



PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

C O N T E N T S

Communal Purity and Jewish “Filbe” in *Cleanness*.....Maija Birenbaum

An Author and a Bookshop:
Publishing Marlowe’s Remains at the Black Bear.....András Kiséry

Denmark’s Rotting Reconsidered.....Jacqueline Vanhoutte

Stillness and Noise:
The Ambiences of John Donne’s LyricsChristopher D’Addario

Attribution and Misattribution:
New Poems by Robert Browning?.....Ashby Bland Crowder

Reading and Not Reading “The Man of the Crowd”:
Poe, the City, and the Gothic Text.....Bran Nicol

A Latin Model for an Old English
Homiletic Fragment.....Stephen Pelle

An Author and a Bookshop: Publishing Marlowe's Remains at the Black Bear

ANDRÁS KISÉRY

LET ME SEE, hath anybody in Yarmouth heard of Leander and Hero, of whom divine Musaeus sung, and a diviner Muse than him, Kit Marlow? Two faithful lovers they were, as every apprentice in Paul's Churchyard will tell you for your love, and sell you for your money"—thus Thomas Nashe, in 1599, at the moment when Christopher Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* became a runaway success, and Marlowe's name something of a brand name, with his work displayed and discussed in Paul's Churchyard, the center of the English book trade.

The Cathedral precinct, and the Churchyard especially, was London's most prominent news exchange, a public arena whose bookshops have even been compared to the coffee shops of a century later, with the implication that the Habermasian public sphere may have originated in these establishments of commerce, social encounter, and intellectual exchange.¹ While Shakespeare is sometimes assumed to have been a regular at his townsman Richard Field's bookshop,² Marlowe is known to have "conversd" with "some stationers in Paules churchyard," and conversed, it seems, about issues far from insignificant: in his letter to Puckering, Thomas Kyd brings up Marlowe's conversation partners because they are potential witnesses to Marlowe's "atheism" as well as to the fact that Kyd himself was not "of that vile opinion."³ Unfortunately for us, although luckily for the stationers involved, Kyd does not seem to have thought it important to remember their names, but his brief reference is suggestive of the environment where people engaged in conversation on topics that were by no means mundane, and where they established private and public, personal as well as intellectual relationships.

In his death, Marlowe came to be associated with the Churchyard even more closely than in his life. In 1600, referring to the author's sudden and quite phenomenal success there, and no doubt hoping for its persistence, Thomas Thorpe wrote that he saw Marlowe's "ghoast or *Genius* . . . walke

the Churchyard in (at the least) three or four sheets,"⁴ and then added that the book he was dedicating to Edward Blount, Marlowe's translation of Lucan, was itself "a spirit" now "raised in the circle of [Blount's] patronage"—a circle that was drawn in the Churchyard, where Blount, one of the most important literary publishers of the early seventeenth century, also lived. Thorpe's often-quoted remark registers the close connection between the emergence of the author and the architectural, symbolic, and social import of the place from which it emerges. Through reconstructing how this location, and the networks of personal and professional connections converging on this location, impacted Marlowe's oeuvre and afterlife, this essay aims to reimagine the distribution of agencies behind the making of Marlowe's works.

Marlowe's career has been influentially discussed by Patrick Cheney as following a classical, Ovidian *cursus*, suggesting that the shape of the poetic oeuvre itself ought to be seen as the conscious poetic creation of its author.⁵ But the history of the reproduction of these texts—the history that transmitted them to us so we can impose such poetic constructions upon them—alerts us to other forces, motives and agents behind Marlowe's oeuvre than Marlowe's self-creating desire for poetic immortality.⁶

The recent success of book history as a scholarly paradigm in early modern literary studies has in part been a function of the theoretical decentering of the author. By translating the theoretical discourse about authorship into socioeconomic terms, book history helped to put pressure on the single authority implied by the attribution of the text to an author, and disperse it among the plurality of agents involved in the collaborative production of texts—patrons, printers and publishers, censors and readers, as well as writers.⁷ Recent literary and historical research has shown some interesting variations in how it understands the formative impact of early modern publishers' choices and decisions on intellectual, literary, and political life. Some scholars, especially those working on the mid-seventeenth century, have identified intellectual and religio-political motives, allegiances, and alliances behind interventions in the marketplace of print.⁸ Historians of late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century literature, on the other hand, have focused on the institutional and commercial realities of book production, and emphasized how the pressures of a capitalist industry shaped literary works.⁹ Such research tends to depend on a rather restricted model of social interaction: it takes the bookseller as the unit of analysis, considering him an individual, calculating agent who weighs market trends and makes investments in the light of the expected rates of monetized return. This analytical framework is largely the function of the nature and scarcity

of available information: a commercial rationality that is tacitly assumed to be timeless and culturally uninflected helpfully makes up for the absence of other, specific motives discernible in the record. Fragmentary evidence of larger forces and interpersonal factors (of cultural bias and religious affiliation, family ties, political convictions, social obligations, and personal obsessions), in so far as it is recoverable, is organized by, and thus subordinated or assimilated to, conscious and calculating individual decision making.¹⁰

When it thus falls back on an implicit and limited version of rational choice theory, the study of literary production returns where it started from several decades ago: to the agency of a centered self—albeit with a significant difference. Instead of the author's centered, controlling self, we end up with the publisher's centered, controlling self as the *primum movens* of the world of letters. Instead of a unique individuality behind original creativity, we now deal with a universal, transhistorical individuality behind the balanced and normalized operations of the marketplace of texts.¹¹

An attention to places, networks, and collectivities considered as agentive forces rather than as merely external, situative contexts might reveal some aspects of literary life that has been obscured or disregarded by the focus on individual agency—whether authorial or mercantile, singular or plural—that defines much of the discussion about literary production and the question of authorship. There is nothing new about an attention to non-individual, and even nonhuman agents. The printing press has famously been described as an agent of change, that is, an agent in the transformation of knowledge and culture.¹² Although more recent work effectively argued for a complex understanding of the role of technology in cultural change, balancing the importance of human and nonhuman agents in an effort to avoid the pitfall of technological determinism, the transformative power of print remains a prime example of the working of a hybrid network of the agencies of humans and objects in knowledge production.¹³ Nor is the press the only material object that has been attributed agency in literary production and circulation: more playfully, the book wheel as a machine that shaped the practice of reading has also been proposed as an agent of intellectual work, for example.¹⁴

Bookshops and the spaces occupied by the early modern book trade have received attention as social environments,¹⁵ but the shop usually features as a synecdoche for the individual bookseller-publisher, or at best as the objectivation of his decisions and activities. As the following study of the early publication history of Marlowe's poems will show, however, on occasion, the shops themselves may also turn out to be agents shaping the

fate of books, authors, and literary afterlives.¹⁶ Shifting our emphasis from the individual bookseller to such networks of a plurality of human agents and environments may allow us to consider the intersections of various commercial and noncommercial factors in literary production and literary authorship without directly reverting to the transhistorical language of commercial rationality.

RAISING THE DEAD

By 1599, Marlowe had been dead for six years. When he died, on 30 May 1593, he had nothing in print with his name on it. Of his works, only *Tamburlaine* was published, and that without author attribution in 1590, in 1592–93, as well as in 1597.¹⁷ At the time, the public figures associated with the play and with the name Tamburlaine were Alleyn, the star actor who played the eponymous hero, and Peter Shakerley, a rather notorious denizen of Paul's Churchyard, rather than Christopher Marlowe.¹⁸ As Tucker Brooke observed, none of the almost innumerable pre-1640 references to *Tamburlaine* prove “with absolute certainty that the speaker knew who wrote the play.”¹⁹ Allusions may abound, but to decode them remained the privilege of those in the know. Such inside information amounts to something less than a public persona—and there were no names named in print until 1609.²⁰ Whatever role Tamburlaine played in Marlowe's self-conception as a poet or author, people browsing the bookstalls were not privy to it—they had no obvious way of knowing that the self-conception was Marlowe's, and the self-image therefore had no way of informing the reception of other works now in the Marlowe canon.²¹ As a result of the scarcity of public reference, early in the nineteenth century, Malone was still somewhat doubtful about the authorship of *Tamburlaine*, thinking the play was either by Nashe or by Nicholas Breton, and it took Collier's forgery of an entry in Henslowe's Diary for the attribution to Marlowe to finally stick.²² The “Marlowe-effect”—the signature tendency of Marlowe's plays to balance on a “ravishing’ razor edge between exaltation and transgression”—may only have become visible as an authorial signature in hindsight, and almost certainly not until the early seventeenth century, when *Faustus* was first published.²³

The circumstances of his death, the connections and suspicions leading up to (and prompted by) the quarrel in Deptford bestowed a certain notoriety upon Marlowe, a notoriety which may well have contributed to the publishers' eager interest in a batch of manuscripts that suddenly became available. We can perhaps say that it was not only *after* his death, but *as a result of* his death, that in 1594, with *Dido Queen of Carthage*, *Edward II*,

and the *Massacre at Paris* all displaying his name on their title pages, Marlowe the “atheist” playwright became a man in print.²⁴ Marlowe the poet, on the other hand—the “dead shepherd,” as Shakespeare refers to him in *As you like it* (3.5.81–82)—took a bit longer to emerge. *The Jew of Malta* as well as *Hero and Leander* and his translation of Lucan were all entered in the Stationers’ Register within a year of Marlowe’s death, suggesting that his literary remains were indeed dumped on the market of manuscripts all at once, making Marlowe something of a phenomenon within the book trade.²⁵ That the two poems were incomplete—both promised to be renderings of classical stories, but both broke off after a few hundred lines—may have been the reason why it wasn’t until the very last years of the century that they actually got published.

Once they appeared, however, Marlowe’s poetic persona, the ghost of the dead shepherd quickly achieved considerable visibility, and not *hic et ubique*, but in a very specific location. The plays published earlier were sold in various shops throughout the city: the publisher of the 1590, 1593 and 1597 *Tamburlaine* (neither of which editions has Marlowe’s name on them anyway) was Richard Jones, whose shop was near Holborne bridge,²⁶ and *Edward II* was published in 1594 and 1598 by William Jones, dwelling “neere Holbourne conduit”²⁷—whereas Marlowe, the poet who came to light around 1598–1600 was exclusively a Paul’s Churchyard phenomenon. Thorpe’s punning reference to a ghost haunting the Churchyard in three or four “sheets” registered precisely this localized emergence. More specifically, and more interestingly, Marlowe the poet was a phenomenon emerging from one particular shop, at the sign of the Black Bear, where by 1600 you could get *Hero and Leander*, Marlowe’s translation of Lucan, “The Passionate Shepherd,” as well as *Dido Queen of Carthage*.

POEMS AND BOOKSELLERS AT THE BEAR

Marlowe makes his first posthumous appearance at the Black Bear just a few months after his death. The 1594 *Dido*, which sports both Marlowe’s and Nashe’s names on the title page, was published by Thomas Woodcock, at the sign of the Black Bear, where he had been working for two decades.²⁸ Woodcock died in April 1594, and this playbook is one of his last publications.²⁹ His shop and his stock were then taken over from Woodcock’s widow by John Flasket and his business partner, Paul Linley, and his titles transferred to Linley in the Stationers’ Register.

Flasket and Linley are two key figures in the story I am telling here. Linley was a stationer, free of the Company in 1586, when he probably

started working as a journeyman bookseller for Woodcock.³⁰ Flasket was a bookbinder, who took his freedom in 1593 from the Drapers' Company, and immediately tried his hand at publishing, bringing out a couple of news pamphlets.³¹ In 1594, Flasket and Linley teamed up to run the shop together, and throughout their remaining careers as booksellers, operated at the sign of the Black Bear. They appear on title pages sometimes together, sometimes separately, but the point is, they had a joint business here, publishing, selling, and also binding books, including the copies of *Dido* that came with the shop. When Linley died in 1600, Flasket became one of the group of drapers translated to the Stationers' Company, and thus Linley's titles could be transferred to him in the Stationers' Register.³² But the shop meant more than a sign, a building, an inventory, and a list of titles in the Stationers' Register: along with the business, the care of the Woodcock family seems also to have been transferred to Linley and Flasket. Flasket took Woodcock's son as an apprentice in 1600, as soon as he became a stationer, two days even before he would have had Linley's titles transferred to him. Flasket continued to publish at the Black Bear until at least about 1607, when his last books were printed and his two apprentices were freed, although for reasons that will become clear, we don't know when exactly he stopped binding and selling books there, or whether in fact he ever did.

Four years went by between 1594 when *Dido* was published and Woodcock died, and 1598, when *Hero and Leander* was published by Edward Blount. Marlowe's poem was the fourth book Blount published, and his first literary publication—from the hindsight of over 400 years, a truly auspicious beginning. Because Blount's later output rather remarkably anticipates the modern canon of early modern literature, with Montaigne's *Essays*, *Don Quijote*, and the Shakespeare First Folio among his most remarkable offerings, he has lately been considered as the foremost literary publisher of the early seventeenth century.³³ We may therefore be inclined to consider Blount's decision to put out the fragment of *Hero and Leander* as an early indication of his remarkable discernment or indeed prescience—an interpretation not necessarily contradicted by the markedly personal tone of his prefatory dedication of the poem. There, Blount rather elaborately describes this flimsy first edition of what he calls an “unfinished tragedy” as some sort of a last rite required of the friends of the deceased after “they have brought the breathless body to the earth.” He sees himself the “executor to the unhappily deceased author,” and his duty “the performance of whatsoever we may judge shall make to his living credit, and to the effecting of his determinations prevented by the stroke of death.”³⁴ Effecting Marlowe's “determinations prevented by the stroke of death” may mean a lot of

things, not least of which would be finishing the piece. For that to happen, Blount transfers the title to Paul Linley no sooner than his edition has been printed, allowing Linley and Flasket to bring out another edition of the poem, not a five-sheet pamphlet like his, but a more substantial book of 13 sheets quarto, completed by George Chapman.³⁵

Blount did not seem to have had a shop of his own around the turn of the century. He rarely indicates his address in his imprint, although we know that in 1597 and 1598, he was selling books “ouer against the great North dore of paules Church.”³⁶ In 1603, he was dwelling, according to the title page of Florio’s Montaigne, “in Paules Churchyard,” but that’s the closest we have about his whereabouts until 1609, when an imprint gives his address at the sign of the Black Bear.³⁷ Kirk Melnikoff pointed out that Blount and Linley had a longstanding connection, which originated in the eight years they spent together as apprentices to Ponsonby, the greatest literary publisher of the late sixteenth century.³⁸ Their ties had a significance that went well beyond the daily routine of their trade: Linley’s will designated the stationers Gabriel Cawood (the brother of Woodcocke’s widow) and Edward Blount as his heirs, leaving to them his part of the shop at the sign of the Bear.³⁹ So from 1600, Blount had a share of the shop, which means that of all the shops in the Churchyard, the Bear is the most likely place for him to have operated from. It is clear from their imprints that after Flasket ended his publishing career, Blount was selling books from the Bear, but given how rarely he mentions his address in his imprints, do we really need to assume that he only starts using the shop then, in 1609? And given his close ties to Linley, could he not have been selling *Hero and Leander* from the Bear as early as 1598?

That *Hero and Leander* was an immediate success is indicated by the two 1598 editions being followed by a third in 1600 and then others in the early seventeenth century, by the series of contemporary allusions and quotations appearing in poems and plays including Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*,⁴⁰ as well as by the publication of another continuation, the perhaps less than successful *Second part* penned by John Petowe, also in 1598.⁴¹

In a couple of years, more Marlowe emerges from the Bear. The pastoral anthology *Englands Helicon* was “Printed by I. R. for Iohn Flasket” in 1600.⁴² This collection of poems was perhaps compiled, and almost certainly prefaced, by another bookseller, Nicholas Ling, and it is usually discussed as his product.⁴³ But in spite of his role in creating the anthology, Ling did not publish it: *Englands Helicon* was advertised as a book “to be sold in Paules Church-yard, at the signe of the Beare,” that is, alongside *Dido Queen of Carthage* and *Hero and Leander*.

Englands Helicon does not only include the poem best known as “The passionate shepherd to his love”—it is also the first to attribute it to Christopher Marlowe. Or, to put it more sharply: in spite of the poem’s wide circulation in manuscript as well as in print throughout the period, until 1653 it is only ever attributed to Marlowe in *Englands Helicon*.⁴⁴ And when in 1653, in the first edition of *The compleat angler* Izaak Walton quotes it as Kit Marlowe’s, of all the available versions, he is reprinting the text from *Englands Helicon*, which questions his authority as an independent witness. The poem known in the seventeenth century by its first line, “Come live with me and be my love,” was much copied and imitated and alluded to, and it may easily have been among the most popular and influential lyric poems of the period.⁴⁵ Its circulation tended to be anonymous and appropriate: when manuscript versions ascribed it to anyone, it was to Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Walter Raleigh, and—apparently—to Thomas Blundeville.⁴⁶ When it was first printed in a shorter version by Jaggard in *The passionate pilgrim* in 1599, the title page of the collection attributed it to Shakespeare. It was also published, several times, in broadsheet, as a ballad, anonymously, under the title “A most excellent Ditty of the Louers promises to his beloued.”⁴⁷ Finally, Shakespeare’s “Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might, / ‘Who ever lov’d that lov’d not at first sight?’” with its attribution of a line from *Hero and Leander* to a “dead shepherd,” is usually taken to imply that Marlowe, the undisputed author of *Hero and Leander* also wrote the “Come live with me” lyric. But calling a dead poet a “dead shepherd” is too conventional a gesture to be admitted as evidence. In fact, if we take Shakespeare’s reference to signal Marlowe’s authorship of the poem, then we would need to take Nashe’s lines from *Summer’s last will*: “Well sung a Shepherd, that now sleeps in skies, ‘Dumb swans do love, and not vain chattering pies’”⁴⁸ to signal Sidney’s authorship of the same, since Nashe is here attributing a line from *Astrophel and Stella* to a dead shepherd.

My point is not that we need to reject the attribution of the poem to Marlowe, only that it is an uncertain, because overdetermined affair, with the only independent witness, *Englands Helicon*, coming from the shop whose owner, John Flasket, had an obvious investment in the scarce commodity that is Marlovian writing.⁴⁹ Whoever wrote the poem, Flasket’s edition of *Englands Helicon* is the book that takes it from Sidney, Raleigh, and, most importantly, from Shakespeare, and invests it with the aura of Marlowe’s posthumous success.

That success entices another manuscript into print, adding another title to a forming poetic oeuvre. In 1600, Thomas Thorpe kicks off his publishing career by putting out another posthumous piece by the poem’s author: the

translation of Lucan. And here, the pattern we have observed in the publication of *Hero and Leander* repeats itself. No sooner has Thorpe's edition of Lucan come out, it is incorporated into a larger bibliographical unit published by Flasket: a *Sammelband* which attaches it to a new edition of *Hero and Leander*. Flasket's 1600 composite advertises itself as *Hero and Leander: begunne by Christopher Marloe: whereunto is added the first booke of Lucan translated line for line by the same author*, where "adding" means issuing Thorpe's edition with *Hero and Leander* to constitute a more substantial, if still not exactly bulky quarto volume.⁵⁰ The book is presented as a single-author collection: it drops from the title page the coauthor Chapman's name (prominently present in 1598), and replaces it with the title of another work by Marlowe. Nor does the authorialization stop here: along with his name, the new edition also omits Chapman's 1598 dedication to Lady Walsingham, the wife of the dedicatee of Marlowe's poem.

Thorpe's claim to fame is his 1609 edition of *Shake-speares Sonnets*, but he also published a number of important plays. He never had a shop of his own. Instead, he seems to have been conducting business through arrangements with other publishers, most importantly, with Blount, his business partner and close friend. Not only did Blount sometimes publish titles entered for Thorpe and vice versa, but as Gary Taylor points out, "Thorpe and Blount were still drinking partners in the 1620s."⁵¹ How closely knit their relationship really was is indicated by the coincidence of a hiatus in their publishing activities. Blount seems to have come close to bankruptcy after publishing the Shakespeare First Folio, as he stopped publishing for about five years after 1623.⁵² Whatever happened to Blount, the same happened to Thorpe: after years as a rather prolific literary publisher, in the 1620s, his output diminished to one book a year, and in 1623, he became dependent on the poor fund of the Stationers' Company.⁵³ In 1624, Blount and Thorpe sold off to Samuel Vicars their most lucrative title: *Hero and Leander*.⁵⁴ And in 1626, the year after Thorpe's death, the shop was sold, and Blount apparently forced to move out.⁵⁵ They clearly fell on hard times, and clearly fell together.

Given their close ties, and given the fact that Thorpe's edition of Lucan was reissued by Flasket, is it not possible that Thorpe was on occasion also conducting business at the Bear? And, to consider the full possible extent of these booksellers' coexistence at the shop: does the fact that Flasket's last publication appeared in 1607 necessarily mean that he then vacated the shop? He was around for *Englands Helicon* to be transferred "by his consent" to Richard More in 1613, which implies that he was still an entity to reckon with and a recognized member of the Company, if not necessarily an

active member.⁵⁶ Flasket was first and foremost a bookbinder, a business he may very well have continued at the Bear after 1608.⁵⁷ But whatever Flasket may have been doing between 1608 and his death in the summer of 1616, his titles continue to be reprinted and sold by Blount from the Bear, without a transfer in the Stationers' Register. This is remarkable, given that practically all other titles printed by Blount were carefully entered for him or for his copublishers, and given that Flasket did consider it worthwhile to sign off on several of his titles when he passed them on to other publishers.⁵⁸ In other words, Blount simply continued Flasket's publishing business, putting out a new edition of *Hero and Leander* every few years, and also reprinting Wilkinson's *Royal merchant* in 1613 and 1615, Dering's *Works* in 1614, and *The Sinner's guide* in 1614 (first published by Flasket in 1607, 1597, and 1598, respectively), without making any formal, legal arrangements. There does not seem to have been a need.

Collaboration and cooperation among publishers is not unusual in the period, but in the case of the Bear, an attention to the—perhaps unusually close and complex—companionship may change the way we perceive the work of the participants.

First of all, in practical terms, the realization of this collaboration and co-existence of Linley, Flasket, Blount, and Thorpe at the Bear helps to clarify some aspects of the rather complicated history of the copyright of Marlowe's *Hero* and of his translation of Lucan, which is another of the titles passed around by the Bear publishers without making a formal transfer. The Lucan and *Hero* were first entered in the Stationers' Register by Wolfe in 1593. In 1598, Blount assigns *Hero* to Linley. Blount also seems to have been in possession of the Lucan manuscript at some point—this is what Thorpe's preface seems to indicate when he refers to Blount's "old right in it" as the reason for publishing it "in the circle of [Blount's] patronage." In 1600, when all of Linley's titles are transferred to Flasket, the two titles are listed together, although there is no trace of a previous transfer of the Lucan to Linley. Finally, in 1624, Thorpe and Blount appear as owners of *Hero*—even though it was never transferred to them from Flasket. Greg in his impressive reconstruction of the history was thinking in terms of the publishers' individual ownership of a commodity: the copyright of the poem. If we assume that we are dealing with a group of stationers operating in the same space, who were making legal arrangements only when this was necessary to signal that the title belonged to the shop, and that the legal arrangements do not adequately represent the realities of the underlying transactions, then some of the gaps in the narrative can easily be filled—or rather, recognized to be nonexistent. The assumed "transfer" of Lucan from Blount

to Thorpe to Linley, and the fact that Thorpe appears to have “acquired” a part of *Hero and Leander* sometime before 1624, are functions of in-house arrangements.⁵⁹

In more general terms: the shift of focus from the booksellers to the shop means a shift from the competitive and fully commercialized dealings in the marketplace—dealings understood as based on the rational speculation of individuals—to a focus that includes the role of informal, noncommercial, and non-monetized exchanges, exchanges both of assets and of ideas, in the shaping and distribution of their output. What these exchanges constitute is not some sort of a fuzzy community of agents without self-interest: rather, a system of collaborations built on a complex web of obligations, some explicit and some encoded in personal ties.

If such an understanding of the business at the Bear is indeed correct, then instead of Blount, already the perhaps most important literary publisher of the early seventeenth century, we have a literary *publishing house*, publishing and selling not just Montaigne, Cervantes, and *Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies* (to mention only Blount’s most significant publications), but also *Shake-speares Sonnets*, some important plays by Chapman and Jonson, as well as a significant part of Marlowe’s oeuvre. The predominantly secular and cosmopolitan output of the Bear seems to anticipate the canon of English Renaissance literature subsequently fashioned by the critical tradition to a rather striking extent.⁶⁰ And while to claim that they somehow invented Renaissance English literature would be to overstate the case—to say that they made Marlowe’s poetic oeuvre is merely to state what the story above amounts to.

THE REMAINS AT THE CHARNEL HOUSE

At the Bear, the slim, unfinished *Hero* started to put on some weight—or, to use a more appropriate metaphor, Marlowe’s scattered remains were gathered into a poetical corpus. The figurative language is made appropriate not only by the tradition, but also by its rather striking use of Blount and Thorpe in their dedications.

Marlowe’s *Lucan* is dedicated by Thorpe to Blount: the resurrected author’s work by one bookseller to another. Thorpe is clearly aware of the funerary language, the language of last rites and commemoration that Blount was using when he was dedicating *Hero and Leander* to Thomas Walsingham, and pushes that imagery one logical step further. If Blount was writing about bringing “the breathless bodie to earth” and about “the impression of the man, that hath been deare to us, liuing an after life in our memory,”

in Thorpe's exuberant dedication, teeming with sarcastic references to the business of literature, "that pure elemental wit Chr. Marlowe" emerges as someone "whose ghost or genius is to be seen walk the churchyard in (at the least) three or four sheets," and the poem itself referred to as "a spirit" now "raised in the circle of your patronage." The metaphors of burial, commemoration, and necromancy are of course reflective of the notion of a literary afterlife, and the trope of seeing the literary corpus as the spectral corpse of the departed, scattered and reassembled so it can haunt us, is familiar from the prefatory materials of the Shakespeare First Folio as well as of Mary Sidney's *Psalms*, but in this case, there is something specifically and locally urgent about them.⁶¹

To understand fully the imagery of Blount's and Thorpe's prefaces, there is something we should know about the shop at the sign of the Black Bear, because everyone in the Churchyard knew it.⁶² According to John Stow, there was "on the North side of this churchyarde, a Charnell house for the boanes of the dead, and ouer it a chapel of an old foundation." Then, in "the yeare one thousand fiue hundred fortie nine, the bones of the dead, couched up in a Charnill (by report of him who paid for the carriage) were conueied from thence into Finsbery fielde, amounting to more then one thousand cart loades, and there laid on a moorish ground, in short space after rayсед (by soylage of the citie) to beare three winde-milles. The chapell and Charnill were conuerted into dwelling houses, ware houses, and sheads for Stacioners builded before it, in place of the Tombes."⁶³ What Stowe describes was the grandest (and most literally disturbing) physical act in the reformation of death in England. Between 1547 and 1553, the obliteration of Purgatory was accompanied by the dissolution of the institutions of the medieval cult of the dead, as required by the Chantries Acts of 1545 and 1547. The vast cultural, financial, and social consequences of the reform were achieved through a campaign that involved massive physical destruction: throughout the country, funeral monuments were demolished or defaced, and the charnels, which were places of commemoration and prayer, were abolished. As part of what Peter Marshall describes as "one of the most audacious attempts at the restructuring of beliefs and values ever attempted in England, a kind of collective cultural de-programming,"⁶⁴ a thousand cartloads of human remains were removed from the vaults of the largest charnel house of the realm, and—together with the funeral monuments that decorated the charnel chapel—were taken to a landfill, to give way to the wares of the stationers. The symbolic import of this narrative encapsulation of post-reformation "mortuary poetics" requires little elaboration: not only are marble and the gilded monuments effaced and outlived by books,

the textual transmission of memory will also “paper over” the gap left empty by the evicted corporeal remains.⁶⁵ Where there were bones, there would be books. Funeral monuments replaced by bookstalls.

What does still need to be stressed here is the role of buildings in this cultural shift. Purgatory was operated from the chantries, the departed were preserved in monuments and charnels; ideological change was therefore to a large extent effected by changing the built environment, by demolishing and repurposing commemorative and mortuary architecture, and by building those three dark satanic mills in Finsbury Fields, as if to make sure the bones would now stay put.

The booktrade played a constructive part in all this. As Stow’s marginal note makes clear, the carriage was paid for by the stationer Reyner Wolfe, the King’s Printer, Cranmer’s protégé, (no relation of John Wolfe, the stationer of a generation later), who had recently come into possession of the charnel and the charnel chapel, and had therefore a vested interest in their reformation and reconstruction (much less in their demolition). The vault of the charnel house no doubt made for an excellent storage place for books, but its original function was remembered for another century: a 1638 lease still refers to the building of the Black Bear as a house “sometimes called the Charnell howse.”⁶⁶

Marlowe’s poetical remains were sold at the Charnel house, and the elaborate imagery of burial and resurrection is something like a Churchyard in-joke, based on a locally known fact about the place where these books were going to be sold from.

JOINING, BINDING, AND DIVIDING: AUTHORSHIP AND THE NETWORK

The reformation of the charnel was instrumental in the annihilation of Purgatory—but memories of the pre-reformation community of the dead and the living remained active in a variety of cultural forms, and the auratic building itself continued to shape cultural production. It had a decisive role in creating Marlowe the poet, and the investment of Marlowe’s poetical corpus with playfully rich mortuary associations is only the most striking aspect of this role.

The work implied in such posthumous production can be presented in a variety of ways. The First Folio of Shakespeare’s plays is prefaced by the editorial claim that the texts in the book are, as it were, resurrected for the readers’ last judgment—“the great variety of Readers” were before “abus’d with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos’d them: euen those, are now offer’d to your view cur’d, and perfect of their limbes, and all the

rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them.” What the vision of this resurrection effaces is the agency behind the miraculous restoration to the texts’ ideal state—Shakespeare’s works are presented as unmediated products of the creativity of a single author, and the traces of Shakespeare’s collaborators erased. In contradistinction to the much later Shakespeare folio, the Marlowe that emerged from the Bear was a distinctly and visibly collaborative one, and each of the Marlowe publications raises significant questions about the nature of authorship and about nonauthorial revision even as it strives to assert the ascription of the text to the dead author.

Take the case of “The passionate shepherd.” The anthology *England’s Helicon* of course adjusted some of the poems it included to make them better fit the pastoral context. For instance, in a poem beginning “On a day, alack the day,” which appears in Shakespeare’s *Love’s labours lost* as Dumaine’s “Song,” as well as, without title, in Jaggard’s 1599 anthology *The passionate pilgrim*, under the thematic pressure of *England’s Helicon* the “lover” becomes a “shepherd,” the genre tag in the title is switched from the courtly “sonnet” to the more appropriately bucolic “song,” and a couplet which implies that the lover’s vows of chastity may after all be overruled by desire is silently dropped.⁶⁷

“The Passionate Shepheard to his love” undergoes a more radical transformation in *England’s Helicon*. As Diana Henderson has observed, unlike all other, later replies to it, “Sir Walter Raleigh’s famous answering poem, ‘The Nymph’s Reply to the Shepheard,’ is less a parody than a necessary and implied companion piece.”⁶⁸ This formal and stylistic observation is borne out by the two poems’ history of circulation: until it was published by Flasket, this favorite anthology piece did not even have an existence separate from what we now refer to as Raleigh’s reply to it. For the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the two poems are a single unit, two parts of a whole: I am not aware of any surviving copy of one appearing without the other until the late seventeenth century. In Jaggard’s 1599 *Passionate Pilgrim*, in the early seventeenth-century broadsheet versions, as well as in the surviving early manuscripts, they always come together, as parts of a dialogic whole. And with the exception of *England’s Helicon*, when this two-part piece is attributed to an author at all, it is attributed as a single item to a single author, although never to Kit Marlowe.

England’s Helicon arranges lyric pieces as individual units, each with a title and an author—even when the author is unknown, it is ascribed to “Anonymous” or “Ignoto.” The attribution is invariably set to the right of a centered uppercase “FINISH” and the byline is followed by a rule even when nothing else follows on the page, sharply separating the poems from

each other. As James Bednarz has observed, the collection thus creates “a typographical code” which “leads readers to focus on the relation between poetic artifacts and their creators.”⁶⁹ But it does more: by isolating the address from the response, this template effectively creates Marlowe’s lyric by dividing a dialogic poem of invitation and reply into two separate entities. Whether by mistake or on good authority, *Englands Helicon* turns the utterances of two lyric personae into the utterances of two authorial personae, and thus invents a scene of sixteenth-century social textuality where previously there had only been a fictional dialogue unfolding within a single piece. That in the course of doing so, it also provides the two parts with titles obviously fashioned according to the pastoral demands of the anthology (the manuscripts title only the reply: they call it “the reply”), is merely signaling the more radical transformation.

The Bear did more than just divulge Marlowe’s remains: it completed, joined, combined, isolated, and shaped them. The first Marlowe at the shop, *The Tragedie of Dido Queene of Carthage, written by Christopher Marlow and Thomas Nash, Gent.*, not only announces the collaborative nature of the text—but, as Kirk Melnikoff argues, Flasket and Linley may well have been selling it as part of a nonce collection consisting of *Dido* and John Dickinson’s 1594 pastoral romance *Arisbas*, that is, as a collection quite similar to the 1600 *Hero*-Lucan reissue. No copy of the collection survives, but among Linley’s titles transferred to Flasket in 1600 in the Stationers’ Register, the two books appear as a single unit, as “CUPYDes Journey to hell with the tragedie of Dido” (the former being the subtitle of Dickinson’s romance)—usually the indication of the two titles being sold as one book. The explicitly collaborative play here becomes part of a multiauthor, multigenre collection with complex erotic and pastoral valences. Depending on the date of the reissue, this combination might have been an attempt to reposition the play in the literary marketplace by linking it to another instance of the fashionably classicising epyllion of which Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander* became the most popular example.⁷⁰

The *Dido-Arisbas* collection, like Flasket’s 1600 *Hero* that was printed to be issued with the Lucan, is in a sense the product of Flasket’s trade—the two collections are a bookbinder’s reinventions of stashes of unsold books in the vault. But Flasket’s work of joining and combining was enabled by the collaborative environment of the Bear. The cavernous warehouse and shop not only afforded room for the wares of a closely knit community of stationers, wares that needed and allowed such repackaging, but it also functioned as a node in a network of booksellers, bookbinders, and writers. How crucial a role such a network could play in the production of Marlo-

vian writing, and in literary production in general, is indicated by the case of the completion of *Hero and Leander*.

First printed as an “unfinished tragedy,” until the twentieth century, *Hero and Leander* was nevertheless thought of as a finished poem of six sestiams. When Francis Meres referred to Marlowe’s poetic output (as opposed to his tragedies) in his “Comparatiue discourse of our English Poets, with the Greeke, Latine, and Italian poets,” he mentioned him, repeatedly, in conjunction with Chapman: “As Musaeus, who wrote the loue of Hero and Leander, had two excellent schollers, Thamaras & Hercules: so hath he in England two excellent poets, and imitators of him in the same argument and subiect, *Christopher Marlow*, and *George Chapman*.”⁷¹ The printed commonplace books of the Bodenham circle also worked with the Marlowe-Chapman complete edition.⁷² All seven further early modern editions of the poem (1606–1637, STC 17416–17422) are reprints of the composite Marlowe-Chapman text, and, after 1600, Chapman’s name even returned to the title page. What was among the most successful poems of the early seventeenth century was called *Hero and Leander: begunne by Christopher Marloe, and finished by George Chapman*. Although Marlowe left it unfinished, it was circulating as a poem begun and then finished, and it remained complete until the twentieth century. Chapman’s dedication to the wife of Thomas Walsingham (the dedicatee of the part by Marlowe) even strives to present the two halves of the poem as parts wedded to each other, joined to become an inseparable whole. What the Black Bear joined together in 1598, only the author-centric purism of modern scholarship put asunder, reducing *Hero and Leander* to an unfinished fragment in most anthologies and editions.⁷³

Chapman’s contribution to the poem was part of his ongoing relationship with the publishers at the Bear. *Nennio, or A treatise of nobility*, which was “Printed by P. S. for Paule Linley, and Iohn Flasket . . . to be sold at their shop in Paules churchyard, at the signe of the blacke Beare” in 1595,⁷⁴ carries a spectacular set of prefatory materials—a long dedication to Essex, followed by sonnets by two of the biggest living stars of the Elizabethan literary establishment, Spenser and Daniel, and by two up-and-coming writers: George Chapman and Angel Day. A few years later, several of Chapman’s plays carry the imprint of Blount and of Thorpe.⁷⁵ But the fellowship at the Bear did not only publish plays—they even commissioned one. In 1601, Flasket paid Chapman to write what was perhaps the most scandalous of early seventeenth-century plays, *The old joiner of Aldgate*, an à clef city comedy about a girl’s multiple suitors and their negotiations with her greedy father, negotiations revolving around the girl’s rather considerable

dowry. The successful run of performances of the comedy by Paul's boys were, according to the examination conducted by Attorney General Edward Coke in Star Chamber, intended to embarrass the father of a rich heiress, a certain Agnes How, also living in the neighborhood, into marrying his daughter to Flasket.⁷⁶ These connections show the publication of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* and Chapman's completion of it a product of a relationship sustained by the company at the Bear, a relationship which—as the use of Paul's boys and the play's address to a local public implies—was defined by the shop's intense participation in the ebb and flow of public opinion.

NEWS AND LITERATURE

Flasket's commission of a play with the intention of using the pressure of public opinion—scandal-mongering, to be precise—to advance his case suggests a stationer with a sharp sense of how information circulated in the public sphere, and also of the ways in which he could benefit from this circulation. This sensitivity also shaped his output: some of the earliest publications of Linley and Flasket are a series of news pamphlets, broadly understood—newsletters, short reports, and transcripts of foreign documents that would have been circulating as manuscript separates. They published accounts of the coronation of Henri IV as well as of one of the many assassination attempts against him, news from the Low Countries, including a transcript of the diplomatic correspondence between King Philip II and the Archduke Albert about the marriage negotiations and about the transfer of the Spanish Netherlands from Philip to Isabel and Albert, timely information about the state of Scotland on the accession of James.⁷⁷ Although no short and quick newsbooks survive with his imprint, Blount was similarly attuned to foreign affairs: he corresponded with English diplomatic envoys, published both bulky histories and longer pamphlets on continental politics, and, most importantly, developed a strongly cosmopolitan and contemporary repertory, making the Black Bear one of the bookshops catering to an audience hungry for information from abroad.⁷⁸

One of their publications offers a glimpse into their engagement with the news exchange around Paul's. The battle of Turnhout, on January 14–15 1596/7, was one of the more successful English interventions in the war in the Low Countries. An account of the role of the English troops supporting Maurice of Nassau under the leadership of Robert Sidney and Francis Vere was acquired by Flasket and Linley, who entered it in the Stationers' Register on January 29, 1596/7, had it printed soon after, and even decided to follow it by "A discourse more at large" of the same battle "Translated

out of French.” The English letter is from “a Gentleman of account, that was present at the seruice, to a friend of his in England.”⁷⁹ Although the printed newsletter does not indicate this, from the Stationers’ Register entry we know that the letter was originally addressed to a Mr. White.⁸⁰ Rowland Whyte was “employed by Sir Robert Sydney, to sollicite his Affairs at the Court, and to relate to him what passed there”⁸¹ in the 1590s, while Sidney was in Flushing. That Whyte may have been instrumental in publicizing his master’s success at Turnhout is implied by the speed with which the letter found its way to the publishers, but also by Whyte’s keen interest in the stage performance of a play representing the battle two years later.⁸² Even if we discount the alluring possibility that Flasket may somehow have been involved in staging the report he published, the example of this lost play shows how news got transferred from one medium to another, from manuscript to print and then to the stage, circulating through the textual networks of which the Black Bear was an important node.

The clear attention of the Black Bear publishers to timely publications, to fresh writing, often from abroad, and often of a political nature, provides an important context for the production of Marlowe at the Bear.

In his life, Marlowe was an author acutely aware of foreign affairs as well as of the domestic demand for news from abroad. *The Massacre at Paris*, which follows French politics until the death of Henri III is a case in point, but so is the *Jew of Malta*, which starts with a gesture at the recent death of the Duke of Guise, or *Edward II*, with its highly topical invocation of the fate of Piers Gaveston—a name that appeared in a series of French pamphlets that attacked Henri III through an analogy between Gaveston and Epernon, Henri’s *mignon*. Marlowe was to a large extent building on the audience’s interest in French politics even when he was writing a play about medieval England.⁸³

Hero and Leander seems rather innocent of all this—but at the Black Bear, a shop known as a purveyor of news, the association of Marlowe’s name with newsworthy topics seems to have been worth exploiting. This may have been the reason why Chapman’s addition found it necessary, in the third Sestiad, to compare “fair Hero, left devirginate” to the situation of Cadiz after the 1595 English campaign, and say that the girl in her post-coital state “Even to herself a stranger, was much like / Th’Iberian city that war’s hand did strike / by English force in princely Essex’s guide.” In Paul’s Churchyard, Marlowe was expected to come up to date and topical even in his death, and Chapman’s additions helped provide the requisite edge.

Blount’s and Flasket’s output shows them to be booksellers investing not just in news per se, but, increasingly, in other types of timely, newsworthy,

publications as well. Flasket was especially attuned to the talk of the town, and, even more, to the talk of the Churchyard. So early in 1602, when the publication of the pamphlet *Work for chimney-sweepers: or A warning for tabacconists* was followed by a series of responses all published in the Churchyard, making tobacco the hot (and best-selling) topic of the moment, Flasket also joined the fray by putting out Sir John Beaumont's *The metamorphosis of tabacco*, another defense of the weed.⁸⁴ Such responsiveness not just to news, but to books becoming news, to momentary publishing phenomena, was an important motive behind the Bear's investment in Marlowe, and a driving force behind the Marlovian moment of the turn of the century.

The 1598 publication of *Hero and Leander*, and the 1600 publication of the Lucan, of Marlowe's poem in *Englands Helicon*, and of the second surviving edition of *Hero and Leander* are separated by 1599, the year of the Bishops' ban, which prohibited the printing of satires and epigrams, the unauthorized publishing of histories and plays, and which ordered the burning of a series of recent satirical publications. Interpretations of the reasons behind the ban abound,⁸⁵ but whatever its motives, the book-burning that took place on June 4, 1599, at Stationers' Hall, had an unquestionable effect on the marketplace of print. The writing of formal verse satire may have subsided, but the demand for various kinds of satirical and *ad hominem* writing did not: epigrams remained popular as ever and plays were now advertised on their title pages as satires. One unwanted effect of the ban was the publicity it provided for the kinds of writing it sought to suppress. In 1601, Flasket tried to capitalize on its aftermath by publishing John Weever's *The whipping of satire*, one of the "whipper pamphlets" reflecting on the uses and abuses of satire, and by selling, or attempting to sell, other similar titles, as evinced by the fine he paid, together with twenty-seven other stationers, for "their Disorders in buyinge of the bookes of humours lettinge blood in the vayne beinge newe printed after yt was first forbydden and burnt."⁸⁶

One of the titles ordered to be burnt in Stationers' Hall in the summer of 1599 was "Davyes Epigrams, with Marlowes Elegyes," and the surviving six editions of the two-part collection suggest that the ban did little to stop its circulation.⁸⁷ Critics tend to assume that Marlowe's translation of Ovid's *Amores* was bound to be banned with Davies and ended up on the list as collateral damage.⁸⁸ Whatever the reason, they were now printed, banned, and reprinted together, and their success seems to have encouraged the publishers to supply the missing Elegies, changing their title from "Certaine" to "All of Ovids Elegies," giving the readers more Marlowe for

their money. We don't know where these Middelburgh imprints may actually have been sold or printed, but it seems clear that their suppression and surreptitious circulation, with Marlowe's name present not just in the form of initials on the first title page, but in full on the title page of the *Elegies*, and also as a signature under several of the individual elegies, made a significant impact on Marlowe's public image. Around 1599, then, Marlowe's name made headlines, as the banned author of bestselling erotic poetry, and the Bear was the place best equipped to cater to the heightened interest in the dead poet's work, even including more (and legitimately printed) erotic verse. Flasket's and Blount's documented habit of selling bootleg stuff from the cavernous warehouse below their shop implies that they would have had no qualms about adding the Middelburgh *Elegies* to their offerings, either. That it is precisely around this time that Flasket was accused of conspiring to sell an illegal edition of Sidney by Waldegrave, the Edinburgh printer who may also have produced the "Middelburgh" Marlowe, makes this tantalizing possibility slightly more plausible.⁸⁹

THE POEMS THAT REMAIN

The individual parts of Marlowe's slim poetical corpus were decisively shaped by the location, and the nature of that corpus as a whole was also deeply affected by the concerns of the publishers at the Bear. The literary ghost that they conjured up was news: it was sensational, scandalous, urgent, current, and also momentary. Emerging from the building "sometimes called the Charnell howse," Marlowe's authorship was intensely personified, the author himself imagined as a ghost personally, even intimately embodied, his writings spirits, sudden apparitions—certainly not monuments. Marlowe's afterlife, the long oblivion from which he had to be resurrected in the nineteenth century, is to some extent a function of this occasional, localized publication, of the absence of a monumentalizing impulse behind the publishing of his books. Although the 1600 *Sammelband* takes a step in the direction of a larger work, Marlowe never gets a monument in the form of a posthumous collection. The hypothetical *Dido-Arisbas* collection and *Englands Helicon* are defined by genre, not authorship. Lucan was linked to *Hero* through the translator, but in the long run, the classical original turned out to be more important than Marlowe's contribution. When in 1614, Walter Burre enters Arthur Gorges' new translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* in the Stationers' Register, he ends up sharing the edition with Blount and Thorpe, presumably because they are recognized as owners of a part of Lucan.⁹⁰ Be as it may, in 1614 the complete *Pharsalia* supersedes Marlowe's partial translation, which does not get reprinted until the nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, around the turn of the century, the Black Bear clearly attempted to use Marlowe as something like a brand name, and to capitalize on the unpublished Marlovian texts available to them. Marlowe's wasn't the only authorial corpus gathered at the Bear. John Florio was effectively a Black Bear author, his published work first emerging from the shop when Woodcock published his *First and Second Fruits*. These two titles were transferred from Linley to Flasket in 1600, and were followed by the Montaigne and the 1611 *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, both published by Blount, in what is another example of an authorial brand being part of the publishing profile of the shop, rather than of an individual bookseller-publisher operating there.

For a shop to collect the works of a contemporary author, or as many of them as possible, was a remarkable move, and by no means standard practice around 1600. But it was not without parallels: take, first of all, William Ponsonby, who perhaps provides a model for developing this kind of author-centered catalog of offerings by acquiring and publishing Sidney and Spenser in the early 1590s, and to whom both Blount and Linley were apprenticed, although before Ponsonby would have put out the literary editions that made him famous. Ponsonby acquires *Astrophel and Stella* and puts out the Sidney folio "with sundry new additions to the author" in 1598—precisely at the time when Flasket and Linley were also beginning to sell Marlowe with sundry new additions. Flasket was closely familiar with Ponsonby's collected Sidney—it was the Edinburgh reprint of precisely this edition that he was illegally selling in 1599.

Or take Simon Waterson, Ponsonby's brother-in-law, whose very first publication was also the very first published work of Daniel, the 1585 translation of *Giovio*, and who continued to publish the poet throughout their careers. Or indeed take Nicholas Ling, the presumed editor of *Englands Helicon*, who made a career of publishing and selling almost all the works of Michael Drayton.⁹¹ Ling's practice may in fact have served as a model for the publishers at the Bear: rather than owning all the copies he sold, Ling worked in collaboration with other members of the trade to become publisher, copublisher, or vendor of a coherent authorial body of work. Ling was part of Flasket's network, their first joint product being *Englands Helicon*, followed in 1606 by Drayton's *Poems lyric and pastorall*. When John Flasket and his colleagues developed a specialty in Marlovian writing, they did not author the idea of such specialty, but rather acquired it, from Ling, Waterson, or Ponsonby, precisely the way they constructed the texts themselves—through a network of collaborative connections passing through the shop.

The history of the publication of *Hero and Leander* and of Marlowe, the poet, is inseparable from the history of the shop and its network. It was this network of personal, occasionally even intimate connections among Woodcock's widow, her son, Linley, Blount, Flasket, Chapman, Ling, and others, knit together by the shop at the Bear, that transformed Marlowe's broken remains into his poetic oeuvre. The transformation reflects the tension between two competing imperatives at work in the publication of Marlowe: the need for the author as an authenticating effect, and the desire for writing to achieve completion and closure. Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* announces the coincidence of the two when its last line declares: *terminat auctor opus*. But such coincidence of formal closure with the authorial act was an impossibility for Marlowe's poems. The afterlife of Marlowe's poetry, and of his works in general, the short-lived success and long oblivion, is defined by this continuing tension between the two fundamental demands of what we have come to consider as the literary.

CODA: ATHEISTS

Christopher Marlowe was accused of atheism, an accusation that defined his public image in the 1590s and in the early seventeenth century.⁹² The charge of atheism also implicated him in a wider network of factional allegations, most prominently made in a pamphlet by Robert Persons and Richard Verstegan, who accused Walter Raleigh of presiding over a "schoole of Atheisme."⁹³ Shortly before Marlowe's death, his lodgings were searched, and his roommate, Thomas Kyd, was interrogated about the Arian text found there. In a letter to Sir John Puckering, Thomas Kyd was begging his interrogator "ffor more assurance that I was not of that vile opinion [i.e. atheism], let it but please your Lordship to enquire of such as he [Marlowe] conversed withall, that is (as I am geven to vnderstand) with [Thomas] Harriot, [Walter] Warner, [Matthew] Royden, and some stationers in Paules churchyard."⁹⁴ This list of witnesses to Marlowe's conversation is certainly not a list of people whose opinions about the merits of Marlowe's arguments about the Trinity and about the divinity of Christ would have been deemed orthodox. But it certainly is a list of characters in the retinue of Henry Percy, the Ninth Earl of Northumberland, himself reputedly an irreligious person. A significant amount of research has been spent on placing Marlowe in the circle of Northumberland, the "Wizard earl," and in 1592 he was certainly reported as saying "himself to be very wel known both to the Earle of Northumberland and my Lord Strang."⁹⁵

The identity of stationers referred to by Kyd will probably never be revealed, but here's a hint of a possibility. As a publishing, book-importing

and bookbinding business, the Bear served a wide and varied clientele. The household accounts of Northumberland show that Linley, Flasket, and Blount were importing, selling and binding books for the Earl around the turn of the century.⁹⁶ It is striking that all three of them appear among the few stationers so employed, confirming their close association; at the same time, their repeated service to Northumberland also links them to the group of poets and intellectuals in his circle, and thus, perhaps, to Marlowe. Their personal beliefs can only be a matter of speculation: while unbelief did certainly exist in the period, atheism, like some of the other key terms we try to use to describe early modern religious perspectives, was primarily an accusatory label, and things and people thus labeled were generally foreign or under foreign influence (as were most things sold at the Black Bear). But Blount's publications included the two key texts of learned *libertinage*: *Montaignes Essays* and Charron's *De la sagesse*, two texts that came as close to being openly vulnerable to accusations of atheism as was perhaps possible in print.⁹⁷ Blount (baptized 1562) and Flasket (baptized 1566) belonged to Marlowe's generation. Linley, who took up his apprenticeship with Ponsoby in 1576, would have been roughly the same age, and, as apprentices, they were certainly present at the Churchyard when Marlowe frequented the shops there.⁹⁸ If we add to this equation Blount's protestations of his friendship of Marlowe in the Dedication to *Hero and Leander*, the young booksellers who later took over the Black Bear may indeed turn out to have been members of a veritable "School of Night"—although a socially more modest one than the fanciful invention that was once present in the pages of all literary histories of the period.

City College of New York, CUNY

NOTES

I am grateful to Colin Burrow, Alan Farmer, Adam Hooks, David Kastan, and Ivan Lupić for their comments on this essay, and especially to Kirk Melnikoff, not only for responding to earlier drafts, but also for sharing with me the manuscript of his book chapter on Marlowe's Dido, which addresses a topic closely related to my own.

- 1 Gary Taylor, "Making Meaning Marketing Shakespeare 1623," *From Performance to Print in Shakespeare's England*, ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2006), 57–58.
- 2 Adam G. Hooks, "Shakespeare at the White Greyhound," *Shakespeare Survey* 65 (2011): 260–75.

- 3 Thomas Kyd to Sir John Puckering, 1593, BL MS Harleian 6848, fol. 154, reprinted in Constance B. Kuriyama, *Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life* (Cornell U. Press, 2002), 228–30.
- 4 *Lycans first booke translated line for line*, by Chr. Marlow (London, printed by P. Short, and are to be sold by Walter Burre at the signe of the Flower de Luce in Paules Churchyard, 1600), A2r.
- 5 Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (U. of Toronto Press, 1997).
- 6 Robert Darcy, "Marlowe and Marston's Cursus," *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman: Lives, Stage, and Page*, ed. Sarah K. Scott and Michael L. Stapleton (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 149–58, outlines an alternative to an authorially produced *cursus* by putting the emphasis on the effects of print, and, more specifically, on the effects of the chronology of publication.
- 7 David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare after Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 23–42.
- 8 Mark Knights, "John Starkey and Ideological Networks in Late Seventeenth-Century England," *Media History* 11 (2005): 127–45; David Como, "Secret Printing, the Crisis of 1640, and the Origins of Civil War Radicalism," *Past & Present* 196 (2007): 37–82; David Scott Kastan, "Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature," *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin (Amherst: U. of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 105–24; Peter McCullough, "Print, Publication and Religious Politics in Caroline England," *The Historical Journal* 51 (2008): 285–313.
- 9 The implications of this research for literary history have been usefully articulated in the debate about the centrality of role of the author's vs. the publisher's intention unfolding in David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book* (Cambridge U. Press, 2001); Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge U. Press, 2003); Lukas Erne, "Reconsidering Shakespearean Authorship," *Shakespeare Studies* 36 (2008): 26–36; David Scott Kastan, "To Think These Trifles Some-thing': Shakespearean Playbooks and the Claims of Authorship," *Shakespeare Studies* 36 (2008): 37–48.
- 10 See most recently the studies collected in *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography*, ed. Marta Straznicky (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge U. Press, 2004) has been influential in his use of the notion of niche publishing as an interface between the marketplace and the content of the published work. Doug Bruster's contribution, and David Hawkes's response to it, in *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*, ed. Linda Woodbridge (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) reflect on some of the difficulties of integrating economics into the study of early modern literary culture.
- 11 In a striking move that completes the Hegelian dialectic of this history, Bruster's most recent piece, "Shakespeare the Stationer," in Straznicky, *Shakespeare's Stationers*, 112–31, returns the centered agency to Shakespeare, but imagines him not as a "creative genius" but rather as someone consciously adjusting his style to the trends of the book market.

- 12 Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, "An Unacknowledged Revolution Revisited," *The American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 87–105; Adrian Johns, "How to Acknowledge a Revolution," *The American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 106–25; Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, "Reply," *The American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 126–28.
- 13 Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society* (Harvard U. Press, 1987), 226–28; Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (U. of Chicago Press, 1998), 11–19.
- 14 Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for Action': How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy," *Past & Present* 129 (1990): 45–49.
- 15 Robin Myers, Michael Harris, and Giles Mandelbrote, eds., *The London Book Trade: Topographies of Print in the Metropolis from the Sixteenth Century* (London: Oak Knoll Press and British Library, 2003); Taylor, "Marketing Shakespeare 1623," Hooks, "Shakespeare at the White Greyhound."
- 16 For a similar approach, see Zachary Lesser, "Shakespeare's Flop: John Waterson and the *Two Noble Kinsman*," in Straznicky, *Shakespeare's Stationers*, 177–96.
- 17 The other piece in print presumably his is the Latin dedication of Thomas Watson's *Aminta* to Mary Sidney, signed by C. M.
- 18 Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe*, rev. ed. (London: Vintage, 2002), 70–76.
- 19 C. F. Tucker Brooke, "The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 25 (1922): 365. See also J. A. Downie, "Marlowe, May 1593, and the 'Must-have' Theory of Biography," *RES* 58 (2007): 256–57, for a discussion of the supposed association of Tamburlaine with Marlowe.
- 20 Richard Levin, "The Contemporary Perception of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*," *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England* (1987): 64.
- 21 Throughout his discussion of the implications of *Tamburlaine* for Marlowe's career in *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*, Cheney talks about the play as a public gesture, describing it as "an advertisement for Marlowe as England's new poet," writing about Marlowe as someone "boldly advertising his own generic progression," as someone who "advertises himself as the new poet of empire," (122, 124, 127). Unfortunately, the supposed advertisement omits to mention the product being advertised, i.e., Marlowe's name—a fact especially troubling given the uniqueness of the *Tamburlaine* plays as "the only works published during their author's lifetime" and consequently representing his "intentions more closely than most of the other works" (115). To point out this inconsistency is not to question Cheney's powerful reading of Marlowe's self-image, only to note that poetic gestures don't always translate into the public gestures their interpretive descriptions seem to imply, and that self-images sometimes remain just that: self-images.
- 22 Tucker Brooke, "The Marlowe Canon," *PMLA* 37 (1922): 386–89; and Thomas Dabbs, *Reforming Marlowe: The Nineteenth-Century Canonization of a Renaissance Dramatist* (Lewisburg: Bucknell U. Press, 1991), 61–64.

- 23 Leah S. Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 42.
- 24 Perhaps, if they were indeed published then: Fredson Bowers, ed., *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge U. Press, 1981), 1:356–57.
- 25 For the standard view of the connection between the stage and print histories of Marlowe's plays in the late-sixteenth century, see Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company 1594–1625* (Cambridge U. Press, 2009), 15–17. For a sharp and compelling critique of this account, see Holger Schott Syme, "The Meaning of Success: 1594 and Its Aftermath," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61 (2010): 490–525. See also Syme, "Marlowe in His Moment," *Marlowe in Context*, ed. Emily C. Bartels and Emma Smith (Cambridge U. Press, 2013), 275–84.
- 26 See Kirk Melnikoff, "Richard Jones (fl. 1564–1613): Elizabethan Printer, Bookseller and Publisher," *AEB: Analytical & Enumerative Bibliography* 12 (2001): 153–84; Kirk Melnikoff, "Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones, Print Culture, and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature," *SP* 102 (2005): 184–209.
- 27 *The troublesome raigne and lamentable death of Edward the second, King of England with the tragicall fall of proud Mortimer: as it was sundrie times publicquely acted in the honourable citie of London, by the right honourable the Earle of Pembroke his seruants. Written by Chri. Marlow Gent.* (London: for William Iones dwelling neere Holbourne conduit, at the signe of the Gunne, 1594).
- 28 Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1990), 26.
- 29 Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554–1640, A.D.*, 5 vols. (London and Birmingham: Privately Printed, 1875), 2:648.
- 30 This is Kirk Melnikoff's suggestion, in his book manuscript, *Elizabethan Booktrade: Publishing and the Development of English Literature*.
- 31 Flasket is identified as a bookbinder in *Ecclesiastical London*, ed. Mary C. Erler, *Records of Early English Drama* (U. of Toronto Press, 2008), 200.
- 32 Arber, *Transcript*, 2:725, 3:164–65.
- 33 On Blount, see Gary Taylor, "The Cultural Politics of Maybe," *Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare*, ed. Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson (Manchester U. Press, 2003), 242–58, and Taylor's article in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (henceforth cited as *ODNB*), s.v. "Edward Blount."
- 34 *Hero and Leander. By Christopher Marloe* (London: Printed by Adam Islip, for Edward Blount, 1598).
- 35 *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marloe; and finished by George Chapman* (London: Printed by Felix Kingston, for Paule Linley, and are to be solde in Paules Church-yard, at the signe of the Blacke-beare, 1598). The date of the transfer in the Stationers' Register is March 2, 1597/98: Arber, *Transcript*, 3:105.

- 36 See *Le premier liure de chansons & airs . . . mis en musique par le sieur Carles Tessier* (Imprimes a Londres: Par Thomas Este, imprimeur ordinaire. 1597. Les presents liures se treuuent ches Edouard Blount libraire demeurant au cimitiere de Saint Paul deuant la gran porte du north dudit S. Paul a Londres); and *A worlde of wordes, or Most copious, and exact dictionarie in Italian and English, collected by Iohn Florio* (London: By Arnold Hatfield for Edw. Blount, 1598), which, according to the colophon on 2Q2v was “Imprinted at London by Arnold Hatfield, for Edward Blunt: and are to be sold at his shop ouer against the great North dore of paules Church.”
- 37 *A letter to Mr. T. H. late minister: now fugitiue: from Sir Edward Hoby Knight* (London: Printed by F. K. for Ed. Blount and W. Barret, and are to be sold at the signe of the blacke Beare in Pauls Church-yard, 1609). Starting 1609, Blount’s editions of *Hero and Leander* and of other titles first published by Flasket also feature the address.
- 38 Melnikoff, *Elizabethan Booktrade*.
- 39 R. B. McKerrow, ed., *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557–1640* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1910), s.v. “Paul Linley,” citing *Dean and Chapter of St. Paul’s*, bk. C, f. 92.
- 40 Brooke, “The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe,” 361–65.
- 41 There are traces of its manuscript circulation preceding this. Most notably, Thomas Edwards’ epyllion *Narcissus* clearly and repeatedly refers to the poet and his poem; see Katherine Duncan-Jones, “Much Ado with Red and White: The Earliest Readers of Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis* (1593),” *RES* N.S. 44 (1993): 490–92. *Narcissus* was published in 1594 by John Wolfe, the publisher who also entered *Hero* in the Stationers’ Register in 1593—in other words, what this early mention suggests is not necessarily the circulation of manuscripts among readers and writers in general, but the circulation of people in and out of another, more famous bookshop well known for bringing together manuscripts, readers, and writers.
- 42 *Englands Helicon* (London: Printed by I. R. for Iohn Flasket, and are to be sold in Paules Church-yard, at the signe of the Beare, 1600).
- 43 J. William Hebel, “Nicholas Ling and *Englands Helicon*,” *The Library*, 4th ser., 5 (1925): 153–60; Hyder Edward Rollins, ed., *England’s Helicon, 1600, 1614*, 2 vols. (Harvard U. Press, 1935), 2:41–71.
- 44 *Englands Helicon* is republished in 1614 with the same attributions.
- 45 R. S. Forsythe, “The Passionate Shepherd; and English Poetry,” *PMLA* 40 (1925): 692–742; John Bakeless, *The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe*, 2 vols. (Harvard U. Press, 1942), 2:149–60; Susanne Woods, “‘The Passionate Sheeheard’ and ‘The Nimphs Reply’: A Study of Transmission,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 34 (1970): 25–33; Douglas Bruster, “‘Come to the Tent Again’: ‘The Passionate Shepherd,’ Dramatic Rape and Lyric Time,” *Criticism* 33 (1991): 49–72.
- 46 Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, Volume I: 1450–1625* (London and New York: Mansell and Bowker, 1980), pt. 2, 326–27.

- 47 The ballad (Printed by the Assignes of Thomas symcock, n.d., ca. 1620) survives in the Roxburghe collection at the British Library, as Roxburghe 1.205. On this sheet, the poem we know as Marlowe's is accompanied by "The ladies prudent answer to her Loue, to the same tune" (i.e., "The nymph's reply," traditionally attributed to Raleigh). Both were printed in *Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. Charles Hindley (1874), 2:282–83, 284–85. This two-part ballad is identified by the *UCSB Ballad Project*, <http://ebba.english.ucsb.edu/ballad/30141> as EBBA ID: 30141. William Corkine, on G2v–H1r of his *The Second booke of ayres* (London: Printed for M. L. I. B. and T. S. Assigned by W. Barley, 1612) assumed it to be known well enough to identify it by the incipit only, as a new descant upon old grounds.
- 48 *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (Oxford U. Press, 1958), 3:271.
- 49 As Ling explains in his preface, "No one thying beeing here placed by the Collector of [the anthology] vnder any mans name, eyther at large, or in letters [i.e., by initials], but as it was deliuered by some especiall copy comming to his handes"—but there have been copies of the poem circulating under others' names as well.
- 50 *Hero and Leander* (London: Printed for Iohn Flasket, and are to be solde in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of the Blacke-bear, 1600).
- 51 Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Was the 1609 Shake-Speares Sonnets Really Unauthorized?" *RES* 34 (1983): 156–64; Colin Burrow, "Life and Work in Shakespeare's Poem," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 97 (1997): 48–50; and Taylor, "Edward Blount."
- 52 Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Book*, 61–63.
- 53 On the last years of Thorpe, David Kathman's *ODNB* entry supersedes the information in Duncan-Jones, "1609 Shake-Speares Sonnets."
- 54 W. W. Greg, "The Copyright of Hero and Leander," *The Library*, 4th ser., 24 (1944): 169.
- 55 Blayney, *Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard*, 26–27.
- 56 Arber, *Transcript*, 3:538.
- 57 Sir Julius Caesar's notes concerning the Star Chamber case revolving around the lost play *The Old Joiner of Aldgate* (about which I have more to say more below) mention that one of the key witnesses in the case, John Oswald, works as a bookbinder for Flasket and his uncle, Mr. Wight, which implies that Flasket has a sizable operation as a bookbinder, employing journeymen binders as well as apprentices. See the note headed "Of flaskett's pretended contract ar two wytnesses only," BL MS Add 14027, fol. 27.
- 58 Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge U. Press, 1997), 18, 60–62 claims that by the 1590s, no more than half of the titles printed were entered in the Stationers' Register, which makes Blount appear a uniquely meticulous person. But Clegg arrives at this figure by a simple comparison of the number of STC items against the number of Stationers' Register entries, and although she recognizes that reprints and reissues account for some of the discrepancy between the two figures, she does not attempt to establish to what extent.

- 59 Some of the problems of course remain. Most importantly and crucially, we don't know how the people at the Bear acquired the two works from Wolfe, why the transfer was never entered in the Register, and, since the copy of *Hero and Leander* was later claimed by Purslowe, who inherited it from Wolfe, we also don't know what was the nature of that transfer. This might of course be explained away by saying that Blount and Thorpe were simply not very good at record- and account-keeping, and that this could even explain their financial demise. Nonetheless, that Wolfe, to whose publishing profile the Bear publishers are remarkably close, was the one who first entered Marlowe's poems but never published them, is an intriguing problem that is potentially central to the story I am trying to reconstruct here, but a problem we will probably never be able to solve.
- 60 To call attention to the retrospective literariness of the output of the Bear does not, of course, imply anything about the respectability of the dealings of Thorpe and his colleagues.
- 61 Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Cornell U. Press, 1993), 310–19.
- 62 Blayney, *Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard*, 23, 25–26.
- 63 John Stow, *A Survey of London* (London, 1598), S6v–S7r.
- 64 Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford U. Press, 2002), 100.
- 65 I owe the term “mortuary poetics” as well as the “paper over” pun to Elizabeth Mazzola, *The Pathology of the English Renaissance: Sacred Remains and Holy Ghosts* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1998), 13, 116, 117–21. See also Philip Schwyzer, *Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature* (Oxford U. Press, 2007), 108–50.
- 66 Blayney, *Bookshops in Paul's Cross Churchyard*, 23.
- 67 James P. Bednarz, “Canonizing Shakespeare: *The Passionate Pilgrim, England's Helicon* and the Question of Authenticity,” *Shakespeare Survey* 60 (2007): 255–58, 260, 262.
- 68 Diana E. Henderson, *Passion Made Public: Elizabethan Lyric, Gender, and Performance* (Urbana: U. of Illinois Press, 1995), 123.
- 69 Bednarz, “Canonizing Shakespeare” 261–62.
- 70 For a detailed consideration of the repackaged *Dido*, see Melnikoff, *Elizabethan Booktrade*.
- 71 *Palladis Tamia/Wits treasury*, 2O2r.
- 72 *England's Parnassus, Compiled by Robert Allot*, ed. Charles Crawford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 273–83.
- 73 Stephen Orgel's 1971 Penguin edition of *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Poems and Translations* is an important exception.
- 74 It was entered to Linley on 27 September 1595: Arber, *Transcript*, 3:49.

- 75 Blount published *Sir Gyles Goosecappe Knight* in 1606. Thorpe was the publisher of *Eastward Ho, All Fools, The Gentleman Usher*, and the two-part *Charles, Duke of Biron*.
- 76 Charles Jasper Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* (Cambridge U. Press, 1936), 12–72, and *Ecclesiastical London*, ed. Erler, 177–203.
- 77 *The order of ceremonies observed in the anointing and coronation of the most Christian King of France & Nauarre, Henry the IIII. of that name . . .* (London: Imprinted by Iohn Windet, and are to be sold by Iohn Flasket, at the great north doore of Paules, [1594]); *The copie of a letter sent to Monsieur de Beauvoir lord ambassador for the French king wherin is shewed the late attempt of a Iesuite who would haue killed the kings Maiestie with a knife* (Printed by Peter Short and are to be sold at the great north dore of Poules by Iohn Flasket, 1594); *A true coppie of the transportation of the Lowe Countries, Burgundie, and the countie of Charrolois: doone by the King of Spayne, for the dowrie of his eldest daughter. Giuen in marriage vnto the Cardinall Albert, Duke of Austria, with the articles and conditions of the same, signed by the King in Madrill. Translated out of Dutch by H. W. Nouember. 1598* (London: Printed by I. R. for Paule Linley, dwelling in Paules Church-yard, at the signe of the Blacke Beare, [1598]); *The Kings declaration and ordinance containing the cause of his warre against the duke of Sauoy, warning his subiects, that they carrie not armes against his Maiestie: and a commandement to all true Frenchmen, to retire themselues to his obedience. According to the copie printed at Paris by Iames Mettayer, ordinarie printer to the King, 1600* (London: Imprinted for Iohn Flasket, 1600), and *The true copping of a certaine letter written from Sluce the 12. of Iune 1606 (according to theyr computation.) Concerning an exploit attempted by the enemie against the said towne. As it was printed at Flushing* (London: Printed by I. R. for Iohn Flasket, 1606) are newsletters published by Flasket or Linley. *The iournall, or dayly register, contayning a true manifestation, and historical declaration of the voyage, accomplished by eight shippes of Amsterdam, vnder the conduct of Iacob Corneliszen Neck Admirall, & Wybrandt van Warwick Vice-Admirall, which sayled from Amsterdam the first day of March, 1598* (London: for Cuthbert Burby & Iohn Flasket: and are to be sold at the Royall Exchange, & at the signe of the blacke beare in Paules Church-yard, 1601); *Certaine matters concerning the realme of Scotland* (London: for Iohn Flasket, dwelling at the signe of the blacke Beare in Paules Churchyard, 1603); and another edition of the same: *Certaine matters concerning the realme of Scotland* (London: Printed by A. Hatfield, for Iohn Flasket dwelling at the signe of the Blacke Beare in Pauls Churchyard, 1603) are slightly longer pamphlets of timely information.
- 78 Taylor, “Cultural Politics of Maybe,” 249–52.
- 79 *A true discourse of the ouerthrowe giuen to the common enemy at Turnhaut, the 14. of Ianuary last 1597. by Count Moris of Nassaw and the states, assisted with the Englishe forces. Sent from a gentleman of account, that was present at the seruice, to a friend of his in England* (Printed by Peter Short, and are to be sold in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of the blacke Beare, 1597); *A discourse more at large of the late ouerthrowe giuen to the King of Spaines armie at Turnehaut, in Ianuarie last, by Count Morris of Nassawe, assisted with the English forces whereunto is adioined certaine inchauntments and praiers in Latine, found about diuerse of the Spaniards, which were slaine in the same conflict: Translated out of French according to the copy printed in the Low Countries* (Printed at London, and are to be sold in Paules Churchyarde, at the signe of the black Beare, 1597).
- 80 Arber, *Transcript*, 3:79.
- 81 Arthur Collins, ed., *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James* (London: T. Osborne, 1746), 2:4, footnote.

- 82 *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley* (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1934), 2:366, 406, 408.
- 83 Paul H. Kocher, "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*," *MLQ* 8 (1947): 151–73, 309–18; David Potter, "Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* and the Reputation of Henri III," *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, ed. Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), 70–95. Alan Stewart's current research, presented, among others, to the Columbia University Renaissance Seminar on September 11, 2012, explores the incredibly wide dissemination of the Gaveston-Epernon analogy in the French pamphlets published in the years leading up to the murder of Henri III.
- 84 *Work for chimney-sweepers* (London: By T. Este for Thomas Bushell, & are to be souled at the great north dore of Powles, 1602); *A defence of tabacco: with a friendly answer to the late printed booke called Worke for chimney-sweepers, &c.* (London: Printed by Richard Field for Thomas Man, 1602); *A new and short defense of tabacco: with the effectes of the same: and of the right vse thereof* (London: Printed by V. S. for Clement Knight, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Holy Lambe in Paules Church-yard, 1602). The Stationers' Register entries show that the defenses all appear in Spring 1602.
- 85 Richard McCabe, "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599," *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 188–93; Lynda E. Boose, "The 1599 Bishops' Ban, Elizabethan Pornography, and the Sexualization of the Jacobean Stage," *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property and Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Richard Burt and John Michael Archer (Cornell U. Press, 1994), 185–200; Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, 198–217.
- 86 Samuel Rowlands's *The letting of Humors blood in the head-vaine* was burnt in October 1600, and the booksellers fined for selling it early in March 1600/1: Arber, *Transcript*, 2:832.
- 87 Fredson Bowers, "The Early Editions of Marlowe's 'Ovid's Elegies,'" *Studies in Bibliography* 25 (1972): 149–72; Roma Gill and Robert Krueger, "The Early Editions of Marlowe's Elegies and Davies's Epigrams: Sequence and Authority," *The Library*, 5th ser., 26 (1971): 242–49.
- 88 Heather James, "The Poet's Toys: Christopher Marlowe and the Liberties of Erotic Elegy," *MLQ* 67 (2006), 103–27, shows that the politics of the Ovidian elegy as a genre, with its "indiscriminate license which overwhelms every element of the rhetorical and social decorum" would have made the collection of Marlowe's translations a transgressive text—and she does so without trying to make a case for this being the reason for their suppression.
- 89 For Blount, see Taylor, "Edward Blount." On the 1599 action in Star Chamber brought by Ponsonby against Flasket and others for conspiring to sell copies of *The Arcadia* printed by Waldegrave, see Henry R. Plomer, "The Edinburgh Edition of Sidney's 'Arcadia,'" *The Library*, 2nd ser., 1 (1899): 195–205; W. W. Greg and E. Boswell, eds., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1576–1602; From Register B* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1930), lix–lx, 80–81. For Waldegrave as a possible printer of the *Elegies*, see Bowers, "Editions of Marlowe's 'Ovid's Elegies,'" 151.
- 90 Entered to W. Burre 27 May 1614, and published the same year by Burre, Blount, as well as by Thorpe.

- 91 Hebel, "Nicholas Ling," 158–60; Bent Juel-Jensen, "'Polyolbion,' 'Poemes Lyrick and pastorall,' 'Poems' 1619, 'The Owle' and a Few Other Books by Michael Drayton," *The Library*, 5th ser., 8 (1953): 153; and Gerald D. Johnson, "Nicholas Ling, Publisher 1580–1607," *Studies in Bibliography* 38 (1985): 204–5.
- 92 Nicholas Davidson, "Christopher Marlowe and Atheism," *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, ed. Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), 129–47, and Downie, "Marlowe, May 1593," 257–66.
- 93 Robert Persons and Richard Verstegan, *An aduertisement written to a secretarie of my L. Treasurers of In gland* (1592), B1v.
- 94 Thomas Kyd to Sir John Puckering, 1593, BL MS Harleian 6848, fol. 154, reprinted in Kuriyama, *Christopher Marlowe*, 228–30.
- 95 John William Shirley, *Thomas Harriot: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 175–240, 315–21; Nicholl, *Reckoning*, 227–57; R. B. Wernham, "Christopher Marlowe at Flushing in 1592," *English Historical Review* 91 (1976): 344–45.
- 96 Gordon R. Batho, "The Library of the 'Wizard' Earl: Henry Percy Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564–1632)," *The Library*, 5th ser., 15 (1960): 252, 256.
- 97 Taylor, "Cultural Politics of Maybe," 253–56.
- 98 Thorpe (bap. 1571) was slightly younger—and around the time when Marlowe would have been hanging out in the Churchyard, he was probably in Spain, spending time with none other than Robert Parsons.



ISSN 0031-7977

COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA