WILEY

Nicholas Breton reads Jane Anger

Author(s): A. Lynne Magnusson

Source: *Renaissance Studies*, SEPTEMBER 1993, Vol. 7, No. 3 (SEPTEMBER 1993), pp. 291-300

Published by: Wiley

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24411906

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

Wiley is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Renaissance Studies*

This content downloaded from 88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Renaissance Studies Vol. 7 No. 3

Nicholas Breton reads Jane Anger

A. LYNNE MAGNUSSON

In *Women and the English Renaissance*, Linda Woodbridge mentions two verbal parallels between *Jane Anger Her Protection for Women* (1589) – the first known book in English purporting to be written by a woman in defence of women – and Nicholas Breton's *The Praise of vertuous Ladies*.[1] With characteristic caution, she draws no conclusion about who copied whom. In this paper, I will show that the parallels are far more extensive than Woodbridge suggested. I will also try to argue that Breton copied Anger. If he did, we have a situation that reverses our usual expectation, when we consider women's few published writings in sixteenth-century England, about the direction of writerly obligation.[2] It is hard to get away from the commonplace that the women's writing is reactive, responsive to men's writing, even if we are able to find in some female-authored texts efforts to revise or to interrupt either specific male-authored texts or the dominant cultural discourses to which such texts give voice. Hence there is a special novelty and interest in making the argument that Nicholas Breton's writing is in fact a reading and rewriting of Jane Anger's. I will propose that Breton assimilates Anger's 'anger' and her alternative version of womanhood into an acceptable, thoroughly familiar and unthreatening 'Praise of vertuous Ladies', although I am aware that in doing so my specific argument can be regarded as an instance of the general and somewhat depressing argument that patriarchies and dominant cultures successfully contain subversive elements. But the case has never even been made that anyone paid any attention whatsoever to Jane Anger's *Protection* until very recently. So the main point that I hope to make is this: not only did Jane Anger articulate her anger and disseminate her critique of some male cultural norms in 1589, but somebody heard: somebody paid attention.

The first version of this essay was prepared for a seminar on 'Renaissance Women as Readers and Writers' at the 1990 Shakespeare Association of America. I am grateful to Margaret Ferguson and Ann Jones for their organization of the seminar and to Donald Foster and Paul Stevens for their helpful comments.

[1] Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance* (Urbana, Ill. and Chicago, 1984), 70. *Jane Anger her Protection for Women* (STC 644) is reprinted in *First Feminists: British Women Writers 1578–1799*, ed. Moira Ferguson (Bloomington, Ind., 1985), 58–73 and in *The Women's Sharp Revenge: Five Women's Pamphlets from the Renaissance*, ed. Simon Shepherd (London, 1985), 29–51. References to *The Praise of vertuous Ladies* and to the five discourses of *The Wil of Wit* are to Nicholas Breton, *The Works in Verse and Prose*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (1869; repr. Hildesheim, 1969), II, 1–63 (pagination irregular).

[2] For a useful list of works by women, 1521–1624, see Elaine V. Beilin, *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance* (Princeton, N.J., 1987), 335–8.

© *1993 The Society for Renaissance Studies, Oxford University Press*

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

I

The first step is to establish whether Breton could have read Anger before writing his work. *Jane Anger her Protection for Women. To defend them against the Scandalous Reportes of a late Surfeiting Lover*, for which there is no entry in the Stationers' Register, exists in a 1589 edition printed by Richard Jones and Thomas Orwin. Within the text, Anger mentions 'this year of 88' (C1^{v}). She also names the book against which she is chiefly reacting as 'Boke his surfeit in love' (sig. C2^{v}). While no copy of this work is known to exist now, *Boke his Surfeit in love. with a farewel to the folies of his own phantasie* was entered in the Stationers' Register to Thomas Orwin on 27 November 1588.[3] *Jane Anger her Protection* was, therefore, almost certainly composed between that date and 25 March 1588/9.

For Breton's *The Praise of vertuous Ladies*, neither the date of composition nor the date of first publication is certain. In 1597, 1599 and 1606,[4] Thomas Creede printed editions of *The Wil of Wit, Wits Will, or Wils Wit, chuse you whether. Containing five discourses.* In 1599[5] the five include a *Discourse Betwixt Wit and Will, The Authors Dreame of Strange Effects, A Discourse of a Scholler and a Souldier, The Miseries of Mavillia* and *The Praise of Vertuous Ladies and Gentlewomen*, and this compilation is rounded out by 'A Dialogue betweene Anger and Patience', 'A Phisitions Letter' and 'A Farewell'. Two pieces of evidence, however, suggest that *The Wil of Wit* was known and read much earlier. In the Stationers' Register for 7 September 1580, there is '[t]ollerated vnto' William Wright a 'booke intituled, *WILLIAM WITTE, wittes will, or willswitt Chuse you whether*', and under 14 March 1582, the Rev. Richard Madox recorded in his diary a social meeting with 'M^{r}. Brytten, once of Oriel Colledge, w^{ch} made wyts wyl'.[6] No copy of *The Wil of Wit* survives from the early 1580s; the next recorded trace of the work is again in the Stationers' Register on 20 October 1596, when '*Willes Witt* with ye miseries of Mavilla printed by Thomas Scarlet' are assigned from William Wright to Thomas Creede.[7] The question crucial to our discussion of how Breton's *Praise* relates to Anger's *Protection* is whether or not *The Wil of Wit* in its early incarnation included all five discourses. Could *The Praise of vertuous Ladies* have been written between 1589 and 1597? Could Breton have copied from Anger?

In arguing that he could, we can first observe the independence of *The Praise of vertuous Ladies* in the physical make-up of the existing editions.

[3] *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640*, ed. E. Arber (1875–94), II, 509. For some speculation about the nature of *Boke his Surfeit*, see my '*Jane Anger her Protection*, *Boke his Surfeit*, and *The French Academie*', *Notes Quer*, 234 (1989), 311–14.

[4] The 1606 edition is said on the title-page to be the fifth printing of the work.

[5] No known copy of the 1597 edition contains all five.

[6] Arber, II, 377; Grosart, I, xx. For a thorough account of the Breton canon, see also Jean Robertson (ed.), *Nicholas Breton: Poems* (Liverpool, 1967), pp. xxxii–clv (esp. p. xli).

[7] Arber, III, 72.

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

In the 1599 and 1606 editions, *The Praise*, the fifth discourse in the loose compilation, has a separate title-page and its own running titles; signatures running from Aaa to Ccc3^{v} do not follow consecutively from the preceding discourses nor does pagination occurring in the first three discourses continue into *The Praise*.[8] The fact that most copies listed in the *STC* of the 1597 and 1606 editions are 'imperfect' or 'fragmentary' may add support to Grosart's conjecture 'that the several portions that form the complete work in 1599, were issued separately' (I.xxiv), or, at least, in configurations that depart from the compilation of 1599.[9] Given this loose make-up of *The Wil of Wit* as printed by Creede, why should we assume that the naming of *The Wil of Wit* in the Stationers' Register in 1580 or in Madox's diary entry of 1582 comprises reference to all five works?

If *The Praise of vertuous Ladies* lacks physical interdependence with the other works compiled with it in 1599, it also lacks intertextual connection. The mode of representation and the tone of the first and last works in the collection are completely unlike. The first two, the *Discourse Betwixt Wit and Will* and *The Authors Dreame*, are of a piece: both are peopled by allegorical characters who cross 'Desart[s] of Desire' or who aspire to come to Vertue's or to Fame's castle; both incorporate choplogic debate and favour paradoxical resolutions (Will and Wit find they need one another). This allegorical bent Breton also displays in his poetic work of the early period – for example, *A Floorish upon Fancie* (1582). The writer describes his work as 'witty': the tedious wit of the two pieces consists in inventive variations, often deploying paradoxes, on such themes as 'Care [is] so comfortable' (p. 13). There seems a youthful earnestness about the works, as with the author's promise at the end of the *Dreame* that he will 'attempt some such enterprise . . . as may . . . purchase mee entertainment of Fame', though 'for a young man it is hard' (p. 19). It is difficult to imagine the young writer easily switching voice and tone to write the opening letters of *The Praise*:

> Gentlemen and others, to whose view shal come this wonderful peece of work of the Praise of Women, considering how little cause of com-

[8] Based on observation of the copies on University Microfilms International of *STC* 3706 (BM copy) and 3707 (HN copy). The relation of *The Miseries of Mavillia* to the first three discourses is equally problematic. The case is complicated still further by the assertion in the Stationers' Register that Creede entered for his copy in 1596 '*Willes Witt* with *ye miseries of Mavilla* printed by Thomas Scarlet'. Did Scarlet print the latter work only, two of the five discourses composing *The Wil of Wit* in 1599, or all five? R. B. McKerrow describes Scarlet as 'a printer and bookseller in London, 1590–6', who 'appears to have been an unruly member of the Company [of Stationers]' and who 'surrendered some of his copyrights to Thomas Creede' in August 1596 (*A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland*, London, 1968, 236). Can we then assume that Scarlet printed the work between 1590 and 1596? For William Wright or despite Wright's entry of 1580? Adding extra discourses (*The Praise? The Miseries of Mavillia?*) to the work Wright had entered, or without additions?

[9] The 1597 Huntington copy (on microfilm) lacks *The Miseries of Mavillia*. Nellie Elizabeth Monroe, 'Nicholas Breton as a pamphleteer', unpubl. thesis (University of Pennsylvania, 1929), 87, claims that the 1606 version she lists contains only the *Will of Wit* and the *Authors Dream*.

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

> mendation is found in a number of them; I beseech you . . . to take in good part what you think I have written against my conscience.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Ladies and Gentlewomen . . .: I have (in your commendations) said as much as I hope you will deserve: and more then I thinke hath beene said for you this great while. (p. 55)

The voice throughout the essay is self-assured, and the tone of playful irony is consistent. From the first two discourses of *The Wil of Wit*, one could not easily predict their author's readiness to produce the fairly sophisticated wit of *The Praise*.

Breton's *Praise* is purportedly a response to other writings. Yet no one seems to have asked whether or not we can identify 'the discourteous discourses of certaine malicious persons, written against Women', which the title-page announces the work to be 'An Invective against'. Surveys of the Elizabethan writings that make up a recurring controversy over women provide few leads to identify 'discourteous discourses' circulated in the 1570s, with the possible exception of 'A Cooling Carde for Philautus and all Fond Lovers', which Lyly appends to *Euphues* (1578).[10] It may be that Breton's more specific characterization of the works against women at the opening of *The Praise* provides clues to their identification:

> When I peruse and consider of the strange discourses of divers fantasticall fellowes, that have no grace but in disgracing of women, in invectives against them, in most despiteful description of their dissimulations, in such shamefull setting out of their sexe; whereby for a few mad-headed wenches, they seek to bring all, yea, most modest matrons, and almost all women in contempt: surely, meethinks, I can terme them by no name fitter for their folly then madde men, that faine would bee authors of somewhat, and knowing not what to take in hand, runne headlong into such absurdities as redounde to their utter dishonor. (p. 56)

The discourteous discourse that best fits this description of those familiar from 1570 to 1597 is Thomas Nashe's *The Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589).[11] It is not only because it disgraces women, inveighs against their dissimulations and professes to hold 'all women in contempt' that *The Anatomie* fits best. In this bizarre and pompous work of a new writer, portentously announced as forthcoming in his 'Preface to R. Greene's

[10] See Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance*, 60–2. Such books seem to have been more popular in the 1560s, with C. Pyrrye's *The praise and Dispraise of Women, c.* 1569, presenting arguments on both sides (Woodbridge, 59–61). See also Louis B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1958), 470–3.

[11] On the summer of 1587 as a likely date of composition, see G. R. Hibbard, *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction* (London, 1962), 10. For rich discussions of the character and detail of the work, see the notes in Ronald B. McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe* (Oxford, 1966), IV, 1–41.

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Menaphon' (1589),[12] Nashe runs headlong into absurdities redounding to his dishonour precisely by writing a learned detraction of women (which he offers as a corrective to the wrong-headed praise of them by writers of romance) to establish his credentials as a serious author.

Although *Jane Anger her Protection* and Nashe's *Anatomie of Absurditie* were published in the same year, there is no evidence to suggest common sources or direct connection between them.[13] Still Anger's first and highly interesting charge against male writers is that they make slanderous portrayals of women out to be their inspired subject matter when their invention runs out:

> The desire that every man hath to shewe his true vaine in writing is unspeakable, . . . they run so into Rethorick, as often times they overrun the boundes of their own wits, and goe they knowe not whether. If they have stretched their invention so hard on a last, as it is at a stand, there remaines but one help, which is, to write of us women. (sig. B1)

Could it be that Jane Anger provided Nicholas Breton with the substance for a criticism of Nashe's *Anatomie*? Might Breton have written *The Praise* after 1589 with both Anger's and Nashe's works in mind? One should note that no works by Breton were printed between 1582 and 1590, years that it is usually assumed Breton spent abroad.[14] If he did indeed return to London about 1590, Anger's and Nashe's works may well have come readily to hand (and perhaps *Boke his Surfeit* as well).

II

The following parallels between *Jane Anger her Protection* and Breton's *Praise of vertuous Ladies* are not noted by Linda Woodbridge.

1 he beginneth and saieth that we allure their hearts to us: wherein he saieth more truly then he is aware off: for we woo them with our vertues, & they wed us with vanities, and men being of wit sufficient to consider of these vertues which are in us women, are ravished with that delight of those dainties, which allure & draw the sences of them to serve us, wherby they become ravenous haukes. (Anger, sigs. B2^{v}–B3)

> For consider right of the word, and the to is as well left out, as the worde falsely written; for indeede it ought to be written wooman, not woman, for that she dooth woo man with her vertues, who weddes her with vanitie. For man being of wit sufficient to consider of the vertues of a woman, is (as it were) ravished with the delight of those dainties,

[12] 'It may be, my *Anatomie of Absurdities* may acquaint you ere long with my skill in surgery, wherein the diseases of Art more merrily discouered may make our maimed Poets put together their blankes vnto the building of an Hospitall' (McKerrow, III, 324).

[13] McKerrow, IV, 2–3, holds this view, though he had not himself read *Jane Anger her Protection*.

[14] Robertson, p. xxiii.

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

which do (after a sort), draw the senses of man to serve them. (Breton, p. 58)

2 They confesse we are necessarie, but they would have us likewise evil. That they cannot want us I grant: yet evill I denie: except onely in the respect of man, who hating all good things, is onely desirous of that which is ill, through whose desire, in estimation of conceit we are made ill. But least some shuld snarle on me, barking out this reason: that *none is good but God, and therfore women are ill.* I must yeeld that in that respect we are il, & affirm that men are no better, seeing we are so necessarie unto them. It is most certain, that if we be il, they are worse: for *Malum malo additum efficit malum peius*: & they that use il worse then it shold be, are worse then the il. (Anger, sig. C1^{v})

But leaving this, some will say a woman is a necessarie evill. That shee is necessarie I graunt, but evill I denie; except it be meant onely in respect of man, that desireth not any thing that is good, and so his desire makes her ill in estimation of minde, for that she is the content of an ill conceit: but (indeed, well considered), he should finde that the ill were in his conceite onely, and not in the woman, who is no other substance then another himselfe. And if I must graunt, as I cannot choose, that there is none good but God: so indeed I must yeeld that woman is ill, and man no better; for if that woman be ill, how can man be good, unto whome ill is so necessarie? But whether may man bee thought worse then ill, that will use that ill worse then it should be? Therefore let man first mend his minde before he so discommend a substance of his owne naturall kinde. (Breton, p. 58)

3 Ther is no wisdome but it comes by grace, this is a principle, & *Contra principium non est disputandum*; but grace was first given to a woman, because to our lady: which premises conclude that women are wise. Now *Primum est optimum*, & therefore women are wiser then men. That we are more witty which comes by nature, it cannot better be proved, then . . . by our answers. (Anger, sig. C2)

Women have witte naturally; wisedome must be had by grace, grace was given to our Lady: then who wiser then a woman? (Breton, p. 58)

4 In woman is onely true *Fidelity*: (except in her) there is constancie, and without her no *Huswifery*. In the time of their sicknes we cannot be wanted, & when they are in health we for them are most necessary. They are comforted by our means. (Anger, sig. C1^{v})

It were but a follie to fill my booke with examples of this woman for constancie, and that for fidelitie, another for huswiferie, and the other woman for worthie wit. Let this suffice in breefe, there is in sicknesse no greater comfort, in health no better companion to a wise man, then a wittie woman. (Breton, p. 59)

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

5 It was my chance to hear a prety story of two wise men who (being cosen germane to that town of *Gotam*) prooved themselves as very asses, as they wer fooles: & it was this. The stelth of a ring out of a wise mans chamber, afflicted that loosers mind, with so grievous passions, as he could take no rest, til he went to aske a friends counsel, how he might recover his losse. . . . [S]eing how daungerously he was disturbed, . . . he [the friend] demanded that cause of that others griefe: who taking a stoole & cushion sate downe and declared that he was undon: through the losse of a ring which was stolen out of his window: further saying. Sir, is it not best for mee to goe to a Wise-woman to knowe of her what is become of my ring? The other answering affirmatively, asked this: if he knewe anye? betweene whome, many wise women reckoned, they both went together for company, wher we wil leave them. (Anger, sigs. C2–C2^{v})

Now for wise women, I thinke he should shew himselfe a verie unwise man that woulde wish for such a one. I remember a prettie speech once uttered by a verie wise man: when a man (as it seemed) not very wise came to him for his counsaile, what he might doo to come by a certaine jewell that was stollen from him out of his chamber, and (having told his losse) before he would heare of his advise: Sir (quoth he), were I not best to go to a wise woman? Yes, marry (quoth hee), if you knewe where any such were. Meaning that they were so hard to hit on, that it were but follie to seeke them. Now what pittie it is to see some men so unwise, to thinke such wisedome in any woman: after he had lost his jewell, if hee would have lookt into himselfe, and found his own follie, before hee had sought such wisedome in a woman, hee should have seene that it were more wisdome for a man to keepe that he hath warely, then unwisely to runne to a woman to seeke for wit how to finde it againe. (Breton, p. 59)

6 Sithence that they hope to finde that through the wisedome of a woman, which was lost by the folly of a man. Wel, seeing according to the old proverb: *The wit of a woman is a great matter*: let men learne to be wiser or account them selves fooles: for they know by practize that we are none. (Anger, sig. C2^{v})

let it suffice that it is wisedome for a man to take heede that a woman be not wiser then himselfe: and how wise so ever he bee, to count them no fooles. For in deede, as the common proverbe is, The wit of a woman is a great matter: and true, when a man with all his wisedome, is sometime to learn wit of her. (Breton, p. 59)

7 Hennes should be served first, which both lay the egs, & hatch the chickins: so it were unreasonable that the cockes which tread them, should be kept clean without meat. (Anger, sig. C4)

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Then let man consider the henne that hatcheth him, and would bee loath to have the cocke have all the meat from her. (Breton, p. 57)

8 & as many of them wil deserve wel, so most care not how il they speed so they may get our company. . . . And therefore thinke well of as many as you may, love them that you have cause, heare every thing that they say, (& affoord them noddes which make themselves noddies) but beleeve very little therof or nothing at all, and hate all those, who shall speake any thing in the dispraise or to the dishonor of our sex. (Anger, sigs. C4–C4^{v})

thinke well of as many as you may, love whome you have cause: hate none: whatsoever you thinke, say nothing in their dishonour, least you growe in their utter dislyking: and then your roome as good as your company. When you seeke for favour, take a flowte with you: I marvaile you can away so long with a womans companie, &c. (Breton, p. 60)

III

If we compare the parallel passages, we can glimpse a logic of reworking that favours the thesis that Breton copied Anger. Consider, for example, Breton's use in (1) above of the qualifying parentheses '(as it were)' and '(after a sort)': where Anger's expression is extreme, Breton tempers the same extreme assertions with self-conscious markers of their hyperbolic status. One can imagine the writer making these interpolations to tone down a source text consistently too forceful in its language to be simply appropriated word for word as a courtly compliment to 'vertuous Ladies'. Some clear patterns emerge where one text is more extended than another in its treatment of shared material. Where Breton's text is fuller, the amplification usually serves either to modify an extreme position or to clarify the logic of a position. In (2) above, we can see an example of the latter. Where Jane Anger makes the case that women's evil nature exists only 'in the respect of man, who hating all good things, is onely desirous of that which is ill, through whose desire, in estimation of conceit we are made ill', Nicholas Breton develops the notion of 'estimation of conceit' – both crabbed and prolix in its expression in Anger – more fully and more clearly. It may be ironic that Breton makes the point about how standard characterizations of women are merely projections of masculine needs and fears easily and clearly, while Anger struggles towards its expression. But it does not follow that Anger was copying from Breton: Breton's passion for spinning out arguments and paradoxes is evident from his many dialogues and 'discourses' and this simple clarification would probably come very easily to him. Where Jane Anger's text is fuller than Breton's, one can observe two notable features. First, we find greater specificity of reference in the Anger passages: for 'now-a-dayes

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

men be so phantasticall' in Breton (p. 58), we have 'in this yeare of 88, men are grown so fantastical' in Anger (sig. C1^{v});[15] and while the story of the foolish man whose ring was stolen is unlocated in Breton, we get in Anger a reference to 'that town of *Gotam*' (no. 5).[16] Second, Anger's passages conspicuously contain Latin tags not included in Breton. If Anger were slavishly copying out material from Breton, it seems unlikely that she would interpolate these bits of Latin into her borrowed text. But it is entirely plausible that Breton would remove out-of-date and obscure references, while modifying extreme positions not in keeping with his purpose and fortifying the logic and clarity of arguments.

IV

A brief characterization of the general differences between the two works is useful at this point. Jane Anger defends *all* women against the slanderous report of 'the surfeiter' and also against offenses she regards as done to women by 'all men in general'. Nicholas Breton extends his praise only to the virtuous ladies he represents as wrong[fully dishonour]ed by the discourteous usages of 'certaine malicious persons'. Anger's *Protection* I take to be a work of articulate anger, the earnest effort of its writer to employ the masculine medium of the printed book to voice real objections.[17] Breton's *Praise* is a piece of cavalier and graceful playfulness, its good-humoured irony always light enough in its touch to promote no offence, to voice instead a protective and paternalistic gallantry. Jane Anger protests against the fictional inventions men make of women, both the positive flatteries they deliver while they woo and the negative images they deliver when the wooing mood is past. Nicholas Breton represents his *Praise* as a pose others might think he has adopted 'against [his] conscience', which indeed he puts on to further 'the hope of good that I have to find by favor of some one' ('To the . . . Reader', p. 55), and he playfully anticipates charges of flattery. Anger challenges women to 'commit[] your protection . . . to the protection of your selves' (sig. A4). Breton's stance suggests that women need male protectors.

If Breton copied Anger, if her text is his invisible source, what is remarkable is how easily he takes over the words which Anger tried to give to her women readers to contemplate 'secretlye our selves with our selves' (sig. C1), words about themselves meant to replace the words of male authorities about their inferior status. Appropriating Anger's role of 'pro-

[15] In one of the parallels noted by Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance*, 70.

[16] On the proverbial foolishness of the men of Gotham, see McKerrow, IV, 10.

[17] In this view I differ from Woodbridge who argues in general that since writers of works in praise or dispraise of women are consciously manipulating a genre they keep a cool distance from their writings. In her specific comments about Anger she argues that to attribute sincere indignation to female writers in this genre and sophisticated playfulness to male writers 'is merely sexist' (*Women and the English Renaissance*, 65).

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

tector' for women, Breton easily turns the words about women's perfection back to the task such words had usually performed so well – the preservation of male priority and place. Indeed, the words Anger wrote about 'the wonderfull vertues wherewith women are inriched' (sig. B2^{v}) lead an after-life beyond the Elizabethan reprintings of Breton's *Wil of Wit* in a Victorian reprint of *The Praise* as a separate work, [18] but in their after-speech they voice no challenge against standard masculine representations of the lesser sex.

Perhaps this casual appropriation of Anger's words to patronizing uses reflects the extent to which the words were never her own. Anger's book is impressive for many reasons: for finding its way into print at all; for articulating in a lively way her protests against the male monopoly over the printed word and against the female status as mere object of masculine discourse; and, not least of all, for deploying a rhetorical posture of revising, correcting, reinterpreting and interrupting the texts of her opponents.[19] Still, the *Protection* is a 'double-voiced' text in a pedestrian and literal way, and neither its reinterpretations and reversals of misogynist texts nor its adaptations of conventional versions of feminine perfection go any real distance towards providing alternative accounts of female selfhood or subjectivity. Anger accused men of inventing women, in their writing, out 'of nothing' (B1^{v}). But if her own words in praise of women did indeed find a graceful place in *The Praise of vertuous Ladies*, perhaps it is because she herself could invent women only out of their writing.

University of Waterloo, Canada

[18] Egerton Brydges, ed. (Lee Priory Press, 1815).

[19] I have discussed Anger's rhetorical strategies and argued that the *Protection* criticizes the rhetoric of Elizabethan romances in ' "His pen with my hande": Jane Anger's revisionary rhetoric', *Engl St Can*, 17 (1991), 269–81.

This content downloaded from
88.157.144.6 on Mon, 27 Sep 2021 22:05:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms