

# **The Art of English Poesy**



# The Art of English Poesy

*by* George Puttenham

---

A CRITICAL EDITION

*Edited by*

**Frank Whigham**

and **Wayne A. Rebhorn**

*Cornell University Press*

ITHACA AND LONDON

Publication of this book was made possible, in part,  
by a University Cooperative Society Subvention Grant  
awarded by The University of Texas at Austin.

Copyright © 2007 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or  
parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in  
writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University  
Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First published 2007 by Cornell University Press  
First printing, Cornell Paperbacks, 2007

Printed in the United States of America

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Puttenham, George, d. 1590.

[Arte of English poesie]

The art of English poesy : contrived into three books : the first of poets and  
poesy, the second of proportion, and the third of ornament (London, 1589) / by  
George Puttenham ; edited by Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn. —  
A critical ed.

p. cm.

Generally attributed to George Puttenham; has also been attributed to Richard  
Puttenham and to John, Baron Lumley.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8014-3758-8 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-8014-8652-4 (pbk. :  
alk. paper)

1. Poetry—Early works to 1800. 2. English poetry—History and criticism.

I. Puttenham, Richard, 1520?-1601? II. Lumley, John Lumley, Baron,  
1534?-1609. III. Whigham, Frank. IV. Rebhorn, Wayne A., 1943- V. Title.

PN1031.P8 2007

821.009—dc22

2007021946

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible  
suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing  
of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks  
and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly  
composed of nonwood fibers. For further information, visit our website  
at [www.cornellpress.cornell.edu](http://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu).

Cloth printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Paperback printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

FOR JO ANNE  
AND  
MARLETTE



# Contents

---

Acknowledgments

*ix*

Abbreviations

*xi*

## Introduction

*I*

- 1. The Documentary Life* 5
- 2. Puttenham's Writings* 15
- 3. The Authorship of the Art* 18
- 4. Puttenham's Archive* 23
- 5. Poetics in the Art* 43
- 6. Puttenham's Ambitions* 49
- 7. Editorial Conventions* 69

## Bibliography

73

**Book 1** 93    **Book 2** 153    **Book 3** 221

**The "Table"** 389

The uncorrected state of sig. Ee2r

395

Emendations

397

Longer Notes

401

Name Glossary

421

Word Glossary

443

Index to First Lines of Illustrative Quotations

449

General Index

455

# Acknowledgments

---

This edition has been very much a communal project. Our principal debt is to our predecessors Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker, editors of the Cambridge edition of 1936, whose intelligence, industry, and sophistication have been a constant humbling inspiration to us. We owe similar thanks to other editors whose work has supported our own, especially Peter Medine, Hyder Edward Rollins, G. Gregory Smith, Brian Vickers, and Gavin Alexander.

Several members of our personal scholarly community deserve special recognition for years of shared labor on this edition, without whose aid it would have been unrecognizably different: David Armstrong, Steven W. May, David Harris Sacks, and Charles M. Young. Many other scholars worldwide have been very generous with their help. We thank J. D. Alsop, Harry Berger Jr., Mary Blockley, Carol Blosser, T. V. F. Brogan, Douglas Bruster, Gideon Burton, Lisa Carroll-Lee, Mary Hill Cole, Joseph Dane, Douglas Eskew, Robert C. Evans, Justin Flint, Cliff Frohlich, James Garrison, Jackie Henkel, Carol Kaske, Lois Kim, Theodore Leinwand, Jason Leubner, Brian P. Levack, Eric N. Lindquist, Arthur Marotti, John Martin, Emily McNee, David Lee Miller, Paul Allen Miller, John Monfasani, Louis Montrose, Vimala Pasupathi, Suzanne Penuel, Ingrid Rowland, Erika Rummel, John Rumrich, Liz Scala, Debora Shuger, Richard Strier, Paul Sullivan, Brian Vickers, Retha Warnicke, Stanley Wells, Brett Wilson, and Stanislav Zimic. We also thank the many scholars who participate in the SHAKSPER, Sidney-Spenser, and H-Albion on-line discussion groups (notably Hardy Cook), whose responses to our many queries have been too numerous to itemize. Finally, we want to express our gratitude to our research assistants Laura Neible, Tim Turner, and Brad Irish for their indispensable work for on the project.

We owe many debts to staff members of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library (especially Gail Kern Paster and Georgianna Ziegler), the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center and the Perry-Castañeda Library of the University of

Texas (especially Gera Draaijer), and to Andrew Ball of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. We also owe a special debt to Charles Willis, who first brought us news of the newly discovered and invaluable cache of data concerning Puttenham's life in the Hampshire Record Office.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the financial support of the Arthur J. Thaman and Wilhelmina Doré Thaman and the Celanese Centennial Professorships of English, and the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin. We also wish to acknowledge a University Co-operative Society Subvention Grant awarded by The University of Texas at Austin. Without the aid provided by these supporters our task would have been vastly more difficult.

We would also like to say how much we appreciate the careful copy-editing our manuscript received at the hands of Amanda Heller and the generous editorial help we got from Ange Romeo-Hall, senior manuscript editor at Cornell University Press. We are especially grateful for the enthusiastic support our project has had from Bernhard Kendler, who was executive editor at Cornell when we began our work and is now retired, and from Peter Potter, who is currently editor in chief at the Press.

Finally, we wish to acknowledge how profound a shared experience it has been for us to work together for many years on this edition of Puttenham's extraordinary book. All of it belongs to both of us, flowers and weeds alike.

# Abbreviations

---

We have employed the following abbreviations for titles cited frequently, when either (1) several versions of a work make confusion possible; (2) we cite from works taken from collections (Smith's *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, for instance); or (3) the abbreviation used would not immediately lead the reader to the appropriate alphabetical listing in the Bibliography (e.g., Croft's edition of Elyot's *Governor*).

1589	<i>The Art of English Poesy</i> , 1589 (Da Capo facsimile, 1971)
Croft	Elyot, <i>The . . . Governour</i> , 1883
CSP	<i>Calendar of State Papers</i>
CWE	<i>Collected Works of Erasmus</i>
EE	Turberville, <i>Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets</i> , 1567
Fraser and Rabkin	<i>Drama of the English Renaissance</i>
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
Hoby	Castiglione, <i>The Book of the Courtier</i> , trans. Thomas Hoby
HRO	Hampshire Record Office
L@P	<i>Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII</i>
LB	Erasmus, <i>Opera Omnia</i> , 1703–1706
LION	Literature Online
LN	Longer Notes
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>Partheniades</i>	<i>Partheniades</i> , in <i>Ballads from Manuscripts</i> , 1873
PRO	Public Record Office
Smith	<i>Elizabethan Critical Essays</i> , ed. G. Gregory Smith, 1904
SP	State Papers
STC	<i>Short Title Catalogue</i>
Taverner	Erasmus, <i>Proverbs</i> , 1569
Tilley	<i>A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries</i> , 1950

Tottel	<i>Tottel's Miscellany</i> , rev. ed. 1965
Udall	Erasmus, <i>Apophthegmes</i> , 1564
Vickers	<i>English Renaissance Literary Criticism</i> , 1999
Whiting	<i>Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases from English Writings Mainly before 1500</i> , 1968
Willcock and Walker	<i>The Art of English Poesy</i> , 1936
Williams	<i>A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language</i> , 1997
Wilson	<i>The Art of Rhetoric</i> , 1994

# **The Art of English Poesy**



# Introduction

---

When George Puttenham reviews his accomplishment at the end of *The Art of English Poesy*, he does so with characteristic density. By referring to “the poetical ornament consisting chiefly in the beauty and gallantness of *his* language and style” (conflating the poet and his art), Puttenham enables the promotion to courtly status of both ambitious man and aesthetic practice. He then voices the core fantasy of the book, of having

appareled him [both art and courtier] to our seeming in all his gorgeous habiliments, and pulling him first from the cart to the school, and from thence to the court, and preferred him to your Majesty’s service, in that place of great honor and magnificence to give entertainment to princes, ladies of honor, gentlewomen, and gentlemen, and by his many modes of skill to serve the many humors of men thither haunting and resorting. (3.25.378)<sup>1</sup>

This extraordinary digest combines richly disparate ingredients. The “apparel” metaphor celebrates a sumptuous joy in gorgeous clothing, poetic dress fit for the court as both entrée and reward, imitating and reflecting the ecstatic dress worn by Henry VIII and his children.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, and partly by this metaphorically sartorial means, the author’s art enables a radical social mobility.<sup>3</sup> The incipient courtier and

1. References to passages in our text of Puttenham consist of book, chapter, and page numbers. Citations of printed sources refer to the works and editions listed in the Bibliography.

2. Not excluding the prim and priggish Edward VI. Sometimes the model was so intense as to be disabling, as we know from Henry and Elizabeth, but even Edward’s favored color, violet, was “so prized by him that no one else dared wear a hat of this shade” (Jordan, *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power* 420).

3. Puttenham might be thought hyperbolic here, but lowborn commoners did in fact rise high socially thanks to their education, especially after the Dissolution—a success that forced the aristocracy and the gentry to start sending their own sons to school as well. One result was that the latter began to take the places usually occupied by commoners in the schools. As

his art are to be pulled "from the cart," Puttenham's recurrent alliterative term for the court's socially base opposite<sup>4</sup>—a locution rich enough to pause over. This usage, according to the *OED*, appears to embrace two social meanings. First, the two-wheeled farm cart; for its rustic social reference we may recall Polonius's oath: "If he love her not . . . / Let me be no assistant for a state, / But keep a farm and carters" (*Hamlet* 2.2.164–66). Second, the cart used "for conveying convicts to the gallows . . . [and] also for the public exposure and chastisement of offenders, esp. lewd women."<sup>5</sup> This figure of the cart might thus carry a multivalent and near-sulfuric energy. When Edmund Bonner sought to blacken Sir Thomas Wyatt's embassy to Charles V in 1538, he wrote to the Lord Chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, claiming that Wyatt had said,

---

early as 1540, when the Dissolution commissioners were setting terms for the new Canterbury Cathedral grammar school and it was proposed that admission be limited to sons and younger brothers of gentlemen, Cranmer objected, saying, "[P]oor men's children are many times endued with more singular gifts of nature . . . eloquence, memory, apt pronunciation, sobriety, and such like, and also commonly more apt to apply their study, than is the gentleman's son delicately educated" (Strype, *Cranmer* 1:129). On how the sons of the privileged competed with the sons of commoners for places in English schools, see, for a start, Hexter's classic study "The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance."

4. The contrastive alliterative pairing of these terms is not solely Puttenham's, though his pairing is the best known, and he uses it at crucial moments. Steven W. May cites two uses of the pair to similar effect, from little-known companion poems to "My Mind to Me a Kingdom Is" (traditionally ascribed to Dyer): "To be a king thy care would much augment, / From Courte to Carte the fortune were but bare"; and "The Court ne Cart I like ne loath" (see May, "Authorship" 389). A LION search finds only three other period uses: in Austin Saker's euphuistic *Narbonus* (1580): "better for thee to leaue the Court, and followe the Cart, then to forsake thy substance, & forgoe thy friends" (230); in Thomas Lodge's *A Margarite of America* (1596): "From height of throne to abiect wretchednesse, / From wonderous skill to seruile ignorance: / From court to cart, from rich to rechlesnesse, / The ioyes of life haue no continuance" (9); and in George Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive* (1606): "softnes and modestie sauours of the Cart, / tis boldnes boldnes does the deed in the Court" (scene 1).

5. *OED* does not cite the usage for capital felons explicitly before 1682, but, in addition to Wyatt's words cited below, the *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London* records the usage as early as 1524: on February 20 "the lady Alys Hungrford was lede from the tower un to Holborne and there put into a carte at the church-yard with one of her servantes, and so caryed unto Tyborne, and there both hongyd" for having murdered her husband (31). Wriothesley's *Chronicle* notes, as one of its final entries, that on June 27, 1556, "were 13 persons carried from Newgate in three carrs to the end of the towne of Stratford the Bowe, and there brent" (2.135). And Henry Machyn's *Diary* specifies (in his characteristically wild spelling) "rod in a care v. unto Tyborne" (five were ridden in a car, i.e., a cart) on July 2, 1556 (109). (*OED* cites "car" as "carriage, chariot, cart, wagon, truck, etc." from 1382 on.) In the fourteenth century, however, the term "car" was sometimes "extended to a sleigh or hurdle without wheels." "Hurdle" here means (from 1412 till very late) "[a] kind of frame or sledge on which traitors used to be drawn through the streets to execution." Apparently the terms "sled/ge," "hurdle," "car," and "cart" overlapped to varying degrees, wheels being inessential, such that, perhaps, being "drawn in a hurdle" and being "carted" were less distinct than they seem to modern ears. Puttenham's words here in 3.25 both accentuate the distance between the courtly poet's cartly origins and his eventual height and bridge the gap by alliteration. Puttenham resorts to the word "cart" repeatedly in the *Art*; as an intensive figure of social depth it reaches its simultaneous zenith and nadir, as a *tapinosis*, in 3.22, where one Sergeant Bendlowes halts the queen's coach at progress time and commits a near-disastrous faux pas by saying, "Stay thy cart, good fellow, stay thy cart, that I may speak to the Queen" (345).

most outrageously, "By goddess bludde, ye shall see the kinge our maister cast out at the carts tail, and if he soo be serued, by godds body, he is well serued."<sup>6</sup> The *OED* defines *cart's-tail* as "the hinder part of a cart, to which offenders were tied to be whipped through the streets," citing an example from Foxe in 1563. Cromwell (Wyatt's ally) suppressed the letter, but after Cromwell's death in 1540 Bonner managed to get the charge taken up again, and Wyatt was, on this and related grounds, investigated—and imprisoned—for treason. Wyatt presented a detailed linguistic defense, which survives. What Bonner took the phrase to mean Wyatt makes clear in his furious and frightened denial: "that by throwinge owte of a cartes ars I shulde mene that vile deathe that is ordained for wretchede theves."<sup>7</sup> In this construction the insult was grave. Given such a range of associations, from manual labor to vile criminality, Puttenham's courtly poet appears to begin his career at an extreme social depth indeed.

On his way from the cart to the court Puttenham also acknowledges the "school," evincing a matter-of-fact respect for the achievement of gentry status through institutional education. The "entertainment" his poet will then be equipped to supply appears to entail both unserious amusement and perhaps some form of "holding court."<sup>8</sup> And such performance embraces both feminizing and erotic service, to judge by its specified audience: three of the four top layers of what Puttenham seems to envision here as a "stepped" pyramid are female: "gentlewomen," "ladies of honor," and his prince, Elizabeth. For the gentlemen, Puttenham offers an insistently elastic, perhaps superserviceable, ensemble of enchanting talents fit for satisfying the many desires of other powerful and ambitious males—both the great and those who haunt them.<sup>9</sup> He hastens to specify that these services offer solace, serious advice, pleasant and honest profit. "No offense i'th' world," as Hamlet has it.

One finally decisive attribute of the courtly poet and his art receives separate and arresting attention: cunning dissembling. Puttenham judges his task complete, he says,

so always as we leave him not unfurnished of one piece that best beseems  
that place of any other and may serve as a principal good lesson for all

6. See Muir, *Life and Letters* 67, cited from *L&P* 1538: XIII.2, no. 270. (Muir provides a useful context for the remark, sputteringly repeated by Bonner. The poet's fascinating and successful defense of his coarse speech appears at 196–200.)

7. Muir, *Life and Letters* 197.

8. Cf. Whigham, *Ambition and Privilege* 36–37, on Kenneth Burke's notion of the "performer-audience dialectic." The urbane artist may be socially inferior to his audience, professionally superior to them, yet bound to woo them. Each side of the dialectic confers both power and abjection. The performative life at court is above all a *predicament*.

9. For a rich and relevant treatment of the freight of "superserviceable" villainy in *King Lear*, see Strier, "Faithful Servants."

good makers to bear continually in mind in the usage of this science: which is, that being now lately become a courtier, he show not himself a craftsman, and merit to be disgraced, and with scorn sent back again to the shop or other place of his first faculty and calling, but that so wisely and discreetly he behave himself as he may worthily retain the credit of his place and profession of a very courtier, which is, in plain terms, cunningly to be able to dissemble. (3.25.378–79)

It is not clear whether this final condition amounts to achieving a durable disposition or enduring the ceaseless hazard of contemptible disgrace. Puttenham's maker, it seems, has but lately become a courtier, and remains anxiously at risk of showing himself a craftsman, deserving degradation to the shop. The way to avoid such humiliation, to maintain courtly place, is to enact oneself in accord with the "profession of a very courtier, which is, in plain terms, cunningly to be able to dissemble."

The objects of this dissembling are catalogued in striking detail: disguising the body with new fashions, the face with many countenances; disguising one's ideas and one's actions, "the better to win his purposes and good advantages" (3.25.379). Such disguising includes false illnesses and journeys and other absences from court, false health and wealth and poverty and busyness and idleness and religion and churlishness, and, of course, false courtesy. These disguisings, he then tells us, having so richly inventoried them, are typical of foreign courtiers, among whom he was raised and whom he knows better than English ones. However reality-based it may be, such deceit is not to be allowed to the English maker, who is to be an honest man and not a hypocrite, and who may dissemble only in the subtleties of his art, where *sprezzatura* may legitimately reign. The many cited disguisings linger for the reader nonetheless, as a rich anthology of "poems of conduct," to match the many examples of courtly poetry and conduct that enliven Book 3.

Puttenham goes on to explore the subtleties of poetic art, leaving behind without explanation the catalogue of courtly dissembling he has been at such pains to detail and then deny. Twice over, in fact: "I speak of the English," he essentially claims, "not foreigners, and of poetry, not conduct." This culminating gesture of *occupatio*, however, exactly epitomizes Puttenham's densely realized art of courtly *conduct*: an aggressively weird fan dance mixing supplication, anxiety, scorn, envy, the undisguised espousal of dissembling, and proud, even exhibitionist, display—all of these exposed, flaunted, coyly bared, and marked "to be concealed," by turns and all at once. The claims of insider expertise and the wincing fears of life (or worse) at the cart horse's tail together invite a view of the author as well acquainted with both precious place and loss, whether in personal memory, by report, or in avid fantasy. Whatever Puttenham may be felt to be doing here, crawling or prancing or

insinuating or sneering, *sprezzatura* is far away: he struggles to shape and control a particular and strong view of himself—both ours and his own—as a designer of courtly promotion. Such emotional density now seems the most distinctive feature of the *Art*.

## 1. The Documentary Life

*Birth, education, marriage.* The sources of Puttenham's complex hungry attitude are mostly lost to us, but many of the surviving details of his life must bear some relation to it. He was a younger son, born to parents on the fringe of Henry VIII's court in 1529 or 1530, one of eight children.<sup>10</sup> His paternal grandfather, Sir George, was present at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520.<sup>11</sup> Puttenham's father, Robert, a Hampshire gentleman, marched with Sir Thomas Elyot, Wyatt's John Poyntz, John Cheke, Fulke Greville (the poet's grandfather), Sir Anthony Rous (a client of the duke of Norfolk mentioned in 3.18 and 3.24), Sir Andrew Flamock (Henry VIII's standard-bearer, mentioned in 3.23), and many others in the ill-fated parade of welcome for Anne of Cleves in 1539.<sup>12</sup> Puttenham's mother, Margery, was the sister of Sir Thomas Elyot, prince-advising author of *The Boke named the Governour* (1531), and Henry's disastrously unpaid ambassador to Charles V for a few months of "unthankfull travayle" in 1531–32.<sup>13</sup>

Puttenham matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, in November 1546; Cambridge was then the seedbed of English humanism, numbering Roger Ascham, Sir John Cheke, Thomas Wilson, and Sir Thomas Smith among its faculty. Taking no degree there, Puttenham was admitted to the Middle Temple, one of London's four law schools, on August 11, 1556 (at about age twenty-seven). Such enrollment was becoming typical for younger sons of elite families, who, without substantial inheritance, had their way to make. Sir Thomas Elyot had been a Templar before Puttenham. There he also met his future brother-in-law John Throckmorton.

Puttenham's legal expertise emerges later in a variety of offensive and defensive contexts, but in 1559 or so, when he was around thirty, he left the study of the law to marry Elizabeth, Lady Windsor (1520–ca.

10. Puttenham states in a letter of late 1578 (preserved in two drafts) that he is "now upon the point of fyftie yeares of age" (PRO, SP 12/126/17 and SP 12/126/18). According to heraldic visitation records, Robert and Margery Elyot Puttenham's children are listed as follows: (1) Richard, (2) George, (3) Francis, (4) William, then Rose, Anne, Mary, and Margaret. (Only the sons' birth order is recorded.) See "Pedigrees" 17–18.

11. *L@P* 1519: III.1, no. 704. The Field of the Cloth of Gold was a famous meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I of France in June 1520, arranged to confirm the bond between the two kings specified by the Anglo-French treaty signed in 1518. In fact each king sought to outshine the other in elaborate displays of clothing, feasting, and games.

12. *L@P* 1539: XIV.2, no. 572.

13. See the records from this period in Elyot's *Letters*; p. 13 is quoted here.

1588), who was some ten years his senior. She was the daughter and co-heir of Peter Cowdray of Hampshire, and widow first of Richard Paulet (will probated February 6, 1552) and then of William, second Baron Windsor (who died August 20, 1558).<sup>14</sup> Baron Windsor had been a benchler of the Middle Temple when Puttenham was admitted, and he captured Windsor's wealthy widow, who had been raised in the same part of Hampshire as Puttenham, inside two years. Puttenham thus not only followed the educational curriculum of a typical late Tudor gentleman, but also exemplified Lawrence Stone's dictum that "for a young man of gentle birth, the fastest ways of moving up the social scale were the lotteries of marriage with an heiress, Court favor, and success at the law. The first of the three is usually neglected or ignored by social historians, but it was probably the commonest method of upward movement for gentlemen."<sup>15</sup> Lady Windsor had retained the Herriard property (her sizable dowry) and her jointure from Baron Windsor (three manors).<sup>16</sup> Their estate was sufficiently impressive that in 1574 they lodged the queen—or at least some of her progress entourage—at Herriard.<sup>17</sup>

*Travels.* Puttenham's life experience was not restricted to England. He speaks at least nine times in the *Art* of his foreign travel: (1) "I myself, seeing this conceit so well allowed of in France and Italy . . ." (2.12.197). (2) "I myself, having seen the courts of France, Spain, Italy, and that of the Empire, with many inferior courts . . ." (3.23.356). (3) "[T]he Prince of Orange . . . looked aside on that part where I stood a beholder of the feast" (probably in Brussels in 1566; see 3.23.356). (4) "In the time of Charles IX, French King [ruled 1560–74], I being at the Spa waters . . ." (3.24.362). (5) "And was some blemish to the Emperor Ferdinand [ruled 1558–64], a most noble-minded man, yet so careless and forgetful of himself in that behalf, as I have seen him run up a pair of stairs so swift and nimble apace, as almost had not become a very mean man, who had not gone in some hasty business" (3.24.377). (6) "I have observed it in the court of France" (3.25.380). (7) "[A]s I have observed

14. Data otherwise unidentified here and elsewhere derive from Steven W. May's *ODNB* essay "Puttenham, George (1529–1590/91)" and from many personal communications from May, as well as from his forthcoming essay on Puttenham's life records, "George Puttenham's Lewd and Illicit Career," which he has shared with unparalleled generosity. Much of this work derives from the Jervoise of Herriard papers, deposited at the Hampshire Record Office in the 1960s but only now receiving attention. We owe our initial knowledge of this cache of data to Charles Willis, a descendant of Puttenham who discovered these records and generously shared his work on them with us. A more particular debt to Willis regarding the library inventories found among Puttenham's papers is noted below.

15. Stone, "Social Mobility" 34–35.

16. Collins, *Peerage* 4.76.

17. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* 4.90: Chambers lists Herriard for September 14–16. Puttenham alludes in the *Art* to Elizabeth's supposed insistence on paying her own way at progress time (see 3.24.375).

in many of the princes' courts of Italy . . ." (3.25.381). (8) "[A]s I have seen of the greatest podestates and gravest judges and presidents of parliament in France . . ." (3.25.381). (9) "[E]specially in the courtiers of foreign countries, where in my youth I was brought up and very well observed their manner of life and conversation . . ." (3.25.381).

Documents in the Hampshire archive show that Puttenham was abroad in 1563 and possibly in 1565 or 1566. In 1578 he deposed that he had gone "beyond the seaes . . . aboute the vth yeare of her Majestyes raigne."<sup>18</sup> He signed papers in Antwerp on February 5 and 8, 1563.<sup>19</sup> He seems also to have traveled to Flanders in 1565 or 1566, according to Richard Hartilpoole, who sued Puttenham in Chancery in April 1567 for back wages, having spent "six wekes and more" with him there.<sup>20</sup> The archive also preserves a later passport, issued on May 5, 1567, to "our welbeloued George Puttenham," entitling him "to returne to the baines [baths] of the spaw or other place requisite for his health."<sup>21</sup> These documents do not positively confirm Puttenham's presence at the banquet in Brussels or at Spa mentioned in the *Art* (3.23.356 and 3.24.362), but they are consistent with such travels. There is thus no reason to doubt his claims of travel abroad, and he may have gained experience of courts there, as he says. In addition to the dates suggested by the cited documents, he may also have traveled (indeed, been "brought up") abroad in the ten years between his matriculation at Cambridge in 1546 and his (late) admission to the Middle Temple in 1556.

*Family relations and social violation.* Most of the historical data about George Puttenham suggest an injured, bellicose, and, it must be said, vicious nature. He resembles in confusing and disturbing ways *King Lear's* Gloster and his bastard younger son, Edmund. Legal records concerning Puttenham document numerous charges and counter charges of crimes against persons and property. He was repeatedly assaulted (suffering murder attempts four times, he claims), sued, countersued, arrested, imprisoned (at least six times), kidnapped, and excommunicated (four times). He was sued for assaulting a parson in his church, and was charged with subornation of murder and with treason (though he was eventually cleared), and with several varieties of what we would now call sexual predation (on which more below). Although it was a litigious and violent age, Puttenham's habits of life were extraordinarily unruly.

18. PRO, SP 12/127/27, f. 48v; SP 12/127/30, ff. 54v-55.

19. HRO, 44M69/t3/1, f. 8. For another possible clue to Puttenham's activities on the continent at this time, see LN 22.

20. PRO, C 3/90/84, m. 1.

21. For a facsimile of this document, see Willis, *Shakespeare and George Puttenham's "Arte of English Poesie"* 397. The passport grants Puttenham a year's absence from England at any time over the next two years.

Most of his collisions with the law occurred in connection with two main problems: his protracted quarrel from 1562 until 1584 with his niece and her husband over the paternal manor of Sherfield, and his deeply hostile divorce from Lady Windsor at some point after 1566. The data are sketchy and uneven, and derive largely from his enemies. We should proceed cautiously. Nonetheless, we must probably discern in Puttenham's struggles some profound failure of settled social and psychological construction within two of the most profound (if hardly unflawed) structures of obligation and identity on which Elizabethan culture rested: the experience of the primogenitural birth family—in Puttenham's case, that of a resentful younger brother<sup>22</sup>—and the cultural matrix of marriage. In this second and better-documented dysfunction, two factors are central. He married, apparently for sheerly instrumental reasons, an older and much richer woman, from whom most of the upward mobility he managed was derived. And he was relentlessly unfaithful and exploitive to his wife and, much more disturbingly to modern eyes, habitually violated a string of poor women and servants whom he misused as smoothly (at least initially) and grossly as he did Lady Windsor.

It should be said at the outset that judging the weight of these actions for reading *The Art of English Poesy* is difficult. For some, they may be so toxic as to render further reading intolerable, confirming Puttenham as a limit case of Renaissance misogyny. In this regard it is as well to recall that such disturbing conjunctions of literary intelligence and moral turpitude are not unique in early English literature. Geoffrey Chaucer was charged with rape (whether sexual assault or abduction we do not know), though eventually cleared. Sir Thomas Malory was also charged with assault and rape. Edmund Spenser, some would argue, welcomed the solution of genocide by famine for the Elizabethan Irish problem.<sup>23</sup> To some, these matters may seem extraliterary, irrelevant, unsightly, or adequately explained; to others, explained away, or worse, passed by in guilty silence. Perhaps, so far as the sexual crimes go, we should speak of a larger cultural pathology, of some volcanic transformation of the ownership logic of cuckoldry panic about the proper "use" of women, a panic only partly intelligible now. Perhaps instead there was a family pathology: Puttenham's elder brother, Richard, was convicted of rape in 1561. As editors we have no illusion of having produced a finally satisfactory frame for the confluence of Puttenham's troubling life and his art as we can know them now.

*The conflict with his brother.* Of Puttenham's relationship with his brother, Richard, we know the least, and indeed, not enough to withhold

22. Cf. Thirsk's famous study of discontented younger sons and the English Civil War.

23. On Chaucer and Malory, see the series of articles by Cannon. For Spenser, see *A View of the State of Ireland* xv–xvi, xix–xx, 101–5.

confidently the sincere sympathy appropriate to abandoned and embittered younger sons in the period. These young men too often suffered the fate of redundant functional backstops in the primogenitural system. Once the heir achieved his majority and inherited, they were unneeded, unwanted, and unprovided for.<sup>24</sup> Richard Puttenham, the heir, had moved to the continent in 1560, probably to avoid the consequences of the rape for which he was convicted the next year.<sup>25</sup> In 1578 George deposed that he had journeyed there around 1562–63 to buy Sherfield from Richard, who had inherited it in 1550 (having already inherited his uncle Elyot's property in 1546).<sup>26</sup> George signed purchase agreements with Richard in Antwerp on February 5 and 8, 1563,<sup>27</sup> and occupied Sherfield until 1567, when Richard came home secretly and, breaking whatever deal had been made earlier, conveyed the manor to Anne and Francis Morris, who then took the house from Puttenham by force.

In the meantime, Puttenham was sued on a separate matter in London in 1565, and in 1569 the sheriffs in London and Middlesex were ordered by the courts to arrest him for contempt in regard to the suit, and for a variety of other crimes.<sup>28</sup> When he was selected to serve as a justice of the peace in 1569, the reforming Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester, wrote to Elizabeth's principal secretary William Cecil praying "that it be not true[,] for his evil life is well known, and also that he is a 'notorious enemye to God's Truthe.'" <sup>29</sup> By June 1570 Puttenham was being held in the Fleet prison, owing, it seems, to a deposition by a Julio Mantuano that Puttenham had slandered the queen and incited him to murder the bishop of London.<sup>30</sup> The divorce testimony records that he "was comytted to the fflete vppon matter of highe Treason,"<sup>31</sup> and in the same year was accused of suborning the assassination of Secretary Cecil.<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless, he seems to have cleared himself from these charges, successfully suing the warden of the Fleet, Brian Annesley, for

24. See, e.g., Lawrence Stone: "Under such a system [of primogeniture], both the elder and the younger children suffered. The latter normally inherited neither title nor estate, unless one of them happened to be heir to his mother's property, and they were therefore inevitably downwardly mobile, until they had made their own fortunes in some profession or occupation. Some were kept hanging around on or near the estate, as a kind of walking sperm-bank in case the elder son died childless and had to be replaced" (*The Family, Sex and Marriage* 88).

25. *CSP Domestic, 1547–1580*, 175: SP 12/16/61 (document of April 25, 1561).

26. PRO, SP 12/127/27, f. 48v; SP 12/127/30, ff. 54v–55.

27. HRO, 44M69/f3/1, f. 8.

28. PRO, REQ 2 219/25. These included both property crimes and at least two instances of assault.

29. HMC Salisbury 1.392–3, Horne to Cecil, January 21, 1568/69. Horne appears to have succeeded: Puttenham's name does not appear on a list of thirty Hampshire JPs who subscribed to the Act of Uniformity in November 1569, nor is he mentioned among those who failed to sign the document (SP 12/59/46, ff. 160–62).

30. This was Edmund Grindal, translated to York May 22, 1570. Mantuano's April 7 deposition (PRO, SP 70/111/627, *olim* 795) alleges that the idea was proposed five months before.

31. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1.

32. PRO, SP 12/66/118.

funds given Annesley to pay Puttenham's debts during his imprisonment.<sup>33</sup> Meanwhile, Puttenham's normal life, such as it was, continued. His men seized the mill at Sherfield in April 1571, but Morris once again recovered it by force. At this time Puttenham was residing there with a Margaret Marriner, whose house, she averred, Morris and his men had pulled down; she and Puttenham rebuilt it, and Morris once again demolished it. The conflict finally came to an end in 1581, when Morris was arrested for harboring the Jesuit Edmond Campion; he died in prison in 1584.

*The conflicts with his wife.* Puttenham's divorce battles aggravated these other tensions. Lady Windsor later deposed that she had accepted Puttenham "onlye by the perswasion of Sr Iohn Throckmorton," and that he then lacked "any porcon of livinge."<sup>34</sup> According to her relations, she had already become alienated from him by the early 1560s, having decided very soon after their marriage in 1559 that he had "married the Landes and the liuinge and not the woman."<sup>35</sup> Things had apparently gone very bad rather quickly, for in the fall of 1562 Thomas Paulet, Lady Windsor's brother-in-law, assaulted Puttenham at Sherfield, later admitting that he wounded him in the head with his dagger, and "then agayne with the blade of the said dagger gave unto the said complainant one other litle Stroke."<sup>36</sup> Lady Windsor finally left Puttenham in 1575, and for her later divorce proceedings prepared an elaborate documentation of her reasons for so doing, consisting of depositions from seventeen witnesses (preserved in the Jervoise of Herriard archive, which documents this rehearsal generally). She concluded that she was "prohibyted by the lawes of god to keepe felowship wth so incestuous [i.e., adulterous] and vnsatyable a man wth diuerse lewd women wherof one at that instant she tooke from his house whose examynacon wth diuerse others of his beastlyke demeanures remayneth most true of Record in tharches [the London Court of Arches]."<sup>37</sup> Several documents affirm Puttenham's physical abuse of Lady Windsor. She addressed him in a written complaint, saying: "Caule to yor remembrance how vildlie you haue in all respectes delt wth me more like a kytchin slaue then like a wyfe. Consider also how Latelie ye haue most wickedlie attempted not onlie to impeach my rybbes but rather to spoile me of my life." Two servants also deposed that he injured his wife's back by throwing her against a door.<sup>38</sup>

33. Annesley is otherwise familiar in literary studies for his youngest daughter, Cordelia, his senility in old age, and the possibility that his experience influenced Shakespeare's rendition of *King Lear*.

34. HRO, 44M69 F2/14/1, bundle 1.

35. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, p. 3.

36. PRO, STAC 5, P66/2.

37. HRO, 44M69 F2/14/1, bundle 1.

38. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, p. 1; HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, bundle 2, no. vii, ff. 2, 4.

According to more of Lady Windsor's witnesses, Puttenham conducted numerous adulteries with her servants, living (perhaps like Gloster) the life of a brutal but persuasive sexual predator.<sup>39</sup> He arranged a marriage for the pregnant Izard Cawley, "the better to geave Colloure to his incontinente Dealinges wth her."<sup>40</sup> With another maid-servant, Mary Champneys, he dealt as follows:

to Wynne his vngodly purpose he firste practized wth faire wordes and rewardes who neverthesse resisted the same of a verie godly Mynde disposed But sith he cold not so wynne her he did dayly so beate her from tyme to tyme in suche sorte that the Maiden shold wax wery of her Service/After wch practice he . . . assaulted the said Maiden in moste wicked Maner and there wth all shewed her what thraldome and misery she shold sustayne and therefore the next way was to assente vnto him in his Carnall desires And that then she shold lyve in the estate of a gentlewoman in greate quietnes and in no lesse wealeth and felicitie.

When Champneys became pregnant, he took her to Flanders to give birth, and then abandoned her there "in grete misery."<sup>41</sup>

Three more such cases are documented by the testimony of neighbors and servants, specifying pregnancies and also financial payouts, which might have been either "hush money" or child support. Puttenham's bailiff, James Kirby, testified that he "dyd at [Puttenham's] Comaundemente paye for the nursinge of the sayde children and also apparell whoe gaued this deponente money allwayes to paye from tyme to tyme as the sayde woman did demaunde of this deponente."<sup>42</sup> These corruptions, so distasteful to modern sensibilities, may seem less disturbing than his treatment of the last of the documented victims, Elizabeth Johnson, whose abuse by Puttenham many local witnesses confirm. Johnson herself deposed in detail how Puttenham had one of his servants abduct her in London as a teenager, luring her with the prospect of a place in service with a lady. She was taken to a house in Paddington, where Puttenham came, and "wthyn an howre or twoe after he came thither he the sayde Mr Puttenham *with muche adoe* had his pleasure carnallye wth her" (emphasis added): surely what we would call rape is meant.<sup>43</sup> For three

39. This is, anyway, one obvious construction—that Gloster was a sexual predator—of Edgar's cruel line, "The dark and vicious place where thee he got cost him his eyes" (*King Lear* 5.3.175–76).

40. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, bundle 1, no. viii.

41. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, bundle 1, no. ii.

42. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, bundle 2, no. vii, f. 9. Middleton's characterization of the maid Diaphanta in *The Changeling* (1622) suggests the possibility that such actions were not always simply gross and one-sided exploitation. She performs a sexual service for her mistress that will net her enough gold to serve as a promising dowry: "I'm for a justice now, / I bring a portion with me; I scorn small fools" (4.1.126–27). Whether such fictions resembled many real-life cases is not at all clear.

43. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, bundle 2, no. vii, f. 3v.

years Puttenham moved Johnson from one place to another, setting her up in custodial housing with the aid of cooperative servants. This arrangement came to an end when Lady Windsor seized Johnson at her husband's farm of Upton Gray, writing to him, "I haue in my custodie a damsell chosen by you as she confessethe for yor owne toothe." Puttenham demanded that she be set free, but his wife replied, "Only yow Longe for her retorne to yor owne person," and felt herself "authorized . . . to answere for her kepinge."<sup>44</sup>

These disturbing materials are, it should be noted, both ambiguous and confusing. Puttenham's exploitation of his victims seems unmistakable, but much of Johnson's relation to the experience is opaque. Her testimony was summoned, possibly suborned or extracted, by Lady Windsor for her own explicitly hostile purposes, which may or may not have coincided with Johnson's. The custodial housing was probably captivity, but may have been concealment (from exposure or rescue) or even an initially imposed but perhaps then accepted "living." Johnson's so-called confession of sexual relations may be guilty, shamefaced, or triumphantly vengeful, or may simply amount to a matter-of-fact legal affirmation of what had happened. Lady Windsor may have liberated her, or locked her up in a different house, feeling "authorized" to do so by Johnson's fear of Puttenham, but Lady Windsor's actions would also have been motivated by her own sense of injury and vengeful spousal self-righteousness, actions possibly quite high-handed, enabled as such by her local clout as county magnate. While Puttenham's gross misconduct seems clear enough, it is equally clear that a great deal of the story is obscure, and was probably driven as much by the energies of status and honor as by those of what we would call gender politics.

In Easter Term of 1575,<sup>45</sup> Lady Windsor left Puttenham, moved in with her children, and reapplied herself to divorce proceedings at the Court of Arches in London, the ecclesiastical court under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury. Puttenham had been bound to provide her with £100 annually for her upkeep, but had failed to honor the bond after 1572. Although the Court of Arches required him in the fall of 1575 to begin paying her £3 a week, he continued to default. The Privy Council then intervened, requiring the alimony on her behalf in 1576, and simultaneously investigating her charge (eventually shown to be true) that Puttenham had illegally transferred the Herriard estate to his brother-in-law Sir John Throckmorton. Puttenham had fraudulently persuaded her to sign the relevant transfer papers, assuring her that they would enable her daughter Elizabeth to inherit Herriard in re-

44. HRO, 44M69/F2/14/1, pp. 1, 2.

45. See the unaddressed copy of Throckmorton's letter dated March 18, 1579, HRO, 44M69/f2/13/3.

version and without crown fees.<sup>46</sup> Instead, the documents disinherited her children.<sup>47</sup>

Incensed by these crimes and by his refusal to obey their summons, in June the Privy Council sent two royal pursuivants (officers empowered to execute warrants) to bring Puttenham before them:

[T]he saide George caused the said two persons by vi. or vij others to be holden in the Churcheyarde of Herryard . . . soe as the said George then and there wth a weapon called a bastynadoe beatte the said persons in very contemptuous maner and brake one of their hedes very sore, for wch cause . . . he rested excommunicated ipso facto, and vnder the danger of the losse of one of his eares.<sup>48</sup>

Puttenham's excommunication from the Anglican Church for failure to pay his alimony was the first of four times he suffered this legal penalty, which had been strengthened by the 1563 Parliament: the statute observed that "diuers persons offending in many great crymes and offences apperteynyng meerely to the iurisdiction and determination of the Ecclesiastical courtes and iudges of the Realme, are manye tymes vnpunished for lacke and want of the good and due execution of the wryt *de Excommunicato capiendo*."<sup>49</sup> Enforcement was stiffened, and fines for failure to respond increased. As we see, Puttenham's beating of the pursuivants made him liable to the loss of an ear, and he may also have been branded, according to another suit (undated).<sup>50</sup> (Whether he actually underwent either of these mutilations remains unclear.)

In 1577 Puttenham left Herriard and became a permanent fugitive. His neighborhood of residence at this time is revealing: the precinct of London called Whitefriars, named for the church of the White Friars, or Carmelites, built in 1241 and torn down at the Dissolution of the Monasteries. The attached privilege of legal sanctuary remained unrevoked until 1697, however, and the tenements there thus attracted "a lawless community of fraudulent debtors, refugees from justice, and women of the streets . . . who defied the officers of the Law and governed themselves."<sup>51</sup> (Such dispossessed "hideout" habitation might remind us of Shakespeare's Edmund, who "hath been out nine years,"

46. Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council* 9.148.

47. The young Elizabeth died before May 1576, and Lady Windsor's heir, John Paulet, sued Puttenham to recover the lands.

48. HRO, 44M69 F2/14/1, bundle 1, Lady Windsor's account, docketed as the "Answer to the allegatons made by georg Puttenham to the Lords of the counsell." A bastinado is a cudgel, though perhaps the phrasing suggests a special kind.

49. *A Table to al the Statutes* (STC 9546), 1570, sig. K5-6v.

50. One William Bethell seems to have affirmed in a suit that Puttenham "for his evell mysdemenor hath byn latley burned in the hande" (PRO, C3 205/14, m. 1). This punishment would probably have been for a different crime (not for his beating of the pursuivants, which carried a potential penalty of branding on the cheek, not the hand).

51. Sugden, *Topographical Dictionary* 564.

and soon "away he shall again," his father determines. In a play so profoundly concerned with outcasts and casting out, this first, curiously undefined use of the word "out," regarding its most lawless refugee, has an implicit reach well beyond the neutral gloss "abroad.") In 1578 the divorce became final, and Lady Windsor's petitions for financial support resumed. In October Puttenham wrote the council that he could not appear before them owing to fear of her children, whom he accused of having assaulted him. On February 3 they had, he claimed, broken into his rooms in Whitefriars with an armed band, served him with another writ *excommunicato capiendo*, and carried him away "without any cappe, hatt or carchiffe bare heded" to prison in Middlesex, after rifling through his chests and desks, where, he said, bonds of £11,000 or more were held.<sup>52</sup> John Paulet, Lady Windsor's son by her second marriage, was seeking possession of Herriard, which should, he thought, have come to him from his father (as part of Lady Windsor's dowry), but which Puttenham had been using as his main residence while married to her. The raid aimed to secure the records needed to recapture the manor.

Puttenham was released from prison in June by collusion with the undersheriff and resumed his fugitive life; the Privy Council then issued another warrant for his arrest on sight to all mayors, sheriffs, and bailiffs.<sup>53</sup> He complained to the council loudly by letter: "[Y]our Lordships haue me in great yll oppinion and displeasure. . . . I shall not be able to lyue in my country (nor anye wherels free from euery mans spoile and inuasion. for who will forebeare to offer me wronge that shall beholde yowr good Lordships apou privat cawses so extraordinaryly and sharply to persecute me with yowr displeasures?"<sup>54</sup> In response to his claimed danger, the council issued letters of protection for his appearance, and arrested him on December 20 "with some difficulty."<sup>55</sup> By July 13, 1579, he had agreed to provide Lady Windsor with six servants, four suits, a coach, and £20 yearly (according to a document partly drafted by Puttenham, completed and revised in more stringent terms in the hand of William Cecil, Lord Burghley).<sup>56</sup> By November he was again, predictably, in arrears, as the course of the law steadily eroded his income, the great bulk of which derived from his access to Lady Windsor's properties. He was imprisoned and excommunicated twice more (as late as 1588). By 1589 Lady Windsor was deceased,<sup>57</sup> and Puttenham soon

52. PRO, STAC 5 P9/4, P3/3. The documents then seized constitute most of the Jervoise of Herriard archive on which this narrative is based.

53. Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council* 10.260.

54. PRO, SP 12/126/16, an unsigned holograph, endorsed in another contemporary hand, "A long lettere drawne to the lords of the Councel. from Mr Georg Puttenham."

55. Thus Throckmorton to Burghley, December 21, 1578, HMC Salisbury 2.222.

56. PRO, PC 2/2, p. 540.

57. PRO, STAC 5 P33/22.

followed her, ending his life nearly indigent. Litigious to the end, he brought suit in that year against Henry, Lord Windsor, Lady Windsor's stepson, for an annuity that in fact had lapsed many years before when she and Puttenham became legally separated. Windsor denied all Puttenham's claims but reported that "the said plaintiff hath ben an importunant Sutor to him for some Anuytie or yearelie Rente as allso for money for the Relievinge of his poore estate . . . vppon which greate and earneste suite of the said plaintiff this defendent hath furnished the said plaintiff as by the waye of Loue with one Hundred poundes or more in ready money at sondry times."<sup>58</sup> In September 1590 Puttenham's nuncupative will left all his possessions to Mary Simmes, his servant. He was buried in London on January 6, 1591.

## 2. Puttenham's Writings

The wildness of Puttenham's personal life did not prevent a significant literary output. Only the *Art* and the *Partheniades* have survived, but numerous lost works are mentioned in the *Art*.

*Partheniades*. This work, a set of seventeen poems totaling 555 lines in praise of Queen Elizabeth, is cited at least eleven times in the *Art*. It survives only in manuscript (BL, Cotton Vesp. MS E.8, fols. 169–78), and was not printed until 1811.<sup>59</sup> Its headnote labels it "The principall addresse in nature of a New yeares gifte." Its final poem, comparing Elizabeth to Pallas, says of her, "O now twenty yeare agon, / Forsaking Greece for Albion, / Where thow alone dost rule" (470–72).<sup>60</sup> This passage roughly dates at least this poem to around 1579. More exact dating is impossible. The first poem's opening lines suggest the presence of royalty at the New Year's celebration: "Gracious Princesse, Where princes are in place / To geue you gold, and plate, and perles of price, / It seemeth this day, saue your royall advice, / Paper presentes should haue but little grace" (1–4). No royalty attended that celebration in 1579–80, but Elizabeth's suitor, the duke of Alençon, was present in 1581–82, and he is mentioned obliquely at 211 as having "bidd [invited] repulse" at the queen's hands (see Morfill's notes). As Willcock and Walker observe (xxxii),<sup>61</sup> there is also some reason to suppose that the seventeen poems were written at different times. Finally, there is no record that the poems were actually presented to the queen; perhaps the headnote is a literary fiction.

58. PRO, C2/Eliz/P17/50, m. 2.

59. In Haslewood, *Ancient Critical Essays* 1.xvii–xxviii.

60. *Partheniades*, in *Ballads from Manuscripts*, ed. Morfill, 2:72–91. All citations of the *Partheniades* are taken from this edition.

61. Henceforth references to Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker's 1936 edition of the *Art* will appear parenthetically in the text.

*Lost works.* At various points in the *Art* Puttenham names the following lost works:

1. *Hierotechnē* (1.12.119), apparently a work on religion: the title seems to mean "On the Art of the Sacred," or perhaps "On the Power of the Gods."
2. "[A] little brief romance or historical ditty in the English tongue of the Isle of Great Britain in short and long meters" (1.19.131).
3. His "*Triumphals* written in honor of her Majesty's long peace" (1.23.135, 3.19.305 and 323).
4. A work titled *Philocalia*, wherein, he says, he has "strained to show the use and application of this figure [*exergasia*] and all others mentioned in this book [the *Art*]" (3.20.333–34; see also 2.12.186 and 3.20.335).
5. A comedy called *Ginecocratia* (2.18.218), about a king ruled by women.
6. His "books of the originals and pedigree of the English tongue" (3.4.228).
7. An eclogue titled *Elpine* (3.13.253), "which [he] made being but eighteen years old, to King Edward VI, a prince of great hope" (perhaps a coronation gift?).
8. An interlude called *Lusty London* (3.15.256, 3.19.282).
9. An interlude called *The Wooer* (3.19.287 and 311).
10. "[A] hymn written by us to the Queen's Majesty entitled 'Minerva'" (3.19.322).
11. A courtesy book called *De decoro* (On Decorum), perhaps in Latin, treating of both words and behavior (3.24.360).

*Self-quotations.* Puttenham cites from his own unnamed writings at least twenty-three times. Many of these passages were surely composed expressly as examples for the *Art*. He does not always identify them as his own; on one occasion (2.18.217) he identifies lines as his own which he elsewhere introduces by saying, "as one replied . . ." (3.19.288). This shifting attribution (along with common sense) suggests that more of his own material appears among the many unidentified passages the book contains (both versified translations and possibly original English verse). We have marked with an asterisk all of his identified self-citations from lost works.

*The Justification.* Puttenham is also the anonymous author of one overtly political work, *A Justificacion of Queene Elizabeth in Relacion to the Affaire of Mary Queene of Scottes*, unpublished until the Camden Society edition of Allan J. Crosby and John Bruce (1867) but well

known in manuscript form at the time. Two of seven contemporary manuscripts (BL, Add. 48027, Harl. 831) ascribe it to him; no other attributions are known (Willcock and Walker xxiii). Its free and open discussion of the queen's ideas, attitudes, and actions, along with its frequently implied eyewitness acquaintance with the highest powers (see 73–75, 79, 84, etc.), suggests the possibility that it was an official commission.<sup>62</sup> This idea has seemed reasonable because public venting of such a risky matter without authorization had cost John Stubbes his hand at the time of the Alençon affair a decade before. Yet there is reason to doubt the “official commission” idea. Just when Parliament began to deal with the affair of Mary's execution (on November 4, 1586), Puttenham was excommunicated and soon thereafter imprisoned by the Privy Council. It therefore seems more likely that he wrote the *Justification* on his own initiative, while imprisoned, as a bid for the council's good graces. The council probably welcomed the *Justification*'s extenuation of their sneaking the death warrant into action on February 8, 1587, past the queen's known opposition. The fact that Robert Beale, clerk of the council, owned a copy he earmarked “It is thought that this book was made by George Puttenham”<sup>63</sup> documents this link.<sup>64</sup>

Surely in recompense, Puttenham received the award of two leases in reversion (i.e., when they became available) in May 1588, by the hand of the queen via Thomas Windebank, Burghley's agent and a Clerk of the Signet.<sup>65</sup> The possible commission of this work and Puttenham's reward for it constitute the pinnacle of Puttenham's approach to Queen Elizabeth. Such a gift was, generally speaking, “very much a personal grant from the Queen.”<sup>66</sup> The probable intermediation of Beale and Windebank, however, make it equally likely that the *Justification* was submitted to Burghley—in effect to the council—and that Burghley arranged for the gift of the leases. Such a route might explain why the *Art* is dedicated to Burghley, not well known as a reader of poetry. It must also be noted that the leases in reversion constituted no great reward. Elizabeth awarded outright leases of crown land, more valuable because they could pay dividends immediately, to many quite minor figures of her household.

62. This is the view of Willcock and Walker, though Steven May strongly questions this possibility in his forthcoming publication, “George Puttenham: Predator, Felon, and Fugitive,” that shapes the objections cited here.

63. British Library, MS. Add. 48027, f. 451.

64. Willcock and Walker believe (xxiii) that the Bodleian MS. Add. C. 83 copy contains corrections in Puttenham's own hand, but May disputes this judgment.

65. The leases were for the parsonage of Marten, Wiltshire, and the parsonage of St. Botolph without Aldgate in London, both for forty years at a total fine of £40 per annum.

66. Thomas, “Leases in Reversion” 67.

### 3. The Authorship of the *Art*

*The Art of English Poesy* was published anonymously.<sup>67</sup> Ever since Willcock and Walker argued in 1936 that George Puttenham was its author, their attribution has gone uncontested. (The recent discovery of several inventories of his personal library somewhat strengthens this view.) The evidence is as follows.

Contemporary references suggest that a man named Puttenham wrote the *Art*. The book was published anonymously by Richard Field, who said it came to his hands "with his bare title without any author's name or any other ordinary address" (Dedication 90). Whoever the author may have been, he was engaged with its publication, altering the text in press and referring in it to many of his other works. Field cannot have been ignorant of the author's identity. The first recorded reference to the *Art*, a slighting one, appears in Sir John Harington's *Brief Apology of Poetry*, the preface to his translation of the *Orlando Furioso* (1591), also published by Field. Harington does not propose, he says, to "trouble [the reader] with the curious definitions of a Poet and Poesie, & with the subtil distinctions of their sundrie kinds; nor to dispute how high and supernatural the name of a Maker is, so christned in English by that vnknowne Godfather, that this last yeare saue one, viz. 1589. set forth a booke called the Art of English Poetrie." After referring in a bruised way to that author's view of translators as mere versifiers (see 1.1.93), Harington goes on to say:

[T]hough the poore gentleman laboreth greatly to proue, or rather to make Poetrie an art, and reciteth as you may see in the plurall number, some pluralities of patterns, and parcels of his owne Poetrie, with diuerse pieces of Partheniads and hymnes in praise of the most praiseworthy; yet whatsoeuer he would proue by all these, sure in my poore opinion he doth proue nothing more plainly, then that which M. Sidney and all the learned sort that haue written of it, do pronounce, namely that it is a gift and not an art, I say he proueth it, because making himselfe and manie others so cunning in the art, yet he sheweth himselfe so slender a gift in it. (2)

Harington does not name Puttenham here, but a surviving manuscript note addressed to Field, concerning the publication of his own book, appears to confirm that Harington refers to the *Art*: "Mr. Field, [. . .] I would have the allegory, as also the apology and all the prose that is to come, except the table, in the same print that Putnams books is."<sup>68</sup> The

67. For extended consideration of this fact and the practice it instantiates, see North, *The Anonymous Renaissance* 104–8 and passim.

68. Cited by Hughes ("Puttenham's 'Arte of English Poesie'" 404) from BM Add. MS. 18,920. The typeface for Harington's allegory, apology, and prose is indeed the same as the one that Field used in the *Art*: further evidence that Field's ignorance of the identity of the *Art*'s author was a fiction.

second edition of Camden's *Remains* concerning Britain (1614) contains an essay by Richard Carew, "The Excellency of the English Tongue," which cites Puttenham by name: "And, in a word, to close up these proofs of our copiousness, look into our Imitations of all sorts of verses afforded by any other language, and you shall finde that Sir *Philip Sidney*, Maister *Puttenham*, Maister *Stanihurst*, and divers more have made use how farre wee are within compasse of a fore imagined impossibility in that behalfe" (43). Finally, in 1614 or so, Edmund Bolton speaks in his unpublished *Hypercritica* of "the elegant, witty, and artificial book of the *Art of English Poetrie*, (the work as the fame is) of one of [Elizabeth's] Gentleman Pensioners, Puttenham"<sup>69</sup> (2.250). These are the early modern recognitions; taken together, they confirm a clear early modern view that the *Art's* author was named Puttenham.

In addition to George Puttenham, two other candidates for the authorship have been proposed: Richard Puttenham (ca. 1520–97 or later), George's elder brother and heir to both Robert Puttenham and Sir Thomas Elyot; and John, first Baron Lumley (ca. 1533–1609), the noted book and art collector, heir to Arundel, and participant in the Ridolfi plot to assassinate Elizabeth and put Mary, Queen of Scots, on the throne.

Richard Puttenham, as we have seen, was convicted of rape in 1561, having fled to the continent the preceding year. Like George, he married unhappily, probably went back and forth between England and the continent several times in flight from his troubles, and spent significant time in the King's Bench Prison for debts he blamed clamorously on his wife.<sup>70</sup> There is little evidence of literary activity.<sup>71</sup> H. H. S. Croft, however, the Victorian editor of Elyot's *Governour* (1883), argued for his authorship of the *Art*, first, on the basis of what he thought to be evidence that Richard could have witnessed the dinner that Arundel attended with Margaret of Parma and William of Orange, while George could not have; and second, because Richard was imprisoned for debt at the time the *Art* was licensed for publication and might have sought to relieve his difficulties by having it printed (anonymously).<sup>72</sup>

Lumley was the candidate of B. M. Ward.<sup>73</sup> Dismissing George out of hand in a footnote (289) and arguing at length against Croft's case for Richard, Ward contended (among other things) that:

69. First printed in Haslewood, *Ancient Critical Essays* 2.221–54.

70. See Stretton, *Women Waging Law* 143, 146–48, 191–92, 222.

71. He did collect an annuity at Chaucer's tomb, as Willcock and Walker note (xvii): see PRO, C. 54/743, no. 40.

72. See Croft 1.clxxiii–clxxxix. Richard was born ca. 1520, and was thus too old to have written *Elpine* at age eighteen for Edward VI in 1547 or after (see 3.13.253), but Croft claims (clxxxvii) that it was not unheard of to address Edward as "the Sixth" while his father was alive.

73. See Ward, "The Authorship of the *Arte of English Poesie*."

1. Unlike Richard, Lumley was the right age to have written *Elpine* (see 3.13.253).
2. Lumley was present at the opening of Parliament in 1553 (see 3.2.223).
3. As Arundel's son-in-law and the eventual inheritor of his estate, Lumley had traveled with him to Brussels and Spa in 1566 (see 3.23.356 and 3.24.362).
4. He gave New Year's gifts to the queen on several occasions, including 1579, when the *Partheniades* may have been presented, while no record of a gift from any Puttenham can be found.
5. He was a courtier and man of rank.
6. He had a notable library.
7. Between the 1589 publication of the *Art* and the 1614 appearance of Carew's essay, many men published essays on poetry (Harington, Harvey, Nashe, Meres, Camden), but none mentioned Puttenham until Carew.
8. Given the specificity of the Harington attribution (to "Putnam"), Lumley must have plotted with Field to have his book printed anonymously and have it given out in rumor that it was the work of "a fellow called Putnam, or something of the sort" (294), since, as a courtier, he would have wished to conceal his authorship.

Willcock and Walker dispose heartlessly of most of Ward's case, arguing among other things (xiii) that as Arundel's son-in-law Lumley is unlikely to have "stood" (3.23.356) at the banquet in Brussels (instead of being seated), and that Lumley's library (which specialized in science, medicine, geography, and music) and his own writings seem quite at variance with the *Art's* basic characteristics. His library contains many of his own writings, including juvenilia, they note, but none of the numerous missing works by the *Art's* author. Lumley was a notable art and book collector as well as a "display" builder who designed the remarkable Grove of Diana, an allegorical garden, at Nonsuch Palace in Surrey. He shows little sign, however, of what we would now recognize as a literary life, though he did translate, at age seventeen (in 1550), Erasmus's *Education of a Christian Prince*.<sup>74</sup> Finally, Lumley was a committed Catholic, a supporter of Mary, Queen of Scots, and a conspirator in the Ridolfi plot, for which he was imprisoned at length in the Tower. Such zeal seems at variance with the views of the author of the *Art*, the *Justification*, and the *Partheniades* (see below).

George Puttenham's case, like his brother's, rests centrally on the name that Harington and those who followed him gave to the *Art's* author. Both external and internal evidence for George link him to *The Art of English Poesy*: (1) his age, (2) his cosmopolitan continental asso-

74. British Library, Royal MS 17 A.xlix.

ciations, (3) his Cambridge humanist training, (4) his Middle Temple legal education, (5) his family of origin (in both its intellectual and courtly-historical aspects) and his humanist library, (6) his authorship of the *Justification* (possibly commissioned, definitely rewarded, externally recognized), (7) his relations to various significant courtly figures and families as well as his externally attested friendship with Sir John Throckmorton, and (8) the possible relationship between the *Art* and *Partheniades*. Let us take these points in greater detail.

1. George was about eighteen when Edward came to the throne in 1547 and could have written *Elpine* for him then (see 3.13.253). (Richard was some ten years older.)

2. The author says he was brought up in foreign courts (3.25.381). We know little of George's youth, but many Englishmen were abroad during the 1550s, and there are signs of continental connections of various kinds: he had an Italian servant in 1569 (the Julio Mantuano mentioned earlier), and, as Willcock and Walker report, "when he was attempting to avoid arrest in 1578 'a lytell frenche boye' acted as a messenger between him and his servants and it was 'in the frenche house' that he lay in hiding" (xxvi).<sup>75</sup> He visited the continent at least twice between 1563 and 1578 (Willcock and Walker xxvii, and May, "George Puttenham: Predator, Felon, and Fugitive"). His handwriting is also predominantly Italic in character, unlike that of most gentlemen of his generation.<sup>76</sup>

3. George's probable education at the Cambridge of Cheke and Ascham fits with the humanist mode of the *Art*, as does the surviving page from his translation of Suetonius and the many Latin and some Greek works in his library lists.

4. The *Art* refers many times to legal matters. George studied at the Middle Temple starting in 1556. He was related to eminent lawyers (Sir James Dyer, Elyot's widow's second husband, and the Throckmortons). His nephew Francis Morris, like others of his enemies at law, treats him as a habitual legal twister.<sup>77</sup> Puttenham tangled with the criminal justice system repeatedly, and he was the privately known author of the anonymous *Justification*, a text steeped in legality. Finally, there are numerous volumes concerned with English law in Puttenham's library lists. (Puttenham's brother Richard also experienced a good deal of legal trouble; the case for his authorship resembles George's on these grounds.)

75. Cited from SP 12/127/28, item 2. Willcock and Walker note (xxvi) that Richard Puttenham also had a foreign servant in 1558 (c.2 Eliz./R 10/27).

76. Renaissance humanists eventually made Italic script, derived from Carolingian minuscule, the "standard" cursive script throughout western Europe, but this process was not well advanced in England when Puttenham was being educated.

77. In 1571 Morris deposed that Puttenham was "full of brables of subtyll practyses and slanderous devyses . . . overconnyng in defacing of truthe by wordes & speache eloquente and in invencon of myscheiffe verie pyfytte" (PRO, STAC 5 P5/10).

5. By his own account the author of the *Art* wrote many other manuscript and lost works. George grew up around books (just as, presumably, did Richard, whose case is equally entitled by what follows in this paragraph). In 1522 the brothers' maternal grandfather, Sir Richard Elyot, willed all his English books to George's mother, Margery Elyot Puttenham.<sup>78</sup> They had the example of their uncle Sir Thomas Elyot generally before them, and the relationship may have been close. In 1533, when George was about four years old, Elyot dedicated his tract *The Education or bringinge up of children* (adapted from Plutarch) to "his only entierly beloved syster Margery Puttenham."<sup>79</sup> Later in life (ca. 1580), George owned a substantial library of some 180 books (nothing like the 3,000 that Lumley amassed, but Lumley was a very wealthy magnate). Many of them were specifically literary, and, as we will see, would have played a significant role in the composition of the *Art*. (Lumley's books play a similar role in Ward's argument.)

6. George was also the (anonymous) author of the *Justification*. Such a touchy commission (if it was one) would normally have been given only to an experienced writer skilled in rhetoric and legal reasoning. These features fit the profile of the author we derive from the *Art* and the Jervoise of Herriard papers, though he had till then no positive public reputation for such skill.

7. Many occasions referred to in the *Art* suggest an author directly, if distantly, acquainted with notables of the court, including four English monarchs. As we have seen, George and Richard's parents were in a position to report firsthand anecdotes about the Henrician court, and George had marital connections, though not invariably genial ones, with eminent lawyers and statesmen: Sir John Throckmorton, George's brother-in-law; Throckmorton's brother Sir Nicholas, Elizabeth's ambassador to France and Scotland; Sir William Paulet, marquess of Winchester and Lord Treasurer; and many lesser but well-connected figures among the Paulet and Windsor families. Puttenham's knowledge of manuscript writings of Dyer, Raleigh, Sidney, and Oxford (a distant marital connection) also argues a degree of acquaintance with the aristocratic world. If the *Partheniades* were actually presented at a New Year's celebration, that would suggest a connection with the court, as does the overnight entertainment of the queen's party on progress at Herriard in 1574. Finally, George's authorship of the *Justification*, with its implicit knowledge of events in Parliament and the Privy Council, not to mention the reward he received for his labors, including recorded thanks from the queen herself (though such thanks may have been merely a verbal formula),<sup>80</sup> all suggest what Puttenham would have experienced

78. According to Croft: Elyot, *Gouernour* 1, Appendix A, 312.

79. Elyot, *Letters* 43.

80. PRO, C. 66/1315, m. 7.

as a meaningful relation to the court, even if the historical documents suggest that his public reputation was, in the eyes of most established courtiers, mainly a spectacle of disgrace.

In particular, the *Art* refers specifically and lovingly to Sir John Throckmorton (see 3.17.263). Throckmorton was a Middle Temple friend of George's as well as being his brother-in-law, having married Puttenham's sister Margaret in 1565. They maintained a friendship, often strained by Puttenham's bad behavior, from the late 1550s until Throckmorton died in 1580. Throckmorton was the principal go-between for Puttenham in both his marriage and his divorce dealings with Lady Windsor and her soon aggrieved and pugnacious family, and mediated the Privy Council's interventions in the affair. (Richard was of course also allied to Throckmorton; indeed, he wrote George in reproach for his abuse of Throckmorton's friendship: see Willcock and Walker xxviii–xxix.)

8. Finally, Willcock and Walker argue at some length (xxxi–xliv) that the *Justification*, known to be from George's pen, exhibits several parallels with the *Art* and the *Partheniades*: a concern with the practical maintenance of civil society by a flexible relation to moral absolutes, guided by natural law; a copious vocabulary; a concern with linguistic exactitude; and an oft-stated devotion to Elizabeth. The first of these arguments must now seem ironic when juxtaposed to the attested records of Puttenham's personal misconduct. He certainly had a flexible relation to moral absolutes. Still, the new information we have about Puttenham's personal life does not disable Willcock and Walker's argument for authorship. Personal goodness is hardly a *sine qua non* for powerful literary and cultural criticism.

There are thus several loci of data that link George Puttenham to the *Art*. The family of origin and the Throckmorton connection (in Richard's case) and the library (in Lumley's) do not exclusively argue for George's authorship. Nonetheless, taken in sum, and in conjunction with the early references to the name Puttenham, these several kinds of data indicate fairly strongly that George Puttenham was the author of *The Art of English Poesy*.

#### 4. Puttenham's Archive

George Puttenham shares with his contemporaries many literary, philosophical, social, and political interests, but more than most of them, he puts what he knows on extravagant display. In *The Art of English Poesy* he parades his classical learning in quotations, allusions, and anecdotes; he borrows from, cites, and argues with contemporary authors; he quotes poetry extensively, frequently his own; and he offers many opinions about issues, people, and what we would call current

events. This ensemble of efforts constitutes most of what readers have known of him for centuries, and by means of it, we believe, he constructed his identity—for himself, for his readers, and for us. For himself especially, such an identity might help displace that other, decidedly historical one which external forces such as the Privy Council (perfectly justly, it will now seem) were stamping upon him for all to see, with what must have been such excruciating vigor.

The *Art* is many things—a poetics and a rhetoric, a theoretical treatise on prosody and a manual of courtly trifles, a work on education and a courtesy book—but it is also an effort at self-fashioning, which labors to constitute its author as a consummate Renaissance intellectual, that is, as a brilliant, learned, cosmopolitan courtier and poet. This image serves his complicated social, economic, and political ambitions, to pull himself, just as his book may serve to pull its readers, “from the cart to the school, and from thence to the court,” and ultimately to prefer himself “to [her] Majesty’s service” (3.25.378). This striking image of the cart (with which we began) may seem, after what we have learned from the historical archive, to bear a much more concrete relevance to Puttenham’s own career than has been apparent. If Wyatt claimed that his frightening phrase about Henry VIII’s being cast out at the cart’s tail actually just meant “left behind” or “left out,” his accuser Bonner managed quite successfully (changing “tail” to “arse”) to make it seem instead as if the poet had likened the king to a deservedly condemned criminal being carted to Tyburn. Puttenham himself had literally been a fugitive and was repeatedly imprisoned; perhaps he had actually been branded, even suffered the loss of an ear. These experiences would have made the hated cart a particularly vivid image for him. All told, he had extraordinarily strong motives to put this cart behind him (rather than himself behind it).<sup>81</sup>

If the *Art* suggests that he hoped to come to rest near the very top of the social and political world in which he lived, the very height of the ambition may itself be not so much a matter of hubris as something like a screen behind which to shove his hateful “record” and the desperate cultural impoverishment it surely entailed. Recall La Rochefoucauld:

[W]e . . . come to form our own best audience. . . . Our efforts to hoodwink the rest of the world amount to a prolonged essay in self-deception. . . . Life [is] a delusion imposed on the actor by himself, a desperate tactic by which he tries to foist a certain sense of himself onto himself, with whom he is far more likely to succeed than with others who lack his reasons for cooperating, and who are engrossed in similar designs on their own selves.<sup>82</sup>

81. For what it is worth, his unusual verb for social transformation—“pulling” his poet from the cart to the court—seems attracted from the cart’s locomotion. All of the verb’s uses in the *Art* concern either carts or pulling down a man’s heart or house.

82. Cited in Jonas Barish’s paraphrase from *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (213).

If Machiavelli, hopelessly out of office, dressed in courtly clothing each night and conferred with the ancients, and exactly there, he told Vettori, wrote of self-determination, which he famously characterizes in *The Prince* as conquering a female by force,<sup>83</sup> it is perhaps not so hard to imagine Puttenham in hiding, carrying his library and manuscripts (and Elizabeth Johnson) with him, constructing the *Art* as the vessel of his “real” life. His highly conspicuous labors and claims in the *Art*, not to mention what we now can see of him at law, mark him as unsatisfied and unsuccessful. Nonetheless, the networks of his birth and marriage, however ragged, and his social contact with such figures as Arundel, Bacon, Margaret of Parma, William of Orange, and the emperor Ferdinand, even if entirely specular, suggest that his fantasy was not altogether counterfactual. By parading his enormous learning in the *Art*, Puttenham creates an identity for himself that is as profoundly dependent on the books he has read as it is willfully independent of the violent lived experience recorded for us in the Hampshire archive.

*The library lists.* When John Paulet and his posse raided Puttenham’s lodgings in Whitefriars in 1578 and confiscated his belongings, they seized more than one hundred books. An inventory was subsequently made of those books. In addition, among the books were two notebooks composed by Puttenham himself, the first sometime between the mid-1560s and the early 1570s, and the second in 1576, both of which also contain additional inventories of his library. Finally, there is a brief list of his books in a letter he wrote to Richard Paulet in October 1580.<sup>84</sup> Although these four inventories do not agree entirely with one another—only a few titles appear in all of them—they nevertheless seem clearly to be authentic. One often cannot decipher just what book is meant by the references, which are sometimes illegible and often vague (e.g., “Plato”), but something over half of the 180 can be identified.

83. See Machiavelli’s letter to Vettori: “When evening arrives, I return home and go into my study, and at the threshold, I take off my everyday clothes, full of mud and filth, and put on regal and courtly garments; and decorously dressed anew, I enter the ancient courts of ancient men, where, lovingly received by them, I feed myself on the food that is mine alone and for which I was born” (151). In *The Prince* he tells us, “Fortune is a woman, and it is necessary, if you wish to keep her down, to beat her and knock her about” (107).

84. Our work on Puttenham’s library has benefited from the research of Charles Willis, who discovered these records and first told us of them, and who has written several books arguing that Puttenham was the real author of some of Shakespeare’s works. While we cannot agree with these theories, we have profited from the first of Willis’s books, which presents useful transcriptions of Puttenham’s three library inventories and the list of books in Puttenham’s letter to Paulet; see *Shakespeare and George Puttenham’s “The Art of English Poesie”* 167–86. (Willis also provides photocopies of some of the originals.) For further discussion of these lists, see Steven W. May’s life of Puttenham in *ODNB*, and his “George Puttenham’s Lewd and Illicit Career.” We are also indebted to Eric Lindquist of the University of Maryland, who kindly shared with us his unpublished paper on the lists, “An Elizabethan Writer and His Books.”

Although much can be inferred about Puttenham's reading from what he says in the *Art*, the titles of the books he owned also tell us a great deal about his interests. The absence of a book from these lists does not mean that Puttenham had not read it, however. Indeed, as we shall detail below, various books important to the *Art* do not appear in the lists. Three explanations for such lacunae suggest themselves. The lists may have been fragmentary and incomplete even when they were compiled. Furthermore, since they all predate 1580, they would not include books he acquired and read after that year (and used when writing the *Art*, which appeared in 1589). In addition, as his financial fortunes plummeted after 1577, he may well have sold books for cash to live on. In general, it is reasonable to believe that Puttenham had read not only many of the 180 or so titles listed in the four inventories but a great many more as well.

Puttenham's library was both eclectic and very "intellectual." There were literary volumes, of course, both ancient (works by Cicero, Ovid, and Horace) and more contemporary (Giovanfrancesco Pico della Mirandola's *La strega*, Jacopo Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, and Pierre de Ronsard's *Elegies*). Yet, there were also many works of history, such as Jean Froissart's *Chronicles*, and travel books such as the account by Nicolas de Nicolay, a French geographer and ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, of his voyages in Turkey and the Middle East. There were volumes on medicine and mathematics, and quite a few on law, politics, and philosophy. The library was stacked with the works of Renaissance luminaries such as Petrarch, Castiglione, Machiavelli, and Erasmus. Generally, one is struck by the unusual breadth of Puttenham's reading, a breadth reflected in the *Art* as well. In it he provides many examples of poetry in English, Latin, Greek, French, and Italian, but he also cites philosophers, rehearses historical anecdotes about both ancient and Renaissance figures, argues a theory of prosody based on a mathematical concept (proportion), and includes bits and pieces of medical, psychological, and other sorts of proto-scientific lore.

*Religion.* The only field obviously underrepresented in Puttenham's library—especially in light of the supreme importance it had in the early modern period—is religion. His library lists contain no Bibles, biblical commentaries, or sermons, nor is there any evidence to suggest significant interest in the debates then raging among Catholics and Protestants. On the one hand, a few anti-prelatical remarks in the *Art* (see 1.7.102 and 1.27.142) suggest he was no papist.<sup>85</sup> On the other hand, to judge by *Partheniades* 11, he may have hated puritans. That poem, canvassing various theories of the creation, speaks of "a secte of

85. Puttenham uses this opprobrious term in the *Justification* when speaking against those who favor Mary, Queen of Scots (99).

men, somewhat precise" (257), whose creator will one day "in his rage" (265) crush the created world like a wicker cage. Such pungent, even violent language seems to be hostile code for puritans—a "sect precise" worshipping (he seems to say) a vengeful God who will damn all else in saving them. He then goes on to speak quite neutrally of the atomism of Democritus and the *vovv* of Anaxagoras, and finishes by saying,

*O bootlesse carke  
Of mortall men searching to knowe,  
Or this or that, since he must rowe  
The dolefull barke  
Which Charon guides,  
Fraught ful of shadows colde and starke,  
That ferrye to the coontryes darke. . . .*

(288–94)

This discussion of religion seems both to exhibit a notable freethinking (especially striking in a gift meant for the queen) and to argue for the pointlessness of putting much faith in such schemes of organization (never mind salvation), when we must all float away into unrelieved dark, alone in fear.<sup>86</sup> Nowhere does Puttenham propose a kinder view of Christianity, when he might easily have done so, to dull the jagged edge of the critique of the puritans, who were, whatever else they might have been, Christians. Indeed, there may be some alignment between the vengeful God of the puritans crushing the world and Puttenham spurning the confident certainties of faith. It may thus be true that the inventories' deficiency of religious titles manifests Puttenham's personal hostility to Christianity. Willcock and Walker judge that what they see as *Partheniades* 11's "unmistakable preference" for atomism "expresses as openly heterodox a criticism of popular Christian teaching as is to be found in Elizabethan literature" (xxxiii). These concerns seem to echo Debora Shuger's summation of the development of prose style during the late Renaissance into one "capable of expressing the libertine, skeptical, individualist, and rationalistic impulses that define modern consciousness."<sup>87</sup>

Two documents from Puttenham's life may support this sense of hostility to religion, as we have seen: the charge (from which he was cleared) that he plotted the assassination of Edmund Grindal, bishop of London, and the letter of Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester, decrying Puttenham's evil life and hostility to "God's Truthe" and seeking to block his appointment as justice of the peace. Nevertheless, we really don't know enough about the assassination charge to judge it, and

86. Cf. his similar poem cited in the *Art*, "The good is geason" (3.19.299).

87. Shuger, "Conceptions of Style" 178.

Horne's hostility to Puttenham may well derive from Hampshire politics of the time. Fighting off the influence of the conservative politico-religious party and John Paulet, Winchester's son and a central figure in that party, Horne "managed to prevent the addition of more associates of the Paulets to the commission of the peace in 1569."<sup>88</sup> That was the year of Horne's attack on Puttenham, whom he may have seen as a Paulet adherent (though this would by 1569 have been quite wrong). A milder form of the hostility to religion hypothesis might stand on the fact that both Horne and Grindal were Marian exiles: Puttenham's aversion may well have focused on the reformed church.

Whatever Puttenham's religious views, in the *Art* he manifests a fairly conventional piety in one poem he himself wrote and cites in Book 3 (see "Our Christ, the son of God," 3.19.283).<sup>89</sup> Moreover, as we noted above, the absence of a title from the library lists does not in itself prove much. It is quite probable that Puttenham possessed—and read—the Bible, as well as other religious books. Nevertheless, the relative numbers of books in one field or another in his library do intimate where his interests and sympathies lay, and they suggest that his concerns were more secular, social, and political than religious. Puttenham's copies of Machiavelli's *Prince* and Castiglione's *Courtier*, of Dante's *De monarchia* and the republican Francesco Patrizi's *De Regno et Republica*, were probably dearer to his heart than Giacomo Riccamati's brief *Dialogo* (1558) concerning the Last Judgment, one of the few religious books he owned.

*Classical sources.* Works by classical authors are especially well represented in Puttenham's library. His Latin authors include Vergil, Ovid, Lucretius, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Horace, and Cicero, as well as minor figures such as Quintus Curtius Rufus and Marcus Manilius. He owned Greek authors as well: Theocritus, Plato, and several volumes of Aristotle (these last two in Latin translation). Likewise, the *Art* frequently refers to Roman poets (Vergil, Horace, Ovid) and the sayings of famous Romans (Augustus, Cato the Elder, Scipio Africanus). Puttenham's easy familiarity with Latin literature and culture should not be surprising. Latin was the language of formal education in the Renaissance, and we know that he was enrolled at Christ's College, Cambridge, in the mid-1540s and studied law at the Middle Temple in the mid-1550s. A single page survives from his translation of Suetonius' *Life of Tiberius*. He may have dreamed, probably when young, of Englishing a Latin classic, as had Stanyhurst and Phaer. The ripe details of Suetonius may have attracted him because of his general fascination with celebrity, whether classical or modern.

88. Ralph Houlbrooke, "Horne, Robert (1513x15–1579)," *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/view/article/13792](http://www.oxforddnb.com/content/lib.utexas.edu:2048/view/article/13792), accessed August 10, 2006.

89. This poem he says he wrote in his "younger years" (3.19.283).

Puttenham also puts his knowledge of Greek on display in the *Art*. He occasionally uses Greek terms such as φωντόστικός (1.8.109) and πῦρ (2.12.184), cites the first line of Homer's *Iliad* in the original (3.24.371), and renames Greek rhetorical terms in English throughout Book 3. Nevertheless, he cites passages in Latin far more often than in Greek; he uses the Latin forms of Greek words, such as *anthropopathis* (1.12.118: "characterized by human feelings"); and he seems to have read many Greek texts, such as Aristotle's *De anima* (On the Soul), not in the original but in Renaissance Latin translations. His library contains no books solely in Greek, though he did have two bilingual volumes in Greek and Latin. Still, he owned a Greek-Latin lexicon, which suggests he may have studied the language with some seriousness. It seems likely that although Puttenham's use of Greek in the *Art* may have been justified at times by his need for a theoretical term or an apt illustration from an ancient text, its main function was intellectual display. To cite the opening line of the *Iliad* in Greek gave Puttenham a kind of distinction that Latin alone could never confer on him, and it was thus an important move in his fashioning of himself in his book.

In general, Puttenham's mastery of Latin and his more limited, though real, acquaintance with Greek show him to be a typical product of a humanist education. That form of education had made its appearance in the late fifteenth century in England, and by the middle of the sixteenth had become more or less a requirement for membership in the ruling elite. Puttenham's uncle Sir Thomas Elyot was one of the most famous humanists of his day, and his *Book named the Governour* (1531) argued for the central value of such education for those who would be the rulers (the "governors") of the country.<sup>90</sup> Focused on the study of the classics, humanist education presented itself not merely as a means of personal cultivation but as a set of tools for social and political advancement. It gave young men the intellectual skills they needed to serve in bureaucratic positions or as personal secretaries to the powerful, equipping them to produce documents and conduct negotiations about trade or diplomacy in Latin. It also provided the cultural literacy they needed to display their merit for elevated position. Twice over, then, humanist education enabled the social advancement of those who, like Puttenham, had mastered what it had to offer.

*Continental sources.* Puttenham's learning was not restricted to the culture of antiquity. Most of the books he owned were actually written after the fall of Rome, and practically all of those during the Renaissance. He says he was brought up in foreign countries (3.25.381), and cites poems as well as sayings and aphorisms in French, Italian, and

90. For introductions to this matter, see Hexter, "Education of the Aristocracy," and Simon, *Education and Society*.

Spanish. Although he owned a substantial number of books in French and Italian and at least one in Spanish, however, texts in Latin far outnumber them. Moreover, while many of these were the works of the ancients, the lion's share of his Latin books, including most of those concerned with philosophy, political theory, and what we would call science, date from the Renaissance, not antiquity. Finally, although English-language texts are conspicuous by their near-absence from the inventories, Puttenham had obviously been reading them as well. He clearly possessed a wide knowledge of English poetry from Chaucer up to his own time; he mentions by name or cites from the works of dozens of English poets in the *Art*, and presents a brief history of English poetry in the last chapter of Book 1. The booklists, however, contain no identifiable mention of *Tottel's Miscellany*, where all of the Wyatt and Surrey poems he cites can be found, nor of the available published work of Gascoigne and Turberville.

Puttenham was also interested in Renaissance Neoplatonism. His library contained several dialogues by Plato, some works by the Florentine Neoplatonist Marsilio Ficino, and even a copy of the works attributed to "Hermes Trismegistus," "Thrice-great Hermes," a collection of writings on magic and alchemy dating from the second and third centuries CE, published by Ficino in 1471 and seen as containing a mysterious ancient wisdom thought to be anterior to Christianity. Puttenham never mentions Ficino in the *Art*, but he does refer to certain nameless "Platonics" when dismissing the notion that some version of the Platonic Ideas may have provided God with models for creating the world (1.1.93). In the next paragraph, however, he goes on to embrace the Neoplatonic conception of the *furor poeticus*, the divine inspiration that allowed poets access to celestial truths (a notion developed by Ficino), and he later refers to Hermes Trismegistus as "the holiest of priests and prophets" (1.8.112). This recondite interest may also lie behind his extensive discussion of emblems and *imprese* (2.12).

*Historical writing.* Much of Puttenham's library could be described as historical-biographical. To judge by the *Art*, he was almost as interested in the actions and sayings of classical and Renaissance figures as he was in the literature of the two periods. Such an interest was quite usual among the heirs of humanism, who loved stories about Vergil and Cato the Elder, Charles V and Julius II, as readily as new poems by Ronsard or Spenser. Contemporary scholars fed this interest by producing not just biographical and historical works but also compendia of notable sayings. The great Dutch humanist Erasmus, for instance, collected classical maxims, idioms, and metaphors in his ever-expanding and enormously successful *Adages* (which eventually numbered over four thousand sayings, annotated in enormous detail), and he combed through countless ancient writers to compile the famous sayings and

quips of philosophers, generals, and rulers in his *Apophthegmata* (pithy sayings). Although the *Adagia* does not appear in Puttenham's library lists, it is quite likely that he had recourse to it at a number of points in the *Art*. He did, however, own a copy of the *Apophthegmata*, and it is virtually certain that he used this book, rather than track down original sources, for many of the sayings and stories of classical figures he records, especially in Book 3. (Some thirty-four passages in the *Art* appear in the *Apophthegmata*.) Puttenham may also have read Nicholas Udall's translation of the *Apophthegmata*, although Udall could not have been Puttenham's main source, since his *Apophthegmes* contains only the third and fourth books of Erasmus's work, and some of the sayings Puttenham rehearses come from its other books.

*Celebrity tales.* The *Art* also presents a wide array of stories and sayings concerning Renaissance celebrities, both English and continental. Since Puttenham says he has seen or lived at "the courts of France, Spain, Italy, and that of the Empire, with many inferior courts" (3.23.356), and claims personal knowledge of English courtly notables of his own and his father's generation, he may have seen them himself, or heard eyewitness accounts of many of the things he reports. Still, some half-dozen of the stories and quips Puttenham records involving French rulers appeared in a single literary source, Gilles Corrozet's *Les divers propos memorables des nobles & illustres hommes de la Chrestienté* (The Various Memorable Sayings of the Noble and Illustrious Men of Christendom), originally published in Paris in 1557. Puttenham owned a copy of this often reprinted work, and probably cribbed a number of stories from it. Moreover, this book was not the only one of its kind; Puttenham may have taken some of his other stories from such texts, as yet unidentified.

*Travel narratives.* Matters farther afield also fascinated Puttenham. His library contained a number of books concerned with the world beyond the boundaries of Europe, including Nicolas de Nicolay's *Navigations, peregrinations et voyages faicts en la Turquie* (Sea Voyages, Wanderings, and Journeys in Turkey) of 1568; Simon Grynaeus's *Novus orbis regionum ac insularum veteribus incognitarum* (New World of Regions and Islands Unknown to the Ancients) of 1555; and a book titled *De regionibus orientalibus* (On the Regions of the East) by a certain Paulus Venetus. This may very well be Marco Polo's *Il milione*, which was in wide circulation during the Renaissance.<sup>91</sup> Puttenham

91. Paulus Venetus is probably "Polo [or Paolo] the Venetian." Another title on a different list—"descriptio Geographique des Provinces de Inde orientale bound in black leather"—is most likely Polo's work: a 1556 edition of his book in French was titled *La Description géographique des provinces & villes de l'Inde orientale*.

does not cite these books in the *Art*, but he does mention Attila the Hun (1.6.101, 2.12.194) and Tamerlane (2.12.194), and explores the motto and liveries of the “king of China in the farthest part of the Orient” (2.12.194), noting the general love of his subjects for the king and his nobles.

Equally notable is Puttenham’s discussion of patterned poems in 2.12. He begins with the famous poem by Simias of Rhodes from the Greek Anthology, in the shape of an oval, which Puttenham mistakenly calls “Anacreon’s egg” (180). Then he turns to two figure poems outside the Western tradition, in the shape of lozenges, one sent by a lady named Kermesine to a “great emperor in Tartary . . . surnamed Timur Cutlu” (182). The latter is certainly Tamerlane, and the other lozenge poem is his reply. This pair is then followed by two more love poems, triangular in shape, exchanged by a Persian sultan named Ribuska and his beloved, Selamour. The sentiments expressed in these poems are, in European terms, highly conventional, and since all the other patterned poems that follow are Puttenham’s own creations, it seems entirely possible that he is the actual author of the Eastern poems he attributes to Tamerlane, Ribuska, and their beloveds (especially since we have been unable to identify any of the persons save Tamerlane). Moreover, Puttenham’s account of how he came by these patterned poems is also slightly suspect. His source was a “gentleman” he had met in Italy “who had long traveled the oriental parts of the world, and seen the courts of the great princes of China and Tartary.” This gentleman supposedly described the genre for him and then gave him a few examples, which Puttenham tells us he has “translated word for word and, as near as [he] could, followed both the phrase and the figure, which is somewhat hard to perform” (180) because of the limitations imposed by the shapes of the poems.

What Puttenham may be claiming here is that the anonymous “gentleman” gave him poems written in the languages of the Tartars and the Persians, which Puttenham has himself translated, demonstrating a linguistic competence notably beyond that of his peers. Perhaps, however, the “gentleman” just composed a few examples for him in Italian. Puttenham is vague about this unidentified Italian “gentleman,” and when we consider that, according to A. L. Korn, the patterned poetry of the Persians and the Turks is very different from the examples Puttenham supplies, we should probably conclude that he had heard about the existence of such patterned poems in non-Western traditions while on his European travels, and is simply producing his own versions of them here.<sup>92</sup> Nevertheless, including such poems in his book suggests his keen interest in what European explorers and traders were doing as they effectively expanded the geographical and intellectual boundaries

92. Korn, “Puttenham and the Oriental Pattern-Poem” 289–303, esp. 294–96.

of Europe in the period. Thus, Puttenham shapes an image of himself that capitalizes on the prestige granted not just to those who had traveled the European continent and visited the courts of France and Spain and the Holy Roman Empire, as he says he has done, but to such celebrated figures as Hernán Cortés, Vasco da Gama, and Francis Drake, the last of whom makes a silent appearance in an anecdote Puttenham tells earlier in this chapter about the sacking of Cartagena in the West Indies (see 2.12.193).

*Self-fashioning texts.* If Puttenham shared Renaissance Europeans' fascination with the Other, he also conspicuously shared their interest in a newly prominent notion of the self, of human identity, as not only inherited or received but also shaped and fashioned. The Renaissance concern with self-fashioning produced a flood of educational and self-help materials—Latin and Greek grammars and dictionaries, sample dialogues and colloquies, treatises, courtesy books—that began as a trickle in Italy during the fifteenth century and inundated Europe in the sixteenth. In addition to a Greek-Latin dictionary and many editions of classical texts, Puttenham owned a copy of the *De morali disciplina libri quinque* (Five Books of Moral Philosophy) by the prince-pleasing courtly poet and Italian humanist Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481), in a Venetian edition of 1552. He also owned Erasmus's *Colloquies*, dialogues the Dutch humanist wrote as school exercises, small works of art, really, that taught students not only how to speak correct Latin but also how to speak in different roles—preparing them for both life in a literate elite and the role-playing that had come increasingly to characterize that elite life. The library also contained a book describing one of the most famous and radical instances of self-fashioning in the Renaissance, namely, the *Arrest mémorable du Parlement de Tholose* (The Memorable Decision by the Parlement of Toulouse), by the French jurist Jean de Coras (Paris, 1572). Republished many times, this book is the account of the trial of Arnaud du Tilh, who for four years succeeded in passing himself off as Martin Guerre, who had disappeared some eight years earlier, taking his place in his village, his family, and even his wife's bed. Puttenham's possession of Coras's little tome speaks volumes about the ultimate fantasy of social and personal mobility that he shared with his culture.

Puttenham also owned copies of the works of the two writers who determined most decisively what self-fashioning meant to the Renaissance: Machiavelli and Castiglione. The first defined his would-be princes as engaging in a continuous masquerade, shaping and controlling the image of the self in order to achieve and maintain political power. Machiavelli also wrote of figures such as Hieron of Syracuse, who began at the bottom of the social order and rose to rule his city-state. Puttenham seems to have shared Machiavelli's perspective when insisting on

the need for his courtier-poet to use indirection, to dissemble, even to lie. That said, however, nowhere does the *Art* seem to have been specifically impacted by the thought of the great Florentine. By contrast, when Puttenham was composing 3.25, the chapter arguing "That the good poet or maker ought to dissemble his art" (378), he was almost certainly thinking about Castiglione, whose *Book of the Courtier*, in French translation, was in Puttenham's library. Like Castiglione, Puttenham writes of using art to hide art, in dissembling one's body, face, actions, and ideas, as well as "the subtleties of [one's] art" (382). And also like Castiglione, Puttenham seems to worry that the art of his courtier-poet may appear morally suspect, and he goes to great lengths in defending its legitimacy, insisting that it not be confused with the dissimulation practiced by hypocrites and "base-minded men" (382)—though he himself has just produced, with a grim smile, perhaps, exactly that confusion, by so richly detailing so many uncomfortable dissimulations of conduct, as we have seen. This maneuver, so typically oblique, may well seem a Machiavellian presentation of the complexities of Castiglione, designed to critique and enable effective prince-pleasing at one and the same time. Here he finds his "defense" on the separation of conduct and aesthetics, while more often he might be said to conflate the two categories. He appears to dissemble artfully his position on dissembling conduct, a perfect amalgam of Machiavelli and Castiglione.

*Rhetorical and literary writings.* The two arts of rhetoric and poetry were seen throughout the Renaissance as being profoundly similar. Both were fundamentally concerned with eloquence; both had the same goal, moving or persuading the audience or reader; rhetoric books frequently used examples from poetry (just as Puttenham versified a number of the prose examples he found in Susenbrotus); and both arts claimed the same mythical civilizing progenitors, Amphion and Orpheus. The difference between rhetoric and poetry was discussed, if only occasionally, but little more was usually said than that poetry, constrained by meter, was less free than the orator's prose. Thus, the Florentine humanist Coluccio Salutati, in a letter written near the beginning of the Renaissance (1374), claims that eloquence "can be treated under two heads, for either it flows forth free and relaxed in melodious prose, or it is confined continually within the narrow straits of meter," and Jean-François Le Grand, writing near the end of the period (1658), says that "poetry is nothing other than the most constrained and strictly observed part of the art of oratory."<sup>93</sup> For these writers, as for virtually everyone else, the most important characteris-

93. For the quotation from Salutati, see Rebhorn, *Renaissance Debates* 21; for that from Le Grand, see 287.

tic defining both oratory and poetry was their *power*, namely, their ability to possess and move their audience in whatever direction they wished. As Henry Peacham puts it memorably, the orator's command of rhetoric makes him "in a maner the emperour of mens minds & affections, and next to the omnipotent God in the power of persuasion."<sup>94</sup> Sidney thinks the very same thing about poetry, stressing how the poet's words will "strike, pierce, . . . [and] possess the sight of the soul," and how his "enchanting skill" is so great that it "holdeth children from play and old men from the chimney corner."<sup>95</sup> Puttenham, of course, agrees with such evaluations, insisting on the "great force" (3.2.226) eloquence displays when moving people. Revealingly, he makes this claim right after he has told the story not of a poet but of the orator Hegesias, whose eloquent arguments about the futility of life actually persuaded people, he says, to commit suicide.

*Scaliger and the Italians.* There is no question that Puttenham knew Italian, although he may not have spoken it as readily as he did French. His library lists include a number of works, both literary and nonliterary, in Italian, including Machiavelli's *Prince*, a volume of Luigi Alamanni's poems, and Carlo Sigonio's commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (although Puttenham's copy of Castiglione's *Courtier* was in French). He also apparently owned an Italian grammar. In the *Art* Puttenham refers to Dante, Petrarch, and Ariosto, the great poets of the Italian Renaissance. He mentions *canzoni* (songs), a word he may be using as the label for the specific poems of Petrarch with different rhyme schemes, or as the title for Petrarch's entire sonnet sequence, which is more usually called the *Canzoniere* (Songbook). He also writes (in a confusing way) about Petrarch's use of a form Puttenham calls the *seizino*. This is perhaps a mistake for "sestina," but Puttenham offers a definition different from that of the *sestina*, which we have been unable to trace (see 2.11.176). Finally, Puttenham occasionally cites bits of Italian in the *Art*, albeit in forms that are not entirely accurate (see, for example, 3.24.370). Nevertheless, he seems to have little awareness—with one very significant exception—of the vast number of treatises on poetics that were produced in Italy during the century before the publication of the *Art* in 1589.

Starting with the 1482 Latin commentary of the Florentine Cristoforo Landino on Horace's *Ars poetica*, Italian humanists produced a steady stream of editions, commentaries, translations, and vulgarizations of classical works concerned with poetics. Although they were continuing a long tradition of using Horace, whose poem was well known throughout the Middle Ages, as a guide to their thinking on

94. Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (1593), AB3v.

95. Sidney, *The Defence of Poesy* 222, 227 (hereafter cited in the text).

poetics, they also recovered and published the Platonic corpus, thus allowing them to reinforce their defenses of poetry by developing Plato's notion of divine inspiration, or *furore poeticus*, which they found in the *Phaedrus* (254a, 265b) and the *Ion* (534). At the same time, Plato forced them to counter his criticisms of poetry (see *The Republic*, Books 3 and 10) as a pale imitation of reality and as morally suspect and dangerous to the state. The greatest impulse to the production of works on poetics in the Italian Renaissance, however, was the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Although Averroës's medieval Arabic translation of the *Poetics* had been turned into Latin in the late fifteenth century, that version of Aristotle's work was seriously defective and did not have much of an impact. Inspired by the humanist enthusiasm for antiquity, Giorgio Valla produced a new and much superior Latin translation in 1498, and the Aldine press in Venice published the Greek original in 1508. Nevertheless, only in 1536, when Alessandro de' Pazzi published a better Greek text with a new Latin translation, did Aristotle become a major figure in the landscape of Italian—and European—literary theory. That position was reinforced by the publication of Francesco Robortello's lengthy commentary on the work in 1548 (*In Librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Explicationes* [Annotations of Aristotle's "Poetics"]), by its first vernacular translation in 1549, and, most important, by Lodovico Castelvetro's *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta* (Aristotle's "Poetics" Translated and Expounded) of 1570, which famously proclaimed the doctrine of the unities of time, place, and action that would come to dominate the drama in the later seventeenth century. By the second half of the sixteenth century, according to Bernard Weinberg, Aristotle's *Poetics* had moved from the scholar's study into the academies of Italy; it had become an essential part of ongoing public debates about poetry.<sup>96</sup>

Motivated in part by the humanist passion for all things classical, Italians were especially interested in Horace, Plato, Aristotle, and classical poetics generally because of a desire to justify poetry in the modern world and to defend vernacular poetry in comparison with that of the ancients. To justify it, they had recourse to the Horatian formula that poetry should be *dulce et utile*, "sweet and useful."<sup>97</sup> In other words, poetry should aim to provide the reader with pleasure, which they usually imagined as a matter of style, and with utility, which they usually imagined in moral and political terms. Moreover, pleasure was almost always seen either as independent of, but consistent with, moral instruction, or as subordinate to it. As Weinberg has noted, from

96. For the material in this paragraph, see Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism* 1.349–404, 502–10.

97. *Ars poetica* 343: *omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci* (he has won the vote who has mixed the useful with the sweet).

the beginning of the Renaissance to the end, this interpretation of Horace was itself shaped by the dominant rhetorical thinking of the period that defined the *officia*, or functions (and ends), of that art as *movere* (to move), *delectare* (to delight), and *docere* (to teach).<sup>98</sup> Even though the recovery of Aristotle led some thinkers to speculate about other questions, such as the place of the marvelous in poetry, the *Poetics* was read in ways that largely made it consistent with this rhetoricized, ethical, and un-Aristotelian Horace. Revealingly, Aristotle's notion of imitation was seen as instrumental in the teaching of virtue, and his concept of purgation as the response to tragedy was often interpreted in moralistic terms as a diminishing of the passions of the audience in order to produce ethically superior citizens. This moralizing view of poetry could justify it in the face of Plato's desire to expel the art from his Republic, just as did critics' Plato-inspired notions that the poet's *furor* was divinely inspired and that what he imitated was not mere external reality but Ideas in the mind of God.

Italian critics also sought to defend modern poetry in comparison with that of the admired ancients. They did so in part by adapting Aristotle's discussions of the genres of tragedy and epic to those genres he did not treat, thus attempting to theorize in classical terms comedy, satire, epigram, and the various subgenres of the lyric, many of which, such as the love sonnet and the madrigal, were simply unknown in antiquity. Nevertheless, the need to defend the value of modern poetry—which led some actually to proclaim its superiority—was occasioned by the attacks that were made on a number of important vernacular Italian authors or works, especially after mid-century. For instance, although Dante was criticized for his difficult language as early as Pietro Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* (Dialogue on the Vernacular) of 1525, the entire *Divina commedia* was proclaimed deficient when judged according to such Aristotelian categories as unity and verisimilitude by Ridolfo (or Anselmo) Castravilla, manuscript copies of whose critique circulated widely after 1572 and provoked a host of replies. Similarly, Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* was attacked for combining features of romance and epic, although those attacks remained partial and fairly tentative between 1549 and 1584, in which year Camillo Pellegrino published *Il Carrafa, o vero della poesia epica* (Carrafa, or of Epic Poetry), a dialogue that reviews ancient and contemporary epics, compares Ariosto's work with Tasso's recently published *Gerusalemme liberata* (The Liberation of Jerusalem [1581]), and comes to the conclusion that Tasso's work is superior to all except the poems of Homer and Vergil for a variety of reasons, especially because of the unity of its plot.

98. Weinberg, *History of Literary Criticism* 2.806–7. Weinberg says that there was a strong desire throughout the sixteenth century to “reduce poetics to a kind of rhetoric,” with its goals of teaching, delighting, and moving (1.463).

Pellegrino's work in its turn incited further attacks and defenses of both Ariosto and Tasso that went on until the end of the century.<sup>99</sup>

Like Sidney, Puttenham shares many of the general views of the Italians—which resemble those of most medieval and Renaissance theorists. Both, for instance, defend the dual aims of poetry to provide pleasure and moral instruction. Puttenham does not, however, mention Aristotle's key notion of purgation in tragedy, nor does he complain in Aristotelian terms, as Sidney does, about the failure of the drama to maintain the unities or about how it violates decorum by "mingling kings and clowns" (*Defence* 244). Puttenham says he had been to Italy, just as Sidney had been, but the latter seems far more sensitive to developments there than Puttenham was. Neither man, however, betrays the slightest awareness of the debates about Dante and Ariosto, although since those debates mainly went on during the last three decades of the sixteenth century, it is understandable that the two English writers, both of whom were dead by 1591, would have missed them. Nevertheless, even though Italian critics such as Robortello, Castelvetro, and Pellegrino seem to have been unknown to Puttenham, there was one writer on poetics who was originally from the peninsula—though he lived virtually all of his adult life in France—whose comprehensive, original work on poetics Puttenham not only read but also seems to have made direct use of in the *Art*. That writer was Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558), whose *Poetices Libri Septem* (Seven Books on Poetry) was published posthumously in 1561.<sup>100</sup>

Scaliger's enormous work treats nearly every aspect of classical poetry, from genre to style to meter to figures of speech to the relative merits of various poets writing in Greek and Latin, both classical and contemporary. There can be little doubt, we think, that Puttenham actively used Scaliger in composing the *Art*, especially in Books 1 and 2. Less important in this regard is the fact that there are many general parallels between Puttenham's theories and Scaliger's. Both share, for instance, an emphasis on representation and on the genres of poetry, and both stress the didactic function of the poet, Puttenham doing so not just at the outset of his book, when he claims that poets were the first philosophers, orators, rulers, and so on, but also when he identifies

99. On the debate over Dante, see Weinberg 2.819–911, esp. 2.820–23 and 2.831–34; for that on Ariosto and Tasso, see 2.954–1073, esp. 2.991–97. Weinberg also describes the debates over the drama precipitated by Sperone Speroni's *Canace* (written ca. 1554, pub. 1597) and Battista Guarini's *Pastor fido* (1590); see 2.912–53 and 2.1074–1105.

100. Puttenham's library lists do not include this work by Scaliger, although they do mention another work by him, his *Exotericarum exercitationum liber de Subtilitate adversus Hieronymum Cardanum* (Book of Exoteric Exercises Written in Opposition to the *Subtlety* of Jerome Cardano [1557]; *Subtlety* is Cardano's 1550 work *De subtilitate rerum*, "On the Subtlety [i.e., Fine Discriminations] of Things," which concerned natural phenomena). Since Puttenham owned this rather obscure and specialized work by Scaliger, it is hard to imagine that he was not also acquainted with the *Poetices*.