Fernando Pessoa.

BACON'S NOVA RESUSCITATIO

BACON'S

NOVA RESUSCITATIO

OR

The Unveiling of his Concealed Works and Travels

BY THE

REV. WALTER BEGLEY

DISCOVERER AND EDITOR OF MILTON'S NOVA SOLYMA
AUTHOR OF
'IS IT SHAKESPEARE?' 'BIBLIA CABALISTICA,' 'BIBLIA ANAGRAMMATICA,' ETC.

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. I.

LONDON
GAY AND BIRD
22 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND
1905

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

BACON'S RESUSCITATIO

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: THE LONG-EXISTING MYSTERY OF GEORGE PUTTENHAM'S 'ARTE OF ENGLISH POESIE'

GEORGE PUTTENHAM'S 'Arte of English Poesie' is one of the most celebrated treatises on poetry that have been handed down to us from Elizabethan times. It is in many respects superior to the other books on the same subject by Sir Philip Sidney, Webbe, and other contemporaries. 'In this work,' says Hallam, who was a competent judge, 'we find an approach to the higher province of philosophical criticism.'

But critics have found the greatest difficulty in settling the point of authorship; for the book was published anonymously in 1589, and the printer, Richard Field, confessed that he was ignorant of the author's name, when he dedicated it to Lord Burghley. From internal evidence, the author

Cf. "Ben Jonson's Conversations with Drummond": ..." The old book that goes about, The Art of English Poesie, was done 20 years since and kept long in wright as a secret." (iii. 487). But this was said in 1619. Is 30 and not 20 meant? Or is the reference to another book? Campion's, for instance, which was pub. in 1602 and also pr. by R. Field.

clearly intended it at one time to be dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and no reason is given why Lord Burghley took the Queen's place. Whatever the secret was, it was extremely well kept, and Sir John Harington, only two years after its first appearance, was unable to ascertain who had written it. A little later on, in 1605, Camden in his 'Remaines concerning Britaine,' refers to the work, but apparently could not or would not name the author, for he speaks of him as 'the gentleman which proved that Poets were the first Politicians, the first Philosophers, and the first Historiographers.' One of the two earliest references to a name for the author is by Bolton in his 'Hypercritica' (*circa* 1620, though not published till 1722). He simply mentions the name of Puttenham as the *reported* author, 'as the fame is,' he says. But he gives no Christian name, and no other information except that he was one of the Queen's Gentlemen Pensioners. Bolton's evidence is not free from suspicion, as I have shown elsewhere that he seems to have known certain literary secrets, and so might have an object in throwing people off the right scent.

The only other mention of this Puttenham without a Christian name is in 1614, in the second edition of Camden's 'Remaines,' where a certain

Richard Carew of St. Anthony, writing a paper 'On the Excellencie of the English Tongue,' speaks of Sir Philip Sydney and Maister Puttenham and Maister Stanihurst as good versifiers. Thus, the contemporary *external* evidence is very weak, and what makes it still less convincing is that no Puttenham can be found in the lists of the Queen's Pensioners, as preserved in the records.

We consequently have to turn for help to the *internal* evidence, and what we can gather concerning the author from any autobiographical allusions we may be able to find. There are many, as it happens, but all very puzzling. First, it is known that there were two brothers, Richard and George Puttenham, who were nephews of Sir Thomas Elyot, the famous author of 'The Governour,' and our book in question has generally been attributed to George Puttenham, the younger brother, whose will was proved in 1590. But, as far as has been made out by careful inquiries, this George never left England, and therefore the many accounts in 'The Arte of Poesie' of the author's travels far and wide on the Continent quite exclude George Puttenham. Richard therefore has to be tried, and, as he was the heir of his uncle Elyot, he might well have gone with his suite when his uncle went as

Ambassador to the Courts of Germany and elsewhere, and thus this internal evidence of the author's frequent Continental travels might suit Richard, who was known to have been many years away from England, in a kind of exile, on account of gross crimes and misdemeanours. But, again, the author says his own age was just 'eighteene' when he wrote his eclogue to 'King Edward VI.' But, according to clear documentary evidence, Richard Puttenham was then much nearer twenty-six.

This seems to exclude Richard, and indeed his whole character, and what we know of his relations to his friends and acquaintances, all would tend to put him aside as an unlikely and unfit person to write such a philosophical and methodical work as 'The Arte of English Poesie.'

In fact, there is much stronger evidence against the Puttenhams as authors than in their favour. For instance, the author says he was an Oxford man, but there is no record on the University books suiting the claim or names of George or Richard Puttenham. Again, the Puttenhams were not likely to tell Field to dedicate the book to Lord Burghley, for they were at enmity with him and his party, whereas at that time (1589) there was no one that Bacon looked up to for

advancement so much as to Burghley; and the mention of Sir John Throgmorton as a 'deere friend,' although *primâ facie* it tells in favour of the Puttenham authorship, is rather discounted by papers in the Government Archives (*cf.* Elizabeth, Domestic Series, State Papers), which show that there were continuous and bitter family disputes in which Sir John was implicated. Moreover, there was a young Throgmorton who went over to France with Francis Bacon in Sir Amyas Paulet's train, but to what branch of the family he belonged I know not.

But let us hear the little that is known about these Puttenhams. Richard Puttenham, Sir Thomas Elyot's nephew and heir, was twenty-six years old in 1546, when his uncle died. He had an only brother George, and a sister Margery, who married Sir John Throckmorton of Feckenham in Worcestershire. Both brothers married rich wives, and both alike were in frequent litigation about family matters, and got into other troubles as well, so their life was not very peaceful. George has been generally credited with the authorship of 'The Arte of English Poesie,' but his claim is very weak. As we have seen, two contemporary writers gave the authorship to Maister Puttenham, but one merely on

Note.

hearsay evidence or common report. Ames, who wrote in 1749, gave the author's name as Webster Puttenham, and Ritson in his 'Bibliographia Poetica,' follows his lead. Then we have Steevens, who called him George from a manuscript (as he termed it) of Nicolson, of which no one seems to know anything. Then the bibliophile Dr. Lort put a manuscript note in his copy sanctioning the name of Webster Puttenham, and presently Mr. Haslewood gave the public a sumptuous quarto reprint, entitled 'The Arte of English Poesie, by Webster, alias George Puttenham.' Then a little later on Mr. Haslewood affirmed unhesitatingly that 'the Christian name was certainly George.' What led him to say this was that he had found a will of a George Puttenham, dated September 1, 1590, and also a manuscript in the Harleian Collection written by George Puttenham as an apology for Queen Elizabeth's conduct in her treatment of Mary, Queen of Scots.

Ex.

Such reasons have been justly called 'flimsy' by Croft, in his 'Life of Elyot' (vol. i., p. clxxxiii), who thinks that Richard was the author, but admits that several circumstances are hard to explain, as, for instance, the fact that the list of the Gentlemen Pensioners of Queen Elizabeth contains no Puttenham; and the author, speaking of foreign

courtiers, says that he had 'very well observed their manner of life and conversation,' but adds immediately that, with regard to those of his own country, he had not had so much experience, which is much against his being a Gentleman Pensioner.

Both the brothers Puttenham are frequently referred to in the Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series), and can easily be found by consulting the index of the different years of the Queen's reign. They seem to have been very litigious, self-willed men.

To add to the other curious coincidences of this inquiry, there is the great similarity of sound between the names Puttenham and Bodenham. We have Master Puttenham and Master Bodenham, and Christian names George and John, and by a curious coincidence we have also a contemporary John Puttanemico, who is a prominent character in the well-known 'Gesta Grayorum' that Spedding made public property. Puttanemico is clearly a pseudonym which someone used to conceal his identity in 1594, which is a date just about midway between the Puttenham of 1589 and the Bodenham of 1598-1600.

Here indeed is a tangled skein of unknown authors to unravel! I think I ought to state

at once that I should not have attempted to meddle with such literary complications unless I felt sure that I had a clue that would lead me where I could see better how to disentangle and put in order the mingled threads of this almost untouched Elizabethan skein. It was the early and 'concealed' literary ability of Francis Bacon which gave me the clue. That most wonderful and illustrious genius was, after all, not idle in those years of his early life, of which the indefatigable Spedding could give us only so meagre an account. It was not likely that a young man of such intellectual promise and with such manifold advantages of birth and training would be idle. But Spedding, who spent a life-time in gathering together all the written productions of his great countrymen, could not fill up the early years at Gray's Inn, or even earlier in France. Spedding could give no written work to Bacon till he was approaching his thirty-fourth or thirty-fifth year, and then nothing very important, nothing more than some sound political advice in letters and pamphlets.

How had Bacon been exercising that wonderful brain of his for the last fourteen or fifteen years? Did he sit in his chair at Gray's Inn, with his head supported by his arm, deeply musing, as he

appears sculptured on his memorial tomb at St. Michael's? Did he sit there thinking and thinking, but putting hand to paper never? Surely not. He was working hard and persistently all through these fifteen years and many later ones, but it was somewhat like a mole's continuous work—that is to say, underground and hidden from the eyes of men. It is only now we are beginning to uncover that which Bacon so carefully concealed from his own generation, but left to future ones.

It is my great wish to do what I can, with my limited knowledge of Elizabethan literature, to help in the work of apportioning to that man, whose intellectual ability and wonderful genius simply astound me, the early works and the proper merit due to his name. We know how pathetically in his will he left his 'name and memory to men's charitable speeches and the next ages.'

Nearly three centuries have passed, and I believe it is reserved to our present century to place the intellect and genius of Bacon in its truer and fuller light. His character, too, shall be vindicated from such traducers as Macaulay and Pope, and from such repeaters of scandal as D'Ewes and Wilson and the Puritan Malignants

generally. But I will say no more of such things now, and I only refer to them here because I do not wish to leave my readers any longer doubtful of the ultimate result and object of my studies concerning Puttenham and Bodenham.

I claim to have brought forward in the following pages a large mass of material, much of which is new, tending to show that young Francis Bacon was in those earlier years, of which Spedding knew so little, busily engaged both in poetical criticism and in philosophical speculations concerning poetry—an education and preparation for his own vast schemes for the common good.

Let us resume, then, by getting rid of John Puttanemico as soon as we can (for he is only a subsidiary character in this exposition), and proceed at once to the main evidence. All that is known of Puttanemico will be found in the third volume of Nichols' well-known work, 'The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth,' which contains the 'Gesta Grayorum' of 1594, where Bacon took such a prominent part, though he was careful to keep his name well out of the proceedings. At p. 302 there is a fictitious and facetious letter 'from sea, directed to the Lord Admiral,' which was read, with other similarly concocted letters, as part of the proceedings and fun of the enter-

tainment. This letter is signed 'John Puttanemico, from the Harbour of Bridewell, the 10th of January, 1594.' These letters were read at the latter end of the period taken up by the festivities at Gray's Inn, which extended from before Christmas till Twelfth Night, though not, of course, continuously. The next *grand night* after Bacon's speeches was Twelfth Night, 'at which time the wonted honourable company of Lords, Ladies and Knights were as at other times assembled.' The Knights of the Helmet were there, and there was 'much pleasant musick' and 'a very stately mask,' and they 'danced a new devised measure,' the Knights choosing their ladies and gentlewomen, and 'danced with them their galliards.' And there was much courtly ceremony.

I think that Francis Bacon would not miss such a pleasant opportunity of showing to advantage before the ladies, and my own opinion is that he was there, and helped to entertain the company, although not in his own name, of course. I think him a likely personage to have written the high-flown and facetious letters wherewith the company were entertained. Bacon was at his best when writing a letter for somebody else or from somebody else, and I should take John Puttanemico's

H. B.

letter certainly, and perhaps some of the others, as having come from his fertile imagination.

There seems to be a semi-concealed vein of indecent *double entente* in this letter of John Puttanemico. I am reminded of the sonnets several times, and also of certain allusive passages in the plays, which were, it seems, not too broad for the Court ladies and gentlemen of Elizabethan times, but would have been scouted in more recent days.

Note this.

Spedding seems to think that Bacon had nothing to do with these letters: he cannot trace 'Bacon's hand.' Well, we think *now* that Spedding has failed to trace Bacon's hand in a good many important passages where it certainly was latent, and therefore he may be of the wrong opinion here.

If this letter of Puttanemico's is really Bacon's, it is a strong additional link to the chain which seems to connect Bacon with the author of 'The Arte of English Poesie' and its supposed author, Puttenham by name.

Another curious point is that the only work we possess signed by George Puttenham is just the kind of work that Bacon laid himself out to execute for his Queen and country. George Puttenham's *acknowledged* work remains in manu-

script, and is a defence of Queen Elizabeth's action in the beheading of Mary, Queen of Scots. We know Bacon's opinion on this much-debated question of State policy, and it quite tallies with what Puttenham writes. There is also a strong legal flavour in the arguments adduced, although the author endeavours to make out that he avoids all legal subtleties and gives plain reasons. Also, as we shall see presently, Bacon was just the man for this kind of work : he was used to it, skilful in the execution of the literary part, and counted upon for such matters by those in authority.

What George Puttenham wrote was this : 'An apologie or true defense of her Majestie's honor and good name against all such as have unduelie sought or shall seek to blemish the same . . . in any parte of her Majestie's proceedings against the late Scotish Queene. . . . By very firme reasons, authorities and examples proving that her Majestie hath done nothing in the said action against the rules of honor or armes, or otherwise, not warrantable by the law of God and of man.

'Written by George Puttenham to the service of her Majestie, and for the large satisfaction of all . . . who by ignorance of the case, or partiallitie of mind shall happen to be so irresolute and not well satisfyed in the said cause.'

This manuscript consists of sixty-nine folios, written in a good and legible hand (possibly a scrivener's), and it has the principal paragraphs summarized in the margin. The author says nothing, of any service to us, about his own personal history. He deals mainly with common-sense arguments and with reasonings adapted for the comprehension and satisfaction of the ordinary citizen. He states towards the end that he has purposely avoided 'farcing it full of texts and authorities of lawes, matters onely known and interpretable by judges, advocates and pleaders, but rather by veritable examples for the satisfaction of the unlearned, and by sure plaine and necessary demonstratione in reason, which no man of good sense will deny.' But nevertheless, as aforesaid, there is a strong flavour of 'counsels' arguments' throughout.

To sum up the case for the Puttenhams, it seems as if George could not possibly be responsible for 'The Arte of English Poesie,' and that Richard had few, if any, important points of evidence in his favour.

George Puttenham's (or Bacon's) apology for the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, will be referred to again presently.

CHAPTER II

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR FRANCIS BACON

Now we must come to Francis Bacon, and see what evidence there is for *his* authorship of this, the most important piece of literary criticism in the whole Elizabethan period. External evidence for Bacon is absolutely nil, for I believe I am the first to suggest Bacon as even a *possible* author, after more than 300 years have elapsed. I hope it will be noticed that I say *possible* author; for there are Baconians who seem firmly to believe that Bacon wrote nearly all the literature of the period that was worth writing. I have not enlisted into their battalion, nor do I intend to do so. But I claim the right to make a suggestion if I am able to bring up reasonable proofs that my suggestion is not absolutely impossible or out of court altogether. I will therefore now go through some of the facts that seem to point to Bacon, and my references will be to the well-printed quarto

of 1811, edited by Mr. Haslewood, which is paged in accordance with the original edition of 1589.

1. The book is printed by Richard Field, who a few years later printed 'Venus and Adonis.'

2. The book is anonymous, and the printer speaks for it in an address to Lord Burleigh. This, I need hardly say, is quite in Bacon's manner.

3. The author is plainly a man of good birth and Court connections, who takes the highest interest in poetry, is a critic of a high philosophical kind, and by no means a bad poet himself. Having Sir Thomas Bodley's evidence that Francis Bacon wasted considerable time in his youth over poetry and 'toys' of invention, Bacon does not seem an unlikely person to make this valuable exposition of the 'arte' he was devoted to.

4. The work is extremely 'methodical' and well arranged. Bacon was most methodical, and was fond of illustrating his arguments by short tales and instances derived from his extensive reading and retentive memory. This book is interspersed with many examples of this very kind. What is more, many of the tales and incidents have reference to French Court gossip, just such as Bacon would have been likely to hear when he was in attendance on Sir Amyas Paulet in France between 1576 and 1579.

There is not space to quote these many instances at length, nor yet many other suggestive passages, but I will briefly note down the pages of the book in order where these things can be referred to more fully.

The Printer's Dedication. To begin with, this printer's dedication seems to be written, not by Field, but by the author of 'Partheniades,' for the word *scypher* is used in the dedication and in the last poem of 'Partheniades' in a very unusual sense, and the inference is that both were written by the same man. But Field did not write the 'Partheniades,' therefore Field probably did not write the dedication, but had it supplied to him. Thus we are met with a Baconian device at the very vestibule.

P. 7 [26]*: Here is a reference to 'marchants and travellers . . . affirming that the American, the Perusine and the very Canniball do sing, and also say, their highest and holiest matters in certaine riming versicles.' Now, Bacon's interest in the New World is well known, and he mentions Peru several times in his authenticated works.

P. 12 [31]: Here is one of the allusions to Alexander the Great, so frequently indulged in by Puttenham. He mentions the great value

* The pages in Arber's reprint are given in brackets.

Alexander put upon the poems of Homer, 'insomuch that every night they were layd under his pillow, and by day were carried in the rich jewell cofer of Darius lately before vanquished by him in battaile.'

Now, Bacon, just like Puttenham, is constantly bringing in Alexander the Great. He was with Bacon a special model or 'pattern' man. His love for Homer, his advantage in having such a tutor as Aristotle, his wondrous conquest of the world, and his wise remarks, are constantly alluded to in Bacon's writings. Julius Cæsar was another of Bacon's 'model' men, but Alexander was the chief one, and it has been thought that Bacon carried his emulation so far as to think sometimes, that as Alexander the Great conquered the material world, so he, Bacon, might perhaps conquer all the provinces of the intellectual world. But the parallel between Bacon and Puttenham here on p. 12 is much closer than a general one drawn from the mention of Alexander the Great, for it is the jewel-coffer of Darius which is specially referred to by Puttenham, and the mention of that is not usual or common.

But Bacon mentions it particularly in the 'Advancement of Learning' as 'that precious cabinet of Darius, which was found among his

jewels.' And we also have it mentioned again in the following lines :

'A statelier pyramis to her I'll rear,
Than Rhodope's or Memphis' ever was:
In memory of her when she is dead,
Her ashes in an urn more precious
Than the rich-jewel'd coffer of Darius,
Transported shall be at high festivals
Before the kings and queens of France.'

1 *Henry VI.*, I. vi. 21.

Here we have Puttenham, Bacon, and the author of that 'doubtful play' '1 Henry VI.,' all making the same allusion to a coffer. But of course the orthodox critics will say: 'There is nothing in this; there was doubtless an earlier common source from which they all borrowed. It no more shows that Puttenham, Bacon, and the author of "1 Henry VI.," were all one man, than the fact of three history papers sent in by different schoolboys, being all virtually alike, would show they were all written by one boy.' This is a fine specimen of the junior pressman's argument, which is so convincing to the general public. But schoolboys at an examination have learnt out of the same manuals, and are very likely to give identical wording to their answers, while it is not every writer who has got

Alexander on the brain, and 'Darius his coffer' as well.

At p. 14 [34] we are told that the poet's phantasie may be 'so passing cleare, that by it as by a glasse or mirrour, are represented unto the soule all maner of bewtifull visions.' And this is a thoroughly Baconian idea, as all who are acquainted with Bacon's philosophic views will, I think, admit without any demur.

Pp. 16, 17 [37]: Here Puttenham complains that 'notable Gentlemen in the Court' have seemed to think it 'a discredit for a Gentleman to seeme learned, and to shew himself amorous of any good Art.' He adds: 'In other ages it was not so, for we read that Kinges and Princes have written great volumes and publisht them under their owne regall titles, as to begin with Salomon the wisest of Kings, Julius Cæsar the greatest of Emperors, Hermes Trismegistus the holiest of Priestes and Prophetes. . . .' Puttenham cites many more, and among them one lady, 'Lady Margaret of Fraunce Queene of Navarre in our time.'

Now, Bacon was very fond of getting consolation to himself by heaping up examples of great men of former times, with whom he could suffer or rejoice in a common fellowship. This fact, taken

in conjunction with the mention of Salomon, Julius Cæsar, Hermes Trismegistus, and Lady Margaret of Navarre, is much stronger evidence in favour of Bacon being Puttenham than may occur to a general reader at first glance. These two pages deserve well pondering; and as for Bacon's love for heaping up lists of men for consolation to himself, see specially Dr. Theobald's fifth chapter, in his 'Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light.'

If anyone by chance should ask me what Elizabethan writer would be most likely to mention in succession Salomon, Julius Cæsar, Hermes Trismegistus among men, and then Lady Margaret of Navarre among women, I should certainly lose no time in hesitation, but say at once, 'Bacon is the man.' For Hermes, see Ded. to Adv. 3.

Pp. 22, 23 [41-45]: Here we have two whole pages taken up with remarks about heathen mythology, which are singularly consonant with Bacon's views in his well-known 'De Sapientiâ veterum.' Moreover, Puttenham ends by referring to 'our bookes of Ierotekni,' where the matter is treated 'more at large.' The 'bookes of Ierotekni,' unfortunately, are not extant. What if the manuscripts containing them furnished Bacon with what he wished the world to know in his 'De Sapientiâ

veterum,' and were, in fact, his first sketch of the subject?

P. 37 [61]: The author refers to 'our Triumphals, written in honour of her Majesty's long peace. Now Bacon was a fine arranger and composer of such courtly pieces.

Pp. 37-39 [61-64], chap. xxiv.: The whole of this chapter is written in a style very similar to that used in Bacon's 'Essays.'

P. 49 [76]: 'He wrate' is used for 'He wrote.' This occurs several times in Puttenham's book. I thought at first it was a strong point in favour of the older man and against Bacon. For 'I wrate' is an archaic usage. But I found from Spedding that Bacon also uses it in his letters.

P. 69 [96]: Here are some excellent remarks on the common Elizabethan street-singers and blind harpers that used to attract boys and country fellows by getting up 'upon benches and barrels heads' and singing their popular stories of old time. Puttenham gives them the name of *Cantabanqui*, and adds some of their romantic and historical themes. For instances he gives 'the tale of Sir Topas, the reportes of Beuis of Southampton, Guy of Warwicke, Adam Bell, and Clymme of the Clough. According to the recent work by Anders on 'Shakespeare's Books,'

pp. 160-162, Shakespeare was well acquainted with these popular tales, and passages are quoted from 'Twelfth Night,' 'King Lear,' 'Henry VIII.,' and '2 Henry VI.,' to show that Shakespeare knew well Sir Bevis of Southampton, Sir Guy of Warwick, and Sir Topas. I do not infer from this that Puttenham and Shakespeare are one, but only this, that Puttenham as well as the author of the Shakespeare plays was acquainted with these heroes of popular minstrels. This goes towards the balance on my side, whereas if it could be shown that Puttenham knew nothing about these popular heroes, it certainly would weigh against his authorship of the 'Arte of Poesie.'

P. 75 [104]: Here we have the strange account of the author 'being in Italie conversant with a certaine gentleman,' who told him all about the shaped verses of the Tartars, the Chinese and the Persians. This is certainly puzzling, for we know very little about Tartar literature even now, and perhaps the author intended to puzzle us and throw us off the track after his identity. But if Bacon went to Italy (and it seems now that he did), he would hear more there about Tartar Cans and Eastern Poetry (at Venice especially) than either in England, Spain or France; for the

knowledge of Chams and Sultans in Elizabethan times was chiefly derived from Italian authors.

But an odd thought struck me about these curiously shaped verses which figure in several successive pages of Puttenham's book, and which he puts forth as of his own composing. I fancied that Nash had referred to Gabriel Harvey as a writer of shaped verses, and I found it was so. Now, Bacon and Gabriel Harvey were contemporaries at Cambridge, and there is every reason to infer that young Bacon would know about Harvey and his doings, Harvey being somewhat of an academic luminary at that time, and given to both Italian literature and discussions on English poetry. So I think it quite possible that Puttenham or Bacon had these shaped verses brought to his notice originally by Harvey. Such verses were by no means common, and were only written as an academic *tour de force*, or in congratulations on weddings and such-like. Cambridge could, however, boast of others besides Harvey. There was Willes the traveller, who printed some as early as 1575. Harvey mentions him, and probably knew him personally. He was a Fellow of Peterhouse, once Professor at Perugia.

P. 115 [151]: A chapter about ornaments for public speeches. Now, Spedding found in 1848 a

private memorandum by Bacon in his 'Commentarius solutus' to this effect :—

'To forward my L. of S. with ornaments for publike speaches.' L. of S. means Lord of Suffolk, as Spedding supposed.

Pp. 116, 117 [152] : Here are long and interesting notices of Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, the father of Francis. These notices betoken very private intercourse with Sir Nicholas in his gallery *alone and at home.*

Succeeding remarks show the author to be well acquainted with the inside of law-courts, and, what is much more to the proving of my contention, it appears that the author was a lawyer and pleader himself. His words are :—

'I will tell you what hapned on a time myselfe being present when certain Doctours of the Civil Law were heard in a litigious cause betwixt a man and his wife ; before a great Magistrat who (as they can tell that knew him) was a man very well learned and graue but somewhat sowre, and of no plausible utterance : the gentleman's chaunce was to say : my Lord the simple woman is not so much to blame as her lewde abbettours, who by violent persuasions have led her into this wilfulnesse. Quoth the judge, what neede such eloquent termes in this place, the gentleman

replied, doth your Lordship mislike the terme, [*violent*] and me thinkes I speak it to great purpose; for I am sure she would never have done it, but by force of persuasion: and if persuasions were not very violent, to the minde of man it could not have wrought so strange an effect as we read that it did once in Egypt, and would have told the whole tale at large, if the Magistrate had not passed it over very pleasantly. Now to tell you the whole matter as the gentleman intended thus it was.'

Puttenham then tells the whole tale. But as he knew so well and so exactly what the gentleman *intended* to say, may we not give a shrewd guess that the author was the very gentleman who intended to tell the tale when pleading before the great magistrate? We may not infer *for certain* that this gentleman in question was a lawyer or professional advocate, but the form of the narrative would lead most people to think so; and if that inference be correct, Puttenham cannot be the author, for he was not a pleader or lawyer. But Bacon would suit the story very well, for he was fond of strange and unusual terms in his speeches, and dearly loved to bring in a tale or illustration from his well-filled budget. There is also another reference which lends addi-

tional force to the arguments for excluding Puttenham and admitting Bacon, and that occurs further on in the book (p. 190 [235]), when the author is referring to the 'manner of speach' a good orator should use, and mentions a 'figure' of speech 'much used by our English pleaders in the Star-Chamber and Chancery.' Now, in any case Puttenham would be little acquainted with such High Courts, even if it could be shown he was a litigious man; but Bacon would know them perfectly and their processes.

On p. 120 [160] and the following three pages we have much on the subject of language which is very Baconian; for especially does the author deal wth the admission of new and foreign words into the general vocabulary, and defends many which he admits he has introduced in the present treatise, it being a custom or fault of his which he is 'not unwilling to acknowledge.'

Now, there was hardly a greater word-coiner among the whole of the cultured Elizabethans than was Francis Bacon. Nash and Harvey might fabricate a greater number of ridiculous and bombastic words in the course of their literary combats, but these were mostly words never meant to be adopted into the language, whereas Bacon's word-coining was serious and persistent.

P. 133 [172]: Here two apparently new words are introduced advisedly into the English language. They are *absolutely* new according to Puttenham, for he says: 'I doubt not but some busie carpers will scorne at my new devised termes *auricular* and *sensable*.'

Now, Bacon was the greatest word-maker of the age, for Nash and Harvey chiefly made up bogus words to annoy each other, and are therefore out of the reckoning.

But these instances on p. 133 do not put the case strongly enough, for in other parts of his book Puttenham defends other new words, as *major-domo*, *idiom*, etc., and uses *moppe* in a new sense, as he admits, and, above all, that strange word *politien*, which soon dropped out.*

But *auricular* deserves a word or two more. If we examine that inestimable help, the 'New English Dictionary' we shall find there is no early use of the word in this particular way, except by Bacon (twice) and Harvey; and as Harvey's date for using it is 1579, he very likely got it from 'The English Poete,' which we know had been submitted to his criticism, so we can almost track the word directly to Bacon. We are also told

* I remember but one other instance, and that is in 'Sapho and Phao,' Bond's edition, ii. 378.

it came from the sixteenth-century French *auriculaire*.

But the ex-stable-boy from Stratford was not going to be beaten by Puttenham's learned words, nor yet by the philosophic Bacon's repetitions in his 'Advancement of Learning.' He, too, has it in his miraculous vocabulary, and in 'King Lear' (I. ii. 99) we have an 'auricular assurance.' What would John Bright have said to this? Ah! what *did* he say?

But great as both Puttenham and Bacon undoubtedly were as coiners of new words for our native tongue, there started up about this same time a young butcher, or at least a young Warwickshire bumpkin, whose father and mother could not write their own names—young William Shaksper or Shaxper of Stratford, I mean—and this young country lad, taken from school early, beat both Puttenham and Bacon hollow in the coining of new words, of which the 'New English Dictionary' of Dr. Murray gives us such splendid proof. 'According to Murray,' which is a good parallel phrase to 'according to Cocker,' Shaxper could give Bacon or Puttenham fifty, or even more, in the hundred, and beat them both easily. Does not this, as the French put it, 'give one furiously to think'?

P. 157 [198]: Here the author says: 'My mother had an old woman in her nurserie, who in the winter nightes would put vs forth many prety riddles.' Then an example is given of one of her riddles, of a decidedly indelicate nature. In fact, this nurse, and the nurse in Marlowe's 'Dido,' and the still more famous nurse in 'Romeo and Juliet,' strike one forcibly as being drawn by *one* hand from the same original. What if this was Bacon's nurse presented to the public on three different occasions by Domino Puttenham, Domino Marlowe, and Domino Shakespeare? Oh, tell it not except in Hanwell, publish it not except in the corridors of Colney Hatch! But are any other old nurses quite like these three?*

---

* As to the remarkable loose-talking 'Wanton Nurse' of 'Romeo and Juliet,' a Harvard Professor of English Literature (B. Wendell's 'Shakespeare,' 1895, p. 118) tries to make out that she was not an original conception drawn out by Shakespeare, but was taken from Arthur Brooke's earlier English version of the story of Romeo and Juliet. His reason is that Brooke has an account, not in the French or Italian originals, of the Nurse's chastisement of little Juliet in the nursery, from which he draws the inference that Shakespeare's Wanton and indelicate Nurse came from Brooke. But what Brooke says the Nurse did to Juliet was neither wanton nor indelicate; it was this:

P. 171 [214]: Here we have a translation from the Greek anthology of that very epigram which Bacon also translated freely in his best authenticated poem beginning, 'The world's a bubble.' It was Farnaby, the famous schoolmaster, who attributed this poem to Bacon as early as 1629, or about two years after its author's death, and Farnaby's authority is irreproachable, for he would be a most unlikely man to make such a statement without good grounds for its truth. Moreover, Farnaby was so interested in the poem that he translated the whole of it into Greek verse, and it was the only English poem admitted into his book.

A.B

So it looks as if Bacon tried his pupil pen on this pessimistic epigram at some date before 1589, and later on improved upon it, as was his wont. Even in its earlier form of 1589 it was an improvement upon another's work, for this very epigram had been translated from Greek into English between 1530 and 1550; so there is a

---

'A thousand times and more I laid her on my lappe,
'And clapt her on the buttocks soft, and kist where I did clap.'

But a perfectly modest nurse might do this, so the inference against originality falls to the ground.

very Baconian look about this translated epigram of the anonymous author of 'The Arte of English Poesie'—the only extract, too, from the Greek anthology in the whole volume.*

P. 175 [219]: The author says: 'When I was a scholler at Oxford they called every such one *Johannes ad oppositum*.'

Now, Bacon has jotted down a notice of *Jo. ad oppositum* in his 'Letter and Discourse to Sir Henry Savile.'†

Moreover, this Johannes was not a gentleman generally known in society, except by such as had gone through the University curriculum, and no record can be found of the Puttenhams at either University. But Bacon was well acquainted with the academical functions and ceremonies of *both* Universities.

Bacon was at Cambridge, not at Oxford.

P. 188 [233]: Here Puttenham quotes a famous 'ditty made by the noble knight, Sir Philip Sidney,' beginning:

'My true love hath my heart, and I have his.'

But the version here given by Puttenham differs from that which Sir Philip Sidney origin-

---

* Is it not a strange and rather suggestive coincidence that this solitary epigram should be the very one Bacon took to try his hand upon?

† *Cf.* Spedding, Works, vii. 101.

ally composed. F. T. Palgrave, in his remarks on this noted ditty, says that it had been altered by Sidney himself before it was quoted here.

How Palgrave discovered this I know not—possibly it is only his supposition; if so, I should prefer the much more likely supposition that Puttenham altered the words when he quoted them. This was a common and favourite device of Puttenham and Bodenham, and has been referred to before. If Puttenham really altered Sidney, it adds to the probability that Puttenham means Bacon.

P. 188 [232]: Here we have a pseudo-prophecy of Chaucer quoted, ending:

'Then shall the Realme of Albion
Be brought to great confusion.'

But according to Skeat (Chaucer, pp. 45, 46) and to Stowe's edition, 1561, the prophecy was worded:

'Then shall the *lond* of Albion.'

So it seems that Puttenham, following a practice peculiarly his own, has altered or improved upon the original line, and substituted 'Realme' for 'lond.'

This change would have no particular import if taken by itself, but when we find that the Fool in 'King Lear' (III. ii. 91) quotes the same line, and

also substitutes 'Realm' for 'lond,' just as Puttenham does, it certainly appears rather suggestive. Such little curios as this produce no effect on the orthodox ; they can easily pass it by, and simply say, 'Puttenham may be Shakespeare's source.'

P. 193 [238]: A good tale of 'Pawlet Lord Treasurer of England and first Marquis of Worcester.' Bacon was in the train of Sir Amyas Pawlet for some years in France.

Pp. 201-206 [247-254]: These pages contain by far the longest exposition in the whole book of 'Poeticall Ornament' (Lib. III.), and this third book comprises more than half of the whole treatise. So it is clear that the author, whoever he was, attached considerable importance to the subject of these pages. But what was the subject ? It was none other than that of 'Poetical Similitudes and Resemblances,' and these were the very subjects that Bacon plumed himself upon, as a man with a natural gift for the easy and appropriate use of such literary devices in a measure beyond that of other men.*

P. 206 [252]: Here is some advice given to Queen Elizabeth as to the best way to treat the Dutch. To begin with, 'advice to Queen Elizabeth' is rather Baconian, but what follows is much more

* *Cf.* 'Is it Shakespeare ?' p. 181.

so. For some copies have another paragraph here of a rather anti-Dutch character, which would seem to have been written *circa* 1585, and therefore before the Armada, at which period of time there was no wish to break up the long peace. In 1589, when the great Spanish Fleet had been sent back crippled and helpless, the feeling about the Dutch was very different, and had veered round from anti-Dutch to quite friendly relations with these enemies of Spain, who had also done some good indirect and also direct service to us in our contest with the Catholic Tyrant, as he was to them. These widely different paragraphs were written at an interval of some years, and the paragraph at p. 206 is the later in date, and was doubtless inserted instead of the other (without any alteration of paging, as the length of each was about the same) about 1589.

Now, all this advice to the Queen, and this revision later on, is extremely Baconian. About 1584 young Francis Bacon, then about twenty-three years old, had addressed to the Queen his wonderfully statesmanlike 'Letter of Advice to Queen Elizabeth,' and very shortly afterwards (*circa* 1585) we have, in Master Puttenham's work on poetry, where we should least expect such a thing, a piece of reasoned advice to the Queen

against alliance with the Dutch, and then, when the book is going to press, or when even some copies had been already issued, circumstances arose which induced the author to change or revise what he had before said, and to make a substitution in all such copies as had not been already distributed to the public.

Now, in this procedure of the supposed Master Puttenham, if we do not see from beginning to end Francis Bacon after his well-known manner, we are not, I'm afraid, sufficiently acquainted with his peculiar methods of literary work. What young man of twenty-three except Francis Bacon would dare or be competent to tender advice to the imperious Elizabeth on matters of high State policy? Who but Francis Bacon would tender advice, afterwards revise it to its very opposite for political reasons, and then insert it casually in a treatise on poetry written for the Queen and sent to her chief Minister, Burleigh?

P. 212 [260]: Puttenham has been complaining of a contemporary plagiarizing poet, and says: 'This man deserves to be endited of petty larceny for pilfering other men's devises from them, and converting them to his own use.' This reminds one of the answer Bacon gave to the Queen about

Sir John Hayward's book. He said Hayward was 'guilty of felony—from Tacitus.'

V. Bowles p. 869.

P. 217 [267]: The oracles of 'Delphos' are mentioned.

This is rather a gross classical blunder, or at least a great piece of carelessness, for 'Delphi' is the correct word.

Rather a gross blunder for Bacon!

The same mistake occurs in Shakespeare's 'Winter's Tale' three times, and also in John Lyly's (?) 'Midas.'

P. 231 [283]: Here begins a long chapter of 'Decencie in Behaviour,' or courtesy and good manners in society. One would not expect this in a work on poetry. But if Bacon wrote the book we are considering, the matter becomes much less surprising, for Bacon's 'courtesy' was one of his most striking and attractive qualities, as everyone will admit who has studied his life, letters and works. Bacon here and there in his writings mentions the value of this quality. It is also a distinct feature of the Shakespeare plays, which abound beyond measure in terms of courtesy. And, what is more, we see the original terms lying about loose in the 'Promus' of Francis Bacon, which was a kind of workshop from which his materials were drawn.

P. 232 [283, 284]: Here are two tales about

Alexander the Great, a hero in whom Bacon took much interest and often refers to. Moreover, these same tales appear *together*, and *follow in the same order* in Bodenham's 'Theatre of the Little World,' a work we shall see many reasons for attributing to Bacon. At p. 240 [293] we have another tale about Alexander.

P. 254 [309]: Here we find some good and sensible remarks about gardening. This was not every man's hobby, even if he always 'dwelt in country quarters'; but Bacon, though he lived so much in Gray's Inn and about town, made a great hobby of this art, and was a decided connoisseur, as witnesseth his 'Sylva Sylvarum.'

It is worth while to notice here that the greater part of the end of Puttenham's second book (pp. 85-113) [126-148] is taken up by comments on the scheme of applying classical metres and classical numerosity to modern English verse. Now, we should hardly expect this from an old man like Puttenham, who really belonged almost to the previous generation, whereas this discussion about classical measures was of comparatively recent date, and formed the chief topic of that Areopagus of English poets, where Sidney, Spenser, Fulke Greville, Sir E. Dyer, and Gabriel Harvey, were the leading spirits, and where

young Francis Bacon was no stranger or outsider, in my humble suspicion. But in any case, from what we *know* of Bacon's literary ability compared with Puttenham's doubtful productions and scant reputation, the former is the more likely critic of the new classical verse-method.

What a strange thing, too, that, in all this long discourse on English classical metres published in 1589, there is not the slightest reference to Sir Philip Sidney, Gabriel Harvey, Immerito, Drant, or anyone connected with the court of the English Areopagus—a court especially constituted for, and chiefly engaged in, dealing with this very matter of which this long discourse treats! There was nothing to prevent Puttenham from referring to these distinguished men, and giving extracts as well; for Harvey's letters and attempts had been in print nearly ten years. But we now know good reasons why Bacon should avoid such references.

CHAPTER III

THE CANCELLED PAGES AND BEN JONSON

And now we come to the consideration of the eight cancelled pages, preserved for us in the copy in the Grenville Library, bearing Ben Jonson's well-known autograph on the title-page, and undoubtedly once in his possession. These are pages 115-124 in Arber's reprint.

It has been said in certain book-catalogues that it was given to Ben Jonson by the author. Possibly it was, but surely not by George Puttenham, or his brother Richard either; for I think Ben would not have left such donors or such talent for his favourite 'Arte of Poesie' quite without notice or acknowledgment. But if Bacon was the concealed author, there might be many reasons why Jonson should not *name* him or refer to the book.

On careful examination, these cancelled pages seem to point to Bacon even more clearly than the substituted passage at p. 206 concerning the

Dutch which has been already considered. These eight pages deal mainly with devices and anagrams both much in vogue in France when Bacon was there, and also in courtly circles in England, but not till many years later on this side of the Channel. Indeed, for an untravelled Englishman (such as was George Puttenham) to make an anagram and put it in print at so early a date as 1589 is most unlikely. These devices are not what we hear of under the name of 'Devices for the Queen,' by Essex and other nobles, in some of which Bacon had the chief construction, as Spedding tells us. No; we are here treated to a discourse on allegorical designs or emblems, chiefly used for heraldic purposes, 'to be embrodered in scutchions of armes,' as the first cancelled page puts it. The Italians called them *Impresa*, and many books were written by Italians and others in those days, with numerous examples of the engraved designs and mottoes. Camden, in his 'Remaines concerning Britaine,' has a good chapter on them, and I have some reasons to believe that Bacon assisted Camden here, as we know he did in the 'Annals.'*

* There is no doubt that Francis Bacon and William Camden, the famous antiquary, were on friendly terms, and were, in a sense, co-workers on contemporary history.

But not only the *Impresa* and the anagrams of these cancelled pages recall Bacon : there is also a remarkable tale of 'a certaine base man of England being knowen even at that time a bricklayer or mason by his science,' who gave out for his crest the 'very device' of 'Atila, King of

---

That is to say, there is plain evidence, which Spedding gives fully, that Bacon had the privilege of reading the manuscript of Camden's 'Annals,' and of suggesting emendations and additions in various places of the text, which were afterwards embodied in the succeeding editions. From several rather hidden indications, we gather that Camden knew the secret of Bacon's poetic and dramatic authorship, and was careful to keep it hidden. In the first place, Camden's 'Remaines' were, for no reason that appears, published anonymously in 1605, with a prefatory address to Sir Richard Cotton, signed 'M. N.'; and when, in the special chapter on 'Poemes,' he mentions the principal recent poets, such as Spenser, Daniel, Jonson, etc., he altogether omits Marlowe; and in the second edition of these 'Remaines,' 1614, we have an additional chapter on 'The Excellencie of the English Tongue,' when we get the first mention by name of Master Puttenham, and the curious allusion *Shakespheare!* and *Barlowe's* fragment as being the modern representatives of Catullus. Then, again, at p. 176 of the first edition, 1605, there is an allusion to a learned friend who had made a device of Pallas' defensive shield with a Gorgon's head on it, and the motto *Nil malum cui Dea*, which is the anagram of William Camden. I suggest this friend was Bacon.

the Huns,' which was *Ferro et flamma.* Puttenham objects to this strongly, and declares that 'the heraldes ought to use great discretion in such matters,' and that so kingly a device was not 'accommodate' to a 'coillen or any meane soldier,' even though such a coat or crest were gained by a prisoner taken in the field.

This reference to the 'bricklayer' has puzzled me very much; it looks so much like a reference to Jonson's feat of arms in the Low Countries when he slew a champion of the enemy in single combat in the presence of both armies, and took his weapons and clothes as *spolia opima.* I think Puttenham must refer to Ben Jonson, for it is evident that this crest was assumed by a bricklayer for some valiant action done in the field of battle, and probably a single-handed action, from the way it is expressed by Puttenham. Nor is it at all likely that two bricklayers should so especially distinguish themselves in combat just about the same time, for there is no valid objection to raise on the score of the date. It is true Puttenham's original book bears the date 1589, but these eight pages are additional matter put in at some later date, and interfere with the original paging. These unnumbered pages might have been inserted in certain copies some two years or

IX.

so later, and that would bring us to the generally supposed date of Jonson's exploit, or Jonson's single combat might have occurred earlier than we generally suppose.

Then Puttenham goes on to refer to the device of Tamerlane, an Emperor in Tartary, who gave the lightning of heaven, with a posie in that language purporting these words, *Ira Dei*, etc.

These allusions to Tamerlane and the soldier-bricklayer seem to me to smack of Bacon rather than Puttenham; and when the author begins to speak a little further on of the French gentlemen who 'of late yeares have taken this pastime up among them many times gratifying their Ladies and oftentimes the Princes of the Realme,' this impression is increased, and we carry ourselves back to Bacon with Sir Amyas Paulet and the French Court, some years before.

There certainly was a time when there was no love lost between Jonson and Bacon; did it hail from the *Ferro et flamma* episode? Anyhow, Jonson possessed the later edition of Puttenham which contained the remarks against him.*

It is also to be noted that in these same

* Lucian, in his dialogue entitled 'Toxaris,' says that the common oath of the Syrians was by the sword and by the fire. Did Jonson borrow thence?

additional pages the device of the Two Pillars of Hercules at the entrance of the Straits of Gibraltar is referred to, and the motto *Plus ultra* is appended to it, as being the device taken by the Emperor Charles V.

We all remember that great device of Bacon which is so well engraved on several of the frontispieces to his books: the same Two Pillars with the Globe of the Intellectual World, or, again, a ship, passing out from between them into the open sea—this was his *Plus ultra*, not the *Ne plus ultra* of the classic tale—and this was also for Charles V. his great and aspiring idea. So we have the marked coincidence that these Pillars with their device betokening boundless endeavour, were in the mind and recollection of Puttenham years before they appeared on the later and more philosophical works of Francis Bacon. Little clues like these are not without a certain weight of evidence.

Pp. 252, 253 [307, 308]: Here is clear evidence that the author was extremely well acquainted with the Court of France and its great officials and secretaries, both in the capital and the provinces. In my view, this almost limits the number of possible authors to *one man only*, and he Francis Bacon—*i.e.*, if we consider duly the nature and contents

of this remarkable book, and especially when we remember that Sir Philip Sidney, Fulke Greville, and Sir E. Dyer, the most likely of the courtier class for the authorship, have to be excluded from consideration altogether. There is then no man to fall back on but Bacon.

The evidence on these pages should be read *in toto*—extracts do not give it justice; but among much else we are told that 'the poore suter desirous of his dispatch is answered by some secretarie or page *il fault attendre, Monsieur* is dispatching the King's businesse into Languedock, Provence, Piemont, a common phrase with the secretaries of France.'

He describes how the aristocratic officials of the Court idle away their time in frivolities, and adds: 'I have sene the greatest podestates and gravest judges and Presidentes of Parliament in France'; and again: 'I have observed in many of the Princes Courts of Italie, to seeme idle when they be earnestly occupied and entend to nothing but mischievous practizes, and do busily negotiate by coulour of otiation.'

Coulour of otiation is distinctly good, and is to me *audibly* the expression of Francis Bacon, and so is *podestates* to a somewhat less degree of clearness; but these two pages are only a very

small portion of the body of evidence tending to show that the author of this book on English poetry was none other but that *Illustris Anglo-francitalus* who was prematurely brought back to his native land by the death of Sir Nicholas Bacon in 1579.

P. 258 and last: Here we have an appeal to the Queen not to consider the work derogatory to the author's dignity, nor yet to allow it to hinder his advancement in the State. Not very suitable, this, to either of the Puttenhams, for they were both well advanced in years, and their antecedents showed no elements of a likely rise or political influence either at Court or anywhere else. One was a decidedly *mauvais sujet*, and the other was provided for, during the rest of his life, as a Queen's Pensioner, if the scant reports we have of him be true ones.

But the whole concluding appeal is so striking, and in the opinion of the present writer so very Baconian in its form and matter, that it shall be presented *in toto et verbatim*:

'*The Conclusion.*—And with this (my most gratious soveraigne Lady) I make an end, humbly beseeching your pardon, in that I have presumed to hold your eares so long annoyed with a tedious trifle, so as unlesse it proceede more of your owne Princely

and naturall mansuetude then of my merite, I feare greatly least you may thinck of me as the Philosopher Plato did of *Aniceris* an inhabitant of the Citie *Cirene*, who being in troth a very active and artificiall man in driving of a Princes Charriot or Coche (as your Majestie might be) and knowing it himselfe well enough, comming one day into Platos schoole, and having heard him largely dispute in matters Philosophicall, I pray you (quoth he) geve me leave also to say somewhat of myne arte, and in deede shewed so many trickes of his cunning, how to lanche forth and stay, and chaunge pace, and turne and winde his Coche, this way and that way, uphill, downe hill and also in even or rough ground, that he made the whole assemblie wonder at him. Quoth Plato being a grave personage, verely in myne opinion this man should be utterly unfit for any service of greater importance than to drive a Coche. It is a great pitie that so prettie a fellow, had not occupied his braynes in studies of more consequence. Now I pray God it be not thought so of me in describing the toyes of this our vulgar art. But when I consider how everything has his estimation by oportunitie, and that it was but the studie of my yonger yeares in which vanitie raigned. Also that I write to the pleasure of a Lady and a most gratious Queene, and neither to Priestes nor to Prophetes or Philosophers. Besides finding by experience, that many times idlenesse

is lesse harmefull than unprofitable occupation, dayly seeing how these great aspiring mynds and ambitious heads of the worlde seriously searching to deale in matters of state, be oftentimes so busie and earnest that they were better unoccupied, and peradventure altogether idle, I presume so much upon your Majesties most milde and gracious judgement howsoever you conceive of myne abilitie to any better or greater service, that yet in this attempt ye will allow of my loyall and good intent alwayes endevouring to do your Majestie the best and greatest of those services I can.'

Thus ends the remarkable book which no one has ever claimed for his own, while in regard to the authorship of it, the contemporary evidence is singularly inconsistent and weak; no writer of that time or afterwards seemed to have any confidence or certainty (except Richard Carew, 1614) when speaking of the supposed author. Some spoke of him as 'the gentleman,' but gave neither name nor hint to help his identification. Those who tell us the most seem to tell us very little, and not one of them goes so far as to mention his Christian name. It might be Jeremiah for all we hear to the contrary from his contemporaries. All we get, even from the most outspoken of them, is that the author, 'as the

fame is,' was one of Her Majesty's Gentlemen Pensioners, Puttenham. But, as before said, when we search the authenticated list of Gentlemen Pensioners, there is no Puttenham to be found. The general summing up of this curious literary problem seems, then, to be this : though there are many difficulties in attributing the authorship of this very able work to Bacon, yet there are far greater difficulties if we choose either of the Puttenhams, or, indeed, any contemporary whatever.

I therefore suggest Bacon as a working hypothesis until the veritable author be clearly discovered.

But I would ask such of my readers as happen to have more than a casual acquaintance with the epistolary and grand prose manner of Francis Bacon to read his final appeal to the Queen once more. While they are doing so, it would be well to remember also the position, the prospects, and the hopes of that aspiring younger son of Her Majesty's late Lord Keeper, who as yet had not attached himself to Essex, and had only his uncle Burleigh and the Queen to look to for advancement to high office.

Could the wording of that appeal, from beginning to end, come from anyone else in those days

so suitably as from Francis Bacon? There is the courtly ingenuity and veiled flattery, there is the spice of classical allusion, given not in an unpleasant pedantic dose, but in a lively example, such as he always had at his fingers' ends, whether for speeches or letters.*

Here is the same depreciation under the same name of 'toyes,' which we have read so often with surprise in his famous essays. Those essays told us, too, that it is not well to stay too long in the Theatre, and in this appeal to the Queen the author excuses himself by saying 'that it was but the studie of my yonger yeares in which vanitie raigned'; and we remember Sir Thomas

---

* It was for this pleasant and lively habit that Gabriel Harvey called young Francis Bacon 'Entrapelus,' and said that whatever chance of earthly fortune befell him in the future, he would always be a *megalander*, which was Harvey's pet name for true literary greatness.

This is not printed, but is a manuscript note in Harvey's writing I noticed in one of his books—'Mr. Quintilian,' I think. He also mentions this 'Entrapelus' again in connection with poetry and oratory, and praises him for the latter very highly. 'Entrapelia' was the Greek for a certain pleasant quality of the mind, a certain restrained levity and humour—a term well known to scholars then. Possibly Harvey took it from the facetious 'Contes d'Entrapel,' full of Gallic humour.

Bodley's grave rebuke, or rather grave expression of sorrow, that his gifted friend Bacon should in younger days have wasted so much time in similar trifling with toys.

The author of this appeal, by his illustration of the skilful charioteer* and his own remarks on it, leads us to infer that he had a good opinion of his own abilities, and that he could, if he had the chance given him by Her Majesty, suitably occupy his 'braynes' in studies dealing 'in matters of State' as well as, if not better than, some of the 'great aspiring mynds and ambitious heads' of the political world. Indeed, he is bold enough to hint, though very discreetly, that some did more harm than good, and were 'better unoccupied and peradventure altogether idle.'

But I must draw my observations on 'The Arte of English Poesie' and its author to a close. I do not deny that there are grave difficulties telling *against* the hypothesis that we owe this unique book to young Francis Bacon. And I shall not be surprised if critics find further difficulties not yet apprehended by me, which absolutely exclude Bacon. Still, I hope I shall not have written quite in vain if I have succeeded in

---

* Does not this call to mind Phaëthon and *currus auriga paterni*?

drawing attention to the literary criticisms of an undoubtedly able man, at the very time when those wondrous flowers of Elizabethan 'phantasie,' both in poetry and in drama, were about to burst forth from their native soil, and to live in unfading bloom to our own and future ages.

There is another piece of evidence which seems strongly to connect Bodenham, Puttenham, and Bacon as a trinity in unity. It is this: In the 'Address to the Reader' which is placed in the vestibule of Bodenham's 'Belvedere, or the Garden of the Muses,' we have the account of the sources of his poetical collections:—

'First, out of many excellent speeches spoken to her Majestie at Tiltings, Triumphes, Maskes, Shewes, and Devises performed in prograce; as also out of choise Ditties sung to her; and some especially proceeding from her owne most sacred selfe.'

Now, Puttenham and Bodenham seem to be the chief authors who refer to Queen Elizabeth's poetry at all. This is a peculiar fact, to say the least of it, and it does not seem to me irrational to suggest that 'my young Lord Keeper' was privileged to know more of the Queen's private essays in verse than was allowed to go forth to

the public eye. Bacon, after some years had passed, thinking that the great Queen was not impervious to flattery of an indirect kind, put forth his 'Arte of English Poesie' anonymously, and still later, in 1600, referred to 'her owne most sacred selfe' as an adept in the poetic art.

Moreover, we must not forget the extraordinary fact that a man of Bacon's most fertile, precocious, and industrious intellect gave nothing worth mentioning to the public until his little volume of essays when he was nearly forty years old. He was a quick worker and writer, and a lover of revision. In his early life there is quite room and time for all Puttenham's works and manuscripts, and more still, consequently no objection comes that way. Indeed, we look for something worthy of such an intellect to fill up the vacuum that apparently exists.

I attach considerable importance to this very unusual circumstance, that such a prodigy of genius, talent, and industry as Francis Bacon undoubtedly was should allow the fields on which his intellect afterwards worked to lie comparatively fallow for that very long and fruitful time between his college days and his arrival at the mature age of nearly forty. Especially is this remarkable when we remember the inscription placed round the

miniature of Bacon painted by Hilliard in 1578, when the youthful genius was but eighteen :—'If one could but paint his mind.'

This clearly shows the strong impression the talents of young Francis made upon his contemporaries. Moreover, there is a strange gap in the recorded life of Bacon between September 25, 1576, and the middle of 1582, nearly *six years!* That this important period between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two in the life of a very precocious intellect should be wellnigh a blank, as far as any record remains of it,—this is passing strange. Spedding, in his exhaustive and lifelong study of Bacon, just notices the almost complete absence of any record during this period of his life, but makes no attempt at any explanation. He tells us of a residence during three months of the year 1577 at Poictiers, in the 'wake of the [French] Court,' and adds: 'So that he had excellent opportunities of studying foreign policy. Of the manner in which he spent his time, however, we have no information.'

Spedding then prints four letters of Bacon in July, September, and October of the year 1580 to a Mr. Doylie at Paris and to his uncle and aunt, Lord and Lady Burghley, written from Gray's Inn, and then adds: 'From this time we

have no further news of Francis Bacon till April 15, 1582.

It seems, as we shall see when we come to other evidence, that the friends of young Francis thought it advisable when he came back from France, and was taking some part in political affairs as well as poetical matters, that a veil of secrecy should be thrown over his doings. His friends at Court and at the Areopagus seem to have been as mute as Pythagoreans, and if it had not been for Gabriel Harvey and the hints scribbled by his pedantic self-conceit in his own manuscript note-books we should have no suspicion of Bacon's connections and pursuits at this blank period of his history.

Now, these six years give ample time and opportunity to the versatile young Francis to be the producer of the many early works mentioned in Harvey's correspondence—I mean the interludes, the comedies, the poems, etc., offered by Immerito to Harvey's criticism—and also to be the setter forth of the various works mentioned by Puttenham as formerly composed by him. That the numerous literary attempts recorded by the author of 'The Arte of English Poesie' as his own, and the equally numerous attempts of Immerito mentioned in Harvey's correspondence, should all

have disappeared becomes less of an insuperable difficulty if we suppose that consummate master of literary concealment, Francis Bacon, to be responsible for the writing of them, as well as the attributing of them to other hands. And the difficulty is still further lessened if we have these six important years of Bacon's early life free for these 'recreations' of his rapid and inventive mind, and also for commencing those extensive commonplace books which afterwards developed into the Bodenham series.

F. B.

CHAPTER IV

GEORGE PUTTENHAM'S MANUSCRIPT ON THE EXECUTION OF MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS

And now let us consider more closely the Puttenham manuscript on Mary's execution. First, there is not one atom of evidence, internal or external, that leads us to connect the writer of the manuscript with Richard Puttenham's brother, except the name given on the title-page of the manuscript. But we know well how delusive were names on title-pages in Elizabethan days. Therefore this *single* positive evidence by no means *settles* the question.

Next, is there any evidence that Bacon was at all interested or likely to defend this political tragedy, or to write an apology for the action of the Queen and her Ministers in this deplorable execution? Certainly there is. We learn from Spedding's 'Life of Bacon'* that a General Elec-

* 'Works of Francis Bacon,' Life, I. 62.

tion to Parliament and the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots before the Commissioners, were proceeding simultaneously.

The verdict resulting in the conviction of Mary had not long been given when the new Parliament was summoned, and Bacon with it, as Member for Taunton. The debates at once begun to touch upon 'the Great Cause,' as this trial and conviction of Mary was called, and D'Ewes tells us that Bacon was one of the speakers on 'the Great Cause,' and also a member of one of the committees to whom it was referred, and who were continually occupied on this subject till December 2, when Parliament adjourned. Bacon took the popular side in defence of Queen Elizabeth's safety against murderous enemies. Spedding thinks that Queen Elizabeth 'was really perplexed in her mind, and did not know what to do.' If this were so, what more likely than that Bacon, as a kind of privileged non-official councillor, should give his opinion to remove the Queen's perplexities, and afterwards put it in manuscript form for private distribution? It was written, as the author says, 'to the service of her Majestie,' and all who are well acquainted with the life and political services of this illustrious genius know that his pen was frequently counted upon and called for when any

serious matters of State policy had to be commented upon in the public interest. We have his 'Observations on a Libel,' his account also of the famous and rather suspicious trial of Dr. Lopez, and several other pieces, with or without his name appended. Others may exist not yet recognised. For although the imperious and rather self-willed Elizabeth, for some reason which can only be guessed at, did not seem quite to like Francis Bacon, and did not help his advancement so eagerly as she might have done, yet it is quite clear that she highly esteemed his advice as her councillor, and his literary ability in presenting arguments to the public and carrying matters through according to her wish and instructions. As a boy, I feel sure he was a special favourite with the Queen, a *persona gratissima*—the clever 'young Lord Keeper'; and later on—say about 1579, when he had just come back from France—I like to believe that he and the great Queen would discuss the Arte of English Poesie together, and that he would present his own recent offerings from the Muses to Her Majesty, and would criticise with dutiful praise any effusions the Queen might deign to show him of her own. And why I like to believe this is because George Puttenham is almost the only critic of poetry who

mentions or quotes the Queen's productions in this line, and the only author who seems to know much about them.

My view—that the George Puttenham who wrote in defence of the Queen's action in permitting the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, was merely a mask for Bacon—was strengthened by the fact that I knew Bacon supposed himself to be 'a good pen,' and well able to write 'apologies' for any important personages who might require them. He seemed absolutely to take a liking to this peculiar literary work. He was frequently writing letters of advice to men of rank and position, if they were starting on their travels, or if there happened to be some policy to be considered, and, young as he was, we know he did not hesitate to address the Queen herself. In fact, my studies of Bacon's life and character lead me to think of him almost as champion in ordinary for the Queen, if any difficulty of State policy, whether domestic or foreign, should arise. This made me naturally more inclined to take the view that George Puttenham stood for Bacon, and that the apology in question was very likely one of Bacon's earliest literary attempts in the Queen's defence. This view of mine has quite recently been made more probable by a passage I came

across by chance in Basil Montagu's 'Life of Bacon' (p. xciii) while looking for something else. It is under the date February 25, 1601, the day Essex was executed, and reads as follows :—

'The Queen, having been coldly received by the citizens after the death of Essex, or moved by some other cause, was desirous that a full statement should be made of the whole course of his treasons, and commanded Bacon to prepare it. He says: "Her Majesty taking a liking of my pen, upon that which I had done before concerning the proceeding at York House, *and likewise upon some other declarations which in former times by her appointment I put in writing*, commanded me to pen that book which was published for the better satisfaction of the world."'

I have put the passage in italics which appears to corroborate the view taken by myself.

I have also another piece of evidence which looks very promising, and which I find in Spedding's 'Life and Letters of Bacon' (i. 96). I can safely say it has never been brought into connection with Puttenham and his justification of Mary, Queen of Scots' execution.

Spedding gives verbatim a letter from Bacon to Archbishop Whitgift with reference to some apology Bacon had written for the Queen and

sent to the Archbishop for revision. Spedding remarks that the letter is without date, and there is nothing to explain on what occasion or on what *apology* it was written, but that these inferences clearly follow. An enclosure is referred to.

1. Bacon had previously submitted to Archbishop Whitgift, for consideration, the draft of some brief narrative in explanation of some of the Queen's actions.

2. The object of it was to justify what she had done; but that the justification was *implied* in a plain statement of the facts, without the help of arguments or apologies.

3. The justification rested upon the fact that her conduct had been consistent.

4. The narrative included a reference to certain statutes.

5. The paper or apology had been sent back to him with some objections, had been then revised by Bacon and sent a second time to the Archbishop with alterations, but in the same form.

Now, Spedding is certain that this apology for the Queen, here referred to, is to be found in a letter by Sir Francis Walsingham to an official person in France concerning the Queen's proceedings towards the Catholics and the Puritans. In fact, he is so certain that he prints the whole of

this letter signed 'Francis Walsingham' among the indubitable writings of Francis Bacon, and in the larger type which he always awards to Bacon's genuine works. This Walsingham letter was found in the 'Scrinia Sacra,' and Spedding may be quite right in his view that it was Bacon using the mask of Walsingham and apologizing diplomatically for the Queen. Indeed, I think it more likely that the correspondence between Bacon and the Archbishop referred to this apology signed 'Francis Walsingham,' rather than to the apology signed 'George Puttenham' which we have been considering; for Bacon alludes to the 'brevity' of his defence, and Puttenham's manuscript occupies sixty-nine folios.

But whether Spedding be right or wrong about the Walsingham letter, it is perfectly clear that Bacon wrote a concealed apology for the Queen's action in some debated political matter, and that the date would suit Puttenham quite as well as Walsingham; for the only limitation of date is that Whitgift must be Archbishop of Canterbury when Bacon wrote about this apology, and that would be true whether George Puttenham or Francis Walsingham be the mask. To sum up this piece of evidence, we gain an additional probability that Bacon wrote Puttenham's apology

for the Queen, because we find from his letter to Archbishop Whitgift that he was no novice at such work, but was writing with all the *savoir faire* of an experienced hand about some unstated justification of the Queen he was then engaged upon, and which never appeared in his printed works or anywhere else under his own name.

CHAPTER V

THE AUTHOR'S CURIOUS WORD-MINT, AND HIS EFFORTS TO SECURE THE QUEEN'S FAVOUR

LET us now resume the question of the internal evidence for the authorship of this important anonymous work of early literary criticism, with which we are chiefly concerned.

'The Arte of English Poesie' abounds in newly-invented words, and the author was clearly a word-maker fond of philology. Indeed, he goes out of his way to invent or supply new words, and does not forget to call the reader's attention to them, and to defend them.

NB. This invention of words, especially compound words, was a favourite practice of Bacon's. He was noted for it in his speeches when he appeared professionally in the courts in his earlier days, and criticised, too, for it was hinted that he used terms which puzzled bench, bar, and audience alike. Here he followed the example of Sidney,

who, as Hall tells us ('Satires,' vi., 255), was one of the earliest authors in the vernacular to bring compound words into vogue. And Puttenham, too, seems to have followed Sidney in this matter, and in many of his remarks on poetry he seems to have read Sidney's 'Apology for Poetry,' which was then only in manuscript, and was not published till some years after Puttenham's book. Sidney seems to have followed the elder Scaliger's 'Poetics' more than any other treatise when writing his 'Apology for Poetry,' and Puttenham does the same. This, combined with several other marked similarities, helps considerably the hypothesis that Puttenham is Bacon disguised. For Philip Sidney, from his character, connections, and literary tastes, was far more likely to have influence upon Bacon than upon either of the brothers Puttenham, as history speaks of them, and far more likely to admit young Francis Bacon into the circle of his literary friends than either or both of these not very notable gentlemen. We should remember that Bacon was a young man of three-and-twenty when Bruno was in London enjoying the friendship and patronage of this same Philip Sidney, and dedicating two of his works to the studious young aristocrat. Sidney was of a serious cast of mind, opposed to Papal and Spanish

tyranny as much as ever Bacon was, and the chief way in which we may suppose him to have been influenced by Bruno would be in the direction of Platonism and Neoplatonism of the liberal Italian type, as opposed to the hide-bound and exclusive authority of Aristotle. Now, Bacon took the highest interest in all these subjects, and was in agreement with Bruno's philosophical ideas of this kind very thoroughly, and, by the way, possibly incurred afterwards the odium of 'forgetting God' from a remembrance of his connection with men holding Bruno's views. But, be that as it may, the point here is that it is in the highest degree probable that a young man so distinguished by talents and birth as was the younger son of the late Lord Keeper, would be introduced, and willingly accepted, into such a circle of thoughtful disputants as were gathered round the popular and beloved Sidney. We know, too, that Sidney was a diligent student of Plutarch, and so was Bacon—a lover of sonnetting, too, when it was in fashion, and we have evidence that 'Astrophel and Stella' had, both in phraseology and style, considerable influence on the writer of the 'ever-living' Shakespeare Sonnets. And recent discoveries seem to favour the view that Bacon, too, was not quite ignorant of the sonnetting mania then rising

into vogue. So altogether there seems a high probability that Bacon would be more closely connected with Sidney's set than can be gathered or proved from the few documents of this literary society that have come down to posterity. We know Dyer, and Fulke Greville, and Gabriel Harvey, were all in the inner circle, and this famous trio, of course, according to my views, must have known of Bacon's interest in poetry,* and inferentially, if not directly, they must have had little doubt as to who the writer of 'Venus and Adonis,' 'Lucrece,' and the 'Sonnets,' really was—and perhaps they knew much more than we do about the 'atheist Tamburlaine' and the 'conjurer' who hailed from Gray's Inn.

With regard to Puttenham's singularly high praise of the Queen's poetical powers, it is worthy of remark how little notice is ever taken of the

---

* Since writing the above, I have carefully read Gabriel Harvey's correspondence with Immerito during Sidney's lifetime (1579-80), and have therefrom collected some amount of evidence which seems to show that young Bacon on his return from France was extremely well received in the high literary and political circles connected with the Court, and was so far privileged as to have interviews (presumably private) with the Queen herself. But for some reason all his friends clearly wished him to remain unknown behind a mask.

fact that Elizabeth wrote poetry, and I doubt very much whether the average literary critic would be able to mention offhand a single line of her poetry, or even to say where any of it could be found. One would naturally go first to look up Elizabeth in the new 'Dictionary of National Biography.' No such information is supplied in the long article there (pp. 203-231)—only this: 'The few attempts at English verse she indulged in are worthless' (p. 230*b*).

I will therefore, as it falls in with my contention, give a brief summary here, for which I am chiefly indebted to Ritson's 'Bibliographia Poetica.'

Elizabeth wrote, while prisoner at Woodstock in 1555, certain verses with a charcoal on a shutter. They are printed in Hentzner's 'Travels.' She wrote a couplet with her diamond, on a glass window (printed in Fox's 'Acts and Monuments').

The following 'Epitaph made by the Queenes Majestie at the death of the Princesse of Espinoye' is inserted among the poems of John Soothern, a contemporary—poems so rare that Ritson says only one copy exists, and that without its title-page:—

'When the warrior Phœbus goth to make his round,
With a painefull course, to toother hemisphere:
A darke shadowe, a great horror and a feare,

In I knoe not what clowdes inveron the ground.
And even so for Pinoy, that fayre vertues lady,
(Although Jupiter have in this orizôn
Made a starre of her, by the Ariadnan crowne)
Morns, dolour and griefe, accompany our body.
O Atropos, thou hast doone a worke perverst,
And as a byrde that hath lost both young and nest,
About the place where it was makes many a tourne,
Even so dooth Cupid, that infaunt, god of amore
Flie about the tombe, where she lies all in dolore,
Weeping for her eies, wherein he made sojourne.'

Then we know officially that 'Two little anthemes or things in meeter of Her Majestie' were licensed to Mr. Barker, Her Majesty's printer, November 15, 1578.

This latter date is important for us. It shows that the Queen was interested in poetry sufficiently to allow something of her own to be published a little before the date of Puttenham's 'Partheniades,' and of Francis Bacon's return from France.

Edmund Bolton, a friend of Bacon's and a fellow-believer in the good effects of Utopian institutions and Houses of Solomon, is one of the few who praise the Queen's verses. He says: 'Those which I have seen and read . . . are princely, as her prose.'

N.B.

And I must not forget that at the end of her

translation of 'Margarete, queene of Naverres godly meditacyon of the christen sowle,' published by Bale in 1548, is a metrical version of the thirteenth Psalm.

Bearing these facts in mind, it seems very strange that we hear so little from contemporaries or biographers concerning our great Queen's poetical ventures. That the Gloriana and Cynthia of her age, to whom all the poets bare witness, should have only two or three witnesses to her own gifts of verse and fancy is a remarkable fact, and is in need of some explanation. The reason would seem to be that the Queen did not think that her recreations in this line were quite worthy of her exalted position as a Maiden Queen. People of any position who wrote poetry were in those times considered 'phantastical,' and as to obtaining any public fame or credit from writing poetry, the idea was scouted, and anything beyond the distribution of manuscript copies among a few personal friends was seldom thought of while the poet was alive. When he was dead this view underwent some change, and there was nothing unseemly then in the surviving friends or relatives committing to print the manuscripts left by the dead author. This was the case with Sidney and others of repute then.

There would therefore be two reasons why the Queen's poetry should receive so little notice or praise: first, because few would be privileged to see the original manuscripts, and, secondly, it would be known that the Queen did not plume herself upon such accomplishments.

However, there were two striking exceptions to this conspiracy of silence, and, strangely enough, they were Puttenham and Bodenham. Both of these mysteriously veiled personalities give the highest praise to the Queen's poetical talent, and both seem to have been especially privileged in the chance of reading and copying her different compositions.

This is what Bodenham says of the source of his poetical extracts, or, to use his own words, 'where these flowres had their first springing':

'First, out of many excellent speeches spoken to her Majestie, at Tiltings, Triumphes, Maskes, Shewes and Devises performed in prograce: as also out of divers choise Ditties sung to her; and some especially, proceeding from her owne most gracious selfe. Likewise out of privat Poems, Sonnets, Ditties and other wittie concerts given to her Honourable Ladies and vertuous Maids of Honour,' etc.

From what we have recently come to know of

Bacon as a concealed poet and frequenter of the Court, I hold that his identity with Bodenham is strongly corroborated by the above extract, in addition to the other strong evidence I have given elsewhere.

And since Puttenham seems to have had similar exceptional privileges of obtaining verses 'proceeding from her most sacred selfe,' even as Bodenham had, and seeing that both have thrown an evidently intentional veil of secrecy over their personal identity—then, I say, there certainly arises a presumption that we have only one man under similarly sounding names, and that man, when traced home, is none other than Francis Bacon.

There seems also this further possible inference that Francis Bacon in his earlier career tried to attract and gain the Queen's favour through the medium of his own skill in the poetic art, but that this attempt failed in some way, and accordingly 'The Arte of Poesie' was *not* dedicated to her for whom it was written.

It is to be noticed that Puttenham, 'for egloyne and pastorall poesie,' prefers 'Sir Philip Sidney and *Maister Challener*,' whilst Meres likewise numbers Master Challener 'amongst the best for pastoral.' Now, as Ritson says ('Bibliographia

Poetica,' p. 155), 'Who he (this Challener) was, or what he wrote, cannot be further ascertained.'

For some reason not quite clear, Meres and Puttenham were 'both in a tale,' and agreed together whether their facts were right or wrong.

We also have noticed before how Meres and Bodenham were united in literary work in the 'Politeuphuia' and 'Palladis Tamia,' the first and second parts respectively of the Bodenham series. This, too, looks as if Bodenham *is* Puttenham. Nor is this all; for one very noticeable thing in the various quotations, phrases, sentences, or classical tags, with which Puttenham adorns his learned and elaborate work, is the almost constant habit he has of turning all these into English verse. The verses are generally very short pieces, most frequently distichs, and remind one of nothing so much as of Bodenham's very numerous similar metrical translations in 'Belvedere,' which he made from the original prose sentences, similitudes, and apophthegms contained in 'Wit's Commonwealth,' 'Wit's Treasury,' 'The Theater of the Little World,' which were all preceding works of the same Bodenham series to which 'Belvedere' belonged.

Puttenham's verse renderings are also like

Bodenham's in being often somewhat allied to doggerel, but we must not expect the finished excellence of a distinguished poet to appear throughout his earlier work. It is sufficient if there be faint signs here and there, and I think these are present both with Puttenham and Bodenham. But several other similarities, still more striking between the Puttenham and Bodenham books will be noticed, and some have been noticed already.

Puttenham has, moreover, a very great deal to say on the antipathies between classical and English prosody, and on the introduction of classical metres into English verse. This was, of course, the great question so earnestly debated in the English Court of Areopagus, where Sidney, Fulke Greville, and Dyer were the London trio, and Gabriel Harvey their special Cambridge correspondent and critic. But we know nothing of any George Puttenham in connection with this famous literary society of 1579-80 and later, and, indeed, he would be too old a man to be likely to have much to do with such novelties of criticism. But the author of 'The Arte of English Poesie' is a most learned and discriminating critic, and his remarks on the great hexameter controversy are anything but antiquated. He

seized upon the absurdity and impossibility of the new literary craze, and declared himself for accent rather than for quantity, thereby severing himself from Harvey, and still further from the rigid rules of the Areopagus and the Sidney set. After discussing various questions connected with this classical innovation through four chapters (xiii.-xvi.), he sums up thus :—

> 'But because in very truth I think these but vaine and superstitious observations, nothing at all furthering the pleasant melody of our English meeter, I leave to speake any more of them, and rather wish the continuance of our old maner of Poesie, scanning our verse by sillables rather than by feete.'

My first question on this is : Should we be likely to have *four chapters* on this literary innovation of the Areopagus from a man like George Puttenham, who in age went back as far as Henry VIII., and is not mentioned as having any connection whatever with the Sidney set or with Harvey, who were the chief exponents of this fad of the rising generation rather than of the receding one to which Puttenham belonged ? To this I reply that no man would be likely to write so fully and deeply on this subject, unless he was intimately connected with the members of

this new literary movement. This objection to Puttenham will not hold good against Bacon, for we know that Bacon was up at his University when Harvey was lecturing on rhetoric, and there are many cogent reasons to convince us that Bacon was perfectly well known to Harvey, Greville, Dyer, Sidney, Fraunce (of Gray's Inn, a great hexametrist), and the flower of English culture at that date, and therefore would be a very likely man to write four chapters, or even more, on a subject that we know much interested him in his youthful days.

But the strongest and most decisive fact is that Bacon absolutely holds the same opinion on this delicate question as Puttenham held, and has thus expressed himself in his 'De Aug.,' VI. i. (Works, IV. 443):—

'And this wisdom of the Ancients is not wanting in the Poets of later ages, in their own Mother-tongues; only this is to be reprehended that some of them, too studious of antiquity, have endeavoured to train Modern Languages to Ancient Measures (Heroic, Elegiac, Sapphic, and the rest) which the Fabrick and composition of these Languages will not bear; and withal is no less harsh to the ear. In the matters of this Nature the Judgment of Sense is to be preferred before Precepts of Art. . . . Nor is this Art but

the abuse of Art, seeing it doth not perfect but perverts Nature.'

So all we know of the opinions of Puttenham and Bacon on this great literary controversy tend to their unanimity of opinion, and probably to their personal identity as well.*

One of the best proofs that the mysterious George Puttenham was the author of the Shakespeare Plays is to be obtained from a comparison of the various figures of speech and their names as given in 'The Arte of English Poesie,' and the way the *same figures*, and sometimes even the *same names*, as used in the immortal plays. This comparison has been made in a most convincing manner by Mr. W. L. Rushton in *Notes and Queries*, but no one seems to have paid much attention to them, nor has Mr. Rushton ever so much as hinted at Francis Bacon having anything to do with the inquiry. The evidence given is so convincingly strong that I cannot suppose that any fair minded critic can possibly refuse it. If Mr. Rushton's evidence be taken in connection with my own evidence concerning Puttenham,

---

* Since writing the above, this argument has been strengthened by the examination of Harvey's private correspondence and letter-book.

Bodenham, and Immerito, it will give very strong corroboration to my assertions concerning the authorship of the Shakespeare works.

It would take up too much space to reproduce here the intricate examples and arguments by which Mr. Rushton proves his case, but a reference to *Notes and Queries*, as given in the footnote,* ought to convince anyone without difficulty.

---

* *Notes and Queries*, 9th Series, vol. xii., pp. 7, 463; vol. xi., pp. 64, 203; vol. viii., pp. 180, 321. Also 10th Series, vol. i., p. 465; vol. ii., p. 464. *Cf.* also Mr. Rushton's published books, 'Shakespeare Illustrated by Old Authors,' etc.

CHAPTER VI

THE 'PARTHENIADES'

But I feel sure that one of the first attacks of opposing critics will be directed against the specimens of the author's own poetry which are presented here and there in the book, and against his 'Partheniades' or poetical New Year's gift to Queen Elizabeth, of which a manuscript copy is extant. They will possibly use the old argument and say the poems cannot be written by Bacon, for he had no poetic genius, and tells us plainly that he did not profess to be a 'poet.' His translation of the Psalms when he was over sixty, we shall be told, 'utterly excludes Bacon from having anything to do with "The Arte of English Poesie."' We shall be told either that the 'Partheniades' are much too good for prosy Bacon to compose, or else we shall hear that it is ridiculous to suppose that the real author of 'Hamlet' and 'Lucrece' could write such silly stuff. Well, I say, let such downright con-

tradictory critics fight it out between them. My own opinion is that both are wrong. The poems that Puttenham gives us in scraps here and there in his book, and the 'Partheniades,' which we have nearly complete, are neither silly stuff nor yet so good that Bacon could never have written them before he was of age. They are really no more and no less than what we might expect from a young man of talent who took a technical interest in the divine art of poesy. Every poet must have a beginning, even as a baby makes inarticulate sounds before its lips have learned to lisp. I take the so-called Puttenham poems to be the early attempts of Francis Bacon to win the Queen by courtly and learned adulation. And if we only examine cursorily the nature and purpose of that New Year's offering of 1579, entitled the 'Partheniades,' we shall, I think, be surprised to find how a most unlikely-looking collection of odes and hymns of praise turns out to have a striking characteristic of Francis Bacon — so striking, in fact, that we could hardly name another contemporary to whom we could attribute it. What I refer to is the extraordinary and pushful advice and comment which is given to the Queen on all kinds of important matters—matters of State, matters of civil policy, invectives against

the Puritans, praise of due ceremonies in Court and Church, dangers of innovation and disputes about religion, and so on.

Now, what man was there of that time, young or old, who was so likely to put himself in evidence before the Queen about such things as the precocious author of the 'Letter of Advice to the Queen,' and the budding philosophic politician who planned 'The Greatest Birth of Time'? Oh, but he was too young, is the reply; he speaks in his last ode of it being 'now twentye yeare ago' since the Queen came to the throne, which would only make him about eighteen. But we must not be too positive about that numeral twenty; it was indefinite and expansive in Elizabethan times, and was a favourite general number both with Bacon and Shakespeare, the latter using it in an indefinite way very often—*e.g.*:

> 'I'll make thee known, though I lost *twenty* lives.'
>
> *Othello.*

Puttenham also, at p. 42, has exactly the same indefinite use:

> 'Sealing the placard of that lovely league with *twentie* manner of sweet kisses.'

In fact, this word 'twenty' may be added to

the already enormous list of Shakespeare-Bacon parallels if the Baconians want it, but I should say they have their hands full enough already.* It is quite enough for my purpose that I find Puttenham uses it in an indefinite way too, as was, no doubt, the ordinary custom then. True, says the orthodox Dowden school, and your 'ordinary custom' cuts the Baconian parallel to pieces. Well, Hippocleides doesn't care, and the Baconians might well spare twenty times twenty of theirs, and perhaps be all the better for the cutting away of the weaker members. Prune off the unproductive branches and you better the tree.

But I must not leave 'Partheniades' without saying that the author was so determined that the Queen should understand his purpose and advice, even if she followed it not, that he put a prose summary at the end of some odes, and, as the work is rare, I may be pardoned for producing verbatim the one which belongs to the thirteenth ode:

---

* [Mr. R. M. Theobald refers to this ('Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light,' p. 276). He says Bacon has a trick of using the word *twenty* to express a large and indefinite number—*e.g.*, 'As for Maximilian upon twenty respects he could not have been the man' ('Henry VII.'). There are about 120 instances in Shakespeare—*e.g.*:—

'Twenty of these puny lies I'll tell.'

Merchant of Venice, III., iv., 74.—Ed.]

'PURPOSE

'Conteinynge an invective agaynste the Puritants, wth singular comēndac̃ion of her Ma^{ties} consyderate judgment and manner of proceedinge in the cause of religion. The daunger of innovations in a coīnonwelth, the poison of sectaryes, and perillous yt ys to shake religion at y^{e} roote by licentious disputes and doctrines.'

Verily, 'Partheniades' was a notable New Year's gift for an old Pensioner of the Queen who is not found on the list, and whom no one seems to identify. One would have expected to hear *something* of such a man. Possibly Puttenham was old and in his dotage. Anyhow, he seems to have died the year after the book was printed.

But there was a *young* Pensioner of the Queen who was very much alive both when the poem was written and when the book of the 'Arte' was printed. He was not one of the body of Pensioners, but his father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, having died suddenly about the time 'Partheniades' was written, he was virtually left a pensioner upon the Queen's bounty for a start in life, as his father had not provided for him. Letters are extant from young Francis Bacon to

his uncle Burleigh, about this time or a little later, on the subject of help from the Queen, and the inference is that it was obtained for him.* All these circumstances point to Francis Bacon as a likely author of 'Partheniades' and presenter of it as a New Year's gift.

Indeed, if we look at the 'Partheniades' numbered 7, 9, 10, and 11, 13, 14, and compare them with the curious literary history of Harvey, Immerito, and E. K., which belongs to the same period (1579), or very nearly so, we find there are 'dreames' and philosophical discussions and theories in both; in fact, the 'Partheniades' might well be the work of Immerito, as far as the subjects or themes of the poems are concerned; and, moreover, Immerito tells us in the 'Harvey Letters' that he was afraid of tiring the ears of those at Court with his compositions. All these coincidences point in Bacon's direction. Especially is No. 10, the 'Vision of a Royal Ship,' very suggestive, for we have a description of the tackle and parts of a ship here, and again in Puttenham's 'Arte of English Poesie' we have another allusion to the same, or a similar poetical treatment of a ship's tackling. Also various parts of a ship are described in verse in

* This is dealt with more fully later on.

an 'Eclogue intituled Elpine,' written when Puttenham was eighteen years old, which was the exact age of Bacon when the 'Partheniades' were presented. And what strikes us as another singular coincidence is the great length of Francis Bacon's description of a ship's parts and tackle in his 'Historia Ventorum.'

It would seem that we have not two men dealing thus with a ship's tackle, but one and the same man, who had interested himself particularly in this theme—not a very common theme, either—in poetry.

But it is in Nos. 13 and 14 of the 'Partheniades' that we get the strongest links of evidence in favour of their Baconian authorship, for they represent the expressed views of Bacon in his 'Advancement of Learning,' given under his own name, and the similar views poetically expressed by him under the name of William Shakespeare (as I hold) in the speeches of Ulysses in 'Troilus and Cressida' (I. iii.), and of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 'Henry V.' (I. ii.).

What Bacon says in his own name is that 'nothing doth derogate from the dignity of a State more than confusion of degrees.'

Ulysses and the Archbishop expand this by that wondrous alchemy of words which I believe