Title	Jest-book formation through the early modern printing industry: the two different editions of Scoggin's Jests
Sub Title	二つのScoggin's Jests：異なる版が語ること
Author	小町谷, 尚子(Komachiya, Naoko)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要刊行委員会
Publication year	2014
Jtitle	慶應義塾大学日吉紀要. 英語英米文学 (The Hiyoshi review of English studies). No.65 (2014. 10) ,p.45- 85
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN10030060-20141031-0045

Jest-book Formation through the Early Modern Printing Industry: The Two Different Editions of *Scoggin's Jests*

Naoko Komachiya

The confusion and conflation of differently originated jester figures date back to Shakespeare's time. *Scoggin's Jests* is often seen as the primary source of jesting material along with *Tarlton's Jests*. The apparent identity of these jests with named figures somewhat obscured the true identity of jesters.[1] Modern editors identify the socially ambiguous jester Scoggin in Shallow's episodic recollection of Falstaff, who breaks 'Scoggin's head at the court gate' in *Henry IV, Part 2* (III. 2. 28–29), as the jester to Edward IV. René Weis, in explaining that Scoggin's name was 'synonymous with "buffoon" in Shakespeare's day through a mid sixteenth-century jestbook, *Scoggin, his iestes*', comments that the reference demonstrates that 'even the young Falstaff was always brawling with various buffoons'.[2] Weis and other editors simply deduce that Shakespeare's misunderstanding resulted from the circulated name of Scoggin, and they do not show any evidence how the conflation occurred. Nonetheless, Shakespeare's reference to Scoggin admits his familiarity in the late sixteenth century, for the jest-book printing went along with the development of theatrical clowns over a 50 year time span from 1590 to 1640. The jest-book was a social product of the printing industry and was influential when it had a renowned figure in its title. The

print history of the jest-book is rather complex, but the case of *Scoggin's Jests*, is a good example of clarifying the process of generating the jest-book during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it will help illustrate the way it was familiarised with the publisher and the reader, and accordingly, the literary writer.

The use of Scoggin's name indicating his status as a high-profile jester involved his appearance beyond literary genres, such as in an influential guidebook to herbal medicines and their application, jest-books, pamphlet books and play-texts. Credited with the same distant roots in the fifteenth century jester in the court of Edward IV, Scoggin appeared differently in the two separate editions of the so-called *Scoggin's Jests*. As has been well-documented, the publication and reception history of the content of the two editions is complex due to the discrepancy of chronology. The 1626 edition, which was published fifty years after its entry to the Stationers' Register is, in fact, the first version of the text, and shows Scoggin's various tendencies and his engagement in wide-ranging comic action narratives. Despite the fact that there were no perfect editions published in the sixteenth century, the fundamental contents of the sixteenth century edition are preserved in the contents of the 1626 edition. The later contents though published earlier in 1613, are derived from the 1626 edition, and narrow Scoggin's interests and pleasures down to ridiculing clerical or self-important figures during his knavish adventures in Rome. The differences in the representation of the two Scoggins show how the figure developed, and reveal the wilful intentions of literary agents in the printing industry as well as in pamphlet writing, and, accordingly, in the later stage performances. Of the two editions, the 1626 provides folkloric elements more noticeably, and its naïvete of clowning was reflected in early modern drama. Therefore, referring back to the original Scoggin in the 1626 edition demonstrates how

and why emerging laughing materials were conserved in the history of clowning. Subsequent examinations of the 1613 edition then clarify the correlation between shifting jesting styles and the development of theatrical clowning during the seventeenth century. Both texts of *Scoggin's Jests* are particularly useful in testifying to the rest of the jest-books a pathway between the writers who used the jester's name and traits and their readers and audience. As a typical example of the 'biographical jest-book' in early modern England, *Scoggin's Jests* brings us a vivid picture of the relationship between the cultural construction and the cultural reproduction of jesting and jesters. In order to demonstrate the emerging jester figure in the presentational text of jesters of early modern England, this paper will see what the name of Scoggin conveyed, how the jest-book compilers utilised the name of a famous clown figure, how and for what purpose the biographical jest-book was created, and what elements of the jest-book merged into the idea of clowning.

In the nineteenth century, William Carew Hazlitt, the editor of *Shakespeare Jest-books* (1864) included *Scoggin's Jests* in the list of the source jest-books for Shakespeare. He highlighted the importance of *Scoggin's Jests*, with reference to its publication history and the later allusions to the work. At the same time, he questioned the establishment of Scoggin's status as its jesting hero:

It would be a curious point to ascertain whether the anecdotes common to these collections and to "Scoggin's Jests," do not refer to the same person; and whether Scoggin is not in fact the hero of many of the pranks attributed to the "Scholars of Oxford," the "Youngman," the "Gentleman," &c. in the following pages [of *A Hundred Merry Tales* and *Merry Tales and Quick Answers*] which were in existence many

years before the first publication of *Scoggins Jests*.[3]

His suggestive remarks have not been contested until today, but unfortunately have also not been 'ascertained'. Hazlitt, by tracing back the printing history to its ascribed author, Andrew Boorde, also presumed that the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* was the later edition of the one which had been licensed to Thomas Colwell, a successor to Robert Wyer, one of Boorde's printers. As for the authorship of these old jest-books, he noted that they were 'the composition of hack-writers'.[4] It is for the most part true that hack-writers, exploiting famous jesters' name for the market, anonymously created their own writings.[5] However, the problem of the jest-book formation requires more extensive elucidation. If we turn to the dissemination of the jest-book through compiling, editing, printing, transmission and reprinting, we have access to the root of Shakespeare's idea of clowning, which resides in it.[6]

Taking up the two editions of *Scoggin's Jests*, I propose to discuss some aspects of Scoggin as an icon for the process of generating the jest-book. I also propose to discuss what I view as a major role of the printer-publishers of jest-books in the transmission of licences to print, namely, the question of how it is related to the early modern formation of the jest-book. An individual name on the jest-book title, such as *Tarlton's Jests* and *Peele's Jests*, established itself in jest-book printing and became part of the advertising and commercial techniques.

Regarding the first issue, it is argued that the making of *Scoggin's Jests* is tangible. Although it was popular with writers and readers of Elizabethan England, Scoggin's character has been largely ignored in the study of jest-book tradition. Through a review of relevant contemporary literature, such as Holinshed's *Chronicles*, this paper will first determine what Scoggin is

and what 'Scoggin' means. Several vague explanations celebrated the character of Scoggin in combining accounts of 'a poet', 'a scholar', and 'a jester', but they contradict each other. Such multi-identification is also found in *Peele's Jest*s: the title reads '*Merrie conceited iests of George Peele Gentleman, sometimes a student in Oxford. VVherein is shewed the course of his life how he liued: a man very well knowne in the Citie of London and elsewhere*'.[7] Therefore, this paper will give an explicit definition to 'Scoggin' in order to clarify the nature of the character as a purposely created icon for profit.

A second contentious issue is the matter of trademark-trade symbol. An effective personality fostered in Scoggin's name was an advantage for tradespeople of the early modern print industry, whether the character was real or fictitious. Though the jest-book formation lies in an as yet underdeveloped concept of copyright in the modern sense,[8] early modern printer-publishers, especially the jest-book printer-publishers needed to be able to act as compatible agents in the field of editor-compilers, in order to confer autonomy and conformity on their products. In the process, the editor-compilers consolidate the existing repertoire and prefigure as a new one, presenting the whole as unified and coherent from the outset. Such strategies are found in different titles but substantially the same texts, i.e. 'renamed' works such as *The Cobbler of Canterbury* in 1590 (reprinted with another title, *The Merry Tales of the Cobbler of Canterbury* in 1614 and *The Tinker of Turvey* in 1630), or in the present example of *Scoggin's Jests*.[9] The printer-compilers' choice of framework and style is one of the secondary elements that Gérard Genette calls the paratext of a printed book.[10] The title and the expository subtitle precede the text, and are presented in isolation on the title page. Set differently in each design and description, the title pages of the two Scoggin books affect the information the reader receives. The

printer-publishers implemented the subtitles as a measure to give freshness to the book published more than 50 years after its first entry to the Stationers' Register. While the 1613 edition by an anonymous author reads '*Scoggins iests. Wherein is declared his pleasant pastimes in France, and of his merriments among the fryers: full of delight and honest mirth*', the 1626 edition reads '*The first and best part of Scoggins iests: full of witty mirth and pleasant shift done by him in France, and other places: being a preseruatiue against melancholy, Gathered by Andrew Boord, Doctor of Physicke*'.[11]

The scope for the printing circumstances seems to be limited to a conceptual framework for examining the cultural values of the printed materials. Revolving around the question of cultural values, this discourse fails to exceed the limits of the same reductive conception of high literature in the sense of a better understanding of select artefacts as refined trade materials. The prevailing notion, that low literature such as ballads and broadsides of topical, ephemeral, and local interest, jest-books, and chapbooks was less important in the literary genre notwithstanding, the discourse helps to confer power to the printer-publishers and consolidate and enlarge it.[12] This discourse also fails to deal with the publishing process as a mechanism, indispensable for the organisation and evolution of active literary circles. The printer-publisher's commitment to the components of a printed book was made on an individual judgment, but when it was demonstrated, the printer-publisher took the advantage of holding 'the right to copy', i.e. the licence, and/or the copy-text.[13] Possessing and controlling the copy, the printer-publisher played a pivotal role in establishing foundations for a flourishing printing industry. As the product of this process, *Scoggin's Jests* can be seen as the logical outcome of marketing activities by those involved in the business of writing and publishing.

The 1613 edition and the 1626 edition are each independent and unique,

between whose licences the stationers seemed to make no attempt to distinguish: despite the differences in its contents from the 1626 edition, the 1613 edition had no record of its first entry. Furthermore, its licence was not discriminated from that of the 1626 edition; and it was printed with the same description 'Scoggin's Jests' in the Stationers' Register. The difference which lies behind their ostensible resemblance in shaping the hero's adventure hides the collaborative authorship-editorship among those who could hold the manuscript or copy-text. In addition, viewing one as the continuation of the other underestimates the specific weight of two separate jest-books as accumulative reservoirs which contain tales of the same kind. The formation of the jest-books is a compound product of both a long-term process and the short-term process of shifting trends. In the entire creation of *Scoggin's Jests*, the printer-publishers combined the editing practices with marketing strategies. Rather than locating their intervention to the normative process of publishing — the transference of the manuscript-copy directly from the writer to the printer —, it is more significant to configure how the printer-publisher of each jest-book contributed to the formation of the early modern jest-book.

1 The Enigmatic Identity of Scoggin

Scoggin's name supplied in the attributions of both the jest-books was used to great effect to certify the reading enjoyment, and the device was very effective in giving credence to jests. Douglas Gray defines John Scoggin [Scogan, Scogin, Skogyn] as 'an entirely fictitious character' and 'the "author" of a jest book', known as *The iestes of Skogyn*.[14] In his explanation of another Scogan, he clearly distinguishes Henry Scogan [Scoggin] who is Chaucer's friend and a poet from the jester-author Scoggin. Gray concludes that the previous edition of *DNB* mixed up the two Scoggins because the

legends of both Scoggins were associated with Oxford.[15] Indeed, the previous *DNB* description depends on Holinshed's statement 'Skogan, a learnd gentleman, and student of for a time at Oxfordes, of a pleasaunte witte, and bente to mery devises'. Holinshed's remark on Scoggin's manner of speech, 'not in such uncivil manner as hath been of him reported' has already shown the disparity between the two portraits of Scoggin.[16] The ambiguity of Holinshed's passage is made in the context of both his dependency on a jest-book and his praise of Scoggin's contribution to the establishment of English language:

> [...] by diligent trauell of *Geoffray Chaucer*, and *Iohn Gowre*, in the time of Richard the second, and after them of *Iohn Scogan*, and *Iohn Lydgate* monke of Berrie, our said toong was brought to an excellent passé, notwithstanding that it neuer came vnto the type of perfection, vntill the time of Quéene Elizabeth [...].[17]

Holinshed does not separate the famous buffoon Scoggin from famous writers, though he writes about Scoggin's position as the foolish entertainer at Edward IV's court in his subsequent volume of the *Chronicles*. The confusion caused by Holinshed's ambiguous description lasts until the proposed definition by Gray. But according to the confused history, Scoggin's name always relates to the literary tradition and the comic court entertainment.

In the jest-book, Scoggin engages in a wide range of activities: as a scholar-jester, Scoggin lives in both the country and the city of Oxford, becomes a resident of London, and visits both the English and French courts. At all of these places, he plays tricks, mocks and deceives others, shows wit, and then ends up being buried at Westminster Abbey (the burial

site for English monarchs) after his death.[18] Is Scoggin more of a poet than a jester? Or is the praise of his presence drawn solely for amusement?

The source for the explanation that Henry Scogan is a poet is actually found not only in his friend Chaucer's writing, but also in his own writings. Earlier in the twentieth century, opposing Skeat's and others' view that Scogan was a respectable man, William Edward Farnham finds Chaucer's *Envoy* has 'affectionate banter', and goes on to suggest that 'the poem rings truest as amicable raillery sent from one poet who knew fun when he saw it to another who did not always hold fast to wisdom of speech and who had that rarest gift of being able to find himself funny'.[19] As in Farnham's suggestion, Chaucer admonishes Scogan, though he never forgets his respect for Scogan's talent of using his tongue, entertainingly creating a parallel between the outcome of his unfaithful affair and the revenge by Cupid for Venus's suffering from disappointment in love.[20] As a result of the image of Scoggin stretching to cover celebrated Oxford scholars and even the jester of Edward IV, the fifteenth century personage of a renowned poet was remodelled in the shape of a jester, and assumed the personage of jester Scoggin rather than poet Scoggin.

Furthermore, the allusions and references establish the cultural and political relevance of applying Scoggin's name to late sixteenth century literature. Scoggin's name was frequently evoked throughout the era and absorbed into English vocabulary: the name has variables, such as 'scogginism', 'scogginist', and 'scogginly'. The earliest Scoggin-related words — 'Scogginism' and 'Scogginist' — were used in 1593 by Gabriel Harvey in *Pierce's Supererogation*, presenting his coined words twice: 'The Ciceronian may sleepe, til the Scogginist hath plaid his part: One sure Conny-catcher, woorth twenty Philosophers', and 'They that haue leysure, […] may peruse his guegawes with indifferency: and finde no Art, but

Euphuisme; no witt, but Tarletonisme; no honesty, but pure Scogginisme; no Religion, but precise Marlowisme'.[21] Harvey parallels Ciceronian and Scogginist, and presents Scoggin's name as a 'conny-catcher', a person of differently intellectual and sophisticated quality, but interestingly in the latter example, Harvey lists 'Tarltonisme' and 'Scogginisme', and associates Tarlton with 'wit' and Scoggin with 'honesty'. And with the references to such prominent authors as John Lyly and Christopher Marlowe, these parallel allusions to a clown figure explain that the writers relied on their influential figures as vehicles for explaining their ideas. In either case, Scoggin is praised for his quick and sharp wit. On the other hand, prior to his use of these coined words, Harvey had already quoted Scoggin's name in his much earlier work coauthored with Edmund Spenser, *Three Proper, and Witty, Familiar Letters* in 1580, 14 years after Colwell's entry of *Scoggin's Jests* in the Stationers' Register in 1566. In the account of prosody, the authors cite an example of 'air' / 'heir' from Scoggin's jests to explain the corruption and absurdities caused by confusions in pronunciation: 'we say not *Heire*, but plaine *Aire* for him to (or else *Scoggins Aier* were a poore iest) whiche are commonly, and maye indifferently be vsed eyther wayes'.[22] Though the two authors evaluate Scoggin's jests as rather low, their reference to the vulgar joke in the jest-book accordingly demonstrates familiarity with their contemporaries.

Another example of Scoggin's fame is found in a popular illustrated guide-book to plants. John Gerard in his herbal book of 1597 refers to Scoggin in his description of a plant which gives out an offensive smell:

[STinking Orach] is a most loathsome sauour or smel; vpon which plant if any should chance to rest and sleepe, he might very well report to his friends, that he had reposed himselfe among the chiefe of Scoggins

heire.[23)]

Whether or not Gerard is punning mischievously on 'heir' and 'air', implying the jester's own bodily odours, he is certainly reiterating that Scoggin's name is ubiquitous, in this case well-known enough to become a useful and easily understandable tool for explaining an unfamiliar plant. Thus, whether or not an actual presence, Scoggin was regenerated by association and reiteration as a court fool famous for his scurrilous jesting.

2 The Print History of *Scoggin's Jests*

The conglomerate personality of Scoggin with the general associations of his wit and mobility in different vocations was an asset to the writing of the jest-book with his name on it. Scoggin's name on both the two extant texts of *Scoggin's Jests* — the 1613 edition and the 1626 edition — functions as an effective trade character. This characterisation of the collection by an individual name is complicated by a confusing print history: two editions in 1613 and 1626. The importance of the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* is that the text becomes a model of regular practice for people in the printing business to refurbish an anachronistic jest-book.

The 1613 edition assumes the role of sequel, all copies of which are unfortunately lost, to that which was reprinted in 1626. Thus, though the 1626 edition is of a later date, its content predates the 1613 edition as their print histories endorse. While both the jest-books promise that the hero is Scoggin, the texts are, however, different in the way they came into the world and what reception they sought among readers. The original text of *Scoggin's Jests* has a longer path that led to the publication of the 1626 edition than its spin-off edition in 1613. The records of the Stationers' Register provide identify the editions *Scoggin's Jests* as published trade

items. The 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* forged a link between the book and the image of the famous scholar-jester in the minds of readers. Moreover, the title became the focus of efforts by publishers to differentiate their books from competition. The attribution 'the first and best' on the 1626 title page was used to help highlight the differences from the 1613 edition. Readers who remembered the reputation of Scoggin could ask for the specific jest-book branded with his name.

2.1 The 1626 Edition

The first record of *Scoggin's Jests* tells us that Thomas Colwell (td 1561–1575)[24] made an entry of the book to the Stationers' Register in 1565/66:

> Recevyd of Thomas colwell for his lycense for pryntinge of *the geystes of* SKOGGON *gathered to gether in this volume*.[25]

Colwell's business included a variety of different publications. Almost a hundred out of his 132 works registered in the Stationers' Register are ballads.[26] In addition to the ephemeral literature, however, Colwell printed other types of publications. The traits of his publications in the records of the Stationers' Register entered in 1565–66 demonstrate his variety of interests. For example, a play, a tale, a fable or a ballad entitled with 'merry' or 'pleasant' appears in the transcriptions of his different entries: 'a play intituled *a merye playe bothe pytthy and pleasanut of ALBYON knyghte*', '*a mery ieste made of the alphabett &c*', 'a ballett intituled *the Cater bralles bothe Wytty and mery*', '*the pleasaunte fable of* OVIDE *intituled HERMAPHRODITUS and SALMACES*' and so on.[27] In addition, he also entered tragedies such as '*the eighte Tragide of SENYCA*' and '*the tragedy*

of SENECA[,] *MEDIA* by JOHN STUDLEY of Trenety Colledge in Cambryge'.[28)] Around 1565–66, he published two collections of jests: *The Merry Tales of Skelton* and *The Mad Men of Gotham*.[29)]

Besides their values as the guarantee for licence holders, the transcripts of these copies help us to review the tracing of Colwell's entry of *Scoggin's Jests* (Table 1). In 1578, Hugh Jackson (td 1576–1616) married Colwell's widow.[30)] When Jackson died, his copies were transferred to Master Roger Jackson (td 1601–1625) on 22 July 1616, one of the ten listed items being described as '*Scoggins Jestes*'.[31)] Then Francis Williams (td 1626–1630) obtained Roger Jackson's licences on 16 January, 1626, with which Williams published *Scoggin's Jests*.[32)] Though the record of Hugh Jackson's succession from Colwell is missing, probably due to the lack of the Company's documents, the other items registered by Roger Jackson as inherited from Hugh Jackson qualify the latter's heritage from Colwell. In the 1616 entries by Hugh Jackson, *Scoggin's Jests* was listed as item 5 in the Stationers' Register, and then in 1626, as item 6, *Scoggin's Jests* was coupled with *The Merry Tales of Skelton*. Both the texts of *Scoggin's Jests* and *The Merry Tales of Skelton,* which were listed separately in the 1616 transcript, hereafter appeared together as a paired item in the entries of the Stationers' Register. Moreover, not only the copies of these collections of tales, but also those of other books, which had appeared in the former entries in 1616 by Roger Jackson, were transferred in 1626 from Jackson to Francis Williams.[33)] When Williams's licences to these copies were finally yielded to John Harrison IV on 29th June, 1630, the entries still included seven out of ten items from the 1616 list of Hugh Jackson.[34)] Though the titles are differently itemised (either paired or separated), they substantiate the point that the one authorised edition of *Scoggin's Jests*, later published in 1626, has the clear tracings of the licence transmission from Colwell. After

Table 1: The Transmission of the Two Editions of *Scoggin's Jests*

The 1626 *Scoggin's Jests* (STC 21850.7)			The 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* (STC 21851)	
Year	Stationers' Register & Publication	Other jest-book publications transmitted with the edition	Year	Stationers' Register & Publication
1565–66	Enter to Thomas Colwell (Arber, I, 299)			
1578	Hugh Jackson married to Colwell's widow (Arber, II, 676)			
			Post 1600	Entered by Thomas Pavier (Arber, III, 563)
				Turned over to Ralph Blower (Arber, III, 563)
			1613	The 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* published by Ralph Blower
			1615	Edward Wright entered for *Scoggin's Jests* (Arber, III, 563)
1616	Roger Jackson entered the copies of Hugh Jackson (Arber, III, 593)	*The Merry Tales of Skelton*, *The Mad Men of Gotham*		
1626	Francis Williams obtained Roger Jackson's copies	*The Merry Tales of Skelton*, *The Mad Men of Gotham*		
	The 1626 *Scoggin's Jests* published by Miles Fresher for Francis Williams			
1630	John Harrison IV obtained Francis Williams's copies (Arber, IV, 237)	*The Merry Tales of Skelton*, *The Mad Men of Gotham*		

transmitting the licences from Colwell to Harrison, many of the items in the list at the time of Hugh Jackson's death reached John Harrison IV, this transfer of rights consequently justifies one transmission process as most probable and faithful: the licence of the original text of the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* descended from Colwell.

The complexity of the transmission of the 1626 edition is presented in the business relationship between the author and the printer. The attributed author of the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* is Andrew Boorde, physician and travel guide writer who died in 1549. Boorde's life as a physician-writer tells of his interest in a wide variety of things, ranging from health to merry tales, and, most commonly, the medicinal effects of mirth.[35] In the late seventeenth century, the biographer Anthony à Wood defended Boorde's writing of merry tales, but in the eighteenth century Thomas Hearne questioned Wood's biography of Boorde, and described *Scoggin's Jests* as 'an idle thing (and therefore unjustly fathered upon Dr. Borde)'. Instead, he attributed Boorde to another jest-book, *The Mad Men of Gotham*.[36] Since then Boorde's editorship of *Scoggin's Jests* has been questioned, denied, and even neglected until recently, apart from tentative approval by John Wardroper in 1970.[37] R. W. Maslen restores Boorde's authorship as a jest-book writer, firstly, in his objection to F. J. Furnivall's account of the denial of Boorde's authorship, secondly, in his examination of Boorde's works to bring to light his purpose of compiling merry tales, and thirdly in his extensive research on the Montpellier medical tradition, which Boorde shared with Rabelais.[38] Having recourse to the same biographical records and the echoes in the writing style of Boorde, which Furnivall used in his discussion, Maslen reaches a different conclusion: Boorde is the authentic author of *Scoggin's Jests*. Not only does Boorde's background of having medical knowledge and clerical experience endorse Boorde's authorship of *Scoggin's Jests*, but it also presents a convincing explanation that the printer's securing of diverse texts written by Boorde was dealt with as a cluster without being separated by category. It further explains that Boorde transcended the limits of the category, and subsequently endorses his authorship of the jest-book.

    In addition, Colwell's other jest-book publication of *The Mad Men of Gotham* always appeared in the subsequent records of the transmission from Colwell.[39] As the attribution in its title 'gathered to gether by A.B. phisike doctour' corresponds to that of *Scoggin's Jests*, it is reasonable that the National Union Catalog of Pre–1956 Imprints attributed the authorship of *The Mad Men of Gotham* to Andrew Boorde.[40] Hugh Jackson, Colwell's successor held both the copies of *Scoggin's Jests* and *The Mad Men of Gotham,* and passed over his rights of these copies to Roger Jackson. The rights eventually came to John Harrison IV in 1630 through Francis Williams. Though Boorde's authorship was questioned, Maslen proposes that along with *Scoggin's Jests*, Boorde is the author of both *The Mad Men of Gotham* and *The Merry Tales of Skelton*. From Colwell's succession from Robert Wyer, publisher of Boorde's health books (td 1530–1561), Maslen concludes that Colwell inherited the right to the former text from Wyer, and he deduces that 'a striking echo of Borde's *Dyetary* [*of Health*]' and Boorde's admiration for Skelton explain Boorde's authorship of *The Merry Tales of Skelton*.[41] Indeed, Boorde stated his purpose of writing in *A Dietary of Health*: 'I do wryte wordes of myrth, truly it is for no other intencyon, but to make your grace mery, for myrth is one of the chefest thynges of physycke the which doth aduertyse euery man to be mery, and to be beware of pentyfulnes'.[42]

    Maslen's focus on the effects of 'mirth' clarifies Boorde's purpose of writing as common to both health books and jest-books. Supplementary to his observation, Maslen admits that the transmission of licences for these three collections establishes Boorde as author. These jest-books printed by Colwell and ascribed to Boorde retrospectively confirm the direct transmission of *Scoggin's Jests* from the first Colwell edition to the 1626 edition.

Table 2: Andrew Boorde's Printers till 1626 (td: abbreviation for trade date)

Name	Boorde's works (short title, year of publication and STC reference)
Robert Wyer (td 1530–1561)	*A Dietary of Health* (1542, STC 3378.5; 1550?, STC 3373; ca. 1550, STC 3382.5; 1554?, STC 3380.5; 1562, STC 3381,); *A Dietary of Health, Selections* (1550, STC 3373)
William Middleton (td 1541–1547 [the date of death])	*A Dietary of Health* (1544, STC 3387.7); *The Breviary of Health* (1547, STC 3373.5)
Robert Copland (td 1508–1548)	*The Principles of Astronomy* (1547?, STC 3386)
William Copland (td 1545 [uncertain]–1569) Successor to printing house of Robert Copland	*The First Book of the Introduction of Knowledge* (1555?, STC 3383; 1562?, STC 3385)
William Powell (td 1535 [uncertain]–1570) Successor to William Middleton (married Middleton's widow Elizabeth). Master of Thomas Colwell and Hugh Jackson	*A Dietary of Health* (1547, STC 3380); *The Breviary of Health* (1552, STC 3374; 1557, STC 3375)
Thomas Colwell (td 1560–1575)	? *Scoggin's Jests* (?1570) *A Dietary of Health* (1562, STC 3381), *The Mad Men of Gotham* (1565, STC 1020.5)
Thomas East (td 1565–1608) Associated Henry Middleton (td 1567–1572), son of William	*The Breviary of Health* (1575, STC 3376; 1587, STC 3377; 1598, STC 3378)
Hugh Jackson (td 1572 [date of freedom]–1616) Married widow of Thomas Colwell	*A Dietary of Health* (1576, STC 3382)
Richard Jones (td 1564–1602)	*The Milner of Abington* (*c.* 1576, STC 79)
Miles Flesher (td 1611–1664) for Francis Williams (td 1626–1630)	*Scoggin's Jests* (1626, STC 21850.7)

Likewise, the practice of transcending category and genre represented by Boorde's ability to write intellectual medical literature alongside entertaining jest-books was adopted by Boorde's printer, Thomas Colwell. Boorde published an encyclopaedic reference book of health for his contemporaries, which was repeatedly published by earlier printers as *A Dietary of Health* (Table 2)*.* It was first published by Robert Wyer, another of Boorde's printers in 1542 and 1554, by Colwell in 1562, and by Hugh Jackson, Colwell's successor in 1576. It should be noted that Colwell, along

with Hugh Jackson, was apprenticed to William Powell, one of Boorde's printers, and then became a successor to Wyer. From their printing houses, Boorde's *A Dietary of Health* came out at least four times. Though the genealogy from Wyer to Colwell is now lost, Colwell's printing of another edition of the same title verifies his printing of Boorde's *Scoggin's Jests* during his trade dates. Because the Stationers' Company started their business in late 1554, there was no record of Boorde's lifetime publication in the Register. However, the fact that Colwell reprinted Boorde's *A Dietary of Health* posthumously, lends the strong probability that Colwell held other of Boorde's manuscripts transferred to him at his succession of Wyer's business. While William Copland and Thomas East, Boorde's other printers only published his medical literature, Colwell published Boorde's jest-books as well. Thus, the internal evidence points to the printer of the earliest edition of Boorde's *Scoggin's Jests* as Colwell.

Meanwhile, given that the 1626 edition is pledged to be 'the first and best', the title confirms the publisher-printer's priority as the original text holder. As the succession of the licence from Colwell agrees with the claim, the 1626 edition was reproduced from the original Colwell edition. Although a date for the earliest publication cannot be definitively established, the contemporary allusions to the Scoggin book confirm that the original jest-book must have been published and circulated before the appearance of the 1613 edition, whose supposed composition date is between the 1590s and the early 1600s as discussed below.

Both internal and external allusions to Scoggin establish the authenticity of the 1626 *Scoggin's Jests* as an edition precedent to the 1613 edition. *The Merry Tales of Skelton* gives us one of the earliest allusions to the hero of this jest-book as a jester: 'Skelton was an Englyshe man borne as Skogyn was'.[43] And the episode of Scoggin and his wife's making an 'heir' ('air'),

which Harvey and Spenser criticised as derogatory in 1580, along with John Gerard's description of a plant's unpleasant smell compared to Scoggin's appeared only in the 1626 edition, not in the 1613 edition.[44)] Another allusion to the 1626 *Scoggin's Jests* is found in one anti-Martinist pamphlet, *A Whip for an Ape*: 'The sacred sect and perfect pure precise, / Whose cause must be by *Scoggins* iests maintainde, / Ye shewe although that purple Apes disguise, / Yet Apes are still, and so must be disdainde'.[45)] These allusions before 1590 refer to the Colwell edition, i.e., the original 1626 edition, and thereby put the earlier edition on the jest-book genealogy. The application continued down to the early seventeenth century. In 1607 the author of *Dobson's Dry Bobs*, in his preface to the reader, places his hero George Dobson in the genealogy of jesting heroes: 'hee is George Dobson, whose pleasant meriments are worthy to be registred among the famous Recordes of the ieasting Worthies: yea hee hath proceeded farther in degree than Garagantua, Howleglasse, Tiell, Skoggin, olde Hobson, or Cocle'.[46)] Moreover, *Dobson's Dry Bobs* follows the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* in its presentation: it has the author's preface to the reader as well as the list of tales. As it is authenticated in the previously published works, the 1626 edition clearly demonstrates that it declares itself to be the originator, which suggests that the 1613 edition is not the first published jests of Scoggin. Though the predated book is not extant except a fragment, the publisher of the 1626 edition reprinted his copy-text, which came down from Colwell; as a result, the printer of the 1626 edition presented the book as the source for all the publicity of Scoggin and Boorde, which lasted for more than 50 years.

The acceptance that Scoggin was a familiar figure, and had free access to any class of people, was reiterated in the various sections where Scoggin adopts his deceptive tricks in the jest-book. *Scoggin's Jests* reflects the

conflict in social attitudes to Scoggin among the early moderns. Born as a work of Boorde, transmitted as a form of biographical jest-book rather than as a product of a patchwork of merry tales, the 1626 *Scoggin's Jests* integrates both the hero's legendary traits and the compiler's aim of writing and printing practices to prove itself a highly mediated text generated in the process of publishing as an established edition.

2.2 The 1613 Edition

As regards the bibliographic entries of *Scoggin's Jests* in the Stationers' Register, one strain of transmission originated from Colwell; but there is another important strain of transmission. *STC* defines the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* as 'a different text, continuing Scoggin's adventures'.[47] Though it has been regarded as derivative of the original edition, namely Colwell's edition,[48] its importance to the history of the jest-book formation is evident in its genealogical traces of the licence, the collaboration among its original author-compiler, and the printer. The records of the 1613 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* revolve around Thomas Pavier (td 1600–1625), a draper and bookseller in London, famous for Shakespearean publications (Table 1). Pavier was also an extensive publisher of ballads, news-books, and jest-books in conjunction with many printers. Consequently he became one of the most active booksellers of his day. Pavier's involvement in the production of the jest-book secured its printing in the seventeenth-century up until around 1640. In fact, in partnership with Pavier, Ralph Blower (td 1597–1615) printed the 1613 Scoggin text. Blower's publications included travel books, history books, and several other works on contemporary wonders. The alliance between Pavier and Blower explains that the syndicate of printers and publishers promoted a common interest in a network. Two years later in 1615, the right to publish the Scoggin book was

assigned to Edward Wright as part of Pavier's rights on 10 February with Blower's consent.[49] Edward Wright was a brother to John (td 1602–1646) and Cuthbert (td 1610–1638), who married Pavier's daughter. Not only Pavier, but also Edward, together with his brothers, was a member of the so-called 'ballad partners'.[50] Again, the rights to *Scoggin's Jests* were circulated within an organised economic activity performed by the members of the same group, with Pavier as the central figure. Lastly in 1626, because of Pavier's death, his widow transferred his copyrights to Edward Brewster (td 1610–1647) and Robert Bird (td 1621–1638), booksellers of theological literature. Neither the subsequent ownership nor reprinted editions of the 1613 edition have been identified so far. The history of the 1613 edition is short, but the list of the transcripts, in which *Scoggin's Jests* was included, illustrates that the book trade on a large scale was promoted on the basis of matrimonial relationship as well as that of a trade partnership.

Before Pavier, however, we can only speculate about the possible process of publishing *Scoggin's Jests* from the succession of the printing house. Again, the right to the copy was passed through the network of ballad printers. A record in the Stationers' Register suggests that Pavier took over the business of other ballad and play printers, from Richard Jones (td 1564–1602) via William White (td 1597–1615). In 1598, White purchased the business of Richard Jones and William Hill, Jones's partner.[51] Two years later in 1600 on 14 August, shortly after Pavier made his first entry to the Stationers' Company on 4 August,[52] Pavier entered his copies of 'beinge things formerlye printed' with other copies which he had obtained from White.[53] Despite that, there remains still another possibility that Pavier obtained the rights to the copy or copy-text of the 1613 edition from his partner Blower; at least the transference of licence to and from Pavier points to Pavier as its early owner. Thus, the publication of the jest-book, linked

with the ballad printers, suggests an institutional relationship formed in the landscape of the printing industry at that time. The 1613 edition was realised in the shorter lineage of transmission across printers and booksellers, while the 1626 edition derived from the assumed author Boorde and his printers. The later printers clearly recognised the appropriateness of re-publishing the early text after decades later.

Though both the texts of *Scoggin's Jests* were published within 16 years of one another, the 1613 edition diverges from the 1626 edition. Words used in both texts conclusively point first to evidence of their separate origins, and second to extensive changes in the surrounding contemporary circumstances of jest-book writing. The composition dates of these texts in reverse order indicate that the two texts were written in different time periods. The 1613 edition has a later vocabulary than the 1626 edition. Especially, the particularity of words used in the books differentiates one composition date from that of the other. Words like 'waghalter', 'coxcomb', 'couson' the variant spelling of 'cozen', and 'burgomaster' whose first entries in *OED* are respectively 1570, 1573, 1573 and 1592, appear in the 1613 edition, and do not belong to the English vocabulary of the lifetime of Boorde who died in 1549, and who is the ascribed author of the 1626 edition. As shown in the examples extant in EEBO, the traces of these words show that they belonged to later sixteenth century vocabulary. For example, 'Waghalter' in *OED* is defined as a newly coined word from 'wag' and 'halter', meaning 'one who is to swing in a halter, or to be hanged'; and the word often appears in early modern clowns' vocabulary.[54] 'Coxcomb', whose original form is 'cockscomb' to mean a cap worn by a professional fool, was applied figuratively to a fool or a simpleton, and soon became a favourite word for early modern dramatists such as Shakespeare, Ford, and Massinger.[55] Likewise, the first entry of the verb 'cozen' meaning 'to cheat'

or 'to deceive' can be traced to the late sixteenth century.[56] The verb became frequently used by the early modern writers, and reflects contemporary trends and new coinages. Above all, the early uses of 'Burgomaster', which means 'mayor' having Dutch origins, are recorded in Holinshed's *Chronicles* in 1586, in Robert Greene's *Greene's Never Too Late* in 1590, and in Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* in 1592.[57] With the success of *Pierce Penniless* recorded in the subsequent editions — three times in 1592, the fourth in 1593 and the fifth in 1595, the word 'burgomaster' became settled in the English vocabulary, and its sense was generally accepted in the 1590s, and seemed to be inevitably taken into the 1613 *Scoggin's Jest* as an inviting topical word.[58] In addition, the first citation of the phrasal expression 'to leave in the lurch', which appears in the 1613 edition in *OED*, was Thomas Nashe's use in *Have with You to Saffron-Walden* in 1596.[59] The vocabulary post Boorde's death, which appears in the late 1590s, contradicts an attribution of the authorship of the 1613 edition to Boorde, and also denies that the book was the same as the one entered into the Stationers' Register by Colwell in 1565–66. Instead, it not only explains the 1613 edition's autonomy as a different text, but also separates the date of the composition of the 1613 edition from that of the original compilation of the 1626 text which provided the 1613 edition with a framework for the hero's characterisation and adventure. It is certain at least that the linguistic differences between the two texts, as shown in such a short-lived word as 'burgomaster', whose use thrived in the seventeenth century, narrow down the composition date of the 1613 edition to a shorter period of time, and place the 1613 edition around from 1590 to 1613, more specifically in the late 1590s, as the use of topical words confirm.

Along with specific vocabulary, negative representations of clerical figures in the text support the aforesaid evidence for a date of composition

around the 1590s. The 1613 edition, as the title declares, contains many of Scoggin's mockery of friars: Rome or Venice-based stories are mostly related to clerical figures, and supply an ideal setting for Scoggin's jesting about them. Three middle episodes from 31 to 32 about Scoggin and a Jesuit, demonstrate comic hostility toward clerical figures. In tale 31, a Jesuit affirms Scoggin is 'a Protestant worse then a Diuell' who 'will flie vpon' him without awe.[60] This episode ushers in its sequels, tales 32 and 33, where Scoggin retaliates against the Jesuit, and in order to expose the poverty of his intellect and make him seem foolish, questions him on the young Christ's subtle religious knowledge and apparent blasphemy in the presence of Joseph. Similarly, in the sequence of tales 31–33, the Jesuit falls victim to Scoggin's scorn in the wake of denunciations of protestantism. Then in tale 51, when Scoggin wants money to go back to Rome, he deceives an inn-holder, pretending to be 'a Iesuit or Athiest'.[61] Taken as an atheist to a Cardinal in Rome, he reveals his true identity as the Cardinals' acquaintance, and the inn-holder finds that he has been cheated into bringing Scoggin to Rome. Beneath Scoggin's successful trick, there is anti-clerical perspective, which is pertinent to the question of what function this jest-book was intended to fulfil.

The phrase 'a Iesuit or athiest', repeated three times in this episode, echoes the author's hatred for Catholic clerics inherent in the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests*.[62] Earlier in 1583 Philip Stubbes had already attacked the then growing sect of Jesuits in his *The Anatomy of Abuses*: explaining 'the diuels agents, […] are called […] by the name of Iesuites, seminarie préests, and catholides, vsurping to themselues a name neuer heard of till of late daies, being indeed a name verie blasphemously deriued from the name of Iesus, and improperly alluded and attributed to themselues'.[63] The comments on Jesuits in *The Anatomy of Abuses* and *Scoggin's Jests* are basically the same

in tenor. Embedded in the framework of Scoggin's journey to Rome, is a strong satirical urgency, caricaturing Catholicism. Unlike the 1626 edition referred to in the Marprelate pamphlet in the 1590s as discussed above, the 1613 edition clearly contains within it criticism of the other faction of Christianity. This indicates that the 1613 text was apparently written after the Jesuits became active in England in 1580, thereby certifying the text's late sixteenth-century provenance. The two texts of *Scoggin's Jests* propagate allegiances which were at opposite poles of the religious spectrum of Elizabethan and Stuart England. In particular, the 1613 edition assumes a sarcastic tone by centralising the episodes which ludicrously mock clerics, and this discloses hidden social criticism against clerics, reflecting the late sixteenth century's religious circumstances, where the escalation of Jesuits was a major concern for protestants.

What can account for the thirteen-year lapse between Pavier's opening of business in 1600 and the publication of the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests*? Why did Pavier delay publication? What scenarios can be proposed to account for this? The following three propositions are uncomplicated, and fit all the evidence that the manuscript of the 1613 edition was composed between the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century, and seems not to have been licensed before its publication. Possibly, when Pavier obtained the copy of the 1613 edition, he did not realise that the copy had not been yet registered. Or, Pavier mistook the copy for the previously registered Boorde-Colwell edition. Another possible proposition lies in the active collaboration between its anonymous author and Pavier. The last possible proposition is that Pavier obtained the manuscript shortly before its publication. In any case, the 1613 edition reflects the interest, alliance and transmission in the jest-book circulation of the early Stuart period.

The mystery of the 1613 edition is related to the question of whether or

not the unnamed 1613 edition became an incentive for the 1626 edition to claim its originality and validity. The questions of anonymity or pseudonymity no doubt deserve attention as they distinguish the jest-books. The anonymity of the 1613 edition enigmatises the purpose of its publication. Instead, the edition withholding the name of the author-compiler, enables the anonymous writer to compile stories from diverse sources within his own framework.[64] The jest-book's borrowing of episodes from collections of merry tales provides conclusive evidence that the 1613 edition was written after 1555, and accordingly denies Boorde's authorship of the 1613 edition, though the manner of writing in both Scoggin books is very similar. The two Scoggin books draw on different source tales from the 'mother jest-books', or the preceding jest-books, though the narrative mode is similar in each. The 1613 edition absorbs a number of tales from *Howleglas*, an English version of *Tyl Eurenspiegel*, which was printed between 1555 and 1560, while the 1626 edition borrows tales from *A Hundred Merry Tales* published in 1526, much earlier than *Howleglas*. Thus, in the process of forming a new series by a break from the original, the printer-compiler uses the strategy of branding the volume with the name of the hero to make it an independent book.

Such skills in advertising a product were common among early printers. Richard Jones, like another balladmonger, Thomas Colwell, published William Elderton's ballads, which were a staple for Colwell in his later business, and also published a jest-book attributed to Boorde, *The Milner of Abington*.[65] These correspondences concerning the publication items between the two contemporary printers imply that the printers and publishers had common generic preferences for their publications. Jest-book publishing resulted from interests shared among these printers, and consequently was localised in the same network. Moreover, Jones published a few books with

Colwell: for Jones, Colwell printed Robert Burdet's *The Refuge of a Sinner*;[66] and both Jones and Colwell jointly printed John Patridge's *The End and Confession of John Felton*.[67]

Not only did Jones concentrate exclusively on publishing ballads and curious literature, but he undertook the editing and compiling practices as an active entrepreneur: he is now generally accepted as the compiler of Clement Robinson's *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, Thomas Proctor's *A Gorgious Gallery, of Gallant Inventions*, and his *The Book of Honor and Arms*.[68] Jones's involvement in editing and compiling suggests that jest-books as compilations were prone to be altered by the publisher. The question of the compilership of *A Bower of Delights* provides a typical example.[69] Although the title declares the author is Nicholas Breton, the work contains only some of his verses. Breton later claimed, in *The Pilgrimage to Paradise*, that the work was falsely assigned to him, complaining 'it was donne altogether without my consent or knowledge', and it consisted of 'many thinges of other mens mingled with few of mine'.[70] Arthur Marotti points out that Jones's practice of altering texts went beyond compiling and editing. He notes that to 'compile verse' in the Renaissance means either to 'compose verse' or to 'collect and edit it'. Marotti then justifies Jones's pseudonymous application of Breton's name for advertising *A Bower of Delights*.[71] Furthermore, Kirk Melnikoff identifies the author of *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* as Jones, denying the view that Clement Robinson was the compiler, which was proposed by Hyder Rollins, the editor of the collected poems by Robinson in 1936. With his examination of the prefatory material and the collection's inclusion of two ballads previously registered by Jones, Melnikoff contests Rollins's view of Robinson's single authorship, and instead demonstrates Jones's contribution as the compiler of the work. The conflict between authorial

right and editing practice that Melnikoff attempts to resolve is mediated in his view by examining the exemplary career of Jones, who is notorious for his editorship of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*.[72] Drawing on Marotti's discussion of Jones as both an editor and a compiler, Melnikoff highlights Jones's importance and quality as a publisher-compiler of both poetry and plays in the history of the book trade. On the threshold of a developing monopoly of copies and authorship, Jones occupied the role of editor to accommodate his printership.

Conversely, in her discussion of the usefulness of anonymity and name suppression for the Renaissance author, Marcy North points out that the manipulative power of a literary anonymity continued despite a growing interest in authorial names emerging in the late sixteenth century. She concludes:

> The authors, printers, and publishers […] garnered the advantages of both naming and anonymity by manipulating print conventions such as the preface, title page, dedication, and signature. In doing so, they participated in the authoring of texts, an act which was more dependent on a group of book producers than modern ideas of authorship allow.[73]

As in the example of the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests*, whose author did not appear in the frontispiece, literary anonymity employed as a commercialised technique facilitated the transfer of the branding of the book from the original to a derived edition, benefiting printing competition and the print economy.

Late Elizabethan printing seems better understood as an outlet for the printer's business practice. The view of early modern printers' political, private, and institutional practices validates the use of pseudonyms and

anonymity for their jest-book compositions. And taken together with Melnikoff's and Marotti's argument on ambitious rival printers' competing in compiling practices, a candidate of the author/compiler of the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* can be nominated: it is conceivable that the edition might be attributable to an ambitious person who enjoyed anonymous compiling practices and concealing his message. Jones's involvement in the 1613 text of *Scoggin's Jests* before it reached Pavier is conceivable because of the following three conditions: Jones had a connection with the original text holder; he compiled with a command of late sixteenth vocabulary; and his authorial role in the work he published remained anonymous.

3 Conclusion

The transmission of these two important jest-books, thus forges relationships between those involved between the two different fields of printing and writing, establishing the jest-book as one of the most important literary and trade items of the time. Both the 1626 and 1613 editions of *Scoggin's Jests* contributed to implanting the jester figure in literary works in a unique and innovative way. The 1626 edition celebrates the jester's trickery and its effect of mitigating melancholy, reinforced with the name of its author, Boorde. And by contrast, the printer of the 1613 edition exploited the anonymity of the writer as well as the advantage of Scoggin's publicity. Unlike the 1626 edition, the 1613 edition lacks a prologue or preface, and only provides a short preliminary explanation directly before the first story — that it is a translation from French. With the suppression of its purpose of writing, the edition does not confirm any anticipation or expectation that a medicinal effect is supplied. The attribution in the title, offers its readers merry and pleasant jests in the prospect of the hero's experiences. Both the 1626 and the 1613 edition's practice of giving a long attribution was typical

of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century publications, whereas the title was short and simple before then. Both editions of *Scoggin's Jests* copied the manner of contemporary printing customs, but it deserves attention that the prefatory matters of both editions differ in their roles as well as in their presentations.

The prefatory matters in the 1626 edition of *Scoggin's Jests* produce two primary effects. Firstly, the title page advertises and promotes the jest-book, announcing that it is the original; secondly, the prefatory matter renders the experience of reading the jest-book more prestigious than that of the 1613 edition, with the emphasis on the purpose of promoting health. The prefatory matters in the 1613 edition, by contrast, present another effect: it takes advantage of the existing *Scoggin's Jests*, i.e., the Colwell edition, and enhances its attractive features, focusing on the single issue of the hero's continuing adventures, especially in his episodes with clerics. The compiler of the 1613 edition apparently knew Nashe's application of new vocabulary, and perceived that his new words conformed to the writing of a jest-book for his contemporaries as sequels, which differentiates the 1613 text from that of 1626. Moreover, the paratextual front matters, such as the title and the expository subtitles of both of the Scoggin books, or the supplementary and rather exceptional explanation slipped before the body text of the 1613 edition, serve as external evidence to the identities of both books. The two texts of *Scoggin's Jests* demonstrate the separate figure of the hero and the early modern writers' exploitation of the hero's and the jest-book's name in its formation: the 1626 edition supplies the ideal ground for curing and nursing both the reader and the society in which the puritans were feared, and the 1613 edition conversely constructed a comically offensive attitude against the Jesuit enemy. With the compiler and the publisher as its catalysts, the 1613 edition emerges as a compromised text in that it was clearly

harnessed as propaganda for the anti-Jesuit movement. In the process of generation, construction, and transmission, they reveal both affinities and disparities. When they were passed between the printer-publishers, they mediated differently to accommodate their printer-publisher's taste and the changes in religious and political allegiances.

The jest-books were revaluated, regenerated, and reproduced as the by-products of a refined and burgeoning printing business. The same amplification applied to the complex combination of the jester and the idea of the early modern critical background. The appearance of *Tarlton's Jests* was benefited by the boost of the publication of *Tarlton's News out of Purgatory*, which inaugurates the mythologizing of a famous clown as a piece of literary history.[74] Rather than functioning as a neutral channel through which the author solely published works as printed materials, the print industry served as an industrial infrastructure for literary circles, the boundaries of genre and literary hierarchy.

Notes

*   This article appeared as chapter one of my Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham, the Shakespeare Institute in 2011. An abridged version of this work was presented in Japanese at the 85th ELSJ Annual General Meeting at Tohoku University in 2013.

1)   R. W. Maslen defines 'biographical jest-books' as 'story-collections centred round the exploits of a single comic figure', following on Margaret Schlaugh's discussion on 'enchained anecdotes in biographical form', gives the stories of the jesting hero who is given a biographical sequence and form. See R. W. Maslen, *Shakespeare and Comedy* (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), pp. 24–44 (p. 28); and see also Margaret Schlaugh, *Antecedents of the English Novel 1400–1600* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 90–99. By contrast, Derek Brewer points out that the jest-book heroes such as Scoggin and Skelton are not real jesters but rather

fictitious jesters created in the jest book. He results in minimising his scope for the Elizabethan clowning when he mixes up real and fictitious jester/clown figures. Derek Brewer, 'Elizabethan Merry Tales and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*: Shakespeare and 'popular' literature', in *Chaucer to Shakespeare: Essays in Honour of Shinsuke Ando,* ed. by Toshiyuki Takamiya and Richard Beadle (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1992), pp. 145–59.

2) René Weis, ed., *Henry IV, Part 2*, The Oxford World's Classics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); A. R. Humphreys also notes that 'Shakespeare's audience would probably associate Scoggin rather with John Scoggin', and attributes the confusion to the circulated name of Scoggin as a buffoon due to the jest book with his name in its title (A. R. Humphreys, ed., *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, The Arden Shakespeare [London: Methuen, 1966], p. 97).

3) W. Carew Hazlitt, 'Introduction', in *Shakespeare Jest-books; Reprints of the Early and Very Rare Jest-books Supposed to Have Been Used by Shakespeare*, ed. by W. Carew Hazlitt, 3 vols (London: Willis & Sotheran, 1864), I, i-x (p. vii). *A Hundred Merry Tales* was published in 1526, and *Merry Tales and Quick Answers* in around 1532: Anon, *A, C, mery talys* ([London: J. Rastell, 1526?]); Anon, *The Merry Tales of Skelton* (London: Imprinted [...] by Thomas Colwell, [1567]). *Scoggin's Jests*, here taken up by Hazlitt, was entered into the Stationers' Register in 1565–66, was published at least 30 years after the publications of the above listed merry tales. For a full discussion, see his introduction to *Scoggin's Jests* in *Shakespeare Jest-books*, II, 38–45 (pp. 38–40).

4) Hazlitt, 'Introductory Notice', in *Shakespeare Jest-books,* II, v-xi (pp. vi-viii).

5) Halasz, describing another famous clown actor Tarlton as one of the celebrities of the time, observes that the early modern writers, printers or publishers used a big name as a convenient tool for sales promotion (Alexandra Halasz, '"So beloved that men use his picture for their sings": Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-Century Celebrity', *Shakespeare Studies*, 23 [1995], 19–38 [p. 32]).

6) Hazlitt conjectured in his discussion of Shallow's reference to Scoggin in *2 Henry IV*, 'What Shakespeare's idea of Scoggin was, it is not very easy to determine; but there can be little doubt that the pranks and drolleries of the latter [Scoggin] were the only qualities which carried his name down to posterity, even if Holinshed be

correct in his intimation that he was not quite so much of a black guard and buffoon as the Jests represent him to have been' (Hazlitt, II, 41–42).

7)   Anon, *Peele's Jests* (London: Printed by Nicholas Okes for Francis Faulkner and Henry Bell [etc.], 1607).

8)   The legal copyright as the right to an intellectual property was enacted in the eighteenth century, but prior to the Copyright Act of 1709, the idea of copyright claimed from the writers' side existed. Lukas Erne quotes George Wither's claim of the stationers' usurpation of the writers' rights — the stationers 'take vppon them to publish bookes contriued, altthered, and mangled at their owne pleasures, without consent of the writhers' — and concludes 'the *idea* of copyright as the right of the author was not absent from Renaissance England' (Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003], pp. 8–10). George Wither, *The Scholar's Purgatory* ([London]: Imprinted [by G. Wood] for the honest Stationers, 1624), sig. A5ᵛ. Once the author gave his manuscript to a printer, he no longer had control over it. And it was occasionally approved that more than two printers printed different editions under the consent of the same bookseller who held 'the right to a copy'. I will use, therefore, 'licence' for the permission of printing, publishing, using an elusive term, avoiding the confusion between 'copyright' — the legal right of both the author's and the publisher's — in a modern sense, and the early modern printer-publisher's licence to use the original text.

9)   Anon, *The Tinker of Turvey* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Butter [etc.], 1630); Anon, *The Cobbler of Canterbury* (London: Printed by Robert Robinson, 1590); Anon, *The Cobbler of Canterbury* (*The Merry Tales of the Cobbler of Canterbury*) (London: Printed [by Thomas Snodham] for Nathaniel Butter [etc.], 1614).

10)   Quoting Philipe Lejeune's word, Genette defines the paratext as 'the fringe of the printed text which, in reality, controls the whole reading.' Gérard Genette, 'Introduction to the Paratext', *New Literary History*, 22 (1991), 261–72 (p. 1).

11)   Anon, The 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* (London: Printed by Ralph Blower [etc.], 1613); Andrew Boorde, *Scoggin's Jests* (London: Printed [by Miles Flesher] for Francis Williams, 1626). Other than the 1613 and 1626 editions, there is the fragment published by Thomas Colwell around 1570 (STC 21850.3).

12) Watt, taking up cheap print, argues for its role as a tool to enlighten the unlearned with the effect of attached illustrations, and then she concludes that it was a form of religious literature exploited by the protestant (Tessa Watt, 'A godly ballad to a godly tune', in *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550–1640* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], pp. 39–73). Annabel Patterson, by contrast, focusing on the middle class reader in her discussion on Holinshed's *Chronicles*, argues that the customary practice of writing chronicles was supported by the syndicate of printer-publishers who worked on the principles of populism. She identifies anecdotes as a relaying tool from the state and the individual which supplies historical perspectives and defined that they serve as one of the 'protocols' for chronicles (Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's "Chronicles"* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994]). Both concern the cultural values of printed books and further their discussion to explore their political and religious objectives.

13) Throughout this essay I will use 'copy' in a limited sense, to refer to the manuscript submitted to the Stationers' Company to be printed, and 'copy-text' as the printer's copy. The term 'copy-text' was McKerrow's to give the authority to the original printer's edition (*The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by Ronald B. McKerrow, 2nd edn, rev. by F. P. Wilson, 5 vols [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958], I, p. xi). Later, W. W. Greg set forth his own copy-text theory, and distinguished an authoritative text in which the printer could have corrected some accidental mechanical — punctuational and orthographical — mistakes, from ones with substantive editorial emendations — the replacement of words or phrases (W. W. Greg, 'The Rationale of Copy-Test', *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 [1950–51], 20–37). As Peter Blayney explains, the ownership of a copy was not a legalised right, and the Stationers' Company had no jurisdiction over the copy. Peter Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. by John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 383–422 (pp. 398–99).

14) Douglas Gray, 'Scoggin [Scogan, Scogin, Skogyn], John (*supp. fl.* 1480), *supposed court jester and author*', in *ODNB*.

15) Douglas Gray, 'Scogan [Scoggin], Henry (*c.*1361–1407), *poet*', in *ODNB*.

16) Sidney Lee, 'Scogan or SCOGGIN, Henry (1361?–1407), poet', in *ODNB* archive.

Raphael Holinshed, *The Chronicles* (London: Printed [by Henry Denham] [etc.], [1587]), p. 710.

17) Holinshed, p. 14.

18) Likewise, George Peele in *Peele's Jests* is described as a gentleman and a student at Oxford. The posthumous jest-book (published in 1607 a decade after his death in 1597) gives his profile and continuing fame among Londoners. The relation between the jest-book and the London theatre business can be inferred from these biographical jest-books' titles.

19) William Edward Farnham, 'John (Henry) Scogan', *Modern Language Review*, 16 (1921), 120–28 (pp. 127–28).

20) 'Alas Scogan of olde folke ne yong, / Was neuer erst Scogan blamed for his tong' (ll. 20–21). Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Works of Our Ancient, Learned, and Excellent English Poet, Jeffrey Chaucer* (London: [s.n.], 1687), p. 568.

21) Gabriel Harvey, *Pierce's Supererogation* (London: Imprinted by John Wolfe, 1593), p. 17 and p. 149.

22) Edmund Spenser (and Gabriel Harvey), *Three Proper, and Witty, Familiar Letters* (London: Imprinted by H. Bynneman [etc.], 1580), p. 55.

23) John Gerard, *The Herbal* (London: Imprinted by [Edmund Bollifant for [Bonham Norton and] John Norton, 1597), p. 258 (sig. R1ᵛ).

24) Trade dates are abbreviated below to td. Unless otherwise noted, the trade dates are given based on *Dictionaries of the Printers and Booksellers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1557–1775,* ed. by H. R. Plomer and others (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1977), and *The British Book Trade Index* (BBTI) <http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk/>.

25) Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554–1640 A. D.*, 5vols (London, 1875; reprinted N. Y: Peter Smith, 1950), I, 299.

26) David G. Hale, 'Thomas Colwell: Elizabethan Printer', *Library*, Series 5, 19 (1964), 223–26 (p. 223).

27) Arber, I, 295, 298, and 301.

28) Arber, I, 304 and 312.

29) Anon, *The Merry Tales of Skelton*; Anon, *The Mad Men of Gotham* ([London]:

Imprinted […] by Thomas Colwell, [1565]).

30) Arber, II, 676.

31) Arber, III, 593.

32) Boorde, *Scoggin's Jests*.

33) Arber, III, 593 and Arber, IV, 149.

34) Arber, IV, 237.

35) Elizabeth Lane Furdell, 'Boorde, Andrew (*c*.1490–1549), *physician and author*', in *ODNB*.

36) Quoted in Anthony à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (London: Printed for Thomas Bennet [etc.], 1691), pp. 61–62 (p. 61). Hazlitt mistook Hearne for Wood (Hazlitt, I, 181).

37) John Wardroper, 'Appendix: Boorde and Scoggin', in *Jest upon Jest: A Selection from the Jestbooks and Collections of Merry Tales published form the Reign of Richard III to George III* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 198–99. Despite the long-established view on Boorde's doubtful editorship, he suggested that Boorde would write about the story of the jesting hero based on his interest in jests.

38) R. W. Maslen, 'The Afterlife of Andrew Borde', *Studies in Philology*, 100 (2003), 463–92.

39) As for the transmission of its licence, Hazlitt was not aware that the licence of *The Mad Men of Gotham* was passed down to Colwell's successors with that of *Scoggin's Jests*.

40) See the record of *The Mad Men of Gotham* in the ESTC.

41) Maslen, 'The Afterlife of Andrew Borde', p. 473.

42) Andrew Boorde, *A Dietary of Health* (London: Imprinted by me Robert Wyer [etc.] for John Gowghe, 1542), sig. A3.

43) *The Merry Tales of Skelton*, Tale 1 (sig. A2).

44) For details of Gerard's description, see above pp. 30–31.

45) Anon, *A Whip for an Ape* (London?: Printed by T. Orwin?, 1589?), p. 4. This tract has been attributed to John Lyly.

46) Anon, *Dobson's Dry Bobs* (London: Printed by Valentine Simmes, 1607), sigs. A3–A3^v.

47) Alfred William Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475–1640*, 2nd edn, revised and enlarged, 3 vols (London: The Bibliographical Society, Vol. I: 1986, Vol. II: 1976, Vol. III: 1991), II, 309.

48) Hazlitt had a bibliographic confusion: he identified the edition stored in the Harleian Collection (items 210, 328, 331–2, Harl. 5995) British Library as the 1613 edition (Hazlitt, I, 39). On the other hand, Wardroper identified the Harleian copy as one printed by Thomas Colwell, the antecedent edition of the 1626 edition, based on his examination of its wording (Wardroper, p. 198). *STC* notes that this fragment copy was printed in around 1570 (STC 21850.3): *STC*, II, 308. As Hazlitt found that the reference to the jest-book in *A Whip for an Ape*, the jest-book with the name of Scoggin was doubtlessly circulated before this Martin Marprelate pamphlet. Judging from the formation of the 1613 *Scoggin's Jests* as stated below, this *Scoggin's Jests* referred to in *A Whip for an Ap*e is the antecedent of the 1626 edition.

49) Arber, III, 563.

50) Watt, 'A godly ballad', pp. 39–73 (p. 45).

51) Arber, III, 702.

52) Interestingly it was when Pavier celebrated his first trade in business with the entry of the second part of *Tarlton's Jests*. For details, see the discussion of the transmission of *Tarlton's Jests* in my article published (in Japanese) under the title 'Tarlton in print: From myth to history' in the *Hiyoshi Review of English Studies*, Vol. 61 (2012), 87–103.

53) Arber, III, 168–70.

54) See 'waghalter' in *OED*. Coincidentally, synonymous words such as 'crackrope' and 'crackhalter' appeared and were prevalent in its contemporary. While the earliest trace of the word was an attributive adjective preceding the word 'slip-string' by John Heywood in 1546, its use as a noun was associated with a rogue, and predominated in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.

55) See 'coxcomb' in *OED*. This derivative spelling of the word, 'cockscomb' first appeared in both meanings in Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* in 1573; then, with another sense as a derogatory name for the head (Thomas Tusser,

Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry [London: Impritned by Richard Tottell, 1573]).

56) See 'cozen' in *OED*. The first entry of 'cozen' meaning 'to cheat' is Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, and another sense 'to deceive' is traced in Philip Stubbes' *The Anatomy of Abuses* in 1583. According to the *OED*'s explanation of its etymology, the verb had derivative endings -on, and -en, the latter of which became prevalent in the seventeenth century. In the above listed examples of Stubbes, the verb appeared with the ending -on. Phillip Stubbes, *The Anatomy of Abuses* (London: Printed by R. W[ard] for William Wright [etc.], [1583]).

57) See 'burgomaster', in *OED*. While the first entry of the 'burgomaster' in *OED* is 1592, there are other earlier uses: in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 'the lord lieutenant with three hundred horsses in their furniture entred Leidon, where he was receiued of the burgomasters, burgesses, and others' (Holinshed, p. 1419); and in Robert Greene, 'her friendes sorrowing suspected the cankred mind of the Burgomaster' (Robert Greene, *Greene's Never Too Late* [London: Printed by Thomas Orwin for N[icholas] L[ing] and John Busby, 1590], sig. E2). In making a satire against the sin of hypocrisy in the government, Nashe features the word 'burgomaster' to topicalise the late sixteenth century political body. By connecting two familiar animal fables, Nashe criticises the knavery of political authority: 'The Beare on a time beeing chiefe Burgomaster of all the Beasts vnder the Lyon, gan thinke with himselfe how hee might surfet in pleasure, or best husband his Authoritie to enlarge his delight and contentment.' (Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penniless* [London: Printed by Abel Jeffes, for J. B[usby], 1592], sig. G3).

58) Dutch 'burger' which means citizen of a burg was assimilated into English 'burgh' as is 'burgomaster'. The 'burgomaster' and 'burgher' are used in place of borough-master and 'borough' by Nashe's contemporary writers: 'I am ioyned with […] Burgomasters and great Oneyres, such as can hold in', in William Shakespeare, *Henry IV, Part 1* (London: Printed by P[eter] S[hort] for Andrew Wise [etc.], 1598), sig. C3; 'Oh Maister Burgomaster see heres your wife come to welcome you home from war…', in George Chapman, *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (London: Imprinted [by J. Roberts] for William Jones [etc.], 1598), sig. F3; 'Goe now and bind the Burghers hand and foot', in Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine* (London:

Printed by Richard Jhones [etc.], 1590), sig. K4ᵛ; 'your Argosies with portlie sayle / Like Signiors and rich Burgars on the flood', in William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* (London: Printed by J[ames]. R[oberts]. for Thomas Heyes [etc.], 1600), sig. A2. Interestingly, 'burgomaster' appeared in the Bad Quarto edition of *Romeo and Juliet* printed by John Danter in 1597, but it was soon replaced with the synonymous 'alderman' in the edition by Thomas Creede in 1599. William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet* (London: Printed by John Danter [and Edward Allde], 1597), sig. C1ᵛ; William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Julie* (London: Printed by Thomas Creede, for Cuthbert Burby [etc.], 1599), sig. C2. Since then, Shakespeare's use of 'burgomaster' has remained only in *Henry IV, Part 1*. By contrast, Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker, and Thomas Middleton used the word even after 1600. There are scarce records of the use of 'burgomaster' after the eighteenth century.

59) 'Whom […] he also procured to be equally bound with him for his new cousens apparance to the law, which he neuer did, but left both of them in the lurtch for him'. Thomas Nashe, *Have with You to Saffron-Walden* (London: Printed by John Danter, 1596), sig. Q1. See the use of 'to leave in the lurch' in 'lurch' in *OED*.

60) The 1613 *Scoggin's Jests*, Tale 31 (sig. C8ᵛ).

61) The 1613 *Scoggin's Jests*, Tale 51 (sig. E4).

62) The society of Jesuits, formed in 1540, established the English College in Rome in 1580 for purposes of education and training. As one of counter-reformers' movements, it achieved rapid growth by targeting the heathen, but it invited the protestants' accusation. The topicality of describing the conflict between Jesuits and protestants is a solid measure of the religious milieu of the time, and the images which make commonsense beliefs on protestants' side a perception. In writing an idyllic adventure of Scoggin outside England, the author of the book launched a campaign against Jesuits' emerging clout and existing religious powers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

63) Stubbes, sig. B6.

64) Anon, *Howleglas* (London: W. Copland, 1555?); Anon, *Till Eulenspiegel* ([Antwerp] J. van Doesborch?, ca. 1510?).

65) Anon, *The Milner of Abington* (London: [J. Charlewood for] By Richard Jhones, [c.

1576]). Kirk Melnikoff's 'Richard Jones (fl. 1564–1613): Elizabethan Printer, Bookseller and Publisher', provides an extensive account of Jones' career (Kirk Melnikoff, 'Richard Jones [fl. 1564–1613]: Elizabethan Printer, Bookseller and Publisher', *Analytical & Enumerative Bibliography*, New Series, 12 [2001], 153–84). Jones's diverse dealing includes 'curious literature most of it of a popular character' (Plomer, *Dictionarie,* p. 159) and some plays of his contemporary. For a chronological list of Richard Jones' publication, see Kirk Melnikoff, 'Appendix: A Chronological Index of Extant Editions of Published and/or Printed by Jones', in 'Richard Jones', pp. 177–84.

66) Robert Burdet, *The Refuge of a Sinne* (London: Imprinted by [T. Colwell for] Richard Johnes [etc.], 1565. April 14).

67) John Partridge, *The End and Confession of John Felton* (London: Imprinted by Richard Johnes, and Thomas Colwell, [1570]).

68) Clement Robinson, *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* (London: Imprinted [by W. How] for Richard Jones, 1578); Richard Jones, *The Book of Honor and Arms* (London: Printed by [Thomas Orwin for] Richard Jhones [etc.], 1590).

69) Nicholas Breton, *A Bower of Delights* (London: Imprinted by Richard Jhones [etc.], 1591).

70) Nicholas Breton, *The Pilgrimage to Paradise* (Oxford: Printed, by Joseph Barnes [etc.], 1592), sig. [3].

71) Arthur Marotti, 'Chapter Four: Print and the Lyric', in *Manuscript, Print, and the English Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 209–90 (pp. 217–18).

72) In his preface to *Tamburlaine*, Jones writes 'I haue (purposely) omitted and left out some fond and friuolous Iestures, digressing (and in my poore opinion) far vnmeet for the matter'. Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, sig. A2. Melnikoff claims that Richard Tottel's *Songes and Sonnetes* motivated Jones to produce the poetry compilation. For full discussion, Kirk Melnikoff, 'Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones, Print Culture, and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature', *Studies in Philology*, 102 (2005), 184–209; for more extensive discussion on Jones's involvement in and contribution to the compiling and editing, see Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.56–62 (pp. 59–60), and

Marotti, pp. 209–90.

73)   Marcy North, 'Ignoto in the Age of Print: The Manipulation of Anonymity in Early
       Modern England', *Studies in Philology*, 91 (1994), 390–416 (p. 416).

74)   For full discussion, see my article, 'Tarlton in print: From myth to history'.