I.—BARNABE BARNES.

By Madeleine Hope Dodds.

[Read on October 31st, 1945.]

CHAPTER I

OXFORD AND FRANCE

Barnabe Barnes, son of Richard Barnes, bishop of Durham, was born in 1571. He was baptized on March 6, 1571, at St. Michael le Belfrey, in the city of York. He matriculated from Brazenose, his father's old college, on July 8, 1586.[1] Bishop Barnes died in the following year, 1587. The bishop made ample provision for his eldest son Emmanuel, and left the residue of his estate to be divided equally between his five younger children, John, Barnabe, Timothy, Agnes and Margaret.[2]

Even this fraction of a bishop of Durham's estate was probably enough to support Barnes at Oxford for several years. His father's death put an end to any hope of rapid promotion in the church, and this may have discouraged him from taking a degree, but as his home in the north was broken up, he probably spent his next few years at Oxford, where the university regulations were not too exacting. Here he made an important acquaintance, John Florio the Italian, who had matriculated from Magdalen College in

[1] Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* II, 47; *Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes*, Surtees Soc., vol. 22, p. 168; *Brazenose Quatercentenary Monographs*, II, pt. 1, pp. 7, 16.

[2] *Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes*, Surtees Soc., vol. 22, p. xv.

1581. He was still at Oxford in 1586, and probably remained there until 1589. Barnabe's acquaintance with him is proved by the sonnet which he wrote for the first edition, 1598, of Florio's Italian dictionary, *A Worlde of Wordes*.[3]

It was probably through John Florio that Barnabe Barnes became acquainted with John Thory or Thorius, the son of a French doctor living in London, who matriculated from Christ Church, Oxford, in the same year as Barnes from Brazenose, on the 1 October, 1586, aged eighteen.[4] John Thory was a friend of Gabriel Harvey, who in 1590 purchased and annotated Thory's translation of "A. de Corro, *The Spanish Grammar . . . with a Dictionary*," published by John Wolfe in the same year.[5] Thory was the link between Barnes and his stimulating but dangerous friend Gabriel Harvey.

On June 13, 1589, William Percy, aged fifteen, matriculated from Gloucester Hall.[6] It was only fitting that the son of the late bishop of Durham should wait upon the brother of the Earl of Northumberland, and so began the friendship between the two which lasted for the rest of their lives. Percy drew Barnes into a coterie with strong Catholic tendencies, and his aggressive Protestantism, to say nothing of other reasons, must have made him not very congenial to many of Percy's friends, with whom, later, he quarrelled, but neither religious differences nor Barnes's vagaries alienated William. As soon as they came up to Oxford, like most undergraduates, they began to write. Barnes's early efforts are probably embodied in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, but they are not distinctively about Oxford and cannot be identified. The usual university course was seven years, but as neither Barnes nor Percy took degrees there is nothing to show how long they remained up. Barnes implies in his sonnets, and Nashe asserts that when his first book was published in the spring

[3] *Dic. Nat. Biog.*; A. Acheson, *Shakespeare's Sonnet Story*, pp. 6-15.
[4] Foster, *Alum. Oxon.*; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* I, p. 624.
[5] Moore Smith, *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, p. 311.
[6] Foster, *Alum. Oxon.*

of 1593, he was an inexperienced youth who had recently come to London, so he may have remained at Oxford until he volunteered for the expedition to France in 1591.

In 1590, Henri IV, who had succeeded to the throne of France in 1589, appealed to England for help against the League. Elizabeth had no desire to lose men and money by involving England in the interminable civil war in France, but her Protestant subjects were full of enthusiasm for the Protestant king, and the French ambassador appealed especially to the Queen's favourite, the Earl of Essex, whose position at court was so strong that it had even survived the discovery of his marriage. Essex was sincerely Protestant. He was also full of eagerness to distinguish himself in the field, and after some months of negotiations he induced the Queen to consent to an English expedition to Normandy. Elizabeth limited her risk very narrowly. She authorized the despatch of 4,000 men under the Earl of Essex for two months; they were to be employed to recover Rouen, which was occupied by the Leaguers, and for no other purpose, and were to be paid by the King of France.

Barnabe Barnes was now nineteen. He had his way to make in the world, and he belonged to a strongly Protestant family. He resolved to fight for the cause, and enlisted in Essex's army as a gentleman adventurer. It is not likely that he could afford to do this out of his own resources. Everyone, even the common soldier, was expected to furnish his own equipment. In 1600 a country gentleman, Robert Delaval of Seaton Delaval, in Northumberland, wrote from London, where his son Robert was preparing to go with "my lord Thumberland" to the siege of Dunkirk:

> I am stayed from rydinge to Oxford as yet by reason that my Lord of Northumberland intendeth wthin twoo or thre dayes to goo into the Lowe Cuntres to se the servyce their. . . . My lord of Northumberland hath not xx men over wth him of which number your brother Robert is one. . . . Your brother is to fynd armes,

shott, pyke and much other furnature of his owne charge, which to me is verye chargeable and so i praye God send sayffe returne.[7]

This is interesting, as it shows what Barnes must have had to provide when he set out on the Rouen campaign. One of Essex's agents wrote that

> If there be any tall and gallant-minded fellows that will go this journey, and be able in good sort to furnish himself, he may see great service, and my Lord will make good account of him.

A man of arms was expected to provide full armour for himself, and to take with him five horses and a competent number of servants, at least two for the horses and one for himself. Barnes must have drawn upon the patriotism of his wealthy relations in the north for his equipment, in which he had to attend the review on 19 July, 1591, when the Queen went to Burleigh's house

> to see the Erle of Essex horse in Covent Garden, 3,000 men appoynted to be embarked for Depe.

Mr. Vivian in his life of Thomas Campion infers from Nashe that Barnes was in Thomas Baskerville's company, and as Baskerville's first command was recruited in Gloucestershire, he suggests that Barnes did not go out to France until February 1591-2, when Baskerville, who had been in England recruiting, returned to Normandy with a force of Londoners. But both Nashe and Barnes himself particularly refer to Essex, Nashe saying that Barnes appealed to the General, and Barnes that he saw Essex in

[7] Newcastle upon Tyne Records Series, vol. IX, *Miscellanea*, pp. 147-165.

NOTE.—The authorities for the rest of this chapter are:—

Sir Thomas Coningsby, *Journal of the Siege of Rouen 1591*, by Sir Thomas Coningsby of Hampton Court in Hereford, edited by John Gough Nichols, Camden Soc., vol. 39 (1847).

Sir Robert Carey, 1st Earl of Monmouth, *Memoirs*, ed. G. H. Powell (1905).

W. B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux Earls of Essex*, vol. I, pp. 212-275.

G. B. Harrison, *Life of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex*, pp. 46-86.

France.' As Essex finally returned to England in January 1591-2, Barnes's soldiering cannot be deferred until February that year.

From the review at Covent Garden the army marched to Dover, where after some delay from contrary winds they embarked for Dieppe. Essex's first move was to go with his horse from Dieppe to the King's headquarters at Noyon. Henri IV was not particularly anxious to undertake the siege of Rouen at this time, but when he understood that the English forces were not to be employed for any other purposes, he sent Mareschal Biron and the Duc de Montpensier to join Essex and invest the town, promising to bring his own army later. On the 6 September the English advanced to besiege Rouen, and there were skirmishes with the enemy for several days. This was the first time that the English force had come under fire, and Barnes, according to his enemy Nashe, "(fearfull cowbaby) he never heard peice shot off but hee fell flat on his face." This might be a very sensible proceeding on Barnes's part, but Essex's army was in heroic mood at this early stage of the campaign. Later experience made some of the soldiers wiser.

At the end of September the English force took part in the capture of Gournai, a small town near Rouen, which fell within a day or two of the arrival of the English. There could not have been a more satisfactory campaign for a coward, as far as the fighting was concerned, but in every other respect the campaign was a hard one. Plague broke out in the camp at the beginning of September, and discipline was very slack, as the soldiers were living on the country. Nominally Henri IV was to provide their pay, but as he had no money he could pay nothing. The adventurers were expected to live upon their own means. Some had independent incomes, some lived on credit, but those like Barnes who had raised enough money to keep themselves and their horses and servants for two months, were reduced to poverty when their money ran short, and

no victory had aroused patriotism at home and brought new supplies from their families in England.

The adventurers submitted to no authority but that of the lord-general, and as Barnes became the butt of the camp he had no one else to appeal to for protection. Nashe tells the following story:

> For his cavaliership, since thou art not instructed in it, let mee tell thee, it is lewder by nine score times than his Poetry; since his doughtie service in France five yeares agoe; I am not forgetting him where, having followed the Campe for a weeke or two, and seeing there was no care had of keeping the Queenes Peace, but a man might have his braines knockt out, and no Justice or Cunstable neere hand to send foorth precepts, and make hue and crie after the murdrers; without further tarrying or consultation, to the Generall he went, and told him he did not like of this quarrelling kinde of life. and common occupation of murdring. wherein (without anie Jurie or triall, or giving them so much leave as to saye their praiers) men were run through and had their throats cut, both against Gods lawes, her Majesties lawes, and the lawes of all Nations: wherefor he desird license to depart, for hee stood everie howre in feare and dread of his person, and it was alwaies his praier, From suddain death, good Lord, deliver us. Upon this motion, there were divers warlike Knights and principall Captaines, who, rather than they would bee bereaved of his pleasant companie, offred to picke out a strong guard amongst them for the safe engarisoning and better shielding him from perrill. Two stept foorth and presented themselves as muskettiers before him, a third and fourth as targatiers behinde him; a fifth and sixth vowd to trie it out at the push of the pike before the malicious foe should invade him. But home hee would, nothing could stay him, to finish Parthenophil and Parthenope and write in praise of Gabriell Harvey.

The facts behind the story probably were that Barnes complained to Essex of some injury done him by his fellow adventurers. They were indignant at this, and formed a mock bodyguard to parade him round the camp. There is no means of knowing when this happened, as Nashe's "weeke or two" is evidently not meant to be taken seriously.

It has been conjectured that Nashe made an earlier attack on Barnes in *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594). Jack

Wilton, the narrator, when he was in Henry VIII's army at the siege of "Turwin," persuaded a certain captain, who was both a fool and a coward, that he was so wise and cunning as to be the very man to go into the French army as a spy, where he might do service that would win a great reward from the King. There was no need to tell him exactly what the service was, for the fool was so much puffed up by flattery that he went off to the French camp, with no idea of what he should do there. Meanwhile Jack informed the provost marshal that the captain had deserted to the enemy, and his place was given to another man. The captain in his new quarters bragged that he was a great man who from discontent with the King of England had come over to the enemy, and could give the King of France information that would enable him to force the English to raise the siege in three days. He was brought before a counterfeit king of France, and ordered to reveal his intelligence, but his lies were so confused and contradictory that he was denounced as a spy and threatened with torture. He confessed the truth, and was tortured, and having nothing more to confess was whipped back to the English camp, where the provost marshal hanged him for a deserter.

The unlucky captain was, like Barnes, a braggart and a coward, but otherwise this story does not resemble Nashe's anecdote in *Have with You to Saffron Walden*. Unlike Barnes, Jack Wilton's victim "never looked in book in his life" and was a clumsy liar. But Jack Wilton's story may have suggested the incident of Parolles and the drum in *All's Well that Ends Well*. Here a braggart is flattered into undertaking an adventure which he knows to be impossible. He is seized, threatened with torture, and exposes his own cowardice. Indeed, he shows up worse than Jack Wilton's captain, who betrayed nothing, though chiefly because he knew nothing to betray. By equating Barnes with Jack Wilton's captain, and the captain with Parolles, the inference has been drawn that the character of Parolles is drawn from Barnes. As will appear later, Shakespeare

must have known Barnes, and Parolles has some of his characteristics, such as his proficiency in foreign languages and his love of fine clothes. But, on the other hand, it seems unlikely that the captain in *The Unfortunate Traveller* was meant for Barnes, as Nashe would have had no hesitation in making the point perfectly clear if he had meant to make it at all.

At the beginning of October, the two months for which the troops had enlisted had expired, and on the 5 October, a messenger came from England with a summons for Essex's recall, though the army was to remain. When Essex left for England it was generally believed that the army would soon follow him. The period for which it had been enlisted was over, and Rouen was not taken. Many of the gentlemen volunteers obtained passports and followed Essex home. In fact the Earl seems to have been rather pleased that this should happen, as it showed his personal influence. Barnes's return to England probably took place now. When Essex had gone, he had no protection against his tormentors, while at the same time he had a suitable excuse for applying for his own passport, and was in company with a number of others. It may safely be concluded that Barnes's soldiering ended in October 1591.

CHAPTER II

PARTHENOPHIL AND PARTHENOPHE

Barnabe Barnes returned to London in October 1591. So far as is known, he had no resources but his wits. His only external asset was a solid, clannish north country family. His elder brother, John Barnes, was a lawyer, and from one or two indications it may be guessed that Barnabe read sufficient law to act as his legal correspondent in London and to follow the cases in which his brother was

interested when John was obliged to be in the north.[1] But though Barnes may have taken to the law to make a little money, his chief ambition was to earn fame and wealth as a poet.

The time was favourable for young authors. Englishmen who were interested in reading, a small company, had long known of the renaissance of literature in Italy, inspired by the classics, and in France, inspired by the Italians. Seventy years before it had seemed probable that the influence of Italy would extend to England at the same time as to France, but this early literary movement was destroyed by the tyranny of the latter part of Henry VIII's reign. Of the three most notable authors then living, Sir Thomas More, Sir Thomas Wyat and the Earl of Surrey, two died on the scaffold and the third barely escaped the same fate. No writers of equal power took their place, but there was a number of humble, hard-working secondary men, who by adaptations, translations and imitations made the new forms and themes of the renaissance known in England, working patiently for the revival of English letters which they believed must come.

In 1579 the hour arrived, with the publication of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*. This book was to the new movement what the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798 were to the romantic movement of the nineteenth century. The reception of *The Shepherd's Calendar* was mixed, though, as there were no professional critics, not so hostile as the reception of the *Lyrical Ballads*, but the new poetry was welcomed by the younger men, and Spenser's reputation increased. Sir Philip Sidney was known to be one of the patrons of the new movement. His position was won by sheer force of character, and was confirmed by his heroic death. His works circulated in manuscript, but none was issued to the public until a surreptitiously obtained copy

[1] Sir John Harrington calls Linus, who is probably Barnes, a pettifogger, i.e. an attorney (see below). When in Durham Barnes lived with his brother John (Eccles, *Barnabe Barnes*, p. 221 in Sisson, *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*).

of *Astrophel and Stella* was published in 1591. The effect was tremendous. Sidney had taken the whole laboriously assembled apparatus of the sonnet convention and had brought it to life. Whether by his own emotion and experience, as he himself said, or by sheer literary genius, the miracle had been worked. To give a modern simile, the aeroplane really flew: and just as all the most enterprising young engineers of 1910 wanted to have aeroplanes, so all the most enterprising young poets of 1591 wanted to have sonnet sequences.

Barnes tells the reader a good deal about his resolution to devote himself to poetry in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, but this at once raises the question whether anything that a poet wrote in sonnet form can be taken as true, or whether it is all purely conventional and quite divorced from his personal experience. In weighing this point, it will perhaps be granted that there is nothing unusual in a young poet, or in fact any young man, being in love with some young woman; it is rather his normal state than otherwise. Also a young poet is usually more interested in his own feelings than in anything else. The range of the sonnet convention was wide, and out of it the poet selected the themes which appealed to him because they came within his own experience.

Barnes says that from his fourteenth to his twenty-first year he led a wild life (sonnet XXXII), but then he found it was absolutely necessary to reform, and resolved that he would devote himself to Pallas and Mars and "never would to beauty yield" (sonnet XXXIII). He locked up his heart, "a tender boy," so that it should not escape (sonnet II), and considered whether he should write of "war and martial chiefdens of the field" or in praise of Queen Elizabeth (Ode 7), but his heart escaped from prison and fled to "light Laya" (sonnets III and IV). One of his odes (Ode 8) is addressed to Laya, and ought therefore to be his earliest surviving poem, but as he calls himself Parthenophil in it, it must have been revised for the volume. In it he refers

to Laya's "matron breast," from which it appears she was a widow—as there is nowhere any reference to her husband. Laya kept his heart a close prisoner for some time, but by and by she had another suitor, a wealthy squire and courtier, for whom she threw over the poor poet, and Parthenophil's heart, glad to escape, fled for protection to Parthenophe (sonnet v).

Such is Barnes's account of his mental and emotional life in his twenty-first year (1591-2), and there seems to be nothing in it difficult to believe. It would be rash to say that such incidents never occur in any other series of sonnets, English, French or Italian, but at least this opening is not in the usual convention. In nine cases out of ten the lover swears that his heart was never touched until he met the lady to whom the sonnets are addressed. To confess that he had had one serious and several transitory passions before meeting her is uncommon.

Who was Parthenophe? From puns in sonnets XLIV and XLVI on Percy and Pierce-eye, it appears that she was a lady of the Percy family.[2] She was not the eighth earl's youngest daughter, Lady Elinor Percy, as Lady Elinor was only eleven in 1592. She may have been a daughter of the seventh earl, a romantic person to modern eyes, though in Elizabeth's time the children of a rebel were apt to be looked upon as particularly inconvenient poor relations. Probably Lady Mary Percy was Parthenophe. In her favour is Ode 3, which is addressed to the virgin Mary, not in the ecclesiastical, but in the human sense, and sonnet XXXVII,

[2] Sonnet XLIV:

"Where be all these? that all these might have taughte her
That Saints divine are known Saints by their mercy
And Saint-like beauty should not rage with pierce-eye!"

Sonnet XLVI:

"Ah, pierce-eye piercing eye and blazing light!"

cf. Elegy XX:

"Thy heart, of adamant! because it takes
The hardest hearts, drawn prisoner unto thine.
Thine eye! because it, wounded many makes,
Yet no transpiercing beams can pierce those eyne!
Thy heart of adamant, which none can wound!
Thine eye of adamant, unpierced found!"

in which Parthenope refuses Parthenophil's suit because she is vowed to virginity. It was said that Father Gerard, the confessor of Lady Elizabeth, the eldest daughter, prevailed upon Lady Mary Percy to give up her marriage portion to his Order and to become a nun.[3] Gerard must, of course, have worn secular clothes in England, and it is quite possible that Parthenophil thought him a rival when all the time he was a priest persuading Parthenophe to virginity. Parthenophe is less likely to have been Lady Jane Percy, the sister of Lady Mary, who eventually was married to Lord Henry Seymour, a younger son of the Duke of Somerset.[4]

The name Parthenophe is taken from *Erotopaignion*, a Latin poem by Hieronymus Agerianus of Naples, published in 1582; in one section of the work, headed "De Parthenophe," the author addresses his native city of Naples in lover-like terms.[5]

Barnes was as anxious to win the favour of the Earl of Northumberland as that of Parthenophe. Allusions to magic in his poems were probably meant to appeal to him, as he was interested in alchemy, astrology and all occult sciences. The astrological sonnets XXXII-XLIII are written with an eye to the Earl's hobbies, about which much information can be gained by examination of his accounts. The Earl was also interested in gardening; Barnes's sonnets are full of trees and flowers. His sonnet XXVII on mazes has a more personal appeal to the Earl, as mazes were the latest fashion in gardening. The Earl cared more for painting than for poetry, and two of Barnes's most successful madrigals describe Parthenophe sleeping, and urge Zeuxis the painter to paint her portrait. It is interesting to learn from his accounts that Zeuxis of madrigal 4 may have been Nicholas Hillyard:

[3] Walpole, *One Generation of a Yorkshire House*, p. 247.

[4] *Notes and Queries*, vol. 169, pp. 246-7. He is usually but incorrectly called son of the Earl of Hertford, who was in fact his brother.

[5] Sir Sidney Lee, *Introduction to Elizabethan Sonnets*, ed. J. Seccombe, I, p. lxxvii.

1585-7. To Mr Hubbard in full payment of his Lordship's picture of Madame Dundragoe £12.
24 antique pictures of the Emperors of Rome £24.
For drawing little pictures or emblems 3s 4d.
Gilding the picture of Cupid 4s.
To Mr Hubbard in part payment for the picture £15.
For the picture of Madam Dundragoe 100s.
1593. To Mr Hillyard for his Lordship's picture 60s.

The following entries in 1586-7 are also to be noted:

1586-7. Shepherd's Calendar 10d.
A book called Academiae Cantabrigiensis Lachrymae 10d.
Life and Death of Sir Philip Sidney 4d.[6]

Barnes was successful for the time being in gaining the patronage of the Earl. From Parthenophe he got as much probably as he wanted or expected. It was not part of a mistress's behaviour in a sonnet sequence to accept the poet.

Barnes produced an impressive array of patrons for his sonnets. At the end of the book are dedicatory verses to Henry Earl of Northumberland (of a thrice noble house); to Robert Earl of Essex and Ewe (thrice valiant); to Henry Earl of Southampton (who is begged to receive the book with his thrice sacred hand); to the Countess of Pembroke, the Lady Strange, and the Lady Bridget Manners, the last being signed by the author. Northumberland and Essex were Barnes's acknowledged patrons. The Countess of Pembroke was the Muse of all sonneteers. Lady Strange was the wife of Ferdinand Lord Strange, the eldest son of the Earl of Derby, and his cousin Sir Edward Stanley had married Lady Lucy Percy, Lady Mary's sister. The Earl of Southampton and Lady Bridget Manners are the two most interesting names. The Earl, who was twenty, had just come to court, and a marriage between him and Lady Bridget was being discussed, though it came to nothing.[7]

[6] Hist. MSS. Com., Append. to 6th Report, *Earl of Northumberland's Accounts*, pp. 227, 229, 230.

[7] C. C. Stopes, *The Earl of Southampton*, pp. 65-6. Mrs. Stopes is amusingly angry with Lady Bridget for slighting the Earl.

All the writers of the day were seeking the young Earl's patronage, but Barnes's dedicatory poems indicate that he had some acquaintance with the Earl's affairs. On the title page is the dedication :

To the right noble and virtuous gentleman, M. William Percy, Esq., his dearest friend.

The rest of the page is torn away, so that we do not know whether Barnes put his name upon it. On the next page there is an address ostensibly by the printer John Wolf :

To the Learned Gentlemen Readers, the Printer

Gentlemen!

These labours following, being come of late into my hands barely, without title or subscription; partly moved by certain of my dear friends, but especially by the worth and excellency of the Work, I thought it well deserving my labour, to participate them to your judicial views : where, both for variety of conceits, and sweet Poesy, you shall doubtless find that which shall be most commendable, and worth your reading.

The Author, though at the first unknown (yet enforced to accord to certain of his friends' importunacy herein, to publish them, by their means, and for their sakes) is unwilling, as it seemeth, to acknowledge them, for their levity; till he have redeemed them, with some more excellent work hereafter. Till when, he requesteth your favourable and indifferent censures of these his over-youthful Poems; submitting them to your friendly patronages.

Farewell! this (blank) of May 1593.

From this, and also from some rather feeble introductory verses, it seems that Barnes had intended to publish the book anonymously, and that he changed his mind at the last moment. The standards of another age are difficult to grasp. The Elizabethans were fairly outspoken, and yet Barnes's sonnets were considered rather scandalous, perhaps because the sonnet had hitherto been a particularly decorous form, so that readers were shocked by passages in sonnets which they would have taken as a matter of course in a pamphlet or on the stage. But Barnes,

with his backing of noble names, had the courage in the end to put his name to his own book. There was one patron, however, not named, but hinted at, who had more than the rest to do with the publication of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*. This was Gabriel Harvey, who in August 1592 came to London and lodged with the printer John Wolf. He and Barnes had friends in common, and may have known each other already; at any rate they met now, as Barnes was also lodging with Wolf. Harvey came on family business, but he had also a literary object. He and his brother Richard had taken part in the Martin Marprelate controversy; they inclined to the puritan side, and were accordingly attacked by the government pamphleteers Lyly, Greene, and Nashe. Harvey was determined during his stay in London to answer Greene's *Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, published in July 1592.

At this time Harvey felt himself an important literary character. He had been the friend, even the guide, of Edmund Spenser, and Spenser's reputation was established by the publication of the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* in 1590. Sir Philip Sidney had been Harvey's patron, and Sidney's sonnets were the latest literary sensation. Harvey felt that the renaissance of English poetry was largely his work, and he was willing to continue his services by finding new poets. Barnes showed him his sonnets, and in fairness it must be said that Harvey had reason for giving him encouragement. Nashe asserted that Barnes would never have written a line or found his way to a publisher without Harvey's help, but that is contrary to everything that is known about Barnes's character, from Nashe himself as well as from other sources. Barnes was by no means diffident, and he had a literary bent. One cannot imagine him bashfully suppressing his talent, or timidly holding back from publication. Nashe for his own purposes was turning to ridicule the conventional modesty of the preface and introductory verses of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*. But while discounting much of what Nashe

says, the fact remains that Harvey praised and encouraged Barnes, and this was destined to bring trouble on them both.

CHAPTER III

LIFE IN LONDON

On the 26 June, 1593, Henry Percy Earl of Northumberland was installed as a Knight of the Garter at Windsor Chapel.[1] Barnabe Barnes was at this time among the gentlemen of the Earl of Northumberland, and attended him on his installation; Nashe sarcastically advised one of his friends in *Have with You to Saffron Walden* to apply to Barnes "if you have ever a chaine for him to run away with, as he did with a Nobleman's Steward's chaine at his Lord's installing at Windsor." What Nashe says is hardly evidence, as he was exercising all his considerable powers of abuse on Barnes, but his anecdote, as Dr. Eccles points out, betokens that Barnes did not remain long in the Earl's service. At any rate his friendship with William Percy was not shaken by his misbehaviour, as appears from the address to him in *Coelia* in 1594.

Parthenophil and Parthenophe survives in a single copy which bears the signature of Barnabe's elder brother John Barnes, the Durham lawyer, with the puritanical motto: *Principium sapientiae timor Jehovae*. There was no demand for a second edition, but the sonnets received a few tributes of approval. Thomas Churchyard in his *Praise of Poetry* (1595) mentions Spenser and Daniel, and continues:

> One Barnes that Petrark's schollar is
> May march with them in ranke.

---

[1] Inscription on the Earl of Northumberland's seat in Windsor Chapel:
De tres noble et puissant Seigneur, Henry Comte de Northumberland, Baron Percy, Seigneur de Lucy, Poyninges, Fitz-Paine, et Bryant, chir du tres noble Ordre de la jarretierre, le 26. jour de Juine l'an 1593.
Arthur Collins, *A History of the Family of Percy* (1750), p. 99.

Thomas Bastard, the college friend of Percy and Barnes, published a volume of epigrams called *Chrestolorus* in 1598, among them one on Barnes, probably written soon after the publication of the sonnets:

> Barneus' verse (unlesse I doe him wrong)
> Is like a cupp of sacke, heady and strong.

Dr. Eccles remarks that it "suggests that sack came readily to mind when you thought of Barnes." In 1595 an unknown "J.C." published a poem, which went into three editions, called *Alcilia: Philoparthen's Loving Folly*, in which the title at least is adapted from Barnes's *Parthenophil.*

Barnes himself seems to have been well pleased with the success of his first book, and, according to Nashe:

> Because he would be noted, getting him a strange payre of Babilonian britches, with a codpisse as big as a Bolognian sawcedge . . . [he] went up and downe Towne, and shewed himself in the Presence at Court, where he was generally laught out by the Noblemen and Ladies.

He left Wolf the publisher's house in Paul's churchyard, where he and Gabriel Harvey had lodged in the winter of 1592-3, and took more fashionable lodgings in Holborn, while he plunged rashly into the violent literary quarrel which was being carried on between Tom Nashe and Gabriel Harvey.

It is not necessary, fortunately, to go into the complicated details of this quarrel, but its course must be given in outline. In December 1592 Harvey published *Four Letters and Certaine Sonnetts especially touching Robert Green.* The book was an attack upon the licentiousness of modern authors. Harvey was one of those men who, without the gift of creating it themselves, are deeply interested in literature; in a later age he would have been a critic or a professor of literature, but in Elizabeth's reign there was no place for him. If he had been wealthy he would have

been a patron, whose opinions would be respected because he could bestow pensions and livings, but the writers of the age would not take correction from a man in no better position than themselves. Harvey wanted to be the Grand Cham of literature that Samuel Johnson became two hundred years later. He felt it his duty to abolish Robert Green, but he addressed Nashe in a milder way. McKerrow says: "He treats Nashe rather as a clever young man who had been misguided and foolish, and who might be easily reclaimed, than as one altogether base. . . . And this it was perhaps that especially irritated Nashe, though we may doubt whether it was so designed."

Nashe retaliated upon Harvey with *Strange Newes of the intercepting of certaine Letters*, published in January 1592-3. Harvey wrote a reply, *Pierce's Supererogation*, which was dated 27 April, 1593, but was not printed at that date, as several friends tried to bring about a reconciliation, which would involve the suppression of Harvey's reply. One of these friends might possibly be William Percy. He composed an epigram:

> I beseech thee, Hobinol, to take thy rest,
> I know some say, thou writest not the best.

This was not tactful, but may have been meant as friendly advice. Another who urged reconciliation was John Thorius or Thory, who has already been mentioned as a student at Oxford, of French descent, while Barnes and Percy were there, and who was now living at Oxford as a physician and translator.

But Barnes and Antony Chewt, another of Harvey's young discoveries, urged Harvey to publish his retort upon Nashe. It was published in the autumn of 1593, as appears from the various dates that occur in it, the latest being August 3rd. Harvey put into it the letters and sonnets from his admirers, which he said induced him to agree to its publication. Barnes's contributions are the longest and most fiery: they consist of a lengthy letter "To the Right

Worshipfull, his especiall deare friend, M. Gabriell Harvey, Doctour of Lawe," and three sonnets, of which the last two, "Nash, or the confuting Gentleman," and "Harvey, or the sweet Doctour," are signed "Parthenophil" and "Parthenophe" respectively. There are also two letters and two sonnets each from John Thorius and Antony Chewt. Thorius devoted himself to praising Harvey and urging a reconciliation with Nashe. Chewt made no suggestion of reconciliation, but abused Nashe roundly. Harvey expressed his thanks for these contributions in a letter printed at the beginning of *Pierce's Supererogation* and addressed to "my very gentle and liberall frendes, M. Barnabe Barnes, M. John Thorius, M. Antony Chewt, and every favorable reader."

Later in the year Harvey renewed the attack on Nashe in *A Newe Letter of Notable Contents*, but Barnes had no part in this. Nashe did not at once reply; he dedicated his new book, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, to the Earl of Southampton, to whom Barnes had written a dedicatory sonnet in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*. As Nashe wished to obtain the favour of the young Earl, he dared not quarrel too violently with the writers who already belonged to Southampton's circle. Barnes and the Harveys looked upon Essex, Southampton's great friend, as their patron, and Nashe therefore suspended hostilities with them. But Southampton seems to have rejected Nashe's advances, for the second edition of *The Unfortunate Traveller* came out without the dedication.[2] After this Nashe had no reason to restrain himself, and according to his own account he wrote a reply, but did not publish it until by chance he met Harvey at the Dolphin Inn at Cambridge in the autumn of 1595. This awoke the old quarrel, and in 1596 Nashe's final retort, *Have with You to Saffron Walden*, was published. In this Barnes comes only second to Harvey in abuse, as Thorius had never quarrelled with Nashe, and

[2] *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, edited by McKerrow, vol. III, pp. 89, 102, 107-10, 115, 116; IV, pp. 346-7, 351, 353-5; V, p. 86.

Chewt had died. *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* is "that Philistine Poem . . . which to compare worse than it selfe, it would plague all the wits of France, Spain and Italy." The stories to Barnes's discredit have already been quoted as they come into his life.

Between 1593 and 1596 Nashe's friends carried on the quarrel. Thomas Campion published a volume of Latin epigrams called *Poemata* in 1595; no. 88 is addressed to Nashe, and congratulates him on driving the profane herd out of the fold of the Muses, while no. 80 is the mockery of Barnes's cowardice in the field mentioned above. Campion probably wrote at the same time three English epigrams ridiculing Barnes, which were published in his *Observations in the Art of English Poesy*, 1602.[3] Campion wrote these epigrams to amuse Nashe and to support him in the controversy with Harvey, but Nashe seems to have had a much greater champion, for following the track of allusions to *Pierce's Supererogation* leads to *Love's Labour's Lost*.

The date of *Love's Labour's Lost*, as of most of Shakespeare's plays, is much disputed. The play was performed at court in 1597; no doubt it was revised for the occasion and new topical jokes inserted, but there are grounds for believing that it was first acted early in 1594. *Pierce's Supererogation* had been published in the autumn of 1593, and there are allusions to it in the dialogue. The character of Moth represents Nashe, and as a generally acknowledged allusion to *Pierce's Supererogation* is put into the mouths of Moth and Holofernes,[3a] the latter may represent Gabriel Harvey, who had already been parodied on the stage in *Pedantius*, a play acted at Cambridge in 1580-1, in which Harvey appeared as a "concise and firking finicaldo fine Schoole-master," and his appearance, his clothes, and his affected way of speaking were all ridiculed. If Holofernes in some of his aspects represents Gabriel Harvey, it seems

[3] *The Works of Thomas Campion*, edited by Percival Vivian, pp. 44, 46, 49, 239, 284, 286.

[3a] Francis A. Yates, *A Study of Love's Labour's Lost*, pp. 4-5.

possible that Sir Nathaniel is Barnabe Barnes. Sir Nathaniel is a curate; Barnes was the son of a bishop, and fond of boasting of it; in 1593-4 he was writing religious poetry, and obtained the patronage of Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham; there was even a rumour that he had become a minister. Sir Nathaniel was to personate Alexander in the pageant of the Nine Worthies, but he was at once dashed by ridicule, and could not utter a single word of his part. Barnes was given to bragging of his exploits in the Rouen campaign, and was laughed at for his cowardice. Sir Nathaniel's part in the play is to praise and admire Holofernes, and Barnes has a similar function in *Pierce's Supererogation*. Finally, Sir Nathaniel is a good bowler, and we know that Barnes once spent an hour in St. James's Park watching the bowlers! The game in both cases is bowls, not cricket. But while these parallels are amusing they must not be taken too seriously, or pressed too far. The play has only a slight framework of plot and character, and almost any sort of topical allusion could be inserted and put into almost anyone's mouth.

The Earl of Northumberland's health was poor. He was deaf, and is said to have had bad sight. His accounts show that he went almost every year to "the Bath" for treatment, and that he knew Sir John Harington, who lived near Bath. William Percy also knew Sir John, and probably through the Percys Harington became acquainted with Barnabe Barnes.

About 1593-5 Harington wrote a series of epigrams, in which he took a loftily detached attitude to the Nashe-Harvey quarrel. His advice to "Doctor Harvey of Cambridge" is:

> The proverbe says, who fights with durty foes
> Must needs be soyld, admit they winne or lose.
> Then think it doth a Doctor's credit dash
> To make himself Antagonist to Nashe.

But the individual against whom Harington directed

the greatest number of his epigrams was "Lynus," who has been identified with Barnes. The points of resemblance are numerous. The name seems to be an allusion to the astrological sonnets in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, for Churchyard in his *Praise of Poesie* says that Lynus was a son of Mercury who wrote the courses of the sun, moon and spheres in excellent verse.[4] Lynus is of good birth, but never has a penny, and is always begging and borrowing money; he is a liar and a coward; he denies that he keeps a mistress, which is true, for she keeps him; he boasts that the stationers sell his writings; he is often drunk, and when he is sober he reels in his walk, so that men may think it is his usual way, and not notice when he is drunk. Paullus (Raleigh) joins with Harington in laughing at Lynus, who criticizes Harington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax*, which appeared in August 1596, and was answered by *Ulysses upon Ajax* in the following month. As the writer of this reply alluded to "the old manciple of Brazen-nose College at Oxford," Barnes's college, Harington may have thought he was the author whether he actually was or not. Lynus was at Brazenose College; in after life, according to Harington, he was "a Broker, a Petty-fogger, a Traveller, a Gamster and a Cogger, a Coyner, a Promotor, a Bawde, Spy, a Practicer in every fraude":

> And missing thrift by these lewd trades and sinister,
> He takes the best, yet proves the worst, a minister.

That Harington calls him a pettyfogger, i.e., an attorney, supports the guess that he may have done legal work for his brother John Barnes, the lawyer. A spy and a promoter were much the same; Harington in other epigrams accuses "promoting Lynus" of trying to lead him into a dangerous conversation in order to inform against him. Barnes was following in the footsteps of Marlowe in undertaking sinister commissions from the government or from noblemen who wanted dirty work done and were prepared

[4] Mark Eccles, *Barnabe Barnes*, in *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*, p. 223n.

to pay for it. It is a rather curious speculation as to when he started on this kind of business, and whether he may have had a sort of family interest in it. His mother was Fredesmunda, daughter of Ralph Gifford of Claydon, Bucks; his uncle Henry Barnes married another lady of the Gifford family, but the Christian name of her father and herself are not known. Gilbert, son of John Gifford of Chillington, Staffs, was Walsingham's principal spy and agent provocateur in the Babington conspiracy of 1585-6. Gilbert Gifford brought into the plot a man called Thomas Barnes, whom he called his cousin, and who lived in London; Thomas Barnes was sometimes called Barnaby as an alias, and this alias seems to have been used by other spies connected with the plot.[5] It is a curious coincidence that the names of Barnaby, Barnes and Gifford should all occur together, but Barnabe Barnes at that time was only fourteen, and it seems impossible that he should have had anything to do with the Babington conspiracy; moreover, no Thomas Barnes can be traced in the family tree of Barnabe's father, the bishop of Durham. Thomas Barnes continued in the government service, and when a spy is called Barnes, he seems to be the man; Barnabe is never specifically mentioned.

Harington's suggestion that Barnes had become a minister has already been mentioned, in the suggestion that he might be identified as Sir Nathaniel in *Love's Labour's Lost*, but there is no reason to believe that he ever entered the church, though in 1595 he may have hoped to do so; in that year he published his *Divine Century of Spiritual Sonnets*, dedicated to the bishop of Durham and written, as he says, on his travels. Harington's epigram was therefore probably written in 1595, but another on *Lynus Poetrie* must have been written earlier, before the publication of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* in 1593, unless Barnes wrote a great deal that he did not publish. The following lines are from this epigram:

[5] A. G. Smith, *The Babington Conspiracy*.

When Lynus thinkes that he and I are friends,
Then all his Poems unto me he sends:
His Disticks, Satyrs, Sonnets and Exameters,
His Epigrams, his Lyricks, his Pentameters.
Then I must censure them, I must correct them. . . .
But yet his rime is harsh, unev'n his number,
The manner much, the matter more, doth cumber,
His words too strange, his meanings are too mistick. . . .

This serves well enough to describe Barnes's numerous experiments in *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*; it shows that he was in the habit of showing his verses to any literary acquaintance, not only to the sympathetic Harvey. The identity of Barnes and Lynus thus seems to be fairly well established; an epigrammatist must have a butt, and Barnes was at least useful to Harington in that capacity.[6]

In 1594-5 Barnes was in France and lived for a time in Paris. He says that he devoted some time each day to writing spiritual sonnets, but he also learnt the use of mercury sublimate, both medicinally and as a poison. As he had no money to spend in travel on his own account, he may have been employed by the government, though of this there seems to be no trace, or he may have gone as a newsagent for the Earl of Essex, who was building up a foreign intelligence system which should be more efficient than the official system of his political rival Sir Robert Cecil.[7] Barnes must have returned to England in the spring of 1595 to arrange for the publication of the sonnets that he had composed since the appearance of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*.

In the publisher's note at the beginning of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* Barnes had promised that his serious muse should bring forth some graver work, and this promise was redeemed in *A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets*, which was printed by John Windet, with a dedica-

[6] N. E. McClure, *Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, pp. 51-2, 152-3, 166, 173, 190, 199, 201, 215, 222, 227, 229, 235, 237, 249, 253, 288, 296, 299, 303, 309, 319.

[7] G. B. Harrison, *The Earl of Essex*, p. 79.

tion to Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham, who had first come to Durham as dean in 1584 when Barnabe's father was bishop, and had made the acquaintance of the family at Stockton Castle, so that he knew Barnabe from childhood. After a dedicatory letter to the bishop there follows an address "To the Favourable and Christian Reader" in which Barnes describes his "hundreth Quatorzaines" as written in order to act as remembrancers to kindle zeal and pure holiness. He expresses his sense of the matchless and incomparable nature of his subject and quotes from the Book of Revelation. The conclusion of this address is as follows:

> And if any man feele in himselfe, by the secret fire of immortall entheusiasme, the learned motions of strange and divine passions of spirite; let him refine and illuminate his numerous Muses with the most sacred splendour of the Holy Ghost: and then he shall, with divine Salust (the true learned Frenche poet,) finde, that as human furie maketh a man lesse than a man, and the very same with wilde, unreasonable beastes; so divine rage and sacred instinct of a man maketh more than man, and leadeth him from his base terrestiall estate, to walke above the starres with angelles immortally.
>
> The severall passions of comforte and ghostly combates, albeit they stand in my booke confused, and peradventure therefore may to some readers seeme disordered and straunge, as in their unequall coherence of praises, penitence, and fearefull afflictions; yet upon some especiall occasions, and in earnest true motions of the Spirite were they devised: and I therefore, in this respecte, implore your generall favours. Reade, I beseech you; and with singleness of zeale and true spirit, give censure according to my good will and indevours.
>
> Farewell.
>
> Bar. Barnes.

"Divine Salust" was Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, whose religious poem, *Divine Weekes and Workes*, translated into English by Joshua Sylvester, had an immense influence in England.

A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets contains only sonnets in the usual Shakespearean form, and a concluding hymn in honour of the Trinity, and has none of the experi-

mental forms and metres of *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*. Under the title is the motto: "Altera Musa venit, quid ne sit et alter Apollo."

To those who disliked Barnes it seemed naturally a piece of disgusting hypocrisy that he should write religious sonnets. Harington, in an epigram already quoted, heaped the names of all disgraceful occupations on him. Nashe jeered at his motto, which Barnes, of course, meant to indicate his change from a profane to a sacred muse:

> Of late he hath set foorth another Booke, which hee entitles no lesse than A divine Centurie of Sonets, and prefixeth for his Posie,
> Altera Musa venit, quid ne sit et alter Appollo?
> As much to say as why may not my Muse bee as great an Appollo or God of Poetrie as the proudest of them? but it comes as farre short as a Paris Garden Cut of the heigth of a Cammell, or a Cockeboate of a Carricke: such another device it is as the godly ballet of Iohn Carelesse, or the Song of Greene sleeves moralized.[8]

But in spite of all that is known about his character, Barnes may be acquitted of hypocrisy. He had a vivid imagination and feelings easily moved. He could work himself up into a fit of the horrors by picturing Hell fire, or intoxicate himself into a celestial ecstasy by reading the magnificent poetry of the Book of Revelation. Neither mood lasted long enough to influence his conduct, but for the moment he was sincere. Nowhere in his sonnets does he claim any virtue in himself. He confesses his sinfulness and has no hope but in divine mercy. His inspiration came chiefly from the Book of Revelation, and he also used the Psalms, but his sonnets are not dry paraphrases. His method was to take a passage from Revelation or Psalms as a theme, and to develop its implications as a musician develops a theme in a sonata.

The dedication of the sonnets[9] shows that Barnes was

[8] *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, edited by McKerrow: *Have with You to Saffron Walden*, III, p. 201.

[9] *A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets* was reprinted by T. Park in *Heliconia*, vol. II (1815).

back in London on 30th August, 1595. In the autumn of that year Ralph Lord Eure was appointed warden of the Middle Marches, an appointment which was to be of great importance to Barnes, although at the time he probably did not know it. Lord Eure set out for his post with the firm determination to make a great reformation in the government of the English border, but unfortunately he had not the abilities to carry his purpose through successfully. It was not long before he quarrelled with Bishop Matthew, as well as with other important men in the north, so that while Barnes was under the patronage of the bishop, he might regard himself as on the opposite side to Eure.

Barnes's religious sonnets are not so good as his love sonnets, but some of them have autobiographical interest, as for instance sonnet XXXIX :

> Invironed with dangers manifolde
> At home and forren, both by land and wave,
> Where change of nations divers daungers gave,
> And novels earst, which I did not behold.
> Much like a doubtful pilgrim, whome infould
> Millions of woes, that knowes no helpe to have,
> Nor how from dangers prest himselfe to save,
> Was I;—but when me thought I perish should,
> My God of Mercy did my life redeeme;
> My God of Mercy did my soule sustaine:
> Oh then how well shall it my Muse beseeme
> To praise the Lord, and Him collaude againe!
> Nay try, vain poets! try that King, that place,
> If God and heaven give not your Muse most grace.

Barnabe Barnes may have written the reply to Harington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax* in England in the summer of 1596, as mentioned above, but all we know about his movements is that some time between September 1595 and December 1597 he was at Brill—the Brill, as it is always called, now known as Voorne, South Holland. Brill and Flushing were the two harbours in the Netherlands which

had been handed over to the English as pledges for the money which Elizabeth advanced for the war waged by the Dutch against Spain, and therefore they had English governors and garrisons. Whether Barnes went as a soldier or as a spy does not appear. The Dutch agreed in 1598 to pay the wages of these garrisons, which had hitherto been paid by the English government, and in the lists of captains and their companies then drawn up the name of Edward Mitchelbourne appears. If he was not Edward Mitchelbourne, the college friend of Percy and Barnes (who, being a Roman Catholic, was not likely to be fighting in the Low Countries), he was probably a member of the same family, and Barnes may have obtained admission to Brill through him.[10]

Nashe's *Have with You to Saffron Walden* was published in October 1596; what he says in it about Barnes has already been quoted. There is a slight implication that Barnes was on his travels again, but this is not definitely stated. Here for the first time is the joke about the sonnet in which Barnes wished to be the wine his lady drank; it was to be repeated by Campion and Marston.

The most exciting year in the life of Barnabe Barnes was 1598, when he was arrested and accused of murder, and twice fled to the north, a remarkable development in the career of a man who had recently written *A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets* and dedicated the book to a bishop. Professor Eccles has told the story so well and in such detail that it need only be summarized here.[11]

Ralph Lord Eure had gone to his post as warden of the Middle Marches determined to effect a clean-up, in the modern phrase, on the Border. In his attempt to accomplish this he inevitably antagonized all the vested interests in the old order, and became hopelessly involved in number-

[10] *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*, ed. C. J. Sisson, p. 180; Hist. MSS. Com., Lord de Lisle and Dudley, MSS. vol. III, pp. ix, xlvii, lxxv-vi.

[11] *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*, ed. C. J. Sisson, *Barnabe Barnes* by Mark Eccles, p. 167 *et seq.*

less border feuds, family, religious, political and personal. Among his allies and subordinates were Thomas Percy, the Earl of Northumberland's steward at Alnwick, and Robert Tailbois of Thornton, the husband of Barnabe Barnes's sister Elizabeth. Among Eure's numerous enemies were Henry Widdrington (Professor Eccles uses another spelling of the name, Witherington), and John Browne, who had formerly been steward of Alnwick, and therefore hated Thomas Percy, but who was now recorder of Berwick.

In October 1597 two of Eure's servants made an attempt to murder Browne, and only failed because he was so uncommonly tough. Robert Tailbois was involved in this affair, though he did not take part in the attack.

In December 1597 Browne and Lord Eure both came up to London to lay their respective grievances before the Privy Council. Browne first met Barnes at this time, at the White Horse tavern in Friday Street, where they had supper in company with Captain Jackson of Berwick, who had been on the Rouen expedition under Essex, and Dr. Roger Marbecke, censor of the College of Physicians and physician to the Queen. Barnes got drunk and became very obstreperous, trying to force Browne to drink a carouse, that is, to drink up the whole cup at one draught, in sack, which Browne disliked, and trying to make Dr. Marbecke "drink tobacco," which he seldom took. When Browne refused the carouse, Barnes abused and threatened him. Next day, when he was sober again, Captain Jackson remonstrated with him, and Barnes confessed that he could not remember what had happened the night before, and asked Jackson to make his apology to the other guests.

After this Barnes went to the north, and returned to London in March 1597/8, in company with Henry Widdrington and Sir Robert Carey, who had been in the Rouen campaign and was now warden of the West March. Widdrington later accused Barnes of trying to poison him on the journey by means of a cup of sack with sugar in it. The

story is somewhat confused. Barnes was said to have challenged Widdrington to drink a carouse, as he had challenged Browne, and when Widdrington refused, Barnes drank one with George Wood. Afterwards he insisted upon one of the cups being washed, because George Wood had been a traveller in Italy and might have put poison into it!

Barnes lodged at the Swan Inn in the Strand, and thence went to visit Widdrington in his lodging near the Savoy, where he met Browne. They invited him to stay in the same house, and at first he accepted, but afterwards suddenly left them and went back to the Swan, where he met Henry Sanderson, who came from the north and was a confidential agent of Bishop Matthew.

The next day, March 21st, Barnes came upon Browne at about five o'clock in the afternoon between Charing Cross and Whitehall, near the lodging of William Waad, clerk to the Privy Council, who was with Browne at the time. Barnes told them that he was going to Whitehall to ask permission to travel beyond the seas, and arranged to sup that night with Browne at his lodgings. Before going on his way he gave Browne a lemon. According to the prosecution this lemon was tainted with some subtle poison which would kill not only anyone who ate it, but even anyone who smelt it. Browne, suspecting nothing, gave the lemon to his friend Waad, who through smelling it but once or twice was afterwards tormented with exceeding great and strange pains in the head. It was stated that Barnes saw Browne give the lemon to Waad; when he was questioned about it he denied this and protested that the lemon was not poisoned, and that Browne asked him for it.

After this meeting Barnes went on to Whitehall and obtained his permit to travel. He then went to a shop in Westminster and bought twopennyworth of figs and a groatsworth of mercury sublimate. On coming back he saw Browne and Sir William Bowes walking in St. James's

Park, and sent his servant Bonaventure Darbishire to tell Browne that he was waiting to have his company at supper. Browne replied that he was busy and asked him to wait a little longer. Barnes and his servant waited for an hour or more, watching the games of bowls in the park, until it was growing dark; then seeing Browne leave the park, Barnes sent Darbishire to him again. Browne came back with the servant and explained that he was going to sup with Widdrington at the Bull's Head in the Strand; he therefore asked Barnes to join him some other time. Barnes, however, insisted that they should at any rate drink together, and after a good deal of argument about whether there was time and where they should go, they finally went to the Queen's Arms at Westminster, where they ordered a quart of sack, two silver cups and a groatsworth of sugar in brown paper, which were brought to them in a private room upstairs.

The prosecution asserted that Barnes smuggled the packet of sugar into his lap, tore open the packet of mercury sublimate which he had brought in his pocket, mixed the mercury with the sugar, and threw the wrapping of the mercury under the table. He then put the poisoned sugar into the cup which he offered to Browne, and said "that he was a Frenchman and would drink without sugar." Browne drained the cup, and immediately cried out that he was poisoned. Barnes answered: "God forbid! How can it be so, for the wine which I drank in the other cup was good." Browne accused him of having poisoned the sugar, and the vintner and others who were there took his part. They filled up the cup with the dregs of the sugar in it, and Barnes undertook to drink it, but he was accused of only filling his mouth, without swallowing, and afterwards spitting the sack out again. Barnes admitted that he spit some of it out, "for that indeed he cannot away with any sugar in his drink, for that he did heretofor surfeit of wine and sugar." After this both he and Browne took salad oil and Barnes managed to slip away. He stopped at a

tavern near Durham House, and called for more salad oil and a feather to tickle his throat to make himself vomit, but he protested that he only did this as a precaution, because the sack had tasted rather hot in his mouth, and because Browne had made such a to-do about poison; for his own part he did not believe that there was anything wrong with the sack, and he had suffered no ill-effects. He went back to the Swan, where Henry Widdrington came after him, demanding his arrest. Barnes, however, was now among friends, and managed to put Widdrington off by promising to be forthcoming in the morning, but when the morning came, at eight o'clock he made off, "thinking that if he should have stayed he should have been prejudiced one way or other."

He excused his flight in court by saying that he feared if he were taken into custody Anthony Felton of Great Felton in Northumberland, now principal of Furnival's Inn, would have laid an execution on him for a debt of £300. He told the servants at the Swan that he was going to Gravesend; he spent a couple of nights hiding in London, giving out another story, that he was going to Dover, and sleeping at the Star, an alehouse in Holborn. He probably wished to go abroad, but feared to be stopped when he tried to embark, or perhaps he had not enough money, so he made off to the north again, and visited Bishop Matthew, who reproved him for using mercury sublimate medicinally, not as a poison. It is satisfactory to know that the bishop cannot have had any knowledge of the poisoning attempt, as he was opposed to Eure and would therefore have disapproved of it both on moral and political grounds.

On 12th April an order to arrest Barnes on the charge of attempting to poison John Browne the recorder of Berwick was despatched to the bishop, and Barnes was arrested and sent back to London, where he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea. He lived there on small sums borrowed from his acquaintances; 40s. from Mr. Tailbois, his brother-in-

law's uncle; 40s. from Mr. Cowper, a councillor of the Inner Temple, whose home was in Durham; 40d. from Mr. Gaylor, a clothworker dwelling at the Golden Key in Cannon Street; and, the most important, 20s. from Thomas Jackson, an officer at the Marshalsea (a different man from the Captain Jackson mentioned above), to whom Barnes sold a mare for 40s. On Sunday May 14th he appeared before the Lords in Council. Browne gave evidence that Barnes had forced himself upon him, had insisted on their drinking together, and had urged him to take sack when he preferred beer. Two of the drawers at the Queen's Arms had tasted the poisoned sack and immediately became ill. The dregs in the poisoned cup were produced in court. Barnes admitted that he had mercury sublimate in his possession, that he had taken antidotes after he was forced to drink the sack, and that he had fled to escape arrest. He had no defence at all, except that he denied everything and professed to believe that there was nothing wrong with the sack.

The case was referred to the Court of Star Chamber, before which Barnes could not plead his clergy and get off with branding in the hand, which was no more than being touched by a cold iron if a sufficient bribe was forthcoming. He did not dare to stand his trial. Thomas Jackson, the official in the Marshalsea who had already befriended him, was in trouble in 1600/1601 for having allowed a prisoner to escape; he managed better on this occasion, as he was not called in question, but it may be suspected that by his means Barnes broke prison and fled to the north, whither warrants were sent for his arrest on July 11th.

The one strong point in Barnes's defence was that no reason was discovered for his attempt to poison Browne. The two men barely knew one another, and the prosecution was reduced to the suggestion that Barnes had cherished a grievance against Browne since their drunken squabble in December. But Professor Eccles has set out the circumstantial evidence which goes to prove that Lord Eure was

the instigator of the attempt, and that Barnes had some powerful influence behind him is shown by the fact that the prosecution was simply dropped at this point. He never was arrested, and after lying low in the north for a few months, he appeared in the Durham Chancery court on 9th February 1598/9 to give evidence for his brother John against his brother Timothy. He would not have dared to do this if he had not known that all proceedings against him were at an end. He probably owed his immunity ultimately to Essex, whom he always regarded as his patron. It is true that Essex had his famous quarrel with the Queen, when she boxed his ears, just at that time, June 1598, but his influence would still be enough to protect a minor criminal such as Barnes, especially as, luckily, no permanent harm was done, and Browne was well again within a month of his adventure. The Percy interest was also on Barnes's side, not so much on account of his friendship with William, as because Thomas Percy was a supporter of Lord Eure against the Forsters, Fenwicks and Widdringtons in the north. Finally the Queen herself had appointed Eure, and had insisted upon keeping him in office in spite of complaints against him. If Barnes had been brought to trial and under cross-examination had revealed the real motive for the attempted crime, it might have been extremely awkward for a number of important people, and consequently he went scot free. The fact that he was practically unknown to Browne made his attempt easier, and also effectually concealed who was setting him on, but he was such a fool that he went about the poisoning in a way that had not the smallest chance of success. Let us hope that he retained enough of the emotions he expressed in *A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets* not to intend to succeed, and that the whole affair was no more than a ruffianly practical joke.

During the time when Barnes's thoughts must have been occupied with his own position and prospects there were some small events in the literary world which would

have interested him in other circumstances. Bastard's *Chrestoloros*, containing the complimentary epigram to Barnes, was entered in the Stationers' Register a fortnight after the poisoning on March 21st, so the comparison of Barnes's verse to a cup of sack was unfortunate. John Marston in his satire *A Scourge of Villainy* gave a couple of lines to Barnes's much-abused sonnet LXXIII, in which he wished to be the wine his mistress drank, and Campion followed suit in a Latin epigram published in his collection of 1602, but not in that of 1595. They both probably took the lead from Nashe. John Florio, who had taught Emmanuel Barnes Italian at Oxford, published his celebrated Italian-English dictionary, *A World of Wordes* dedicated to the Earl of Southampton, in which one of the commendatory poems was by Barnabe Barnes. "Resolute" John Florio, as Professor Eccles observes, published the poem though its author was then under arrest on suspicion of poisoning.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVIL'S CHARTER

After his unsuccessful attempt at poisoning, Barnabe Barnes retired to the north, where he lived quietly for some years in the midst of his family. The Barnes clan had settled down in the bishopric of Durham. Two of Barnabe's uncles and his youngest brother Timothy held property and positions in Darlington and the neighbourhood. His eldest brother Emmanuel was rector of Wolsingham, one of the richest livings in the bishopric.[1]

Barnabe Barnes was an anomaly in this breed of solid acquisitive men. The brother with whom he had most to do was John Barnes, chancellor of the diocese of Durham

[1] Longstaff, *History of Darlington*, pp. 121, Append., pp. lxxxii-iii; *Deputy-Keeper's Reports on the Public Records*, vol. 37, pt. 1, p. 105; Surtees, *History of Durham*, 1, p. lxxxii.

and clerk of the peace. While Emmanuel and Timothy married in the normal Elizabethan way, John and Barnabe remained bachelors, which was much less usual then than it is now. Barnabe would no doubt gladly have married if he could have found a wealthy bride, but John's celibacy was more remarkable, as he had a good position and a good house in the North Bailey at Durham.

We know that John Barnes lived in the North Bailey, because his burial is recorded in the parish register of St. Mary le Bow on 19 July, 1613, but unfortunately dates forbid the identification of his house with that built by the Calvinistic widow of Dean Whittingham (1563-79):

> Mrs Whittingham, after the death of her husband . . . did carrye awaie dyverse grave-stones of blew marble, and other throwgh stones, that did ly upon the priors and mounkes, out of the Centrie Garth, when she buylded her house in the [North] Baley, which stones some of theme ar laid in the threshold of the dores, and two great ones lyeth without the doures, over against the walle before her front stead. For the which facte she was complayned upon, and so laid those two without the dour that before was maid wall-fast within her house; which howse came after to Mr Jo. Barnes, and after to Mr Jo. Richardson, who lived theire a longe season; but, in his tyme, ther came an olde man with comly gray hayres to begg an alms, and lookeinge aboute hym upon the tombe stones, which lay in the court yard, saide to the party that came to hym, that whilest those stones were theire nothinge wolde prosper aboute the howse; and, after, divers of his children and others dyed. So he caused them to be removed into the Abbey yard, wher now they are; but before the alms came to serve the man he was gone, and never seen after.[2]

As this account was written about 1593, Mr. Jo. Barnes was not Barnabe's brother but his uncle, who died in 1591.[3] The brothers had another uncle, James Barnes, who was buried at St. Mary the Less on 27 July, 1593; his orchard in the South Bailey is mentioned in 1597, when he was "late deceased."[4]

[2] *Rites and Monuments of Durham* (Surtees Soc., vol. 107), p. 61.
[3] Longstaff, *Hist. of Darlington*, p. lxxxii.
[4] *Durham Wills and Inventories* (Surtees Soc., vol. 32), II, p. 280.

At feasts and fairs the young men and women of the six little parishes in Durham used to compete with each other in singing, dancing, and "disguising." An early Elizabethan poet described a meeting between the North Bailey (St. Mary le Bow) and Elvet (St. Oswald's):[5]

In lusty may
the north bayly
att Elvett
heer dyd mett
there was dysguysing
piping and dansyng
the maydens came [singing]
When I was in my mother's bower
I hade all that I wodde
the bayly berith the bell away
the lylly the rose the rose I lay.

The disguising was some form of the St. George play, and in it the players wore copes which had been cast out of the cathedral at the reformation, one of them woven of blue and gold (blue cloth of gold) ornamented with gold flowers, the border and orphreys embroidered in different coloured silks with scenes of the Crucifixion and Resurrection. The material of which it was made was perhaps one of the three pieces of cloth of gold of blue colour with flowers interwoven, given to the Prior of Durham in 1355 at the funeral of Ralph lord Neville, in return for the privilege of burial within the cathedral. These copes were long used by the boys and girls of Durham for their may-games, but were finally restored to the cathedral about 1625, to the great indignation of the puritans.[6]

The church of St. Mary le Bow was so called because there was an arch at the west end over the narrow street. In the graveyard there was an ancient hawthorn tree, under which it was a privilege to be buried.[7] The present church has no arch, but in spite of modern alterations it is easy to

[5] *Durham University Journal*, N.S., vol. I, pt. 3.
[6] Boyle, *Guide to Durham*, pp. 253, 344-5.
[7] Surtees, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 39.

imagine Barnabe coming out of one of the houses in the North Bailey on a May morning to go through the arch of Bow church, up Lygate (Lychgate, the corpse road) by the cemetery, from which the scent of the white hawthorn mingled with that of the apple-blossom in his uncle James's orchard. He must often have gone in this direction to wait on Bishop Tobie Matthew, who continued to be a friend and patron of Barnabe and his brothers. Here in the street he might encounter the boys and girls of the parish holding a return meeting with those of Elvet, the girls singing their sweet, haunting song :

> " The Bailey beareth the bell away,
> The lily, the rose, the rose, I lay."

the boys flaunting the stained and tattered but still magnificent copes once wrought for the glory of God and worn in the great cathedral that towered over the whole scene. Through the pleasure of the spring, sunshine and flowers and singing girls, there was a faint note of sorrow and loss, from the cemetery where the hawthorn grew, the desecrated copes, the house whose walls were built with the gravestones of monks ; and if Barnes, as an aggressive Protestant, did not find anything to regret in the fall of the monastery, he could not look up the street and see the towers of the North Gate without being reminded of a family tragedy.

Barnabe's two younger sisters Margaret and Anne, who were children when their father made his will in 1589, had been married before 1593, Margaret to Henry Blakeston and Anne to a gentleman with the strikingly renaissance name of Aristotle Knowesley.[8] His elder sisters, Elizabeth and Mary, were married before 1589. Elizabeth, the eldest, was the only unfortunate member of this large family. Her husband was Robert son of Ralph Tailbois of Thornton Hall, which was described in 1854 as follows :

[8] *Deputy-Keeper's Reports on the Public Records*, vol. 37, pt. 1, p. 116.

Thornton Hall, on the road to Staindrop, is an interesting relic of the Tailbois family. It has [been] much altered by the Salvin and Bowes races, but much of the projection, towards the road, is Perpendicular Gothic, being ornamented with right ugly nondescript animals near the top. In the upper story of this part is a fine Jacobean ceiling with the arms and crest of Tailbois, and the devices of an anchor, fleur-de-lis, and escallop, in the pannelling. A still finer and older one is on the ground floor, intersected with beams carved with elaborate late Gothic tracery, and adorned with ciphers on the bosses and half way along the beams. The roof is evidently shortened, but the part remaining contains ciphers disposed as follows: RAIF A[ND IAN]E TALB, evidently pointing out Raife Talboys who married Jane Bertram and died 1591 as its constructor.[9]

Unfortunately in building this fine house Ralph Tailbois got into debt, and his son inherited an encumbered estate. Although, as escheator of the Bishopric, he was the servant of Bishop Matthew,[10] he took the part of the Bishop's opponent Lord Eure, and was probably the connecting link through whom Eure commissioned Barnabe to poison Browne.[11] Robert Tailbois's debts accumulated, and about 1601 his creditors had him lodged in the North Gate of Durham, which was the town prison.[12] During the three years that he languished there his wife Elizabeth, in order to be near him, lodged with her brother John in the North Bailey. The burial of "Mr. Tailbois" was entered in the register of St. Mary le Bow on 8 January, 1604/5. His will was witnessed by Barnabe Barnes and Aristotle Knowesley; he left to his brother [-in-law] John Barnes his manuscripts and law books, and to his brother [-in-law] Barnabas his other manuscripts; apparently he also dabbled in literature, but if he wished Barnabe to be his literary executor, his hopes failed.[13]

When the new reign began and King James I actually

[9] Longstaff, *Hist. of Darlington*, p. 150.
[10] Eccles, *Barnabe Barnes*, p. 208; *Deputy-Keeper's Report*, vol. 37 (1), p. 120.
[11] Eccles, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-2.
[12] *Durham Wills and Inventories* (Surtees Soc., vol. 32), II, p. 212.
[13] *Victoria County History of Durham*, III, p. 2; Surtees, *Hist. of Dur.* I, p. lxxxii; III, p. 382; Eccles, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

passed through Durham in 1603 on his way to the south, Barnabe no doubt felt that the old scandal had blown over and that there was an opportunity for a new career. He appears in 1604 as Barnabe Burning-glass in Thomas Middleton's *Black Book*.[14] An ingenious explanation for the name of "Burning-glass" has been offered by Miss Alice Walker, who quotes from Thomas Lodge's *A Fig for Momus*, a satire of 1595, the lines:

> ... Tell blear-eid Linus that his sight is cleere,
> Heele pawne himselfe, to buy thee bread and beere.

Linus or Lynus was the name by which Sir John Harington satirized Barnes in his epigrams, and the suggestion is that Lodge used the same pseudonym for the same man, and that Barnes was short-sighted and carried a magnifying-glass, which, Middleton implies, could also be used as a burning-glass to light his pipe.[15] In *The Black Book* he is laughed at in the old way, and pictured as sitting smoking on the stage in the theatres; but Barnes had taken a serious turn again, as he did at the time of the *Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets*, and he was busy with the composition of a book which should show his fitness for important government employment. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 3rd February, 1605-6, and published with the title:

> Foure Bookes of Offices: / Enabling Privat / persons for the speciall service of all good Princes and Policies / Made and devised by Barnabe Barnes / London / Printed at the charges of George Bishop, T. Adams and C. Burbie / 1606.

The printer was Adam Islip, the successor of John Wolf, who printed William Percy's *Coelia*. The book is a stately folio, dedicated to the King, no doubt by permission. In the dedication Barnes reveals one of his sources by his vigorous repudiation of "that puddle of princely policies"

[14] Eccles, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-9.
[15] *Review of English Studies*, vol. IX, no. 36, 1933, Oct., p. 474.

Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Barnes's copy of *Il Prencipe*, in the original Italian, with his autograph on the title page, is in the Dean and Chapter Library at York, to which it came among the books of Bishop Tobie Matthew.[16] After the dedication comes "Barnabe Barnes his Preface to the honourable and discrete Reader." He explains that the four books are apportioned to the four Cardinal Virtues:

(1) Temperance, considering the resemblance which it should have with a Princes treasure, . . . which office of Treasurers possesseth the first book. (2) Prudence, deciphered and figured in the secret counsellors office. (3) Justice. (4) Fortitude conteining certaine qualities of a true souldier.

By these foure are all blessed monarchies, Kingdomes, Commonweales, and policies susteined, governed, directed and protected, that is by Temperance, Prudence, Justice and Fortitude, shadowed as I said in the Treasurer, Counsellour, Judge, and Souldier: for they be moderate, wise, just, and valiant alike; that not any difference of their places be discerned, which of them may be greater or lesse than another.

He then defines the opposite of these virtues:

(1) To Temperance my first countertenor one base and one alte: for out of discords with the countertenor (being moderator) is the concord composed of perfect harmonie. The base hereof is covetous and unnecessary penurie; the triple or alte is raised from extreame profusion or excesse.

To Prudence the base is "follie," the triple or alte "Malicious wilinesse and calliditie." To Justice the base is "dissolute indulgence or secure lenitie," the triple or alte "extreeme crueltie." To Fortitude the base is "baseness of spirit or pusillanimitie," the alte "audacious temeritie." He then proceeds to group and oppose all these various qualities by "geometricall and analogicall harmonie" and "in opposition likewise ex diametro," such as that "valour is just, wise and temperat," "avaritious misers be foolish, unjust and timerous."

[16] Eccles, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-7.

The attempt to describe the perfect statesman by personifying each of his separate qualities was a favourite fancy of Gabriel Harvey's, and came to its most magnificent expression in *The Faerie Queene*; Barnes is a minor follower of Harvey,[17] and a very dull one; his book is a fluent outpouring of commonplaces. The remarks on contemporary characters and incidents are the only passages of any interest; the best of these is his account of the Earl of Essex on the Rouen campaign (see appendix to this chapter). In the first book he praises Sir Francis Drake, the Earl of Cumberland, Sir Thomas Cavendish (Candish) and Sir Humfrey Gilbert, "but having mentioned Sir Francis Drake, in him is comprised so much as they could deserve." However, not to slight his contemporaries, he adds:

> divers other gallant gentlemen, borne here in England amongst us, have percase some fortunes in store, to make them as glorious in such services, as any that ever travailed.

Later he mentions:

> That most prudent and worthy Lord Treasurer William Cecil, goodly well approved over all causes and in all business either publicke or private, during the late and most deare mirrour of good government Queene Elizabeth, of most renowned and everliving memorie.

In the second book, *Of Secret Councillors*, there is a passage, quite irrelevant to the subject but more original than the rest, emphasized by a marginal note: An Exhortation to make famous and precious our English language amongst all parts of Christendome:

> One speciall point remaineth, wherein I would for our owne nations glorie wish, that all our countreymen would be very studious, and according to their faculties forward and ayding, that is, to labour how they may copiously devise and adde words derived from the Latines, from the French and Dutch languages, fitly fashioned into the true Dialect and Ideome of our vulgar.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

This is followed by a slight sketch of English literature, mentioning Gower, Chaucer, Lydgate, translations of the Bible, Sir Philip Sidney, "that divine starre of sweet wit and invention." He continues:

> The case is lamentable, and I have many times thought it, how few be the Chronologiers and Historians of our age, how doubtfull and unfaithfull much of their matter, how fearefully and vainly seduced by misprision and affection.

Further on he makes the well-worn comparison of the state to the parts of the body; the heart the secret council, the liver the prince's treasure, the lungs the laws, the head the prince, the loins and thighs the true nobility, the ribs, bulk and other baser entrails the folk and meaner yeomanry, the two legs honest merchandise and tillage or husbandry, and follows this up with a long argument in favour of the union of England and Scotland:

> Since then it hath pleased the true wisdome and omnipotent grace of God, to make of these two kingdomes one bodie under one head: meseemeth it should not sticke in any man's opinion, how the same can any way proove unfit or unprofitable. Which diverse, more upon perverse opinion than any reasonable consideration, impudently seeme to beleeve. But the wiser sort (which though fewest in number are soundest in judgement) perfectly know the contrarie. . . . Considering therefore, that by nature every bodie hath one head onely; like one roote, from which many branches united in one tree, doe spring (if it be not a monstrous bodie) so sembably should each head have but one bodie: for how deformed and horrible were it in the sight of nature, that one head should have two bodies.

He praises Lord Burley and Sir Francis Walsingham, and concludes this book with "a vehement and pathetical exhortation from all kindes of treason," referring to the Gowry conspiracy and the gunpowder plot.

In the third book, on the office of a judge, he tells at great length the story of Prince Hal attempting to rescue his servant by force from the Lord Chief Justice in the court of King's Bench. Another passage seems to be a defence of himself against the charge of attempting to poison

Browne, which he maintained was a mere calumny, but it may be a discreet plea for the Earl of Northumberland, lately imprisoned on an unproved charge of guilty foreknowledge of the gunpowder plot:

There is one most pernicious disease ingendred in these humors (i.e. lies, calumnies, fraud, hypocrisie, dissimulation and arrogancie) which being very rife in some princes courts I may not forget. The condition is in killing, imprisoning and undoing certaine persons and some of good desert, which in the politick Courtier of Duro dipascolo, seemeth commonly to be bent against noble Gentlemen, of greatest respect, honest, innocent and unconvicted: these being brought upon the pits brinck, are many times charged and surcharged with treasonable or nefarious accusations, wherein they perish; as Petro de Vineis, Alvaro de Luna, Giacobo Corde, Christophero Colombo, Philip de Comyns, with other very wise and honourable Counsellors, even of our fathers times and of our memories, which did in such cases miscary: neither is it safe or behoofefull that I particularize.

His remarks on the necessity of discipline in an army are inspired by memories of the disorderly camp at Rouen in 1591, and his defence of himself against the charge of cowardice may be found in the following passage:

Rashnesse attempteth perils inconsiderately, which without mature consultation and in a blind force not respecting abilitie to performe rusheth into dangerous actions, either through ignorance, pride, desperation, stupiditie, pusillanimitie, or some foolish ambition of vaine glory, which mancipateth the minde.

He ends with the praises of famous soldiers:

The most famous and best renowned souldiers that in our times have bene noted, were Ambrose Dudley the old Earle of Warwicke, Thomas Ratcliffe Earle of Sussex, the three brethren of that honourable race of Ricot, the two noble and unfortunate Earles of Essex, both deceased, the father and sonne, the Lord Willoughbie late Governour of Barwicke, Sir Roger Williams, Sir Philip Sidney, who singeth in heaven crowned both with martiall and civill girlands, Sir Thomas Morgan; but there have bene so manie, and yet are of gallant heroicall spirits alive amongst us; that it were infinite to reckon, and would rather bring one into suspition of that fault (for which I detest to converse in the houses of great princes) then any wayes answere to the worthinesse of them whom I commemorate.

Two of the extant copies of the book have at the beginning commendatory verses by the author's friends. The first of these is by W. Percy, Musophilus, a pen-name that was also used by Samuel Daniel:

To Master Barnabe Barnes, this Madrigall upon his Booke

If all the world were sought from Malta to Mone,
From candid Gaule, to black-brow'd Calicute;
No frame more various mought have been made one
In ev'ry joynt, or point like absolute;
For as some Spirits while they have beene attent
On states of Princes, and on earthly right,
Have follow'd the worldly side, with that intent;
And yet unmindfull of the highest Sprite.
Others againe (too much I ween yblent
With heavenly zeale and with Religion)
Have for the same the Secular forwent:
So if a meane there be (as meane but one
To twine the Crossier with the Sword atone)
O let me then (with licence) to avow,
'Twill, right Paladine, be by onely you.

There follows the signature and the motto "Spes calamo occidit." In these lines there is an allusion to Barnes's ambiguous position in regard to the law and the church. He seemed to be always on the verge of entering upon a career in one or the other, and yet never did so. The next set of verses is to the credit of Barnes, not for the beauty of the poetry, but for the personality of the writer, who signs Johannes Forde Encomiastes. This was the future dramatist, who in 1606 was a youth of twenty in the service of the Earl of Devonshire. Barnes may have made his acquaintance through Thomas Bastard, whose patron was the Earl. This is the first appearance of Ford's name in print; in the same year 1606 Devonshire died and Ford published an obituary poem *Fame's Memorial*, to which Barnes in his turn contributed commendatory verses.

The next writer in praise of Barnabe's *Foure Bookes of Offices* is, surprisingly, Thomas Campion. William Percy must have brought about a temporary reconciliation, but

Campion's feelings towards Barnabe were not warm enough to make him sacrifice his mocking epigrams, which appeared again in his 1619 edition, ten years after Barnabe's death.

Thomas Michelbourne, a friend from Oxford days, contributed lines in which he said that the book was

> Nil ultra, and the farthest continent
> That wisest statist ever yet did runne.

The last contributor was Robert Hasill, of whom nothing is known, except that Professor Mark Eccles suggests he may possibly have been Robert Hassall who wrote in 1601 a *Lamentable Mone of a Soldier for the losse of his derely beloved Lorde*; the lord seems to have been Essex, and this would provide a link with Barnes.[18]

Foure Bookes of Offices was a costly production, meant to be presented to noblemen, who were, of course, expected to give the author a reward. The copy that was destined for Henry Howard Earl of Northampton has survived with Barnes's dedicatory letter written in it:

> To the right noble Lord Henry Earl of Northampton one of his Majesty's most honourable privy council.
>
> Most honourable good L. the greate Prudence and learning wch god in such rich measure hath bestowed upon your Lordship emboldeneth me a poore Scholler to represent these my late studies to your Lordship having heretofore presented them to the kinges most royall handes: Wherein your Lordship shall percase find some thinges not unworthie your reading att Vacant houres; beseeching your good lord (out of your native benevolence toward learning) t'accept hereof, I most humbly kisse your noble handes.
>
> 10 May 1605
>
> Your Lordship's most humble to command Bar. Barnes.

The date of 1605 is obviously a slip for 1606, as is shown both by the entry in the Stationers' Register and by the allusion to the gunpowder plot in the book itself.

Professor Eccles suggests that Barnes could only have afforded this expensive form of advertising his own powers

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 230-1 and n.; M. Joan Sargeaunt, *John Ford*, p. 5.

if he had a subsidy from William Percy. He may have received such financial help if he applied for it before the beginning of November 1605. The book may well have been begun before that fatal date, while the house of Percy was still prosperous; but a more likely source for a subsidy is Lord Eure. It would be unkind to suggest that the reformed Barnabe threatened blackmail, but a very respectful letter to Lord Eure, thanking him for his past goodness to members of Barnabe's family, and professing the writer's great fidelity and devotion to his lordship's interests, would surely have produced a handsome donation without any need for unpleasant hints or threats.

The most revealing part of the book is the commendatory poem by John Ford, a young man at the outset of his literary career, just as Barnes had been when he made friends with Gabriel Harvey fourteen years earlier. We see Barnes chiefly through the eyes of the satirists, but this new acquaintance shows the sort of person to whom he was attractive. His principal attackers, Nashe and Harington, were irritated by him because he was of the same type as themselves, and by exaggerating their qualities he caricatured them. They, like him, were active, exuberant, talkative, worldly and ambitious, but they had too much intelligence to go to the lengths that Barnes did, and they disliked him accordingly. But William Percy and John Ford were of a different type, men of an aloof, solitary disposition, with a strain of melancholy and eccentricity. They found mixing with their fellow-men difficult, and they were warmed and cheered by Barnes's exuberance; he was a medium for bringing them into contact with the world, for, in spite of their aloofness, each of them had a desire for self-expression, shown as much in poor William's impossible attempts at playwriting as in Ford's great dramas.

As Barnes was the friend of dramatists, it was almost inevitable that he should try his hand at writing a play himself. Gunpowder Plot, 5th November, 1605, was a date of

great importance in his life, for it inspired him with the idea of his first, perhaps his only, play, *The Devil's Charter*, a Tragedy containing the Life and Death of Pope Alexander the Sixth. It is a chronicle play without plot, founded on the legend that Cardinal Roderigo Borgia sold his soul to the Devil in order to become Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503). Barnes rather weakens the effect of the bargain by making the Cardinal become Pope by simple bribery, and only sell his soul pointlessly to the Devil afterwards. On the other hand he improves the conclusion. Alexander VI, as in the legend, invites the cardinals who are his enemies to dine with him, and arranges that their wine shall be poisoned, while his, of course, is pure. In the legend the wine is changed by the mistake of the servant, so that the Pope and his son Cæsar Borgia are poisoned, and their guests escape, but Barnes makes the Devil exchange the poisoned and the harmless wine, a more dramatic incident. The play is a brisk series of events, mostly murders, but without any structure. Fresh characters are introduced all the way through; some appear for one or two scenes and disappear again, others appear only to be murdered.

The Devil's Charter was performed at court by the King's Men, Shakespeare's company, at Candlemas (2nd Feb.) 1607. This is the only known performance of the play, and it may have been the only occasion on which it was acted, but in 1606 anti-papal feeling ran very high. The gunpowder plot caused an immense sensation, which was kept alive by the trial and execution of the conspirators during the early months of the year. A play which represented the papal court in such lurid detail was exactly to the popular taste, while the scene was laid in the past to avoid any trouble with the authorities. Although there is no proof, it is highly probable that Barnes wrote the play soon after the discovery of the plot, and that it was performed to delighted audiences in 1606. At the beginning of act II the Pope enters with a linstock in his hand; the

dramatic justification for this is that the King of France is marching on Rome, and the Pope is about to appoint a master of the ordnance, but surely the sight alone would bring a shout of delight from the house. In act III, scene ii, Cæsar Borgia hires a ruffian called Frescobaldi, who describes himself thus:

> My name is Frescobaldi, as for my pedigree,
> My mother was of consanguinitie with the Princess
> Of Perugia: my father of the noble family of the Oddi,
> Florentines both: I my selfe
> Brought up a Page under Rayner King of Sicily,
> Have serv'd against the Turkes and Sarazines,
> Where at Vienna (with my single Pike,
> Arm'd in a Maly Briggandine of Naples,
> And with an old-Fox which I kept in store,
> A monument of Mars when I depart)
> I did unhorse three Turkie Ianizaries.
> Then (in the warres of Ferdinand the King)
> This Hippe was shott through with a Crocadile,
> But that it were too tedious I could shew you:
> Under the King of Ramaines I was cut
> Just from this shoulder to the very pappe:
> And yet by fortunes of the warre am heere,
> I thanke God, and my Surgion, all fix, trillill.
> I fought at Malta when the towne was girt
> With Sargeants heads, and bul-beggers of Turkie:
> And by my plot (mining below the rampier)
> We gave th'obgoblings leave to scale our walls,
> And being mounted all upon that place:
> I with my Lint-stock gave fire to the traine,
> And sent them capring up to Capricornus.
> Which when the wise Astronomers of Greece,
> Prodigiously discovered from a farre.
> They thought those Turcaes fiery meteors.
> Which with their Pikes were pushing in the clowds,
> The learned Booke-men writte strange Almanacks,
> Of signes, and apparitions in the ayre:
> And by these honors (if I prove a blabbe)
> Then call mee villaine, varlet, coward, skabbe.[19]

[19] A Maly Briggandine: a coat of mail. An old-Fox: a large sword. A Crocadile: a kind of cannon also called a lizard. All fix, trillill: as right as rain—"fix" is a Dutch word meaning fit (*M.L.R.*, vol. 1

This is a popular description of Guy Fawkes, not as he really was, but as horrified Londoners pictured him. Fawkes was born in York almost exactly a year before Barnes, and was baptized in the same church, St. Michael le Belfrey, on 14 April, 1570, as Barnes was on 6 March, 1570/1. While Barnes was publishing *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* in 1593, Fawkes, who had become a Roman Catholic, went to the Low Countries as a soldier of fortune and took service with the Spaniards. He was present at the siege and capture of Calais in 1596, and it was during his experiences as a soldier that he learnt the art of laying mines under buildings, as the plotters first intended to do under the Houses of Parliament.[20] The "signes and apparitions in the ayre" are an allusion to the pamphlet of *Strange News from Carlstadt* (Feb. 1605/6), where "two armies were seen in the air, the one encountering the other."[21] The same pamphlet suggested the passage in *King Lear*, act I, scene ii, "These late eclipses of the sun and moon portend no good to us," etc. *King Lear* was acted at court on 26th December, 1606, five weeks before the performance there of *The Devil's Charter*. The trials and executions of the plotters and suspected plotters took place from the end of January 1605/6 to the beginning of May 1606, when Henry Garnett was executed. The production of *The Devil's Charter* may be dated some time between February, when the pamphlet was published, and May. At least if Barnes did not write the play then, and if the King's Men did not produce it at once, they both lost a great opportunity. It is a play for the occasion only, and has practically no value as literature, but at that time, when excitement over the plot was worked up to a high pitch, it was in all probability successful, and that may have been

(1905-6), p. 122). Sargeants heads: perhaps a joke on Saracen's Head, an inn sign. Bul-beggers: horrible apparitions.

(McKerrow's notes in his edition of the play, pp. 113, 114, with the exception of Saracen's Heads, which is my own conjecture.)

[20] *Dic. Nat. Biog.*; Gardiner, *What Gunpowder Plot Was*, pp. 98-9; Harrison, *Second Elizabethan Journal*, pp. 90-1.

[21] Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, p. 280 and n.

the reason for its performance at court. We may compare it with the performance of the play *An Englishman's Home* in 1913-14. The play was nothing in itself, but excited everyone because of the international situation.

James I had a personal reason for feeling an interest in *The Devil's Charter*, as he believed himself to have been the object of a papal poisoning plot.[22] Though this was probably unknown to Barnes, and certainly to the ordinary playgoer, it explains James's interest in *The Devil's Charter* and the performance at court.

Barnes acknowledged the chief source of the play by making the historian Francisco Guicciardini the presenter or chorus. His history of Italy was first published in 1561, and an English translation by Geoffrey Fenton appeared in 1579. The history was extremely popular; both the Earl of Northumberland and Gabriel Harvey had copies in their libraries, and Harvey praised it enthusiastically.[23] The various stories of the compact between Alexander VI and the Devil are discussed by Professor McKerrow in his edition of the play.[24] Barnes added some details which were more spectacular than the original story, or more feasible for the stage, as for instance, where in Widman's German version of the story the Devil appears in the form of a toad, Barnes substitutes the apparition of a sergeant. The contract was that the Devil should claim the Pope's soul in eleven and eight, which Alexander VI interpreted to mean nineteen years, but which the Devil, in most versions, twists into meaning eleven years and eight months. But after he edited the play Professor McKerrow discovered an English version of the story in which the period was eleven years and eight days, as in Barnes's play.[25]

[22] Logan Pearsall Smith, *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, I, 34-5, 40-2, 44-5, 80-5.

[23] McKerrow, *The Devil's Charter*, pp. vi-vii; Hist. MSS. Com., Append. to 6th Rep.; Eccles, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

[24] McKerrow, *op. cit.*, pp. viii-xi, xx.

[25] *M.L.R.*, vol. I (1905), p. 127.

Raising the devil, magic and conjuration were favourite dramatic incidents since Marlowe's *Faustus*; the attitude of both author and audience was something between joking and earnest, very much like that of the audience at the present-day murder play. The author is expected to make us sometimes laugh and sometimes shudder. Barnes has a scene of comic conjuring between the two soldiers of fortune Baglioni and Frescobaldi, act III, scene v, in which they conjure one another first by the names of well-known chapbook devils,[26] then by the names of strong drinks, Mullisack (mulled sack), Birrhe Martia (March beer), Mathew Glynne (metheglin) and many others, finally by the names of well-known prostitutes. But the scenes in which Alexander VI raises the Devil are meant to be taken seriously, and here Barnes derived his magic from *Heptameron seu Elementa Magica* of Petrus de Abano (1246-1320). All these sources are fully dealt with by Professor McKerrow. Professor Eccles adds two points, first that Barnes certainly could read Italian, as his copy of *Il Prencipe* is still extant, and second that Katherine Sforza's defence of Forlì in spite of the threat to kill her sons is taken from Machiavelli's *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, which Barnes mentions by name in *Foure Bookes of Offices*, and that there is a similar scene in *George-a-Greene*.[27]

There are two modern editions of *The Devil's Charter*, the earlier appearing in W. Bang's *Materialien*, 1904, edited by R. B. McKerrow, the second in *Old English Drama, Students' Facsimile Texts*, 1913, edited by J. S. Farmer. It is not necessary therefore to give a detailed account of the play, as it is available to the ordinary reader. It is written for the most part in straightforward blank verse, with some passages of rhyme and of prose, but no complete scene in either. There are obscurities here and

[26] One of these names is Gargantua. Professor McKerrow considers that this was taken from a chapbook (p. 117), and that Barnes did not know the works of Rabelais; but William Percy quotes "Dr Rablays" in his epigrams, and Barnes may have borrowed the book from him.

[27] Eccles, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-8.

there because of printers' errors, because Barnes has expressed himself badly, or because he has used some uncommon word, which, as we have learnt from *Foure Bookes of Offices*, he did on principle to expand the English language, but there are no difficulties of thought. The play is crude propaganda against the Church of Rome.

The influence of Marlowe is conspicuous both in the scenes of raising the devil and in the character of Cæsar Borgia, who is a half-sympathetic superman like Tamburlain; he also has some resemblance to Shakespeare's Richard III, but this may be due to Marlowe's influence in both Richard and Cæsar. In act IV, scene iv, Cæsar appears in quite a favourable light, admiring the courage of Katherine Sforza when she defies him, preserving the lives of her children, whom he has pretended to kill, restoring them to her after his victory, and promising them all friendship and good treatment. The audience is not given to understand that he is acting hypocritically or that his fair promises are not carried out, unless he is intended to give a sinister tone to his last instructions to his lieutenant:

> So much as is in us, we pardon all,
> Use them as Cittizens of Rome in favor,
> Other instructions you shall have here-after;
> Till then regarde your charge, and so farewell.

The chief interest of the scene is the stage direction, when Cæsar says:

> Come hither Katherine wonder of thy sex,
> The grace of all Italian woman-hood:
> Cæsar shall never proove dishonourable,
> Behold thy children living in my Tent.
> (He discovereth his Tent where her two sonnes were at Cardes.)

This may have suggested the scene in *The Tempest* where Prospero opens his cave and reveals to Alonso his son Ferdinand, whom he thought dead, playing chess with Miranda.

Another important stage direction is in act I, scene v :

(Enter Lucretia alone in her night gown untired, bringing in a chaire, which she planteth upon the Stage.)

Later her husband Gismond di Viselli enters; she invites him to sit in the chair and begins a violent quarrel with him, at the climax of which "She graspeth him in his chaire," that is, she works the mechanism of the chair so that he is held fast round the neck, as appears from his cry: "Oh, help, I am strangled." He is not actually suffocated, as she stabs him with his own dagger. After she is sure he is dead :

She unbindeth him, layeth him on the ground, putteth the dagger in his hand, and paper on his knee, and taking certaine papers out of his pocket putteth in others in their steade; and convaieth away the chaire.

This mechanical chair is used by John Ford in *The Broken Heart*, act IV, scene iv, and as Barnes and Ford knew each other, it is probably a reminiscence of *The Devil's Charter*, although *The Broken Heart* was written long after Barnes's death, and has no other resemblance to his play.[28]

These two scenes by writers so much greater than Barnes, which were possibly suggested by *The Devil's Charter*, show his chief qualification as a playwright—his strong sense of theatrical effect. There is no true poetry in the play and hardly any attempt to represent character, but the audience's interest is held by sensational incidents and by pageantry. Several scenes are plain slabs of history, but they are put across by means of marching armies, battles, martial music, papal processions, and a banquet.

The wicked apothecary who provides poisons for the Pope's victims is called Rotsi or Ratsi. There is no such name in Guicciardini or any of Barnes's authorities, but a well-known highwayman called Gamaliel Ratsey was executed in 1606. He was a popular ruffian, and two

[28] Joan Sargeaunt, *John Ford*, p. 145.

pamphlets on his career were published.[29] He had nothing to do with poisoning, but when Barnes was in want of a name he took one that was well known at the moment.

Enough has been said to show that Barnes's first attempt at playwriting was probably highly successful, though with a spurious form of success. On 16 October, 1607, the play was entered in the Stationers' Register; the publisher was John Wright and the play is entered as "The tragedie of Pope Alexander the Sixt" . . . "as it was played before his Maiestie." On the title page it is stated to be "more exactly revewed, corrected and augmented since by the Author for the more pleasure and profit of the Reader." This is the first play of which the author expressly stated that he prepared it to be read.[30] The phrase "corrected and augmented" sometimes implied that there had been a previous unauthorized edition, but no one has suggested an earlier edition of *The Devil's Charter*. From four copies of the quarto which Professor McKerrow examined he was able to work out valuable conclusions about the way in which plays were printed. Without attempting to reproduce his detailed work, it may be said that he allows us to see Barnes going to the printing-house and correcting the sheets as they were passing through the press; but he was not a good proof-reader, and the text is faulty in many places. The quartos were "Printed by G.E. for Iohn Wright, and are to be sold at his shop in New-gate market, neere Christ church gate. 1607."

The dedication of the play is: "To the/Honourable and his/Very Deare Friends/Sir William Herbert,/And Sir William/Pope/Knights,/Associates in the/noble Order of/the Bathe./Barnabe Barnes Conse/crateth his love." In the copy of the play in the Huntington Library the dedication is followed by ten lines of verse which do not

[29] G. B. Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, p. 260.

[30] Creisenach, *English Drama in the Age of Elizabeth*, p. 86. For a discussion of the elaborate stage directions see Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, pp. 107, 112-13, and J. G. Adams, *The Globe Playhouse*, pp. 114, 210.

appear in any of the copies used by Professor McKerrow.[31] Sir William Herbert was the husband of William Percy's youngest sister Elinor, so Barnes's connexion with the Percy family remained to the end. Herbert was created Baron Powys in 1629.[32] Sir William Pope was the son of John Pope of Wroxton, and was created an Irish peer by the titles of Baron Belturbet and Earl of Downs in 1628.[33] He had a country house near Oxford.[34] Thus Barnes had as his patrons two rising men who might be useful to him hereafter, but as a matter of fact his time was short.

It is doubtful whether he wrote any more plays. In the auction catalogue of the library of Isaac Reed in 1807 there is the entry: "Barnes, The Devil's Charter, £1,—The Battle of Hexham MS. 1/-." This might mean either that *The Battle of Hexham* was by the same author as *The Devil's Charter*, or that it was anonymous, or that it was by another author called Barnes. The play, whatever it was, has never been identified. A play called *The Madcap* by Barnes was licensed in 1623, but as Barnabe had then been dead for fourteen years, it is not likely that he was the author.[35]

The only other facts known about Barnabe Barnes are that he returned to Durham to die there, and his burial was entered in the register of St. Mary le Bow in December 1609; the date of the day is missing. It may be inferred that he died in the house of his brother John in the North Bailey. As he was baptized on 6 March, 1570/1, he had nearly completed his thirty-eighth year; his was a short life but a merry one.

Barnes stands for the typical Elizabethan, exuberant, unscrupulous, continually experimenting with life. He tried everything once—study, war, law, love, poetry, crime,

[31] Eccles, *op. cit.*, p. 233.
[32] Ulric Nisbet, *The Onlie Begetter*, p. 46.
[33] McKerrow, *The Devil's Charter*, p. 102.
[34] Anthony A. Wood (ed. Clarke), *Life and Times*, vol. 1, p. 253.
[35] Eccles, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-6 and n.

religion, politics, drama—and he died in his prime, before he had exhausted life's possibilities.

There is a curious shadowy reappearance of Barnabe Barnes about 1628, when Ford's play *The Lover's Melancholy* was performed. It was printed in the following year. In this play, Palador, the hero, returns from the wars to find that his lady Eroclea has disappeared. She presently returns disguised as a boy under the name of Parthenophil. The name of course would have no association for the audience; *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* were long forgotten. But Ford was a student and often indulged in literary allusions; both the name of *The Lover's Melancholy* and the mask which occurs in the play are derived from Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, with acknowledgements by Ford in a footnote, and we may be sure that he remembered Barnes when he used the name of Parthenophil. Palador did not recognize his love in her disguise, but he had more excuses for this than many heroes, as Ford contrived his plot so that Palador should only see Parthenophil on two occasions, and then only for a brief glimpse. When the exigencies of the plot caused her to vanish again, Palador uttered the well-known lines:

> Parthenophil is lost, and I would see him,
> For he is like to something I remember
> A great while since, a long, long time ago.

Ford was thinking only of his heroine, but the dreamy music of these lines forms a strange memorial for that swashbuckling Elizabethan who was Barnabe Barnes.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

Barnabe Barnes on the Earl of Essex in *Foure Bookes of Offices*:

But that I may speake somewhat of him according to true iudgement and indifferencie: because paraduenture some haue either maleuolently with exceeding bitternesse abused his honorable acts contumeliously; and others percase which haue as blindly in

the contrary sanctified him as one more then a man beyonde his deserts, and the measure of his nature: both which are most odious to the true taste of all noble natures: I say thus much, which they (that wisely did know him) will acknowledge also. His minde was incomprehensible: by nature, a man much addicted to pleasures, but much more to glorie. If he were at any time luxurious (which some very impudently haue thrust vpon his dead coffin, against all truth and modestie) it was very little, and that when hee was idel, which was very sildome: howbeit neuer could any delicacies or corporall comforts drawe him (since he was imployed in the publicke counsels of his Prince and countrey) to neglect any serious businesse. He was eloquent, and well knew the guilefull trappes and insidious treacheries of this world, by good experience and much reading. He was affable and soone any mans friend, that was either by friendes commended vnto him, or had any specious apparance of good qualities in him. The loftinesse of his wit (as I may most properly terme it) was most quick, present and incredible: in dissembling with counterfeit friends, and in concealing of any matter and businesse of importance, beyond expectation. He was bountifull, magnificent, and liberall in all the course of his life, hauing commended multitudes of people vnto liuings, pensions, preferments, and great sums of money, as appeared both by the land of his owne, which he sould and ingaged to maintaine the same; and by the large dispensation of his Soueraignes treasure committed to his trust and discretion. And which I may speake in truth most boldly, his fortune was alwayes good before, as appeared in France and Cadiz; but much inferior to his valorous industrie (which with the great and weightie hammer of his reason and engine, did strike diuine beames and noble sparkes from the anuile of glorie) vntill his late vnfortunate voyage in Anno 1597, and that his other pestilent and inauspicious expedition for Ireland: before which times it was difficult to be discerned, whether his valour or fortune were more. I my selfe a Boy, haue seene him in the French warres to communicate in sports and sometimes in serious matters with men of meane condition and place, their fortunes and parentage valued; to bee delighted and exercised in labouring with the mattock in trenches, fosses, and in other workes amongst his battels; to be busied in setting of watches, in making of barricadoes at his quarter, and in often walking the round. Also that vice (which contagious ambition much affecteth) could neuer be noted in him; which was to detract from the credite and good fame of any his fellowes in her Maiesties counsell, they being absent, or of any other man: only this it went neere him and laie heauie to his heart, that any of them should be thought more wise or valiant than himselfe, being

scarce a vice, but emulation rather proceeding from the mightinesse of his spirit; and (without doubt) he did exceed many of them in many things. By which meanes, euen as Salust describeth Sylla, so did he become precious in presence of his souldiers. From his child-hood hee was hardened with exercise, taking pleasure in some trauaile and labours which other men for the most part would haue reputed miseries and calamities. His apprehension and prudence was admirable, by which he would and many times did preuent and turne the mischeifes and fallacies of his enemies vpon their owne heads; he was circumspect in all matters appertaining his owne office and charge; and would not endure, if by any meanes, counsell, or engine he could deuise, to leaue any safe euasions or munitions offensiue or defensiue with his enemies. And that which was most rare in so great a captaine (though in discipline of warre, he declared himselfe seuere as was fit, meeke and honourable towards his captaines which had well deserued) neither did his mildnesse and facilitie withdraw from his reputation, nor his seueritie deminish the loue of his souldiers: onely this to conclude of him in the person of a Generall. The end of his life was much lamented by the better and nobler part of his countrimen, it was very grieuous to them that were his friends and louers, it was pitied and repined against with a certaine kinde of regret by forreners and strangers, which had heard of his valour, and those enemies or emulators rather of his heroicall vertues in Spaine and France, which had felt the weight of his valour, reioyced not vpon report of his death. I would if it had so pleased God, that he might haue died in the warres vpon the enemies of his countrey, that I might heroically with good cheere haue registered his death in these offices: to conclude with his discription of body briefly to being the same, with that which Tacitus did write of Julius Agricola: "decentior quam sublimior fuit, nihil metus in vultu, gratia oris supererat, bonum virum facile credideres, magnum libenter." He was tall and in authoritie, yet was he more comely then loftie: in his forehead and countenance much valour and boldnesse were imprinted and expressed, his lookes were very gratious; they that had iudiciously beheld him, would haue easily beleeued that he was a very good man, and would haue bene very glad to haue knowen him a mightie man: and that which was most rare and admirable in men of our age, in his distresse and calamities, his mind was not onely great and noble like his blood and place, but much loftier and firmer, then in his most firm honours and prosperitie. And so much in briefe, so neere as I could, haue I done to life, the morall qualities and perfections of that heroicall Generall without adulation or partialitie.