“Verie Devout Asses”: The Stupid Puritan Clown*

ROBERT
HORNBACK

Si les puritains de la Renaissance se considéraient comme érudits et rationnels, les auteurs qui leurs étaient contemporains étaient loin de les représenter ainsi. Leur portrait était plutôt marqué par une stupide irrationalité. Apparues en réponse à divers scandales, ces images, incluant le clown satiriste « Martin Marprelate », le fou illettré William Hacket, ainsi que la controverse au sujet de la « méthode » simplifiée du héros intellectuel puritain Peter Ramus, remplissaient plusieurs fonctions. Pendant que les puritains se réclamaient de la supériorité de la divine inspiration sur la tradition intellectuelle et que ce discours émaillait l'enthousiasme religieux de la Contre-Renaissance dirigé contre la raison humaniste, leur stéréotype clownesque illustrait les modes établis de ministère, d'interprétations, d'éducation classique, de rhétorique et de logique en réponse aux attaques fanatiques. Cette polémique était si familière qu'elle a inspiré l'université tout comme la scène publique et jusqu'au clown shakespeareen Will Kemp.

In his classic essay, “The Place of Laughter in Tudor and Stuart England,” Renaissance historian Keith Thomas observed that laughter can be a revealing guide to “past tensions and anxieties” and to “areas of structural ambiguity” in a society.¹ Sociologists have likewise demonstrated that because ambiguity produces anxiety, humour can function to “clarify boundaries” in order to “reduce ambiguity” or at least “make [it] appear less threatening.”² A frequent tactic in joking for resolving the perceived threat of an ambiguous other, then, is to stereotype the butts of jokes “as identities who are significantly ... incompetent, and whose ineptness distinguishes them from us, reinforcing our own identity.”³ Not altogether surprisingly, just such put-down humour and stereotyping were means of defining occasionally ambiguous doctrinal and ideological boundaries in post-Reformation England, when discrediting opposing religious views was often achieved by associating one’s opponents with laughable ignorance. Thus, in the late 1590s a yeoman from

Yorkshire reviled his parish parson by proclaiming, "Parson thou art an ass ... I never saw such an ass as thou art," just as a man in Buckinghamshire in the 1630s mocked a parson in his village as "tinkerly," that is, low class and unrefined.⁴ Most famously, many Renaissance "puritans,"⁵ presenting their own doctrine as rational religion, insisted on associating Catholicism with ignorant, crudely magical superstition. Mocking the ritual of gospel reading during Rogation, for instance, radical Elizabethan reformer Henry Barrow called it "charming the fields,"⁶ while in *Michael Wodde's Dialogue* (1554), one character jested: "As for your Latine Gospels read to the corne, I am sure the corne understandeth as much as you, and therefore hath as much profit by them as ye have, that is to sai, none at al."⁷ Increasingly, as they pushed for further, more extreme reformation, puritans promoted a learned self-image in opposition even to fellow English Protestants through an avowed insistence upon a learned (but ultimately above all) *preaching* ministry. They consequently decried the supposed ignorance of "bare reading" or "dumb" (i.e., non-preaching)⁸ ministers and arrogantly derided their moderate opponents as "ignorant and atheistical dolts."⁹

Though Renaissance puritan stage clowns are hardly altogether unknown,¹⁰ what is less familiar, to literary scholars at least, and what I hope to demonstrate here, is that mainstream English Protestants, ostensibly employing what Grace Tiffany characterizes as an "'I'm rubber, you're glue' style of argument,"¹¹ responded in turn by mocking so-called puritans as "godly coxcomb[s],"¹² labeling them "silly, ignorant and downe-righte English puritans"¹³ and "lewd [i.e., ignorant] brethren that seem and would be thought to have authority, and have none."¹⁴ Oliver Ormerud, for instance, could write in *The Picture of a Puritaine* (1605), "they are full of pride, thinking themselves ... to have knowledge when they are ignorant" (sig. C1 r–C2 v). Worse still, the bishops claimed, puritans planned to displace "wise, learned and discreet men, and commit the whole government of the Church to master pastor and his ignorant neighbors."¹⁵ In short, in the Renaissance, stereotypical puritan ignorance—like censoriousness and hypocrisy—became so familiar that Robert Bolton could complain that being termed "puritans" effectively "deprived [those so named] *ipso facto* ... of learning and good religion."¹⁶

Similar accusations appear frequently in Renaissance English drama. In the anonymous play, *The Puritan* (1606), for example, puritans are "proud Cocks-combes" (sig. B3 r) and "pure-starch'd foole[s]" (sig. C1 v), just as in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) they are not merely hypocritically gluttonous but are characterized by their "arrogant and invincible dullness" (1.4.142) as "a herd of ... proud ignorants" (5.2.39). Most expansively, in the Cambridge play *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (c.1597),¹⁷ where charac-

ters mock the puritan “stricte Stupido” for his stupidity, speaking “Of stricte Stupido that puling puritane,/ A moving piece of clay, a speaking ass,/ A walking image and a senseless stone” (ll.410–12) and “that plodding puritane.../ ... that earthcreeping dolt,/ Who, for he cannot reach unto the artes,/ Makes showe as though he would neglect the artes” (ll.417–20); there is no real enactment of the puritan’s familiar “stricte” severity. Such a characterization reveals the degree to which stupidity had become a stereotypically puritan trait. Yet, even granting the typical dynamics of put-down humour or the familiar “I’m rubber, you’re glue” argument outlined above, how did stupidity *alone* come to be sufficient to characterize a recognizable stage puritan—in light of the puritans’ presentation of themselves as the learned party? Why was it that, by contrast, “contemporary critics ... accuse[d] puritans of ignorance and a desire to destroy England’s educational institutions”?¹⁸ To answer such questions we may begin by examining specific clues provided by Stupido himself.

I

One notable feature of Stupido’s idiocy is its explicit association with the clownish persona of the pseudonymous “Martin Marprelate,” the subversive puritan gadfly who skewered Church authorities in the scandalously humorous Marprelate Tracts (1588–1589). “[S]ell all these books, and b[u]y a good *Martin*,” Stupido arrogantly counsels, “and twoo or three hundreth of chatechismes of Jeneva’s printe, and I warrant you will have learning enoughe. *Mr. Martin* and other good men tooke this course” (ll. 352–56). On the one hand, Stupido’s remark reflects the puritans’ pride in their promotion of Bible reading, while, on the other, it points to the limitations on learning that an emphasis on reading only particular editions of the Bible and very few interpretations implies. More importantly, the *Parnassus* author points to Marprelate as an exemplar justifying ignorance since Stupido proposes following Mr. Martin’s “course.”

And indeed the clowning Martin was a target, and source, of anti-puritan stereotyping. In 1589, in response to the Marprelate Tracts, the bishops commissioned and engaged in a wide-spread propaganda campaign against puritanism, and both sides of the controversy refer to the involvement of the stage in the Marprelate “war.” Playwrights were so prolific in penning comedies at Martin’s expense that the author of *Pappe with an Hatchet* (1589; attributed to John Lyly) could refer to him as virtually a “stage plaier” himself;¹⁹ indeed, the author of *Martins Months Minde* claimed that “everie stage Plaier made a jest of him” so that Martin “took it very grievously, to be made

a May game upon the stage,”²⁰ and “Martin Junior” complained bitterly that the stage players, “in the action of dealing against Maister Martin, haue gotten them many thousande eie witnesses, of their wittlesse ... conceites.”²¹ Stage attacks suggesting Martin’s own witlessness had evidently rankled the puritans.

If the notoriety of Martinist satire (Christopher Hill calls the episode “the biggest scandal of Elizabeth I’s reign”)²² might seem to point to its effectiveness, it clearly provoked a backlash of anti-puritan stereotyping. In their propaganda, the Martinists assumed a low-class, ignorant stereotype, for, as contemporaries recognized, they had resurrected and appropriated the popular persona and idiom of the lower class rustic, mechanical, or artisan stage clown employed by Dick Tarlton, the most famous comic actor of his day, “who died in early September 1588, a matter of weeks before the first tract appeared.”²³ Martin himself invoked the recent example of Tarlton in claiming: “I thinke Simonie be the bishops lacky. Tarleton tooke him not long since in Don John of Londons cellor.”²⁴ Because of Tarlton’s own apparent satire against corrupt bishops, Martin felt enough of an affinity with him to urge others to pray for Tarlton’s soul because he was an “honest fellow” who had made “dean Johns [Bishop John Whitgift’s] ears ... longer,” like an ass’s.²⁵ Even though the tactic of appropriating Tarlton’s stage personality may have been momentarily effective in popularizing the puritan cause, it incited a rebuttal when the puritans invited their opponents to compare Marprelate repeatedly to the stage clown. In *A Whip for an Ape*, for instance, Lyly observed that “Now *Tarlton*’s dead ... For knave and foole thou [*Martin*] maist beare pricke and price” (ll. 53–54), and in *Mar-Martin* Lyly noted: “These tinkers termes, and barbers jesses first *Tarleton* on the stage, / Then *Martin* in his bookes of lies hath put in every page” (sig. A4 v). These comparisons may even suggest some hostility to the deceased Tarlton as a precedent—perhaps actually the predecessor—for Martin’s anti-episcopal slanders, but the chief point here is that the resemblance between the object and style of Martin’s and Tarlton’s satirical clowning was apparent enough to contemporaries.

Although most literary scholars have nonetheless been curiously reluctant to explore the impact of Martin’s famous clown persona on subsequent representations of puritanism, it was partly because the Martinists had employed “the language of the street, the slang of the craftsmen, and the dialect of the uneducated” to appeal to the common people²⁶ that the anti-Martinists consistently mocked Martin as “but a cobbler by occupation.”²⁷ Subsequently, they expanded the attack to characterize all puritans who would be portrayed as clown-like “ecclesiastical cobbler[s],”²⁸ “godly Cobbler[s],”²⁹ and ignorant, “base mechanically” preachers,³⁰ a “type often used in anti-Martinist ma-

terial.”³¹ Thus, Thomas Nashe derides the puritans’ “dunsticall Sermons,” specifying, “Such Sermons I meane as our sectaries preach in ditches, and ... when they leape from the Coblers stal to their pulpits.”³² But it was not merely anti-Martinist literature, but anti-puritan attacks generally which mocked the brethren as cobblers and “mechanicks.” The satirist John Taylor, in particular, would later make much of this tactic, skewering the “impudent rabble of ignorant Mechanicks, who have dared to presume to preach” (A4 v) in *A Cluster of Coxcombes* (1642), while in *A Brown Dozen of Drunkards* (1648), a work whose subtitle refers to the “Zeale-drunk staggering Times,” Taylor depicts a puritan as “a poor, silly, simple, vulgar, Mechanick Ideot” (sig. C4 r). And, in *A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques: Wherein is discovered the strange preaching (or prating) of such as are by their trades Coblers, Tinkers, Pedlers, Weavers, Sow-gelders, and Chimney-Sweepers* (1641), Taylor derides the “Calveskin doctrin” (sig. B2 r) of “the most famous preaching Cobler Samuel Howe,” that “zealous Cobler” or “learned Cobler” (sig. B2 r), in order to demonstrate that “A Cobler to a Pulpit should not mount,/ Nor can an Asse cast up a true account” (sig. A3 v). Taylor also plays on the cobbling pun to “mend bad Soales” here (sig. B2 v), just as he does in *A Tale in a Tub, or a Tub Lecture As it was delivered by Mi-Heele Mend-soale* (1641), featuring ignorant puritanical rambling by a cobbler preacher.

Undoubtedly, the puritan Martin’s clownish preaching persona had invited such “scoff[ing] at the artisan-provincial base of the movement.”³³ Certainly, there were actual “mechanic preachers,” proselytizing throughout London and towns like Norwich,³⁴ but it was the Martinist authors themselves whose puritan persona most embodied such a “tinkerly” stereotype, for as Neil Rhodes has argued, it was “Martin Marprelate and his subsequent opponents [who had] amalgamated” the roles of “clown and preacher,” especially as they fleshed out the persona of “Martin, the clowning preacher.”³⁵ The result, I would argue, was that puritans were stereotyped for decades thereafter, as Nashe describes them, as “better beseeming a priuie then a pulpit, a misterming Clowne in a Comedy, then a chosen man in the Ministrie.”³⁶ Martin himself, though initially imitating the “happy unhappy answers” of Tarlton,³⁷ was one model for such a clown since the persona had in fact frequently employed “misterming” or malapropisms such as “itsample” for *example*, “outcept” for *except*, “argling” for *arguing*, “ingram” for *ignorant*, and “ingramnesse” for *ignorance*. And indeed, Martin emphasized the ignorance of his own clownish persona so that he boasted that, even being “Such a simple ingram man as [he was],”³⁸ he would be able to prove the bishops’ lack of true authority, and he pleaded: “You must then beare with my ingramnesse. I am plaine.”³⁹ Though clearly humorous, the lowly persona that

Martin adopted to heighten his popular appeal exacerbated anxieties about his radical challenge to the established church.

After all, such use of mis-terming, “mechanical” language and an ignorant persona evoked the specter of lower-class radicalism, thereby inviting the association of Martin with the incessant “fear-mongering over Anabaptist tendencies” once purportedly prevalent among puritans generally.⁴⁰ Of course, Martin too seemed to be aware of how nearly he resembled the commoner leaders of the Anabaptists, those radical, apocalyptic enthusiasts who had rebelled against the existing social order in Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands. Whereas he had enjoined the bishops to “never slander the cause of reformation or the furtherers thereof in terming the cause by the name of Anabaptistrie,”⁴¹ Martin himself had also self-consciously incited fears of just such lower-class radicalism by threatening that “The people are altogether discontented,” so that denying further reforms will “breed Anabaptistrie,” which in turn, he warned, “will alienate the ... subjects from their lawfull governour.”⁴²

Martin’s overt and implicit threats of radicalism reflect a desperate strategy with inherent risks: although most modern scholars would not conceive of such terms as Anabaptist and puritan as interchangeable, they were once all too often conflated, especially—and not coincidentally—post-Marprelate. In *Basilikon Doron*, for instance, James I claimed that the Anabaptists and the Familists were most deserving of the name of puritan, “because they thinke them selues onely pure.”⁴³ Earlier, during the 1590s, Nashe wrote of the puritans in *An Almond for a Parrat*, “let the worlde knowe you heereafter by the nam[e] of Anabaptists.”⁴⁴ Meanwhile, Archbishop Parker warned that the Presbyterian’s “fond faction” aimed at establishing an Anabaptist “Munzer’s commonwealth,” claiming: “[I]f ... it will fall out to a popularity, ... it will be the overthrow of all.”⁴⁵ Likewise, Archbishop Whitgift could report in the wake of Marprelate that Presbyterian (i.e., “puritan”) writings contained “the very steps and degrees to anabaptism.”⁴⁶ Even more overtly, Richard Cosin’s *Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation: viz. Presbyteriall Discipline* (1592) asserted, from the title page on, the precise “resemblance ... vnto the like, happened heretofore in Germanie.” Matthew Sutcliffe, too, warned of the dangers of puritanism by referring to the Anabaptists’ recent rebellions in Münster, Amsterdam, and Strasbourg: “The precedents of the Anabaptists, doe teach us what an unbridled thing the people is, where they take the sword to worke reformation with.”⁴⁷ Such fears must have seemed real enough, if, as D. G. Allan would have it, the often clown-like leaders of sixteenth-century popular risings in England were “combinations as it were, of biblical saviours and lords of misrule.”⁴⁸ Still, it was not just the case that

such associations with puritanism were fed by anxieties about Anabaptist revolt; they also suggested anti-intellectualism and a promotion of irrationality—two other features of the puritan clown type.

Renaissance puritan claims to intellectual superiority took a severe blow after a sensational incident that puritan Josias Nichols called “one of three most greivous accidentes” which did “verie much darke the righteousness of our cause”⁴⁹ (the first two being the Marprelate scandal and the Brownists’ separation from the Church). The third “accident” occurred at a time when the puritan leader Thomas Cartwright and eight puritan ministers were on trial, on July 16th of 1591, as two deluded puritans “got them vp into an emptie cart” in Cheapside and “out of that choise pulpit”⁵⁰ proclaimed that they were prophets and witnesses with news from Heaven that the supposedly gifted and divinely inspired William Hacket, actually merely an ignorant, “wholy vnlettred” (sig. C2 r), simple-minded lunatic, was the Messiah and ruler of Europe and that the Queen had abdicated the throne. Hacket had “[given] out to diuers that hee was a *Prophet* of Gods vengeance” and that “*If Reformation be not Established in England in the present yeere, three great plagues shall fall vpon it*” (sig. C3 v). Eventually, Hacket’s disciples were convinced that he “indured” all the “torments” that conjurers and “Deuils in hell ... could practise against him” in order to prevent him from “establishing the Gospell,” after which “all Kings and Princes should ... yeelde their sceptors vnto him” (sig. E3 v). Twelve days after the deluded puritans’ announcement of the second coming, Hacket’s brief “reign” ended as he hung from the scaffold and had his “traytors heart” taken “foorth, and showed out openly to the people” (sig. L3 r), but only after he had screamed delusional, “blasphemous and hellish wordes” (sig. L1 r), threatening that if God did not deliver him from his enemies he would “fir[e] the heauens, and teare [Him] from [His] throne” (sig. L3 r), as well as railing treasons to the horrified onlookers. To the puritans’ embarrassment, the shocking episode recalled the earlier Anabaptists’ revolt in Münster.

This 1591 episode echoed the lurid anti-puritan propaganda John Bancroft had been promoting since Marprelate. Seizing another opportunity to link puritans to the Anabaptists, Bancroft was able to make the sensational incident “the logical climax of his literary exposure of the puritan movement” thereafter.⁵¹ Cosin did likewise in his *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation* (1592), writing that through Hacket the puritans were like “the Anabaptists in *Germanie*: who pretended like puritie, and intended also a dangerous Reformation” (sig. M4 v) to tempt “the common multitude” (sig. I3 r) into sedition. Cosin claimed that after Hacket’s arrest and subsequent investigation, authorities discovered seditious pamphlets in the chamber of puritan

leader Wiggenton (of *Maygame of Martinisme* fame). One pamphlet entitled *The Fooles bolte* purportedly included the verse, “A Christian true although he be a clowne, / May teach a king to weare scepter and crowne” (sig. F3 v), which Hacket was said to have confessed was framed for the occasion, apparently to refer to himself (sig. F3 v). Just as Martin (whom even Nichols called “foolish Martin” [sig. H8 v]) did, radical puritans like Hacket seemed—or at least were *made*—to confirm a dangerously ignorant stereotype drawn from the Anabaptists.

Puritan intellectual capability was further called into question via associations with such religious radicals’ claims to divine inspiration and hence constant references to “the spirit,” which anti-puritan satirists portrayed as mere irrationality and outright madness—the insane Hacket himself was believed to have been “mooued . . . inwardly by the spirit,” being “indued with an extraordinarie and singular spirite.”⁵² In one anti-Martinist tract Lyly jeered that no place would suit puritans better than “Bedlam . . ., so mad they are, and so bad they are,” since “all proceedes of the spirit. I thinke thou [Martin] art possest with the spirites of Iacke Straw and the Black-smith, who, so they might rent in peeces the gouernment, they would drawe cuts for religion.”⁵³ So, too, Nashe’s depiction of the Anabaptists in Münster in his *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594) portrayed inspiration as ignorant madness:

Why, inspiration was their ordinary familiar, and buzzed in their ears like a bee in a box every hour what news from heaven, hell and the land of whipper-ginnie. . . . They would vaunt there was not a pea’s difference betwixt them and the apostles: they were as poor as they, as base trades as they, and no more inspired than they....⁵⁴

Likewise, one of the most famous Renaissance stage puritans, the zealous, hypocritical madman Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, repeatedly speaks of the “spirit” (“I was moved in spirit” [3.6.79]; “Friend, I will leave to communicate my spirit with you” [4.6.93]; “I will not fear to make my spirit and gifts known!” [5.5.38]; and “Yes, [my vocation] is of the spirit” [5.5.52]). He also proceeds, in a fit of inspired enthusiasm, to tear down what he believes to be idolatrous gingerbread and puppet stalls before, infamously, losing a debate with a puppet. In yet another example of satire against inspiration, George Chapman’s *The Memorable Masque* (1613) features the puritan Capriccio, a fraudulent subversive who describes himself a number of times as a “man of wit”⁵⁵ but who is really “a buffoon” (ll. 261 and 263) who wears bellows on his head, symbolic of the “inspiration” which puffs up his brain:

Sinful? and damnable? What, a puritan? Those bellows you wear on your head shew with what matter your brain is puffed up, Sir; a religion-forger I see you are and presume

of inspiration from these bellows; with which ye study to blow up the settled governments of kingdoms. (ll. 255–58)

But perhaps the most celebrated burlesque of inspiration appears in the skeptic Samuel Butler's masterpiece *Hudibras* (1663) in which the ignorant squire Ralpho, a puritan Independent, is described at length in terms of the knowledge instilled in him through the spirit:

And he another way came by't [his knowledge]:
Some call it *Gifts*, and some *New light*;
A Liberal Art, that costs no pains
Of Study, Industry, or Brains. ... (l.1.475–78)
Whate're men speak by this *new Light*,
Still they are sure to be i'th' right.
'Tis a *dark-Lanthorn* of the Spirit,
Which none see by but those that bear it ... (ll. 497–500)⁵⁶

Throughout the early modern period, such mockery of inspiration as deluded ignorance would be a conventional feature of anti-puritan comedy.⁵⁷

II

However humorous, what was at stake in attacks on inspiration was nothing less than the basis for authority of interpretation—for what Bancroft called the “authoritie and libertie of judging”⁵⁸—and thus the very stability of authority itself. Oliver Ormerud, writing in *Picture of a Puritane*, questioned in particular the assertion of spiritual authorization underwriting what Cosin had already characterized as the “opinion of equality of authority”⁵⁹: “[A]re all Prophets? are all teachers? doe all speake with tongues? do all interpret?”⁶⁰ Nashe for one reported disdainfully of “an assemblie of the brotherhood” he had observed: “[A] roome full of Artificers ... sat rounde about uppon stooles and benches to harken to ... I. Cor. 3, ... [Then,] the reader began first to utter his conceit upon the Text, ... then it came to his next neighbors course, and so in order Glosses went a begging, and Expositions ranne apace.”⁶¹ If, in the words of Thomas Cranmer, the faithful had once been advised in their pursuit of scriptural interpretation to “expound it no further, th[a]n you can plainly understand it,”⁶² many Elizabethan observers found not such restrained interpretation but unbridled “Expositions” at full gallop. Mainstream Protestants objected above all, Robert Weimann observes, that the sole basis for authority among the puritans was inspiration,⁶³ and therefore, as Nashe would have it, the irrational “violence of long babling praiers.”⁶⁴ Thus, puri-

tan exegesis was portrayed as self-authorizing enthusiasm, as opposed to the relative rationality of the hierarchical authorities' learned tradition.

The conformists' hostility to inspiration supports John Morgan's assessment in his important study, *Godly Learning*, that the Renaissance was a period marked by an ongoing "struggle between 'enthusiasm' and 'reason' for dominance in religion."⁶⁵ In this struggle, the puritans were suspicious of—and most stood stoutly in opposition to—"human reason," "natural reason," and all that was a product of "humane" arts and learning. In lieu of the reason promoted by the "humane learning" of ensconced Humanist education, puritans advocated an infusion of the Spirit (i.e., enthusiasm or inspiration), which would, they believed, allow what they deemed "right reason," that is, a divinely-augmented, "regenerate reason." Thus, Elizabethan puritan icon William Perkins insisted that he who wished to be truly wise "must reject his owne naturall reason, and stoppe up the eyes of his naturall minde, like a blinde man, and suffer himself wholly to be guided by Gods spirit in the things of God, that thereby he may be made wise unto salvation."⁶⁶ Richard Greenham likewise defended revelation in opposition to reason by proclaiming that "there are many things to be learned, which we cannot attaine unto by naturall reason onely, without spirituall revelation."⁶⁷ Richard Capel was blunter in his attack on reason—in defense of enthusiasm—in claiming: "And as our reason is carnall, it is a secret friend to Satan, takes part with him against us.... Because it hath the Divell for its dam ... downe with reason, away with our owne wit, let faith doe all, else faith will do nothing."⁶⁸

In many respects, such puritan opposition to learned reason, what Morgan characterizes as a sort of "Counter-Renaissance," was fundamentally anti-intellectual, indeed a "revolt against intellectualism."⁶⁹ This is true because, for all their study, the learned had little to tell the puritan; intellectuals could only theorize about abstract knowledge (through "carnal" as opposed to spiritual or divine reason) whereas puritans *knew*—or certainly felt—they were right, both in their hearts and by what they deemed divinely-inspired experience:

The knowledge of the reprobate is like the knowledge which a mathematicall geographer hath of the earth and all the places in it, which is but a generall notion, and a speculative comprehension of them. But the knowledge of the elect is like the knowledge of a traveller which can speake of experience and feeling, and hath beene there and seene and knowen the particulars.⁷⁰

Similarly, a puritan such as Thomas Granger had little use for bookish learning when he insisted that "if a man be not guided by the Spirit, his observa-

tions are but superstitious, and false rules, his readings erroneous, yea, though he hath read all Bookes..., he wants wisdom, he hath no learning.”⁷¹ After all, as Francis Rous explained in *The Heavenly Academie: Or the Highest School*, whereas “the head being captivated by humane reason [was] subject to error, ... yet the heart ..., [informed] by the Spirit” was never wrong, instilling a resolute conviction of certainty into those so enlightened.⁷² What was more, such learning “taught in the schoole of Christ,” where the “Master ... is Truth it selfe,” provided “an unknowne kind of knowledge, which cannot be taught by man.”⁷³ In fact, the “knowledge taught by God in his heavenly schoole,” to which only the puritans had access, was infallible in that it came from an omniscient source.⁷⁴ Not surprisingly, then, the “knowledge thus taught of God, doth give such an assurance of an understanding ... and doth so seale upon the soule the truth ... that all objections ... cannot blot out the stamp and character of this seale.”⁷⁵ What could even the best reason and logic or any amount of evidence do in the face of such unwavering, faith-based certainty? Inevitably, for all those who were not so “illuminate,” learned University Wits and brilliant Humanists like Nashe and Lyly among them, “right reason” was the worst sort of arrogantly self-righteous, self-serving enthusiasm.

The learning advocated by “godly” puritans and other radical reformers did in fact constitute a virtual Counter-Renaissance, then, insofar as it was opposed to the Humanist project of promoting knowledge. The puritan attack on learning went well beyond the Humanist attacks by Erasmus and Rabelais on the medieval Scholastics and Scotists for sophistic obscurantism, since the Humanists were intellectuals and scholars who had advocated *real* learning, and particularly the study of Biblical and Classical texts in their original language, spirit, and context. By contrast, the puritans denounced such Humanist-oriented “humane” learning as they came to regard virtually all non-inspired learning, including (often) study of ancient languages, the use of learned logic (except, as we shall see, Ramist logic), any use of rhetoric that was not plain-style, and in fact any nuance, complexity, or subtlety with suspicion as hair-splitting nonsense, or, worse, diabolical deception. Notably, the puritans denounced those learned men for whom theology was not a matter solely of inspiration but partly an intellectual matter, and all those who approached the Gospel using their training in (especially Aristotelian) logic, that is, in what puritans viewed as “a meere ... carnall manner.”⁷⁶

Elizabethan Brownists and Barrowists, moreover, actually believed that universities were “the very guard of Antichrist’s throne.”⁷⁷ Robert Browne, father of Brownism, denounced the university curriculum for its emphasis on “those trifling bookes of Aristotle and of all that vaine Philosophie” and

claimed that the Bible “expresly sett downe, all necessarie & general rules of the arts & all learning.”⁷⁸ Likewise, Henry Barrow attacked the curriculum as “profane, curious, [and] unfit for a Christian” for its inclusion of “the curious and heathen artes, prophane and vaine babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called ... wherewith they ... corrupt al[l] the youth of the land.”⁷⁹ Barrow responded to the reasonable enough objection that he was opposed to learning with the less-than-comforting assurance that “I with my whole heart allow of any art or science that is consonant to the word of God, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness”⁸⁰—biblical texts and puritan doctrine, nothing classical or Humanist, and certainly no diversity of opinion.

Browne and Barrow were not really out of the mainstream of puritan thought in this respect, however, since in general “the puritan, of course, saw the Bible as containing *all* necessary knowledge.”⁸¹ We cannot agree, then, with William P. Holden’s utter dismissal of anti-puritan satire focusing on godly attitudes toward learning in his conclusion that “The charge of opposition by the Puritans to learning is not easily supported; it can, however, be said that they opposed various aspects of education in the universities.”⁸² Knowing what “aspects” even mainstream puritans opposed and supported requires that we take anti-puritan criticisms much more seriously, especially given that puritan diatribes against “humane learning” unleashed the attacks of radical preachers who went further still in preaching that universities should be abolished and all books but the Bible burnt. Thomas Heywood was not far off when he claimed of the puritan in 1609 that “He blames degrees in the Academy next, / And gainst the liberall Arts can Scripture bring.”⁸³

The response to the haughtiness of such fundamentalist anti-intellectualism was, not without reason, alarm and indignation. Richard Hooker, for instance, portrayed all puritans as simply opposed to the light of learning:

But so far it is, ... the star of Reason and learning, ... beginneth no otherwise to be thought of than if it were an unlucky comet; or as if God had so accursed it, that it should never shine or give light ..., but be esteemed as the star in Revelation called Wormwood: which being fallen from Heaven maketh rivers ... in which it falleth so bitter, that men tasting them die thereof.... [F]or which cause they never use Reason so willingly as to disgrace Reason.⁸⁴

While such an attack on puritanism was undoubtedly painted with a very broad brush, it is nonetheless true that the puritans’ grand promises of a more learned, less “dunsticall” religion were problematic and dubious to the conformists in the large majority; that religiously-inspired “godly learning” was in fact superior to “humane learning” was a matter of interpretation (or rather

inspiration) to say the least. Due to their suspicion of learning and opposition to reason, puritans' incessant boasting about their own intellectual superiority seemed to many critics simply outrageous and gave rise to the kind of epithets we saw at the outset—"proud Coxcombs" and "a herd of ... proud ignorants." Indeed, to the anti-puritan satirist Taylor, the puritans' pride in their intellect seemed topsy-turvy, upside-down logic:

Each Ignorant, doe of the Spirit boast,
And prating fools brag of Holy Ghost,
When Ignoramous will his Teacher Teach,
And Sow-Gelders and Cobblers dare to preach;
This shows men's wits are monstrously disguised,
Or that our country is Antipodised.⁸⁵

It is with similar palpable indignation that the Humanist Nashe would describe puritans as "Verie deuout Asses ... dunstically set forth"⁸⁶ and as "transported with the heate & ignorance of [their] zeale."⁸⁷ Nashe went further in purporting to describe, first hand, the effects of the puritan abridgement of Humanist learning: "I frequented the Churches of the Pruritane [sic.] Preachers that leape into the Pulpit with Pitchfork, to teach men, before they have learning, judgment, or wit enough to teach boyes."⁸⁸ Many contemporaries shared this dim view of puritan learning.

In response to puritan attacks on human reason and "humane" learning, satirists portrayed puritans as having an absurd, self-righteously arrogant antipathy toward all literacy and learning, just like artisanal Anabaptist leaders such as the leather-dresser and furrier Melchior Hoffman, "whose wild ideas were fostered by his own lack of formal education and open contempt for learning."⁸⁹ Anti-puritan propagandists such as Matthew Sutcliffe claimed that among puritans "[l]earning hath lost almost all reputation," since "these unlearned and unwise consistorians declame against learning."⁹⁰ And so, Stupido scorns those that "learne these artes in the laborious schools" and recommends the counsel of his uncle: "Studie not these vaine arts of Rhetorique, Poetrie and Philosophie; there is noe sounde edifying knowledge[e] in them."⁹¹ Once again, Stupido appears to reflect fears of puritan anti-intellectualism fueled by Martin Marprelate when he railed against the bishops' sly, "bomination learning."⁹²

Post-Marprelate, satirists could mock puritan hostility to learning. Nashe, for instance, imagined puritans railing against education by drawing, dubiously, on New Testament precedent:

'Sir Peter and Sir Paul were ... Fisher-men ... They were none of these ... Graduates, nor Doctors, therfore why should we tie our Ministrie to the prophane studies of Vniuersitie?

What is Logicke but the highe waie to wrangling, containing in it but a world of bibble-babble? Neede we anie of your Greeke, Latine, Hebreue, or anie such gibberinge, when we haue the word of God in English? Go to, go to, you are a great companie of vaine men that stand upon your degrees and tongues, with tittle tattle, I cannot tell what, when ... the Apostles knew neare a Letter of the booke.⁹³

Here, the Apostles' humble origins are appropriated in opposition to ancient languages (including Hebrew), an insight Taylor echoed in making the puritans rationalize ignorance based on Christ's choice of simple fishermen as followers: "And God still being God (as he was then) / Still gives his Spirit to unlearned men."⁹⁴ Illiteracy, it would seem, would be most Christian, according to such use of precedent. Again as Nashe had, Thomas Overbury included a portrait of the puritan as self-righteously and zealously ignorant in his *Characters* (1614):

His ignorance acquits him of all science ... and of all language but his mother's .... Anything else, ... he cannot abide ... : Latin the language of the beast, Greek the tongue wherein the heathen poets wrote their fictions, Hebrew the speech of the Jews that crucified Christ, ... logic ... the subtleties of Satan.⁹⁵

Likewise, in *A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques* (1641), Taylor, echoing Overbury, depicted puritans railing that "The Latine is the language of the Beast" (sig. B3 v), so that classical learning is, again, actually Satanic. Ridiculing the puritans' belief that "the Spirit is the only teacher," Taylor could declare them to be "'Gainst Schooles, and learning ... Tongues, Science, Logick, Rhetorick" (sig. B3 v), so that his puritans rationalize their ignorance on the following grounds:

All humane knowledge ... they detest
Th' unlearn'd (they say) do know the Scriptures best:
That humane learning breeds confusion, ...
And that the learned ones were, are, and shall
Be ignorant of human learning all. (sig. C3 v)

Remarkably, ignorance and a stout opposition to learning, knowledge, and literacy were, in short, two of the most consistent attributes of the Renaissance puritan stereotype.

Humorous opposition to literacy in particular as profane gibbering and vanity could also constitute a grotesquely distorted caricature of the puritans' familiar insistence upon a *preaching* rather than a so-called *reading* ministry as a sign of learning. The puritans' hostility to reading the orthodox *Book of Common Prayer* was evident in the famous puritan tract, *A View of Popish Abuses Yet Remaining in the English Church* (1572):

By the word of God ... they make [an office of preaching] an office of reading: Christ said go preach, they in mockery give them the Bible.... And that is not the feeding that Christ spake of.... Reading is not feeding, but it is as evil as playing upon a stage, and worse too. For players yet learn their parts without book....⁹⁶

Although puritans presented their demand for more preaching in the context of an avowed insistence on a more learned ministry, because they often voiced their opposition to a “reading ministry” in such overstated terms, opponents burlesqued their position as the ridiculous, elided extreme, “Reading ... is ... evil.”

During the period of especially intense anti-puritan satire in the wake of Marprelate and Hacket (that “Christian ... clowne” who “May teach a king to weare scepter and crowne”), even Shakespeare seems to have taken part in presenting the ignorant, self-righteous puritan radical according to the standard associations with godly rhetoric, clownishly irrational inspiration, lower-class radicalism, and hostility to learning in his brilliant, largely ahistorical portrayal of a carnivalesque Jack Cade in *2 Henry VI* (c.1591–92). In his first appearance in 4.2, the zealous rebel Cade’s second line, with its biblical echoes of scripture from Leviticus, Ezekiel, and Luke (scripture that had “provided a revolutionary agenda for the Anabaptist leaders”), would have reminded audiences not so much of the historical figure as of contemporary puritan caricatures: “For our enemies shall fall before us, *inspired with the spirit* of putting down kings and princes” (4.2.30–31).⁹⁷ Cade’s artisan or mechanic followers are also depicted as the godly when they echo puritan cant, speaking of their “vocation” (“‘Labour in thy vocation,’” [l.14]) as well as of “sin” and “iniquity” (“Then is sin struck down like an ox, and iniquity’s throat cut like a calf” [ll.24–25]).⁹⁸ Recalling Cosin’s recent depiction of Hacket in *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation*, Cade even invokes the cause of puritanism as he “vows *reformation*” (4.2.57–58); shares the puritans’—and especially Hacket’s—suspicion of devils when he accuses an opponent of having “a familiar under his tongue” (4.7.98); claims to be “[i]n despite of the devils and hell” (4.8.201–2) and boasts that he could defy “ten thousand devils” (4.9.59–59) in possible allusions to Hacket’s boasts that he constantly endured all the torments that “Deuils in hell” could cause him; cites the Biblical authority of the lack of hierarchy in Eden to support his cause (“And Adam was a gardener” ll.121); zealously “pray[s] God” (4.9.37), “beseech[es] God” (4.9.36), invokes “God’s curse” (4.8.31), and piously objects when a man “speaks not i’ God’s name” (4.7.101). And since the levelling “Anabaptisticall Brother[s]”⁹⁹ envisioned an essentially communist society, Cade promises that “All the realm shall be in common” (4.2.60–61), claims that in one universal livery all “may agree like brothers” (4.2.67), re-

fers to his followers as “Fellow-kings” (4.3.148–49), and declares that wives shall be “in common” too, since, he adds, “we charge and command that their wives be as free as heart can wish or tongue can tell” (4.7.113–15), evoking orthodox propagandists’ fears such as those stated in the famed *Homily of Obedience* (1560): “Take way kings, princes, rulers, ... and such estates of God’s order, ... no man shall keep his wife, children, and possessions in quietness, all things shall be in common.”¹⁰⁰ In an Elizabethan context, therefore, there can be little doubt that Shakespeare recast the historical rebel Cade in terms of the contemporary clownish puritan stereotype.

Most importantly, in terms of this stupid puritan type, Cade is characterized as embodying the distorted, stereotypically puritan “Counter-Renaissance” antipathy toward literacy. In fact, Shakespeare characterizes Cade as an arrogant, illiterate zealot, violently declaiming against literacy as a profane enormity, thereby recalling such figures as Browne, Barrow, or Hacket. Thus, when informed that the clerk of Chatham “can write and read” (4.2.75), for instance, Cade exclaims “O, monstrous!” (ll.78). The Clerk’s literacy also makes him “a villain” (ll.79) and “a conjuror” (ll.81). After Cade examines the clerk with “Dost thou use to write thy name? Or hast thou a mark to thyself like an honest plain-dealing man?” (ll.89–91) and the rebels learn that the Clerk can indeed write his name, Cade’s ignorant followers explode, “He hath confessed—away with him! He’s a villain and a traitor” (ll.94–95), and Cade contemptuously orders, “Away with him, I say, hang him with his pen and inkhorn about his neck” (ll.96–97). Later, Cade denounces Lord Saye’s literacy on conspicuously moral grounds:

Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of the realm in erecting a grammar school; and, whereas our forefathers had no ... books ... thou hast caused printing to be used.... It will be proved to thy face that thou hast men about thee that usually talk of a noun and a verb and such abominable words as no Christian ear can endure to hear.... Moreover, thou hast put [poor men] in prison, and because they could not read thou hast hanged them, when indeed only for that cause they had been most worthy to live. (4.7.30–42)

As did real-life radical reformers like Barrow who railed against the “heathen ..., prophane and vaine babblings ... wherewith [schools] ... corrupt al[l] the youth of the land,”¹⁰¹ and in keeping with a general stereotype of puritans as opposed to learning, Cade views literacy as a corrupting influence, so that grammar schools and knowledge of grammar are abominations, education itself becomes un-Christian, and illiteracy is a matter of pride, indeed a type of election.

Thus, the illiterate “mechanic” preaching of Cade, evoking Marprelate’s recent combination of clown and preacher, oversimplifies and misconstrues the already ridiculously overstated puritan diatribes against a supposedly un-Christian ministry or “office of reading” that is “as evil as playing upon a stage.” Cade’s clownish preaching—and his suspicion of Latin in particular (“Away with him, away with him! He speaks Latin” [4.7.53])—also recalls anti-puritan parody of puritan opposition to “prophane studies,” and especially Latin as the diabolical language of “the Beast.” In truth, Cade’s zealous moralizing rhetoric sounds fairly tame compared to historical puritans’ opposition to reason (i.e., “reason is ... a secret friend to Satan ... downe with reason”) or Barrow’s attacks on institutionalized studies that were “profane, curious, [and] unfit for a Christian,” including “prophane and vaine babblings.”¹⁰²

III

In a context of stereotypical puritan anti-intellectualism, anti-puritan satirists were able to find a further complement to their stupid-puritan stereotype even in a celebrated academic controversy at Cambridge involving the “reformed” rhetoric, logic, and all-encompassing “method” of Calvinist academic Peter Ramus, who was martyred in 1572 at the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre at Paris, and who was thereafter the intellectual hero and primary academic authority of the puritan faction at Cambridge. In *I Parnassus*, the puritan Stupido marks his ignorance not merely through his identification with Marprelate but, from his first lines, through his equal devotion to Ramus: “Welcome, my welbeloved brethren! trulie (I thanke God for it!) I have spent this day to my great comfort. I have (I pray God prosper my labours!) analised a peece of an hommellie according to Ramus, and surelie in my minde and simple opinion Mr Peter maketh all things verie plaine and easie” (ll.322–27). Like Martinism or puritan hostility to reason, belief in Ramus’s authority contributes to the stereotype of puritan stupidity. As we shall see, the Cambridge satire echoes the standard criticism of Ramus, that is, that he had dumbed down learning by making it “plaine and easie” for “simple understanding[s].”

Born c.1515 into poverty (with a charcoal burner for a grandfather and a humble farmer as a father), Pierre de la Ramée did not have an auspicious start as an academic. Rather, because economic hardships forced him to interrupt his studies twice, he was, somewhat embarrassingly, older than the other boys in college, and there were also “stories that young Pierre was slow in learning and found it hard to reason to the point.”¹⁰³ Nevertheless,

a determined Ramus finally earned his Master of Arts degree at the then-tardy age of 21.¹⁰⁴ Undaunted, he soon ambitiously set to work on “a savage and sweeping attack on Aristotle and Aristotelians” in his *Remarks on Aristotle*,¹⁰⁵ in which he claimed to have found “no division of logic in the *Organon*” and argued that “the chaos” he found needed to be simplified and set “into order”¹⁰⁶—indicating the marked fixation with order that was to become characteristic of Ramism. But when Ramus’s work was put on trial, he “seems to have held against Aristotle chiefly the fact that he did not start each book of the *Organon* with a definition” so that on March 1, 1544, a royal commission denounced Ramus as too poorly versed in philosophy to teach it and forbade the publication of his attacks on Aristotle, which contained things which were *faulses et estraunges*, for *les grand bien et prouffit des lettres et sciences* because of his demonstrable incompetence in attacking Aristotle’s dialectic both in obvious bad faith (*mauvaise volonté*) and even “without giving evidence of understanding it.”¹⁰⁷ Most humiliating of all, prior to Henry II’s accession, Ramus was forced to teach math—hardly a strength—rather than his beloved logic.

In his aim of simplifying and re-ordering Aristotle, Ramus was especially concerned that his counter-method be easy for schoolboys to memorize. If memorization was already deemed centrally important to understanding in his day, throughout Ramus’s work, reason (*ratio*) is “practically *identical* with memory,” as “[t]he memorization process for Ramus is virtually synonymous with understanding.”¹⁰⁸ Ramus was frank in boasting that “however simple and few the precepts [in] which”¹⁰⁹ it was rendered, his method was superior because “it is the best possible method for enabling the schoolboy to memorize the twenty-eight lines of Ovid in question.”¹¹⁰ For all his attacks on Aristotelian syllogisms, Ramus and his English followers—among them, William Perkins and Martin Marprelate himself—were, in practice, particularly focused on syllogisms and “epitomes” (brief summaries) in keeping with Ramus’s counsel:

When you have cut out from the parts of the continuous discourse the many syllogisms therein (after having found them, for they are often concealed), take away all the amplifications, and, after making brief headings to note the arguments used, form into one syllogism the sum total of the discourse, this sum total being ordinarily self-evident, although it may be swelled to undue proportions by accumulations of ornaments.¹¹¹

Like Ramus’s humble origins and his muddled attack on Aristotle, the vaunted “simple . . . precepts” of Ramist method presented an easy target for Ramus’s relentless opponents.

Such traditionalists discredited the authority of Ramism in much the same fashion as Martinism and puritanism generally, that is, by way of repeated associations with ignorance, the lower classes, and clowns. As a result of Ramus's biography, his self-avowed aim of simplifying or reducing logic and rhetoric into forms more easily memorized by schoolboys, his reputation among his critics for dilettantism and misunderstanding the subjects he treated,¹¹² and the unsubtle application of Ramist method by puritan devotees (including unlearned auto-didacts), Ramism came to be associated with sophistic, pedantic ignorance among the Aristotelian, anti-puritan faction. For example, satirists such as the Cambridge-educated Nashe mocked the puritan Ramist faction for their "thredde-bare knowledge" and claimed that "these men make no other vse of learning but to shewe it ... [and] seeme learned to none but to Idiots, who with a coloured shew of zeale, they allure ... to their [i]llusion."¹¹³ Moreover, no doubt observing Martin's use of syllogisms and "epitomes," Nashe concluded by 1590 that Marprelate himself was once part of the Ramist faction at Cambridge: "Who then such an vn-natural enemie to *Aristotle*, or such a new-fa[n]gled friend vnto *Ramus*?"¹¹⁴ Martin had in fact gone so far in his enthusiasm for Ramus as to insist that his opponents "should write syllogistically ... because [their] stile [was] rude and barbarous,"¹¹⁵ while Lyly retorted that Martin "hath sillogismes in pike sauce."¹¹⁶ Nashe furthered the connection between Ramism and ignorance by mocking, mercilessly, the somewhat rustic background of one of Ramus's most outspoken advocates at Cambridge, that is, the pedantic, quarrelsome, sometime-Cambridge-don, Gabriel Harvey, the son of a rope-maker, who patterned himself after his hero Ramus.¹¹⁷ Referring dismissively to Harvey during the Nashe-Harvey pamphlet war, Nashe writes, "for what can bee made of a Ropemaker more than a Clowne?"¹¹⁸ Nashe would also rail against Harvey, that "peruerse *Ramisticall* hereticke,"¹¹⁹ for "abusing of *Aristotle*, & setting him vp on the Schoole gates, painted with Asses eares on his head," asking, "is it any discredit for me, thou great *babound*, ... to be censured by thee that hast scorned the Prince of Philosophers ...?"¹²⁰ It was likewise the puritan Ramist faction that Nashe had in mind when he mused: "I know not how it commeth to passe, by the doting practice of our Diuinitie Dunces, that striue to make their pupills pulpit-men ... [T]hose yeares which should bee employed in *Aristotle* are expired in Epitomes."¹²¹

In failing to appreciate Aristotle, Ramus, like his disciple Harvey, was mocked as an ignorant dilettante. For example, in making Ramus a character in *The Massacre at Paris* (c. 1590), Christopher Marlowe, witness to the conflict between Ramists and Aristotelians during his Cambridge years, gives

voice to the conventional criticisms of Ramus “having a smack in all/ And yet ... never sound[ing] anything to the depth” (1.7.25–26):

Was it not thou that scoff’st the *Organon* ...?
He that will be a flat dichotomist,
And seen in nothing but epitomes,
Is in your judgement thought a learned man.... (1.7.27–31)

To this accusation, Ramus retorts that “I knew the *Organon* to be confus’d,/ And I reduc’d it into better form” (1.7.46–47) and, referring to one of his critics, boasts, “my places, being three, contains all his” (1.7.44–45). Such a response did little to quell concerns that Ramus had “reduc’d” the body of knowledge, that he was arrogantly uninformed and notoriously reductive.

Although the use of dichotomies as a means of systematizing or ordering logic/rhetoric was not exclusive to Ramists, as Marlowe succinctly suggests, Ramus and his followers were recognizably “flat dichotomist[s],” and Walter Ong notes that the Ramist method is indeed “definitely committed to the dichotomy.”¹²² Thus, it took little effort for satirists to reduce, in turn, such conspicuous reduction in logic to *reductio ad absurdum* as when the persona of the Shakespearean comic actor Will Kemp appears in the third part of the *Parnassus* trilogy at Cambridge (1601) instructing Philomuses in how to be a stage clown by parroting Ramist dichotomies. In Act 4, observing his pupil Philomuses, “Kemp” first remarks, “your face me thinkes would be good for a foolish Mayre or a foolish iustice of peace” (ll.1849–50). Then, remarkably, Kemp demonstrates how to be such by employing Ramist rhetoric:

marke me—Forasmuch as there be two states of a common wealth, the one of peace, the other of tranquility: two states of warre, the one of discord, the other dissention (ll.1852–1856) .... I am determined not onely to teach but also to instruct, not onely the ignorant, but also the simple, not onely what is their duty towards their betters, but also what is their dutye towards their superiours (ll.1866–1869).¹²³

Here, the Cambridge author uses the persona of Kemp to expose Ramus’ dichotomization as arbitrarily and irrationally imposed upon any subject, so that Ramists end up simply repeating themselves and forcing false dichotomies. At the same time, the satire reflects the fact that “the evolution toward greater and greater dichotomization gathers momentum” in Ramus’ work until it “spreads to all the other arts and ultimately to all reality.”¹²⁴

The “foolish Mayre or ... foolish iustice of peace” is of course also part of a broad attack on puritan incorporations, for, as Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes have demonstrated, “There were a sufficient number of zealous

magistrates to form a recognisable type.... [and] the zealous justice guyed in the theatre was very likely to be a Puritan.”¹²⁵ We see a conspicuous use of the zealous puritan magistrate type Heal and Holmes have identified in the theater in a play staged by Paul’s Boys, *Blurt, Master Constable* (1601–2), where the Dogberry-like Blurt often refers reverently to God, such as when he says, “For your serving God I am not to meddle” (1.2.61), and he speaks in moralizing, puritanical terms as when he is outraged by the “Curtizans” who “are about some ungodlie Acte” (4.3.152–53). Blurt demonstrates as well a penchant for speaking in malapropisms with the puritans whom Nashe described as suited to be “misterming Clowne[s] in a Comedy.” He speaks, for instance, of his duty “in any fray or resurrection [i.e., *insurrection*]” (4.3.119–20). Blurt also preaches against “baudie house[s], or sincke[s] of wickedness” (1.2.76–77) and fervently admonishes, “[P]ray take heede with what dice you passe, I meane what company, for Sathan is most busie, where he findes one like himselfe” (1.2.141–43). The puritan magistrate type and the religiously-inspired “resurrection” malaprop also appear in Taylor’s jest-book *Wit and Mirth* (1629) when a country mayor says: “My Brethren and Neighbors, I do hear that the Queen is dead, wherefore I thought it exceeding fit we should despair to this place, that being dissembled together we might consult ..., for ... I stand in great fear that the people will be unrude, so that we shall be in danger of strange Resurrection.”¹²⁶ Clearly, the zealous, ignorant, “misterming” puritan magistrate was often a figure of fun in Renaissance England.

IV

3 *Parnassus* also suggests that puritan clowns were the famous Shakespearean actor Will Kemp’s specialty, since he is presented as teaching an amateur actor, in effect, to “watch me and do it like I do it” (i.e., “marke me—”). Indeed, with “[h]is reputation as a clown ... already established in London by 1590,”¹²⁷ being subsequently known as the “head-Master of Morrice-dauncers,”¹²⁸ Kemp was likely staging comic jigs mocking puritans during the Marprelate controversy between 1588–1589,¹²⁹ since Martin was skewered on the stage, Patrick Collinson observes, “within the generic conventions of ... the jig.” Harvey gives the titles for two such anti-Martinist jigs: *The Holie Oath of the Martinistes*, *That, Thinking to Sweare by His Conscience, Swore by his Concupiscence* and *The Zelous Love-Letter, or Corinthian Epistles to the Widow*.¹³⁰ In addition, one Marprelate war pamphlet, *Martins Months Minde*, claimed that Martin “took it very grievously, to be made a May game upon the stage,” specifying the stage of Shakespeare’s company before their

move to the Globe in 1599, "The Theatre."¹³¹ Similarly, one of Nashe's pamphlets refers to a stage portrayal of puritan leaders taking part in the riotous *May-game of Martinisme*:

Penry ... is the foregallant of the Morrice, ... *Martin* himselfe is the Mayd-Marian, trimlie drest uppe in a caste-Gowne, and a Kercher of Dame Lawsons, his face handsomlie muffled with a Diaper-napkin to cover his beard, and a great Nosegay in his hande ... *Wiggenton* daunces round about him in a Cotten-coate [i.e., a fool's long coat] to court him with a Leatherne pudding, and a wooden Ladle.¹³²

Because of allusions to *The May-game of Martinisme*, "mentioned separately in three anti-Martinist pamphlets,"¹³³ it would seem that an anti-Martinist *May-game* actually took the stage as a jig, probably with Kemp in the role of Martin. Kemp was, after all, especially identified with the Morris dance, so much so that he danced a sort of marathon Morris from London to Norwich in 1599, a feat he memorialized in *Kemps nine daies wonder* (1600), where he claims in the dedication that he is "such a one as ... hath spent his life in mad liggess and merry iestes."¹³⁴ So known for jigs was Kemp that his name was sometimes attached to them for publication (though he apparently did not author them). Between 1591 and 1595, the Stationer's Register includes the following "Kemp" jigs: *The Third and Last Part of Kemp's Jig*, *Kemp's Pleasant New Jig of the Broomman*, and *Master Kemp's New Jig of the Kitchen-Stuff Woman*.¹³⁵

A "Kemp" is even listed in *Theses Martinianae* (1589) as one of the many publishing "profane pamphlets ... against Martin" (sig. Diiii v). This important reference to Kemp's anti-puritan clowning has largely been discounted, however, on the basis of two red herrings. The first relies on the fact that, in response to "ballet-maker[s]" and "priuate Jigmonger[s]" who have "fill[ed] the country with lyes of his neuer done actes" in his name,¹³⁶ Kemp writes in *Nine daies wonder* that this work is the "first Pamphlet that euer Will Kemp offred to the Presse."¹³⁷ If *Nine daies wonder* (1600) is Kemp's *first* pamphlet, then how could he be one of the "haggling and profane" pamphleteers in 1589? The answer, as we saw in the jigs listed above and indeed with the fraudulent "ballet-maker[s]" and "Jigmonger[s]" in 1600, is that some of the anti-Martinist jigs in which Kemp had performed found their way into print and were subsequently associated with their star. The complaint in *Theses Martinianae* thus registers Kemp's prominence in anti-Martinist staging, not his actual authorship of jigs. That the Martinists were mistaken in assuming Kemp's authorship of anti-Martinist works associated with him can hardly allow us to dismiss the fact that his anti-puritan comic line had apparently gotten noticed.

The second red herring has to do with a contemporary who shares Kemp's name. According to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, "It is possible that the Plymouth schoolmaster [William Kempe] may be the 'Kemp' mentioned in 'Theses Martinianae,' ... as one of the pamphleteers in behalf of the bishops against the puritans in the Martin Mar-Prelate controversy."¹³⁸ Such a conjecture has never been tested and the possibility ultimately proves to be very remote indeed. The schoolmaster named William Kempe was hardly likely to have been one of the most "haggling and profane" in attacking Martin as he was decidedly puritan himself. His three published works include not only a translation of a work by the puritans' beloved Ramus entitled *The arte of arithmeticke in whole numbers and fractions; in a more readie and easie method then hitherto hath bene published written in Latin by P. Ramus; and translated into English by William Kempe* (1592), but also a zealously anti-Catholic work, *A dvitifvl invective, against the haynous treasons of Ballard and Babington* (1587), referring to the plot to replace a Protestant Queen Elizabeth with the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots. The latter work, dedicated to puritan Lord Mayor of London George Barne, rebukes "that vngodlie disposed woman, the Scottish Queene" and goes on to characterize the "vngodlie enterprise" in terms of "Antechrist," the "lewd Italian Frier ... the Pope and cursed crue, of Papists," "poperie," and the "cursed pope" in opposition to "true religion," "Gods gospell," and "zeale."¹³⁹ Thus, we can more safely conclude that the profane Kemp mentioned as an enemy to the puritan Martin was not the godly schoolmaster and was instead the noted anti-Martinist comic actor.

After all, that Kemp had participated in attacks on Martin is demonstrated by the 1590 commendatory dedication by Nashe in one anti-Martinist tract to "Brother Kempe" (with the puritan cant endearment "Brother" in addressing fellow "brethren" here reflecting Kemp's anti-puritan comic line), "that most Comickall... Cavaleire Monsieur du Kempe, Jestmonger and Vicegerent generall to the Ghost of Dicke Tarlton," which suggests the commendation of one comedic anti-Martinist "Cavalier" to another.¹⁴⁰ Likewise, in *Strange News* (1592), during the Nashe-Harvey pamphlet war, "a re-run of the Marprelate controversy,"¹⁴¹ referring as we have seen dismissively to puritan-sympathizer and Ramist Gabriel Harvey, Nashe writes: "for what can bee made of a Ropemaker more than a Clowne? *Will Kempe*, I mistrust it will fall to thy lot for a *merriment*, one of these dayes."¹⁴² Nashe's remark not only perpetuates the anti-Martinists' tactic of constructing puritans as low-class, ignorant clowns, but it also reveals Nashe's recognition that, like his own satire, Kemp's "merriments" were often topical, targeting puritans. Such references to Kemp, therefore, do not merely demonstrate that he had be-

come famous by 1590 but, as in the reference to Kemp in *Theses Martinianae* (1589), that he had achieved fame by acting in anti-Martinist comedy.

In fact, even Kemp's so-called "applauded Merrimentes," as advertised on the title page to *A Knacke to Know a Knave* (1592), which was based upon a Catholic play, were markedly anti-puritan—the play ends with "Honestie" refusing to amend the death sentence imposed on the two puritan villains with the bitter jest, "Trulie no, the spirit doth not moouue me therunto" (G 4^v). In the play's brief clown scene, featuring the "mad men of Goteham," Kemp likely took the part of Jeffrey the cobbler, who is the misterming mayor of Gotham. In a mere 39 lines of scripted dialogue (one suspects Kemp improvised more in performance to warrant advertising his connection to the play on the title page), the mad aldermen of Gotham are economically depicted as having several of the stereotypical features (even beyond ignorance) of the stage puritan. As the clowns debate who shall deliver their petition to the king, they invoke God's name, as when the Miller prays "Jesus blesse him" (ll. 1367), or when the Smith hypocritically tries to invoke the "vertue of [the] godhead" of the "god of [his] occupation" (ll. 1374–75), the pagan god Vulcan, at which the cobbler Jeffrey rebukes, "But soft you, your God was a Cuckold, and his Godhead was the horne, and thats the Armes of the Godhead you call upon" (ll. 1376–78). Furthermore, lines such as "nay, neighbor, be not angrie" and "O neighbor, I can not beare it, nor I will not beare it" (ll. 1369, 1388–89) show these clowns using the typical puritan reiteration, the biblical negative imperative, and the chiding, biblical "O." Evidently, then, as in the *Parnassus* play, Kemp's stock "applauded merriments" were typical of anti-puritan comedy in mocking conventional puritan types such as the "ecclesiastical cobbler" and the foolish puritan magistrate.

It is within the particular context of Kemp's celebrated anti-puritan clowning (which probably also included his appearance as Jack Cade when *2 Henry VI* was staged c. 1591–92)¹⁴³ and of the stupid puritan stereotype generally that Shakespeare wrote his own strict, stupid puritan clown for Kemp—for whatever reason, likely Kemp's last Shakespearean role—in 1598. Like the officiously "foolish Mayre or ... foolish iustice" that a fictional "Kemp" presented as his comic line in the *Parnassus* play, in *Much Ado About Nothing*, Master Constable Dogberry,¹⁴⁴ the "learned constable" (5.1.213), is—anticipating that "kind of puritan" Malvolio's (2.3.140, 147) trick of singularity in *Twelfth Night*¹⁴⁵—an arrogantly officious, pedantic "officer, ... and which is more ... a rich fellow enough, go to, ... and one that hath two gowns, and everything handsome about him" (4.2.72–77). Not only does Dogberry actually preach (e.g., "I think they that touch pitch will be defiled" [3.3.52–3]), but his diction is strikingly puritanical. Notably, he speaks

consistently of God—a remarkable 23 times in his appearance in a mere *four* scenes (3.3, 3.5, 4.2. and 5.1), including, to offer but a few instances, “God’s a good man” (3.5.32–33); “God is to be worshipped” (ll.35); “Gifts that God gives” (ll.38); “write ‘God’ first, for God defend but God should go before such villains” (4.2.17–18); “God save the foundation” (5.1.301); “if a merry meeting may be wished, God prohibit it” (ll. 307). While calling upon God is not in itself unusual, such incessant invocations make Dogberry sound self-consciously pious, stereotypically zealous, or “godly,” as does another tick we have seen previously, the puritan habit of referring to other godly folk as “neighbors” (3.3.7, 12, 77, 80, 3.5.1, 16, 32, 36, 5.1.308)—a levelling, communal epithet akin to “brother.”¹⁴⁶

Dogberry also employs a “characteristically puritan trick of style,” “the quasi-Hebraic use of repetitive clauses with amplification”¹⁴⁷: “Marry, sir, they have committed false report, moreover they have spoken untruths, secondarily they are slanders, sixth and lastly they have belied a lady, thirdly they have verified unjust things, and to conclude, they are lying knaves” (5.1.202–5). Although such repetition also resembles that of Jonson’s famous puritan Zeal-of-the-Land Busy—“it were not well, it were not fit, it were abominable, and not good” (1.6.72–73)—that the cramming repetition of synonyms was recognizable puritan-speak is also noted by Eugene E. White. The two major (and mutually reinforcing) methods in puritan rhetoric, White demonstrates, were reiteration and cumulation, “the method of developing an item of support by either restating it in a somewhat different form or repeating it in the same words” and “the method of securing magnification of impact by presenting a tightly structured series of related items in support of an idea—the cumulated effect of the series being greater than the thrust warranted by the logical and psychological merit of the items as individual pieces of support.”¹⁴⁸ Of course, when comic asses like the illiterate Dogberry or the magistrate modeled by the persona of “Kemp” use such rhetoric, they merely sound illogical, echoing conventional satire.

Above all, Dogberry and neighbour Verges often sound not merely stupid but puritanically pious even in their famous malaprops. Consider Verges’s conclusion that men who are not “good men and true” should “suffer salvation [i.e., *damnation*], body and soul” (3.3.2–3). Lapsing similarly into fervent sanctimony, Dogberry exclaims in strict judgment, “O villain! Thou wilt be condemned into everlasting redemption [i.e., *damnation*] for this” (4.2.50–51), followed by, “No, thou villain, thou art full of piety [i.e., *impiety*]” (4.2.70–71). Thus, Dogberry and Verges regularly misuse words that (were they real people) they might have overheard from the puritans’ famous preaching ministry, as when Dogberry claims that the Sexton “hath reformed

[i.e., *informed*] Signor Leonato of the matter” (5.1.238) or when he prays that God may “prohibit” (i.e., *permit*) a “merry meeting” with Leonato in the future (5.1.307). Apparently, Shakespeare implies, the unlettered Dogberry, for whom “writing and reading” are “vanity” (3.3.18–19), has encountered weighty words such as “reformed,” “redemption,” “salvation,” “piety,” and “prohibit,” while gadding to sermons. Dogberry thus recalls the conventional type of “misterming Clowne in a Comedy” that Nashe claimed puritan preachers resembled. Yet, puritan admissions suggest that actual godly malaprops were probably all too common, since sermons frequently “over-run [the people’s] understandings”: “Many ... have that in their minds which is not ripe for utterance; and through ill education and disuse, they are strangers to the expressions of those things which they have some Conceptions of.”¹⁴⁹ One would, I believe, be hard-pressed to find a better explanation of Dogberry’s pious-impious malaprops.

Though it is not necessary to the conclusion that Dogberry was recognizably of the proud ignorant puritan type in the tradition of Marprelate, Stupido, or Kemp’s “merrimentes” elsewhere, Dogberry’s attempts at pedantry (i.e., he is humorously referred to as the “learned constable” [5.1.213]), as performed by that occasional mocker of the French scholar Ramus, “Monsieur du Kempe” (here, too, recall Dogberry’s affected “Adieu. Be vigilant ....” [3.3.82–83]), may even have taken on a decidedly Ramist flavour for an Elizabethan audience. In particular, Dogberry employs the puritans’ incessant rhetorical use of the Ramist method of ordering by numbered lists—“secondarily they are slanders, sixth and lastly they have belied a lady, thirdly they have verified unjust things ...” (5.1.203–5)—and his absurd “sixth and lastly” may even allude to Martin Marprelate’s and martyrologist John Foxe’s somewhat overblown yet homely “sixtly and lastly.”¹⁵⁰ Whether employing a dichotomy or a list, Ramist method was based primarily on the importance of ordering logic; indeed, Ramist dialectic is, essentially, order. Ramus had boasted, for instance, that the basis for his dialectic was the “order found within things themselves,”¹⁵¹ and he had attacked Aristotle for failing to consider that most important question, for him, of “what is first, what second, what third.”¹⁵² Likewise, in his first treatment of “method” in his *Training in Dialectic*, first published pseudonymously in 1546, Ramus had defined method as “the arrangement of many good arguments.”¹⁵³ And, in the final revision of his *Dialectic* (1572), Ramus would write more expansively: “Method is the intelligible order of various homogeneous axioms ranged one before the other according to the clarity of their nature.”¹⁵⁴ In Dogberry’s attempt at intelligibly ordered Ramist method, however, his inability to count prompts Claudio’s jest, “Rightly reasoned, and in his own

division" (5.1.209)—a possible jibe at Ramus once being forced to teach math. The arrogant Dogberry was not merely generically pretentious in his attempted transitions and numbered lists, then, but rather he was pedantic in a manner that some would have recognized as a burlesque of the Ramist learning valorized by puritans ranging from the fictional Stupido to the historical Perkins.

Indeed, given that, in Ramism, order was synonymous with method, and memorization virtually equivalent to understanding, Dogberry's illogical reasoning may have constituted a subtle satiric rebuttal to Ramist method. Dogberry is illogical not, as Ramus would have it in his attack on Aristotle, merely because his discourse lacks order; instead, as we have seen, the "learned constable" painstakingly *attempts* to order his rhetoric not just in his "sixth and lastly" speech but also when he conscientiously insists, "write God first, for God defend but God should go before such villains" (4.2.18–19). Nor does Dogberry fail to understand because he cannot remember things (recall that for Ramus "reason" is "practically *identical* with memory" and "memorization ... is virtually synonymous with understanding"),¹⁵⁵ since Dogberry's memory is, ironically, elephantine and obsessive (e.g., "But masters, remember that I am an ass. Though it be not written down, yet forget not that I am an ass" [5.1.69–70]), but rather because he orders and remembers without first *understanding*, and thus takes things out of context, zealously imposing form divorced from content or meaning. This idiosyncrasy, of course, matches precisely the anti-Ramists' charge against Ramus, who as we saw, according to his critics and the royally commissioned censors, had attacked Aristotle's supposed lack of organization "without giving evidence of understanding" the content first.

More broadly, we might also consider the ways in which both Dogberry's susceptibility to mis-hearing and zealous malapropisms and Cade's exaggerated misinterpretations of the puritan opposition to the reading ministry reflect ironically on what Bryan Crockett has called the puritan "cult of the ear,"¹⁵⁶ the belief not simply that preaching was generally edifying but that *hearing* the word of God was the best path to salvation and enlightenment. After all, "The usual Protestant claim [was] that biblical ideas are imparted not primarily by reading but by the spoken word."¹⁵⁷ And, as Crockett further notes, "Protestant reformers frequently support their position by quoting Paul's statement, 'Then faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God' (Rom. 10:17)."¹⁵⁸ But as "Protestant 'logolatry' supplant[ed] the idolatry of which the reformers accuse Catholicism,"¹⁵⁹ Shakespeare's stupid puritans point to what was potentially dangerous about the cult of the ear. That is, puritans' absolute faith that hearing would be edifying did not adequately ac-

count for rampant individual misinterpretation. As with the satire of Ramism and inspiration, the basis for authority of puritan interpretation was once again called into question.

And yet, I hasten to add, even if Dogberry in particular deflates the proud ideals of puritan logolatry, interpretation, learning, and rhetoric, our response to Dogberry is more complex than seeing him solely as a figure of fun at the puritans' expense, in part because he is such a delight. We also learn that Dogberry is well meaning, a good "neighbor" and friend to his partner Verges, and, ultimately, an essential part of the community, who plays a key role in unravelling the villains' plot. It may also be instructive that we find ourselves more frustrated with Leonato's arrogance and impatience in dismissing Dogberry in 3.5 than we are with Dogberry's own humorously self-satisfied delays. And, on another level, Dogberry's mis-hearing malapropisms subtly reflect the theme of overhearing in the play as a whole—as in the punning title *Much Ado About Nothing*, where "nothing" would have been pronounced like "noting," a term for hearing, as in music. Dogberry's mistaking, ironically, is analogous to the mistakes other, supposedly wiser, characters make. Shakespeare thus represents Dogberry—a kind of stupid puritan—as anything but ostracized in the play. As a result, for all of many puritans' antipathy to the professional theatre, Shakespeare's humorous take on puritanism seems decidedly more tolerant, patient, and inclusive than that of other satirists.

In the end, there were many rationales for staging the puritan minority as "Stupidos." Representations of stupid puritan clowns could serve a variety of functions, ranging from the shoring up of ideological boundaries and the debunking of the spiritual claims and education of an extreme wing of Protestantism, to buttressing the authority of existing modes of interpretation. Moreover, Martin Marprelate's populist adoption of a low-class, clown-preacher persona (provoking the anti-Martinists' satire and Will Kemp's on-stage "merriments") aided conformist opponents in stereotyping puritans as ignorant, "Anabaptisticall," "ecclesiastical cobblers," who were irrationally inspired by the spirit and unable to exercise reason. Similarly, Ramus's attack on Aristotle and his boasts of producing a simplified method allowed depictions on stage and in print of puritan learning as dumbed-down pedantry; the arrogance of godly magistrates and their vaunted "learned ministry" opposed to the "reading ministry" and "humane learning" contributed further to a prevalent Renaissance English stereotype of puritans as, above all perhaps, "proud ignorants." At the same time, the interplay between the university drama (with its delight in the professional actor Kemp's puritan clowns) and public theatre author Shakespeare's awareness of Ramist rhetoric and the

controversies regarding reason and authority of interpretation is significant: it suggests ways in which interest in such concerns cut a wide swath across the culture, and it demonstrates that “academic” and “professional” drama were not so separate as critical tradition has often allowed.

An examination of the stupid clown typology also points to ways in which humorous portrayals could require layered responses from various audience members. My exploration of Dogberry ultimately complements Grace Tiffany’s analysis of the carnivalesque puritan clown type in this respect. Tiffany demonstrates through her rich examination of what is apparently yet another Kemp role,¹⁶⁰ Falstaff’s embodiment of once-familiar puritan traits (including, again, puritan rhetoric¹⁶¹), that Shakespeare’s puritans “were never unsympathetically rendered or wholly unattractive.”¹⁶² Instead, as we have seen especially via Dogberry, but also I think in the simultaneously grotesque and charismatic Cade, the audience experiences what Tiffany characterizes as a kind of shared “delight”¹⁶³ in the Shakespearean puritan. However otherwise satirical such puritan characterizations no doubt could be, it would be foolish to ignore “the audience sympathy generated for”¹⁶⁴ them, something which arguably performed a sort of “compensatory function”¹⁶⁵ for members of an audience that no doubt did include some puritans, as well as something that “probably softened the anti-Puritan attitudes of mainstream playgoers.”¹⁶⁶ Indeed, we cannot dismiss the sympathy invoked for the banished Falstaff, the duped and defeated Cade, or even the notoriously abused wits of the foolishly vain Malvolio, since such characterizations all focus on the costs of ostracizing puritans. So, too, even as the proud ignorance of Shakespeare’s brand of devout asses participated in satire aimed at exposing the potential dangers of such zealous folly, it could also compel fellow-feeling.

Notes

* This essay is, in part, a follow up to issues raised but undeveloped in my earlier article, “Staging Puritanism in the Early 1590s: The Carnivalesque, Rebellious Clown as Anti-Puritan Stereotype,” *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 24.3 (Summer 2000), pp. 31–68. I would like to thank Jeanne McCarthy, Elizabeth Richmond-Garza, Leah Marcus, Oscar Brockett, Eric Mallin, Brian Levack, Douglas McFarland, Chris Holcomb, and Ted Hornback for their advice, participants at the 2003 Sixteenth Century Studies Conference for useful feedback and encouragement, Oglethorpe University for supporting my research, actors at Georgia Shakespeare for inspiration, and the staffs at the Huntington and Folger Shakespeare Library for assistance as I worked to complete this project.

1. Keith Thomas, “The Place of Laughter in Tudor and Stuart England,” *Times Literary Supplement* (21 January 1977), p. 77.

2. Christie Davies, "Ethnic Jokes, Moral Values and Social Boundaries," *British Journal of Sociology* 33.3 (September 1982), p. 383. See for instance Davies's discussion of ethnic jokes which occur with regularity particularly in competitive, modern industrial societies: pp. 383, 390.
3. Susan Purdie, "The Butt: The Third Position," *Comedy: The Mastery of Discourse* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1993), p. 59.
4. Borthwick Institute, York, High Commission Cause Papers, 1597/12; Buckinghamshire Record Office, D/A/V4, fo. 53v.
5. My use of the term "puritan" throughout echoes that of English historian Peter Lake: "The term 'puritan' is used to refer to a broader span of opinion [than the presbyterian platform alone], encompassing those advanced protestants who regarded themselves as 'the godly' .... It is therefore used as a term of degree, or relative religious zeal rather than as a clear-cut party label. Thus, while all presbyterians were puritans, not all puritans were presbyterians and the usage here is designed to reflect that." In *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), p. 7. For further discussion of such issues, see Patrick Collinson, "Concerning the name Puritan, a comment," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), pp. 463–88; Peter Lake, "Defining puritanism—again?," *Puritanism*, ed. F. Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), pp. 3–29.
6. *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587–1590*, ed. Leland H. Carlson (London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1962–1966), p. 543; quoted in Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England* (1971; rpt.: New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 64.
7. John Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain: Chiefly Illustrating the Origin of Our Vulgar and Provincial Customs, Ceremonies, and Superstitions* (1848–49; rpt.: New York: AMS Press, 1970), p. 203.
8. Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 390, 42.
9. Martin Marprelate, *The Epistle* (1588), in *The Marprelate Tracts [1588–1589]* (Leeds: The Scholar Press facsimile reprint, 1967), p. 33; subsequent Marprelate references are from this edition.
10. On the often subversive "carnavalesque puritan" type with respect to Falstaff and Martin Marprelate, see especially Kristen Poole, "Saints Alive! Falstaff, Martin Marprelate, and the Staging of Puritanism," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.1 (Spring 1995), pp. 47–75 and Grace Tiffany, "Puritanism in Comic History: Exposing Royalty in the Henry Plays," *Shakespeare Studies* 26 (1998), pp. 256–87. See also J. Dover Wilson, *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).
11. Tiffany, p. 269. Tiffany does not address accusations of stupidity, but rather of "sophistical argument" (p. 260).
12. *Some Annals of the Borough of Devizes*, ed. B. H. Cunnington (Devizes: G. Simpson & co., 1925–26), vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 59–64; quoted in David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603–1660* (1985; rpt.: Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 51.
13. Peter Studley, *Looking-Glasse of Schisme* (London, 1634), p. 160.

14. Inner Temple Library, MS. Petyt 538/47, pp. 526–7.
15. Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (1958; rpt.: New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), p. 199, quoting *Tracts ascribed to Richard Bancroft*, p. 93.
16. Robert Bolton, *Mr. Bolton's Last & Learned Worke ... Together with the Life and Death of the Author, Published by E[dward] B[agshaw]* (London, 1632), in "Life," sig. B3 r–v.
17. *Pilgrimage to Parnassus with the Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus. Three Comedies performed in St. John's College.* (1597–1601), ed. Rev. W.D. Macray (London: Clarendon, 1886).
18. John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560–1640* (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 14.
19. John Lyly, *Pappe with an hatchet. Alias, a figge for my God sonne* (1589), in *The Complete Works of John Lyly: Now for the First Time Collected and Edited from the Earliest Quartos with Life, Bibliography, Essays, Notes, and Index*, ed. R. Warwick Bond, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), vol. 3, p. 408.
20. E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), vol. 4, p. 230.
21. Martin Marprelate, *Martin Juniors Epilogve* (1589), sig. D3 v.
22. Christopher Hill, *Writing and Revolution in 17th-Century England*, vol. 1 of *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), p. 75.
23. Patrick Collinson, "Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*: The Theatre Constructs Puritanism," *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 166.
24. Marprelate, *Epistle*, p. 19.
25. Marprelate, *Hay any worke for Cooper*, p. 46.
26. Donna B. Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1992), p. 76.
27. Lyly, *Pappe with an hatchet*, in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 408.
28. Thomas Nashe, *An Almond for a Parrat* (1590), in *Works: Edited from the Original Texts*, ed. R.B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London: A.H. Bullen, 1904–1911), vol. 3, p. 344; subsequent citations are from McKerrow.
29. Lyly, *Mar-Martin* (1589), in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 426; vol. 2, pp. 97 and 98.
30. Nashe, *Christs Teares Over Iervsalem* (1594), in *Works*, vol. 2, p. 62.
31. Joseph Black, "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588–89), Anti-Martinism and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28.3 (Fall 1997), p. 719.
32. Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse* (1592), in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 192.
33. Charles Nicholl, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 77.

34. J. W. Martin, "Christopher Vitel: An Elizabethan Mechanic Preacher," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 10 (May 1979), pp. 15–22.
35. Neil Rhodes, *Elizabethan Grotesque* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 158, 4. Rhodes argues here in terms of prose "satirical journalism" and its use of "the grotesque" in the 1590s, following Marprelate, not in terms of the stage clown or puritanism more generally.
36. Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 27.
37. Edwin Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors and of Other Persons Associated with the Public Representation of Plays in England before 1642* (New York: Greenwood, 1968), p. 347.
38. Marprelate, *Epistle*, p. 16.
39. Marprelate, *Epitome*, p. 2.
40. Black, p. 719.
41. Marprelate, *Epistle*, p. 39.
42. Marprelate, *Epistle*, p. 52.
43. James I, *The True Law of Free Monarchies and Basilikon Doron of James VI*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1996), p. 94.
44. Nashe, *An Almond for a Parrat* (1590), in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 352.
45. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, DD*, ed. Bruce and Perowne (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1853), p. 437.
46. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 137.
47. Whitgift quoted in Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 137; Matthew Sutcliffe, *An Answer to a certaine libel supplicatorie* (London, 1592), p. 72. On Anabaptist rebellion on the Continent, see Bernard M. G. Reardon, "The Anabaptists," *Religious Thought in the Reformation* (London: Longman, 1981, 1995), pp. 196–207.
48. D. G. Allan, "The Risings in the West 1628–31," *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, vol. 5 (1952–3), pp. 76–85.
49. Nichols, *Plea for the innocent* (Middelburg: 1602), sig. D5 r.
50. Richard Cosin, *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation* (London, 1592), sig. I3 r.
51. Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan*, p. 424.
52. Cosin, *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation*, sigs. K2 v, C2 r.
53. Lyly, *Pappe with an hatchet*, in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 409.
54. Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller, or, The Life of Jacke Wilton* (1594), in *Works*, vol. 2, p. 233.
55. George Chapman, "The Memorable Masque of the Two Honourable Houses or Inns of Court," *Jacobean and Caroline Masques*, 2 vols., ed. Richard Dutton (Nottingham: Nottingham Drama Texts, University of Nottingham, 1981–87), vol. 2, pp. 19–32; vol. 2, pp. 200, 220, 245.
56. Samuel Butler, *Hudibras*, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 15–16.
57. English satire against puritan inspiration continued right down through Swift's *Tale of a Tub* (1710) with its depiction of the irrational idiot Jack (representing John Calvin), "a

Person whose Intellectuals were overturned” (p. 345), and of the sect of “the Learned Aeolists” (p. 340), puffed up with winds which they worshipped, spewed forth on their congregations, and which informed all their learning:

[A]ll Learning was esteemed among them to be compounded from the same Principle. Because, First, it is generally affirmed, or confess’d that *Learning Puffeth Men up*: and Secondly, they proved it by the following Syllogism; *Words are but Wind; and Learning is nothing but Words; Ergo, Learning is nothing but Wind*. For this Reason, the Philosophers, among them, did in their Schools, deliver to their Pupils, all their Doctrines and Opinions by Eructation, wherein they had acquired a wonderful Eloquence. (p. 342)

Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub* (1710), in *The Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Robert A. Greenburg and William B. Piper, A Norton Critical Edition (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1973). By the mid-eighteenth century, “enthusiasm” was “often associated, in [Henry] Fielding’s work, with the Methodists.” Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones*, ed. John Bender and Simon Stern, Oxford World’s Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 878 n. 83.

58. Robert Weimann, *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), p. 81.
59. Cosin, *Conspiracie*, p. 83.
60. Oliver Ormerud, *Picture of a Puritane* (enlarged edition, London, 1605), p. 70.
61. Nashe, *The Returne of Pasquill*, in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 89.
62. John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 132.
63. Weimann, “Breach in Authorization,” in *Authority and Representation in Early Modern Discourse*, pp. 68–82.
64. Nashe, *Unfortunate Traveller*, in *Works*, vol. 2, p. 234.
65. Morgan, p. 50.
66. William Perkins, *The Workes ...*, 3 vols., (London, 1626–31), vol. 2, p. 464.
67. Richard Greenham, *The Workes of the Reverend Richard Greenham ...*, ed. Henry Holland (London, 1612), p. 757.
68. Richard Capel, *Tentations: Their Nature, Danger, Cure* (London, 1635), pp. 106–7.
69. Morgan, p. 62; here quoting Hiram Haydn’s *The Counter-Renaissance* (New York: Scribner, 1950), pp. 84–85. Morgan notes that “[o]n only one occasion, however, did Haydn specifically mention that puritans fitted the patterns of the ‘Counter-Renaissance.’”
70. Arthur Dent, *Pastime for Parents* (London, 1606), n.p.
71. Thomas Granger, *A Familiar Exposition or Commentarie on Ecclesiastes* (London, 1621), pp. 40–41.
72. Francis Rous, *The Heavenly Academie: Or the Highest School. Where Alone is that highest Teaching, the Teaching of the Heart* (London, 1638), pp. 44–45.
73. Rous, pp. 30, 42.
74. Rous, p. 42.
75. Rous, p. 42.

76. Richard Sibbes, *Light from Heaven* (London, 1638), pp. 20–21.
77. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1972; rpt.: New York: Viking Press, 1973), p. 243.
78. Robert Browne, *Treatise upon the 23. of Matthewe* (Middelburg, 1582), p. 181.
79. Henry Barrow, *A Brief Discoverie of the False Church* (1590), in *The Writings of Henry Barrow*, p. 539.
80. Barrow, p. 539.
81. Morgan, p. 75.
82. William P. Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572–1642* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 55.
83. Thomas Heywood, *Troia Britanica: Or, Great Brittaines Troy. A Poem Deuided into XVII. Seuerall Cantons, intermixed with many pleasant Poeticall Tales* (London, 1609), p. 90, stanza 63.
84. Richard Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (ca. 1650), in Morgan, p. 68.
85. John Taylor, *The World Turn'd Upside Down* (London, 1647), sig. A3 r.
86. Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller* (London, 1594), in *Works*, vol. 2, p. 233.
87. Nashe, *The Returne of Pasquill* (London, 1589), in *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 78–79.
88. Nashe, *The Returne of Pasquill*, in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 73.
89. See Bernard M. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Reformation* (1981; second edition: London and New York: Longman, 1995), pp. 203–4.
90. Sutcliffe, sig. A2 v.
91. *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with the Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus. Three Comedies performed in St. John's College.* (1597–1601), ed. Rev. W. D. Macray (London: Clarendon Press, 1886), p. 12.
92. Marprelate, *Hay any worke for Cooper*, p. 3.
93. Nashe, *An Almond for a Parrat* (London, 1590), in *Works*, vol.3, p.350.
94. John Taylor, *A Swarme of Sectaires, and Schismatiques* (London, 1641), sig. B3 v.
95. Sir Thomas Overbury (and Others), *Characters, Together with Poems, News, Edicts, and Paradoxes Based on the Eleventh Edition (1622) of A Wife Now the Widow of Sir Thomas Overbury* (1614), ed. Donald Beecher (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 2003), p. 239.
96. *A View of Popish Abuses Yet Remaining in the English Church* is excerpted in *Religion and Society in Early Modern England, a Sourcebook*, ed. David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 84.
97. See Knowles, *King Henry VI Part 2*, n. 31–32 (p. 300): “Cf. Leviticus, 26.8, ‘and your enemies shall fall before you upon the sword’ .... Texts like Ezekiel, 21.26, ‘Remove the diadem, and take off the crown ... exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high’, and Luke, 1.52, ‘He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree’, provided a revolutionary agenda for the Anabaptist leaders, as in Thomas Muntzer’s ‘Special Exposure of False Faith’ ([p.] 1524).” Knowles, however, does not argue that Cade and his followers are puritan. *King Henry VI Part 2*, ed. Ronald Knowles, The Arden Shakespeare edition (Walton-on-Thames Surrey: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1999). All references are to this edition unless otherwise noted.

98. In the Arden edition Knowles includes the following note for these lines: "reminiscent of Old Testament rituals of atonement for 'sin and 'iniquity' using various beasts, including the calf and bullock. See Leviticus, 9 and 16" (299). Likewise, when Cade praises the Butcher saying, "They fell before thee like sheep and oxen" (4.3.3), Knowles notes: "There is possibly an allusion here to the Israelites fighting the Philistines: see 1 Samuel, 14.32" (311).
99. Nashe, *Unfortunate Traveller*, in *Works*, vol. 2, p. 232.
100. Quoted in Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in 17th-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), p. 189.
101. Barrow, p. 539.
102. Quoted in Morgan, p. 242.
103. Walter J. Ong, S.J., *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983, 1958), p. 19.
104. Ong, p. 21.
105. Ong, p. 197.
106. Ong, p. 44.
107. Ong, p. 24.
108. Ong, p. 194; emphasis mine.
109. Ong, p. 193.
110. Ong, p. 194.
111. Ong, p. 191.
112. Ong, pp. 18–20.
113. Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie* (London, 1589), in *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 20, 21.
114. Nashe, *An Almond for a Parrat* (1590), in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 368.
115. Marprelate, *Epistle*, p. 53.
116. Lyly, *Pappe with an hatchet*, in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 411.
117. Harvey had described Ramist "method" with religious fervour as "a heavenly virgin who directs the goddesses of all the Arts" in his *Ode Natalitia* (1574), an elegy to the martyred Ramus. Kendrick W. Prewitt, "Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method," *Studies in English Literature* 39, 1 (Winter 1999), pp. 19, 21.
118. Rhodes, p. 92; Nashe, *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 286–87.
119. Nashe, *Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (London, 1596), in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 136.
120. Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse*, in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 196. See also: "This is the Dick [Richard Harvey, Gabriel's brother] that set *Aristotle*, with his heeles vpwrd, on the School gates at *Cambridge*, and asses eares on hys head." *Have with you to Saffron-Walden*, in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 85. In *I Parnassus*, disillusioned by his considerable failures, Gabriel Harvey is lampooned as Madido, who recounts his fruitless travails in Ramist method: "I set up my unluckie feete in this ile *Dialectica*, where I can see nothings but ... phantasmes; as soon as I came hither I began to read Ramus his mapp, *Dialectica est &c.*; .... Upon this I threw away the mapp in a chase, and came home, cursing my witless head ...." *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, ed. Rev. W. D. Macray, pp. 8–9.

The tradition of mockery at the expense of supposed Ramist irrationality would also be an issue later in the early modern period in derivative characterizations of “Methodists.” Once again the connection was to Ramism, since “the term ‘method’ was appropriated from the Ramist coffers and used to form the term ‘methodists’ to designate first enthusiastic preachers who made an issue of their adherence to logic’, and finally the followers of John Wesley, who had been the author of a logic textbook vaguely reminiscent of Ramism” (Ong, p. 304). Although Ramism would ultimately gain in prestige (particularly through Ramism’s influence on Harvard [Ong, pp. 12, 15, 302]), the appropriation of the Ramist term “method” to denigrate “enthusiasm” demonstrates how thoroughly many once viewed Ramism as irrational.

121. Nashe, “To the Gentlemen Stvdents of Both Vniversities,” in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 318.

122. Ong, p. 201.

123. Compare the obvious Ramist rhetoric here to that used by Gabriel Harvey and William Perkins. In his “Earthquake Letter,” as both Kendrick W. Prewitt and Gerald Snare have demonstrated, Harvey uses Ramist method to frame his second explanation for a recent earthquake in April of 1580: “Accordingly, Harvey arranges the efficient causes into their Ramist categories and does the same with the final causes. He begins with a consideration of the two internal causes (the material and the formal).” See Kendrick W. Prewitt, “Gabriel Harvey and the Practice of Method,” *Studies in English Literature* 39, 1 (Winter 1999), p. 28; Gerald Snare, “Satire, Logic, and Rhetoric in Harvey’s Earthquake Letter to Spenser,” *Tulane Studies in English* 18 (1970), pp. 17–33. Likewise, we may observe the non-conformist puritan Cambridge don Perkins (1558–1602) ordering his argument according to dichotomies in his *A Golden Chain, or, the Description of Theologie* (first published in Latin in 1590 and subsequently going through fifteen editions in several languages, including English, in the following two decades): “Predestination hath two parts: election and reprobation .... The degrees are in number two: the love of God and the declaration of his love .... The declaration of God’s love is twofold. The first, towards infants elected to salvation, the second, towards men ....” Quoted in *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook*, ed. David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 114.

124. Ong, pp. 200–201.

125. Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500–1700* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 181.

126. *A Nest of Ninnies and Other English Jestbooks of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. P. M. Zall (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), p. 129.

127. Nungezer, p. 216.

128. William Kemp, *Kemps Nine Daies Wonder. Performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich*, ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce (London: Camden Society, 1860; reprinted: New York: AMS Press, 1968), p. 3.

129. Though they do not emphasize the jig, both Nicholl and Poole argue that Kemp performed in anti-Martiniest travesties. See Nicholl, p. 68; Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 34, 201 nn. 69, 74.

130. See Collinson, “Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*,” p. 167, here citing C. J. Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare’s Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 127.

131. Chambers, vol. 4, p. 230.
132. Nashe, *The Returne of the Renowned Cavaliero Pasquill of England* (1589), in *Works*, vol. 1, p. 83.
133. Nicholl, pp. 68, 288–89 n. 27.
134. Kemp, p. 2.
135. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 224–225.
136. Kemp, p. 20.
137. Kemp, p. 19.
138. *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. XXX, “Johnes-Kenneth,” ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1892), p. 390.
139. Reproduced in *Fugitive Tracts Written in Verse which Illustrate the Condition of Religious and Political Feeling in England*, ed. Henry Huth, (London: Chiswick Press, 1875), n.p.
140. Nashe, *An Almond for a Parrat* (1590) in *Works*, vol. 3, pp. 339, 341; Nicholl, p. 68.
141. Rhodes, p. 92.
142. Nashe, *Works*, vol. 1, pp. 286–87.
143. Many critics suppose that Shakespeare wrote *2 Henry VI* in 1591 before he probably wrote *1 Henry VI* in 1592, but I include a possible composition date of 1592 to reflect the fact that not all are agreed on the 1591 date for *2 Henry VI*. See, for instance, Hanspeter Born, who argues for a date “between March and August 1592” (p. 334) in “The Date of 2, 3 *Henry VI*,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25 (1974), pp. 323–34. The earlier date would make Kemp’s appearance as Cade likely and the latter certain.
 Jean Howard conjectures that Kemp “may have played the part of Cade.” *The Norton Shakespeare Edition Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997), p. 207. Other critics have shared this hypothesis. See T. W. Baldwin, *The Organisation and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1927), p. 268; E. W. Talbert, *Elizabethan Drama and Shakespeare’s Early Plays: An Essay in Historical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963), pp. 56–60; Stephen Longstaffe, “‘A short report and not otherwise’: Jack Cade in *2 Henry VI*,” Ronald Knowles, ed., *Shakespeare and Carnival: After Bakhtin* (Basingstroke: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 13–35. Kemp’s specialization in puritan clowns, combined with his connection to the Morris and the jig (Cade is described as “caper[ing] upright like a wild Morisco” [3.1.365]), the Marprelate war allusions to Kemp’s anti-puritan merriments, and Kemp’s fame before 1590 make Kemp’s performance as Cade (c. 1591–92) all the more likely.
144. In the Quarto of *Much Ado*, printed in 1600, Kemp’s name appears as the speech heading for Dogberry in 4.2, partly perhaps in order to prevent confusion between the speech headings for Constable and Conrade (the latter listed as “Con.” in the scene): sigs. G4 v–H1 v. See *Shakespeare’s Plays in Quarto: A Facsimile Edition of Copies Primarily from the Henry E. Huntington Library*, ed. Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), pp. 514–15. The speech heading for Kemp here is generally taken, rightly I think, as clear evidence that the part was composed for Kemp before he left Shakespeare’s company after the 1598 season.

145. For discussion of Malvolio as a type of worldly puritan, see Paul Yachnin, "Reversal of Fortune: Shakespeare, Middleton, and the Puritans," *English Literary History* 70.3 (2003), pp. 757–86.
146. Heywood comments on such sayings: "His [the puritan's] phrase is, Verily; By yea and nay;/ In faith, in truth, good neighbor, or good brother." *Troia Britanica*, p. 89, stanza 51.
147. Leah S. Marcus, "Of Mire and Authorship" *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 173–74. Marcus does not refer to Dogberry.
148. Eugene E. White, *Puritan Rhetoric: the Issue of Emotion in Religion* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972), p. 187. White does not refer to Dogberry.
149. R. Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor* (London, 1656), pp. 357, 431–32.
150. Marprelate, *Hay any worke for Cooper*, p. 12; John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1583 edition) [online], (hriOnline, Sheffield), p. 1976. Available: <<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/foxe/>>. [Accessed: 03.27.2006]
151. Ong, p. 195.
152. Ong, p. 195.
153. Ong, p. 245.
154. Ong, p. 251.
155. Ong, p. 194.
156. Bryan Crockett, "'Holy Cozenage' and the Renaissance Cult of the Ear," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 24 (1993), pp. 47–65 and *The Play of Paradox: Stage and Sermon in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), especially pp. 5, 50, 55–56, 69.
157. Crockett, *Play of Paradox*, p. 55.
158. Crockett, *Play of Paradox*, p. 9.
159. Crockett, *Play of Paradox*, p. 55.
160. Wilson notes that the Quarto edition of *2 Henry IV* reads "Enter Will" at Falstaff's apparent entrance "early in the Doll scene (2.4)"; *The Fortunes of Falstaff*, p. 124. Compare to my note 144 above.
161. Here see also Poole, pp. 34–37
162. Tiffany, p. 257.
163. Tiffany, pp. 266, 275, in reference to Falstaff.
164. Tiffany, p. 266.
165. Tiffany, p. 260.
166. Tiffany, p. 279.