Art of Flattery was very probably the Cynicus: both dialogues are between the author and Diogenes. It is interesting that the other surviving early sixteenth-century English translation of Lucian should feature another Cynic, Menippus, whose Menippean satire influenced both Lucian and Fulwell.¹⁰

-
10. This survives only in a cropped fragment of four pages, without title-page; the translator is not known; it was printed by John Rastell in about 1530, and contains part of the text in Latin and English verse of the Menippus, or Necromantia (STC 16895).
-

Lucian boasted that he had created a new literary genre in the satirical dialogue: a hybrid form bred out of the crossing of Dialogue and Comedy, which he jokingly compares to the hippocentaur, half horse and half person.¹¹

11. To One Who Said 'You're a Prometheus in Words', in Lucian edited and translated by A.M. Harmon, K. Kilburn and M.D. Macleod, Loeb Classical Library, 8 vols (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1913-1936; rptd. 1960-1967), VI, 425. Future references to this edition will be shortened to Loeb Lucian.
-

Dialogue had been used by the Greek philosophers, notably

Plato; Lucian mockingly states that 'Dialogue...took his conversations very seriously, philosophising about nature and virtue' (To One Who Said 'You're a Prometheus in Words', Loeb Lucian, VI, 427). Comedy, on the other hand, 'jested and joked', and delighted in mocking at the earnestness of Dialogue: 'Dialogue's companions she mocked as "Heavy-thinkers", "High-talkers", and suchlike. She had one delight - to deride them' (VI, 425-427). Hence the two forms 'were not entirely friendly and compatible from the beginning' (VI, 425). In The Double Indictment, or Trials by Jury, Lucian imagines himself brought to trial at the complaint of Oratory and Dialogue. Dialogue, a 'bearded man in a mantle...said to be the son of Philosophy', complains of his loss of dignity (Loeb Lucian, III, 139). Lucian has dragged him down from his lofty contemplations and put him 'on the same level as the common herd':

he even dug up and thrust in on me Menippus, a prehistoric dog [i.e. Cynic], with a very loud bark...and sharp fangs, a really dreadful dog who bites unexpectedly because he grins when he bites....What is most monstrous of all, I have been turned into a surprising blend, for I am neither afoot nor a horseback, neither prose nor verse, but seem to my hearers a strange phenomenon made up of different elements, like a Centaur.

(Double Indictment, Loeb Lucian, III, 145-147)

Lucian imitated Menippus's tone of 'serious-smiling' (Barbara P. McCarthy, 'Lucian and Menippus', Yale Classical Studies, 4 (1934), 3-55 (p.16)). He says that his audience expects 'literary novelties...jokes,...the skippings of Satyrs';

instead to their surprise 'they find steel instead of ivy' and are 'confused by the unexpectedness of the thing' (Dionysus, Loeb Lucian, I, 55). Underneath the jesting is a steel barb, and the humour seduces the reader into a contemplation of serious issues.

Fulwell, too, points out the mixture of humour and seriousness in his dialogues (Art of Flattery, p. 94); like Lucian's, his dialogues are 'made up of different elements', and written in a Menippean mixture of prose and verse. The philosophic origin of the satirical dialogue, and the influence of Lucian, may be seen in his Seventh Dialogue between Diogenes, the Cynic philosopher, and 'Ulpianus': here the ancient ancestry of the satiric dialogue in Greek, and especially Cynic, philosophy is preserved, as Diogenes expresses his anti-materialistic ideology to Ulpianus, just as he did to 'Lycinus' in the Cynicus (Loeb Lucian, VIII, 381-411). One can also see the influence of the Menippean form in Fulwell's use of mixture of prose and verse in the Second and Eighth Dialogues; Lucian similarly used a Menippean mixture of prose and verse in, for example, Menippus or the Descent into Hades and Zeus Rants (Loeb Lucian IV, 73-109, II, 91-169).

Structurally speaking, Lucian used two forms of the satiric dialogue: the frame dialogue - narratives set in a dramatic frame, as in the Icaromenippus - and the purely dramatic dialogue, such as Charon (McCarthy, 'Lucian and Menippus', pp.16-17). Often his dialogues are set in a

supernatural world rather than the real everyday world, and have as speakers gods or allegorical characters such as Truth, Frankness, Justice, Virtue and Pleasure (e.g., in The Double Indictment). In the Eighth Dialogue, Fulwell tries to imitate this otherworldly setting in the court of Jupiter. He may have had in mind Lucian's Icaromenippus, in which Menippus visits Zeus in heaven and attends a banquet at which entertainment is provided by Apollo playing the flute, Silenus dancing the can-can, and the Muses singing Hesiod and Pyndar (Loeb Lucian, II, 315). Fulwell makes the entertainment of Apollo merely another illustration of court flattery, as 'a simple sot named U.F....saw how Mercurie was fauoured for his fables, and commended for his cogging' (p.123.14), and he 'rayled and raged at the egregious flatterie vused among the Gods and in Iupiters court, not sparinge any state or degree' (p.129.6). Fulwell uses the frame device in the First Dialogue to introduce the narrative of Lady Truth, and he uses another allegorical figure, Lady Fortune, in the Second Dialogue.

There are many passages in Lucian which contain the same themes used by Fulwell in The Art of Flattery: for example, Lucian's portrayal of court life 'where envy is great, suspicions are countless, and occasions for flattery and slander are frequent' (Slander, Loeb Lucian, I, 373). The itching and shoving to get to the top which Fulwell so vividly describes in the Fourth and Eighth Dialogues are also chronicled by Lucian. The good and honest man, who is not skilled in the

art of flattery, is the one to suffer:

Everyone, wishing to be first himself, shoves or elbows his neighbour out of his way and, if he can, slyly pulls down or trips up the man ahead. In this way a good man is simply upset and thrown at the start, and finally thrust off the course in disgrace, while one who is better versed in flattery and cleverer at such unfair practices wins.
(Slander, Loeb Lucian, I, 373)

Nobody is immune from flattery: 'Nobody is so high-minded and has a soul so well protected by walls of adamant that he cannot succumb to the assaults of flattery' (Slander, I, 383).

THE RENAISSANCE DIALOGUE: ERASMUS

Elizabeth Merrill in her study The Dialogue in English Literature maintains that in the sixteenth century new impulses directed the dialogue towards satirical ends, and 'it often expressed the feelings of men who were profoundly stirred by the living issues of their times' (The Dialogue in English Literature (New York, 1911; rptd. 1970), p.30). One sees this process happening in Erasmus: his Colloquies began as a textbook for schoolboys, like Aelfric's Colloquium, to teach Latin conversation, but, as Merrill points out, 'the simple interchange of conventional phrases' in the earlier dialogues - the Formulae - gave way to a satirical presentation of the corruption of the church and a ridicule of superstition (The Dialogue in English Literature, p.40). The gradual evolution of the formulae into dramatic dialogues - 'short dialogues with definite outlines of plot and brief characterization' - is outlined by Craig R. Thompson in his translation of the

Colloquies (The Colloquies of Erasmus (Chicago and London, 1965), pp.555-556; subsequent references are to this translation).

Merrill compares Erasmus and Lucian: 'Just as Lucian had laughed at the weakness of the gods of Olympus, Erasmus laughed at the corruptions of the church and priesthood of his day' (The Dialogue in English Literature, p.40). A more appropriate parallel would be Lucian's satire on the supposed guardians of morals and ethics of his day, the philosophers, whose hypocrisy and failure to live up to their own doctrines is a major target of his satirical dialogues. In the Christian era the clergy were naturally substituted for the philosophers.

Erasmus began his career as a Greek scholar by translating Lucian; according to R.R. Bolgar, he was 'entranced' by Lucian's 'colourful world' (R.R. Bolgar, The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries (Cambridge, 1954), p.299; Bolgar lists Erasmus's translations of Lucian made from 1506 to 1514 on p.441).

The satirical nature of Erasmus's colloquies, especially in their attacks on the abuses of the church and superstition, incensed the more conservative Roman Catholic element. A motion of censure was passed at the Sorbonne, and the work was eventually placed on the Index (Thompson, Colloquies, pp.623, xxxi). In his defence of the Colloquies, Erasmus stresses the mixture of seriousness with the comic: 'earnest maxims mingled with pleasantries' (Colloquies, p.625), and also their underlying serious purpose - they at once improve Latinity and

expose popular prejudices:

Entertainment is thrown in as a bait, to entice an age sooner captivated by what is agreeable than by what is good for it.

(Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, 1526, in Thompson, Colloquies, p.624)

In De Utilitate Colloquiorum, added to the 1520 edition and expanded in the 1529 edition, Erasmus makes the Lucianic boast that

Socrates brought philosophy down from heaven to earth; I have brought it even into games, informal conversations, and drinking parties.
(Colloquies, p.630)

The reference to Greek philosophy shows that Erasmus was aware of the ancestry of the satirical dialogue, and that he is working in the tradition of Lucian. He talks of

stealing (as it were) into the minds of young folk, who, as Aristotle truly wrote, are unsuitable hearers of moral philosophy, at least of the sort that is taught by formal rules.
(Colloquies, p.625)

For example, Rash Vows with its attack on pilgrimages contains 'righteous admonitions' on 'the irresponsibility, ignorance, or superstitiousness of many folk' (Colloquies, p.627).

Erasmus also points out that critics, in condemning the dialogue Courtship, 'fail to notice how much thoughtful counsel is mingled with the pleasantries' (Colloquies, p.628). After discussing individual colloquies, especially those which attack superstitions and the abuses of the church, Erasmus insists that 'This is not defaming the religious orders but instructing them' (Colloquies, p.633; my italics).

The variety of the colloquies is staggering; in an

epistle to the reader added to the 1519 edition, Erasmus makes a remark which suggests a link between the Colloquies and the classical idea of satura: that he had 'patched up a book like Aesop's crow; or rather he concocted them just as a cook mixes up many scraps to make a broth' (quoted by Preserved Smith, Erasmus, a Study of his Life, Ideals and Place in History (New York, 1923; rptd. 1962), p.287).

Perhaps Erasmus was remembering 'Aesop's jackdaw, cobbled up out of motley feathers from others' in Lucian's The Mistaken Critic (Loeb Lucian, V, 381).

The book is indeed a hodge-podge; there is no overall unity, no attempt to make it into an organic whole. The colloquies were written over a period of fifteen years, beginning with the Formulae in 1518, and ending with the philosophic linking of Epicureanism and Christianity in The Epicurean in 1533. Not all the dialogues are satirical: some provide models for schoolboy behaviour, like the pious Whole Duty of Youth, or advice on how to study in The Art of Learning. Others are associated by theme, such as those attacking superstition and the venality of members of religious orders - for example, Rash Vows, In Pursuit of Benefices, The Shipwreck, The Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake, The Funeral; or the series on courtship, marriage and family life - Courtship, Marriage, A Marriage in Name Only or the Unequal Match, The New Mother. Others are linked by setting, such as the convivia or dinner-party dialogues - The Profane Feast, The Sober Feast, The Godly Feast, The Poetic Feast, and advice on

how to give a successful dinner-party in A Feast of Many Courses. These convivia were influenced by dialogues such as the Symposium of Plato and Lucian's hilarious convivium The Carousal, or the Lapiths in which Lucian's favourite targets, the philosophers, get drunk and disgrace themselves by brawling at a wedding feast. In The Profane Feast, Greek philosophy is discussed and the difference between Stoicism and Epicureanism defined; Diogenes and Aristippus are mentioned, and Diogenes's diet of 'raw vegetables and clear water' (also referred to in The Art of Flattery) is not favoured.

For the settings of his dialogues Erasmus prefers the ordinary everyday world - they are confabulationes domesticae, in Thompson's phrase (p.xxii); only very occasionally does he use the supernatural world, as in Charon, modelled on Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead. Erasmus is influenced by Lucian too in his occasional use of a Menippean mixture of prose and verse, as in the opening of The Poetic Feast, or in The Imposture with its amusing experiments in different types of metre - Thompson calls it 'a Lucianic jeu d'esprit', inspired by Lucian's Pseudosophistica (Thompson, Colloquies, p.412).

LUCIAN, ERASMUS, AND FULWELL

Fulwell may have got the germ of the dominant idea of The Art of Flattery from two dialogues of his illustrious predecessors in the satirical dialogue. Both are explorations

of two 'illiberal' arts, the art of being a parasite in Lucian's The Parasite: Parasitic an Art, and the art of lying in Erasmus's Pseudocheus and Philetymus: the Dedicated Liar and the Man of Honour. These two dialogues are interesting because they illustrate the shift in moral emphasis in the satirical dialogue. In both the speakers are limited to two persons.

In The Parasite Tychiades questions Simon as to what 'art' he uses to support himself. Simon admits that he is ignorant of the arts of music, medicine, geometry and rhetoric; or even of the 'vulgar' arts of shoemaking or carpentry, but that he supports himself very successfully by 'parasitic', the art of being a parasite. As with other arts, to master it a 'complex of knowledges' is needed: for example, knowing whom to cultivate, how to curry favour at banquets, and an expert knowledge of cookery. Simon claims it is the best art, for it is learned without pains, tears, or floggings: 'Who ever set out for a dinner looking gloomy, like those who go to school?' he asks (Loeb Lucian, III, 265). Tychiades, instead of denouncing Simon as we expect, on the contrary decides to join him and become his pupil in 'parasitic'. This gives an ironic and cynical twist to the dialogue; it is influenced by the vogue for the paradoxical encomium, in which something unworthy and debased is ironically praised.¹² Lucian

12. The paradoxical encomium is 'a species of rhetorical jest or display piece which involves the praise of unworthy, unexpected, or trifling objects, such as the praise of lying and envy or of the gout or of pots and pebbles'

(Henry Knight Miller, 'The Paradoxical Encomium with Special Reference to its Vogue in England, 1600-1800', Modern Philology, 53 (1956), 145-178 (p.145)).

also parodies the method of Socratic dialectic, with its technique of question and answer and love of definitions (e.g. Loeb Lucian, III, 251-255).

In Pseudocheus and Philetymus Erasmus adopts a more overtly moral tone: Philetymus, the 'man of honour', asserts the correct moral standards. 'Aren't you ashamed of yourself?' he asks Pseudocheus at the beginning of the dialogue (Colloquies, p.134). He questions Pseudocheus about the art of lying:

Phil.: Is there any writer who treats of the art of lying?

Pseud.: Your rhetoricians have explained a great deal of it.

Phil.: Their subject is eloquence.

Pseud.: True, but clever lying is a large part of eloquence.

Phil.: What's clever lying?

Pseud.: You want a definition?

Phil.: Yes.

Pseud.: Lying in such a way that you gain by it but can't be found out.

(Colloquies, p.134)

At first Pseudocheus jokes about lying and teases Philetymus; then he boasts that he has a more assured income from the art of lying than Philetymus has from his property. When Philetymus asks for a 'sample', Pseudocheus exposes some of the lies he uses to cheat people. (Pseudocheus is thought to be modelled on Erasmus's bookseller, Francis Berckman.) Philetymus is thoroughly disgusted, and ends the conversation by exclaiming, 'Bad luck to you with your tricks and lies!' Pseudocheus retorts, 'Snarl away in your filthy rags of

righteousness', reminding the reader of the Cynic philosophers who were the original inspiration of the satiric dialogue (Colloquies, p.137).

In Erasmus's dialogue we find a more typical pattern for the later (Christian) satirical dialogue: the two interlocutors are divided into the good and virtuous man who upholds the correct moral values and denounces vice, and the Adversarius (to use Randolph's term), who represents the particular vice being denounced. The tricks and impostures of the Adversarius are enumerated and exposed. Unlike Fulwell in his dialogues, Erasmus allows his liar to have the last word: the colloquy ends with Pseudocheus boasting, 'I'll live enjoyably with my thefts and lies under the patronage of Ulysses and Mercury' (Colloquies, p.137). He is not changed or altered by his confrontation with the Man of Honour, even though Philetymus tells him that he can change his way of life if he wants to, for 'man was endowed with speech in order to proclaim truth' (p.134). This is typical of the 'stasis' of satire, as explained by Alvin Kernan:

the two opposing forces...are locked in their respective attitudes without any possibility of either dialectical movement or the simple triumph of good over evil. Whatever movement there is, is not plot in the true sense of change but mere intensification of the unpleasant situation with which satire opens. (The Cankered Muse, p.31)

The virtuous remain virtuous and the vicious remain vicious, like the diametric characters in Like Will to Like, and the Author and flatterers in The Art of Flattery.

From the art of being a parasite in Lucian and the art

of lying in Erasmus, it is a short step to the art of flattery in Fulwell. The tone of flippant sophistication in Lucian gives way to moral earnestness and righteous indignation in Erasmus and Fulwell.

To sum up: Fulwell was working in a satirical tradition which can be clearly seen in The Art of Flattery. His concept of satire was that of satura, a mixture and variety, rather than of 'satyre', with its type-figure of the rough and shaggy satyr. He chose the satirical dialogue as his vehicle, influenced by both Lucian and Erasmus. In Erasmus he saw the form adapted to deal with contemporary problems such as simony and church abuses. The structure of his dialogues was influenced by the bipartite division of classical verse satire into 'thesis' and 'antithesis'. His denunciations of vice in the antithesis have the flavour of the medieval homiletic 'complaint' tradition, with its threats of damnation to sinners and its use of the Bible as an ethical standard.

The English Dialogue Before Fulwell

A study of sixteenth-century English dialogues before Fulwell reveals a lively awareness of the problems and techniques of the genre, and an experimentation with different structures and models.¹³ Not only did dialogue writers look

13. The English dialogue in the Renaissance is largely uncharted territory. Elizabeth Merrill's The Dialogue in English Literature (New York, 1911; rptd. 1970), ranging from the medieval period to the nineteenth century in 131 pages, can give only a brief and general survey of the subject; Rudolf Hirzel's mammoth two-

volume study, Der Dialog: ein Literaturhistorischer Versuch (Leipzig, 1895), devotes only a few pages to the Renaissance and Reformation, concentrating mainly on Italian writers. Unfortunately I have not been able to see R.L. Deakins' unpublished thesis, 'The Tudor Dialogue as a Literary Form' (Harvard, 1965).

back to Lucian for inspiration, but also to Plato, Cicero and St Augustine.

Fulwell's greatest English predecessor in the use of the dialogue form was Sir Thomas More. In his late twenties, More (like his friend Erasmus) served his apprenticeship as a dialogue-writer by translating several of Lucian's dialogues into Latin - The Cynic, Menippus, and The Lover of Lies (Philopseudes). Later his opponent John Frith rather inaccurately taunted the future saint with being 'another Lucian, neither regarding God nor man' (Translations of Lucian, edited by Craig R. Thompson, The Complete Works of St Thomas More, Vol. 3, Part I (New Haven and London, 1974), p.xxiv). In dedicating his Latin translations to Thomas Ruthall, More explained the attraction of Lucian's dialogues: they fulfil the Horatian maxim and combine 'delight with instruction' (Translations of Lucian, p.3). More was particularly impressed by the way in which the dialogues are didactic, yet do not antagonize or alienate the reader:

Refraining from the arrogant pronouncements of the philosophers as well as from the wanton wiles of the poets, he everywhere reprimands and censures, with very honest and at the same time very entertaining wit, our human frailties. And this he does so cleverly and effectively that although no one pricks more deeply, nobody resents his stinging words.
(Translations of Lucian, p.3)

What an ideal position for a satirist to be in! More attempted to do the same in his 'Lucianic' satire, the Utopia, translated into English by Ralph Robinson in 1551. C.S. Lewis comments that it was written by 'More the translator of Lucian and friend of Erasmus, not More the chancellor or the ascetic' (English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, p.169); and Warren W. Wooden believes that it should be regarded as a 'Lucianic or Menippean satire' ('Thomas More and Lucian: a Study in Satiric Influence and Technique', University of Mississippi Studies in English, 13 (1972), 43-57 (p.43)).

T.S. Dorsch argues that Book I of the Utopia is modelled on the 'Lucianic dialogue form' and Book II on Lucian's narrative traveller's tale, The True History: the Utopia is thus 'a Lucianic "true history" appended to a partly Lucianic dialogue' ('Sir Thomas More and Lucian: an Interpretation of Utopia', Archiv für das Studium der Neuren Sprachen und Literaturen, 153 (1966), 345-363 (pp.350, 351)). The influence of Lucian is also manifest in Sir Thomas Elyot's dialogue Pasquil the Playne (1533), a 'mery treatise, wherin plainnes and flateri do come in trial' (Pasquil the Playne, facsimile of 1533 edition, in Four Political Treatises 1533-1541 (Gainesville, Florida, 1967), A1^v, p.42), which is 'quite in the Lucianic vein of jesting satire favoured by Erasmus and More' (John M. Major, Sir Thomas Elyot and Renaissance Humanism (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1964), p.98).

Other writers turned to Plato for inspiration. C.S. Lewis praises More's A Dialogue Concerning Heresies as 'great Platonic

dialogue: perhaps the best specimen of that form ever produced in English' (English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, p.172); but Rainer Pineas has pointed out that the dialogue appears to have been modelled on St Augustine's Contra Academicos (Thomas More's Use of the Dialogue Form as a Weapon of Religious Controversy', Studies in the Renaissance, 7 (1960), 193-206 (pp.198, 193-194)). Elyot was directly inspired by Plato's dialogues in his Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man (1533): it consists of five dialogues between Plato and Aristippus, whose hedonistic philosophy Fulwell attacks in The Art of Flattery.

Elyot must have read with interest the discourse on dialogues in Diogenes Laertius's Life of Plato, which Elyot informs us in the Proheme that he 'happened for my recreacyon to reade' (Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man, in Tudor Prose 1513-1570, edited by Edmund Creeth (Garden City, N.Y., 1969), p.182). Diogenes Laertius defines the dialogue as

a discourse consisting of question and answer on some philosophical or political subject, with due regard to the characters of the persons introduced and the choice of diction. (Lives of Eminent Philosophers, translated by R.D. Hicks, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (London & Cambridge, Mass., 1959), I, 319)

He gives a short history of the dialogue, and classifies the Platonic dialogues into two categories, 'one adapted for instruction and the other for inquiry' (I, 321): the latter 'has two main divisions, the one which aims at training the

mind and the other at victory in controversy' (I, 321). Plato in Elyot's dialogue aims at 'training the mind' of the recalcitrant Aristippus and his method of question and answer conforms to what Diogenes Laertius calls 'mental obstetrics' (I, 321). According to Diogenes Laertius, Plato was 'the first to introduce argument by means of question and answer' (I, 299) and in imitating this Elyot often puts into Plato's mouth the kind of Socratic question which already contains the answer expected: for example, 'Is ignorance any other thing, Aristippus, than lacke of knowlege?' (First Dialogue, p.199). Or, 'What sayest thou, Aristippus, is not wisdom knowledge? Or what thyng is it els?' - to which Aristippus irritably replies with another question: 'Why doest thou aske me that question, wherof no man maketh any doubt?' (p.195). There is almost an element of parody in such an exchange. Major points out that the dialogue 'resembles the Theaetetus, Plato's dialogue on knowledge' (Sir Thomas Elyot and Renaissance Humanism, p.263). Elyot uses such Platonic techniques as clarification by contrast: knowledge is defined by contrasting it with ignorance, the true king by describing a tyrant. 'All these devices Elyot could have learned only from a careful study of the actual dialogues of Plato' (Major, p.264). Elyot also uses the technique of Socratic questioning in The Defence of Good Women (1540):

the question and answer method identified with Socrates is cleverly employed to settle the problem of women's worth....Elyot well understood the Socratic technique. (Major, p.262)

Lehmberg calls The Defence one of Elyot's 'Platonic dialogues of counsel' (Sir Thomas Elyot: Tudor Humanist (Austin, 1960), p.174).

Ascham's Toxophilus (1545) is modelled on both Platonic and Ciceronian dialogues. The first book owes much to Plato's Phaedrus and Cicero's De Oratore: to emphasize the correspondence, the dialogue opens with Toxophilus reading 'Phaedro Platonis' as he walks in a field outside Cambridge (Toxophilus, in The Whole Works of Roger Ascham, edited by J.A. Giles, 3 vols in 4 (London, 1864; rptd. New York, 1965), II, 11). The second book of the dialogue is a 'catechetical' or 'master-pupil' dialogue, in which a novice asks questions about some art or science from an expert (Lawrence Ryan, Roger Ascham (Stanford and London, 1963), p.76). The opening of Book II is closely imitated from Cicero's De Partitione Oratoria (Ryan, p.307, note 64).

In spite of these classical precedents, More had difficulty in structuring his dialogues when he turned from the satiric to the expository and polemical dialogue; his A Dialogue Concerning Heresies (1529) and A Dialogue of Comfort Against Tribulation (written in 1534) are amorphous in form. More's division of these works into books and chapters, organized under headings and topics, is a structural device which militates against the impression of a free-flowing discussion, such as is found in the Platonic dialogues. The chapter-divisions give only a superficial sense of organization. The chapters vary greatly in length - from a

page to as much as 37 pages in A Dialogue of Comfort: 'the variation...reaches absurd proportions' and the chapter-divisions are 'eccentric' in the view of Leland Miles, and they convey 'a sense of disorder'.¹⁴ More himself ridiculed

-
14. Leland Miles, 'More's Dialogue of Comfort as a First Draft', Studies in Philology, 63 (1966), 126-134 (p.128); Frank Manley, introduction to A Dialogue of Comfort Against Tribulation, edited by Louis L. Martz and Frank Manley, Yale Complete Works of St Thomas More, Vol. 12 (New Haven & London, 1976), p.lxxiii; afterwards referred to as Yale Dialogue of Comfort.
-

the artificiality of this arrangement in his attack on Christopher Saint-German's dialogue Salem and Bizance (published in 1533):

Let hym shewe me where euer he hath herde in his lyfe any twoo men in theire talking together, deuide their present communicacion into chapters. This is a point not onely so farre fro the nature of a dialogue, but also from all reason, that a very childe woulde not I weene haue handeled the thyng so childishelye.

(The Debellation of Salem and Bizance (1533), quoted in the commentary to Yale Dialogue of Comfort, p.340)

Another artificiality in A Dialogue Concerning Heresies is More's avoidance of speech prefixes: the Author and Adversarius are simply referred to as 'I' and 'he'. This led Tyndale to refer derisively to the dialogue as 'Quoth I, and quoth he, and quoth your friend' (quoted in E.E. Reynolds, The Field is Won: the Life and Death of Saint Thomas More (Milwaukee, 1968), p.210). Yet another awkwardness is More's use of the device of a letter from an unnamed friend to introduce the Adversarius, also unnamed, and thus to present the occasion of the dialogue. Tyndale

was quick to ridicule this fictional letter in his Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue (1530):

In the first chapter, to begin the book withal,
...to give you a say [i.e., an assay] or a
taste what truth shall follow, he feigneth a
letter sent from no man.

(An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue,
edited by Henry Walter, Parker Society
(Cambridge, 1850; rptd. New York, 1968), p.78)

A more serious defect is the way in which More uses the techniques of fiction to dismiss a cause célèbre at the time - the alleged murder of Richard Hunne by the chancellor of the Bishop of London while Hunne was in the Bishop's prison. More claims to have been one of the lawyers present at the inquiry into the suspicious circumstances surrounding Hunne's death, and his lively eyewitness account is used to combat the disquieting rumours repeated by the Messenger (the *Adversarius*). More turns the examination of supposed witnesses into a hilarious farce, in which the judges and those present in the courtroom burst into laughter at the ridiculous hearsay evidence presented, and he succeeds in raising doubts in the reader's mind about the Hunne affair. Tyndale indignantly repudiated More's account as pure fiction: 'He jesteth out Hunne's death with his poetry, wherewith he built Utopia' (An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue, p.166). To Tyndale, More's use of humour was simply a smokescreen, a way of distracting attention from the points at issue:

He jesteth out the matter with Wilkin and Simkin,
as he doth Hunne and every thing; because men
should not consider their falsehood earnestly.
Wherein behold his subtle conveyance. (An Answer,
p.146)

A sidenote to this passage states baldly: 'M. More is a common jester, and a scoffer.'

Tyndale was particularly incensed by More's reports of interrogations of protestants, such as that in Book IV, chapter 11 of A Dialogue Concerning Heresies, of an unnamed Lutheran whom Tyndale indentifies as Dr Ferman. He attacks More's credibility: 'he so made them, or so disputed with them, but that they added and pulled away, and feigned as they list, as their guise is' (An Answer, p.194). Tyndale accuses More of using the techniques of fiction and trying to pass them off as fact: 'His eleventh chapter is as true as his story of Utopia, and all his other poetry' (An Answer, p.193). There is an obvious difference between Hythloday in Book I of the Utopia purporting to remember a conversation held at Cardinal Morton's eighteen years previously, and More claiming to be accurately reporting, word for word, a lengthy cross-examination of a Lutheran at which 'it happed me to bee lately present' (A Dialogue Concerning Heresies, in The Workes of Sir Thomas More... Wrytten...in the Englysh Tonge (1577), Scholar facsimile, 2 vols (London, 1978), I, 104-288 (Book IV, chapter 11, p.262E). What may be appropriate in a work of fiction becomes suspect in a supposedly factual one. This may be why More abandoned the use of the dialogue form in his subsequent polemical works. In his lengthy Confutation of Tyndale's Answer he imitated Tyndale's technique of quoting his adversary verbatim and then refuting him in

his own person. The fictional structure of the dialogue disappears.

Another problem which occupies More in his dialogues is the mixture of humour and seriousness - the 'spoudogeloion' or 'ioca seriis miscere' which was a feature of the Lucianic/Menippean dialogue.¹⁵ As we saw (above, p.19), Fulwell was

15. The topos of mixing serious and comic is discussed in J. Wight Duff, Roman Satire (Berkeley, 1936; rptd. Hamden, Conn., 1964), p.9; E.R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, translated by W.R. Trask (London, 1953), pp.417, 420; A.R. Heiserman, Skelton and Satire, p.303; and D. Duncan, Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition, pp.57-59.

also defensive about his mingling of iocus and serium, and cites the precedent of Erasmus. In A Dialogue Concerning Heresies More defends the inclusion of

certaine tales and mery wordes which he [the Messenger] mengled with his matter, and some such on mine owne parte among, as occasion fell in communicacion. In which albeit I sawe no harme, yet somewhat doubted I lest thei should vnto sad men seme ouer light and wanton for the weight and grauite of such an earnest matter. (Book I, prologue, p.106D)

He states that there are precedents of 'right holy men' (unnamed however) in books 'answeringe to the obiections of heretiques', and, following their example, he has 'not also letted to write a mery worde in a right earnest worke' (p.106E). Rainer Pineas believes that these 'merry tales' were put into the mouth of the Messenger (who has Lutheran sympathies) in order to discredit him in the eyes of the reader ('Thomas More's Use of Humor as a Weapon of Religious Controversy',

Studies in Philology, 58 (1961), 97-114 (pp.106-107)).

But there is little indication that persona-More in the dialogue disapproves of his stories. For example, when the Messenger embarks on an off-colour story about a poor man cuckolded by a priest, More urges him on with: 'A mery tale...commith neuer amysse to me' (Book I, chapter 6, p.127D). Pineas agrees with Tyndale that More used humour as a distraction, as in the case of Richard Hunne, to 'divert his readers' attention from the points at issue' ('Thomas More's Use of Humor as a Weapon of Religious Controversy', p.107).

In A Dialogue of Comfort Against Tribulation, More's last dialogue, there is an argument between Anthony and Vincent, the two interlocutors, about the propriety of humour in a serious discussion. Vincent, the younger of the two, argues that

a merry tale with a friend refresheth a man much,
and without any harm lighteth his mind and
amendeth his courage and his stomach, so that
it seemeth but well done to take such recreation.
(Utopia and A Dialogue of Comfort, edited by
John Warrington, Everyman's Library, revised
edition (London, 1951), Book II, chapter 1, p.216)

Anthony is dubious, even though he admits that 'myself am of nature even half a giglot and more'; and he regrets the way in which they, 'coming now together to talk of as earnest sad matter as man can devise, were fallen yet even at the first into wanton idle tales'; he will not be 'so partial...to my fault as to praise it' (p.217):

let us by mine advice at the least wise make
those kinds of recreation as short and seld as
we can. Let them serve us but for sauce and
make them not our meat. (pp.218-219)

Manley relates More's spoudogeloion to Menippean satire:

there is an incongruity in A Dialogue of Comfort in

the strange, Menippean combination of merry tales and anecdotes side by side with the grim realities of mental and physical torture....More's merry tales serve a function similar to the verse interludes in Boethius' De Consolatione. Both look back to the mixture (satura) of verse and prose in the anatomy or Menippean satire.
(Yale Dialogue of Comfort, p.cxix)

Craig Thompson believes that the key to understanding the Utopia is 'the just mode of balancing the serious and the non-serious' (introduction, More, Translations of Lucian, p.lii). But critics have been divided as to whether Utopia is a 'jeu d'esprit' or a 'serious didactic argument'; More's Lucianic tone of 'serious-smiling' has baffled them.¹⁶

-
16. The conflicting critical viewpoints are summarised in David M. Bevington, 'The Dialogue in Utopia: Two Sides to the Question', Studies in Philology, 58 (1961), 496-509 (p.497); and A.R. Heiserman, 'Satire in the Utopia', PMLA, 78 (1963), 163-174 (p.163).
-

If problems of form and tone occupied More, so did the question of balancing the speakers in the dialogue. In the Utopia, the dialogue of Book I dissolves into Hythloday's monologue describing the island in Book II. In A Dialogue Concerning Heresies persona-More is the dominant figure, instructor and authority to the unnamed young man, the Messenger, who seeks his advice on how to combat the arguments of the protestant reformers. Schuster points out More's 'polemical adoption of "the generation gap" as a dialogic pattern' - an idea More probably derived from William Roye's

A Breve Dialogue bitwene a Christen Father and his Stobborne

Sonne (1527).¹⁷ More's dominance leads to the submergence of

-
17. More, The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer, edited by L.A. Schuster, R.C. Marius, J.P. Lusardi, and R.J. Schoeck, 3 parts, Yale Complete Works of St Thomas More (New Haven and London, 1973), Vol.8, part 3, p.1172.
-

the Adversarius, and dialogue peters out into monologue and declamation:

throughout the Dialogue the messenger shows less and less opposition to More, until by the fourth book he has become a mere yes-man to More's rhetorical questions, 'Very true...by my trouthe', being his stock answer. (Rainer Pineas, 'Thomas More's Use of the Dialogue Form as a Weapon of Religious Controversy', p.204)

In A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation, More again uses the 'dialogic pattern' (in Schuster's phrase) of master and pupil, old man and young one. Anthony, the wise old man to whom young Vincent turns for advice and comfort, is the dominating speaker, but More is concerned about the 'interparling' between them. Book II opens with Anothony apologizing for talking too much, for his 'many words...spoken...without interpausing'; he wishes that he

had not so told you still a long tale alone, but that we had more often interchanged words and parted the talking between us, with offer interparling upon your part in such manner as learned men use between the persons whom they devise, disputing in their feigned dialogues. (Utopia and A Dialogue of Comfort, Everyman edition, p.214; all subsequent references are to this edition)

More seems to realize that 'unbroken disquisitions' (in Manley's phrase) become tedious and wearisome to the reader, especially

after a monologue which lasts for twelve pages (Book I, chapters 19 and 20), and he seems to resolve on a more equal distribution of speeches and a livelier cut and thrust of debate. Anthony resolves to give Vincent equal time:

When I was once fallen in, I left you little
space to say aught between. But now will I
therefore take another way with you, for I
shall of our talking drive you to the one-half.
(Book II, p.215)

But Anthony cannot wholly restrain his loquacity; as Manley points out, 'some of Anthony's unbroken disquisitions [in Book II] are in fact even longer than in the first book' (Yale Dialogue of Comfort, p.lxix), and Leland Miles notes 'the intermittent disappearance of the character Vincent' ('More's Dialogue of Comfort as a First Draft', Studies in Philology, p.130).

However, More lavishes some care on the figure of Vincent. Encouraged by Anthony to 'interparl'. he caps one of Anthony's merry tales with one of his own (Book II, pp.215-216); and he gives a satirical imitation of a Lutheran sermon in Saxony (Book II, chapter 6). However, Anthony maintains his authoritative stance: sometimes he snubs Vincent when he ventures to ask a question, as when he replies that 'That were somewhat out of our purpose' (Book II, p.260). He asserts his superiority, not only by playing the role of instructor (as in telling Vincent how to deal with someone who is suicidal), but also in teasing him with the unanswerable question, 'how can you now prove unto me that you be awake?' (Book II, chapter 16, p.265). More extorts some amusement from this playful philosophy,

as Vincent realizes that his leg is being pulled: 'you go now merrily to work with me indeed when you look and speak so sadly', and he is driven to assert, 'I know well enough that I am awake now, and so do you too, though I cannot find the words by which I may with reason force you to confess it' (p.266).

In the teacher-pupil set-up of the dialogue, Anthony must predominate and Vincent ask for advice, comfort, and counsel; his role is a subordinate one. Manley comments on these respective roles:

Anthony is usually responsible for sustaining the argument. Vincent's primary function is rhetorical. He serves as the voice of our response, articulating objections likely to be present in the reader's mind. Vincent's objections make concrete the abstract nature of the discourse and give it an air of reality it would not otherwise possess.
(Yale Dialogue of Comfort, pp.lxxxviii-lxxxix)

There is a similar pattern of dominance / subordination in Elyot's Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man. It is as if the model of the master-student type of dialogue is firmly fixed in Elyot's mind. The legendary wit and repartee of Aristippus (as he appears in Diogenes Laertius's life of him) is absent, as is the cut and thrust of debate between two seasoned philosophers. Aristippus, the Adversarius, is demoted to playing the student to Plato's 'master'. 'Interparling', to use More's word, consequently degenerates into expository monologue. E.J. Howard comments on Elyot's handling of the dialogue form,

Like others in the sixteenth century, Elyot made something of the dialogue closely resembling a

monologue with occasional exclamatory interjections.
 (Introduction, Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man, edited by E.J. Howard (Oxford, Ohio, 1946),
 p.xviii)

As in the Platonic dialogue, the Adversarius must be convinced by Plato's arguments, so that the dialogue ends with Aristippus's admission: 'to say the truth it hath made me to change some what of myn olde opinion'; to which Plato confidently replies, 'The nexte tyme that we mete I wyl make the[e] to chaunge all' (Fifth Dialogue, p.274). This is different from the 'stasis' in the satirical dialogue: in Pasquil the Playne, for example Harpocrates and Gnatho are not swayed by Pasquil's arguments; nor are the flatterers swayed by the Author in The Art of Flattery.

More's satire in his dialogues is directed against conventional abuses. In the Utopia, 'Hythloday begins with one of the most convention-ridden of all satiric objects - the Court' (Heiserman, 'Satire in the Utopia', p.167). The 'jesting parasite' and venial friar in the Cardinal Morton episode in Book I are used to attack court life and the ancient vices of friars - greed, lack of charity, and 'proud anger' (Heiserman, p.168). Self-serving courtiers, kings who are either dupes or tyrants, policies determined by flattery, the greed and selfishness of the rich, 'the manners of the world nowadays': none of these would come as a surprise to Renaissance readers of satire, and most of these 'satiric objects' crop up again in The Art of Flattery. Abuses of the church are dealt with at length in A Dialogue Concerning Heresies, and the criticisms of the Reformers are presented through the Messenger, in the same way that criticisms of society are

presented through Hythloday in the Utopia. The chapter 'Of flattery' in A Dialogue of Comfort deals with 'the craft of flattery' (Book III, chapter 10, p.332), and forms in itself a kind of mini-satire on people's susceptibility to flattery and their childish love of praise: 'For men keep still in that point one condition of children, that praise must prick them forth' (p.336). There is reference in the chapter to the satiric tradition on flattery in the works of Juvenal, Terence and Martial.

Court flattery and religious hypocrisy are the 'satiric objects' attacked in Elyot's Pasquil the Playne. The dialogue is concerned with the behaviour of those who surround the prince, and three interlocutors present different possibilities of political behaviour: Pasquil, that of plain speaking, 'rude and homely'; Gnatho, a flatterer (named after the parasite in Terence's Eunuch), who 'alway affirmed, what so euer was spoken of [i.e. by] his maister'; and Harpocrates, a priest, who keeps a discreet silence (A2, p.43). The character of Pasquil is derived from the famous statue in Rome, 'on whome', as Eloyt explains, 'ones in the yere, it is leful to euery man, to set in verse or prose any taunte that he wil, agayne whom he list, howe great an astate so euer he be' (A1^V, p.42).

To Gnatho (as with the flatterers in The Art of Flattery) flattery is something to be studied, 'as it were a crafte gathered of lernynge and scripture' (A5, p.49). Like the practitioners of flattery in The Art of Flattery, Gnatho soon takes on the role of instructor to Pasquil in the art. 'I

teache the in parables,' he blasphemously claims, 'for this craft wolde not be opened to euery man: for it shulde not be for my profyte' (B3^V, p.62). Gnatho criticizes Pasquil's 'ouerthwart' (contrarious) fashion of speaking (A6, p.51). His 'yndiscrete libertie in speche, wherin thou vsest vnprofitable tauntes and rebukes' is unprofitable not only because he loses preferment by it, but also because 'nothyng that thou blamist, is of one iote amended' (A4^V, p.48). In the Menippean tradition of the dialogue, Pasquil has something of the character of a Cynic philosopher, like Diogenes. Gnatho tells him to 'leaue thy bourdinge and currishe philosophie / sens it is neyther profitable / plesant nor thankefull' (B2, p.59). His good words will be 'lost in the rushes: and if any yll meaning may be pycked out, it is caste in thy nose to put the in daunger' (B2, p.59). But Pasquil, like the true satiric hero, is proud of his bluntness: 'Judge what men list, my thought shal be free'. He claims to use words unambiguously, as opposed to the rhetoric of Gnatho: 'Thoughe I haue not so moche lernyng as you,' he declares to his two opponents, 'I vse alwaye my wordes in theyr propre signification' (C6, p.83).

Over the dialogue looms the figure of the monarch with his 'evil affections' of 'avarice, tyranny and beastly living', surrounded by his time-serving councillors; plain-speakers like Pasquil are not of his council. He rules over a society in which truth is being supplanted by the 'craft' of flattery.

This sampling of the English dialogue demonstrates the variety of models used - Lucianic, Platonic, Augustinian, Ciceronian - as well as a consciousness of the technical aspects of writing dialogues: 'interparling'; the characters of the speakers and the interaction between them; the mixture of seriousness and humour. The versatility of the dialogue form held a fascination for the Renaissance writer. In particular, in an age of censorship and political repression, the dialogue could be used as a cloak for the author's own opinions, and could utter ideas which were politically inexpedient and dangerous. The author could always defend himself by pointing out that the interlocutors were not expressing his own opinions. Thus William Stafford was careful to cover himself in the title of his dialogue: A compendious or briefe examination of certayne ordinary complaints of diuers our country men in these our dayes: which although they are in some parte uniust and friuolous, yet are they all by way of dialogues thoroughly debated and discussed (1581, STC 23133). He explains 'Why the Booke is made by way of Dialogue':

that kinde of reasoning seemeth to mee best for bouldinge out of the truth, which is vsed by waye of Dialogues, or colloquyes, where reasons be made too and froe, as well for the matter intended as against it: I thought best to take that way in the discourse of this matter, which is, first in recounting the common and vniuersall grieues that men complayne on now a dayes, secondly in boulding oute the verye causes and occasions of them, thirdlye, and finally in deuising of remedies for al the same. (A2)

His interlocutors cover a cross-section of the population:

knight, merchant, doctor, husbandman and craftsman. The popularity of such a dialogue which attempted to wrestle with contemporary problems is attested by the fact that it went through three editions in one year. The 'uniust and friuolous', the heterodox as well as the orthodox, could be safely expressed.

Despite the 'two-sidedness' of the dialogue in expressing opposing points of view, it is noticeable how often one of the interlocutors is dominant, and how often the master-pupil model of dialogue is followed: persona-More in A Dialogue Concerning Heresies, Anthony in A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation, Plato in Of the Knowledge that Maketh a Wise Man, all maintain an authoritative stance over their adversarii. It only remains to discuss Fulwell's handling of the dialogue form.

'THE ART OF FLATTERY': A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Dryden, in his Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (prefixed to his translation of Juvenal and Persius in 1693) laid down a blueprint for 'the designing of a perfect satire':

it ought only to treat of one subject; to be confined to one particular theme; or at least, to one principally. If other vices occur in the management of the chief, they should only be transiently lashed, and not be insisted on so as to make the design double.

(Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays, edited by George Watson, 2 vols (London, 1962), II, 145)

Although satura means variety, Dryden insists that a satire must have a unity which binds together the variety into an

artistic whole:

And if variety be of absolute necessity in every one of them [satires], according to the etymology of the word, yet it may arise naturally from one subject, as it is diversely treated, in the several subordinate branches of it, all relating to the chief. It may be illustrated accordingly with variety of examples in the subdivisions of it, and with as many precepts as there are members of it; which altogether may complete that olla, or hotchpotch, which is properly a satire.
(pp.145-146)

Fulwell, although writing over a century before Dryden's Discourse, might almost have had this 'important secret' (as Dryden calls it) in mind, for in designing his satire, he centers it on 'one particular theme', that is, the art of flattery, with its 'several subordinate branches' of 'glosyng, coggyn, doublenes, dissimulation, iesting and rayling' (Art of Flattery, p.41.20). Each of his eight dialogues, and also the preliminary matter, concentrates on this one subject; yet at the same time variety is achieved by use of different types of flatterers from different walks of life and professions, who provide, in Dryden's phrase, 'variety of examples' of the main theme. The satire is further diversified by the use of different literary devices, such as allegory, fable, 'character', dream, mock encomium, acrostic verse; and by varying the medium in using a Menippean mixture of prose and verse.

Despite this *mélange*, there is a dominant overall pattern to the satire which gives it a skilful and satisfying structure: the Author, poor, ignorant, innocent and naive,

asks some successful figure - the Adversarius, in Randolph's terminology - the secret of his success. The Adversarius - Fortunatus, Friar Francis, Sir Simon - reveals his method of rising in the world through the art of flattery, and explains his tricks, deceits and lies. The Author leads him on with questions; then, overcome with righteous indignation, blasts the moral turpitude of his interlocutor in a fiery denunciation replete with quotations from the Scriptures. The Author always has the last word. This pattern is satisfying because, although the Author is unsuccessful in worldly terms, he demonstrates that he is morally superior. It is easy to identify with him and experience a natural delight in virtue triumphing over vice. As the pattern repeats itself, the reader's anticipation is aroused: we await the inevitable denunciation with relish, the exposure and discomfiture of the flatterer and hypocrite. We begin to realise that the Author is not as naive as he pretends, that he is trapping his opponent into an admission of guilt. The device is similar to that used by Pascal in The Provincial Letters, in which the author assumes the role of innocent questioner, who, however, eventually reveals his moral earnestness and indignation at the answers he receives. Pascal also used dialogue and the interview technique: 'he strikes the note of irony disguised as naiveté', as his translator and editor, A.J. Krailsheimer, points out (The Provincial Letters, translated and edited by

A.J. Krailsheimer (Harmondsworth, 1967), p.16). Both Fulwell and Pascal, through an assumption of naive simplicity and innocent-seeming questions, corner their opponents into morally untenable positions, and expose them for what they really are.

Fulwell also adheres to Dryden's 'rule' concerning the satirist's presentation of morality:

The poet is bound, and that ex officio, to give his reader some one precept of moral virtue, and caution him against some one particular vice or folly...he is chiefly to inculcate one virtue, and insist on that. (Discourse, p.146)

Fulwell cautions his readers against hypocrisy, and advises them to stick to truth and honesty in everyday dealings, to become one of the followers of Lady Truth rather than one of the detestable crew of flatterers surrounding Lady Fortune. Although his style in The Art of Flattery is colloquial and easy, giving a deceptively simple air to the work, a closer examination shows that the book is carefully structured in the accepted manner of classical satire, according to 'the precepts and examples of the Ancients, who were always our best masters' to quote Dryden again (Discourse, p.144).

Structure

Reference has already been made to Randolph's analysis of the bipartite structure of classical verse satire, and to the fact that a similar structure emerges in Fulwell's dialogues (above, p.xx). According to Randolph,

some specific vice or folly, selected for attack,

was turned about on all its sides in Part A (if one may arbitrarily call it so) in something of the way premises are turned about in the octave of a sonnet; and its opposing virtue was recommended in Part B. ('The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire', p.369)

As mentioned above, Randolph labels these two parts 'thesis' and 'antithesis'. There is frequently 'an outer shell-like framework' in which 'a combative hollow man or interlocutor', the Adversarius, 'serves as whip and spur to the Satirist' (Randolph, p.372). Sometimes the Adversarius 'is only a straw decoy who utters no word but simply listens throughout the satirist's monologue' (Randolph, p.372). The 'admonition to virtue' in Part B is sometimes 'cleverly introduced by way of quotable proverb and maxim' in Part A (Randolph, p.374).

This pattern emerges in the First Dialogue. It is introduced by a rhymed maxim which serves as an admonition to the reader (p.16); similar maxims introduce the subsequent dialogues. In the First Dialogue, a framework is provided by the Adversarius, Fulwell's printer William Hoskins, who starts off the discussion on Fortune by accusing the Author of being ungrateful for 'her good gifts on you bestowed' (p.16.9). However, 'friend printer' soon drops out of the dialogue, having provided the 'frame' for the Author's narration of his visit to Lady Fortune's court and his account of his meeting with Lady Truth which form the main portion of the Dialogue (pp.19-21, 21-28), the latter consisting of the monologue of 'Truethes communication' to the Author (pp.22-28). The dialogue between Author and printer, then, soon dissolves into the Author's monologue narratives and reported speech (as with the dialogues of More discussed above). Despite having

been identified as an historically existing person (unlike the allegorical Lady Fortune and Lady Truth), the Adversarius in the First Dialogue is a 'hollow man' who lapses into a 'straw decoy', merely part of the 'outer shell-like framework' which 'encloses the entire piece' (Randolph, p.372). The fact that he is a printer and an 'olde felowe and frinde' (p.16.10) of the Author is really irrelevant to the concerns of the dialogue. He remains mute at the end of the dialogue and is allowed to make no further comment.

The First Dialogue falls into two opposing parts: the Thesis (to use Randolph's term) asserting that 'flattery and dissimulation is the way to wyn Fortunes fauour' (p.13.18), and the Antithesis, provided by Lady Truth, who is in obvious opposition to 'flattery and dissimulation'. The Thesis is illustrated by the Author's account of his experience at Dame Fortune's court, at which he was not rewarded for his 'approued fidelitie' (p.17.20), but has the chagrin of seeing a 'detestable crewe of fooles, flatterers, and parasites' - including Pierce Pickthank, Frances the Flatterer, Crispin the Counterfeit and Dayy Dissembler - receiving her gifts (p.21.11). In the Antithesis, the Author declares that he will be Truth's 'man' when she comes to England; but he finds the truth that 'wise men are not wanted, till they are lodged in their graues' (p.27.10) unpalatable, and cannot give up the hope that he will get some windfall from Lady Fortune. This leads naturally into the Second Dialogue, his confrontation

with Lady Fortune in person.

The Second Dialogue is also structurally divided into two parts: the Thesis, in which the values of Dame Fortune are expressed; and the Antithesis, in which the Author categorically rejects them. The division is emphasized by the use of verse for the Antithesis in contrast to the prose dialogue of the Thesis. The verse monologue of the Antithesis allows the Author to have the last word and to triumph over his (now departed) Adversarius, even to be rude and impertinent to Lady Fortune by giving her the 'fig of Spain'. The meek tone of the suitor in the Thesis changes into the rude invective of the Antithesis, in which the Author flatly rejects the 'flattering lore', 'flattering scooles' and 'filthy art' of Dame Fortune (p.33.20, 21; p.34.7).

The Second Dialogue is more lively and more strongly satirical than the First. The contrast between Thesis and Antithesis is sharper. There is a certain sly humour in the way in which the Author dares to denounce Lady Fortune only after she has left the scene. When she is present, he humbly asks her, 'But is there any vniuersitie wherein this science [flattery] is studied?' (p.33.9); after she is gone, he has the courage to announce 'I loth thy flattering scooles' (p.33.21). He rejects the philosophy of Aristippus, with his 'cogging skill' (p.34.13), for that of 'plaine Diogenes' (p.34.15), thus reinforcing the antithetical structure with a presentation of opposing philosophies.

In the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Dialogues Fulwell's

satire is bolder: he chooses, not an allegorical abstraction such as Lady Fortune or a 'hollow man' such as William Hoskins as his Adversarius, but contemporaries who embody the vice of flattery. At least one of these (Sir Simon) is a very thinly disguised lampoon on a living person; and Friar Francis and Fortunatus may have been recognizable figures (as discussed in the Commentary). The confrontation between Author and Adversarius becomes sharper and the attack more trenchant. Fulwell uses what Power calls 'the structure of accusation': she notes that in English formal satire 'the structure of accusation and its grounds is the logical heart of each satire' (Doris C. Powers, English Formal Satire: Elizabethan to Augustan (The Hague, 1971), p.33).

To avoid monotony, Fulwell varies the antithetical structure. For example, in the Third Dialogue, the Author cannot contain some outbursts of indignation in the Thesis before the denunciation of Friar Francis in the Antithesis. In Part A a simple and friendly-seeming Author encourages the friar to expose his tricks and immorality - his false prophecy, pretended palmistry, and his approval of a sermon condoning thieves. Part B (starting on p.53) contains the expected blistering denunciation of the Adversarius. This is, however, foreshadowed by two mini-rebukes in Part A: in the first, the Author quotes Scripture at Friar Francis, but then holds his fire: 'I pray you proceede with your discourse, and we wyll set Saint Paule asyde till you haue done' (p.45.19). The Friar dismisses the Author's admonitory

quotations from Saint Paul and describes his 'pretenced Reuelacion' to Dame Gibbes (p.46.10). The Author plies him with questions and draws him out to reveal further wrongdoings - 'had you other shiftes in store?' (p.50.18). Then he angrily accuses the Friar of belonging to the 'rable' of 'a company of cogging coistrels' (p.52.15) and proclaims that he is 'ashamed to heare any more' (p.52.20); but then, inconsistently, encourages further revelations.

There is also variation in the pattern of the Antithesis in the Third Dialogue: this time it is not a monologic declamation by the Author. Friar Francis is allowed to defend his position, and even to score debating points on the Author: for example, about Peter's denial of Christ, and whether Peter was ever at Rome or not. The Author still has the last word, and preserves his tone of moral superiority: 'I shal pray to God to illuminate thy hart with his holy spirite' (p.59.16). But Friar Francis is by no means a 'straw decoy' and there is more of a sense of genuine conflict in the Dialogue.

In the Fourth Dialogue, too, Fulwell allows the Adversarius to get in a few digs at the Author. Fortunatus sneeringly taunts him:

I see full well, the Fox wyll eate no grapes
because he cannot reatch them, so thou
mislykest honor and dignytie, because thou
canst not attayne vnto it. (p.70.1)

The Fourth Dialogue is less complex in structure: Fortunatus recounts his 'prety sleights' (p.61.15) in the Thesis, and proclaims his belief that 'who so preferreth honesty before

honor, shal proue himself a foole' (p.64.21). The Antithesis (beginning p.66.5) condemns this attitude; the Author exhorts Fortunatus to 'study the art of trueth (which god wyll prosper): for trueth in the end shal preuaile' (p.67.7), and he admonishes him to 'Respice finem' (p.67.18).

There is a similar pattern in the Fifth Dialogue of Author drawing out Adversarius by means of leading questions in the Thesis, and then when he has revealed his 'sinister practises' (p.75.16) denouncing him in the Antithesis. The Author elicits the trust of Sir Simon by appealing to their 'olde acquaintance' (p.70.7):

When I knew you first you had no such skill,
but contented your selfe to liue as barely
as I, and other your poore neighbours. (p.69.17)

Lulled by this sense of shared experience, Sir Simon freely admits that he is a sheep in wolf's clothing and he misjudges the Author's complicity. The Author holds back his moral condemnation of the sinister practices until the monologue Antithesis (beginning p.84.3) in which his indignation is vented in a four-page tirade. Before this denunciation, however, he makes remarks which may be ambiguously interpreted as either admiration or condemnation, but which Sir Simon interprets as favourable. It is only when the Author cannot elicit any further compromising information, such as the price of benefices - 'A secret not to bee publicuely knowen' (p.83. sidenote) - that he launches into his declamation against 'all thy practices, as thou hast particularly recited them vnto me' (p.84.8). He exhorts Sir Simon to repent and 'liue

hereafter like an honest man (if thou canst)' (p.87.12), but the implication is that Sir Simon cannot and will not change his ways. If he does repent, 'all to late shal it then be' (p.85.17), as the Author predicts with relish. The Author's final words, 'Truth seeketh out no corners, nor searcheth for coulorable shiftes' (p.87.19), stand out in direct contrast to Sir Simon's shiftiness.

The Fifth Dialogue is the high point of The Art of Flattery; it is the most trenchant, detailed and effective of the eight dialogues. The Sixth Dialogue 'betweene Pierce Pikethank, drunken Dickon, dame Annat the alewife, and the Author' forms a deliberate contrast to the high seriousness of the Fifth, as one descends from the analysis of the abuses of religion to the comic relief of the 'alie' rhetoric of the tavern. Fulwell also varies the structural pattern: instead of opening as we now expect with a dialogue between Author and Adversarius, the Sixth Dialogue commences with a 'trialogue' (to use Wycliffe's and More's term) between drunken Dickon, Dame Annat and Pierce Pickthank. Dickon and Pierce then 'depaint' each other in the mode of the satirical 'character'. Dickon's suggestion that they 'leaue [their] painting, and fall to drinking' (p.94.8) is well received and Pierce begins a drinking song - 'with hay iolye Ienkin I see a knaue a drinkyng' (p.94.13). Again the dialogue is divided into two antithetical parts: the Antithesis consists of a monologue by the Author addressed to the reader, opening with an apology for 'this drunken dialogue' (p.94.16). In Part B, the Author

repeats the device of the 'character' in Part A as he anatomizes the 'mischeuous practises' (p.96.12) of Dickon and the religious hypocrisy of Pierce Pickthank, who cloaks 'his hollow harte, with a holy pretence' (p.96.12). He ends with a prayer that God will protect us from this kind of dissembler, 'and sende vs his grace, that wee may embrace the honest and godly retinew of Lady Truth, and shake of all such flatterers and dissemblers (p.98.16). This stresses once again the antithesis presented in the dialogue: between flattery and dissembling on the one hand and truth and honesty on the other. The former is once again presented dramatically in the Thesis, and the latter revealed in the Antithesis.

As Fulwell uses the device of contrasted 'characters' in the Sixth Dialogue, so he uses a contrasted pair of set speeches in the Eighth Dialogue. U.F.'s address in verse to Jupiter (pp.124-128) is counteracted by 'Tom Tapsters lecture' (pp.130-137), also in verse, giving cynical advice to a 'lord' on how to exploit his tenants. The Eighth, and last, Dialogue is the most complex in structure, although it still retains the Thesis/Antithesis division, the Antithesis being presented in the Author's 'judgment', beginning p.138, his concluding condemnation of the 'execrable science' of flattery (p.150.18), culminating in the final flourish of the Latin quotation from Mancinus. The Thesis section, however, is embellished: the straightforward confrontation

between Author and Adversarius is abandoned. The Dialogue opens with a conversation in a tavern reminiscent of the tavern scene in the Sixth Dialogue, with low-life characters - Tom Tapster, Miles Makeshift and Wat Wily, 'cogging knaue' and 'foysting varlet' (p.119.23). The dialogue between the three rogues, with Author's comment, gives way to Tom Tapster's 'dream' about Jupiter's court, which seems to be modelled on Lucian (as mentioned above). The verse declamatio of U.F., related as part of Tom's dream, is contemptuously commented on by Wat Wily and Miles Makeshift, who condemn the Author as 'a very saucy and presumptuous foole' (p.128.12). Miles Makeshift asks Tom Tapster, as 'a publyke reader in the science of Adulation', to 'reade a lecture of that arte' (p.129.17), and Tom's verse 'lecture' follows. Miles and Wat enthusiastically praise Tom as 'a perfect rethorician' (p.138.5), and ask 'friend Fulwel' for his judgment. As noted above, the Author's judgment forms the Antithesis.

In Tom Tapster's dream - the dream vision which is a favourite satiric device - the mythological setting of Jupiter's court forms a contrast to the realism of the opening dialogue with its low life characters and tavern setting. The reader is transported from earth to an ironical vision of heaven which turns out to be a parody of courtly corruption: Jupiter surrounded by 'the petie gods and goddesses' who 'endeuored with al diligence to curry fauour by sundry strang and vncustomed sleights' (p.121.13), sleights

which are variations on the tricks of Sir Simon, Friar Francis, and Fortunatus. U.F. impetuously, but ineffectually, tries to counteract this atmosphere of adulation with his satirical depiction of the 'cocklorels bote' full of flatterers, and his warning to Jupiter to 'looke well about' him for the 'deepe dissemblers' who surround him (pp.127.21; 128.4). The frenetic but fruitless activity of the flatterers is contrasted with the stillness of the seated figure of Conscience with her 'garments all to torne' and her 'homely raggs' who 'smiles at tyrants that turmoile/ to make their will a lawe' (p.126.6). Conscience parallels the allegorical figure of Lady Truth in the First Dialogue, just as Jupiter's court echoes those of Lady Fortune and Fortunatus.

The Seventh Dialogue also varies the Author/Adversarius pattern in that it is the Author, Ulpianus, who is now put on the defensive as Diogenes rebukes him for deserting 'the fieldish quiet lyfe' for the court (p.99.7). Instead of the usual pattern of Author admonishing Adversarius, Ulpianus is forced to defend his sortie into Fortune's court as an attempt 'to learne experience' motivated by a search for wisdom and a desire for 'insatiable knowledge' rather than out of an attraction to the 'sugred bane of Fortunes toies' (p.110. 9ff.). Instead of the Author drawing out the Adversarius with questions, Diogenes draws out Ulpianus to describe his experience of court life. There is no clearcut division into Thesis and Antithesis, except that Ulpianus is encouraged by Diogenes to describe his 'faithfull friend'

Edmund Harman with 'truthfull praise' (pp.115.13; 116.9; 117). In Ulpianus's panegyric in acrostic verse, Harman stands out as a pattern of what a true courtier (and patron) should be, in contrast to the grasping and scrambling flatterers described earlier in the Dialogue, just as the philosophy of Diogenes contradicts the values of Aristippus. The dialogue is also embellished with the homely exemplum of the mouse (p.101) and the Aesopic fable of the fox and the raven (pp.112-113), in the same way that declamatio and Theophrastan 'character' are used in the Eighth and Sixth Dialogues. In this, Fulwell follows the precedent of More, who enlivened A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation with Mother Maud's fable of the fox, the ass and the lion (Book II, chapter 14), and the fable (attributed to Aesop) of the hen that laid the golden egg (Book II, chapter 17, p.302).

Fulwell's literary skill is shown in the way in which he manipulates and varies the structures of the dialogues. Although he uses the bipartite structure he varies both Thesis and Antithesis to avoid monotony, and uses a variety of literary devices - fable, 'character', declamatio, dream, acrostics - to the same end. When it suits his convenience, he uses monologue or reported speech as well as the direct dialogue of confrontation between Author and Adversarius.

Although Fulwell uses the technique of confrontation in his dialogues, it is noticeable that the Author never converts the Adversarius or causes him to change his ways.

As noted above (xxxiv), Kernan calls this phenomenon 'satiric stasis':

In formal satire action is always arrested before it leads to change, and the satirist, inflexibly locked in an attitude of hostility to the evil world, stands always facing unregenerate fools and villains. (The Cankered Muse, p.204)

This is, Kernan maintains, the 'normal "plot" of satire'.

In this, the satiric dialogue is in contrast to the Platonic form of dialogue, in which the Adversarius is swayed to his opponent's point of view: as are the Messenger in More's A Dialogue Concerning Heresies; Vincent in his A Dialogue of Comfort; Aristippus in Elyot's Of the Knowledge which Maketh a Wise Man; Caninius in his The Defence of Good Women; and Philologus in Ascham's Toxophilus.

The Persona of the Satirist

Kernan maintains that 'the satirist must be regarded as but one poetic device used by the author to express his satiric vision', and that there is a basic satiric persona which is in itself one of the conventions of satire as a literary form (The Cankered Muse, p.15). Because the Satirist is merely a conventional persona, Kernan warns against the danger of being distracted from the satire itself into a consideration of the biography of the author (the 'biographical method') and the contemporary social scene he is criticizing (the 'historical method');

In this way satire is denied the independence of artistic status and made a biographical and historical document, while the criticism of

satire degenerates into discussion of an author's moral character and the economic and social conditions of his time. (The Cankered Muse, p.2)

The historical approach is taken by Hallett Smith in his essay 'Satire: the English Tradition, the Poet, and the Age', in which he insists that,

The significant sources of satire are not literary or philosophical; they are social and economic. For the understanding of satire, and response to it, we need not so much an acquaintance with models and conventions, or an understanding of ideas and principles, as a knowledge of the social milieu from which the satire sprang. (Elizabethan Poetry (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), p.194)

Readers of satire can hardly stop themselves from asking biographical or historical questions; as Kernan admits, 'the authors of satire [themselves] have encouraged this response to their works' (Cankered Muse, p.2). In this edition attempts to answer these questions have been made in the biography of Fulwell and in the commentary on the text, for it seems improper for an editor to ignore them. But Kernan warns us that

We need to approach satire in the way we do other poetry - as an art; that is, not a direct report of the poet's feelings and the literal incidents which aroused those feelings, but a construct of symbols - situations, scenes, characters, language - put together to express some particular vision of the world. The individual parts must be seen in terms of their function in the total poem and not judged by reference to things outside the poem such as the medical history of the author or the social scene in which he wrote. (Cankered Muse, pp.4-5)

Fulwell - unlike Erasmus, More in his last dialogue The Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation, Sir Thomas Elyot in his three dialogues, and Ascham in Toxophilus - does not use

a third party as his mouthpiece in his dialogues: the Author remains firmly in the centre of attention. The author's decision to include himself in his dialogue as one of the interlocutors has interesting resonances for the reader, who naturally assumes that the author is putting forward his own point of view. This poses special problems for an author who is discussing sensitive political and social problems, and it is hardly surprising that Fulwell found himself in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities for attacking the Wells clergy. Other writers of dialogues faced the same problem: More in the Utopia presented heterodox ideas - such as the abolition of private property - through the mouth of his Adversarius, Hythloday, yet maintained his own orthodoxy as a public servant by creating a persona of More the man of the world, pragmatist, compromiser, and realist as opposed to the idealist Hythloday. When More criticizes English society he does so through Hythloday, with the added precaution of back-dating the period to which the criticisms refer 'to a time twelve years before Henry VIII came to the throne' in the Cardinal Morton episode (Dorsch, 'Sir Thomas More and Lucian', p.352). After Hythloday has related the conversation at Cardinal Morton's, More makes no comment on his radical proposals for a more humanitarian kind of government and society; just as, at the end of Book II, he does not criticize or refute Hythloday.

Similar strategies were used by other dialogue-writers. For example, Cicero tried to evade the political implications

of attacking belief in the gods and traditional religious rites in De Natura Deorum. His original plan was to play a prominent part in the dialogue, but he changed this to being merely a mute character:

he was able not only to be present at the meeting and listen to all the arguments pro and con but also, as an Academic, to form an independent judgment.

(Philip Levine, 'Cicero and the Literary Dialogue', Classical Journal, 53 (1958), 146-151 (p.150))

In this way he could avoid the charge of heterodoxy, and continue in public life being a member of the college of augurs.

More's use of the author-persona in A Dialogue Concerning Heresies is more complex. More emerges in the dialogue as a champion not merely of orthodoxy but also of intolerance and religious bigotry. It shocks a modern reader when More maintains that 'the burning of heretikes... is lawful, necessarye, and wel done' (Book IV, chapter 14, p.274G), and that heretics do not need a fair trial because they are ipso facto liars and perjurers (Book III, chapter 2). He presents himself as an extremist who will go to any lengths to exterminate heresy, while the Messenger is a more moderate and humane person - someone who is troubled, as many others at the time were, by the burning of heretics, unfair trials, and scandals in the church. There is a strong sense of duality in the dialogue, a schizophrenic quality of 'two-sidedness', in spite of the strongly orthodox persona of the author, and also despite More's sincere horror

that fifteen centuries of Church doctrine were being swept away by the Reformers, and his fear and dread of the radical changes of the times. Schuster notes this sense of inner duality:

it seems most probable that the oppositions which the Host [More] and Messenger objectify and dramatize exist as oppositions within More's sensibility, but not within his will;

this despite the fact that

More's polemical voice, for all its modulations, is seldom if ever hesitant or unsure.
(*'Thomas More's Polemical Career 1523-1533'*, in *Yale The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*, Part 3, p.1143)

In The Art of Flattery, the reader is constantly reminded that the Author is to be identified with Ulpian Fulwell by the frequent references to and puns on his name and initials (e.g. pp.16.13; 30.7-9; 102.3; 117.13; 123.14; 138.15; 143.5; 145.18). Lady Truth refers to Fulwell's profession of clergyman, 'professor of holy write' (p.24.13); Lady Hope's letter is sent from Naunton, where Fulwell was rector (p.18.4). In the Seventh Dialogue he uses his Latinized Christian name, Ulpianus, instead of the less specific 'Author'. Fulwell thus insistently encourages a biographical response.

But with Kernan's caveat in mind, it is no surprise that the personality of the 'Author' is that of the traditional Satirist. He adopts what Kernan calls 'the pose of simplicity' (Cankered Muse, p.17): he is a 'simple sot' (pp.2.13; 123.14), or 'simple foole Fulwell' (p.21.18);

rustic and unsophisticated - 'more carterlike then courtierlike' (p.19.9); a plain honest man incapable of duplicity, 'vtterly voide of dissimulation and flattery' (p.17.20).

But the Author, country innocent though he is, is not above a shrewd and sarcastic observation on those 'that swingd vp and downe in brauerye of other mens cost' (p.19.13). He slyly exploits the vanity of one of the courtiers, Double Diligence, who condescends to walk beside him to show off his 'Pecoocks plewmes,...to ostent his brauery by my contrary' (p.19.21). Through this crafty manipulation he manages to gain access to Lady Fortune, despite his shabby appearance. He is not above using the flatterer's tool to gain his own ends, as when he fulsomely flatters Friar Francis:

I am ryght ioyous that I haue met with so noble
a doctor this morning at whose handes I haue
alredy learned one lesson, and by whose company
I hope to attayne more skylle: I pray you master
Fryer let me be your companyon thys day, for I
am all readye enflamed with the loue of your
companye. (p.40.4)

Friar Francis cannot resist this appeal, and is led to reveal his nefarious practices to someone who seems to be such an eager and admiring student.

There is a certain ambiguity in the motivation of the Author which is typical of the presentation of the Satirist. If he attacks flattery, he also has to defend himself against the charge that he himself is a flatterer.

Some say that in times past,
In Flatteries Schoole thou hast been traynde;
And yet to thriue foundst not the cast. (p.144.13)

In the Fortunatus episode, Fulwell inserts a defensive sidenote: 'To publish deserued commendacions is no flattery' (p.62). He is hesitant to praise his patron Harman:

Some men would deeme i flatter him,
if i should write his fame. (p.116.5)

Yet he is both attracted and repelled by the worldliness and greed of Dame Fortune's court, and is eager to join the crowd of suitors clamouring for her largesse. He too is overcome by cupidity:

and as did the rest, so dyd I holde oute my
hand for her beneuolence. I gaped wide,
but other snatched vp the benefits before
they fell to the ground, I stretched forth
my arme and opened my hande, but I coulde
finger nothing. (p.20.17)

There is a suggestion of sour grapes as he surveys those who have received the 'benefits': they are 'William Sommers kynred' (p.21.6), fools rather than wise men: the pickthank, the flatterer, the counterfeit and the dissembler, a 'detestable crewe of fooles, flatterers, and parasites' (p.21.11). The Author had formerly categorized himself as a fool - 'as wise as Will Sommer' (p.8.4). What distinguishes him from the 'detestable crewe' is that he is a 'simple' fool (p.21.18), and Lady Truth notes his 'simplicitie, among suche a sorte of snatching companions' (p.21.16). He will not resort to their base tricks to get his reward but retains his moral integrity.

Yet at the same time the Author, like the scrambling courtiers at Dame Fortune's court, is ambitious; he wants the worldly rewards which Dame Fortune bestows. In the

First Dialogue he tacitly admits that he would desert truth for fortune. This implicit admission is perhaps used to forestall the hostile feelings of the reader; the Author is not judging-erring humanity from an impossibly lofty height, but he too has his susceptibilities and temptations, he too would like worldly recognition. This is like Marston's admission:

[I] my selfe am not imaculate,
 But many spots my minde doth vitiate.
 (Certaine Satyres, II, 11-12; quoted by
 Powers, English Formal Satire, p.72)

Powers comments that Marston was claiming to be 'a man among men and therefore better qualified to evaluate realistically the shortcomings of his contemporaries than the one who stands at a lofty distance from them' (English Formal Satire, p.72) - another ploy of the satiric persona. Horace also uses the method of 'endowing the Satirist with self-effacing humility, or inferiority, or ignorance as devices for engaging the reader in an encounter that would be pleasurable to him and forestall his hostile feelings' (Powers, p.82). Fulwell's Author is endowed with similar traits.

In The Art of Flattery the Author pursues worldly success: he avidly interviews the successful - Friar Francis, Fortunatus, Sir Simon - in order to find out their secrets of how they made it to the top. In the Seventh Dialogue he has deserted the tub and diet of roots of Diogenes for the glitter of court life. He tries to impress Jupiter with his oratorical powers in the Eighth Dialogue. But his attempts

to become successful are doomed to failure because he remains 'simple' - honest and truthful; he cannot learn the 'fawning lore' of Dame Fortune's 'flattering scooles' (p.33.20); he refuses to 'frame [his] liuing trade' unto her 'filthy art' (p.34.7). Despite his yearning for success, there is a point at which the honourable man must draw the line. Although the Author is shabby and foolish, he has the moral courage to speak his mind and attack flatterers and sycophants. The flatterers would like to repress the Author's honesty and plain speaking. Such freedom of speech should be restrained, in Wat Wily's view: it is 'madnesse..to permit fooles freely to speake their mindes' (p.128.16). Despite his social inferiority, the Author emerges in a heroic light, as morally superior, the outspoken 'man' of Lady Truth.

The satire is indeed presented in terms of a moral duty on the part of the Author: he was not only 'iustly moued' but 'vrged in conscience' to write it, to expose 'the wicked and impudent exercises of the flattering flocke in these dayes', as he explains in his dedicatory epistle (p.5.6). It may be a 'verye simple and vnpolished peece of woorke' and a 'rude...treatise' (p.7.7,4), but the image of the 'filthie fountaine' spreading 'great and grieuous enormities' through the land (p.5.2) suggests Fulwell as a heroic cleanser of the Augean stables of the commonwealth. The depiction of the satirist as being 'iustly moued' and 'vrged in conscience' to write is again a conventional one: 'difficile est saturam

non scribere' in Juvenal's famous words (Satire I.30, Juvenal and Persius, edited and translated by G.G. Ramsay, Loeb Classical Library (London & New York, 1918), p.4). The satirist, viewing the corruption all around him, can no longer contain himself, and is forced to write by an overwhelming sense of indignation and disgust. Fulwell expresses this in the Fifth Dialogue when he bursts out to Sir Simon that 'nowe I cannot choose but declame against all thy practices' (p.84.7). Like other satirists, he presents himself as a 'champion of virtue who dares to speak the truth in a world where the false insolently maintains itself as the real' (Kernan, Cankered Muse, p.21).

The Adversarius

The main thrust of Fulwell's satire is expressed through the device of the Adversarius. His choice of Adversarius is varied: a living contemporary, his printer William Hoskins; a dead Greek philosopher, Diogenes; an allegorical figure, Lady Fortune; and conventional satiric types such as the drunkard, the simonist, the venial friar, the unscrupulous courtier. In this Fulwell was following the tendency of sixteenth-century satire, as noted by Peter, to veer 'from the presentation of semi-allegorical types to the portrayal of familiar contemporary figures' (Complaint and Satire, p.113).

Hoskins is more of a 'Companion', to use Powers's term (English Formal Satire, p.57), than a true adversary to be attacked and admonished. As noted above, he is used mainly

as a sympathetic listener to the Author's revelations, like Maecenas in Horace's first satire. Like the Author Hoskins is an honest man who realized that he is unsuccessful because he cannot descend to 'flattery and dissimulation' (p.18.18). This insight is repeated by Lady Fortune in the Second Dialogue as she takes the role of instructor to the Author in response to his complaint that he 'was neuer instructed in the scoole of scambling' (p.31.11). If he wishes to succeed, she tells him, he must first become skilful in the art of flattery,

and the first principle of it is this, qui nescit Simulare, nescit Viuere. (Hee that knoweth not how to dissemble cannot tel how to liue.) (p.33.2)

Friar Francis, Fortunatus, and Sir Simon are also cast in the role of teachers to the supposedly ignorant Author. 'I will for good felowships sake teach vnto thee the eighth liberall science, which is a verie profitable Arte', the Friar declares (p.40.20). He commends his own proficiency in this 'science', 'for I am an auncient practicioner therein, and think my selfe of sufficiency to proceed Doctor in that faculty' (p.41.5) - 'A Doctor in knauery', as the sidenote caustically comments. He instructs the Author in some of the finer points of flattery:

it is as fit a point of flattery to glose in that which is neuer like to com to pas, as to promise that which a man neuer ment to geue, or wold do him no plesure to whom it is offered. (p.51.15)

Sir Simon in the Fifth Dialogue boasts that he is 'an absolut schoolemaster' in the art of flattery (p.70.3), for 'I set

aside al other studies, and dedicate my selfe wholly to that' (p.70.1). He offers to be the Author's 'reader' or tutor in the art (p.84.1).

Fulwell uses the idea of the 'schoolmaster' teaching vice to good effect. The humble and sometimes even obsequious pupil - 'may I bee so bolde as to learne at your handes...?' the Author asks Fortunatus (p.60.10) - suddenly changes into the stern preacher rebuking vice in the Antithesis, now a teacher himself, but of virtue and truth. The roles are reversed. The former 'reader' in the art of flattery is himself read a lecture:

If these be the fruites of flattery, for gods
sake (syr) learne sum new trade of fressher
fashion, and study the art of trueth.... (p.67.4)

Fulwell's most powerful Adversarii are the two members of the clergy, Friar Francis and Sir Simon. The flattering friar and the simonist are, of course, two conventional objects of Renaissance and medieval satire, but Fulwell goes beyond the general to the particular and hints that he is exposing contemporary individuals as well as presenting familar types of corrupt clergy. Peter comments that

The whole tendency of the age was away from
the broad anonymity of Complaint, and it was
more at a sort of scandalous gossip than at
generalized moral judgements that the poets
began to aim. (Complaint and Satire, p.121)

Fulwell includes both.

Friar Francis is a mixture of type and individual. He chooses as his victims: rich and attractive women: 'This was no poore mans house, but a good fat Farmer, and my dame

was a lusty wench, and had a rowling eye' (p.43.5). In this he is like Chaucer's Friar Huberd who has a preference for 'worthy wommen' and 'faire wyves' and who avoids the 'beggestere' and 'poraille' (Prologue to Canterbury Tales, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, edited by F.N. Robinson, 2nd edition (London, 1957), ll.217ff.). There is much circumstantial detail in the presentation of the Jane Gibbes episode in the Third Dialogue, not only in the exact method by which Friar Francis deceives Jane Gibbes, but also in the size of her family and the specific ages of her daughters (p.43.9). (It is interesting to note that Gibbs is a common Somerset name and occurs often in the wills of the period.) When he is thinking about 'what daungers are commonly incident vnto men and women' (p.49.2) in the palmistry episode, the Friar chooses drowning, a hazard to which the people around Wells were particularly exposed on account of frequent flooding in the area (Commentary, to p.49.4-5).

The Friar preys upon the piety as well as the superstition of Jane Gibbes when he claims that he has received a vision from God. He abuses the sacred and privileged profession of 'we Friars' who

are not suspected because we are accounted men
mortified from fleshlye lustes, and are
authorised to shriue secretly both men and
women. (p.44.18)

Through 'pretenced Reuelacion' (p.46.10) and 'forged inspiration' (p.54.3) Friar Francis perverts the natural love and concern of a mother for her children into the pettier vices of

social climbing, snobbery and 'Souerantie (the thinge that Women cheiflye deasire)' (p.46.18). He encourages vanity and selfishness rather than concern for others, as when he promises a woman who is unhappily married a new husband

with whom she should haue her owne will, and welth at pleasure, and she should see her desyre vpon her enemies, and beare the swing and sway of all the women of the parish. (p.50.7)

Instead of preaching the gospel, he preaches for profit; given enough money, he 'will affirme that theeues ought to be rulers, and not to be ruled, yea and are worthy to be canonised among the Saintes' (p.53.14). His subversion of the moral order has brought the church into disrepute; as the Author points out, this kind of corruption was one of the causes of the abolition of the religious orders. Friar Francis is

one for whose cause the worde of God is euell spoken of, for thou and such as thou art, haue bene the ruin and ouerthrow of many goodly houses, to the great annoiance of pouertie. (p.54.18)

Sir Simon, too, is both type and individual. Fulwell's identification of Sir Simon as Archdeacon of Wells Cathedral indicates that he is detailing and exposing local abuses as well as presenting a conventional satiric figure of the simonist. Sir Simon is almost a textbook study of simony, the buying and selling of ecclesiastical preferment. He boasts of selling one benefice for a bowl of ale 'spyced with a hundred duckets' and that he is still 'not as yet vnfurnished of my pluralytie' and has 'the feate to fishe

and catch' more (p.69.5, 12). By becoming all things to all men, 'a man at all assayes' (p.72.8), a boon companion, bowler, frequenter of ale houses, and 'my Lordes mery greeke' (p.73.3), he has 'had more lyuinges heaped on me, then law would permit mee to receiue, but I would refuse none' (p.72.11). He reveals the methods of evading the law against pluralities:

When so euer any lyuing came vnto mee more
then by law I was capable of, I wolde either
make marchandice of one, or els make ouer my
entangled lyuinge vnto some man of such
aucthorytie, as against whom no common promoter
durst presume. (p.72.14)

An important part of Sir Simon's fishing for benefices is cultivating the right people by offering hospitality - not the 'keeping of hospitality' which was one of the duties of the clergy, as he explains 'not for eche poore knaue and euery rascal, or for the poore and impotent, but for lords, knights, esquiers, and gentlemen' and their pet dogs (p.78.5). This is Sir Simon's perverted idea of 'Almes' (p.78.sidenote).

Like Friar Francis, Sir Simon has an eye to the main chance. When he feels it is more profitable, he gives up his ecclesiastical vocation for civil law or mining. He tries to cheat his tenants out of their land. In this incident, Fulwell gives the distinct impression of going beyond conventional satiric commonplaces to the attack of specific local abuses of the Somerset clergy - abuses which are documented in the lawsuits connected with the leasing of property belonging to Wells Cathedral in the sixteenth century, as discussed in the Biography. Sir Simon confesses

in particular 'one of my practises which sticketh more in my stomach then all the rest' (p.78.22), the victim of which was not only 'a verye honest man' but also 'my very friend in time of necessitie' (p.79.6). Greed and envy, not need (for Sir Simon is by this time prosperous and furnished of many pluralities) motivate him to betray his friend: 'oh how it greeued me to see so swete a sop (as he enioyed) out of my dishe' (p.79.13). Sir Simon's subtle villainy and evil nature are betrayed in the way in which he works out the details of his plot to cheat his friend, his refusal 'to receiue my rent of him, because the forfaiture of his liuing, stoode vpon the non paiment of his rent' (p.81.12). Friendship and hospitality - 'such cheare and frindli entertainment, as right wel deserued great thankes' (p.82.13) - are repaid by treachery, the Judas kiss, and the confiscation of his friend's home.

Sir Simon admits that his behaviour was 'pestilent wilinesse' (p.82.20). He makes no attempt at self-justification. Perhaps this is a weakness in Fulwell's portrayal of him: he is too anxious for his satire to hit home plainly to wrap it in irony or subtlety. The Fifth Dialogue stands out as the strongest satire and perhaps the one in which the Author is most personally engaged. At the same time Fulwell uses such hoary and well-worn satiric commonplaces as the accusation that 'honest termes' are used 'to cloke...vices' (p.86.14), or 'Clenly terms for filthy faultes' (p.86.sidenote):

First, couetousnes is thrift: extortion, good

husbandrie; pryde is clenlynnesse; lecherie,
a spurt of youth; and swearing is lustinesse.
etc. (p.86.15)

The Fifth Dialogue demonstrates the elasticity of satire: the conventional can be set side by side with the personal, the general type with a particular example. Sir Simon is both the satiric type 'Sir Simony' and a particular Archdeacon of Wells against whom Fulwell bore a personal grudge.

Fortunatus shares Sir Simon's callousness. Like Sir Simon, he has no use of gratitude or genuine friendship. He is ruthless in the way he uses others in his climb to the top, so that he will be 'not Lady Fortunes mynions mans man, but Lady Fortunes minions fellow' (p.63.8). Once he has attained that height, he discards those who helped him in his upward climb. The Author naively supposes,

Then I doubt not but the authors of your
preferment were at your handes right
bountifully rewarded. (p.63.15)

Fortunatus scornfully rejects such a suggestion:

Gertes and so they were, for I not only deprived
them from their former dignities, but also
banished them the Court. For thinkest thou
that I would suffer any man to be in the Court
that might iustly vpbraide mee with these
words? I was the causer of this thy preferment,
or thou maist thank my father or friends for
thy dignities? Nay, I wyll none of that....
(p.63.18)

Fulwell depicts the court as a dog-eat-dog world, a nightmare world without affection or kindness. Fortunatus is surrounded by those as heartless as himself, who will rejoice maliciously in his fall: 'at whose ouerthrow, men rather reioyce then lament (p.65.9).

Fortunatus's choice of a dedication to attract the attention and favour of a powerful courtier has unfortunate repercussions on the reader's perception of the Author. Fortunatus dedicates a 'pleasant pamflet' to Lady Fortune's minion, 'in the preface wherof I fed his vaine glorious humor with magnificent titles and termes' (p.62.11). He is careful to choose the right psychological moment to present the gift.

I wayted oportunitie to delyuer my sayde pamflet vnto the patron when I founde hym in a mery moode (which is a thing specially to be regarded of al suters) it plesed him so wel to read his owne commendations, that he vouchsafed to pervse the rest. (p.62.22)

A carefully calculated appeal to human vanity is seldom wasted, although Fulwell felt obliged to insert a defensive sidenote in Q2 which distinguished between wise and foolish dedicatees (p.62). There is an immediate suspicion on the part of the reader that Fulwell has used the same ploy as Fortunatus in dedicating The Flower of Fame to Lord Burghley and The Art of Flattery to his wife. As suggested above, this is part of the ambiguity of the Satirist, who lashes those vices in others that he is conscious of in himself. There is a certain irony in the fact that Fulwell, the attacker of flattery, should himself have been called 'a rhyming flatterer of the Tudors' (Robert Bell, Lives of the Most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of Great Britain, II, 103).

As ambition and greed undermine human relationships in the Third, Fourth and Fifth Dialogues, so drunkenness does in the Sixth. 'Nippitatum', 'hufcap' or 'dagger ale' 'wil

make a man looke as though he had seene the deuill, and quickly moue him to call his owne father hooreson' (p.88.14). Pierce Pickthank and 'dronken Dickon' are on a lower level than Sir Simon, Friar Francis, and Fortunatus; instead of money, fame and fortune, lands and rents, positions in court or church, they search for 'some shift or other to quenche the scorching heat of our parched throtes' (p.88.11). Their attempts to obtain a free 'pot of ale of the ryght stampe' (p.90.3) provide some of Fulwell's most relaxed and humorous dialogue. Dickon makes the mistake of praising Dame Annat's moral qualities, while Pierce more astutely concentrates on her physical charms; she prefers being told that she is 'yong and smoth' (p.90.12) than that she is friendly, honest and generous, for women's natures 'are most affected with hearing commendations of their youth, bewtie, and comely feature' (p.90.22).

This is gentle satire after the anatomizing of Sir Simon, Fortunatus, and Friar Francis; there is a refreshing homeliness in Dame Annat's retort to Dickon - 'I cannot pay the brewer with faire wordes' (p.90.6). Fulwell is at pains to emphasize that Dickon is a type rather than an individual: 'vnder whom I comprehende all maner of Roisters, rakehelles, and drunkardes' (p.95.8). One is reminded of the inebriates and roisters in Like Will to Like, except that drunken Dickon is handled with a lighter touch. Hence in Like Will to Like is presented with gross realism: when he

is drunk he falls down, berays his breeches, moans and groans and suffers from a hangover: 'Hark how his head aches, and how his pulses do beat' (Like Will to Like, 1.505). Dickon is treated with comic grotesquerie reminiscent of Nashe's character sketches or Shakespeare's Bardolph, with his 'most riche precious and glorious nose' set in 'a flusshing fierie face, whereat a man may warme his handes in the colde winter, and light a candle at any tyme' and a 'terrible tartarian beard, a notable harbour for the crablouse' (p.92.16). All this surmounts a deformed body with its hunched back, great paunch like a pregnant mare, 'blounsing buttoke' and splay foot (p.93.10). This is in the tradition of Renaissance humour:

laughter almost ever cometh of things most
disproportioned to ourselves and nature....
We laugh at deformed creatures. (Sir Philip
Sidney, A Defence of Poetry, edited by
J.A. van Dorsten (London, 1966), p.68)

Dickon indeed deliberately exploits the nasty tendency in people to laugh at and ridicule someone else, under the guise of 'sport'. The Author darkly hints that under Dickon's mad merry exterior and 'verie broad iestinge,' there are 'mischeuous practises' which he will unveil in a future work (p.95.11; 96.2). Dickon is reminiscent of the 'natural' fools described by Enid Welsford, whose rages and violence were regarded as a source of diversion (e.g. the exploits of Jack Oates, The Fool, His Social and Literary History (London, 1935, rptd. 1968), pp.162-163).

The humorous tone of the opening of the Sixth Dialogue changes into seriousness as the Author unmasks Pierce Pickthank as a religious hypocrite, whose 'condition is to cloke his hollow harte, with a holy pretence' (p.96.12). This side of Pierce has certainly not been revealed in the opening of the Dialogue, where his flattery of Dame Annat seems innocuous rather than sinister. Fulwell embroiders on the theme of religious insincerity which had been touched on earlier in Sir Simon's boast:

with the papist I was a papist; with the
protestant an earnest gospeller, in the
newfound Famely of Loue, I was a louing
companyon. (p.72.3)

Fulwell's delineation of religious hypocrisy is a poignant one given its historical context of the English Reformation in the sixteenth century: the oscillation from Roman Catholicism to Anglicanism under Henry, to extreme protestantism under Edward VI, back to Roman Catholicism under Mary, and to Anglicanism again under Elizabeth. Pierce Pickthank harps on his 'conscience' to both protestant and Catholic, and he uses the clichés of each side: Protestantism is 'Gods true relygion', the Roman Catholic church is 'our holy mother the spouse of Christ' (pp.97.10; 98.9). The vignette of the religious hypocrite is skilfully done. Fulwell attacks no religious persuasion, even though as an Anglican clergyman one might expect him to attack Roman Catholicism. Instead he appears to have a genuine disgust that religion was being used for expediency:

Alas how is relygion vsde
 to serue the turne at neede:
 Whose cloke hides sundry hypocrites
 that many errours breede?...
 To flatter Princes many men
 apply them to the time:
 They force no whit relygions fall,
 so they aloft may clime. (p.127.5, 17)

Tom Tapster, in the Eighth Dialogue, provides the climax to the 'detestable' crew of flatterers. Like Dickon, he is outwardly jolly and merry, but in reality he is a sinister influence, 'a maister or captaine parasite, which kinde of people are the peruertors of verteouse affections, and corrupters of noble nature' (p.139.1). The other flatterers are essentially self-seeking, using the 'eighth liberal science' for selfish ends. Tom seeks to corrupt the very cornerstone of the commonwealth, the aristocrat and landowner, who has in his control the land which produces food and clothing (sheep and beef), employment, and social welfare. Tom objects that

Thy purs is open to the poore,
 their naked lymmes to cloke.
 (p.131.11)

His intent is to undermine the old ideal of the aristocrat as a magnanimous and generous patriarch inspired by the spirit of the good of his country and noblesse oblige. Tom suggests that such generosity and concern for others would ruin the noble lord and reduce him to penury. He must become selfish and grasping. Instead of looking after his tenants he should get as much as he can out of them. By hinting that their copyhold is doubtful and that 'the lease

is loose' he will be able to extort free gifts of provisions from them (p.134.11). In managing his estates he must know 'what gaine a plough wil yeelde' (p.135.16) and keep a sharp eye on the profits of grasier, butcher and shepherd. He should be diligent in attendance at court, but only because it is 'Whence profit growes, and fauour springs' (p.132.6); he should take advantage of the 'cheats' there, for 'in Court such cheats do chance / as causeth gaine to grow' (p.132.12). Instead of seeing that the clergy are adequately provided for, he should alienate their tithes and sell glebe lands:

Pinch on the parsons side my Lorde,
the whorsons haue to much. (p.133.19)

Tom Tapster's advice would lead to widespread misery, unemployment, and distress. In Tom's 'lecture' Fulwell reflects the breakdown of the values and social structure of the old feudal society and the advent of capitalism and materialism.

The figure of Diogenes in the Seventh Dialogue embodies the rejection of materialism, the opposite end of the spectrum from the other Adversarii. Diogenes reduces life to the satisfaction of basic necessities:

A wodden dish is worth plate,
where mettals are vnknowne;
In steede of goblet, nature gaue
vs handes that are our owne.
(p.103.20)

Hunger and thirst can be simply satisfied with roots and water, shelter provided by an upturned tub. Diogenes is

in bold contrast to the 'franticke folly' and 'foolish fancy' of court life, with its gaping 'for gayne of golden pray', its 'secret spight' and 'open malice' (pp.99.3; 100.11, 20). Since Diogenes seeks no favours, he is not afraid to speak the truth:

And thus I dare be bolde to speake,
as trueth shall offer cause. (p.101.21)

Ulpianus is attracted to the austere asceticism of Diogenes; yet he is not quite ready to give up the attractions of court life. He does not condemn the court as totally vicious, for it contains men of the calibre of Edmund Harman, 'a faithfull frend to the Author' (p.117.sidenote). The existence of Harman suggests there is a middle way between withdrawing from the world, like Diogenes, and succumbing to its corruptions, like Sir Simon and Friar Francis, for Harman is both virtuous and prosperous: 'Dame Vertue gaue him worships seat / in spight of Fortunes face' (p.116.1). This is perhaps a relief to the Author, who is both attracted and repelled by court life.

Philosophy: 'Some Particular Vision of the World'

Kernan defines satire as 'a construct of symbols - situations, scenes, characters, language - put together to express some particular vision of the world' (Cankered Muse, p.4). Fulwell's 'particular vision' may be seen in the way in which he not only presents examples of corrupt people in his satire but also probes into the cause of their corruption.

The two strongest satires in The Art of Flattery, the Third and Fifth Dialogues, in particular, concentrate on this probing.

Both Friar Francis and Sir Simon give autobiographical accounts of their conversion to the Eighth Liberal Science. Both began their careers idealistically and took their religious vocations seriously. Friar Francis soon found that his attempt to carry out his religious duties conscientiously led to social ostracism, and Sir Simon found a similar resistance on the part of his congregation when he tried to be a conscientious preacher. Fulwell does not merely itemize examples of corruption, then, he probes into its cause in, as he sees it, a corrupt and venial society which does not wish to be reminded of its faults and 'foule disorders' (p.70.20). Thus he obliquely attacks the audience reading the satire - their resistance to 'holsome and godly counsell' (p.42.17), and their objection to having their 'sin and wickednesse' reproved (p.70.17). We do not love those who point out our vices or those of our badly behaved children, and we drive sincere and earnest men to lying and flattery in order to win our approval. We like only the clergy who pander to our vices; or, if they must attack vice, they should at least attack those of other people, as Sir Simon explains he is careful to do (pp.73-74). People would rather be entertained than admonished; they prefer 'dogtriiks in steede of doctrine' (p.74.sidenote). They in fact encourage and approve of the corruption of their clergy; the greedy patrons of benefices who wish to 'make marchandice' of the church are

only too glad to reward Sir Simon's apostacy:

Then began my credite to encrease, and those
that before spake euell of mee, now gaue mee
good reporte. (p.72.3)

When he inveigles not only the archdeaconry of Wells but also 'certein fat benefices in that same prouince', Sir Simon is given tacit approval - 'whereat the world smiled and spake of me much shame' (p.77.11). Although people might condemn Sir Simon's 'practises' verbally, inwardly they approve; Fulwell exposes this double standard, the dichotomy between words ('spake of me much shame') and deeds ('the world smiled').

Fulwell gives an allegorical account of the corruption of society in the First Dialogue, in Lady Truth's 'communication'. Truth is deserted for Pleasure, who

began with many subtil steightes and secret
practises to allure vnto her filthie delites
the affections of mortall men. (p.23.11)

Truth is constantly assaulted and persecuted by 'the viperous broode of cursed Cain' (p.22.21); by 'traiterous heretickes' (p.25.4); and by 'three pernitious haggas of hell' - 'the first was Fleshly Appetite (an impudent harlot) the second Pride, the third Ambition' (p.25.17). According to this allegory, it is mankind's fallen nature which causes the corruption of society; his seduction from the path of righteousness by the desire for pleasure, wealth, lust, and success - and, of course, flattery, which panders to the other vices. In his epistle 'To the friendly Reader' Fulwell attacks the 'filthy trade' of flattery, 'whereby both noble men, gentlemen, and good naturde men are abused'

(p.8.9). He links flattery with original sin:

this...execrable science hath so peruerthed the nature of many in this age, and hath taken such habit in mans affections, that it is in moste men altera natura, and very difficile to be expelled; yea, the verye sucking babes hath a kinde of adulation towards their Nurses for the dugg, which (in my iudgement) commeth vnto them by corruption of nature. (p.9.1)

Flattery was the cause of the Fall of man, and 'sathan hymselfe was the first scoolemaister' of the 'wicked science' (p.140.6):

It appeareth that by the subtiltie of this art doctor deuill deluded our first parentes in Paradiſe, with his flatteringe promises of much more then he could perfourme, the effect wherof, the world feeleth, and shal do vntil the consummation therof. (p.140.10)

It follows that flatterers are the devil's disciples, and it is they who 'haue...peruerthed the natures of men in these our daies' (p.98.19).

If Truth is beset by enemies, she also has her staunch defenders and protectors - God, for one; Faith, Hope and Charity who neatly counterbalance the trio of Fleshly Appetite, Pride and Ambition; the holy prophets; Christ; the apostles; Christian princes; her 'noble champions (the famous doctors)' (p.25.4); her sister, Lady Virtue; and Queen Elizabeth. Part of Fulwell's moral plan in The Art of Flattery is to provide 'mirrors' or patterns of virtue which will counteract the examples of vicious and fallen men he presents as objects of satire. The reader is presented with one of these mirrors in the preliminary matter, in the dedicatee Lady Burghley. She is described as 'a mirror of

worthynesse' (p.1.6) - like the 'mirrors' of virtue in The Flower of Fame. An impressive list of her qualities is given: she is a 'platforme' (model) of learning, virtue, godliness, noble nature and courtesy, 'a patterne of prudence and discretion, for others...to imitate' (p.6.8).

There are no personal reminiscences, no anecdotes based on personal experience or hearsay, to illustrate Lady Burghley's virtue or to bring her to life as an individualized human being; she remains a 'mirror', a 'platforme' and a 'patterne', on the same abstract level as Virtuous Living in Like Will to Like or the three queens of Henry VIII in The Flower of Fame. But the assertion of the existence of such a person is in itself important; there is satisfaction to be derived from the fact that in this 'vnhappie age' (p.5.12) there are still such bulwarks of virtue in existence who do not 'sinke in the stinking puddle of follye' (p.6.4), a puddle caused, figuratively speaking, by the 'filthie fountaine of pestilent flatterie' (p.5.3).

Edmund Harman is another of Fulwell's mirrors of Virtuous Living, a pattern of the Christian gentleman: modest, gracious, generous, content with his lot, a defender of the poor, a lover of learned men, patient in suffering wrong; his virtues itemized in acrostic verse (p.117). Fulwell also holds up a Biblical exemplar as a model for fallen humanity - John the Baptist, who,

although he were the Kings chaplaine, namly
King Herodes, fed not his Lorde and Maisters

eaers with flattering doctrine for promotions sake, but reprobued his sin to his face, for the truthes sake. (p.55.7)

John the Baptist, like Diogenes, rejected materialism and court luxury, and spurned ambition. He was 'a true preacher, not protesting one thing and performing another' (p.55.21). He rebuked the publicans, the Pharisees, the soldiers, and Herod himself - a cross-section of those having power over others in society. Finally, 'he was content rather to lose his hed then recant' (p.57.6). He provides a foil for the corrupt, self-serving friar and archdeacon.

Above all these mirrors and patterns is God Himself, a punitive and threatening presence,

whose eyes thou canst not bleare with all thy cunning in Adulation, because he is scrutator cordis, the searcher of the verye heart of man and will not bee deceiued by any arte of glosing wordes etc. (p.85.19)

The day of reckoning will come, the moment of truth for the dissembler, as the Author warns Sir Simon:

when thou shalt stand before the tribunal seate of Christ, and all thy filthye factes shalbe then layde before thy shamelesse face, and penetrate the brasse thereof. (p.84.20)

Friar Francis is also threatened with the day of judgment:

thou hast denyed Christ our sauour, who in the generall iudgment will also deny thee, except (by his special grace) thou repent. (p.54.6)

The 'pit of hell' awaits the unrepentant (p.57.26). It is the responsibility of those in religious vocations to provide 'the foode of the soule' for their flocks (p.71.4). In denying his congregation this spiritual sustenance, in refusing

to rebuke sinners - the 'couetouse, extortioners, proude, voluptuous or blasphemers of Gods holy name' - Sir Simon is risking their souls as well as his own and 'such shall dye in their owne sinne, and their blood shal be required at thy hands' (p.86.9, 11). As to flatterers in general, 'the plague of God is imminent ouer the place of their abode, and threatneth vengance both vpon them and their fautors' (p.96.8).

Being a 'professor of holy write', as Lady Truth calls him, it is natural that Fulwell should look to the Bible and Christianity to provide the moral framework of his satire, a sense that 'God standeth with true meaning men, and frustrateth the wicked policies of vnconscionable dealers' (p.81.19). Virtue will be rewarded, and in a tangible way:

so shall god blesse your store and encrease,
both in the feild and in the kitchin, in the
house and in the barne. (p.67.8)

But Fulwell is also influenced by the long tradition of pre-Christian classical satire, with its embodiment of Cynic and Stoic philosophy. In the Eighth Dialogue he adds references to Diogenes and Plato to his quotations from 'the canonicall bookes of the Bible' (p.140.2). One can see this classical influence in the pre-Christian figure of Diogenes the Cynic and in the occasional references to Stoicism. Sir Simon urges the Author to give up his 'stoicall studie, and become a philosopher of our sect' (p.70.5). Like Horace; the Author prefers 'the mene estate' (p.65.10).

The 'filthy foule philosophy' of the sybaritic Aristippus is condemned (p.112.9). Peter says that the Elizabethan satirists 'imported into the classical satires that they read a didactic and reformative intention "more like to sermons or preachings then otherwise"' (Complaint and Satire, p.109, quoting Puttenham). If Fulwell's dialogues are compared with Lucian's, one can see that Fulwell adds on a piece of sermon or preaching in the Antithesis.

Although Fulwell reveals knavery and duplicity in church and court, he remains optimistic that abuses will be reformed by those in power.

But (god be thanked) these disorders are lyke to be reformed by the prouidence of our noble Queene and her honorable counsaile, with the Bishops and fathers of the Church. (p.87.2)

This is in striking contrast to both the pessimism expressed by the earlier dialogue writers, such as More and Elyot, and the savage cynicism and disillusionment of later satirists such as Marston, Jonson and Webster. Both More and Elyot in their dialogues express the gloomy feeling that the world is coming to an end and that the schisms in religion are a sign of imminent doom. Pasquil exclaims that

god helpe vs, the worlde is almost at an ende,
For after noone is tourned to fore noone,
vertue into vice vice into vertue, deuocion
into hypocrisie, and in some places men saye,
faythe is tourned to herisye. (Pasquil the Playne, B5, p.65)

Pasquil complains that the world is in such a state that 'The more straunge the better lyked, therfore with greatte

payne a man may knowe an honest man from a false harlotte' (A3, p.45). The Author in The Art of Flattery, by contrast, has no difficulty in distinguishing 'an honest man from a false harlotte' or ferreting out religious hypocrisy. There is nothing in Fulwell's work like Ferdinand's 'I do account this world but a dog-kennel' in Webster's Duchess of Malfi (V.5.68), or Malevole's 'this earth is the only grave and Golgotha wherein all things that live must rot;...man is the slime of this dung pit' (The Malcontent, IV.5.125). This kind of savagery and pessimism is absent from Fulwell's writing, and his admonitions seem, by contrast, fairly benign.

STYLE

'The satirist always presents himself as a blunt, honest man with no nonsense about him' and 'usually calls attention to his simple style and his preference for plain terms which express plain truth' (Kernan, Cankered Muse, pp.16-17). More does this at the beginning of the Utopia: he claims that his writing is not 'fine and eloquent' but 'sudden and unpremeditate', and

the nigher it should approach to his [Hythloday's] homely, plain, and simple speech, so much the nigher should it go to the truth, which is the only mark whereunto I do and ought to direct all my travail and study herein.
(Letter to Giles, Utopia and a Dialogue of Comfort, edited by John Warrington, p.6)

Fulwell follows this tradition: his satiric persona, the Author, claims that his book is a 'verye simple and vnpolished peece of woorke' (p.7.7), 'very rude both in phrase and also

invention' (p.5.footnote.1.3), written with a 'rusty quill' (p.1.10), and 'shewes not forth one dramme of skil ne wit' (p.2.10). He has no 'robe of Rethorike' or 'filed phrase' (p.146.10); he is not one of 'the fine sorte of writers that now swarm in England', who, however, frivolously devote their talents to 'the currant handling of Venus Pageants' rather than attacking abuses (p.5.footnote.1.5; my italics).

In his opening verses, 'A dialogue betwene the Author and his Muse', the Author expresses his 'dread' (punning on the second syllable of Lady Mildred's name) about the reception of his 'rude booke', and a fear that he will be deemed 'ouer sausie' by his dedicatee (p.2.7). This 'dread' is reminiscent of Skelton's 'Drede' in The Bouge of Court; Skelton's satire similarly opens with an expression of literary insufficiency, as Drede is admonished by Ignorance to give up writing, for 'but feeble is his brain' (The Complete Poems of John Skelton, edited by Philip Henderson, third edition (London, 1959), p.37). The Author's Muse reassures him that Lady Burghley does not favour 'coy conseite of curious eloquence' (p.3.13). It is not necessary 'To hunt for termes' (p.3.16), for 'Good wil vnlearned shall finde fauours grace' (p.2.18).

One need not take too seriously Fulwell's modest claim that he has no 'robe of Rethorike' or 'filed phrase'. This is in the tradition of the satirist who 'will proudly call attention to the absence from his writing of the usual ornaments of poetry' (Kernan, p.3). Kernan points out that such

claims to blunt, straightforward, and unskilled honesty made by the satirist are so patently false as to be outrageous, for in practice he is always an extremely clever poetic strategist and manipulator of language who possesses an incredibly copious and colorful vocabulary and an almost limitless arsenal of rhetorical devices. (Cankered Muse, p.4)

'High' diction was in any case thought to be inappropriate to satire. Heinsius in his Preface to Horace (1612) praised Horace's use of 'low and familiar' words (Powers, English Formal Satire, p.101n). 'Colloquial diction and a natural word order....the avoidance of elaborate and symmetrical schemata' and frequent use of antithesis and aphorism were thought to be more fitting to the genre (Powers, p.44). The language of satirical songs, for example, was 'a mixture of plain words, popular sayings, common figures of speech, and jokes' (Heiserman, Skelton and Satire, p.213). Skelton's Colin Clout boasts about his 'ragged' rhyme:

For though my rhyme be ragged,
Tattered and jagged,
Rudely rain-beaten,
Rusty and moth-eaten,
If ye take well therewith,
It hath in it some pith. (Complete Poems, p.251)

What Fulwell calls 'glittering skill' (p.14.15), 'golden art' (p.15.9), and 'golden wordes' (p.10.1) are suspect because superficial, pertaining to adulation rather than truth.

Fulwell adopts the plain style in his satire, but this does not mean that he is unconscious of rhetorical effects. For example, he uses alliteration to obtain the effect of spluttering indignation as he inveighs against 'the filthie

fountaine of pestilent flatterie' and the impudence of the 'flattering flocke' (p.5.3). Contrasting alliteration of fs and ts is used to distinguish the flatterer and the truthful: Aristippus's

filthy foule philosophy
more frindship hath obtaynde,
Then truthfull tongue and trustie heart
that neuer was distainde. (p.112.9)

B-alliteration is used to achieve a threatening emphasis concerning the time 'when brauerye shall be turned to beggery and bewty to baldnes' (p.67.11). Like Lyly, Fulwell uses what Croll calls 'figures of sound' in his prose, but very sparingly (Morris W. Croll, 'The Sources of Euphuistic Rhetoric', in Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm, edited by J. Max Patrick and R.C. Evans (Princeton, 1966), p.241). In the following passage, consonance and rhyme are used for the purpose of taunting Fortunatus:

Sir, if there be no meane to attaine vnto
brauery without the exercise of knauery
(for I account flattery no better) I wyll
rather content my selfe to liue beggerly.
And as for your brauerye, and such as you
are, it is maintained with double theeuery,
which is almost as ill as vsurye....(p.66.5;
my italics)

This similarity of endings was known as homoioteleuton (Croll, p.242). The Author's virtuous choice of living 'beggerly' is contrasted with the conspicuous consumption of Fortunatus, his 'brauery', the ostentatious and absurdly expensive clothing of the courtier. The produce from his lands which should go to feed the poor, is converted instead into money to buy his finery:

for your beefe is on your back, and the rest
 of your wonted victualles conuerted by strange
 metamorphosis, into breeches, and brauery.
 (p.66.22; my italics)

The labials of the b-alliteration hammer home the point. Fortunatus's perverted values are exposed: his vanity over his appearance is of more concern to him than the plight of his tenants and 'the poore husbandman' who 'was wonte to ingurgitate himself in your kitchin' (p.66.14, 19). The Latinate neologism 'ingurgitate' (first recorded use 1570) seems out of place and awkward in this context, in glaring contrast to the down-to-earth monosyllables of 'beef' and 'back'. In general, Fulwell wisely avoids such inkhorn terms. Fulwell's long rambling sentence here, beginning with 'I heard one say' and ending thirteen lines later (p.66.12-67.1), conveys the ranting tone of the Author's righteous indignation, as he attacks the selfish and self-seeking courtier.

Alliteration is also used to emphasize the corruption of Sir Simon, as in the sibilant 'I set a side my satyricall sermons, and became a plausible preacher' (p.71.19). The conversion of Sir Simon from 'painefull preacher' (p.76.13) to 'plausible preacher' is emphasized by both antithesis and alliteration:

I reiected solitarines, and became a bone
 companyon; I left my bookes and fell to
 my bowles, I shut vp my studye, and sought
 out the ale house, and then who so good a
 fellow as sir Simon? (p.71.21)

The books and the study of the conscientious minister are

deserted for the frivolities of bowls and ale house. The rhetorical question which caps the series of antitheses places ironical emphasis on the adjective 'good'.

That antithesis (often pointed with alliteration) should be a favoured stylistic device is not surprising given the fact that Fulwell shows a fondness for antithesis both in the structure of his dialogues (their division into Thesis and Antithesis) and in his presentation of contrasted pairs of characters (Diogenes/Aristippus; Friar Francis/John the Baptist; Fortunatus/Edmund Harman). These in turn reflect the moral dichotomy between good and evil, flattery and truth; a black and white moral world. The use of antithesis to express the apostasy of Sir Simon from good to bad clergyman is repeated in the Author's diatribe:

thou hast acknowledged thy returne from
grauitie to knauery, from holynesse to
holownesse, from lyght to darknesse, from
truth to lying, and from sinseritie to
flatterie. (p.84.10)

Here again Fulwell uses homoioteleuton (grauitie...knauery, sinseritie...flatterie), and alliteration added to consonance (holynesse...holownesse), but he uses such 'syllabic antithesis' (to quote Croll again) with a light touch, for it is essential that invective should have movement. It must carry the reader forward; too heavy and self-conscious use of 'figures of sound' would slow the prose into the marmoreal and static cadences typical of Euphuism. The contrast between holiness and hollowness is repeated in Fulwell's portrayal of another religious hypocrite, Pierce Pickthank: 'his condition is

to cloke his hollow harte, with a holy pretence' (p.96.11). The idea is then reinforced by being repeated in a different way: 'Hee is a Sainct outwardlye and a Deuyll inwardlye' (p.97.3). As Croll comments on Latimer's use of figures of sound and rhetorical schemata in his sermons, 'Their purpose is almost wholly to heighten the effect of a rattling invective, or to wing the shafts of ridicule' (Croll, p.279). They are not ends in themselves, as they tend to be with Lyly. Alliteration, and other devices, are used didactically rather than merely decoratively.

Fulwell is not above poking fun at style, and perhaps by doing so drawing attention to his own use of words. In the Eighth Dialogue, U.F.'s address to Jupiter is condemned for its 'malepart and saucie boldnes' (p.123.20) and Miles Makeshift declares that 'the subtiltie of his metaphoricall phrases deserued iust punishment' (p.128.14). Wat Wily forestalls Fulwell's critics by condemning such

taunting talkatiue veines, whose tongues are
alwaies bent to shoote their doltish boltes
at other mens vices, and yet see not their
owne follies. (p.128.18)

In contrast, Tom Tapster's 'lecture' is highly praised as a model of good style:

he sheweth himself a perfect rethorician,
his wordes are so cunningly cowched, that
they importe much matter in fewe words, euery
word hath his weight, ech sillable his
perfect sence, he is pithy without
prolixitie, short, yet substanciall.
(p.138.5)

Both 'lectures' are recited in crisp verse composed of split fourteeners. U.F. uses the metaphor of the ship of fools,

Cocklorel's boat, to launch his attack on flattery, but one could hardly call this, or the allegorical figure of Conscience, over-subtle. U.F.'s method is generally one of simple clarity, and the abuses of the age are spelled out in words of largely one syllable:

What hole so small in writings olde,
that cannot now be found;
But lucre and large conscience makes
Some holes where words be sound. (p.126.1)

Every word hath his weight.

By contrast, Tom Tapster's exordium seems bombastic and cliché-ridden: 'As flying fame with golden trompe....' etc. (p.130.4). But when Tom delivers his instructions to the landowner, he is similarly blunt and to the point:

Why should the butcher gaine the hide,
in bying of a beefe....
Tis well when tenants crouch and creepe,
to fill the landlords chest. (p.135.21; 136.3)

The style is 'homely' and unambiguous.

Fulwell uses proverbs liberally in order to attain a homely and colloquial style. At least 92 proverbs can be documented from Tilley, and these do not include the Latin proverbs and sententiae which he also uses. 'Pithy proverbs in our English tongue doth abound', Fulwell remarks in the Prologue to Like Will to Like (1.13), and B.J. Whiting comments that there are 'few plays with as large a percentage of proverbs' as this play (Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama (Cambridge, Mass., 1938; rptd. New York, 1969), p.128). Perhaps Fulwell was influenced by Heywood's works, in particular his lively Dialogue Conteynyng the Number of the

Effectual Prouerbes in the English Tounge (1562); or, more simply, by the Renaissance love of proverbs, and the rhetorical training which encouraged writers to use proverbs and sententiae for 'amplification' and persuasion. Thomas Wilson advises that

in praising or dispraising, wee must bee well stored euer with such good sentences, as are often vsed in this our life, the which thorowe arte beeing increased, helpe much to perswasion.

(The Arte of Rhetorique (1560), edited by G.H. Mair (Oxford, 1909), p.116)

In Fulwell's Epistle to the Reader, the complaint about behaviour 'in this age' results naturally in a series of proverbially-inspired exclamations:

How swift are some men with golden wordes to promes, and how slacke to performe: howe easie to haue a friend in wordes, and how harde to finde one in deeds....(p.10.1)

Like other writers of the time, Fulwell often uses proverbs in clusters. Heiserman comments on the 'whole passages made of proverbs cleverly pasted together' in Skelton and early satire (Skelton and Satire, p.174); Croll notes a similar tendency in Lyly: 'Proverbs are likely to occur in Euphues in clusters or nests....this way of using them was a convention of sixteenth-century style' (Euphues, edited by M.W. Croll and H. Clemens (London and New York, 1916; rptd. New York, 1964), p.14n.).

There is such a 'nest' in the Seventh Dialogue: Aristippus's 'holy water of the court' (court flattery) is countered by Ulpianus's attempt to obtain something more

tangible than airy promises. Aristippus's series of glosing proverbs - 'What winde driues thee?.../ aske and receiue, / But speake and thou shalt speede' (pp.108.19; 109.1) - are answered by Ulpianus's more down to earth ones:

I gaue him thanks, but yet I thought
 these goodly golden wordes
 Would proue but winde of slender weight,
 and bushes voide of burdes.
 I calde to mynde an olde sayd sawe,
 which I haue not forgot:
 Tis wisdom to take time in time,
 and strike whyle thyron is whot.
 When Pig is proferd, ope the poke,
 my Nurse taught me that tricke:
 My poke was open by an by,
 my hammer was very quick. (p.109.3)

Words are but wind; Ulpianus is quick to take out his hammer, figuratively speaking, to strike while the iron is hot, and is eager to seize the pig in the poke: he immediately asks for a 'simple place' at court, reminding Aristippus that 'Poore men are pleasse with potage ay / til better vittailles fall' (p.109.21). Aristippus is not impressed with his homely proverbs learned at his nurse's knee:

First learne the skill to flatter fine,
 and then thou maist be plaste. (p.110.10)

Ulpianus retorts with more proverbs:

All promises are not performde
 All glistering is not golde. (p.111.9)

When he is bashful about naming his faithful friend at court (his patron Harmon), Diogenes encourages him with a series of three proverbs on truth which emphasize the moral of the work:

Truth may be blamde but neuer shamde,
 Truth needes not feare her foe:

In truthfull praise a man may speake,
Truth needes no glosing sho. (p.116.7)

In the final Envoy, Fulwell uses proverbs both philosophically and defiantly. When he asks, 'What writer euer found the cast / To please all men?' he concludes that this is impossible with the proverb 'So many heads, so many wittes' (p.145.5). He submits to the criticism of the 'learned trayne', but defies the foolish with another proverb:

As for fooles boltes, that would thee hitte,
Thou shalt full well their shot sustayne. (p.145.17)

In his 'invective', Fulwell chooses a vocabulary which is blunt rather than self-consciously clever. His epithets are direct - filthy, foul, stinking; his insults are plain - Friar Francis is a 'belly god' (p.53.21) and a buzzard (p.54.20); the flatterer is 'right cosen to a dog' (p.139.20). In this he maintains the conventional persona of the Satirist - blunt, honest, direct, and truth-telling, in contrast to the empty painted rhetoric of the flatterer. Style is the man; he would rather be 'truthes drudge, then Fortunes flattering dearling' (p.8.6).

Critical Comments on 'The Art of Flattery'

Critical comments on The Art of Flattery have been few. John Payne Collier thought Fulwell 'a highly humorous author' (A Catalogue of Heber's Collection of Early English Poetry... with Notices, by J. Payne Collier (London, [1834]), p.104); Corser calls him a 'humorous and clever writer' (Collectanea Anglo-Poetica, p.390). The Art of Flattery was 'a humorous work which attained considerable popularity', according to

Gordon Goodwin (DNE, VII, 768); in Collier's opinion it is a 'singular and amusing work', 'not only of great curiosity but merit' (John Payne Collier, A Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language, 2 vols (London, 1865), I, 296, 298). Some of the dialogues are 'in pointed prose, and others in familiar, satirical and humorous verse' (ibid., p. 298). 'One of the best portions' is U.F.'s address to Jupiter in the Eighth Dialogue which Collier quotes in full: 'All this must be admitted to be extremely good, and so severe that part of it could hardly have been well relished' (ibid., pp. 298, 299). Corser finds the Sixth Dialogue 'very entertaining'; it 'abounds with old saws and proverbs'; the Third Dialogue is 'exceedingly humorous', and Pierce Pickthank's description of drunken Dickon in the Sixth Dialogue is 'curious and humorous' (Corser, pp. 392, 394). Irving Ribner calls the work 'scurrilous'; the dialogues are 'satirical and highly cynical' ('Ulpian Fulwell and his Family', p. 444; 'Ulpian Fulwell and the Court of High Commission', p. 268). A.B. Gough, on the other hand, finds the satire 'dull and poorly written, and his own grievances are intruded with morbid persistence', this in spite of the fact that he 'vehemently assails some of the most crying evils of the day' ('Who Was Spenser's Bon Font?', Modern Language Review, 12 (1917), p. 142).

Whether a reader finds The Art of Flattery amusing or not rests on a personal value judgment, but a study of the work leads to an appreciation of the richness of the

Elizabethan satirical tradition. Yet Fulwell wears his learning lightly, and the satire has a deceptively simple air about it - he is merely 'simple foole Fulwell', and the skill and care with which he constructs his dialogues may be overlooked. His aim is that of the Renaissance poet: to instruct and delight. His theme, the art of flattery, is not one which is restricted to the sixteenth century. His complaint that 'wise men are not wanted, till they are lodged in their graues' (p.28.15) is a perennial one, as is his contention that people are rewarded for their mastery of the Eighth Liberal Science rather than for merit. As such, his satire transcends the narrow limits of the sixteenth century and is universal in appeal.

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

1. Editorial Principles

The text of The First part of the eight liberall science: Entituled, Ars adulandi, the art of Flattery, with the confutation thereof (hereafter called The Art of Flattery) survives in two editions, the second of which claims on its title-page to be 'Newly corrected and augmented'. The first edition survives in only two copies (Q1a, Q1b), but collation shows that gatherings A, B, and G were entirely re-set by the printer and were probably revised by the author. The second edition appears to have been revised by the author, who added a new section entitled 'A short Dialogue, betweene the Authour and his booke'. The problem facing the editor, therefore, is not entirely straightforward: there are two substantive states of the text, and three states for gatherings A, B and G. Since the evidence indicates that the author has revised each state, every variant reading must be scrutinized with the greatest care, including the punctuation.

This edition aims to be a critical old spelling edition, utilizing the principles and techniques developed by Greg, McKerrow, and Bowers. An attempt has been made to steer between the Scylla of what Bowers ironically calls 'virtuous conservatism' and the Charybdis of what George Story calls 'unprincipled eclecticism'.¹⁸ As Bowers has remarked:

18. Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists (1955), p.73: 'there are many examples of timidity and incompetence hiding under the protective coloring of virtuous conservatism;' George Story, 'Some Recent Theories of Textual Criticism', Thought from the Learned Societies (Toronto, 1962), p.26.

eclecticism ceases to be a word of fear when suitable safeguards are erected to prevent the unprincipled selection of readings according to personal taste and without consideration of authority or bibliographical probability.¹⁹

-
19. 'Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden', Modern Philology, 48 (1950), 12-20 (p.13).
-

McKerrow was faced with a similar problem of an authorially revised text when he was editing Nashe's The Unfortunate Traveller in 1904. The second edition of this book claims on the title-page, like The Art of Flattery, to be 'Newly corrected and augmented'.²⁰

-
20. The Works of Thomas Nashe, edited by R.B. McKerrow, (London, 1904-1910), second edition, revised by F.P. Wilson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1958), II, 188; McKerrow discusses the problem II, 191-197. All subsequent references are to McKerrow's Nashe.
-

McKerrow's decision to choose the second edition as his copy-text has now become a matter of bibliographical history. After surveying the evidence for authorial revision, he concluded:

it is not now considered to be the duty of an editor to pick and choose among the variant readings of his author's works those which he himself would prefer in writings of his own, but merely to present those works as he believes the author to have intended them to appear. Whether, from a literary point of view, the first or the second edition of The Vnfortunate Traueller is the better, is perhaps open to question. But with this I have no concern whatever, at any rate here, for if an editor has reason to suppose that a certain text embodies later corrections than any other, and at the same time has no ground for disbelieving that these corrections, or some of them at least, are the work of the author, he has no choice but to make that text the basis of his reprint.

I have therefore whenever possible, though sometimes, I own, not without regret, followed that edition which was said by the publisher to be 'Newly corrected and augmented.' (ibid, II, 197; my italics)

Later textual critics have criticized McKerrow's procedure and advocated a more flexible approach to the problem of authorially revised texts which would avoid the pitfall of what Maas called 'the tyranny of the copy-text' and what Greg called 'the mesmeric influence of the copy-text'.²¹

21. Greg, 'The Rationale of Copy-Text' (1949), reprinted in Collected Papers, edited by J.C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966), 382, 383.

As Greg has pointed out, it is extremely difficult in an authorially revised text to distinguish between substantive variations of the author and those which the printer might introduce - his 'normal amount of unauthorized variation' (ibid, p.387). McKerrow's solution to the problem in his Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare (1939 - 35 years after his edition of The Unfortunate Traveller) was to take as his copy-text for all the accidentals of the text the earliest edition, which would be closest to the author's MS, and insert into it all substantive alterations from the revised edition, 'saving any which seem obvious blunders or misprints' (quoted Greg, ibid, pp.380-81). However, this solution is not appropriate to The Art of Flattery, which provides a fascinating object-lesson for the textual critic.

In surveying the variants between the surviving states of The Art of Flattery, the editor is forced into asking why the changes were made, and the answers to this question

which emerge from the text lead to the problem of authorial intention. James Thorpe says that 'The ideal of textual criticism is to present the text which the author intended.'

He sees

the literary work as an intricate entangling of intentions. Various forces are always at work thwarting or modifying the author's intention.²²

-
22. 'The Ideal of Textual Criticism', in James Thorpe and C.M. Simpson, The Task of the Editor, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library (Los Angeles, 1969), p.3; 'The Aesthetics of Textual Criticism' (1965), reprinted in Bibliography and Textual Criticism, edited by O.M. Brack and Warner Barnes (Chicago, 1969), p.136.
-

This is particularly true of The Art of Flattery: some changes were made to improve the literary style and also the pointing and breaking up of long sentences and paragraphs. But other changes seem to have been made by Fulwell out of fear of censorship and perhaps of further prosecution. (The legal action taken against him after the publication of the first edition is documented in the Biography.) A whole series of alterations in the second edition appears to have stemmed, as I discuss below, from a fear of alienating or irritating his supporters at court, as well as for the purpose of blurring the identification of local habitations and names.

When, therefore, Fredson Bowers defines the aim of a critical edition as 'to produce a text that recovers the author's final intentions more faithfully than any perserved transmitted document',²³ as far as The Art of Flattery goes,

-
23. 'Old-Spelling Editions of Dramatic Texts', in Studies in Honor of T.W. Baldwin, edited by D.C. Allen (Urbana, 1958), p.9.
-

it is difficult to identify Fulwell's 'final intentions' with the second revised edition. It was not that Fulwell did not consciously intend to make the alterations at the time, but that he was motivated by fear, and if he had lived in a more permissive society his 'final intentions' would in general have been closer to Q1a (the earliest state of the text) than Q1b or Q2 - indeed, he might have gone even further in a more detailed and pungent attack on society. He certainly had this in mind for his projected (but as far as is known, unwritten) Second Part, for he states plainly in Q1 that he intends in it to 'particulerlie descend from men of countenance, by degress, euen vnto the very begger' (p.10.4). But the Establishment was hostile to satire, and Fulwell must have felt the sword of Damocles suspended over his pen.

A critical edition of The Art of Flattery cannot, therefore, adopt the purely mechanical procedure for revised texts advocated by McKerrow (accidents from earliest edition and substantives from latest revised edition), or to a lesser extent by Greg and Bowers, because they do not consider the special case of a revised text due to censorship, as opposed to purely literary considerations. The nearest that Bowers comes to the problem is in his article 'Established Texts and Definitive Editions', in

which he considers the case of an author revising a 'derived' text, i.e. a later edition which is not set up from an independent manuscript. The example that he gives is The Indian Emperour which Dryden revised in the second and third editions. Bowers states:

the verbal variants must be assumed to be authoritative except for those suspected to represent transmissional corruption. Thus as a whole the variant words in the first edition, in such a case, cannot be assumed to be theoretically as authoritative as the altered words of the revised third edition. It follows that a critic may not pick and choose between the first and third-edition variants. ('Established Texts and Definitive Editions', Philological Quarterly, 41 (1962), 1-17 (p.3))

Later in the same article, in discussing proof revisions by the author, he says that 'the revision would carry the superior authority of the author's final intentions' (p.8), but he does not consider all the possible motivations behind authorial revision. Only in a footnote does he admit that there may be 'exceptions', and he does not go on to discuss them, pleading lack of space (p.11, footnote 11). He puts forward only one example of one kind of exception, that is:

if it could be shown that the revisions were made in order to adjust the work to a lower grade of reader. (p.11, note 11)

Otherwise, the editor must always adopt the latest authorial revisions, even if these 'may seem to a literary critic to be inferior in merit to the readings of earlier editions' (p.11, note 11), as is generally admitted to be the case in the final authorized edition

of Whitman's Leaves of Grass.

Revisions made under the pressures of censorship must surely create another class of 'exceptions'. The editor of The Art of Flattery is bound to 'pick and choose' between the variants found in the three states of the text, according to the motivation detected on the evidence of the variants as to the author's reason for making the changes. Some appear to have been made for literary reasons, some out of fear of censorship, and some appear to be 'indifferent' - either what Honigmann calls 'tinkering' with the text by the author, or the kind of inevitable substantive changes introduced by transmissional corruption (E.A.J. Honigmann, The Stability of Shakespeare's Text (London, 1965), p.63). Editorial decisions must be made accordingly.

2. Treatment of the Text

Q1a has been adopted as the copy-text, since it is closest to the author's manuscript, and also the closest to Fulwell's original satirical intentions that can be recovered. However, where Q1b and Q2 readings appear to correct misprints in Q1a, or to effect stylistic improvements, they have been adopted. They have not been adopted when they are introduced to suppress information (names and places) in Q1a, or when their tendency is to weaken and deflect the satire. Sidenotes not in Q1a, but introduced in Q1b or Q2, are assumed to be authorial in origin and have been included in the text.²⁴ Occasionally in Q2 Fulwell

24. An example of authorial concern over, and responsibility

for, sidenotes, is Bale's complaint about the printing of The seconde part of the Image Of both chyrches (Percy Simpson, Proof-Reading in the 16th 17th and 18th Centuries (Oxford, 1935), p.2).

appends to his Latin quotations an English translation, or substitutes the English translation for the Latin, and these translations have been included in the text. All substantive variants are recorded in the footnotes, in order, as Bowers says, that the reader of the text will

- (a) be able to recontruct from the data the significant details of the copy-text;
- (b) be in possession of the whole number of facts from which the editor constructed his text. ('Established Texts and Definitive Editions', p.10)

For the sake of convenience, long s has been modernized, and so has vv for w; but the i/j, u/v convention has been retained as in the copy-text. It should be noted however that in this particular text the distinction between initial and medial u and v is not always maintained, so that one finds forms like 'yeluet' (p.67.4) and 'invey' (p.70.15), and the copy-text has been followed here. The copy-text is also inconsistent in its italicization of proper names and has been followed in this, since although the practice is not authorial it gives an interesting indication of a possible change of compositor (as discussed below).

All substantive variants have been listed in the footnotes, but not simple misprints in Q2: e.g. 'steatagems' Q2 for 'stratagems' Q1 (p.48.7), or 'chatced' Q2 for 'chatted' Q1 (p.48.15). Minor alterations of word division in Q2 have not been noted: e.g. 'indeed' Q2 for

'in deede' Q1. Spelling variants have not been noted in the collations of accidentals - e.g. modestie/modesty - except when they clarify an obscure or over-archaic form in Q1: e.g. 'coppis' Q1; 'coppies' Q2, 'flanting' Q1; 'flauntinge' Q2 (pp. 134.11; 127.15).

Silent emendations: The accidentals of the copy-text, Q1a, have been followed, apart from the following silent emendations and exceptions:

- 1) Contractions have been silently expanded: e.g. 'ȝ', 'ē', 'ȝ', 'ȝ', '&c' have been expanded to 'that', 'the', 'with', 'thou', 'etc', always with reference to Q2.
- 2) Speech prefixes have been italicized (in Q1 they are in black letter throughout); in the Eighth Dialogue they have been expanded on the few occasions when they are abbreviated in Q1: e.g. 'M. ma.' Q1 has been expanded to 'Miles make shifte.', following the expanded form given in Q2.
- 3) Headings have been italicized throughout; in copy-text they are in a mixture of black-letter, italics, and roman (see Bibliographical Description).
- 4) The customary capital letter after a decorated capital has been normalized to lower case: e.g. 'WHen' to 'When' (p.5.1).
- 5) Turned letters have been ignored unless they form a new word: e.g. 'yon' for 'you' (p.80.15).
- 6) The occasional use of square brackets instead of round has been normalized to round.
- 7) Paragraph marks, printer's 'leaves' etc have been omitted,

whether at the beginning of headings or in the text.

8) Ligatures and the accent on double 'ée' have not been reproduced.

9) The final period occasionally omitted from sidenotes has been silently restored (also the occasional lower case instead of capital letter at the beginning of a sidenote is silently altered). Similarly with the period after roman numerals: e.g. '.ix.' for '.ix_λ' (p.26.21).

10) The verses at the beginning of each dialogue (except for the Seventh), which form a kind of motto to the dialogue, have been italicized, as in Q2.

11) Spacing errors have been silently corrected: e.g. 'Ifeele' (p.31.5), 'h e' (p.36.20), to 'I feele' and 'he'. The opposite process occurs when spacing is occasionally omitted when it should be there to indicate an acrostic: e.g. 'Modest' has been silently changed to 'M odest' (p.117.3) to show the acrostic 'EDMVND' formed by the beginning letter of each line.

Punctuation: Punctuation presents an interesting problem in this text, since there is evidence that the author revised it in Q1b and Q2, but there also must inevitably be the sophistication which occurs in reprinted texts.²⁵ Where it appears that the author has attempted

25. Moxon says that the Corrector of the Press should be 'very sagacious in Pointing' which indicates that liberties were taken in the printing house (quoted by Simpson, Proof-Reading, p.113).

to improve the punctuation of the copy-text, and in

particular to break up his long rambling sentences, or to clarify clause-divisions, I have not hesitated to emend the copy-text. Obviously, however, there can be no cast-iron method of distinguishing between authorial revision and printing-house interference, whether of the compositors or the corrector of the press. I have, in general, followed the paragraphing of Q2, which breaks up the long stretches of unrelieved prose.²⁶ However, I have tried to avoid the

-
26. McKerrow, in editing The Unfortunate Traveller, thought that the paragraphing of the second edition was compositorial and not authorial; but it seems natural that an author should wish to break up long stretches of prose, and there seems no evidence for inferring, as in the case of The Unfortunate Traveller, that the paragraphing in The Art of Flattery is compositorial (McKerrow's Nashe, II, 195-6).
-

over-sophistication and over-punctuation of a reprinted text, where I have felt this due to compositorial interference, especially in the proliferation of commas. Fulwell was, on the whole, careful of his punctuation, and especially seemed to like a fairly rigid punctuation-pattern of verse, as discussed below (pp. clxxi ff.), although editorial decisions in this respect must be arrived at by a certain amount of what Greg calls 'frankly subjective procedure' ('The Rationale of Copy-Text', p. 387). Punctuation adopted from Q1b and Q2 are noted in the Emendation of Accidentals following the text (pp. 147 ff.).

A few minor innovations (apart from those listed among the silent emendations) have been made: the italicizing of a pun on the name 'Mildred' in the preliminary verses 'A

dialogue betwene the Author and his Muse, as touching the dedication of this booke'. The name is in italics in the first line of the stanza (p.3.7), and it seems to have been an oversight on the part of the printer that 'Milde' and 'Dread', the opening words of lines 2-3 of the stanza, were not italicized (p.3.8, 9).

Another minor departure from copy-text is the Q2 punctuation of the phrases referring to the Eighth Liberal Science and the Art of Flattery, which emphasizes the leitmotif of the book and the idea around which the satire revolves.

The evidence for priority of states in Q1 and a discussion of the changes made to the text in Q2 follows.

3. Stationer's Register Entries

4th March 1576 [1577]

iiij^{to} marcij

Henry Bamford.

Lycenced vnto Henry Bamford
the copies next herevnder
mencioned w^{ch} were sold vnto
him by W^m hoskins

} iiij^s iiij^d

j. The pourtraiture of A trusty
servaunt.

Assigned to
Richard Jones.

ij. The maner to Dye well

As appearithe in
this booke the iiij
of marche 1577.

iiij. Philemo Sisterno.

iiij. The flower of fame.

v. The first part of the viij
liberall science.

vj. The Booke of witches

vij. xviiij sortes of Ballades.

(Liber B, 138^r; Arber, A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, 5 vols (London and Birmingham, 1875-1894; rptd. New York, 1950), II, 309; subsequently referred to as Arber)

3rd March 1577 [1578]

iiij^o Die marcij

Richard Jones

Lycenced vnto him by the
consent of henrye Bamford.
all those copies w^{ch} the
said henry bought of william
hoskins and were lycencid by
the said henry as appearith
in this booke the iiiijth
of marche 1576

} iiij^s iiiij^d

(Liber B, 146^r; Arber II, 325)

4. Bibliographical Descriptions

Q1, 1576

Copies: Q1a Trinity College Cambridge, Capell S.6².

Q1b British Museum, C.57.b.49. (Variant state)

In Q1b, gatherings A, B and G have been entirely reset.

Q1b is imperfect: only the last 8 lines of sig. N1 remain, the rest of the page is torn out, and of the 8 surviving lines, the right hand portion of the text is torn, affecting the catchword on N1 recto, and two

words on the two bottom lines of N1^v. Leaf N2 is lacking.

Title: [within a frame of type-ornaments, 152.5 x 102 mm.]

¶THE FIRST / part of the eight li- / berall science: /
 Entituled, Ars adulandi, the / art of Flattery, with
 the con- / futation thereof, both very / pleasant and
 profitable, deu- / ed and compiled by / Vlpian
 Fulwell. / (..) / His diebus non peractis, / Nulla
fides est in pactis. / Videto. / Mel in ore, verba
lactis / Fel in corde fraus in factis / Caueto. / Who
 reads a booke rashly, / at randone doth runne, / He
 goes on his arant, / yet leaues it vndone. /

¶Imprinted at London, / by VWilliam Hoskins, and are /
 to be folde at his shop ioyning / to the midle Temple
 gate, / within Temple Barre. / 1576. / (..)

['THE' (first line): 'H' is an 'E' with an 'I' joined
 on to it at the right to make an 'H'; STC transcribes
 as 'E'. 'Mel', swash 'M'; 'Hoskins', middle 's'
 short not long.]

Collation: 4^o ¶⁴ A² B-M⁴ N², 52 leaves, ff. [6] [1-8]
 9-46 [fo.27 unnumbered; 10 misprinted as 'Ol'; fo.25
 misnumbered '17'; foliation starts on D1, at beginning
 of 3rd Dialogue]; §3 signed (- ¶3, B3, C2, D3, E3,
 L3; + H4, L4; ¶4 signed ¶4.)

(Q1b) Signatures as above, except 'B.i.' signed 'B.';
 B2 missigned 'A.ii.'; G1 signed 'G_A' instead of 'G.';
 N1 torn, N2 lacking; §3 (-A2,G2,G3). Ff. [6] [1] 2-4

[5-8] 9-44 [45 torn, 46 lacking]; ff. 21,22,23,24
numbered '4' '4' '2' '2' respectively (sig.G).

Colophon: (N2^v) ¶ Imprinted at London, by / William
Hofkins, and are to be / folde at his shop ioyning to/
the midle Temple / gate, within Tem- / ple Barre. /
(.,.) ['shop' has short 's' instead of long]

(Q1b) Lacks N2.

Contents: ¶1: Title. ¶1^v: Blank. ¶2- ¶2^v: '¶ A dialogue
betwene the Author / and his Muſe, as touching the
dedication / of this booke.' ¶3- ¶3^v: Dedication '¶ To
the right noble and vertuous / Lady, the Lady Mildred
Burgleigh [sic], wife / vnto the ryght honorable Lord
Trea- / ſurer of England. Vlpian Fulwell / wiſheth
perfect felicitie. / (.,.)' signed ¶3^v 'Your houours
[sic] moſt humble / Vlpian Fulwell.' ¶4-A1: '¶ To the
friendly Reader, / Vlpian Fulvvell. / (.,.)' signed (A1)
'Vlpian Fulwell.' Beneath this, A1, 12 ll. verse,
headed: '¶ The printers deſire vnto thee (gentle /
Reader) to pardon his negli- / gence for the faultes
eſca- / ped in this booke / (.,.)' A1^v-A2^v: '¶ A
deſcription of the ſeuen liberall / Sciences, into whoſe
company the / eight hath intruded her ſelfe.' Verses,
each under the heading of one of the 'liberal sciences',
i.e. Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Music, Astronomy,
Geometry, plus the eighth, 'Adulation, or Flatterie.'
B1-C1: '¶ The firſt Dialogue betwene the / Author

and the printer.' C1^v-C4: '¶ The ſecond Dialogue
 betwene the / Author and Lady Hope.' C4^v-E4: '¶ The
third Dialogue betweene / the Author and a Frier.'
 E4^v-F3: '¶ The fourth Dialogue betwene the / Author, and
 Fortunatus.' F3^v-H2^v: '¶ The fifth dialogue betweene /
 Syr Symon the person of polle / Iobbam, and the Author.'
 H3-I3: '¶ The ſixt dialogue betweene / Pierce Pikethank,
 dronken Dickon, / dame Annat the alewife, & / the
 Author.' I3^v-L1^v: '¶ The ſeauenth dialogue betweene /
 Diogenes, and Vlpianus. Wherin is expreffed vn- / der
 the perſon of the Author, the ſimplicitie of ſuche as /
 thinke the court to preferre all that flock vnto it, /
 which after experience had therof, is / found an vnfit
 place for ſim- / ple perſons of groſſe / education./(..)'
 L2-N2^v: '¶ The eyghth dialogue betweene / Tom Tapſter,
 Miles makeſhift, / Wat Wyly, and the / Author.' ends
 N2^v '¶ FINIS.' [swash 'N']

(Q1b) A1 ſigned 'Vlpian Fulwell.' (b.l. not roman);
 verſe omitted. A1^v 'liberal' [broken final 'l'];
 'eighth hath intrudeth / herſelfe.' A2^v 'Adulation
 or Flatterie.' B1 '¶ The firſt Dialogue betwene the
 [roman] / ...Printer.'

RT: The [swash 'T'] firſt [ſecond, third] Dialogue /
of the eighth [sic] liberal ſcience. (BCDE)
 ['f rſt' B3^v; 'fi' no ligature B4^v; 'ſecond' 'e', 'c'
 and 'n' badly inked C2^v, C3^v; 'Dialogu' C3^v; '¶ The'
 D1^v; 'of the...ſcien' only bottom tips of letters of

'of the' inked C4.]

The fourth [fifth, fixt, feuenth, eigth] dialogue /
of the eigth liberal science. [roman type] (FGHIKL)
[H1^v incorrectly headed 'fixt'; H4^v incorrectly headed
'fifth'; L3^v incorrectly headed 'feuenth'; 'fift' H2^v;
'eighth liberall' H4; 'liberall' K1, L1.]

The eight dialogue / of the eigth liberal science.
[roman type] (MN)

['eight liberal' M3, N2]

¶2^v Betvveene the Author & his Muse.

¶3^v The Epistle. [swash 'T', 'E']

¶4^v To the Reader.

A1 To the Reader,

(Q1b) The first Dialogue / of the eighth liberal
science. [roman type] (sig. B)

[liberall B4]

The fift Dialogue / of the eighth liberall science.
(sig. G)

[fifth G3^v, G4^v; science. [sic] G2; liberal G3, G4]

A1 To the Reader.

CW: ¶ 4^v to A1 ¶A A1^v Doth A2 Adula- A2^v The [The]
B4^v refteth C4^v Author [~.] E1 Ba-[Babel] E2 Herodes
[Herods,] F4^v (com-)panion, G1^v lyke G2 faue
G4^v (pre)uented H2 Firft [~,] I3^v For [for] K4^v Sharp
L2 T.Tap- [T.Tapfter.] L4^v but [But] M4 Is M4^v maiſter
[No CW on ¶2^v, ¶3^v, C4, L3, M2.]

(Q1b) [No CW on A1, A2, A2^V] A1^V Mu^fike G1^V(mon-) fters
 [No CW on G2; lacking on M4 (page torn); N1 we<> (page
 torn); N2 lacking.]

Typography: 30 ll. with s.-n., prose, 140(153) x
 85(105) mm., 93.5 black letter per 20 ll. (D3^V in
 B.M. C.57.b.49); verse, 34 ll. 140(153) x 58 mm.,
 82.5 mm. per 20 ll. (M1 in B.M. C.57.b.49).

(Note: verse measure according to run-over line; but
 on M4 the verse measure is 61 mm., according to the
 run-over line; and on L4^V one line measures 68 mm.,
 and no run-overs are used.)

Dedication to Lady Burghley and verses 'A description
 of the seuen liberal Sciences' in roman:

82 mm. per 20 ll. (¶3^V in Capell.S.6.(2))

(Q1b) Verses, 'A description of the seuen liberall
 Sciences' in black letter.

Note: Measurements of the type-pages and the
 width of the printer's measure are extremely irregular
 in this book, as discussed below.

Decorated initials & ornaments:

6-line 'W', ¶ 3, 21 x 22 (W with foliage).

7-line 'I', ¶ 4, 28 x 26 mm. (2 figures holding up wreath).

Type ornaments: Cl, 13 x 49 mm.

E4, 13 x 49 mm.

Notes: STC 11471. STC Film 567 (Q1b text).

(Q1a) The Trinity College, Cambridge, copy was owned

by the Shakespeare editor Edward Capell (1713-1781). His copy has passages marked in pencil, enclosed in square brackets, and with a pencilled number placed in the margin. The passages illustrate Elizabethan vocabulary and idiom, and were reprinted in the second edition of Capell's Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare,³ vols (London, 1779-1780), Vol. III: The School of Shakespeare: or, Authentic Extracts from Divers English Books, That Were in Print in That Author's Time (pp.246-247).

On H4^v, there is a split on the paper, probably due to a fold in the paper, which affects the spacing of words in the RT and the first 4 lines of text.

(Q1b) Ink scribbles on ¶2 and B4; name in ink written at bottom of N1^v: "William By<tha>" (?). Bookworm holes at bottoms of pages, repaired except for D4-F4, affecting last line of text on E2^v 'what' and 2nd last line and last line of E3, 'feare' and 'twaine?'. Sotheby's sale 17 June 1910, lot 437, seller unknown, bought by Barr, £2.12s.; bought by British Museum 12 October 1910 from P.M. Barnard, Manchester bookseller.

Press Variants Q1

Apart from the three reset gatherings mentioned above, there are two gatherings in Q1 which show press variants:

	<u>Uncorrected</u> (Q1a)	<u>Corrected</u> (Q1b)
E2 ^v sidenote	I commen- dation	A commen- dation
	<u>Corrected</u> (Q1a)	<u>Uncorrected</u> (Q1b)
K1 ^v sidenote	A hungry/ plague to/ sée meate &/ drinke and/ yet to starue//	[Omitted]
K2 sidenote	Frēch nets/ are to catch/ englishe/ fōdles.//	[Omitted]
K3 ^v .1.3 1.25 1.26 1.28	So thou that yet Aristip ^Λ kinde? winde?	So thou thou [<u>sic</u>] that it Aristip? ~: ~.
K4 sidenote	A good Ora/ tor.//	[Omitted]

One error of spacing on K3^v is not corrected: i.e.
line 19 'listnot'. The outer forme is not corrected,
and there are several obvious misprints - e.g. K4,1.7
'n&' [sic] for 'no'; 1.31 'of rootes of some such dish'
for 'of rootes or some such dish': all these are
corrected in Q2.

Q2: 1579

Copies:

- (*) [W. How f.] R. Jones, 1579. STC 11471a
- a. HN. 31389 (STC microfilm 384)
 - b. E. H.26.b.7
 - c. HD. 11471a
 - d. O. Malone 731

(†) [W. How f.] R. Jones, n.d. STC 11472

e. L. C.37.d.10 (STC microfilm 567)

The only difference between * and † is a variant title-page which omits the date.

Title: (*) [within a frame of type-ornaments 172 x 103mm.]

THE / FIRST PARTE, OF /The [swash 'T'] Eyghth liberall
Science: / Entituled, Ars adulandi, / The Arte of
 Flatterie, / with the confutation therof, both very /
 pleasaunt and profitable, deuised and / compiled, by
Vlpian Fulwell. [roman 'V', 'F'] / Newly corrected and
augmented. / His diebus non peractis, / Nulla fides
est in pactis. / Videto. / Mel in ore, verba lactis, /
Fel in corde, fraus in factis. / Caueto. [roman 'H',
 'N', 'V', 'M', 'F', 'C'] / Who reades a booke rashly,
at randon [sic] doth runne: / Hee goes on his errand,
yet leaues it vndone. / Imprinted at London, by /
Richarde Jones, [swash 'R', 'J'] and are / to bee solde
 at his shoppe ouer / agaynst Sainct Sepulchers
 Church. 1579.

(†) [within a frame of type-ornaments, 170 x 102 mm.]

THE FIRST PARTE, / Of the Eyghth liberall / Science:
Entituled, / Ars adulandi, the Arte of Flatterie, with /
 the confutation therof, both very plea - / saunt and
 profitable, deuised and com- / piled, by Vlpian
Fulwell. [roman 'V', 'F'] / Newly corrected and
augmented. / His diebus non peractis, / Nulla fides

eſt inſactis. / Videto. / Mel in ore, verba lactis, /
Fel in corde fraus in factis. / Caueto. / [roman 'H',
 'N', 'V', 'M', 'F', 'C'] / Who reades a booke raſhly, /
 at randon doth runne: / Hee goes on his arrant, / yet
 leaues it vndone. / Imprinted at London, by / Richarde
Jones, [swash 'R', 'J'] and are / to bee ſolde at his
 ſhoppe ouer / agaynſt Sainte Sepul= / chers Church.

Collation: 4^o A-I⁴ K² (K², K^{2v} blank), 38 leaves
 unnumbered. § 4 signed (-A1, A3, C4, H3, I3).

Colophon: None

Contents: A1: Title, verso blank A2-A2^v: ' ¶ A Dialogue
 betweene the Author / and his Muſe, as touching the
dedica= / tion of this booke.' A3-A3^v: Dedication
 ' ¶ To the Right noble and vertuous / Lady, the Lady
Mildred [swash 'M'] Burleigh, / VVife vnto the right
 honorable Lorde Treasorer / of England, Vlpian Fulwell
wiſheth perfect / Felicitie.' signed A3^v 'Your Honours
moſt humble, / Vlpian Fulwell. [roman 'Y', 'H', 'V', 'F']
 A4-B1: 'To the Freendly Reader, / Vlpian Full Well.'
 signed B1 'Vlpian Fulwell' B1^v-B2^v: ' ¶ A diſcription
 of the ſeuen liberall / Sciences, into whoſe company
the eight / hath intruded her ſelfe.' B3-C2: ' ¶ The
 firſt Dialogue betweene / the Author [swash 'A'] and the
Printer.' C2^v-C4: 'The ſeconde Dialogue betweene the /
Author, [swash 'A'] and Lady Fortune.' C4^v-E1^v: ' ¶ The
 thirde Dialogue, between the / Author and a Frier.'

E2-E4: 'The fourth Dialogue betweene the / Author,
 [swash 'A'] and Fortunatus.' E4^V-F3: 'The fifth
 Dialogue, betweene / Pierce Pickthank, drunken Dickon. /
 Dame Annat the Alewife, and the Author.' F3^V-G2: 'The
 sixth Dialogue, betweene / Diogenes, and Vlpianus.
Wherin is ex- / pressed vnder the person of the Author,
 the simpli- / city of such as thinke the Courte to
 preferre / all that flocke vnto it, which after
 experience / had therof, is found an vnfit place for /
 simple persons of grosse education.' G2^V-H3: 'The
 seventh Dialogue, betweene / Tom [tailed 'm'] Tapster, Miles
 [swash 'M'] makehifft, / Vvat Vvily, and the Author.' H3^V-H4^V:
 'A short Dialogue, betweene the / Authour [swash 'A']
 and his booke [tailed 'k'], wherin is shewed / sundry opinions
 that were vttered of the first Im- / pression of this booke,
 which the Authour / him selfe hearde in Paules Church
 yeard. / and else where.' I1-K1^V: 'The eyghth Dialogue,
 betweene Sir / Symon the Parson of Poll Iobbam [tailed 'm'],
 / and the Authour.' K2-K2^V blank.

RT: The first [thirde, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh,
 eyghth] Dialogue, / of the eyghth liberall science.
 [roman type. 'science.' B4; 'Dialogue' B3^V, D4^V, E3^V;
 'f' in 'of' not inked I2. C3^V incorrectly headed 'first'
 instead of 'second'; G1^V incorrectly headed 'seventh'
 instead of 'sixth'.]

A2^V Betweene the Author and his Muse.

A3^v The [swash 'T'] Epistle.

A4^v To the Reader.

B1 To the Reader. [swash 'T', 'R']

H4 Betweene the Author and his booke.

H4^v Betweene the Author[^]

CW: A4^v vnto B2^v The [The] C4 The [The] D2^v (inci-)
dente [dent] E1^v ¶ The [The] E4 The [The] F1 liniaments,
[liniamentes,] F1^v company[^] [~,] F2 Amonge [Among]
F3 The [The] G2 The [The] H1 When [when] H3 A [A]
[no CW on I3^v] I4 bee [damaged 'h'?] [hee] (correct reading
'hee')

Typography: 37 ll. with s.-n., prose, 152(163.5) x
90(107) mm., 82 mm. black letter per 20 ll. (B4 in
B.M. C.37.d.10); verse, 45 ll. 156(169) x 90(106) mm.,
73.5 mm. per 20 ll. (H1^v in C.37.d.10).

Text in black letter with roman RT and sidenotes;

Ded. to Lady Burleigh, verses 'A discription of the
seuen liberall Sciences', Lady Hope's letter in First
Dialogue (B3-B3^v), & verses 'A Short Dialogue, between
the Authour and his booke' in roman type. 93R per 20
ll. (A3^v, prose; dedication).

Large black letter in 'To the Freendly Reader':

93 mm. per 20 ll.

Decorated initials: A2: 5-line 'M' 17.5 x 18 mm;

A3: 5-line 'W' 21x21 mm; A4: 8-line 'I' 35 x 35 mm,

St John and eagle; B3: 4-line 'S' 17.5 x 18mm;

C2^V: 5-line 'F' 17.5 x 18; C4^V: 4-line 'F' 14.5 x 14;
 E2: 5-line 'A', 17 x 18; E4^V: 5-line 'P' 17 x 17.5;
 G2^V: 5-line 'M', same as A2; H3^V: 4-line 'W' 17 x 18;
 I1: 4-line 'A' 14 x 14.

Type ornaments: B1 13 x 79; C2 19 x 90; C4 13 x 79;
 E4 19 x 90.

Notes: (Q2a) S.R. Christie-Miller, Britwell Court -
 Rosenbach - Henry E. Huntington

S.R. Christie-Miller inherited the Britwell Court library from Samuel Christie-Miller (d. 1889) and the famous bibliophile William Henry Miller (1789-1848) (S. de Ricci, English Collectors of Books and Manuscripts (Cambridge, 1930; rptd. New York, 1969), pp.108-110). His copy is described as 'some head-lines shaved, brown morocco extra, g.e. by C. Lewis' (Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge, Catalogue of a Further Selection of Extremely Rare and Valuable Works...from the Renowned Library Formerly at Britwell Court...the Property of S.R. Christie-Miller Esq., third day, 8 February 1922, p.50, no. 307). Dr. A.S.W. Rosenbach, the agent of Henry E. Huntington, bought it for £80 (Book Auction Records, 19 (1921-1922), p.272). Charles Lewis (1786-1836) was a celebrated London bookbinder (DNB, XI, 1051).

'3' in MS at bottom of title-page; no other MS marks.

(Q2b) Advocates' Library, Edinburgh (National Library of Scotland)

The margin is cropped on E2, shaving the first

sidenote; a blot on E2 obscures the beginnings of 11.23-24. H3, line 28: 'scipo' is underlined in ink, and the correction 'cibo' printed in the margin.

Q2(c) Houghton Library, Harvard College: the Latin verses on the title-page have been cut out and the hole patched with plain paper.

Farmer - Chalmers - ?Brown - Crawford - Quaritch - White

Dr Richard Farmer (1735-1797), Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and author of An Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare (1767), was interested in 'the minor lights of Elizabethan Literature' (de Ricci, p.58). His collection was sold on 7 May 1798; the sales catalogue lists this copy as item 5779 (Bibliotheca Farmeriana. A Catalogue of the Curious, Valuable and Extensive Library...of the Late Rev.^d Richard Farmer [London, 1798], p.263).

George Chalmers (1742-1825) was the author of A Supplemental Apology for the Believers of the Shakspeare-Papers (1799), in which he makes a reference to The Art of Flattery (Commentary to p.67.18). His library was sold in 1841-1842, this copy being wrongly described as the first edition, 'excessively rare, title mended, a piece wanting in the centre' (The Catalogue of the Very Curious Valuable, and Extensive Library of the Late George Chalmers (London, 1841-1842), Part I, p.104, item 1739). The annotated copy of the sales catalogue in the British Library (S.-C.E. 66(1)) states that it was sold to

B(rown?) for $\frac{1}{2}$ 17. Corser describes this copy in his Collectanea Anglo-Poetica, C, 396, as being 'in rather tender condition'.

The bookplate of William Horatio Crawford, of Lakelands, County Cork, is pasted on the first flyleaf Quaritch, the antiquarian booksellers, bought Crawford's copy for $\frac{1}{2}$ 4, according to the annotated sales catalogue in the British Library (S.-C.S. 1006, Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge, The Lakelands Library. Catalogue of the Rare and Valuable Books, Manuscripts and Engravings, of the Late W.H. Crawford, Esq. Lakelands, Co. Cork, 12 March 1891).

William Augustus White (1843-1927) bought it from Quaritch on 13 April 1891, according to White's note on the flyleaf. He was a noted American book collector specializing in the Elizabethan period; most of his Elizabethan collection went to Harvard after his death (Carl L. Cannon, American Book Collectors and Collecting (New York, 1941; rptd. Westport, 1976), pp.329-331). Henrietta C. Bartlett's catalogue of his collection states that there are 'two others known' - i.e. two other copies of the second edition of The Art of Flattery (Catalogue of Early English Books, Chiefly of the Elizabethan Period. Collected by W.A. White (New York, 1926), p.49).

Manuscript annotations: flyleaf 1: '14454.12.24* / This at Chalmer's $\frac{1}{2}$ 17 / Collier, Heber, Chalmers'

flyleaf 2: Top L corner: 'Crawford Sale / Bill[?] 4
+ 10% / \$21.⁵⁰'

Top R corner: 'W.A. White / 13 apl '91 / 1st ed. not
extant / this is 2nd / 3rd is n.d. / see Collier II.37'

In different hand: 'The Library has a photostat
reproduction (positive) of the copy in the Henry E.
Huntington Library. (Call-number: 14454.12.25)'

Pasted in printed sales catalogue slip, from Crawford
sale catalogue 1891:

1292 FULWELL (ULPIAN) ARTE OF FLATTERIE, black
letter, half bound, autograph signature and
note of R. Farmer, sm. 4to. R. Jones, 1579 /
Very rare. This copy sold for £17 at Chalmers'
sale, and a subsequent edition for £24.4s. 6d
in Bindley's.

Flyleaf 3: Farmer's annotation: 'R. Farmer. /

This piece is very scarce. Ames has not mentioned it
in his Typog. Antiq. Jackson of Clare-court (a /
Bookseller) inform's me, y^t a copy / sold at an auction
some time ago / for 9 Shillings. / Fulwell wrote likewise
an Interlude / call'd "Like will to Like, quoth the /
Devil to y^e Collier." &c. See Tanner'

In a different hand: 'A subsequent Edition of this
sold at Bindley's sale / for £24.4.6'

A1^v (verso of title-page): 'Harvard College Library /
From the heirs of William A. White / June 30, 1939'

On C2 there is a signature in a sixteenth-
century hand: 'William Cartar'; on H3 in right margin
'By me Edn<> / Edward / Carter'

Scribbles and doodles on B3, C4, D1, E2, E4, H3, H3^V, 13^V, K1^V. On A4 there is a small hole in the paper affecting the catchword. On leaf K1 there is a tear in the page affecting lines 23-24 of the text and the fourth sidenote on K1^V.

(Q2d) Bodleian, Malone Collection.

Edmund (or Edmond) Malone (1741-1812), editor of Shakespeare, was an avid collector of Elizabethan drama; his collection (which also included Fulwell's Flower of Fame and Like Will to Like) was presented by his heirs to the Bodleian (DNB, XII, 881; de Ricci, p.63; Catalogue of Early English Poetry and Other Miscellaneous Works Illustrating the British Drama Collected by Edmond Malone, Esq., and Now Preserved in the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1836); Fulwell p.15).

MS notes: D3^V (upside down on page): 'A audiui et non vidi / nisie frem non nerraron[?]' ; K1^V: 'THOMAS WILLIAMS'.

(Q2e) n.d. Bindley - Heber - Payne

James Bindley (1737-1818) was an avid collector of early English literature (de Ricci, p.94). His copy of The Art of Flattery was sold on 11 January 1819 along with the Forrest of Fancy (1579) for £38 6s. 6d. (A Catalogue of the Curious and Extensive Library of the Late James Bindley...Sold by Auction by Mr Evans, 4 parts ([London], 1818-1820, Part II, p.37, no.1030); annotated copy in British Library 822.d.4).

Richard Heber (1773-1833) was the main purchaser at the Bindley sale (de Ricci, p.94); he records on the flyleaf that he paid £18 16s. 6d. for the copy and had it bound by C[harles] Lewis at a cost of £1 8s.. In the sales catalogue of his collection it is described as a 'fine copy, in venetian morocco, by C. Lewis' (Bibliotheca Heberiana. Catalogue of the Library of the Late R. Heber, 13 parts [London, 1834-1837], Part 4 (sold by Evans, 11 December 1834), p.104, no. 757). According to John Payne Collier's annotated edition of Part 4 of the sale catalogue it was sold to the bookseller [John Thomas] Payne for four guineas (A Catalogue of Heber's Collection...With... Prices and Purchasers' Names (London, [1834], p.8). Bought by British Museum from Payne and Foss, booksellers, 12 January 1838.

Manuscript annotations: Pasted in slip on binder's blank (Heber's annotation): 'THE ARTE / OF / FLATTERIE / BY VLPIAN / FVLWELL / [rule] / R. JONES/ N.D. / Bindleys II Sale. n.1030/

Jan. 1819.....18.16.6

C. Lewis - ani 1833 1. 8.0

(10. H.1.

20. 4.6

195 [c.p.]'

Pencilled numbers and shelf marks on title-page and verso.

B2^v, line 22: the misprint 'cares' has been corrected in ink to 'eares'.

Written on blank page, K2^v: 'By how much the more you

are worthy of pryse / By so much the less yow are
thin[k?]e your selfe prod [proud?]; in different hand:
'Sam: Cockerell'; 'By me Jhon Chamberlyn' crossed out;
'Eliz. 155[1?]'.

Other Editions

Edward C. Wright, 'The English Works of Ulpian Fulwell',
pp.278-441; mentioned above, Biography, pp.7-8.

Wright is not aware of the existence of the first state
of the text (Q1a); his collations of Q1b and Q2 are
incomplete.

Press Variants, Q2

	<u>Corrected</u>	<u>Uncorrected</u>
A3.1	had L.	adh HN.HD.E.O.
C3 ^V .34	dearely HN.O.E.L.	bearely HD.
D1 sidenote (1)	<u>in</u> HN.L.E.(? smudged could be 'o'). O. (? smudged & damaged 'n'?)	<u>iu</u> HD. [= 1st sidenote on D1]
D1 ^V .25	field (which I knew HD.E.	fielde (which I new HN.O.L.
F4.17	learne, O. ~ . HN.L.E.	learue, HD.
G1 ^V .5	thee: E.O.	thee _Λ HN.HD.L.
I3 ^V sidenote (2)	<u>Sir Simon is</u> <u>a seruisable</u> <u>spaniell.</u> HN.O.	<u>Sir Simonis</u> <u>vseruisable</u> <u>spvniell.</u> E.HD.L.
I3 ^V .22	practises HD.E.L.O.	p ractises HN.

Doubtful and shifting of type:

The typography of Q2 is not always clear.

C1, sidenote (4) Christi^{an}] HD.L. O.E. (O.,E.: the 'an' only slightly raised); Christi an HN.

C1, sidenote (6) minde.] HD. (could be blot or showthrough); minde _A HN.O.E.L.

C3, sidenote (3) it,] O.HD.L.; ~ _A HN.E.

E2.8 iuste] HN.L.O.E.; iyste (?) HD.

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE VARIANT STATES OF Q1

Only two copies of the first edition of the Art of Flattery survive, one in the British Library and one in Trinity College, Cambridge, in the Capell collection. The latter is not listed in STC, although it will be in the new revised edition when it is published: it is however in Steevens's, Cranwell's, Sinker's and Greg's catalogues of books in Trinity College Library.²⁷

-
27. George Steevens, Catalogue of Mr. Capell's Shakesperiana; Presented by him to Trinity College Cambridge, and Printed from an Exact Copy of his own MS (1779), unpaginated, item 14; Edward Cranwell, An Index of such English Books Printed before the Year MDC., as are Now in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (Cambridge & London, 1847), p.24; Robert Sinker, A Catalogue of the English Books Printed before MDCI. now in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (Cambridge & London, 1885), pp.199-200; W.W. Greg, Catalogue of the Books Presented by Edward Capell to the Library of Trinity College in Cambridge (Cambridge, 1903) p.44.
-

A detailed collation of these two copies reveals that they exist in variant states, following Fredson Bowers's definitions of 'state' and 'issue':

In its broadest sense, STATE covers all alterations in a book, even those made after sale has begun, where no change is made to the original title-page by cancellation....the addition, substitution, or deletion of any material constitutes a state when done by stop-press alteration or during continuous printing if it is insufficient in bulk to comprise a change in edition and cannot be shown on the evidence of the title-page to have been differentiated in sale. Changes of this variety are chiefly authorial and may substantially affect the text of the forme or even of a number of the sheets involved, but in theory they are precisely the same as proof-corrections. (Principles of Bibliographical Description (Princeton, 1969), pp.42,49)

Detailed collation of the two copies, Q1a (Trinity College Cambridge) and Q1b (British Library), reveals that gatherings A, B and G have been entirely reset, but the title-page remains the same. The first crucial problem which presents itself to the editor, therefore, is to examine the variants in detail in order to determine which of the two states is the earlier, and therefore the more authoritative. To do this, it is necessary to compare the two copies gathering by gathering and page by page (where applicable), in order to determine priority of state. The first preliminary gathering, ¶, is identical in both copies - including the title-page, thus making the two copies variant states, and not variant issues, as discussed above.

Gathering A

Gathering A has been reset. In A1 recto the headline is set lower down on the page in Q1b than in Q1a: in the

opening ¶4^v-A1, the running-titles 'To the Reader' are not on a level horizontally in Q1b, whereas in Q1a they are normal. Another difference between the two copies is that the author's name at the end of the epistle to the reader is printed in roman type in Q1a and in black letter in Q1b: but most striking is the omission of the verse of the printer to the 'gentle Reader' in Q1b. This is the only substantive variant on this page: the other variants solely concern accidentals, except for a misprint caused by a turned letter ('labonr' in Q1b for 'labour' in Q1a).

A1^v: The layout has been improved in Q1b by printing three stanzas on the page instead of three stanzas and the heading and first line of the fourth stanza as in Q1a: it is not as visually pleasing to the reader to have a broken stanza on the page. The compositor of Q1b has also spaced out the heading into four lines instead of three, and has set up the text in black letter, instead of roman, type, with the headings to each stanza in a larger black letter type instead of small italic. This is also a visual improvement as one compares the two openings: in Q1a the roman type is thin and small, and the appearance of the page suffers from bad show-through. Q1b also suffers from show-through, but the thicker and heavier black letter type makes it less irritating and noticeable than the more 'greyish' thin roman in Q1a. The changing of the arrangement of stanzas in Q1b leads to a different catchword: 'Musike' instead of

 'Doth' (roman) in Q1b.

Variants: There are no substantive variants on this page. The misprint 'deligh' in Q1a has been corrected to 'delight' in Q1b. The collation of punctuation is probably misleading, because certain words appear to have a full stop in Q1b where the comma in Q1a is obviously the correct pointing; but the commas in Q1b are not always well defined: after the words 'brest', 'bent', 'content', 'speed', 'right', 'display', there appears to be a large round full stop, but this may be simply an over-inked comma; the comma in Q1a, however, is well defined.

A2: Because the compositor of Q1b has transferred two lines from Q1a to A2, he is obliged to fit four full stanzas into A2: the headline in Q1b is noticeably higher than that of A1^V, the facing page of the opening. The compositor has dispensed with the direction-line, omitting both catchword and signature reference. There is no running-title on this page either in Q1a or Q1b.

Variants: 'breed' in Q1a is altered to 'bred' in Q1b (thus rhyming with 'head'). On the last line of the page, 'thou' has been changed to 'then' in Q1b, in the line 'A world of wealth and wisdom thou hast gaine'. Two errors of spacing in Q1a are corrected in Q1b, i.e. 'echeblisse' and 'restsin'; on the other hand in Q1b 'entriug' introduces a turned-letter misprint, as does 'seueu' for 'seauen'.

A2^V: Q1b again omits the catchword, although there

is plenty of space for it on the page. One substantive variant is introduced on this page: line 2, 'vaunts' (Q1b) for 'wants' (Q1a). This corrects an obvious error in Q1a: the 'vaunts' carries on the sense of 'brags' in line 1:

Behold the brags that sisters seuen haue made,
Suruiew their vaunts that seeme to shine so bright
(Q1b text: wants Q1a; my italics; p.14.13-14).

Again Q1b corrects a spacing error of Q1a: 'then they' for 'thenth ey'; and a misprint is introduced in Q1b, 'shhift' for 'shift'.

Summary: Bowers has warned of the danger of using 'collateral' or 'metacritical' evidence in arguing for priority of states, and advocates confining oneself to strictly bibliographical evidence:

Metacritical evidence, sometimes masquerading as bibliographical, will often presuppose that of two texts the more correct version is the later. Bibliography is not concerned with such literary matters of content, but endeavors on the evidence of printing to determine (without regard for the correctness or error) which form must have preceded the other. This examination based on the demonstrable evidence of a material object will frequently reverse normal literary judgment. (Principles of Bibliographical Description, p.32.)

He has also warned against 'the folly of applying a veneer of bibliography to disguise what are actually critical guesses' (Bibliography and Textual Criticism (Oxford, 1964), p.38). However, the evidence to be derived from the methods of analytical bibliography appear in this case to be slight, and to be confined to:

1) the running-title on A1;

2) the improved appearance of the layout of A1^V.

1) In Q1b, the RT of A1 appears to deviate from the norm: in Q1a the two RTs of the page-opening are on a level, whereas in Q1b they are not congruent. If we work on the hypothesis that Q1b was printed later than Q1a, this could be explained by the fact that, in cutting out the printer's apology to the reader for 'fautes escaped', the compositor narrowed the opening of his page on the forme, since he had less than half a page of material to set up on A1. This hypothesis is borne out by the measurements of the type-pages:

	Q1a	Q1b
A1	133(154) x 84	- - ^d x 83
A1 ^V	- (147.5) ^a x 84 ^b	- (150) ^a x 83 ^e
A2	- (144) x 84 ^b	- (146) x 81 ^e
A2 ^V	129(-) ^c x 84 ^b	- (110) ^c x 82 ^e

a. HT

b. Verse; measured to CW

c. No RT; not full page text

d. Less than half page of text

e. Measured to showthrough; no CW.

2) Having a smaller type-page to work from, the compositor of Q1b transferred two lines from the bottom of A1^V to the top of A2, and spaced out the heading on A1; however he omitted the direction-line on A2, perhaps feeling that it would make too tight a squeeze and destroy the neat spacing of his four stanzas.

When we have exhausted the bibliographical evidence,

we are forced to resort to 'metacritical' and 'collateral' evidence. As Bowers himself admits,

To disbar critical judgement from the editorial process would be an act of madness, for there will often come a time when literary criticism is necessary to assist in the interpretation of bibliographical evidence. (Bibliography and Textual Criticism, p.19)

By critical judgement we can see that 'vaunts' is a correct reading displacing the incorrect 'wants'.

The only other substantive variant, apart from the 'thou'/'then' change on A2, is the removal of the entire portion of the verses headed 'The printers desire vnto thee (gentle Reader) to pardon his negligence for the faultes escaped in this booke.' There are not an extraordinary number of 'faultes' in the book, by the standards of the time. Did the printer for some reason wish to remove these verses, which are entirely conventional and absolutely innocuous? If he did wish to remove them, why did he not simply cancel this leaf, and paste in a cancel leaf, rather than resetting the entire gathering?

A purely bibliographical reason connected with a hypothetical history of the printing of the book might be that the printer for some reason did not print enough copies of sheet A to piece out his edition: the formes had been unlocked and the type distributed before he realized this, and he was obliged to re-compose another two formes and print off the required number of copies. Doing this in a hurry, he decided to omit his own verses to the reader to save time. Bowers gives an example of

this kind of minor resetting performed before the end of continuous printing in an effort to make up the full number of sheets when early in the book a decision was made to enlarge the total impression of an edition.²⁸

28. Principles of Bibliographical Description, p.47: the example is the Opera of Bovillus, printed in Paris in 1510; he also cites the resetting of slightly over one-quarter of Gibbon's Decline and Fall, first edition, 1776 (p.48).
-

However, one thing that militates against this hypothetical printing history of the book - even granted that the printer judged it popular enough to enlarge the impression - is that we are dealing here with a preliminary gathering, which according to the 'postulate of normality' would ordinarily be printed after the body of the text. Gathering A contains half of the preliminaries - the ending of the epistle to the reader, and the verses describing the 'eight' liberal sciences; the text proper starts on Bl, with the First Dialogue.

Another hypothesis would have to lean on what Bowers calls 'collateral' evidence, not that of analytical bibliography which Bowers prefers as being more 'scientific'. This would be related to the fact that Fulwell got into trouble over his attack on members of the ecclesiastical establishment at Wells in this book: he was summoned before the Court of High Commission and forced to make a public apology to the Bishop of Wells (as discussed above, Biography pp.93-99). It may be that Hoskins, the printer,

scenting trouble in the air, felt that he did not wish to draw attention to himself, and perhaps thought that the conventional apology for the 'faultes escaped' might be capable of a sinister interpretation by Fulwell's ecclesiastical censors. The verse reads:

Sith through my fault, such faults are scape,
 by letters wrongly plaste:
 As some perhappes, wil seeme to taunte,
 to haue the booke defaste.
 That thou accept the authors minde,
 I craue with humble sute:
 The fault is mine, the paine is his,
 and thou shalt reape the fruite. (p.11)

He then desires the reader to 'mende them with thy pen'. Hoskins certainly condones Fulwell's intentions, and is anxious for the reader to 'accept the authors minde' in correcting his errors. Perhaps Hoskins felt that this linked him too much with Fulwell and his point of view in the satire, a link which is emphasized by the author himself in the First Dialogue which is 'betweene the Author and the printer' (p.16). It is significant that in gathering B, the direct identification of the printer in the dialogue with the printer of the book - 'In deede (my olde felowe & frinde W. Hoskins)...' (Q1a, p.16.10) - is altered in Q1b to the more indefinite 'my olde fellowe & frinde W.H.'. However, it hardly takes a genius to identify 'W.H.' with the 'William Hoskins' of the title-page imprint.

To sum up, it might be felt that the trivial nature of the omission of the printer's verses to the reader makes the entire resetting of gathering A something of

a puzzle. On the other hand, fear might very well have played a part in Hoskins's action. The story of the printer who almost lost his right hand to the public executioner because he printed something which offended the authorities is well known; so are Nashe's complaints that the slightest thing could be misread, twisted and deliberately misinterpreted by government informers.²⁹

-
29. The printer was Hugh Singleton, who published John Stubbes's The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf only three years later in 1579: he was sentenced to have his hand cut off, but was saved at the last moment (E.H. Miller, The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp.171-2). A convenient summary of some of Nashe's complaints is given in Phoebe Sheavyn, The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age (Manchester, 1909), p.57.
-

Gatherings B and G

It is convenient to consider these two gatherings together, since they are connected by evidence of the foliation and running-titles. The first thing which distinguishes the two states in gathering B is the difference in type of the running-titles: in Q1a they are in italic, in Q1b they are in roman type. This change is particularly noticeable at the end of the gathering in Q1b, where the roman type of the first half of the running-title on the verso of the page (B4^v) contrasts strongly with the italic type of the second half of the running-title on the recto (C1): 'The first Dialogue' / 'of the eigth [sic] liberal science.'. The running-titles in roman type in Q1b disrupt the original

pattern of italic running-titles in Q1a, which continue uninterruptedly from gathering B through to gathering E, when they then switch to roman type from F to N. The original printing history may be reconstructed as follows (from Q1a): when the compositor began setting up the text, he started using italic for the running-titles. The text proper, the First Dialogue, starts on B1: italics were used consistently in gatherings B to E comprising the first, second and third dialogues. Then for some reason, perhaps a change of compositor, or perhaps the division of the book between two compositors for two-press printing, the running-titles were set up from F onwards in roman type. When the compositor came to set up the preliminaries - normally, except in the case of a reprinted edition, done after the body of the text - he set up the running-titles in roman type, except for ¶3^v which is in italics (probably because this looks better with the small roman type of the text than the black letter).

What seems to have happened in Q1b is that the compositor reset gathering A (the preliminaries) and followed his exemplar in using roman type for the running-title on A1, and continued automatically to set the running-titles in roman in gathering B, even though his exemplar had changed the running-titles to italic in gathering B. I would be only when the sheets were folded and bound that the discrepancy between roman and italic type became

noticeable in the B4^v-C1 opening, and since normally the reader does not scrutinize the running-titles, the discrepancy is hardly serious. Gathering G, the other reset gathering in the book, has roman running-titles in both copies.

One strange feature of gathering B in Q1b is the presence of foliation which is entirely absent in Q1a. One would expect foliation to begin on B1 recto, with the beginning of the text proper at the First Dialogue. However, in Q1a foliation is not registered until D1, which is numbered '9', and is the beginning of the Third Dialogue: it is the ninth leaf of the text, counting from the beginning of the First Dialogue, B1. In Q1a, then, foliation is absent in gatherings B and C, while in Q1b foliation appears normally in gathering B and is absent in gathering C (gathering C being identical in Q1a and Q1b and not reset). In Q1b, B1 contains the head-title for the First Dialogue and is unnumbered; B2, B3 and B4 are numbered '2', '3' and '4' respectively.

In gathering G, the foliation of Q1b is very odd, and gives the strongest proof by its deviation from the normal course of being the later state. Up to this point, the foliation had progressed normally up to folio 20 on F4: G1 in Q1a is logically numbered '21', G2 '22', G3 '23', and G4 '24'; but in Q1b G1 is numbered peculiarly out of all sequence and logic '4', G2 '4', G3 '2', and G4 '2'. Then in both copies H1 is mis-numbered

'17' and the normal expected sequence of foliation recurs from '26' on H2.

This strange foliation of gathering G in Q1b appears less puzzling when we compare the headlines, comprising both running-titles and foliation, in sheets B and G. Then everything becomes clear, and, indeed, even normal according to the printing practices of the time. The evidence rests upon the recto containing the second half of the running-title and the foliation. Sheet B (inner forme) has two headlines on the recto leaves:

B2: 'of the eighth liberal science. 2'

B4: 'of the eighth liberall science. 4'

The compositor must have set up gathering G after the printing of inner sheet B had been completed. As was customary, he used the running-titles of B(i) in his skeleton forme which was to be used for sheet G.³⁰

30. Fredson Bowers, 'Notes on Running-Titles as Bibliographical Evidence', The Library, 4th Series, 19 (1938-39), 315-338, has an intensive discussion of this practice.

But, carelessly, the compositor did not bother to remove the old B foliation from his headline, and he did not insert the correct foliation for sheet G. He merely transferred the whole headline to his new skeleton forme. Thus B4 headline is found en bloc on G2, and B2 on G4. The headlines used for G(i) were then used again for G(o) - one skeleton being used for both formes. The headlines for the recto leaves of sheet G are as follows:

B2(i) = G4(i): 'of the eighth liberal science. 2' I
 B4(i) = G2(i): 'of the eighth liberall scienc. [sic] 4' II
 B2(i) = G3(o): 'of the eighth liberal science. 2' I
 B4(i) = G1(o): 'of the eighth liberall science. 4' II.
 (i) = inner forme; (o) = outer forme.

If we assume that the skeleton of the inner forme of G was printed first, as seems to have been the predominant practice,³¹ the compositor would have unlocked

31. McKerrow, An Introduction to Bibliography, pp.18-19; quoted Bowers, 'Notes on Running-Titles', p.335.

the forme of B(i), and used the furniture for setting up the skeleton of G(i). He was able to use only two of the running-titles of B(i) in G, namely the rectos, for the running-titles of the versos had 'The first Dialogue' and he now needed to compose new running-titles for the versos, since sheet G contains the Fifth Dialogue. According to normal practice, we would expect B4 to be transferred to G4, and B2 to G2,³² but instead we find

32. Bowers points out that,
 According to Moxon's description of stripping a wrought-off forme and transferring the skeleton piece by piece to the new letterpress, great emphasis is laid on the necessity to set each piece about the new pages in precisely the same position it occupied in the wrought-off forme.
 ('Notes on Running-Titles', p.323)

the opposite:

B2 = G4
 B4 = G2.

This would be explained if for some reason B(i) was placed

upside-down on the stone. Moxon's diagram ('Notes on Running-Titles', p.322) for imposition of a quarto is as follows:

	A4	A3 ^v
Inner	A1 ^v	A2
	A3	A4
Outer	A2 ^v	A1

According to this, A4 should be transferred to A3, A2 to A1. But if B(i) was placed above G(i) on the composing stone, but upside-down according to the diagram above, the supposedly diagonal transfer of running-titles becomes perfectly logical: each running-title is laid 'in precisely the same position' from the point of view of the compositor transferring the running-titles:

B(i)	B2 I	
		B4 II
G(i)	G4 I	
		G2 II

Only one slip occurred: when the compositor was transferring II, two of the letters became transposed, so that the running-title reads 'scienec' instead of 'science'. This is a not uncommon occurrence in the transference from an old forme to a new skeleton. Charlton Hinman calls it a 'stripping accident' (The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, 2 vols (Oxford, 1963), I, 105, 128), and Bowers gives several examples in the article mentioned

above.³³ When the skeleton forme was used again for

33. E.g. Dekker's Roaring Girle (1611), where the spelling 'Girle' becomes 'Girel' in the transference of the same running-title:

But errors in running-titles suddenly appearing and then being corrected are a commonplace and in themselves do not furnish sufficient proof that the skeleton was not left undisturbed, since it is possible to conceive that accidents happened when the letterpress was taken out from beneath the titles. ('Notes on Running-Titles', p.320)

Bowers comments on this example again later: when...the spelling Girel occurs only on C2 of the uncorrected state, if other evidence were lacking it would not follow that the inner forme was necessarily printed last when this spelling is not found in the outer forme. The running-title was not fixed in the skeleton but transferred, and therefore such an error could occur at any time. (p.337)

G(o), however, the mistake was put right, and the running-title reads 'science' (G1). The transference of the running-titles from inner to outer skeleton of sheet G is perfectly regular and in accordance with Moxon's diagram:

G(i)	G4 I	G3 ^V IV
	G1 ^V III	G2 II
G(o)	G3 I	G4 ^V IV
	G2 ^V III	G1 II

On this occasion, there were four running-titles to transfer, versos as well as rectos. The verso headlines are as follows:

G1^V(i) = G2^V(o): 'The fift Dialogue' III

G3^V(i) = G4^V(o): 'The fifth Dialogue' IV

It may be deduced, therefore, from the evidence of the running-titles and foliation alone, that Qlb contains the later state of these two gatherings, B and G - and this entirely apart from any evidence from the substantive variants in the text. As Bowers says, the kind of evidence obtained from analytical bibliography is the most satisfactory and reliable, because it is entirely impersonal and non-subjective, and does not depend on the value-judgements of literary criticism, nor upon speculation; it has what Bowers calls 'impersonal concreteness' (Bibliography and Textual Criticism, p.19).

Having said this, it will now be necessary to examine the variants in these two gatherings page by page, and if possible see if they shed any light on the question of why the printer chose to reset these two gatherings.

Gathering B

B1: There are two substantive variants on this page: most important is the changing of 'W. Hoskins' to 'W.H.' in Qlb, in line 11. The first eleven lines of text (four of which are verse) retain the same line-endings; thus when Qlb substitutes 'W.H.' for 'W. Hoskins', the compositor had to space out the letters to justify the line. The other variant is the removal of the sidenote at the top of the page in Q1a; in Qlb it is transferred to a more appropriate placing on B2^v,

where it is placed opposite the text to which it refers. The appearance of the page is improved in Qlb by the speech-headings having been transferred to the margin, instead of being centred as in Qla: this leaves a space between the head-title and the beginning of the verse, instead of the speech-heading having the appearance of continuing the head-title as in Qla.

B1^V: Two substantive alterations are made on this page. The most important is in line 14: the letter from Lady Hope ends 'from my house at Naunton &c.' in Qla, whereas Qlb has 'from my house at N.' Fulwell became rector of Naunton in 1570 (Biography p.76). It seems that the text has been deliberately altered here to make it less specific, perhaps to avoid the identification of the allegorical 'Lady Hope', and certainly to destroy the idea strongly conveyed by the word 'Naunton' that Fulwell is talking about his own personal situation as Rector of Naunton. This variant is undoubtedly the most exciting and interesting in the three reset gatherings.

The other alteration is in line 5, where 'Vlpian Fulwell' in Qla is changed to 'V.F.' in Qlb. As with the 'W. Hoskins'/'W.H.' alteration on B1, this seems to be an attempt to make the identification less personal and precise, although, as with B1, this is puzzling: it does not take much effort of the imagination to see that 'V.F.' is 'Vlpian Fulwell' or that 'W.H.' is William Hoskins, especially since the First Dialogue is headed

quite explicitly as being 'betweene the Author and the printer'.

B2: B2 is Q1b is mis-signed 'A.ii.', although correctly signed 'B.' on the previous leaf of the gathering, and 'B.ii.' in Q1a. Otherwise, there are no significant variants. A minor misprint is introduced into the Q1b text: the spacing error 'wasmokt' for Q1a 'was mokt'.

B2^V: As already noted above, Q1b contains a sidenote which has been moved here from its original position on B1 in Q1a. In line 9, the incorrect present tense of 'snatch' is corrected to the past 'snatched'. The long, rambling 34-line sentence which spans the last 12 lines of B2 and the first 22 lines of B2^V is re-punctuated in Q1b. Two colons are introduced to clarify the pointing: one after 'bred' in line 4, and another after 'prison' in line 7; the sentence is broken into two by the insertion of a full stop in line 14 after 'dish'; and a redundant comma is removed after 'past' in line 4. Another improvement is the colon substituted for a comma on line 26, after 'companions', introducing direct speech. However, not all the alterations in punctuation in Q1b are for the better: for example, line 9 omits a necessary comma after 'ground', perhaps because the compositor was short of space and had to squash his words together in order to justify the line. Also, a misprint is introduced: 'deuied' for Q1a's 'deuided'.

B3: There is one substantive variant on B3: 'worldly'

in line 25 in Qlb is substituted for 'wordly' in the phrase, 'to the vtter extinguishing of all wordly creatures' (p.23.3). 'Worldly' is obviously the correct reading. However, the 'wordly' in 'wordly adversaries' is allowed to stand in line 19 (p.22.20): it may just possibly have been intended as a verbal quibble by the author, referring perhaps to the 'Syren like songs' of Lady Pleasure the 'adversary' of Lady Truth. Also 'wordly', according to OED, is an obsolete form of 'worldly' (Commentary, to p.22.20). The omission of a full stop at the end of a sentence in Qla is corrected in Qlb (line 28).

B3^V: A new sidenote has been introduced beside lines 20-22 in Qlb, which draws attention to Christ, in addition to the Prophets, Apostles and Christian Princes of the other sidenotes on this page. Qlb also corrects an error in the positioning of the second sidenote, 'Prophets': it is moved up to its appropriate place beside line 15, 'I was conuersant among ^e y holy prophets' (p.24.3). The new sidenote concerning Christ in Qlb is placed in the old position of sidenote (2), by line 23, which is concerned with Christ, not the Prophets. Otherwise, the only substantive variant is line 8, where Qlb omits one word in Qla, the word 'very' in the phrase 'sauing a very fewe'.

B4: There are no significant variants.

B4^V: B4^V contains one substantive correction in line 5: 'journey thither' is a correction of an omission

after 'journey' in Q1a. This correction is only found in Q1b; Q2 follows Q1a. The punctuation is also corrected: a comma is added in Q1b after 'Ladie vertue' (line 3); and as in B2^V, an attempt has been made to divide one of Fulwell's long rambling sentences, a full stop being added after 'nation' in line 10 and a new sentence begun, breaking up a 16-line sentence in Q1a. More effective pointing is also introduced in line 13 by a comma after 'parciality', and in line 16 by a full stop after 'thereat' and one after 'worship' in line 28.

Summary: The substantive alterations in this gathering are few, but they point to the intervention of the printer and the author in order to soften and make less explicit the satirical implications of this dialogue. The alterations of 'W.Hoskins' to 'W.H.' and of 'Vlpian Fulwell' to 'V.F.' seem trivial, and feeble if they were an attempt to disguise the persons referred to; but the alteration of 'Naunton' to 'N.' is of the greatest significance and the earlier reading provides a much-needed clue to the allegory of this dialogue and the next. The alterations in punctuation also occasionally appear to be authorial, for we see some attempt to tidy up long rambling sentences. It is unlikely that the printer would undertake this improvement, although there are instances when the compositor seems to have added or subtracted a comma here or there as was usual at the time.

Gathering G

This was the third and final sheet to be reset. The compositor of Q1b departed from his practice of doing a page-by-page reset at the beginning of the gathering on two occasions: G1^V has the catchword '-sters' instead of Q1a 'lyke'; G2 omits the catchword altogether, and repeats the last two words of G2 at the top of G2^V, so that the dittography 'saue it saue it' is introduced; G1, G2^V, G3, G3^V, G4, G4^V, however, all preserve the same catchwords as the exemplar.

G1: Variants show a greater sprinkling of misprints in Q1b: e.g. 'beganmy' for 'began my' line 4; 'be-/before' for 'before' line 5; 'serning' for 'seruing' line 27; 'ueither' for 'neither', 2nd sidenote; 'marchandie' and 'hauə' [turned letter] for 'marchandice' and 'haue' in 3rd sidenote; 'chplain' for 'chaplain' in the 5th sidenote. There are no substantive variants on this page.

G1^V: There are no substantive variants, apart from the addition of a sidenote in Q1b. Some misprints are introduced - 'commendacious' for 'commendations' line 8; 'contranersies' for 'contrauersies' line 19; the peculiar spelling 'vncionsconably' in Q1a is regularised to 'vnconsionably' in Q1b line 18.

G2: As with G1^V, a sidenote is added in Q1b. Apart from this, there are no substantive variants.

G2^V: There are a few minor substantive variants: in line 13, 'and tooke on mee a habit of holynesse' (Q1a),

Qlb leaves out the word 'on'; in line 16, a word is added in Qlb: 'of a priste hood' instead of 'of priesthood' in Qla's 'and took on me the offer of priesthood'; in line 24 'promotions' is changed to 'promocion' in Qlb.

G3: No substantive variants, apart from the addition of two sidenotes in Qlb.

G3^v is more interesting, as it has one significant substantive variant, apart from the addition of a sidenote in Qlb. This is the substitution of 'dignitye' in Qlb for Qla's 'archdeconry' in line 20:

There is a verye honest man dwellinge neare vnto a Towne called Dropmall in the Countrey where my dignities are, which honest man was my very friend in time of necessitie, who dwelleth on a lyuing geuen vnto hym by an olde maister of his, who was sumetimes Archdecon of the place that I now possesse, and by my archdeconry [dignitye Qlb] I am now his Landlorde. (Qla text; my italics; p.79)

It must be admitted that this variant is puzzling: it certainly blurs the identification of 'Sir Simon' as an archdeacon - but not much, since on G3 Sir Simon has already told us that he is Archdeacon of 'Slew', and since lines 18-19 already carry the implication that Sir Simon is an archdeacon - i.e. 'an olde maister... who was sumetimes Archdecon of the place that I now possesse' (my italics). 'The place' may mean 'the position' (or office) of Archdeacon, or it may mean only 'the land', Sir Simon now being landlord of the 'verye honest man' he attempts to cheat. Presumably the alteration,

if it was made out of fear of censorship, was supposed merely to indicate that by some chance Sir Simon got hold of the land, but was not in the 'position' of archdeacon. If so, Fulwell was not bending over backwards to prevent the identification of Sir Simon as the Archdeacon of Wells. If he was, he would have altered the name of the town Dropmall (line 14) and the names 'Tesremos' and 'Slew' which it is not too difficult to guess are merely 'Somerset' and 'Wel(l)s' spelt backwards.

A more prosaic explanation of this variant is that it was merely due to eyeskip on the compositor's part. The phrase 'my dignities' appears on line 15, and the compositor's eye jumped when setting up the 'my' before 'archdeconry' and set 'dignitye' instead. However, we have found some tendency in gathering B to soften the particular application of the satire, and this is the only substantive variant which can be interpreted as carrying on this tendency in gathering G, which is, after all, the portion of the book most likely to have inflamed the ire of the ecclesiastical authorities.

G4: There are no substantive variants; a turned letter is corrected in line 11: 'yon' in Q1a to 'you' in Q1b.

G4^v: The position of the sidenotes has been slightly altered: the first moved down one line in Q1b, the second moved up two lines. A third sidenote has been added in Q1b, the bitterly ironic 'a good turne wel

requited' opposite that portion of the text in which Sir Simon rewards the honest tenant's 'cheare and friendly entertainment' by dispossessing him of his land. Otherwise, the only substantive variant is the substitution of 'lawfully' for Q1a's 'leafully' in line 18: the two words in fact mean the same thing, but come from different roots. A misprint is introduced in Q1b with 'receute' instead of 'receiue' (line 3), and an error of spacing is corrected in the first sidenote.

Summary: If Fulwell and his publisher Hoskins were afraid of getting into trouble over The Art of Flattery and were considering modifications to the text to avoid censorship, one would expect to find such modification above all in the Fifth Dialogue, the most inflammatory and libellous portion of the book. It comes as no surprise, then, to find that gathering G, which comprises eight of the fifteen pages of the Fifth Dialogue, has been reset. However, having said that, it must be admitted that the substantive variants are few and trivial, the only significant one being the substitution of the vaguer 'dignitye' for 'archdeconry' in G3^V. But other mentions of archdeacons are allowed to stand, and the placenames are not altered. If the intention of the printer in resetting this gathering was to avoid trouble, it must be admitted that he did not do a very thorough job of it.

The only other substantive alterations in Q1b are the addition of six sidenotes to the text. These sidenotes, if anything, serve to intensify the satirical bitterness

of the dialogue: e.g.

Sir Simō preacheth for profit. (G1)
 Sir Simō preacheth dogtriks in steede of doctrine. (G2)
 Sir Simon is a seruisable spaniell. (G3)
 Another mā's liuing was a great eye sore to Sir Simon. (G3^v)
 a good turne wel requited (G4^v)

It is noticeable that they are all directed against Sir Simon, and they all underline Fulwell's hatred for this unscrupulous clerical villain.

In general, then, it may be concluded that the printer, and probably the author as well, decided to reset the three gatherings in order to tone down some of the more personal references of the satire: this is certainly the case in gathering B; the evidence is less certain in A and G. It is not clear why Hoskins did not simply cancel the offensive leaves and set those anew, instead of the whole gatherings. It is clear from the evidence of the running-titles and foliation alone, that B and G in Q1b are the later states of the text, and that therefore, according to current theories of editing, the Cambridge copy (Q1a), being the prior state, must be used as copy-text. The evidence for gathering A is not so clear-cut, but the probability is that the Cambridge copy again has priority, for the reasons discussed above.

Punctuation Variants: Q1, Gathering A

The two variant states of Q1 show some interesting punctuation variants in the stanzas of the verse section 'A description of the seuen liberall Sciences' (etc.) on

A1^v-A2^v. In Q1a, the punctuation shows the same pattern occurring in each stanza, with a few minor exceptions; Q1b, which is printed in black letter with a punctuation mark which is very unclear and which may be either a large full stop or an over-inked comma, is much more random in its punctuation. The consistency in punctuation in Q1a seems to point to authorial rather than compositorial origin. The following table illustrates the punctuation of the ends of lines only:

Q1a	stanza	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
line	1:	,	,	,	^	,	,	,	,	,	,	,
	2:	,	,	,	,	,	^	,	^	,	,	,
	3:	:	:	,	:	:	:	,	:	:	:	:
	4:
	5:	,	,	,	,	,	,	.	,	,	,	,
	6:
Q1b												
line	1:	.	,[?]	^	^	,	,[?]	,	^	,	.	.
	2:	.	,[?]	,	.	.	^	.	^	,	,	,
	3:	,	,[?]	,	,	.	.	^	,	,	,	,
	4:	.	.	,	.	.	.	,
	5:	,	,	,[?]	,	,	,	^	^	.	,	^
	6:	,	.	.	.	,	.	.

The omission marks indicate absence of punctuation at the end of the line.

As I have said, the bad inking and poor type of Q1b make it almost impossible to distinguish sometimes whether a mark is a comma or a full stop, but one thing is immediately striking in the Q1b table: there are no colons at all; whereas line 3 of each stanza in Q1a is almost consistently punctuated with a colon (on 9 occasions out of 11), which is used to indicate a rhetorical break in the stanza. Line 3 of stanza 3 'runs on', and so the colon is dispensed with in Q1a: 'My golden

study shall yeeld thee such store,/ Of flowing words...'.

Line 3 of stanza 7 has a comma, but perhaps might be more effectively punctuated by a colon, and this may be a compositorial departure from the norm.

The striking regularity of this overall pattern of punctuation in Q1a may give a clue as to possible emendations when the norm is departed from and the punctuation seems unsatisfactory. For example, in stanza 6, the second line has no punctuation in Q1a, Q1b or Q2. Q1a reads:

My globe and I, will shew the lore of light_Λ
Thou shalt foresee what tempests will arise: (A2; p.14.2)

Taking the clue from the normal punctuation pattern of the stanzas, a comma is to be expected here, and it has been emended accordingly. Other disruptions of the pattern in Q1a are: -

(1) stanza 7, ll.5-6 (p.14.11-12):

Now when thou hast vs Sisters seauen obtainde.
A world of wealth and wisdome thou hast gainde. (A2)

(2) stanza 8, ll.2-3 (p.14.14-15):

Suruiew their wants [Q1a; vaunts Q1b, Q2] that seeme
to shine so bright_Λ
My glittering skill shall clips them in the shade:
(A2^v)

In (1.) Q1b has no punctuation after 'obtainde', and Q2 follows Q1a; although 'obtainde_Λ' is perfectly logical in the circumstances, in view of the carelessness of Q1b as far as punctuation goes, it seems more 'authorial' to emend to the general pattern rather than to Q1b. A similar line has been followed with regard to (2). Modern

taste might prefer a semi-colon here, or even a period; but a semi-colon is never found in this text, and the whole object of preparing a critical old-spelling edition is, as Bowers points out, to 'restore the conjectured true original':

The moment that an editor emends a single reading in his document, he is attempting this modification of the only physical evidence in the belief that because of the intermediary scribal or compositorial process the reading of his document is not that of the lost manuscript, and hence it is incumbent on him to restore the conjectured true original in his edited text. (On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists (Philadelphia and London, 1955), p.70)

On the other hand, there is an example of punctuation which retains the normal pattern, but which is incorrect, in stanza 6:

To thee such secrets shall apeare in syght.
That Starres and Planets shall thy mates remaine,
(A2; p.14.4-5)

Here the editor's task is clearly to emend to a comma after 'syght', even though Q1b and Q2 follow Q1a here.

Running-Titles, Compositorial Analysis, and Evidence of Type-Page Measurements, Q1

The running-titles of Q1a are somewhat irregular, and it is difficult to work out precisely in what order the formes went through the press. (The variant running-titles of gatherings B and G in Q1b have already been dealt with above, pp.cliii ff.) The book is divided into two sections: B-E, with italic running-titles, and F-N, with roman ones. The verso running-titles change

according to the number of the dialogue.

List of Running-Titles, Q1a:

B-E: Verso

1. The first Dialogue] B1^V, B2^V. Ligature 'fi'; break in 'u'.
2. The first Dialogue] B3^V, B4^V. No ligature 'fi'.
3. The ^{se}cond Dialogue] C2^V, C3^V. Badly inked: only part of 'n' shows; the 'e' of 'Dialogue' does not appear in C3^V, Q1a; slight shifting of type in C3^V.
- 4a. ¶ The third Dialogue] C4^V(HT), D1^V. Break in 'h' of 'third'. C4^V has breaks in bottom of 'g'; D1^V has perfect 'g' and is heavily inked, suggesting that the supposed breaks in C4^V are simply due to poor inking.
- 4b. Without paragraph mark '¶'. D4^V, E3^V. Slight shift in spacing; same break in 'h' of 'third'.
5. The third Dialogue] D2^V, D3^V, E1^V, E2^V. Slight shifting of type in D3^V and E2^V.

B-E: Recto

- I. of the eighth liberal ^{sc}ience.] B3, C1, D1. Broken 'g': only right portion of loop of descender; break in 'h'.
C1 & D1 with a hint of the left side of the loop of the 'g'.
- Ia. B4. Badly inked; slight shifting of type, but same 'g' and same break in 'h'.
- Ib. C2, D4. Same as I, but with more of the 'g' - all except a portion of the left side of the loop. Slight shifting of type in D4.
- Ic. E1. 'g' in same state as Ib, but shifting of type: wider space between words 'eighth' and 'liberal'.

Id. E2. Same spacing as E1, but with 'g' in state I, as in C1 & D1.

II. of the eighth liberal {science.}] B2. Badly inked.

Broken 'g' - only upper right portion of loop of descender present; nick in final 'e' of '{science}'.

Ila. C4. More of 'g' present, all except gap in bottom of loop; damaged 'e'. (Badly inked in Q1a: only bottom tips of letters show in 'of the', and the 'ce.' of '{science}' missing; inking normal in Q1b.)

Iib. D2, D3, E3, E4. With unbroken 'g', slightly different 's', no break in 'n' of final 'e' of '{science}', but same spacing as II (B2). Slight shifting of type in E4.

III. of the eighth liberal {science.}] C3. Shows some similarities to II (B2): e.g., same break in final 'e' of '{science}', and a similar long 's'; but spacing entirely different, and the 'g' is unbroken.

F-N: Verso

6. The fourth dialogue] F1^V. Break in 'e' of 'The'.

7. The fourth dialogue] F2^V. Break in 'd'; small break in 'g'.

8. The fifth dialogue] F3^V(HT), G3^V, G4^V. Ligature 'fi'.

9. The fifth dialogue] F4^V, H4^V. Ligature 'fi'; second 'f' in 'fifth' at a slant; larger break in 'g'.

10. The fifth dialogue] G1^V, G2^V. Break in 'e' of 'The' (as in (6)); ligature 'fi'; small break in 'g'.

11. The sixth dialogue] H1^V. Broken 'T'; break in 'd'; small break in 'g'.

12. The fifth dialogue] H2^V. Ligature 'fi'; break in 'd' (cp. (7)).

13. The {ixt dialogue] H3^V. Thinning in descender of 'g'.
14. The {ixt dialogue] I1^V, I2^V. Break in 'h'; break in 'e' of 'the'.
15. The {euenth dialogue] I4^V; K3^V?, K4^V? (slight shifting of type; different '{').
- 15a. L3^V(?). With shifting of type; damaged 'T'.
16. The {euenth dialogue] K1^V. Broken 'T'; break in 'h' of 'The'; large break in 'g' (cp. (9)).
- 16a. K2^V, L1^V. New 'The' and shifting of type, but same 'g'.
17. The eigth dialogue] L2^V. Broken 'T' (cp. (16)); small break in 'g' of 'eigth'; larger break in 'g' of 'dialogue' (cp. (16)).
18. The eigth dialogue] L4^V.
19. The eight dialogue] M1^V, M2^V, N1^V. Small break in 'g' of 'eight'. (N1^V: wider break in 'g'.)
20. The eight dialogue] M3^V, M4^V. Break in 'h' of 'eight'; break in 'g' of 'dialogue'.
- 20a. N2^V. Damaged 'T' and slightly different spacing of 'The'.

F-N: Recto

- IV. of the eigth liberal {cience.] F1, H1, H2. Slight break in descender of 'g'.
- V. of the eigth liberal {cience.] F2, G2, I1, M2, N1. 'of' askew; bigger gap between 'of' and 'the': otherwise similar to IV with same break in 'g'.
- Va. G1. Identical to V, except for 'ce.' at end, which appears to have slipped; wider space between 'n' and 'ce'

of 'science'.

Vb. I2, M1. Same askew 'of' as V, but change in spacing after 'li' of 'liberal'. Same length as Va, but shift in spacing 'eral {cien' of 'liberal {science.'; wider gap between words 'liberal {science'.

VI. of the eigth liberal {science.] F3. Break in 'g'; break in 'a'; break in 'h' of 'the'.

VII. of the eigth liberal {science.] F4, G3. Very similar to VI, but different spacing; similar break in 'g', but no break in 'a'.

VIIa. G4, I3, I4. Same break in 'g'; words 'liberal {science' closer together.

VIIb. K3, K4, L3, L4. No break in 'g', though thin.

VIII. of the eighth liberall {science.] H4.

IX. of the eigth liberall {science.] K1, K2, L1. Slight break in 'g'; slight shifting of type L1.

X. of the eight liberal {science.] M3, M4, N2. Break in 'g'; break in 'e' of the 'the'.

TABLE OF RUNNING-TITLES

I: B-E

B(i)	4 ₁ ^v	Ia 1	2 II	3 ^v 2
B(o)	3 ₂ ^v	I 1	2 HT	4 ^v 1
C(i)	4 ₁ ^v	IIa HT	3 Ib	3 ^v 2
C(o)	3 ₂ ^v	III 3	4a(HT) I	4 ^v 1

D(i)	4_v 1	Ib 4a	5 IIb	3_v 2
D(o)	3_v 2	IIb 5	4b I	4_v 1
E(i)	4_v 1	IIb 5	4b Id	3_v 2
E(o)	3_v 2	IIb 5	HT Ic	4_v 1

II: F-N

F(i)	4_v 1	VII 6	8(HT) V	3_v 2
F(o)	3_v 2	VI 7	9 IV	4_v 1
G(i)	4_v 1	VIIa 10	8 V	3_v 2
G(o)	3_v 2	VII 10	8 Va	4_v 1
H(i)	4_v 1	VIII 11	13 IV	3_v 2
H(o)	3_v 2	HT 12	9 IV	4_v 1
I(i)	4_v 1	VIIa 14	HT Vb	3_v 2
I(o)	3_v 2	VIIa 14	15 V	4_v 1
K(i)	4_v 1	VIIb 16	15 IX	3_v 2
K(o)	3_v 2	VIIb 16a	15 IX	4_v 1
L(i)	4_v 1	VIIb 16a	15a? HT	3_v 2
L(o)	3_v 2	VIIb 17	18 IX	4_v 1
M(i)	4_v 1	X 19	20 V	3_v 2

M(o)	3 ^v 2 ^v	X 19	20 Vb	4 ^v 1	
N(o)	1 ^v 2 ^v	V 20a	N(i)	1 ^v 2	19 X

B-E

In the first section, B-E, one skeleton forme was used, and the transfer of the running-titles appears to be fairly regular, with the exception of C3 (III). This may be a version of II with different spacing, but if it were one could expect it to recur later. There are diagonal transfers between B(o) -C(i), C(o)-D(i), and D(i)-D(o), which Bowers claims is 'somewhat unusual but not unknown' in books of the period.³⁴ The apparently

34. Bowers, 'The Printing of Hamlet, Q2', Studies in Bibliography, 7 (1955), 41-50 (p.43). He continues: 'I have observed it before and speculated whether it meant that some compositors stripped the forme not horizontally or vertically, but instead on a diagonal.'

different states of running-titles I and II may be merely due to variations in inking and presswork. This is certainly suggested by the variation between Id and Ic, where the 'g' in Id appears to 'revert' to the earliest state I, whereas in fact the spacing of Id is the same as Ic, and the two belong together.

A portion of the head-title on C4^v is used as a running-title on D1^v: this is easily recognized because the paragraph mark '¶' is retained. Later, the paragraph mark was removed by the compositor, and the running-title

is used in this second state, 4b, on D4^V and E3^V.

F-N

In the second section of the book, the transfer of the running-titles is much more confused, and it is difficult to identify them with absolute accuracy. The evidence suggests that at least two compositors were working on this section of the book. One of them, hypothetically called A, set up F(o), and it can be clearly seen that he used his skeleton forme for F(o) to set up H(o) next:

F(o)	VI	9
	7	IV + '17'
H(o)	HT	9
	12	IV + '17'

The compositor forgot to change the foliation number when he transferred the headline from F1 to H1: thus H1, which should have the foliation '25', is misnumbered '17'. He was also careless in that he forgot to change the verso running-title of F4^V: H4^V belongs to the Sixth Dialogue, and the compositor mistakenly let 'The fifth dialogue' stand. He should have composed a new running-title for H4^V (Sixth Dialogue), and used (9), 'The fifth dialogue' for H2^V. Instead, he composed a new running-title (12) for H2^V. (He could not use (7) because this belonged to the fourth dialogue.)

Compositor A was equally muddle-headed when it came to the next transfer, from H(o) to H(i):

H(o)	HT	9
	12	IV
H(i)	VIII	13
	11	IV

By this time, F(o) must have been distributed, and so he was not able to re-use VI for H4, and had to compose a new running-title, VIII, to fill in the blank left by the head-title for H3, which begins the Sixth Dialogue. In fact, he only transfers one title in the skeleton, IV, which is moved from H1 to H2. H1^V falls in the Fifth Dialogue, and H3^V in the Sixth: he should, therefore, have transferred (12) ('The fift dialogue') from H2^V to H1^V. Instead, he made up a new title, (11), which is inappropriate here, since it reads 'The sixt dialogue' instead of 'fifth'. He then had to make another new title for H3^V, this time correctly, 'The sixt dialogue'. So in the course of two transfers of his skeleton forme, compositor A made three mistakes: two in the dialogue number, and one in the foliation number.

According to Bond's theory of casting off copy, variations in the number of lines on a page, when they depart from the norm laid down by the printer for the book, may give an important clue as to the order of the formes through the press. When prose copy is cast off, irregularities are most certain to occur: in the outer forme if the inner forme is cast off and imposed first, or in the inner forme if the outer is done first. As Bond says:

Casting off is a difficult task; a prose manuscript, especially if written in a crabbed hand or heavily corrected and interlined, would be hard to cast off accurately. (William H. Bond, 'Casting off Copy by Elizabethan Printers: A Theory' Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America 42 (1948), 281-91 (p.285))

If Bond's theory is applied to Q1a, we find that there is a norm of 30 lines of prose to the page, and 34 lines of verse which is set in smaller type. (The verse pages are regular, as one would expect, because verse is easy to cast off.) Discounting the preliminaries (gatherings ¶ and A), and pages which are not full pages of text (e.g. beginnings and endings of dialogues, mixtures of verse and prose, etc.) there are 66 full pages of text, of which 11 are irregular. There are 7 abnormal gatherings out of the 11 1/2 gatherings which comprise the text: 3 in the outer forme, 3 in the inner forme, and one in both outer and inner:

gathering	abnormal pages	no. of lines (norm 30)	(i) or (o)	no. of full pages
1. C	C2 ^v	31	(o)	2
2. D	D3	28	(o)	7
3. E	E1 ^v	31	(i)	6
	E2 ^v	31	(o)	
	E3	32	(o)	
4. F	F1 ^v	31	(i)	6
5. G	G3 ^v	28	(i)	8
	G4	27	(i)	
6. H	H4	26	(i)	6
7. L	L2 ^v	31	(o)	4
	L3	32	(o)	

According to Bond's theory, then, the formes imposed first were: C(i), D(i), F(o), G(o), H(o), and L(i); gathering E is inconclusive, but probably E(i).

The running-titles of forme H certainly bear out Bond's theory, since, as discussed above, it is incontrovertible from the transfer of the heading of F1-H1 that H(o) was imposed before H(i), so that the irregularity

in the number of lines occurs in the inner forme. Assuming, then, that Bond's theory holds for Q1a, and that F(o) was imposed first by compositor A, who then went on to H(o) and then H(i), compositor B started with F(i), after A had cast off the copy for F(o). We know that G(o) was imposed before G(i), since G(i) has two irregular pages, and compositor B's skeleton forme seems to have been transferred as follows:

F(i)	VII 6	8(HT) V
G(o)	VII 10	8 Va
G(i)	VIIa 10	8 V

Compositor B seems to have been a more efficient workman: he used a portion of the head-title of 'The fifth dialogue' on F3^V for the running-title on G(o) (G4^V) and G(i) (G3^V). From G(i) compositor B next seems to have moved his skeleton to gathering I, probably I(i):

G(i)	VIIa 10	8 V
I(i)	VIIa 14	HT Vb
I(o)	VIIa 14	15 V

From this point, the rectos in the skeleton forme were split: VII was transferred, as one would expect, to K; but V and Vb were transferred to M. (It may be that V and Vb are two different running-titles, rather than variant states of the same one, for it seems very odd that the two states should recur again in M - rather too

much of a coincidence.)

		I(o)	VIIa	15	
			14	V	
K(i)	VIIb	15		M(i)	X 20
	16	IX			19 V
K(o)	VIIb	15		M(o)	X 20
	16a	IX			19 Vb

It looks as if compositor A, for some reason, took V/Vb from B's skeleton forme, and used it to set up his next assigned portion of the text, gathering M. Perhaps he had helped B to set gathering K, and felt that he was entitled to a portion of his skeleton in return. But why did he not take both recto running-titles?³⁵

35. A similar 'curious mixture of titles from...two different sets' is noted by Bowers in 'The Printing of Hamlet, Q2', p.42; and pp.47-49. Bowers thinks it an 'odd matter...that he [compositor X] used a quarter from his fellow compositor's forme, which is highly unusual in two-press printing' (p.48).

Whatever happened, B was forced to set up a new recto running-title, IX, which he then used in conjunction with VIIb through gatherings K and L. One mistake was made: in transferring the skeleton from K(o) to L(i), K4^V, 'The seuenth dialogue' (15) went to L3^V, which should have a title for the Eighth Dialogue, not the Seventh.

Meanwhile, compositor A used the skeleton of M(i) for half-sheet N:

M(i)	X 20		
	19 V		
N(o)	V	N(i)	19
	20a		X

Compositorial Analysis

In the above discussion of running-titles, it has been assumed, perhaps rashly, that two different compositors may be distinguished on the evidence of the skeleton formes alone (i.e., in F-N). But bibliographers have discovered examples of two compositors working on the same forme.³⁶

-
36. For example, John Russell Brown, 'The Compositors of Hamlet Q2 and The Merchant of Venice', Studies in Bibliography, 7 (1955), 17-40, esp. p.19; Fredson Bowers, 'The Printing of Hamlet, Q2', pp.45-46.
-

An attempt to discover the compositors by spelling-tests has been disappointingly negative, in that no clear-cut results have been achieved. This seems to be usually the case with prose texts,³⁷ and the bulk of The Art of Flattery

-
37. Norman Sanders comments on this in his Introduction to Greenes Farewell to Folly, in 'An Edition of Greenes Farewell to Folly and Alphonsus, King of Aragon' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham 1957), p.xxvi.
-

is in prose. There is, however, a peculiarity in the punctuation of proper nouns which seems to distinguish two compositors. One compositor habitually never italicizes proper nouns - or rather, one should say, romanizes, since roman type rather than italic is used in this black letter text. The other tends to romanize names which look as if they are Latin, and place names, but to leave English names in black letter. For example, on H1^v, he puts 'Christ' and 'Saint Paules' in black letter, but 'Plutos' in roman type; on H4^v, 'Dickon' is in black

letter, but 'Ianus', 'Magus', and 'Iudas' in roman; on F4^v, 'Gods', 'syr Iohn', 'Christe', 'Ierusalem', 'sir Simon' etc. are in black letter, but 'Protheus' in roman. Strictly speaking, 'Ierusalem' should be in roman type, since other place names, like 'Rome' (I2^v), 'Tesremos' (G2^v), 'Dropmall' (G3^v), and 'Slew' (G2^v, G3, G4) are in roman type; so is 'Erasmus of Roterodame' (I1^v).³⁸

38. This peculiarity of absence of italicization of proper nouns is not found in any other books printed by Hoskins, of which only four others survive. The one nearest in date, Fulwell's Flower of Fame (1575), has many inconsistencies in punctuation of proper nouns, but no absence of such punctuation: e.g. sometimes 'Henry' (for Henry VIII) is in black letter, and sometimes in roman type; place names show a similar inconsistency: e.g. on C2^v one finds the following: Henrie, Phillips, Macedon, God, Messias, Iesus Christ, Ierusalem, Henry, Englande, Maximilian, Frauncis, Germanie, Selimus...of Turkie, etc; yet on the following page, C3, 'Englande' is in black letter.
-

Whatever minor inconsistencies there may be in this schēma, there is a very striking division of the book into two halves by the punctuation of proper names. It falls into the same division that has already been noted in discussing the running-titles: i.e. gatherings B-E have complete absence of romanized proper nouns, with the single exception of 'Simon Magus' on E3^v. (Yet on E3^v, 'Christe', 'saint Peter', 'Rome' and 'Nero' are in black letter: one would expect the two latter to be in roman.) Preliminary gathering ¶, and the bulk of gatherings F to N, show scatterings of romanized proper nouns only, since only classical-looking names, and some place names, are

romanized. Hence the pages which have only English names, or Biblical ones, register neutrally in this compositorial test. Out of a total of 102 pages of text, only about 38 can be 'identified' by this method, but all the 'romanized' proper nouns fall in F-N, or ¶, with the single exception of E3^v.

One very clear example of this compositorial division in the section F-N occurs in gathering L, where both types of compositorial habit are illustrated. L1-L2^v are neutral, but L3 and L4^v have romanized names, while L3^v and L4 do not:

sig. black letter

roman type

L3

Sir Morpheus
Iupiter
Mars
Ioue
Lady Venus
Vulcan

L3^v

Iupiter
Vulcan
Appollo
Ioue
sir Cupid
Mercurius
Englishe, Spanish,
French, Dutche,
Romaine, Moscouian
Babylonian (etc.)

L4

U.F.
Mercurie
Ioue
Bayard

L4^v

Iupiter

This suggests that the B-E compositor, a stolid non-romanizer, helped out the F-N compositor(s), at least on this forme, L(i). One consequence was that he made a

mistake in transferring the skeleton from K, re-using running-title 15a, 'The seuenth dialogue' on L3^v, which belongs to the Eighth Dialogue.

The non-romanizing compositor also seems to have reset gatherings B and G in Q1b, although a comparison of the variants in Q1a and Q1b shows marked differences in spelling habits; and he also seems to have set half-sheet A, as well, for Q1b. In G2^v and G3, he followed his exemplar, i.e. Q1a, in romanizing 'Tesremos' and 'slew', but by G3^v he had reverted to his non-romanizing habits: 'Dropmall' (G3^v) and 'Slew' are in black letter, whereas in Q1a they are in roman.

Evidence from the Printer's Measure

Examination of the printer's measure confirms the evidence from the running-titles that the book was divided up into two main sections:

Q1a:	<u>RT</u>	<u>Printer's Measure</u>
	B-E, italic	85-6 mm.
	F-N, roman	83-4
	¶ (prelim.)	82-3
A	"	84

Bowers, in his article 'Bibliographical Evidence from the Printer's Measure' (Studies in Bibliography, 2 (1949-50), 153-67, (p.156)), suggests that such a division is indicative of simultaneous two-section printing.

The normal expectation would be for half-sheet A to have been machined with half-sheet N, and the evidence

of the printer's measure seems to confirm this. Neither A nor N in Q1a contains a watermark, so unfortunately this hypothesis cannot be clinched by evidence from the paper. However, evidence from spelling may also confirm that the same compositor set A and N: the running-titles of N1^V and N2^V read 'The eight dialogue', and this peculiarity of 'eight' for 'eighth' is also found in the head-title of A1^V: 'into whose company the eight hath intruded her selfe.' (In Q1b, the variant reading is 'eighth' here.)

The printer's measure in the variant gatherings in Q1b, A, B and G, is also revealing:

Q1b:	<u>RT</u>	<u>Printer's Measure</u>
	B roman	86 (87 B1 ^V)
	G "	82-3 (85, G1)
	A —	81-3

It can be seen that the compositor used a composing stick of the same measure as Q1a in gathering B. On G1 he continued on more or less the same measure (85 mm.): then he seems to have realized as he set G1 that F-N in Q1a was on a different measure of 83-4, and he narrowed his stick as he went down the page. G1 measures 85 mm. at the top and 80 at the bottom! This rather haphazard course continues in the rest of the gathering:

G1 ^V	82
G2	82/80
G2 ^V	82
G3	83/82
G3 ^V	80/83
G4	79/80
G4 ^V	81/82

That gathering A should have a printer's measure of 81-3 suggests that it was set up after G.

Another thing that the running-titles and printer's measure of Q1b indicate is that the resetting of the variant gatherings in Q1b was not done directly after or during the printing of Q1a, but that enough time must have elapsed for the skeleton formes to have been distributed.³⁹

39. Bowers remarks in his article on 'Bibliographical Evidence from the printer's measure', p.157:

In general, one is likely to conjecture that any interruption of the printing sufficient to cause a single compositor to adjust his stick again after working on some other book would most likely have been sufficient to cause the skeleton-formes to be broken up.

Perhaps the changes were made after Fulwell's appearance before the Court of High Commission in 1576.

The disturbed running-titles of Q1a, F-N, also suggest that there may have been second thoughts or alterations to copy going on while the book was going through the press. It seems significant that gathering H was set after F(o), skipping over the highly satirical gathering G, which was later to be reset for Q1b. This may indicate that Q1a is not the first state, but only the earliest one to survive.

6. Q2: 1579

STC lists three editions of the Art of Flattery:
11471 printed by W. Hoskins in 1576; 11471a printed by

R. Jones, 1579; and 11472 with the entry '[Anr.ed.]
Newly corrected. 4^o R. Jones, [1580?].'⁴⁰ This is

40. A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640 (London, 1926; rptd. 1963), p.252.

misleading, for the phrase 'Newly corrected and augmented' appears on the title-pages of both 11471a and 11472, whereas the entry in STC implies that only 11472 claims to be 'newly corrected'. The revised STC (according to information supplied by Katherine F. Pantzer at Harvard) will correct the entry under 11472 to read '[A variant, without date.]' The only difference between 11471a and 11472 (apart from a few press corrections) is the title-page, which has been reset in 11472: the wording is identical, but some of the typography and lining has been changed; the last line in 11472 omits the date and has been moved over towards the right to centre it. (See plates 2 & 3.) The only other variants on the title-page are 'in pactis' (11471a), 'inpactis' (11472); and 'errand' (11471a), 'arrant' (11472). (Q1 also has 'arant'.) The wording of the title-pages of Q2 follows exactly that of Q1, apart from the imprint of course, except for the addition of the phrase 'Newly corrected and augmented.'

Q2, then, exists in two variant states: the first corresponds to STC 11471a, is dated 1579, and exists in four copies, (a) - (d). The second state corresponds to STC 11472, but is not 'another edition' as STC states: it consists of exactly the same sheets as 11471a but with a variant title-page, without date. This

survives in only one copy, (e). (The Bibliographical Descriptions pp.cxxxvii ff. give a listing of copies.) Unfortunately, an examination of the chain-lines and watermark of (e) yields no certainty as to whether the title-page is disjunct, and therefore likely to be the later state. Allan Stevenson's test for examining the chain-indentations of the paper, which has a 50-50 chance of demonstrating disjunction, is negative.⁴¹ There

41. Allan Stevenson, 'Chain-Indentations in Paper as Evidence', Studies in Bibliography, 6 (1954), 181-95.

is no watermark on the title-page, the watermark appearing in the two middle leaves in the gathering (A2-A3). The chain-lines of the sheet are askew: looking at them from the recto of A1, they slant upwards towards the right, being slanted in relation to the lines of type. The chain-line on A4 is parallel to the top of the line of type, which certainly suggests that A1 is disjunct from A4, and that therefore 11472 is likely to be the later variant. On the other hand, the chain-lines of A2 and A3 are also slanted. The fact that 11472 follows Q1's 'arant' instead of 'errand' of 11471a, however, suggests that it may be the earlier state, set up from Q1; but it is hardly conclusive per se. Luckily, it is not a matter of vital importance since the text itself is not affected. As Franklin B. Williams points out in 'Penny-Pinching Printers and Tampered Titles', 'cancellation of title-pages was common' in this period (Studies in Bibliography, 14 (1961),

209-211 (p.209)). He gives as reasons for this practice the desire to eliminate a misprint, or substitute a better piece of advertising; but gives no examples concerned with a change in dates.

In general, Q2 is badly printed mainly in a scrubby, small black letter type which is squashed up on the page, making it difficult to read. The printer, as was usual with reprints, sacrificed pleasantness of layout and easy readability to considerations of economy, especially in verse sections where two lines of verse are squashed into one.

Relationship between Q1 and Q2

As we have seen, the title-page of Q2 claims to be 'Newly corrected and augmented', and there is some truth in this claim. The most striking 'augmentation' is the addition of a new set of verses placed between the Seventh and Eighth Dialogues in which Fulwell records the reaction to the publication of The Art of Flattery. The heading is self-explanatory:

A short Dialogue, betweene the Authour and his booke, wherin is shewed sundry opinions that were vttered of the first Impression of this booke, which the Authour him selfe hearde in Paules Church yeard. and else where.

The order of the dialogue has been changed: the controversial Fifth Dialogue of Q1 between 'Syr Symon the person of polle Iobbam, and the Author', which specifically attacks the Archdeacon of Wells in Somerset, is moved to become the

eighth dialogue in Q2. It may have been intended to omit this dialogue and end with the newly composed verses, which are printed in large roman type, well spaced out, and which end on H4^V with a large capitalised 'FINIS.' The verses begin on H3^V, and look as though they were spread out in order to fill the remaining three pages of the gathering, and provide a typographically impressive ending to the volume. Then, for some reason, either Fulwell or the printer changed his mind, and decided to include the Fifth Dialogue after all, and added it on to the end. If the additional verses had been printed in smaller type and less spaced out, and perhaps the text of the preceding dialogue compressed into a smaller space, the compositor would probably have been able to finish the Eighth Dialogue on gathering I, instead of spilling over into another gathering of which he needed only one leaf: as it is, the text ends on K1^V in Q2.

In consequence of the Fifth Dialogue being moved to Eighth in Q2, the 6th-8th Dialogues are moved up one, i.e.:

5th Dialogue (Q1) becomes 8th (Q2)
 6th Dialogue (Q1) becomes 5th (Q2)
 7th Dialogue (Q1) becomes 6th (Q2)
 8th Dialogue (Q1) becomes 7th (Q2).

In this edition, the dialogues are given in their original, Q1, sequence, and the verses between the Author and his Book placed at the end, as seems, from the evidence

presented above, to have been the original intention in Q2. The verses seem to have been designed to 'round off' the book in a satisfactory manner, not without panache as Fulwell cocks a snook at his detractors -

Goe tell them all, that I despise,
The scoffes that taunting tongues do frame -

while at the same time paying his respects to his 'right noble patronesse' and 'the troupe of learned trayne' who are presumably more discerning. The final verse is particularly suited to the 'finis' of a book, as Fulwell bids it farewell and says that henceforth it must stand on its own merits: 'I send thee forth to walke alone.'

In general, the substantive variants in Q2 are introduced in order to tone down the pointedness of the satire, although, surprisingly in view of Fulwell's appearance before the Court of High Commission, there are practically no cuts or omissions. A full collation of substantive variants is given in the footnotes to the text, but perhaps it would be appropriate to comment on the more striking ones.

1. p.5.8-9: In Q1 Fulwell states that flattery is a trade and an occupation. He deletes this idea in Q2, and replaces it with a challenge to 'the fine sorte of writers' to attack flattery instead of writing about 'Venus Pageants'. He turns away from the accusation that many people in Elizabethan England are earning a living by flattery, which is actually the thesis of the dialogues, to a vaguer moral

appeal to English writers to tackle serious rather than frivolous subjects. The attention is shifted from the moral abuses of the day to the subject-matter of contemporary literature.

2. p.10.4-5: The phrase 'men of countenance' is deleted in Q2; Fulwell seems to be afraid of offending those in authority. He hints that his 'second part', a forthcoming sequel to Part I, is going to contain a more detailed and far-ranging condemnation of society: 'certes if I should particulerlie descend from men of countenance, by degrees, euen vnto the very begger....' (Q1). Q2 leaves out the upper classes and concentrates on the beggar: a pretty safe target to attack.

3. p.10.8: In Q2, Fulwell is afraid of being misinterpreted, and appeals to the reader 'not to wreste my woordes vnto a worse sence, then my playne meaninge hath pretended'. When reading the First and Second Dialogues, it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that Dame Fortune is Elizabeth and her court the Elizabethan court; in Q2 Fulwell is at pains to give the satire a more allegorical interpretation: Fortune is Mammon, 'and her stately pallace, is the wide worlde...'.

4. p.30.13-17: A passage with a very oblique reference to the court has been deleted, presumably because the phrase, 'my threedebare garments had ben conuerted to courtly apparaile', might give offence in high places.

5. p.96.7-10: Fulwell's threat that 'the plague of God

is imminent ouer the place of their [the flatterers']
abode' is deleted in Q2.

6. p.128.3-6: the judgement that those who flatter
princes deserve to be exiled is omitted in Q2.

7. p.129.9-12: the reference to Cornelius Agrippa's
'displaynge of courtiers in his booke de vanitate
scienciarum' is omitted in Q2.

Apart from these additions and deletions, which are
in the main concerned with reducing possible offence to
the court, there are two other classes of alterations in
Q2:

i. References to personalities and places are obscured:
thus 'Iane Gibbes' becomes 'I.G.' (p.43.21); 'Tesremos'
(i.e. Somerset spelt backwards) is changed to 'M.', and
'Slew' (Wells spelt backwards) to 'N.'. This process
had already begun in Q1b where 'Naunton' was changed to
'N.' in Dialogue 1.

ii. Latin quotations are translated, or sometimes the
Latin is left out and only the English equivalent given
in Q2: e.g., pp.16.11-13; 33.4-5; 45.6-11, 13-18;
87.19-20.

There are also a few corrections of misprints:
e.g. 'stile' for 'stild' (p.1.3); 'mouth' for 'mouh'
(p.34.19); 'winde' for 'wine' (p.110.8), etc.; although
some misprints are also introduced Q2 (e.g. 'sinisters
practis' for 'sinister practises' (p.9.17); 'surged band'
for 'sugred bane' (p.102.9); 'How shifte some men' for

'How swift are some men' (p.10.1).

There is evidence of what Honigmann (The Stability of Shakespeare's Text, p.2) calls authorial 'second thoughts' in Q2 in which some stylistic improvement is attempted. In the Second Dialogue, for example, the repetition of the word 'force' is avoided in Q2:

And for my part I force thee not,
 Thy Frownes I can sustayne,
 For yf thou force my spedye fall,
 I fall but in the playne.
 (Q1 text; p.37.5-8; my italics)

Q2 substitutes for the third line of the stanza,

For if thou cause my speedy fall.

Another example of a revision to avoid repetition occurs in Dialogue 6, where Dickon is 'displaying the conditions' of Pierce Pickthank. He gives a catalogue of his vices, which reads, in Q1:

And to begin withal, thou art an egregious
 flatterer, a deepe dissembler, a singular
 good Bawd, a playn counterfayt, a priuie
pykthank, an archerakehell, a natural varlet,
 a knaue incarnate, and to conclude, a passing
pikethanke.... (Q1, H4-H4^v; p.91.14-18; my italics)

The repetition of 'a priuie pykthank,...a passing pikethanke' robs the sentence of its vituperative climax, and the weak repetition is eliminated in Q2.

Another stylistic improvement is Q2's 'new newes and true newes' for Q1's weaker 'new & trew newes' (p.120.21-22).

(Perhaps another attempt may have been the alteration of Q1 'which was the thing for the which I wished, and fisshed' (p.63.4-5) to Q2's 'for the which I fished', eliminating the rather unpleasant rhyming of 'wished,

and fisshed'; but this is hypothetical, for the clumsy 'which was the thing for the which' remains, and so the text has not been altered here.)

There are also changes which might come under Honigmann's classification of 'indifferent' variants, which may be the author 'tinkering' with the text, or may be merely compositorial changes. An example would be p.121.8: 'he led me by the hand into a pleasant paradise' (Q1 text); 'he led me vp by the hand...' (Q2; my italics). Or, p.139.1, 'reputed for a maister' (Q1; my italics), 'reputed a Maister' (Q2). A puzzling alteration of the text is the omission of the three similes 'lyke Ianus,...like Magus,...like Iudas' (p.91.19-20) in Q2. Here it seems that there is no attempt at stylistic improvement, but an attempt on the part of an ignorant compositor or corrector of the press to suppress names - not realizing that the similes refer to mythological or Biblical persons rather than contemporary ones like Fulwell, Hoskins or Jane Gibbes.

Also noticeable when examining the text of Q2 is the addition of many new sidenotes which are presumably by Fulwell. Many of them give an unmistakable punch to the text: 'A warme seruise I warrant you' (p.132); 'The Diuell sendeth such counsaylors' (p.133); 'Some men call this, holy water of the Court' (p.108). They often breathe a kind of naive indignation which is one of Fulwell's most endearing qualities, or contain bits of

encapsulated worldly wisdom: 'Some women loue to bee counted yonge' (p.90), or, more seriously, 'Man can not bleare the eyes of God' (p.85).

Q2, then, lives up to the boast of its title-page: it is both newly corrected and augmented, and there seems little doubt that most of the revisions were carried out by Fulwell himself. Every variant in Q2 must therefore be scrutinized with the greatest attention. However, the author's intentions must also be taken into account. How far are the changes in Q2 due to Fulwell's fear of further censorship or prosecution? He had already been obliged to recant and publicly apologize to the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Under these circumstances, it is surprising that a second edition of the book came out at all, and it is highly significant that the alterations made in Q2 are designed not to irritate the court, rather than to mollify the ecclesiastical authorities against whom the most pungent part of the satire is directed. Fulwell seems to be relying on his friends at court, especially probably the Burghleys, to whom two of his books are dedicated, to protect him against the ecclesiastical establishment.

CONCLUSION:

The copy-text of this edition is Q1a, which is the earliest form of the text to survive, and which contains Fulwell's satire in its least expurgated state. The

accidentals of Q1a are most likely to be closest to those of the author in spelling and punctuation. However, since Q1b and Q2 both show signs of having been altered by the author, and Q2 was almost certainly revised by Fulwell, the edition cannot be a straight reprint of Q1a. The added sidenotes of Q1b and Q2, and the 'augmentation' of the 'Dialogue betweene the Authour and his booke' must both be incorporated into the text. The order of the dialogues follows Q1 rather than Q2, for the reasons outlined above, and the additional verses in Q2 are printed at the end of the text as a fitting finale.