THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

THE AGE OF SHAKESPEARE

Edited by

R. MALCOLM SMUTS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2016

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016933501

ISBN 978-0-19-966084-1

Printed and bound by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

CHAPTER 13

ENGLISH VERNACULAR HISTORICAL WRITING AND HOLINSHED'S *CHRONICLES*

DANIEL WOOLF AND JANE WONG YEANG CHUI

WHAT did the ordinary English man or woman know about history in Shakespeare's age? The answer naturally depends on who that 'ordinary' person was. Social status, education, gender, and even economic prosperity could determine both what knowledge of history an Elizabethan or Jacobean person acquired and how they acquired it. For a large majority of the population, the past was omnipresent even if written or printed history was not. It circulated, and had impact on the present, in various ways: through custom and prescription (in such basic aspects of life as terms of land tenure, rents, and rights of way); through images (print woodcuts,[1] tapestries, stained glass, and heraldic display among the more affluent); through religious practice; and through oral tradition. Moreover, much of the landscape, as Adam Fox, Alexandra Walsham, and others have demonstrated, was dotted with human, natural, and geological remains of varying antiquity. These gave rise to stories, legends, and tales—recorded by antiquaries and other scholars with a scepticism that hardened over the next century or so—involving figures from English history (kings, nobles, prelates), foreign invaders (Brutus the Trojan), heroic figures of chivalry (Guy of Warwick), giants (Gogmagog), climatological events (great storms, floods, comets), and so on. In a conservative society that valued precedent and inherited practice, and which also frowned on innovation and human-driven change, the past was often inescapably present.[2]

[1] J. Knapp, *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: The Representation of History in Printed Books* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003).

[2] Adam Fox, 'Remembering the Past in Early Modern England: Oral and Written Tradition', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 9 (1999): 233–56; idem, *Oral and Literate Culture in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

At the high end of the social hierarchy, knowledge of history was becoming rather more widespread but was still considerably narrower and shallower than it would become after the mid-seventeenth century: 'narrower' because focused on particular episodes, persons, or periods (with a bias towards ancient history, biblical history, and matters British);[3] 'shallower' because confined to such sources as were readily available and also because cognitively limited by a scripture-based cosmology which took it as axiomatic that the world was no more than six millennia old, had been created by God in six days, and would have a finite existence, ending (soon, some thought) in a Day of Judgement. Notwithstanding the limitations placed on temporal horizons, various phenomena stimulated an increased interest in 'history', a term which to contemporaries meant 'writings about the past', or even, to many, the telling of a story, rather than the more modern sense of 'the cumulative events of the past'. The Reformation, with its reorientation of religion away from centuries of accumulated ritual and tradition towards a faith grounded in scriptural authority, played a significant role. The advent of Renaissance humanism, and a privileging of the classics, would prove similarly influential (though more haltingly and somewhat later than is usually assumed), discussed by Paulina Kewes in Chapter 15 of this volume, and Nicholas Popper, in Chapter 14.

Arguably the most powerful engine of increased historical knowledge was print, which not only generated multiple copies of historical works previously limited to manuscript circulation, but eventually spawned entirely new genres of historical writing and a market for them, in turn responding to reader tastes and consumption patterns with new titles in accessible, portable, and affordable book formats. At the start of the Tudor era, a mere decade after the arrival of William Caxton's printing press in England, the number of historical titles in print was tiny and still outnumbered by circulated manuscripts. By the time Elizabeth I died in 1603, the literate reader would still prize the exclusivity and privilege of a text in manuscript, but the quantitative balance had decisively shifted in favour of print. The seventeenth century would see the graphed curve of available historical works rise still more steeply, especially during and after the civil wars.

2011); Daniel Woolf, 'The "Common Voice": History, Folklore, and Oral Tradition in Early Modern England', *Past and Present* 120 (August, 1988): 26–52; for general studies see Keith Thomas, *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England* (Creighton Trust Lecture, 1983) and Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). For an interesting study on trees as a locus of beliefs about the past, see Nicola Whyte, 'An Archaeology of Natural Places: Trees in the Early Modern Landscape', in *Uses of the Past in Early Modern England*, ed. M. Neufeld, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, special issue, 76 (2013); see also the same author's *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Windgather Press, 2009). Andy Wood's *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) appeared after this chapter was in close to finished form.

[3] For a periodization of the shifting foci of historical writing in both England and Scotland over a three-century period beginning about 1400, see Daniel Woolf, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of Enlightenment', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, vol. 3: *1400–1800*, ed. José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and Daniel Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 473–96.

This chapter offers, first, a brief overview of English historical writing and its development up to the early seventeenth century, with special attention to the dominant form, the chronicle, prior to its early seventeenth-century decline as a 'living' genre—living in the sense of a genre of which new examples continued to be written and published.[4] In the second part, we will examine more closely the creation, structure, and politics surrounding a specific example, Holinshed's *Chronicles*, by any standard the most ambitious of all Tudor histories in its size and scope, using its treatment of Irish matters (less often a focus of interest than its English parts) to explore some of the issues surrounding its composition and revision. Published in two editions (1577 and 1587) and occurring at the apogee of the Elizabethan chronicling tradition, Holinshed's *Chronicles* were, famously, the major (though not the only) source for much of what Shakespeare and many other writers put into dramatic form. They have become a subject of study in their own right since the mid-1990s, with a recent comprehensive handbook published, an online version of both editions easily available to scholars,[5] and several efforts at rehabilitating the reputation of Holinshed and his associates (and by implication chroniclers more generally) from the disparaging criticisms of near-contemporary humanists and more modern scholars.[6]

England's Chronicling Tradition

Holinshed's *Chronicles* did not appear in a vacuum but represents the tail end of the long tradition of writing chronicles in England, and especially of what one might consider chronicling's Elizabethan Indian Summer. The Middle Ages, in England as in Europe, had produced hundreds of historical works, the great majority written in Latin, not all of which were 'chronicles' in the strictest sense.[7] For the purposes of this chapter, a chronicle will be considered as any work of history that includes, in some combination,

[4] For a full account of this decline see Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), chap. 1. Chronicles continued of course to be read, cited, and used in the writing of other sorts of history; and older titles on occasion were reprinted. Unpublished manuscripts of others are extant from the early eighteenth century.

[5] <http://www.english.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/>.

[6] Serious efforts at re-examining Holinshed's *Chronicles* in their own right commenced in earnest with Annabel Patterson's *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) and continued with Richard Helgerson, 'Murder in Faversham: Holinshed's Impertinent History', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric and Fiction, 1500–1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David H. Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 133–58. Both allude to the intellectual reasons for the chroniclers' fall from grace. See also Igor Djordjevic, *Holinshed's Nation: Ideals, Memory, and Practical Policy in the Chronicles* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010) and *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicle*, ed. Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), hereafter abbreviated as *OHHC*.

[7] The most comprehensive study remains Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, 2 vols (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974–82); a more recent concise treatment is Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 2004).

(a) retrospective writing about the past before the writer's time and (b) writing about the more recent past and (c) writing about annual events unfolding as the writer recorded them. To be a true chronicle a work must also be organized in a particular way, into year-long sections known as annals, though that form of organization, used by some classical historians such as Thucydides and Tacitus, was also borrowed by late Elizabethan and Jacobean historians such as William Camden; the difference lay in the process of selection and in the tendency of the chronicler to include many things not specifically related to the political and military bias of classical and humanist historiography. One major change in historical writing during Europe's Renaissance and, later in England, was the inclination of many historians to abandon annals as their primary unit of organization in favour of other divisions, for instance the life and reign of a particular king.[8] Classical histories and their Elizabethan imitators were not chronicles and for the most part would have been understood by educated readers to be quite different in content, structure, and style.

The qualification 'for the most part' is important: Tudor and early Stuart readers, many of whom recorded their thoughts on the historical works which they read in commonplace books or in annotations on the text itself, were notoriously loose in their use of literary terms, and thus one can find casual references even to Thucydides or Caesar as chroniclers. This became less and less common as the sixteenth century drew to a close, not least because of the increasing bias of the educated elite towards Greco-Roman models of historical writing. Works on historical method sharpened the distinctions, though many of them considered the chronicle a debased form, at best offering the raw materials for true history.[9] The word 'chronicle' increasingly became associated with medieval historical writing, and by extension with the many Tudor works that emulated the structure, though not the content and tone, of their medieval antecedents.

From the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, the writing of history in England, as on the Continent, had rested predominantly in the hands of the clergy. Apart from transgenerational monastic chronicles, there were individual works narrating the martial activity, deeds, or 'gesta' of rulers and warriors, and chivalric romances, often in vernacular (English or Old French) verse. Perhaps most important for Tudor audiences, there was also a widely influential mid-twelfth-century work of historical fantasy by the hyperactively imaginative Geoffrey of Monmouth,[10] who either invented wholesale or bestowed spurious achievements upon a whole line of entirely fictitious British kings of remote antiquity, thereby helping to spawn the Arthurian literature of the late Middle Ages (Malory) and Tudor era (Spenser).

[8] This is most often attributed to humanist influence though it should be noted that there were plenty of medieval precedents for non-annalistic writing, such as the *Gestae* of various emperors, archbishops, and popes produced in the tenth to thirteenth centuries.

[9] For these tracts, commonly referred to under the umbrella title *artes historicae*, see A. Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[10] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Great Britain*, trans. L. Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966).

Most of these works were written in Latin, mainly for clerical audiences though occasionally for a king or noble patron. The warming of lay interest in history was spurred in part by episodes such as the Crusades and later the Hundred Years War, which created an appetite for accounts of great deeds and often also bolstered magnates' confidence and self-image. By the time of England's Yorkist–Lancastrian struggle, it is fair to say that although the proportion of aristocrats and major land-owning gentry who could read was relatively small (and those who could read Latin smaller still) an interest in acquiring knowledge of the past had been firmly established.

At the same time, a vernacular tradition, largely dormant for three centuries, had begun to reawaken, particularly in Old French and Middle English, and often in verse (which lent itself more easily both to memorization and performative recitation). Apart from translations of Latin works (for instance Ranulf Higden's widely circulated world chronicle, the *Polychronicon*),[11] there were two major strains of vernacular texts, first a chivalric/heroic variety best represented by the Anglo-French chronicler of the Hundred Years War, Jean Froissart, and similar works. This strain also included accounts of more ancient history, in a similar vein, especially the series of poems, derived directly or indirectly from Geoffrey of Monmouth, and familiarly termed *The Brut* because of their commencement with the arrival in Britain of the mythical Trojan émigré, a son or grandson of Aeneas. These were adapted in prose form and became one of the first works printed by Caxton under the title of *Chronicles of England*.[12]

A second vernacular strain of historical writing arose quite independently in England's towns which, like their counterparts in the rest of Europe, jealously guarded their independence from feudal magnates and their special relationship, typically established in charters of incorporation and grants of privilege, with the Crown. Initiated as a basic form of communal record-keeping—typically organized into annals according to the mayoralty or other civic office cycle—town chronicles eventually memorialized everything from local prices to natural and man-made disasters (fires, plagues, floods), omens (such as meteors and comets, or monstrous births) and the visits of grandees, especially kings.[13] They were, at least at first, devoid of the narrative skeleton detectable in most monastic chronicles, or in the verse and prose chivalric romance histories because they were never intended to be 'stories' at all so much as municipal records.

By the end of the fifteenth century vernacular historical writing in verse and prose was well established in England though relatively few instances of it apart from the translated version of Higden's *Polychronicon* and *The Brut* had as yet reached print; crossover between the reading interests of urban merchants and nobles is visible in

[11] J. Taylor, *The 'Universal Chronicle' of Ranulph Higden* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

[12] Lister M. Matheson, 'Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the *Polychronicon*, and the *Brut*', *Speculum* 60 (1985): 593–614.

[13] Charles Lethbridge Kingsford's century-old survey, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), has now been superseded, in particular by Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*, vol. 2 and Mary-Rose McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century* (Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 2002).

some texts, and in Caxton's and later printers' decisions about what to publish. While the very locally specific annals maintained by towns or private citizens did not migrate from manuscript into print, many newer chronicles, aimed in part at a vernacular, literate urban readership but embracing events well beyond the local, adopted their structure while simultaneously including a healthy dose of the more militaristic and heroic (and sometimes legendary) content of the Froissart–Brut tradition. Two prominent examples, both familiar to Tudor readers, were John Hardyng's mid-fifteenth century metrical account of events in fifteenth-century England and, at the very end of the century, the Londoner Robert Fabyan's prose survey of English history from Brutus to Henry VII, published in 1515 as *New Chronicles of England and France*.[14] Both works also demonstrate that by this juncture, classical influences were creeping into vernacular chronicling—Hardyng in particular is known to have made himself familiar with some ancient authors.

Throughout the sixteenth century, the chronicle remained the dominant form of historical writing in England, despite the importation of more 'modern' humanist exemplars. Henry VII, for instance, following Lancastrian and Yorkist practice, supported émigré historiographic 'hired guns' such as Bernard André and Pietro Carmeliano (a writer of highly flexible views who had previously served, and extolled the virtues of, the now-reviled Richard III). And it was during the first Tudor's reign that the papal official Polydore Vergil (*c.*1470–1555) arrived in England. A native of the duchy of Urbino, Vergil would spend most of the rest of his life in England. He broke with the medieval chronicling tradition in his Latin, classically inspired *Anglica Historia*, a book that did for England what a century of Vergil's fellow Italians had done for numerous city-states and not a few European monarchs. Published at mid-century in several editions, its initial influence was limited, not simply because it was in Latin and published abroad but because Vergil's scepticism towards certain inherited beliefs (the historicity of King Arthur and Brutus the Trojan) and the reliability of Geoffrey of Monmouth infuriated a large number of English and Welsh writers. Yet, along with Sir Thomas More's brilliant character assassination (unpublished in More's lifetime) of Richard III and the emerging scholarship in philology, as well as the impact of foreign historical works in a classical vein, Vergil's history represented the historiographical wave of the future with its 'higher' style of neo-classical Latin, greater selectivity of subject material, sharpened focus on the political, and—though this point can be overstated—a more critical attitude towards sources.[15] The humanist mode of writing English history did not fully flourish until the 1590s and early 1600s, however, when regnal histories (Sir John Hayward on Henry IV and other kings, Francis Bacon on Henry VII, William Camden on Elizabeth, and Samuel Daniel on all the kings from the Conquest to the fourteenth century) became the fashion, along

[14] *The chronicle of Jhon [sic] Hardyng in metre, fro[m] the first begynnyng of Engla[n]de, unto [the] reigne of Edwarde [the] Fourth* (London, 1543).

[15] For Vergil and More, and other early humanist efforts, see F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967), 33–78.

with a preference for a spare and politically instructive writing style much influenced by Tacitus.[16]

The decades in between still belonged to the chroniclers. Print helped bring into the public domain a number of older histories originally composed in Latin, Anglo-Saxon, or Middle English, many of them resurrected at the direction of Archbishop Matthew Parker, collector and sometime editor. It also permitted newly written chronicles to find their way quickly into very many hands and encouraged their writing, often at the instigation of market-attuned booksellers and printers. The print run of a single edition or issue of any text in Tudor England is conventionally estimated to have fallen between 800 and 1,200 copies. Some of the Tudor chronicles appeared in several editions. This may not appear to be a very wide circulation until one remembers first that the total population of England and Wales was barely 4 million in 1600, with the literate population among both sexes amounting to a fraction of that, and secondly that book-lending and reading aloud extended the potential reach of even a single copy. History was not the dominant genre of reading by any stretch of the imagination—a role it would ultimately assume, shared with the novel, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—but the evidence of private libraries, wills, and diaries tells us unmistakably that ownership, borrowing, and actual reading were increasing among both urban and rural readers of middling social status, and even among women, who previously had read very little of it.[17]

The reasons for reading historical works varied. The Ciceronian notion of history as *magistra vitae* was not confined only to ancient historical works; episodes and characters could be lifted, for didactic purpose, from English chronicles. Indeed, the very elasticity of chronicles—their capacious ability to include interesting episodes and anecdotes that did not need to fit with an overarching narrative—potentially provided attentive readers with a wider variety of lessons, instructive episodes, cautionary tales, and even examples of divine providence than did their leaner and more tightly focused humanist counterparts.[18] Information was also important. In an age without, as yet, the encyclopaedias of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, obtaining details about particular events, geography, the environment, local politics and office-holding, and economics was not straightforward. The chronicles often offered up such details and thereby unintentionally provided an easy target for the derision of later historians and of literary wits such as Ben Jonson or Thomas Nashe who sneered at 'lay

[16] For these 'politic' histories, the earliest of which appeared more or less contemporaneously with Shakespeare's English history plays, see Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 237–85; Wyman Herendeen, *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007).

[17] For some treatments of historical readership in the period see Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present* 129 (1990): 30–78; William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995); and Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England*.

[18] A point made very well with respect to Holinshed by Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, but extendable to other examples of the genre.

chronigraphers, that write of nothing but of mayors and sheriefs, and the dere yere, and the great frost'.[19] Apart from such data, and earnest didacticism, some readers read for entertainment and from sheer curiosity: it is no accident that the word 'history' also became associated at this time with works of fiction, beginning with cheap print chapbooks and broadsides and ending, a century and a half after Shakespeare, in the novel.

For whatever reasons, an interest in chronicles continued to grow. Some enterprising printers, following in Caxton's footsteps, saw a modest market opportunity here and produced, either for themselves or at the behest of booksellers, new works of history. Richard Grafton (*c.*1511–1572), was the archetype: holding the title of 'King's printer' under Edward VI, he fell from grace under Mary and turned, like Caxton half a century earlier, from printing to writing. Apart from publishing one version of Hardyng's fifteenth-century verse chronicle, Grafton himself would author *An Abridgment of the Chronicles of England* (1562 and several subsequent editions) and a *Chronicle at Large* (1569). This led him into a prolonged quarrel with a rival, John Stow (1525–1605), who accused him of lifting much of his material wholesale from other sources. Stow himself would prove even more prolific, authoring three different series of chronicles (each issued several times with updates), under the titles *Summary*, *Chronicles*, and eventually *Annales*, the final editions of which appeared, with continuations by Edmund Howes, in 1615 and 1631—the last new chronicle to be published in England, though some later works deliberately adopted the word 'chronicle' in their titles.[20] Stow represented precisely the sort of new, urban readership for which he wrote—son of a tallow-chandler, he was a member of one of London's major Livery Companies, the Merchant Taylors', though he appears to have made much of his living by writing history books.[21] He would eventually play a significant role in producing Holinshed's *Chronicles*, having, it seems, abandoned the idea of writing such a mega-chronicle himself. Apart from his chronicling activities, Stow was a competent antiquary who authored a prose *Survay of London* (1598) which fit into the emerging genre of 'chorography'.[22] But like his erstwhile rival Grafton, he also exemplified a tendency among enterprising authors and savvy publishers, accentuated in the last decades of the sixteenth century, to reissue older works, or

[19] *Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow (London: Bullen, 1904) 1.194.

[20] For instance Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle of the Kings of England* (1643 and several subsequent editions).

[21] Stow's career and writings are well covered in Barrett Beer, *Tudor England Observed: The World of John Stow* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997); *John Stow (1525–1605) and the Making of the English Past: Studies in Early Modern Culture and the History of the Book*, ed. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London: British Library, 2004). A modern version of the 1604 edition of Stow's *Summarie of the Chronicles of England* was published recently with annotations by Barrett Beer (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2007).

[22] The chorographies, which included most famously William Camden's *Britannia* require separate treatment; though they manifestly contained much historical material, contemporaries until at least the 1630s did not consider them to be 'histories'.

recompile material wholesale from earlier chronicles, rather than write genuinely new works.[23]

Apart from the emerging new humanist histories by the likes of Sir John Hayward, Camden, Bacon, and Daniel, and Sir Walter Ralegh's apocalyptically inflected *Historie of the World* (1614),[24] two further historical writers must be added to this roster. Both are in some ways difficult to categorize because *sui generis*, at least in England. The first, Edward Hall or Halle (1497–1547), a London-based lawyer, civic official, and sometime Member of Parliament is the great amphibian of the day: he had a familial connection to the earlier chronicler Robert Fabyan, but was neither a humanist historian in the style of Polydore Vergil nor really a chronicler. Like Vergil and other humanist and ancient historians Hall sought to tell a unified story across several reigns—indicated tellingly by the title, which nowhere uses the terms 'chronicle' or 'annals'. *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*, posthumously published in 1548 (by Grafton) delivers exactly what its title suggests—an account, organized into reigns subdivided in turn into annals, of how the disorder and dynastic conflict occasioned by the deposition of Richard II was resolved by Henry VII's victory at Bosworth Field, and consummated in the rule of his son by Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII. This covered, on a shorter time scale, themes addressed in the latter parts of Vergil's Latin history, and more or less created the notion of the years between Richard II's accession in 1377 and Henry VII's 1485 as a distinctive period in English history. It can arguably be seen as sharing with Holinshed's later and much longer work the title of principal source to Shakespeare's two English tetralogies.

The second of these exceptions in order of time, and by far the most widely read, was John Foxe, the 'martyrologist'. His *Acts and Monuments* (first published in England 1563 and expanded and reissued several times during this and ensuing centuries) was both a complete record of protestant martyrdoms by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Catholic persecutors, and a history of the Church from early times. Drawing on early sacred and ecclesiastical histories going back to Eusebius of Caesarea, but also on contemporary records and oral accounts from witnesses, Foxe established the authoritative Protestant view of the English past as a series of struggles between true religion and the forces of darkness led by Rome and its secular allies. It is no exaggeration to call this the single most influential work of English historical writing of the sixteenth century. Like Hall's work, however, it was no chronicle.[25]

[23] Woolf, *Reading History*, 48–57.

[24] Ralegh's *History* has now received an excellent, comprehensive treatment, Nicholas Popper, *Walter Ralegh's History of the World and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

[25] Foxe's work has encouraged a virtual cottage industry of modern scholarship including several volumes of essays and an online edition. See most recently *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, ed. Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas Freeman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); John N. King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). The online edition of Foxe is *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011), available from: <http//www.johnfoxe.org>.

Hall and Foxe represent distinct strains of contemporary historiography that were deeply influential, in different ways, on the successive teams of authors who compiled Holinshed's *Chronicles* in the 1570s and again the 1580s.[26] Although very obviously an heir to the previous century of chronicling, this was also a work that appeared, though the authors did not know it, when the market for new published chronicles was about to wane. In this waning, print again played a role as the chronicles became a victim of their own success; having responded to growing interests in history, they created a market that they were soon unable to satisfy, even through frequent reissues and updates. Meanwhile, the chroniclers' materials were appropriated by writers in other genres, including history plays, historical poems, and, of course, the humanist prose histories of medieval reigns. These lifted material wholesale from the chroniclers (of necessity in an age when 'coal-face' research in archival sources was still the exception rather than the norm), and they sometimes maintained, as had Edward Hall earlier, an annalistic organization. But, they eschewed the chroniclers' tendency toward inclusiveness in favour of a focus on key events, causal links, political lessons, and maxims, and even a single episode as in the case of Hayward's account of the fall of Richard II and rise of Henry IV.[27] Given these changes in fashion, and the business acumen of London's publishers and printers, it is unsurprising that the appetite for new chronicles disappeared, in particular for very expensive 'super-chronicles' such as Holinshed's, which after its second edition did not even merit a simple reprinting until the early nineteenth century.

Holinshed's *Chronicles*: One Chronicle to Rule them All?

This was an unexpected fate for the most ambitious English historical project (antiquarian achievements such as Camden's *Britannia* excluded) of the Elizabethan era, a 'chronicle to end all chronicles'.[28] If far from the most original or scholarly, Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* was, in the nearly 3.5 million words of its second edition, the largest historiographical project conceived and executed in sixteenth-century England. For a work so closely associated with the creation, via Shakespeare, of a robust and durable English understanding of the country's past, it is perhaps ironic that it was initially the brain-child of a Dutch-born printer, Reyner (Reginald) Wolfe, who was more interested in universal, rather than strictly English, history. Following his move to London in the 1530s, Wolfe's connections soon made him one of the most important printers in an England undergoing religious ferment; his own support of prominent reformers

[26] S. Lucas, 'Holinshed and Hall', OHHC, 203–15; T. F. Freeman and S. Brietz Monta, 'Holinshed and Foxe', OHHC, 217–33.

[27] John Hayward, *The first part of the life and raigne of King H*

[28] The phrase applied to the 1587 edition b

doubtless contributed to his success, which was later interrupted during Mary's reign owing to his printing of evangelical works. At Elizabeth's accession the printer returned to his press and was appointed as a master of the Stationers' Company in 1559. While he continued to publish a wide array of works, he also acquired historical manuscripts in hopes of publishing a work on cosmography and universal history which he at one point titled, perhaps in imitation of Ranulf Higden two centuries earlier, a 'Policronicon'. Wolfe hired Raphael Holinshed (whose origins remain obscure) and the better-known William Harrison to assist him. Wolfe's death in 1574 did not put an end to the project, which his associates, supported by a consortium of Stationers, inherited.

Holinshed himself shaped the first edition of what became *The Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Ireland* (1577), printed by Henry Bynneman. In his dedication to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, he explained that Wolfe had 'willed' him with the task of continuing the project. Holinshed acted as the principal, with Harrison responsible for the *Description of England* at its beginning and Richard Stanihurst providing the same for Ireland.[29] Holinshed's initially intended to produce the work that he had been preparing with Wolfe in two volumes, but these plans evolved as he encountered problems with the writing, editing, and publication of what was meant to be Wolfe's universal 'Cosmographie.' The difficulties of realizing Wolfe's vision quickly became apparent: 'when the volume grewe so great, as they that were to defray the charges for the Impression, were not willing to go through with the whole, they resolved first to publishe the Histories of Englande, Scotlande, and Irelande, with their descriptions, whiche descriptions, bycause they were not in such readinesse, as those of forreyn countreys, they were enforced to vse the helpe of other better able to do it than I.'[30] The histories of England and the British isles were initially to be compiled in one volume, while the second would cover the history of foreign lands. The latter aspect was largely abandoned when Holinshed and his editors were overwhelmed by the excessive materials on British history.[31] The abridged histories of foreign countries were excluded from the chronicles, but they made brief appearances when their histories impinged on the British narrative. In the end, the first volume would include the ancient history of England to the Norman Conquest, Irish and Scottish history, and the second volume would contain the continuation of English history to 1576.

Despite the radical departure from Wolfe's original concept, Holinshed still struggled with producing the *Chronicles* under the pressure of the publishers.[32] Fortunately, he and his colleagues had ready access to a good portion of the materials they needed. Stanihurst apparently already had access to Edmund Campion's 1571 history of Ireland

[29] The editorial team for the second, 1587 edition would include William Harrison again (mainly revising his earlier *Description of England*) John Stow (passingly involved in the first edition), Abraham Fleming, William Patten, John Hooker (alias Vowell), and Francis Boteville, better known as Francis Thynne. See Henry Summerson's two chapters in *OHHC*, 61–92; and Alexandra Gillespie and Oliver Harris, 'Holinshed and the Native Chronicle Tradition', *OHHC*, 135–51.

[30] Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Ireland* (London, 1577), sig. ¶2v.

[31] Felicity Heal and Henry Summerson, 'The Genesis of the Two Editions', *OHHC*, 3–20, at 4, 5.

[32] Ibid.

before he began work on the project, which provided adequate descriptions of contemporary Ireland.[33] The ancient history of Ireland was almost entirely lifted from Gerald of Wales' late twelfth-century *Topographia Hibernica* and *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Harrison's history of Scotland was largely taken from John Bellenden's *History and Croniklis of Scotland* (1536) and that work's Latin source, Hector Boethius' *Historia Gentis Scotorum* (1527). England itself proved a bigger challenge. The authors faced a relatively new problem for English historical writers accentuated by the aspiration to provide universal coverage: a plethora of available materials from which to choose (no fewer than 181 authors, including 45 chroniclers, were listed in the book's preliminaries),[34] and which needed to be assembled into a whole, without as yet a full array of the critical tools that allowed later historians to privilege some past accounts and ignore others.

The editors' opportunity to improve on their work came after Holinshed's own death, probably in late 1580 or early 1581.[35] A Stationers' Company licence to produce a folio version of the *Chronicles* was granted in 1584 to a new consortium of John Harrison and George Bishop (two of the original publishers), now joined by Ralph Newbery, Thomas Woodcocke, and Henry Denham (who would eventually print the second edition). The new consortium shaped the second edition (1587) in different ways and seems from the start to have aimed at producing a work that might reach a higher status of reader through both a reform of content and improved printing quality. Most notably, the appointment of the clergyman Abraham Fleming as the new chief editor ensured that the revision would be more structurally coherent, and the errors in the first edition were carefully scrutinized and corrected. Fleming's Cambridge humanist background, facility with Latin, and prior experience in translation and editorial work proved especially valuable. He implemented further 'improvements' to the revised work. Fleming included an introduction of a new volume, bringing the account forward from where the earlier edition had ended at 1576 to 1586; the woodcut illustrations from the first edition were also removed, possibly because images produced in this way were beginning to fall out of fashion;[36] significant changes were also made to the arrangement and division of the text. In 'Holinshed 2.0', the lengthy histories of the pre-Norman period were divided into separate books and chapters with titles, an intrusion of humanist literary convention on to the chronicle's annalistic base.

More notably, Fleming's 'fingerprints' were all over the new edition, especially in his moralizing commentaries within the text and on its margins (another humanist

[33] Campion had been Stanihurst's tutor at Oxford. For a discussion on Campion's stay in Ireland, see Colm Lennon, *Richard Stanihurst the Dubliner, 1547–1618* (Blackrock: Irish Academic Press, 1981), 35–44; and Vincent Carey, *Surviving the Tudors: The 'Wizard' Earl of Kildare and English Rule in Ireland, 1537–1586* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002).

[34] Alexandra Gillespie and Oliver Harris, 'Holinshed and the Native Chronicle Tradition', *OHHC*, 135–51.

[35] His will was proved in London on 24 April 1581 but the actual date of his death remains unknown: Henry Summerson, 'Raphael Holinshed: New Light on a Shadowy Life', *OHHC*, appendix B, 705.

[36] James A. Knapp, 'Illustrations in the 1577 Edition', *OHHC*, 111–32, at 131; and Heal and Summerson, 'Genesis of the Two Editions', *OHHC*, 14.

modification), encouraging readers to draw appropriate responses to historical events.[37] The deposition of Richard II, for instance, is often cited as one of the more controversial events depicted in the *Chronicles*, though in fact it seems to have aroused precious little concern among authorities (in contrast to John Hayward's closer call with his *Henry IIII* in 1599 and again in 1601). Holinshed's report of the episode is self-conscious; even as he describes Richard's faults, he notes that the young king was a victim of his corrupt advisors and companions. Here, he breaks off from the historical narrative:

> Thus have ye heard what writers doo report touching the state of the time and doings of this king. But if I may boldlie saie what I thinke: he was a prince the most unthankfullie used of his subjects of any one of whom ye shall lightlie read. For although (thorough the frailtie of youth) he demeaned himself more dissolutelie than seemed convenient for his roiall estate, & made choise of such counselors as were not favoured of the people, whereby he was the less favoured himselfe: yet in no kings daies were the commons in greater wealth, if they could have perceived their happie state: neither in any other time were the nobles and gentlemen more cherished, nor churchmen lesse wronged. But such was their ingratitude towards their bountifull and loving sovereign ... which stirred such malice betwixt him and them, till at length it could not be asswaged without perill of destruction to them both.[38]

Fleming's addition to Holinshed's comments further asserts the injustice that Richard suffered at the hands of Bolingbroke; the latter is described as unnatural, and his cruelty 'tigerlike'.

In her study of the *Chronicles* published just over twenty years ago, Annabel Patterson has suggested that the interjections were 'indifferent', thereby rejecting the view that 'Tudor chroniclers were seen to be promoting a providential view of history, especially since Holinshed states that Bolingbroke "and his lineal race were scourged afterwards, as a due punishment unto rebellious subjects." '[39] She claims that 'the facts of the reign continue to speak for themselves'.[40] More recently, Jennifer Richards has noted that it may be more useful to consider such interjections less in terms of the purported proto-liberalism of some of the editors than of an attempt to 'teach' readers to be independent, and to judge events not only by what the chronicles have just reported but from their own critical reading of the text (in this case, the contradictory commentaries about Richard II being a bad king nonetheless deserving of sympathy—more or less the perspective Shakespeare would encourage in his dramatization).[41] The interjections shape readers' understanding of a historical event through multifaceted renderings by

[37] For early modern reading practices, particularly pertaining the reading of histories see Anthony Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England*, 79–131; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*; M. Woodcock, 'Narrative Voice and Influencing the Reader', *OHHC*, 337–54; and Chapter 14, this volume, by Nicholas Popper.

[38] R. Holinshed, *The third volume of Chronicles, beginning at duke William the Norman* (1587), 508.

[39] Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, 116.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Jennifer Richards, 'Rhetoric,' *OHHC*, 285–302, at 287.

various editors with different political, social, and religious views. Patterson tries to extricate Holinshed's *Chronicles* from the dominant view of earlier scholars who saw the *Chronicles* as a product of Tudor state propaganda echoing the prevailing political, social, and religious ideologies of the day,[42] and those who regarded the work as of little intrinsic literary value—worth studying mainly because of its use by Shakespeare and others.[43]

More recently, Igor Djordjevic's *Holinshed's Nation: Ideals, Memory and Practical Policy in the Chronicles* (2010) has reconsidered how early modern readers perceived medieval history. He focuses on the writing practices of the editors, particularly their assembly and reshaping of sources concerning the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Like Patterson, Djordjevic uses literary techniques to analyse some of the *Chronicles*' more well-known and sustained narratives (Richard II's deposition, the transition of power from Henry IV to Henry V, and the Yorkist–Lancastrian struggles of the 1450s–80s).[44] Djordjevic's monograph has now been complemented by the mammoth *Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles* (2013). The essays in this comprehensive volume reconsider the many dimensions of the *Chronicles* in light of recent research on early modern political, cultural, and religious history. More importantly, the contributors hope to encourage a 'scholarly reawakening' in the study of Holinshed and a systematic analysis of its text and its intellectual and political contexts.[45] The interdisciplinary nature of the volume provides an exhaustive and, barring significant new documentary evidence, probably definitive treatment of Holinshed's two editions.

An essay on Holinshed and on chronicling would not be complete without some discussion of the issue of political and religious censorship. Thanks to the work of Cyndia Susan Clegg in particular,[46] it is now possible to achieve a more rounded understanding of the process of censorship and of its influence on the publication of various genres, histories among them. Even in the first edition of the *Chronicles*, Holinshed reminds readers that the material in the work 'may be thought to giue offence in time present, which

[42] E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1944); Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 72; Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 25–6.

[43] See for instance, May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 119; Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 23 (an account that postdates Patterson's). See also Archer, Heal, and Kewes, 'Prologue', *OHHC*, xxx.

[44] See Djordjevic, *Holinshed's Nation*, *passim*, and Henry Archer, 'Holinshed and the Middle Ages', *OHHC*, 171–86.

[45] Ian W. Archer, Felicity Heal, and Paulina Kewes, 'Prologue', *OHHC*, xxxiv.

[46] Cyndia S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 146; see also her chapter on censorship in *OHHC*, 44–59; and *The Peaceable and Prosperous Regiment of Blessed Queene Elisabeth: A Facsimile from Holinshed's Chronicles (1587)*, ed. Cyndia S. Clegg with commentary by R. McLeod (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 2005). A useful general analysis of the censorship of language in the period is Debora Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

referred to the time past, when the Authour writte, are not only tolerable but allowable'.[47] The names of these authors immediately follow the preface, but the degree to which they were held accountable for 'offence' to Elizabethan authorities was less important than the editors' interjections in relation to the political climate in England, and the ways in which the authorities responded.

Authors probably had at least as much to fear from offended individuals (who might object to the unfavourable portrayal of a relative or an ancestor) as from a 'state' censorship that was highly erratic in its application and unable to catch every instance of potential literary sedition. (One recalls that it was not the Crown but Lord Cobham who would object to Shakespeare's buffoonish depiction of Cobham's ancestor Sir John Oldcastle, forcing the change of name to 'Falstaff'.)[48] Moreover, it can reasonably be argued that authorities were nearly as often interested in the *shaping* of a message as in its outright deletion from print. Nor is it the case that only very recent or near-contemporary events were likely to be subjected to scrutiny. The Irish sections of the two editions of Holinshed provide a good illustration of both these points. Stanihurst's 'History of Ireland' in the 1577 edition of the *Chronicles*—seemingly the only part of that edition to arouse governmental attention, and that only briefly—covered the period up to 1547, which could hardly be considered contemporary thirty years later. Yet Stanihurst knew that even though his history ended with the reign of Henry VIII, its publication in the Elizabethan era could be potentially dangerous. Dedicating it to Sir Henry Sidney, then serving his final term as Lord Deputy of Ireland, Stanihurst expressed the underlying anxieties of the early modern chronicler:

> How cumbersome (ryghte Honorable) & daungerous a taske it is, to engrosse & divulge the doings of others, especially when the parties registred or their issue are liuing: both common reason sufficiently acknowledgeth, and dayly experience infallibly approueth. For Man by course of nature is so partially affected to himself, and his bloud, as hee will bee more agreeued with the Chronicler for recording a peeuish trespasse, than hee will be offended with his friend, for committing an heynous treason.[49]

The order to 'stay' the Irish chronicle (in which 'many things are falcelie recited and contrarie to the ancient records of the said realme') demonstrated that Stanihurst's concerns were valid. In early December (1577), the Privy Council ordered the Bishop of London to investigate the number of copies sold in England and Ireland; the printer was also obliged to halt the printing and selling of Stanihurst's Irish chronicle or 'answer the contrarie at his uttermost perill'.[50] The reasons behind this act can only be speculated from

[47] Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1577), sig. ¶5v.
[48] The authors are grateful to the volume's editor for reminding them of this Shakespearean example.
[49] *Holinshed's Irish Chronicle* (1577), ed. L. Miller and E. Power (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1979), 321.
[50] Ibid., xvi.

the passages that were cancelled and revised. Liam Miller's and Eileen Power's modern edition of the *Irish Chronicle* (1979) and more recently, Clegg's chapter on censorship in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles* note the offence that Stanihurst may have caused, particularly in his somewhat scandalous depiction of the Archbishop of Dublin, John Alen.[51] Stanihurst's treatment of the Kildare rebellion and his favourable portrayal of the Earl of Kildare may also have been a cause of concern for the Privy Council, since the English were determined to prevent the re-emergence of a Kildare ascendancy.

In the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1587), the Irish section was refashioned at a time when Crown control over Ireland tightened and renewed efforts were made to colonize large areas of the island with English planters. John Hooker, who took over Stanihurst's history of Ireland in the 1587 edition, was personally embroiled in Irish affairs when Peter Carew hired him as his legal advisor to establish Carew's ancient rights to lands in Idrone in the 1560s. While Stanihurst was largely concerned with affairs within the English colonial government, Hooker aggressively promoted imperial expansion. Hooker's addition to Stanihurst's text, 'The Supplie of the Irish Chronicles,' sets the tone to his second edition. Imperial expansion is front and centre in Hooker's version; his dedication to Sir Walter Ralegh (a leading investor and landholder in the Munster plantation, the largest of its time) celebrates conquest, and Spain looms in the background as England's competitor in the quest for imperial expansion. Ralegh's attempt to colonize Virginia is lauded as 'the first English colonie that ever was there planted, to the no little derogation of the glorie of the Spaniards.'[52] For Hooker, Ralegh's ambitions and achievements epitomize the rhetoric of colonial discourse:

> For what can be more pleasant to God, than to gaine and reduce in all christianlike manner, a lost people to the knowledge of the gospel, and a true Christian religion, than which cannot be a more pleasant and a sweet sacrifice, and a more acceptable service before God? And what can be more honorable to princes, than to inlarge the bounds of their kingdoms without injurie, wrong, & bloodshed; and to frame them from a savage life to a civill government, neither of which the Spaniards in their conquests have performed? And what can be more beneficiall to a common weale, than to have a nation and a kingdome to transferre unto the superfluous multitude of frutelesse and idle people (here at home dailie increasing) to travel, conquer, and manure another land, which by the due intercourses to be devised, may and will yeeld infinit commodities?[53]

The colonial government was consistently preoccupied with the imposition of religion, the establishment of civil (English) government, and the civilizing of the 'savage' Irish. Stanihurst's and Hooker's respective versions of Irish history provide

[51] Ibid., xvi–xvii. A compilation of the cancelled and condensed materials can be found in the appendices in Miller's and Power's volume. See also C. S. Clegg, 'Censorship' [illegible]

[52] Holinshed, *The first and second volumes of Chro*[illegible]

[53] Ibid.

readers with a glimpse of how *Holinshed's Chronicles* were shaped not only by the editors' approach towards prevailing political ideologies of the period, but by their patrons' attitudes and ability to exert pressure on authorities to amend historical narratives.

The 1587 English history in Holinshed's *Chronicles* was similarly shaped by personal and political sensitivities, including strains between England and Spain over the Low Countries, and the failure to betroth the English queen to the Duke of Anjou. The authorities censored more than twelve pages describing Anjou's government in the Low Countries in order to conceal the queen's 'personal regard for Monsieur and her government's investment in Monsieur's Dutch enterprise'.[54] Modern scholars have also suggested that cuts were sometimes made because of complaints from influential individuals, notably Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Like many among Elizabeth's inner circle, Leicester was often accused of abusing the queen's affections, and, in his case, of mismanaging England's intervention in the wars in the Netherlands in 1586–87. Holinshed's *Chronicles* was, however, filled with praise for Leicester, whose popularity was described alongside his extravagance in the Netherlands. Anne Castanien has suggested that sections on Leicester were removed from the 1587 edition at the earl's request, in an effort to play down rumours in England of his reckless expenditure on entertainments.[55] Latin poems that praised Sir Henry Sidney were also removed, and reports of Sir Philip Sidney's death were condensed, possibly to accommodate the queen's wishes.[56]

The reasons for the outright removal of some sections and condensation of others suggest that there were no consistent criteria to determine which types of material were considered objectionable. The fact that seemingly offensive material was not always completely removed, but merely condensed, suggests that English authorities did not simplistically react to every comment that a modern reader might well assume to have occasioned governmental discomfort. Though the term 'censorship' is often associated with oppression and tyranny in modern sensibilities, the censorship of Holinshed's *Chronicles* certainly should not be perceived as such. In fact, the authorities appear to have well understood the nuances of representation and reception. Their purpose was less the outright erasure of distasteful bits of history than their mitigation through condensation, rewriting, and reshaping. In this sense, Holinshed's *Chronicles* is multi-vocal not simply because it was written by a diverse group of men from different walks of life, but also because it was written, produced, and revised—even *after* printing—by a diverse set of invisible hands.

[54] Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, 146.

[55] Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, 317; A. Castenien, 'Censorship and Historiography in Elizabethan England: The Expurgation of Holinshed's Chronicles' (PhD dissertation, University of California, Davis, 1970), 271–2. In her detailed discussion of the 1587 edition Clegg (*OHHC*) argues that there were several distinct stages of censorship, both pre- and post-publication.

[56] Patterson, *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles*, 317; for the censorship of the Sidney material, see Elizabeth S. Donno, 'Some Aspects of Shakespeare's Holinshed', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50 (1987).

Conclusion

The study of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, and of the wider chronicling tradition to which it belongs, has changed drastically over the last two decades, suggesting that there is indeed a 'scholarly reawakening' of interest, as the editors of *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles* have hoped. It is no longer possible to say, as the literary critic Stephen Booth remarked in 1968, 'we care about Holinshed's Chronicles [only] because Shakespeare read them.'[57] Nor is the ready dismissal of the work as an inferior or primitive form of historiography defensible. Recent studies on Holinshed's *Chronicles* have demonstrated that these assumptions are no longer sustainable. The complexity involved in the making of both editions of the *Chronicles*, and the conditions that simultaneously obstructed, limited, and facilitated its publication make it distinctive as an early example of the dynamics involved in publishing a large-scale historiographical project. And the final text itself is unique among Elizabethan chronicles, displaying in its second edition a selectivity and organizational pattern, under the guiding hand of Fleming, which renders it a meaningful whole. It is attention to both these aspects of distinctiveness that can shed new light on the intricacies and varieties of early modern historical representation during the sunset of the English chronicling tradition.

[57] Stephen Booth, *The Book Called Holinshed's Chronicles* (San Francisco: Club of California, 1968), 72.