
THE HARVEY NASHE QUARREL

Neither the reasons behind the public quarrel in print between Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe, nor the frequent references to the 17th Earl of Oxford in the tracts related to the quarrel, have ever been satisfactorily explained, although a good general outline of the controversy is to be found in McKerrow's edition of the works of Nashe.

This paper advances a new hypothesis which provides an explanation of the quarrel, and of Oxford's role in it. A basic assumption of this new hypothesis is that Oxford used Robert Greene and Thomas Nashe as pen-names throughout the quarrel, but without Gabriel Harvey ever being aware of that fact.

The Harvey/Oxford quarrel (as it will be referred to throughout this paper) had its origins in the bitter factionalism at court in 1578/9 over the Queen's proposed marriage to the Duke of Alencon. The Earl of Leicester and his allies, including his nephew and at that time heir apparent Philip Sidney, opposed the marriage, while Leicester's enemy, the Earl of Sussex, and his allies, including Oxford, supported it.

In July 1578, Gabriel Harvey (to whom Oxford had given 'angels' while Harvey was a student at Cambridge, probably because of Harvey's kinship to Oxford's childhood tutor, Sir Thomas Smith) was briefly in Leicester's service. This is evident from Harvey's *Gratulationes Valdinenses*, written in connection with the Queen's visit to Audley End during her summer progress of July 1578, in which Harvey refers to Leicester as his 'lord', and otherwise indicates that he was in Leicester's employ at the time, and was even expecting to be sent on a foreign mission as one of Leicester's representatives.

Given Harvey's adherence to the Leicester faction, and the rivalry between Leicester and Sussex over the French marriage, it is not surprising to find that, under cover of extravagant praise, Harvey mocks and insults Oxford in *Gratulationes Valdinenses*, urging Oxford to abandon literature, and to throw away his 'bloodless pen' in order take up military pursuits at a time when England was at peace and when the Queen had refused Oxford any employment, either military or otherwise. One can only surmise that Harvey, having ungratefully forgotten Oxford's earlier generosity to him while he (Harvey) was a student, and having thrown his lot in with Leicester, thought to curry favour with Leicester by mocking and insulting Oxford. Oxford took no action at the time, but he undoubtedly filed Harvey's insult away for future reference.

The next provocative action against Oxford on Harvey's part occurred in 1580 when, in an attempt at self-promotion, Harvey publicized some of his private correspondence with the poet Edmund Spenser, including his (Harvey's) disquisition on the earthquake of April 6, 1580, in *Three Proper and Witty Familiar Letters*. The volume was prefaced by a dedicatory essay by an anonymous 'well-willer of the two authors'. Harvey always maintained that *Three Letters* had been published without his consent. However, in *Strange News*, Nashe/Oxford accused Harvey of being solely responsible for the publication of *Three Letters*, stating flatly that he recognized Harvey as the anonymous

'well-willer' by his writing style. Included in *Three Letters* were English hexameter verses entitled *Speculum Tuscanismi* in which Harvey mocked Oxford as an Italianate Englishman, although without expressly naming him. In *Three Letters* itself, these verses are termed by Harvey 'a bold satirical libel', and in his private letter-book, which is still extant, Harvey confirmed that the verses were aimed at Oxford, and directly linked them to his *Gratulationes Valdinenses* speech to Oxford in 1578. Leicester had long since 'shaken off' Harvey as an employee and follower, but it would seem that Harvey still thought of himself as a partisan in the Leicester camp. In *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets*, Harvey claimed that John Lyly had 'incensed' Oxford against Harvey over the *Speculum Tuscanismi* verses at the time of their publication, but that Oxford had merely shrugged the matter off. As will be seen, however, Harvey was mistaken in thinking that Oxford had ignored this additional insult from Harvey.

The publication of *Three Letters* had unexpected consequences for Harvey which landed him in serious trouble. In one of his letters to Spenser in *Three Letters*, Harvey had referred to Spenser's 'old controller', and had spewed out some vitriolic comments about this individual. The Controller of the Household, Sir James Croft, took this as a reference to himself, and the matter was discussed by the Privy Council, of which Croft was a member. According to Nashe/Oxford in *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, Harvey took sanctuary for eight weeks in Leicester's household, but eventually Sir James Croft dislodged him from this haven, and had him confined to the Fleet prison for a time, where (again according to Nashe/Oxford in *Have with you to Saffron Walden*), Harvey behaved himself in an almost deranged manner. Harvey finally managed to convince the Privy Council that by Spenser's 'old controller', he (Harvey) had meant to refer to his own personal long-time foe at Cambridge University, Dr. Andrew Perne. After this explanation, and after mediation by Leicester, Harvey was allowed to return to Cambridge, where (according to Nashe/Oxford) he again behaved himself bizarrely, acting as though in this disgrace he had accomplished something noteworthy.

Although Oxford, as mentioned earlier, took no direct public action after the publication of the *Speculum Tuscanismi* verses in 1580, he nonetheless did something indirectly. In the second part of *Mamillia* (1583), which he wrote under his pen-name of Robert Greene, he included some mocking verses against Harvey which are a parody of Harvey's *Speculum Tuscanismi* verses. In these verses, Harvey is referred to as an 'injurious gentleman' who is to be 'left to his folly'. There is no historical evidence that Gabriel Harvey saw these verses, but it seems reasonable to infer that they came to his attention, with the result that Harvey too now had an injury to store up for future reference, although, of course, Harvey would have considered this as a slight against him by Robert Greene, not by Oxford. We see here one of the primary causes of Harvey's later attack on Greene in *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets*, which helped to initiate the 1592 stage of the Harvey/Oxford quarrel.

After Oxford/Greene's parody of Harvey's verses in *Mamillia*, nothing further seems to have occurred until 1589, when all these old injuries flared up again with the publication of Robert Greene's *Menaphon* with a preface by a new writer, the young Thomas Nashe. This preface was one of the earliest works Oxford published under the pen-name Thomas

Nashe, and in it the young Nashe had the temerity to offer critical comment, mostly of a favourable nature, on a number of English writers. For once, Nashe/Oxford seems to have forgotten about literary decorum, and to have overlooked the fact that such critical comment might be seen as presumptuous coming from the fledgling young author which Nashe was supposed to be.

One of the writers mentioned in the preface to *Menaphon* was Gabriel Harvey, and it seems that the Harveys took umbrage because this fledgling young author, Thomas Nashe, had not accorded Gabriel Harvey sufficient praise. It is well known that Gabriel Harvey had an overweening ego, and even the most fulsome praise from Nashe/Oxford would likely not have satisfied him, but it must be admitted that in the preface to *Menaphon* the praise of Gabriel Harvey is distinctly low-key, and the Harveys no doubt felt insulted by this.

In 1589, the year in which *Menaphon* was published, the Marprelate controversy was also in full swing, and an anonymous anti-Marprelate tract was published in that year entitled *Pap with an Hatchet*. This anonymous tract is generally attributed to John Lyly, and Harvey clearly thought it was written by Lyly. *Pap with an Hatchet* helped to ignite the Harvey/Oxford quarrel by means of a pointed reference in it to Gabriel Harvey's *Three Letters* of 1580 (which contained Harvey's disquisition on the earthquake of April 6, 1580) and the troubles which befell Harvey after its publication. The anonymous author of *Pap with an Hatchet* wrote:

And one will we conjure up, that writing a familiar epistle about the natural causes of an earthquake, fell into the bowels of libelling, which made his ears quake for fear of clipping. (Bond, v.3, p.400)

The author of *Pap with an Hatchet* then went on to say that he had been waiting for ten years to 'lamback' Harvey. This seems a rather pointless ambition for John Lyly, but a perfectly understandable one for Oxford, who must indeed have been waiting ten years for an opportunity to avenge the insults which had been bestowed on him by Harvey in 1578 and 1580.

Harvey's response to *Pap with an Hatchet* seems to have been immediate. He wrote a very lengthy reply, the *Advertisement for Pap-hatchet and Martin Marprelate*, dated November 5, 1589. However, having written the *Advertisement*, Harvey did not publish it, for whatever reasons. He set it aside, and it was not printed until 1593 as part of his *Pierce's Supererogation*, which was published in the midst of the Harvey/Oxford quarrel. This fact, incidentally, contributes to the confusing nature of *Pierce's Supererogation*, because part of it was written in 1589 and part of it in 1593.

Thus, although Gabriel Harvey's reply to the taunt in *Pap with an Hatchet* was written immediately after the publication of *Pap*, it was not published until several years later. However, Gabriel Harvey's younger brother, Richard Harvey, rushed into print in 1589 with a book entitled *Plain Percival* in which he attacked Martin Marprelate, the anti-

Martinists, and the author of *Pap with an Hatchet*, whom he called 'the cook ruffian, that dressed a dish for Martin's diet'.

Richard Harvey then followed up *Plain Percival* with another intemperate and withering blast in his epistle to another book entitled *The Lamb of God*, entered in the Stationers' Register on October 23, 1589 and published in 1590. In the epistle, Richard Harvey attacked Martin Marprelate and John Lyly, and took Nashe severely to task for the preface to *Menaphon*. In the epistle, Richard Harvey says of Martin:

. . . a ridiculous mad fellow . . . Martin cannot be content to be vain, fantastical, and fond in his bald ridiculous vein, but he will needs be absurdly arrogant, notoriously seditious, and intolerably odious. . . . A busy fellow, a spiteful railer, an odious jester, a factious head, a contentious wit, a seditious commotioner, a most insolent libeller, in brief, one of the most pernicious and intolerable writers that ever I had read in our language. . . . I will not call him a steal-counter, or a water-drinker, but where he is best known, he was never thought but a scarecrow, or bull-beggar. He calleth others fools and asses, but he proveth himself . . . a notorious fool, and arrant knave. (McKerrow, v.5, pp.177, 179)

Of Nashe's comments on writers in the preface to *Menaphon*, Richard Harvey says, with heavy sarcasm:

. . . that the jolly man will needs be playing the doughty Martin in his kind, and limit every man's commendation according to his fancy, profound, no doubt, and exceeding learned, as the world now goeth in such worthy works. (McKerrow, v.5, p.180)

If Oxford was Marprelate and/or if Oxford was Nashe, one can imagine his blood boiling as he read this epistle to *The Lamb of God*.

Moreover, Oxford's blood would not have been boiling against Richard Harvey alone. The style of Richard Harvey's comments about Martin Marprelate very much resembles Gabriel Harvey's inimitable writing style, and Nashe/Oxford was convinced that Gabriel Harvey was an anonymous co-author of the epistle to *The Lamb of God* (1590). In *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, Nashe/Oxford claims that Gabriel Harvey and his brother Richard *together* wrote the epistle to *The Lamb of God*, although the book was published under Richard Harvey's name alone. Nashe/Oxford says:

. . . that Master Lyly never procured Greene or me to write against him, but it was his [i.e. Gabriel Harvey's] own first seeking and beginning in *The Lamb of God*, where he and his brother [Richard] (that loves dancing so well), scumbered out betwixt them an epistle to the readers against all poets and writers, & M. Lyly and me by name he beruffianized & berascalled, compared to Martin [Marprelate], & termed us piperly

make-plays and makebates, yet bade us hold our peace, & not be so hardy as to answer him, for if we did, he would make a bloody day in Paul's Churchyard, & splinter our pens till they straddled again as wide as a pair of compasses. Further be it known unto you, that before this I praised him (after a sort) in an epistle in Greene's *Menaphon*.
(McKerrow, v.3, p.130)

After all these insults and counter-insults, the Harvey/Oxford quarrel was ready to break out in full force. However, despite the provocation by the Harveys, Oxford did nothing for two years until the publication of Robert Greene's *Quip for an Upstart Courtier* in 1592, which contained the insult that pushed Gabriel Harvey over the edge.

Why did Oxford not respond in 1589/90? When one considers his situation at that time, it seems that discretion was the better part of valour. Oxford was probably going through the worst period of his entire life. His wife Anne had died in 1588, he was completely ruined financially, his children were being raised by others, and, if he was Martin Marprelate, he was in serious danger had his identity been discovered. He was writing feverishly under a variety of pen-names (mostly satire), perhaps partly as a way of getting through this difficult time. In any event, he lay low insofar as the Harveys were concerned until July, 1592.

In 1592, Greene/Oxford and Nashe/Oxford finally struck back directly at the Harveys.

The first blow (by Greene/Oxford) was a relatively mild one, but it hit Gabriel Harvey where it hurt, perhaps more so than Greene/Oxford could ever have calculated, because Gabriel Harvey was ashamed of his lowly origins as the son of a rope-maker, whereas Greene/Oxford and Nashe/Oxford thought that aspect of the matter of little importance.

In the midst of a tract which was otherwise entirely unconcerned with the Harveys, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, entered in the Stationers' Register on July 20, 1592, Greene/Oxford inserted the following passage:

The rope-maker replied that honestly journeying by the way he acquainted himself with the collier, & for no other cause pretended. And whither are you a-going, qd. I? Marry sir, qd. he, first to absolve your question, I dwell in Saffron Walden and am going to Cambridge to three sons that I keep there at school, such apt children, sir, as few women have groaned for, and yet they have ill luck. The one, sir, [Richard] is a divine to comfort my soul, & he indeed, though he be a vainglorious ass as divers youths of his age be, is well given to the show of the world and writ alate The Lamb of God, and yet his parishioners say he is the limb of the devil and kisseth their wives with holy kisses, but they had rather he should keep his lips for Madge, his mare. The second, sir, [John] is a physician or a fool, but indeed a physician, & had proved a proper man if he had not spoiled himself with his Astrological Discourse of the terrible conjunction of Saturn

and Jupiter. For the eldest, [Gabriel], he is a civilian, a wondrous-witted fellow, sir-reverence sir, he is a Doctor, and as Tubalcain was the first inventor of music, so he, God's benison light upon him, was the first that invented English hexameter, but see how in these days learning is little esteemed: for that and other familiar letters and proper treatises he was orderly clapped in the Fleet, but sir, a hawk and a kite may bring forth a kestrel, and honest parents may have bad children. Honest with the devil, qd. the collier, etc. (McKerrow, v.5, Supplement, pp.75-6)

The reference to Harvey's 'English hexameters' and to the matters in *Three Letters* which landed Gabriel Harvey in the Fleet is very pointed. *Three Letters* had obviously rankled with Greene/Oxford.

This passage in *Quip for an Upstart Courtier* threw Gabriel Harvey into a rage, and he journeyed to London at the end of August 1592 on matters of family business (see McKerrow, vol. 5, p.80), but also, according to his own testimony, with the intention of suing Greene (not knowing, of course, that Greene was a pen-name of Oxford's). Harvey's arrival in London for that avowed purpose must have posed a perplexing problem for Oxford. What to do? The pen-name would be exposed if Harvey launched a libel suit against Robert Greene, and that might be inconvenient since Oxford had of recent years moved from writing light prose romances under the Greene pen-name to writing social satire such as the cony-catching tracts. People would be shocked to learn that Greene was really the 17th Earl of Oxford. The solution? Quickly kill the pen-name off, and find another. Hence, *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592).

Groatsworth had the effect of putting a stop to Harvey's plan to sue Greene, whom he seems to have accepted as a real person who had inconveniently died just when he (Harvey) was on the verge of seeking revenge against him in the law courts. Greene's sudden death would thus have been the end of the matter had Harvey been the kind of person to know when to let well enough alone. But Harvey wasn't that kind. Instead of going quietly back to Cambridge, he attacked the 'dead' Greene in *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets* (1592). In order to discourage interest in Greene's death, *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* had portrayed the popular and prolific author as a reprobate whom no respectable person would want to have too much to do with, living or dead. But Harvey seems to have interpreted the self-denigration in *Groatsworth* as a licence for himself to attack the dead Greene in bitter terms.

Harvey's attack on Greene in *Four Letters* (1592) has caused a certain amount of confusion because it was published in two parts, first as a small 'butterfly' pamphlet in which Harvey attacked Greene and (for some unknown reason) bestowed compliments on Nashe. But in the interim, Nashe/Oxford published his popular tract *Pierce Penilesse*, in which he got in his long-delayed riposte to Richard Harvey for the epistle to *The Lamb of God*. In *Pierce Penilesse*, Nashe/Oxford attacked Richard Harvey in round terms.

Nashe/Oxford's *Pierce Penilesse* was entered in the Stationers' Register on August 8, 1592. The exact date of publication is not known, but McKerrow makes a good argument

for publication on September 8, five days after the death of "Robert Greene". (v.4, pp.77-8) *Pierce Penilesse* was thus probably published after Gabriel Harvey had written his first 'butterfly' pamphlet attacking Greene. Once Harvey got hold of a copy of *Pierce Penilesse*, his earlier praise of Nashe turned to fury against him, and in *Four Letters* (1592), enlarged from his earlier 'butterfly pamphlet', Harvey lashed out at both Greene and Nashe.

It's easy to see what it was in *Pierce Penilesse* that changed Gabriel Harvey's mind about Nashe. Nashe's railing attack on Richard Harvey in *Pierce Penilesse* is devastating. It is lengthy, but merits quotation in full:

On the contrary side, if I be evil entreated, or sent away with a flea in mine ear, let him look that I will rail on him soundly; not for an hour or a day, whiles the injury is fresh in my memory, but in some elaborate polished poem which I will leave to the world when I am dead, to be a living image to all ages of his beggarly parsimony and ignoble illiberality, and let him not (whatsoever he be) measure the weight of my words by this book, where I write *Quicquid in buccam venerit*, as fast as my hand can trot, but I have terms (if I be vexed) laid in steep in aquafortis & gunpowder, that shall rattle through the skies, and make an earthquake in a peasant's ears. Put case (since I am not yet out of the theme of wrath) that some tired jade belonging to the press [Richard Harvey], whom I never wronged in my life, hath named me expressly in print (as I will not do him), and accused me of want of learning, upbraiding me for reviving, in an epistle of mine [i.e., in Greene's *Menaphon*], the reverent memory of Sir Thomas More, Sir John Cheke, Doctor Watson, Doctor Haddon, Doctor Carr, Master Ascham, as if they were no meat but for his mastership's mouth, or none but some such as the son of a rope-maker were worthy to mention them. To show how I can rail, thus would I begin to rail on him. Thou that hadst thy hood turned over thy ears when thou wert a bachelor, for abusing of Aristotle, & setting him up on the school gates, painted with asses' ears on his head, is it any discredit for me, thou great baboon, thou Pygmy braggart, thou pamphleter of nothing but paeans, to be censured by thee, that hast scorned the prince of philosophers, thou, that in thy dialogues sold'st honey for a halfpenny, and the choicest writers extant for cues apiece, that camest to the logic schools when thou wert a freshman, and writ'st phrases? Off with thy gown, and untruss, for I mean to lash thee mightily. Thou hast a brother, hast thou not, student in almanacs? Go to, I'll stand to it, he fathered one of thy bastards (a book, I mean), which, being of thy begetting, was set forth under his name.

Gentlemen, I am sure you have heard of a ridiculous ass that many years since sold lies by the great, and wrote an absurd *Astrological Discourse* of the terrible conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter, wherein (as if he had lately cast the heavens' water, or been at the anatomizing of the sky's entrails in Surgeons' Hall) he prophesieth of such strange wonders to

ensue from stars' distemperature, and the unusual adultery of planets, as none but he that is bawd to those celestial bodies could ever descry. What expectation there was of it both in town and country, the amazement of those times may testify, and the rather because he pawned his credit upon it in these express terms: *If these things fall not out in every point as I have wrote, let me forever hereafter lose the credit of my astronomy.* Well, so it happened not to be a man of his word; his astronomy broke his day with his creditors, and Saturn and Jupiter proved honest men than all the world took them for, whereupon the poor prognosticator was ready to run himself through with his Jacob's staff, and cast himself headlong from the top of a globe (as a mountain) and break his neck. The whole university hissed at him, Tarleton at the Theatre made jests of him, and Elderton consumed his ale-crammed nose to nothing in bear-baiting him with whole bundles of ballads. Would you, in likely reason, guess it were possible for any shame-swollen toad to have the spet-proof face to outlive this disgrace? It is, dear brethren, *Viuit, imo viuit*, and, which is more, he is a vicar.

Poor slave, I pity thee, that thou hadst no more grace but to come in my way, Why, could not you have sat quietly at home, and writ catechisms, but you must be comparing me to Martin, and exclaim against me for reckoning up the high scholars of worthy memory? *Iupiter ingeniis praebebat sua numina vatam*, saith Ovid; *Seque celebrari quolibet ore sinit.* Which if it be so, I hope I am *Aliquis*, and those men, *quos honoris causa nominavi*, are not greater than gods. Methinks I see thee stand quivering and quaking, and even now lift up thy hands to heaven, as thanking God my choler is somewhat assuaged, but thou art deceived, for however I let fall my style a little, to talk in reason with thee that hast none, I do not mean to let thee scape so.

Thou hast wronged one for my sake (whom for the name I must love) T.N., the master butler of Pembroke Hall, a far better scholar than thyself (in my judgment) and one that showeth more discretion and government in setting up a size of bread than thou in all thy whole book. Why man, think no scorn of him, for he hath held thee up a hundred times whiles the dean hath given thee correction, and thou hast capped and kneed him (when thou wert hungry) for a chipping. But that's nothing, for hadst thou never been beholding to him, nor holden up by him, he hath a beard that is a better gentleman than all thy whole body, and a grave countenance, like Cato, able to make thee run out of thy wits for fear if he look sternly upon thee. I have read over thy sheepish discourse of *The Lamb of God and his Enemies*, and entreated my patience to be good to thee whilst I read, but for all that I could do with myself, (as I am sure I may do as much as another man) I could not refrain but bequeath it to the privy, leaf by leaf as I read it, it was so ugly, dorbellical and lumpish. Monstrous, monstrous and palpable, not to be spoken of in a Christian congregation; thou hast

scummed over the schoolmen, and of the froth of their folly made a dish of divinity brewis which the dogs will not eat. If the printer have any great dealings with thee, he were best to get a privilege betimes, *Ad imprimendum solum*, forbidding all other to sell waste-paper but himself, or else he will be in a woeful taking. The Lamb of God make thee a wiser bell-wether than thou art, for else I doubt thou wilt be driven to leave all, and fall to thy father's occupation, which is, to go and make a rope to hang thyself. *Neque enim lex aequior ulla est, quam necis artifices arte perire sua*, and so I leave thee till a better opportunity, to be tormented world without end of our poets and writers about London, whom thou hast called piperly make-plays and makebates, not doubting but he also whom thou termest the vain Pap-Hatchet will have a flirt at thee one day, all jointly driving thee to this issue, that thou shalt be constrained to go to the chief beam of thy benefice, and there beginning a lamentable speech with *cur scripsi, cur perii*, end with *paruum prava decent, iuuat inconcessa voluptas*, and so with a trice, truss up thy life in the string of thy sance bell. So be it, pray pen, ink and paper, on their knees, that they may not be troubled with thee any more.

Redeo ad vos, mei auditores, have I not an indifferent pretty vein in spur-galling an ass? If you knew how extemporal it were at this instant, and with what haste it is writ, you would say so. But I would not have you think that all this that is set down here is in good earnest, for then you go by St. Giles, the wrong way to Westminster, but only to show how, for a need, I could rail if I were throughly fired. (McKerrow, v.1, pp.195-9)

The rest of the quarrel is fairly well known. Nashe/Oxford replied to Harvey's *Four Letters in Strange News* (1592). Harvey then sued for peace, but after obtaining a magnanimous and generous epistle of apology and reconciliation from Nashe/Oxford in the first edition of *Christ's Tears Over Jerusalem*, Harvey immediately published two tracts against Nashe, *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593) and *A New Letter of Notable Contents* (1593), which treachery caused Nashe/Oxford to furiously retract his apology in the epistle to the second edition of *Christ's Tears* in 1594. Harvey also treacherously incensed the London authorities against Nashe, and according to a letter written by Sir George Carey to his wife on November 13, 1593, Nashe was for a short time imprisoned for a passage written 'against the Londoners' in *Christ's Tears*. There was then a hiatus for two years until, in 1596, Nashe/Oxford published *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, goaded, he claimed, by the fact that so many people were saying that he was unable to answer Harvey. In 1597, Nashe disappeared in the wake of the Isle of Dogs affair. Shortly thereafter, in 1597, Nashe/Oxford made amends to the Harveys with the publication of *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, which was entered on the Stationers' Register on October 11, 1597. (McKerrow, v.5, p.107) In this tract, Nashe is thoroughly taken to task as a libeller without any overt mention of Gabriel Harvey, and the public score between Harvey and Nashe was thus settled, with both having taken a final lambasting, and neither having emerged as victor.

Nashe's final publication, *Nashe's Lenten Stuff*, was published in early 1599. That Thomas Nashe could have published a book while the Elizabethan authorities were on the look-out for him, particularly when all books were censored by the ecclesiastical and governmental authorities prior to printing, seems impossible unless Nashe was, indeed, a pen-name for Oxford. *Nashe's Lenten Stuff* generally reveals a reformed Nashe, unremittingly positive in his praise of Yarmouth and of one of the staples of England's economy, the red herring, although here and there traces of the satirist break through.

On June 1, 1599, the quarrel came to an end with an official ban by Archbishop Whitgift and Richard Bancroft on the printing of any further books by Harvey and Nashe:

That all Nashe's books and Doctor Harvey's books be taken wheresoever they may be found and that none of their books be ever printed hereafter.
(McKerrow, v.5, p.110)

The reason for the ban is obscure, but a passage in *Have with you to Saffron Walden* (1596) suggests that the impetus for the ban might have come from Nashe himself.

Deceive not thyself with the bad sale of [Harvey's] books, for though in no man's hands, yet in his own desk they may be found after his death, whereby, while printing lasts, thy disgrace may last, & the printer (whose copy it is) may leave thy infamy in legacy to his heirs, and his heirs to their next heirs successively to the thirteenth and fourteenth generation, *Cum priuilegio*, forbidding all other to print those lewd lying records of thy scandal and contumely but the lineal offspring of their race *in sempiternum*.

Nashe's point is that Harvey's *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593) and *New Letter of Notable Contents* (1593) would survive in print long after he and Harvey were dead, and succeeding generations would have only Harvey's side of things unless Nashe answered him. It is evident from this passage that the question of what future generations would think of the quarrel was very much on Nashe's mind in 1596, and if it really was Oxford who wrote under the name 'Thomas Nashe', perhaps Oxford himself had the ban imposed so that no trace of either his or Harvey's 'scandal and contumely' would remain to succeeding generations. In other words, the ban may not have been imposed solely because the ecclesiastical authorities disapproved of the books. They probably did disapprove of them, but at the same time they couldn't have disapproved to any significant degree because they had licensed them to be printed in the first place. The ban may thus have been imposed at least partly in order to protect Nashe and Harvey's reputations from the scandal of having their bitter feud known to future generations.

Despite the ban, Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* was published in 1600. In the third Parnassus play, *The Return to Parnassus*, there is an epitaph to Nashe which suggests that he was dead by December 1601, although in another part of the same play he is spoken of as though he were still alive. Gabriel Harvey lived on in relative obscurity to a ripe old age, but without ever publishing anything more.

Works Cited

Bond, R. Warwick. *The complete works of John Lyly*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Carey, Sir George. Letter of November 13, 1593. See Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Christ's Teares, Nashe's 'forsaken extremities'". *Review of English Studies*, New Series, Vol. 49, No. 194 (1998), pp.167-80.

Jameson, Thomas Hugh. *The Gratulationes Valdinenses of Gabriel Harvey*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Yale University, 1938.

McKerrow, Ronald B. *The works of Thomas Nashe*. 5 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Stern, Virginia F. *Gabriel Harvey: His life, marginalia and library*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.