The rise of the English novel needs rethinking after is has been confined to the „formal realism“ of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding by Ian Watts influential book\(^1\). The development of „real“ English fiction was not acknowledged before the beginning of the 18th century because literary criticism insisted on the strict separation of „romances“ from „novels“\(^2\). This separation seems to be highly artificial, for *Pamela, Clarissa, Tom Jones*, even *Joseph Andrews* and the invincible *Moll Flanders* contain romance plots.\(^3\) It is also very insular to neglect England’s European literary context by fixing the rise of the novel exclusively to journalism and the spirit of the so-called „moral weeklys“ such as *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*.

In the literary history of the Renaissance, which was a European cultural movement, the novel genre, naturally including English literature, was developed from classical and medieval epic romances, from popularized chivalric romances in prose and their mock opposites: picaresque novels, from Italian and Spanish novellas of love and intrigue, last but not least from plays re-written into prose. Characterization was much more advanced in the dramas than in novels of the time of Shakespeare. A widely accepted definition of the novel genre is:

> [...]an extended fictional prose narrative [...] long enough to justify its publication in an independent volume, [...] The novel differs from the prose romance in that a greater degree of realism is expected of it, and that it tends to describe a recognizable secular social world, often in a sceptical and prosaic manner [...] The novel has frequently incorporated the structures and languages of non-fictional prose forms (history, autobiography, journalism, travel writing), [...] it should have at least one character, and preferably several characters shown in processes of change and social relationship; a plot, or some arrangement of narrated events, is another normal requirement.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel* (Berkeley: UCP, 1957), Ch. 2: “Realism and the Novel Form”.


My analysis of Lyly’s *Euphues and His England* (1580), Sidney’s *Arcadia* (1580 / 84), Nashe’s *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1584), and Deloney’s *Jack of Newbury* (1596 – 97) will prove that the idealistic values of the old chivalric aristocracy melted into the more practical values of the new capitalist middle-class meritocracy. Romance and novel concepts, however, remained intertwined because more and more romances mixed ethical truth with the more novelistic elements of empirical realism.

**EUPHUES AND HIS ENGLAND** (1580)

Right from its beginning, most English fiction has been concerned with manners. Like no other literary genre, the novel reflects the social criticism and change of public taste, values, and morals. John Lyly’s *Euphues*-novels mark the trend from the conduct book to the novel of manners.

*Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578) is the negative romance of a young man who travels from Cambridge (the city of wisdom) to Rome (the city of pleasure), deceives his friend by seducing his bride and is punished by her unfaithfulness. The subtitle informs us about the legacy of moral writings such as Stubbe’s *Anatomy of Abuses* (1583), Nashe’s *Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589), or Sir Robert Burton’s famous *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). In his polarization of wit and WISDOM, Lyly criticizes the negative effects of the customary Grand Tour from which young English noblemen came home not as heroes in a bildungsroman, invested with the Roman cardinal virtues of WISDOM, JUSTICE, COURAGE, and HONOUR but infected with vices thought to be Italian such as chattering and cheating. This must have led Queen Elizabeth’s teacher Roger Ascham to the

---


conclusion: „Englese Italianato, e vn diabolo incarnato [...]“\(^8\) Lyly’s antithetical style culminates in the chiastic „anatomy“ of Euphues as

This younge gallant, of more wit than wealth, and yet of more wealth than **wisdome**, [...] usieng iesting without **meane**, & abusing mirth without **measure**. (Euphues I, 184. Italics mine.)

The artfully cross-structured notions of wit and wisdom, the alliterations in euphuism, are functional. Style and structure prove that Euphues accepts neither means nor measure because he is poorest in wisdom.

[...] **witte** although it hath been eaten with the canker of his owne conceite, and fretted with the rust of vaine loue, yet beeinge purified in the still of **wisdome**, and tried in the fire of zeale, will shine bright [...] (Euphues I, 242. Italics mine)

Wit can be fruitful if it is controlled by the cardinal virtue of WISDOM.⁺ This Aristotelian ideal of the balancing function of wisdom comes close to the English educational principle of self-discipline.

After the moral criticism and so much hostility towards women, in *The Anatomy of Wit*, Lyly was forced to write „Euphues‘ Glass for Europe“*, the conclusive chapter in his novel of manners *Euphues and His England* (1580)¹⁰: „O thrice happy England where such Consaylors are, where such people live, where such **vertue** springeth.“ (Euphues II, 197. Italics mine.). Besides the moralizing wisdom in Lyly, Englishmen found much to tickle their vanity by the juxtaposition of their country to Italy, their councillors¹¹ to casanovas, their people to the sons and daughters of Rome, and their virtue to foreign vices.

Of course, the rising middle-class cherished their national prejudice against Southern Europeans by accepting *Euphues and His England* as a conduct book. It was

---

¹ Edward Arber (ed.), *Roger Ascham, The Scholemaster* (Westminster: Constable, 1897), 78, 67: “It is your shame ([..] you gentlemen of England) that one may[de] [...] the Queenes Maistrie her selfe. [...] that beside her perfect readings, in *Latin, Italian, French*, and *Spanish*, she readeth here now at Windsore more Greeke every day than some Prebendarie of the Chirch doth read *Latin* in a whole week.”

² Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachian Ethics*, Book VII, where the Greek philosopher puts wisdom on top of all cardinal virtues because it keeps the “golden measure”.


published in 12 editions until 1640 with imitations by Greene, Lodge, and Munday.\textsuperscript{12} Highest was Lyly’s praise of English, in contrast to Italian, women:


The praise of English women culminates in the apotheosis of Queen Elizabeth I:

The lyuing \textit{God} is only the \textit{Englysh God}, wher he hath placed \textit{peace}, whych bringeth all plentie, anoynted a \textit{Uirgin Queene}, which […] with her \textit{worthinesse}, winneth the good willes of straungers, so that she is no less \textit{gratious} among hir owne, then \textit{glorious} to others, no less \textit{loued} of her people, then \textit{meruailed} at of other nations. (Euphues II, 210. Italics mine).

\begin{center}
\textit{THE COUNTESSE OF PEMBROKE’S ARCADIA (1581 / 1584, publ. 1590 /94)}
\end{center}

The praise of the Church of England, the outstanding worth of its Head and Defender of the Peace, provides a good transition to Sir Philip Sidney’s \textit{The Countesse of Pembroke’s Arcadia} (1581/1584, publ. 1590/1593).\textsuperscript{13} Dedicated to his sister, Sidney’s masterpiece reads like a fashionable pastoral romance set in Greece.

King Basilius has withdrawn from governing and politics to the province of Arcadia where two shipwrecked Princes, Pyrocles and Musidorus, disguised as Zelmane, the amazon, and Dorus, the shepherd, court his beautiful daughters Philoclea and Pamela. Love and passion cause trouble in bucolic utopia. Both, King and Queen fall unreasonably in love with Zelmane, alias Prince Pyrocles, the usurper Amphialus abducts the princesses into the castle of his evil mother Cecropia, Queen of Night. During the ensuing civil war, Pyrocles and Musidorus cast off their disguises, vanquish Amphialus and Cecropia, restore Basilius to his throne and marry their adored princesses.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[12]{Ernest A. Baker, \textit{The History of the English Novel}, II (London: Witherby, 1929).}
\end{footnotes}
The scale of virtues in the *Arcadia* is that of the conventional high romance. Good examples are how Pyrocles confesses his love to Philoclea and his readiness to kill himself if she rejects him.

[... ] you that Nature hath made the Loadstarre of comfort [...] whom vertue hath made the Princesse of felicitie [...] whom my choyse hath made the Goddesse of my safetie [...] my desire may be waied in the ballances of Honour and let Vertue hold them. For if the highest Love in no base person may aspire to grace, then may I hope your beautie will not be without pittie. If otherwise you be (alas but let it never be so) resolved, yet shall not my death be comfortless, receiving it by your sentence. (*Arcadia, II*, 259. Italics mine)

Love is the compass of nature, guided by beauty. Pyrocles gives away himself to Philoclea, including his life, because her virtue not only balances his love with honour, she incites his sublimation from felicity to God’s grace. Pamela, in her cool constancy, admits premarital love only as sexless eros in the courtly tradition whereas Philoclea, once her heart is won, trusts herself completely to Pyrocles, only appealing to the restraints of his virtue.

Thou hast then the victorie; use it with vertue. Thy vertue wan me; with vertue preserve me. Doost thou love me? Keepe me then still worthy to be beloved. (*Arcadia II*, 260 - 261. Italics mine.)

Compared to the stereotypes in Lyly’s work, the psychological realism in Sidney’s romance is remarkable. Not only is dueling criticized if it is based on ambition, revenge or on an excessive code of honour. The main characters are complex, contradictory, very true to life. They even follow a self-analytical interest: [...] when others marke their sheep, we [...] marke [mentally observe] our selves.“ (*Arcadia I*, 8.).

Virtue is not only its own reward, it has to be based on the free will to act according to the highest moral principles, even in temptation or under torture. In his *Apology for Poetry or the Defence of Poesy* (publ. 1595), Sidney had based the superiority of literature to philosophy and historiography on

[...] that delightful teaching [...] in the Ethike and Politique consideration, with the end of well doing, and not of well knowing onely.  

---


Ethically, the *Arcadia* cannot have been intended as an escapist pastoral romance. On the contrary, it mirrors more than Sidney’s criticism of the Elizabethan court, it should also be read as a political *roman à clef* about the state of the nation.

[...] his oft-quoted desire when he lay dying, that it should be destroyed, might suggest that in an age of political censorship he recognized the implicit danger to his family in allowing such an obvious political allegory to survive him.\(^{16}\)

A key to *Arcadia* reveals Basilius, the weak Duke, as Queen Elizabeth I, the power-greedy Cecropia as Mary Stuart in her ambition to reserve the throne to her son James, the ideal love Philoclea as Sidney’s „Stella“ Penelope Devereux, Lady Rich, the majestic Pamela as her sister Dorothy, and the hero Pyrocles together with Knight Philisides as portraits of Sir Philip Sidney himself.\(^{17}\) Rough as these identifications may be, it cannot be denied that Sidney supported the Protestant cause after he had witnessed the Saint Bartholomew’s Day massacre of the Huguenots in Paris (1572). Consequently he helped organize a Union of Protestant princes in Germany (1577) and supported the Dutch war of independence from Spain (1578). Spenser dedicated his *Shepheardes Calendar* (1579) to him as a Protestant hero.\(^{18}\)

Queen Elizabeth, despite her excommunication by Pope Pius V in 1570, was not ready to lead the Protestant Union against the progressing counter reformation on the Continent. She was almost persuaded by Sidney’s enemy, the Earl of Oxford, to agree to a diplomatic marriage with the Catholic Duke of Alençon, and expelled the author from her Court for opposing this match (1580). Under the pressure of Lord Burghley, Elizabeth „[...] was no activist in Foreign affairs [...]“\(^{19}\) Therefore, Sidney had many reasons to be dissatisfied with the Queen’s hesitating policy and with the power of the oligarchy „[...] making the Royall countenance serve to undermine the Royall soveraintie.“ (*Arcadia*, II, 185.).

---


In his exile, Sidney composed such “[...] moral and political lessons [...]”\textsuperscript{20} into his \textit{Arcadia} that he could criticize contemporary problems in his romance – novel, for “[...] its strongest ties are with the England of Sidney’s day.”\textsuperscript{21}

Euarchus, the Justice King, is Sidney’s paragon of the ideal ruler for the English people, because he alone is able to save Arcadia. He is

\begin{quote}
[...] a Prince, & a father of people, who ought with the eye of \textit{wisdom},
the hand of \textit{fortitude}, and the hart of \textit{justice} to set downe all private conceits, in comparison of what for the publike is profitable. (\textit{Arcadia}, III, 468. Italics mine.)
\end{quote}

Impartial versus his own son, because the law is above himself, the ideal statesman fulfills the principles of his private virtues of WISDOM, FORTITUDE, JUSTICE in order to be successful in the highest public virtue, GOOD GOVERNMENT.

Sidney’s \textit{Arcadia} was the most popular English combination of romance and novel in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. It had more than 20 editions\textsuperscript{22} until Richardson in \textit{Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded} (1740) named his protagonist after the second heroine in the Elizabethan knight’s romance – novel of private and public affairs. \textit{Arcadia} was seminal for the 17\textsuperscript{th}-century sentimental novels of the salons, such as Honoré d’Urfé’s \textit{Astrée} (1607 – 1624) and Mlle. de Scudéry’s \textit{Clélie} (1654 – 1661) which returned to England in first translations of 1620 and 1656.\textsuperscript{23}

The fact that Sidney’s \textit{Arcadia} is not even mentioned in a recent introduction to fiction in text and context\textsuperscript{24} proves the poor state of research on the English novel in the time of Shakespeare, not only in Germany.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} Roger Howell, \textit{Sir Philip Sidney}, 165.
\end{flushright}
THE UNFORTUNATE TRAVELLER; OR THE LIFE OF IACKE WILTON (1594)

The Unfortunate Traveller, or The Life of Iacke Wilton (1594)\textsuperscript{26} is almost unanimously categorized as the first English picaresque novel. The Spanish model, Lazarillo de Tormes (1554), had been translated 18 years before Thomas Nashe, the most aggressive university wit,\textsuperscript{27} published his anti-romance.

In the second half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, a new genre was born, and Don Quixote (1605 / 1615) would reluctantly give the coup de grace to its old chivalric form with its loci amoeni of ideal bucolic landscapes, the forest and the castle, its giant figures of the shepherd knight, the royal court, the pure virgins in distress, the usurper and the queen of night.

[...] from arcadia and chivalry to the desolate urban landscape of misery and hunger; from romance to irony – in fact, the Copernican revolution that produced a new genre – [...]\textsuperscript{28}

Concerning The Unfortunate Traveller one could add: „From arcadia to the battle fields of Europe.“

The narrative technique changes from an epic omniscient point of view with eclogues to a first person eye-witness narrator\textsuperscript{29} and mock-Petrarchan love sonnets. The

\textsuperscript{26} Thomas Nashe, “The Unfortunate Traveller”, in: Robert Ashley and Edwin M. Moseley (eds.), \textit{Elizabethan Fiction} (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), 203 – 308; Notes 419 – 436. This text is taken from a collation of the two 1594 editions of \textit{The Unfortunate Traveller} in McKerrow’s collection. All quotations are taken from this text.

\textsuperscript{27} Manfred Pfister, “The Unfortunate Traveller”, in: \textit{Kindlers Literatur Lexikon}, Vol. 22 (München: dtv, 1974), 9736.

\textsuperscript{28} Javier Herrero, “Renaissance Poverty and Lazarillo’s Family: The Birth of the Picaresque Genre”, \textit{PMLA}, 94 (1979), 876 – 886; 884.

unfortunate traveller is not an outcast, not a suffering Lazarillo but an ultimately successful rogue in a roguish world.

I, Jack Wilton, (a gentleman at least,) was [...] a page, belonging [...] unto the confines of the English court; where what my credit was, a number of my creditors [...], sole king of the cans and [...] provant [...] (203.)

 [...] let me [...] ruminate a line or two on the excellence of my wit: but I will not breathe either till I have disfraughted all my knavery. [...] (217.)

I think confidently I was ordained God’s scourge [...] (218.)

The novel consists of 15 episodes, knit together by the rogue’s adventures which have a more or less true historical background.

Jack’s first four plots are set during Henry VIII’s Flemish campaign in August and September, 1513. At Tournai he ruins a quartermaster by suspecting him of high treason, so that the miser distributes victuals, especially gallons of cider „[...] frankly amongst poor soldiers; [...]“ (208.). During the siege of Thérouanne Jack talks a stupid captain into „[...] the art of dissembling [...] as perfect as any courtier.“ (212.). The hated captain pretends to desert to the French camp as a traitor and come back as a secret agent with the actual result that he gets „Jack Drum’s entertainment“ (211.) by order of the French King first and on his return by the English King alike. Short of money, Wilton in his third jest disguises as a whore and steals six crowns from a lecherous Swiss captain. His fourth trick is to make a false alarm so that the clerks „[...] resigned their desks, with the money that was in them, and in fine, left me and my fellows (their foolcatchers) lords of the field: [...]“ (218.).

These four plots read as if they had been taken from popular jest books or lower-class coney catching pamphlets. Wilton reassures us that „[...] I was no common squire, no undertrodden torchbearer; [...]“ (219.), returns to England only to have to flee from the „[...] sweating sickness. [...] with the contagious heat [...] died more thick than of the pestilence: [...]“ (220). Such an epidemic occurred in and around London in 1517.

During the sixth episode we find Jack Wilton back on the Continent as a mercenary soldier with François I in the battle of Milan (1515), with the German Emperor at Frankenhausen (1525) and during the crushing of the anabaptist uprising of Münster in 1534. Warfare is described with exaggerated cruelty in a grotesque kind of realism.

 [...] there were more arms and legs scattered in the field that day than will be gathered up till doomsday: the French king himself in this conflict was much distressed, the brains of his own men sprinkled in his face, thrice was his courser slain under him, and thrice was he struck on the breast with a spear: [...] (222.)
This new realism is radically different from the chivalric cult of heroic warfare. Nashe’s description of the anabaptists at Münster as

[...] base handicrafts, as cobblers and curriers and tinkers [...] (224.).
[...] by pitched, I do not mean set in order, for that was far from their order [...] most of them pitched their patched clothes to make them impierceable: [...] they expostulate with God to grant them victory, [...] (225.)
[...] when according to their Anabaptistical error they might all be christened in their own blood. (223.)

This scene ironically and cynically refers to the Puritan sects of the Dissenters who refuse the Oath of Supremacy to the Church and King of England (Act of 1534) and alludes to their doctrines of insubordination, revelationism, and fervent faith instead of good works. The author by his narrative voice of Jack Wilton indirectly criticizes Gabriel Harvey, his enemy in the Marprelate Controversy.

Hear what it is to be Anabaptists, to be Puritans, to be villains; [...] (231.)

After his return to Middleborough, Wilton enters the service of a page for Lord Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Surrey, the famous poet of blank verse and inventor of the English sonnet, infatuated with his spiritual paramour „Geraldine“ (Elizabeth Fitzgerald of Kildare, a descendant of the Giraldi of Florence), takes Jack into the expected romance plot on a Grand Tour which proves to become the nightmare of the seven episodes of Wilton’s unfortunate travels: Rotterdam – Wittenberg – Vienna – Venice – Florence – Rome – Bologna.

At Rotterdam, Wilton pretends to have visited Erasmus and Sir Thomas More (who never met there) in order to praise their criticism of court and country in Laus stultitiae (1509) and Utopia (1516).

Erasmus [...] seemed so much to mislike the indiscretion of princes in preferring of parasites and fools, that he decreed [...] to swim with the stream, and write a book [...] in commendation of folly.
[...] Sir Thomas More traveled in a clean contrary province, for he seeing most commonwealths corrupted by ill custom & that principalities were nothing but great piracies, [...] a manifest conspiracy of rich men against poor men. [...] he concluded [...] to lay down a perfect plot of a commonwealth [...], which he would entitle his Utopia. (235.)

After this fair appraisal of the greatest Catholic critics of European Renaissance poverty, Nashe introduces his readers to the University of Wittenberg, in a secret satire of Cambridge and an open criticism of Germany. The professors are crouchers in hooded
hypocrisy, Protestant plagiarists of Cicero but more lengthy and verbose. The citizens and craftsmen are presented as ridiculous drunkards and crafty gluttons, just „leaden-headed Germans“ (240.) who rather admire the tricks of Cornelius Agrippa (1486 – 1535), a reputed magician, instead of understanding the disputations of Martin Luther, the great reformer, and his supporter, the humanist Carolostadius (1480 – 1541).

On their way to the Emperor’s court at Vienna, Wilton and Surrey agree on a new stratagem which is rather taken from comedies than from romances: they change names, clothes and characters.

It was concluded betwixt us, that I should be the Earl of Surrey, and he my man, only because in his person, which he would not have reproached, he meant to take more liberty of behavior: as for my carriage he knew he was to tune it at a key, [...] . (241. Italics mine.).

That Surrey was a fire eater but fastidious about his reputation, are historical facts. Cornelius Agrippa appears as a character in the novel. In his magic glass he shows Geraldine „[...] sick wheeping on her bed, and resolved all into devout religion for the absence of her lord.“ (242.). Surrey cannot refrain from making a plaintive poem praising Geraldine’s fair beauty, silver breasts, starry eyes, heavenly hair, dewy breath, dainty limbs, rose-crowned cheeks, nectar kisses.

In Vienna, the chief entertainments are still boozing and gluttony, in Venice whoring, theft, murder and treason are added.

[...] our special approved good pander Petro de Campo Frego [...] . The devil himself is not such a devil as he [...] . He must have the back of an ass, the snout of an elephant, the wit of a fox, and the teeth of a wolf; he must fawn like a spaniel, crouch like a Jew, leer like a sheepbiter. If he be half a Puritan, and has Scripture continually in his mouth, he speeds the better. (247.)

[...] he was seen in all the seven liberal deadly sciences [i. e. WRATH, GLUTTONY, AVARICE, LUST, ENVY, PRIDE, SLOTH]30, not a sin but he was as absolute in as Satan himself[...] he planted in us the first Italianate wit that we had. (248. Italics mine.)

Surrey and his image of Geraldine („[...] he was more in love with his own curious forming fancy than her face; [...] „, (250.) stand for the romance plot, whereas Wilton and his jailbird Diamante („[...] she was immaculate honest till she met with us in prison.“,249.) represent the picaresque plot of the novel. After their release, Diamante proves to be with child. In Rome Wilton sees her kissing „very lovingly“ (286.) with a prentice, but in Bologna he marries his courtesan as a symbolic act of his ultimate reform –

all this was impossible only 20 years earlier in a traditional English novel of manners or chivalric romance because the serious early English novels were received as conduct books for the reading public.

Surrey, Wilton, and Diamante owe their liberation from the dungeons of Venice to John Russell, the English ambassador (though not at Venice but connected with the Earl) and to the religious and cultural critic Pietro Aretino (1492–1554), head of the Venetian Parnassus, honoured by Charles V, Francis I, Henry VIII, Nashe’s paragon of literary virtues

[...] he writ with nought but the spirit of ink [...] (251.)
His pen was sharp-pointed like a poinard; no leaf he wrote on but was like a burning glass to set on fire all his readers. [...] His life he contemned in comparison of the liberty of speech. (252.)
Tully, Ovid, Seneca were never such ornaments to Italy as thou hast been. (253. Italics mine.)

The ancients are quoted to give prestige to conventional fictions, the picaresque novel makes fun of them and favours the moderns. Consequently, the picaresque hero takes French leave from feudalism, poetry and appearances, when the Earl of Surrey asks him to part with Diamante,

[...] fully possessed of her husband’s goods, she invested me in the state of a monarch. (254.)
²My earldom I would sooner resign than part with such a special benefactor. [...] Lo, into my former state I return again; poor Jack Wilton and your servant am I, „[...]” (256. Italics mine.)

There is a new middle-class self-reliance in these words and mocking criticism in the page’s description of his master’s love sonnet.

[...] his tongue thrust the stars out of heaven, and eclipsed the sun and moon with comparisons ; [...] The alchemy of his eloquence out of the incomprehensible drossy matter of clouds and air, distilled no more quintessence than would make his Geraldine complete fair. (257.)

Surrey’s proud challenge in the Duke of Florence’s court against all comers, „(whether Christians, Turks, Jews, or Saracens)” (257.) in defence of his Geraldine’s beauty exaggerates a fastidious notion of honour because it retaliates rumours or verbally uttered doubt, i.e. matters of taste and free opinion, by violence, up to the risk of death, in a tournament of tilting and duelling.

The symbolism of the knights’ armour is pompously far-fetched and obsolete, their real appearance exotic, grotesque and ridiculous.
The right honourable and ever-renowned Lord Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, my singular good lord and master, entered the lists after this order. His armour was all intermixed with lilies and roses, [...] his helmet [...] like a gardener’s water pot, [...] The symbol thereto annexed was [...] Ex lachrimis lachrimae. [...] his horse [...] in full proportion and shape of an ostrich. [...] some other Pegasus, (258.) [...] The words to this device was Acculeo alatus, I spread my wings only spurred with her eyes. [...] his shield was framed like a burning glass, [...] on the outside whereof was his mistress’ picture [...] (259.) [...] on the inside a naked sword tied in a true love knot; the mot, Militat omnis amans. (260.)

This description is a show of useless ritual: a watering-can as a helmet, a Pegasus like a stuffed ostrich, a burning glass as a shield standing for the legend that the flowers of love are watered by tears, that the ostrich is the fastest runner, eats iron and hatches its eggs with hot rays from the eyes. The tedious descriptions of eight more absurd knights and five shields that follow, revive remains of the past which any common infanterist could shoot from their horses with his crossbow or primitive musket despite all their armour and

valour but

Only the Earl of Surrey, my master, observed the true measures of honour, and made all his encounterers new scour their armour in the dust: so great was his glory that day as Geraldine was thereby eternally glorified. (264. Italics mine.)

Surrey is then dutifully called back to England, and Wilton to Rome, the Babylon, Sodom, and Gomorrah of the Renaissance. Nashe’s view is that of the Established Church which accepted the Lutherans. The radical Protestants and the Catholics, especially Jesuits and the competitive Spaniards are faced with mistrust and criticism. The Pope, according to The Unfortunate Traveller, is a three-headed (Tiara-crowned) monster.

The only description of Jack’s outer appearance is given because Juliana, „one of the Pope’s concubines“ (287.) falls in love with his youth and beardless face when Zadoch the Jew sells him to Doctor Zachary, the Pope’s physician, to be bleeded to death and consequently taken to pieces in an anatomy:

[...] a young man [...] of the age of eighteen, of stature tall, straight-limbed, of as clear a complexion as any painter’s fancy can imagine: [...] (287.)

After his survival of the plague (1522), after witnessing Esdra’s rape of Heraclide, a second Lucrece, after his imprisonment by Zadoch, after his nightmares to be anatomized by Zachary (not an Anatomy of Wit), after seeing Zadoch’s cruel torture and burning, Wilton and his Diamante meet again in a mock-romance anagnorisis in Juliana’s
household like the „Three Brothers“ in the Grimms‘ folk- and household fairy tales, only to conspire against their countess because she sexually exploits Wilton to the border of consumption,

[...] pack all her jewels, plate, money that was extant, and to the waterside send them: to conclude, courageously rob her, and run away (299.)

to Bologna.

In Rome, the unfortunate traveller had finally become „[...] a historiographer of my own misfortunes [...]“ (266.). Freed from the danger of being hanged, Jack Wilton learns from a banished English earl that the hope of profiting from a Grand Tour is an illusion. The arguments are insular and full of national stereotypes. They sum up the disillusioning message of Nashe’s novel of roguery31 Jack breaks out of the Chain of Being because he is a chained being:

„ [...] The first traveller was Cain [...] Travel (like the travail wherein smiths put wild horses) [...] is good for nothing but to tame and bring men under.

God had no greater curse to lay upon the Israelites, than by leading them out of their own country to live as slaves in a strange land. (280.)

He that is a traveller must have the back of an ass to bear all, a tongue like a tail of a dog to flatter all, the mouth of a hog to eat what is set before him, the ear of a merchant to hear all and say nothing: [...] there is no liberty or freedom. [...] when thou hast a thousand thousand masters [...] then shalt thou find there is no such hell as to leave thy father’s house [...] (281.)

[...] let others tell you strange accidents, treasons, poisonings. [...] in France, Spain and Italy: it is no harm for you to hear them, but come not near them.

. What is there in France to be learned more than in England, but falsehood in fellowship, perfect sloveny, to love no man but for my pleasure, to swear Ah par la mort de Dieu (italics Nashe’s) [...] Nought else have they profited by their travel, save learned to distinguish of the true Bordeaux grape and know a cup of neat Gascoigne wine from wine of Orleans; [...] From Spain what bringeth our traveller? A skull-crowned hat of the fashion of an old deep porringer [...] A soldier & a braggart he is [...]; he jeteth stuttering, dancing on his toes with his hands under his sides. (283.)

[...] they have not a good morsel of meat except it be salt pilchers to eat [...] all the year long: [...] they are poor beggars, [...]  

31 It is of no avail to pretend that The Unfortunate Traveller is not a picaresque novel, see: Robert Rehder, “Realism again: Flaubert’s Barometer and The Unfortunate Traveller”, in: Wolfgang Görtschacher, Holger Klein (eds.), Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction (Lewiston, NY, Salzburg, Austria: Mellen, 1995), 241 – 258, 249. Rehder mixes up the narrator, Jack, with the author, Nashe himself: 253 ff.
Italy, the paradise of the earth and the epicure’s heaven, how doth it form our young master? [...] From thence be brings the art of atheism, the art of epicurizing, the art of whoring, the art of poisoning, the art of sodomy. [...] it maketh a man an excellent courtier, a curious carpet knight: [...] It is now a privy note among the better sort of men, when they would set a singular mark or brand on a notorious villain, to say, he hath been in Italy. (284.)

The devil and I am desperate, I of being restored to heaven, I of being recalled home."

Here he held his peace and wept. (285. Italics mine.)

These statements, terribly generalizing as they are, represent the auctorial voice in Nashe’s novel. They are based on Jack’s own experience, confirmed by the other unfortunate traveller, they conform to the standardized images of France, Spain, and Italy in other early English fictions. The clichés of the German upper class theoretician and lower class drunkard, of the French gallant, of the Spanish braggart, and of the Italian bandit seem to have fired the everlasting English prejudice against foreigners from the time of Shakespeare to the European Union.

To make The Unfortunate Traveller a popular novel, Nashe filled it with episodes of love (Geraldine, Diamante), wonder (the tournament of Florence and the mechanical paradise in Rome), crime (theft, treason, murder), sex (courtisans, concubines, whores, nymphomania and rape), cruelty (executions by burning, stabbing, shooting and on the wheel), even sentimentality (homesickness, nationalism, weeping). Robinson Crusoe, Jack Wilton’s successor, feels banished to the deserted island because by running away from home, he had sinned against the Fifth Commandment

Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee. (Ex. 20, 12.)

Wilton’s misfortunes come to an end after Cutwolfe, the real scourge of God, had revenged Heraclite’s death and the murder of his brother by shooting Esdres of Granado into the throat so that he cannot revoke his commitment to the devil. The spiral of revenge, another Italian speciality, according to Nashe, is only cut by Cutwolfe’s final torture and destruction on the wheel.


33 The Authorised King James Version.
Mortifiedly abjected and daunted was I with this truculent tragedy of Cutwolfe and Esdras. [...] that ere I went out of Bologna I married my courtezan, performed many alms-deeds, and hasted so fast out of the Sodom of Italy that within forty days I arrived at the King of England’s camp twixt Ardes and Guines in France.(307.)

The 15 episodes of The Unfortunate Traveller are less chaotically written than it seems. They are differenter pearls on a string, a literary necklace, the ends of which are locked after the historical time of 7 years in almost the same place. The background and personalities are rendered faithfully, even if they come to life as fictional characters. Irony and the clash of tale and truth produce grotesque effects. The social and cultural criticism involved, consciously follows a strategy to provoke, to reveal, to prove ethical principles in a Mondo Cane.

The self-conscious narrator is not a postmodernist invention, for Nashe invests Jack Wilton with discipline and self-analytical intelligence.

Gentle readers [...], as freely as my knavery was mine own, it shall be yours to use it in the way of honesty. (210.) My heroical master exceeded in [...] freedom, magnanimity, and bountithood. Let me not speak any more of his accomplishments, [...] and leave myself no vigor of wit or effects of a soul to go forward with my history. (232.)

It were too tedious to manifest all the discontented or amorous devises [sic] that were used in this tournament: [...] I will rehearse no more, but I have an hundred other: [...] (263.)

I bought it out; let others buy experience of me better cheap. (267.) Yet this I must say to the shame of us Protestants; if good works may merit heaven, they do them, we talk of them. (270.) Let not your sorrow die, you that have read the [...] narration of this elegiaical history. Shew you have quick wits in sharp conceit of compassion. (267.)

[...] the foresaid goodwife Countess comes to me; she is no longer a judge but a client. How she came, in what manner of attire, with what immodest and uncomely words she courted me, if I should take upon me to enlarge, all modest ears would abhor me. (295 – 296.Italics mine.)

Jack Wilton, of course, is invested by Nashe with the strategies of Ciceronian rhetoric and with the highest level of convincing oratory on the contemporary stage. In his various addresses to the reader, placed at strategic points, Nashe demonstrates that he has a preference for ‘showing’ – as opposed to merely reporting. The novel in the time of

---


Shakespeare greatly profited from strategies of speech and from the dramatic art of characterization in the playhouses.

Wilton is not always a reliable narrator. He observes and minutely reports the tragedy of the rape of Heraclide who preferred death to living on even with the *innocent* loss of her *honour*. Nevertheless the narrator introduces Cutwolfe’s punishment of Esdras with the words: „Prepare your ears and your tears, for never till this thrust I any tragical matter upon you.“ (300.) only to shift the story of Cutwolfe’s revenge on the rapist and „emperor of homicides“ (301.) to the executioner’s own point of view, given as his „insulting oration“ (301 – 306.). On the whole, however, Nashe’s novel and the narrative roles of Jack Wilton are better planned and more advanced than they seem to be.

And so as my story began with the king at Turney and Turwin36, I think meet here to end it with the King at Ardes and Guines.37

Only its popularity left much to be desired. *The Unfortunate Traveller* went through merely two editions until 1600.

THE MOST PLEASANT AND DELECTABLE HISTORY
OF JOHN WINCHCOMBE, OTHERWISE CALLED JACK OF NEWBURY:
AND FIRST OF HIS LOVE AND PLEASANT LIFE (1596 – 97)38

The self-made man who, by his own DILIGENCE, his „Persistent effort or work; his industrious character, i.e. his serious application to business.“39, rises from rags to riches, is the paragon of virtue40 in the new middle-class novel *Jack of Newbury* (1597) by Thomas Deloney. The American Dream of success was made in England by the English novel in the time of Shakespeare and then exported to the New World by the Puritan colonists of Massachusetts (1620).

36 Henry VIII landed at Calais on June, 30, 1513, and captured Thérouanne and Tournai on Aug., 4 and September 23 of the same year. (Ashley, Moseley, *Elizabethan Fiction*, “Notes “., 419.)

37 Henry VIII’s camp at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520 was at Guisnes, Francis I’s at Ard, and the meeting place of the two rulers in the valley between the towns. (Ashley, Moseley, *Elizabethan Fiction*, “Notes”, 436.)

38 In: Ashley, Moseley (eds.), *Elizabethan Fiction*, 315 – 402. Notes 437 – 443. Quotations are taken from this text.

39 *The Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “diligence”.

[...] imitations of the Arcadia were the norm for fashionable romance, while the lower ranks of the reading public had a continuing supply of [...] frequent editions of Thomas Deloney’s works.  

*Jack of Newbury* is categorized in the history of the novel as a „popular chivalric romance“[42]. I should rather define it as a popular novel romancing middle-class values.[43] The hero, John Winchcombe, a young master of broadcloth weaving from Newbury (Berks.)

[...] was wondrous well-beloved of rich and poor [...] that he was every gentleman’s companion. (315.)

[...] so careful and diligent, that all things [...] prospered [...] for his business [...]. (316.)

Thus was Jack’s good government [...] that by his good example [...] his diligent labour [...] his singular virtue being noted by the widow. (317. Italics mine)

The young master in a textile mill is popular and behaves with such dignity that he is every gentleman’s equal. At the same time he is a good businessman so that, after the death of his boss, the well preserved widow casts an eye on him. A tanner, a rich taylor, even a parson cannot compare with Jack’s virtues. His diligent work gives the best example, and he is a good manager. „Good government“, a public virtue in the chivalric romance, is reduced by Deloney to the more private virtues of correct behaviour and to the good management of a factory or business.

[...] well he perceived [...] his dame’s affection [...] that her estate was reasonable good, [...] that he should find a house ready furnished, servants ready taught, and all other things for his trade necessary, he thought it best not to slip that good occasion, [...] (322. Italics mine)

Not Platonic love but practical affection and a reasonable match count. This makes John Winchcombe master of an established business. Chivalric idealism and picaresque cynicism are replaced by optimistic materialism. New bourgeois values are „reasonable“ instead of „wise“, „ready furnished“ instead of „artfully conceived“, „ready taught“ instead of „highly educated“, „trade“ and „proficiency“ instead of „rank“ and „status“, „good occasion“, a sales mentality, counts instead of „great principles“.

---


[42] Salzmann, 98.

After some jealousy and jests, the widow lays John into his master’s best bed, arranges their private marriage, and John Winchcombe becomes Jack of Newbury. At the wedding breakfast, seated at the table’s end, Jack explains:

“[…] by God’s providence, and your dame’s favour, I am preferred from being your fellow to be your master, I am not thereby so much puffed up in pride, that […] I will forget my former estate: Notwithstanding […] it shall be wisdom in you to forget what I was, […] and in doing your diligence, you shall have no cause to repent that God made me your master.” (333. Italics mine.)

The new boss justifies his social rise from fellow to master by PROVIDENCE. Preferment or damnation by God’s providence are the poles in the Puritan dogma of PREDESTINATION. „Diligence „ and „industry“, motivated by predestination turned worldly, i.e. working hard for a better status by means of a good career and a high income, are the motors of Capitalism. The good Capitalist should not be proud nor should he become immodest, but his servants should prudently forget their former equality and do their DUTY.

The widow proves to be a shrew but after both have tried one another’s PATIENCE, the first chapter of the novel ends like a fairy tale: „[…] in the end she died, leaving her husband wondrous wealthy“. (337.) In the bourgeois world, PRUDENCE replaces wisdom, DILIGENCE becomes more important than duty, Constancy changes into PATIENCE. WORK and WEALTH are hardly mentioned in Euphues, Arcadia and The Unfortunate Traveller because the nobility and the picaro despise work and the aristocrats are rich, anyway. The unfortunate traveller, of course, is a „fortune hunter“ in all the word’s meanings, and he gets away with it.

In the second chapter, Jack of Newbury, one of the most desirable widowers in England, decides to marry one of his own servants,

[…] whom he had tried in the guiding of his house a year or two; and knowing her carefulness in her business, faithful in her dealing, an excellent good housewife, thought it better to have her with nothing, than some other with much treasure. And beside as her qualities were good, so was she of a comely personage, of a sweet favour and fair complexion. […] The maid (though she took this motion kindly) said, she would do nothing without the consent of her parents. (338. Italics mine.)

The new wife, corresponding to his business and age alike, has to be a virgin, with the qualities of leadership, loving care and solidarity, an excellent housewife. We do not even know her name but she is one of the pretty sweet-tempered Southern Midlands blondes
who is preferable because of her good character to equally beautiful upper class girls with a rich dowry. Her lower class father speaks the broadest Buckinghamshire dialect with malapropisms. She is neither a match nor is the marriage romantic – despite her expectation of a good fortune – she follows the Fifth Commandment and, contrary to Richardson’s Clarissa, subordinates her happiness to the will of her parents.

The visit of her father leads the reader on a guided tour of Newbury’s manufacture with 200 looms, 1000 child, female and male workers singing and provided with food and drink from his own restaurant, butchery, dairy, and brewery. Deloney puts this into ballads together with a song of the Scottish invasion which Jack of Newbury helps to beat back by equipping 250 soldiers and himself for Queen Katharine’s army, thus outdoing the contribution and patriotism of the nobility, while the King was in France at Turney and Turwin (1513), the setting we know from the beginning of *The Unfortunate Traveller*.

Their patriotism is going to be rewarded when, in the third chapter, King Henry VIII visits Newbury who presents his commonwealth in the allegory of a golden beehive and a fruitful tree.

![Verse](Verse_image)

The commonwealth, a model for Henry’s kingdom, is a fruitful tree, if not Cardinal Wolsey and the oligarchy, the drones in the beehive, sought its downfall by greed, envy, and treason. This is prevented by middle-class PRUDENCE, the virtue of business and aristocratic FORTITUDE, the virtue of military strength. Lord Chancellor Wolsey had displayed on a colossal scale the pride and power of the Pope. His wealth was reported equal to that of the Crown. Wolsey’s fall led to the sale of the English monasteries and prepared the foundation of the Church of England (1530).

For Jack of Newbury’s merits,

---

His Majesty would have made him knight, but he meekly refused it, saying, „I beseech your Grace let me live a poor clothier, among my people, in whose maintenance I take more felicity than in all the vain titles of gentility: for these are the labouring ants whom I seek to defend, and these the bees which I keep: who labour in this life, not for ourselves, but for the Glory of God and to do service to our dread souveraign.“ (361. Italics mine.)

The refusal of a knighthood is extraordinary, and so is Jack’s understatement of being a poor clothier. Defoe’s Moll Flanders, 125 years later, would do anything to become a gentlewoman because the middle class economically and culturally started to absorb the gentry.\textsuperscript{45} Jack’s provoking self-assertiveness sets the solidarity with his working people against vanity. His unbelievably harsh criticism is compensated by the anti-aristocratic royalism of the lower and middle classes for God, King and Country. The following chapters of The History of John Winchcombe confirm its middle-class ideology: the greats of Greek and Roman antiquity have been advanced from trade and commerce:

„[...] by wisdom, learning, and diligence. I would wish you to imitate the like virtues, that you might attain the like honours: [...] the idle hand shall ever go in a ragged garment, and the slothful live in reproach: but such as do lead a virtuous life and govern themselves discreetly shall of the best be esteemed, and spend their days in credit.“ (367, Italics mine.)

Deloney’s new MERITOCRACY is financially superior to the old aristocracy by WORK, intellectually superior by LEARNING, and morally superior by VIRTUE. With CREDIT a new value is introduced, MONEY: it is a new form of esteem beyond the notion of „honour“ by high birth or good action, it includes self earned trust like a credit card. With credit, Jack of Newbury forces Sir George, the historical Edward Rigley, to marry „Mistress Loveless“ (399.), one of his maids whom the aristocrat had seduced. The intertextuality with Lovelace in Richardson’s tragic novel Clarissa; or the History of a Young Lady (1748) is obvious.

My explication de texte focusing on the transition from aristocratic to middle class values has proved how wrong it is to define the History of John Winchcombe as a „popular chivalric romance“\textsuperscript{46}


\textsuperscript{46} Salzmann, English Prose Fiction, ch. 8, 109.
This is more true of Sidney’s *Arcadia* which is not half as remote and unworldly as literary historians still believe. Imitations of the *Arcadia* were the norm in 17th-century fiction because of its advanced character analysis and political key function. *Euphues and His England* is more functional in style than *The Anatomy of Wit*. It has the contemporary background in common with the *Arcadia*, as a novel of manners its kinship is closer with *John Winchcombe*.

Deloney's concept of the novel is situated between the *Arcadia* and Nashe’s *Unfortunate Traveller* with whom it has in common that the historical background has been shifted 80 years back to the reign of Henry VIII in order to avoid the criticism of living persons for reasons of censorship. Nashe ironically dedicated *The Unfortunate Traveller* to the Earl of Surrey despite the fact that Surrey had been executed in 1547. The extensive use of colloquial dialogue and dramatic description are responsible for the historical realism found in Nashe’s and Deloney’s works.

Implicitly, it has been proved that the separation of „romances“ from „novels“ is wrong. Clara Reeve in *The Progress of Romance* (1785) is unreliable because she defends her concept of the Gothic Romance. William Congreve’s *Incognita* (1692), the first English fiction officially bearing the title of a novel, really is a novella in the style of Gascoigne’s *Adventures of Master F.J.* (1573) in the Boccaccio tradition.

The novels of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding are not new inventions but hybrids composed of Lyly’s novel of manners, Sidney’s psychological romance and love letters, Nashe’s picaresque realism, episodic structure and self-conscious narrator, Deloney’s middle-class values and dream of social success. And something equally characteristic of the 18th and 19th century novel happened in the time of Shakespeare:

*Enfin, déjà à ce moment, commençait à se former une littérature destinée principalement aux femmes [...]*

---

