

The *Chronicles* of Hall and Holinshed: Published under Pseudonyms ?

Kevin Gilvary

In this paper,¹ I review the major publications of Chronicles or Histories during the Tudor Period and argue a case that the two most famous Histories, Edward Hall's *Chronicle* (1548) and Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicle* (1577 and 1587), were pseudonymous. Both Hall and Holinshed were historical figures in England, but neither one was known for any other writings during the period; a case emerges that they were used as "front men" while the actual authors were able to conceal their involvement and avoid personal attacks, possible imprisonment and retributive punishment.

During the Tudor period, many writers outside the ruling groups ("outsiders") raised issues and criticized the government; to avoid recriminations, they resorted to various stratagems, e.g., satire, continental exile or anonymous and pseudonymous attribution. Among the most famous critical works were the anti-Marian publications of the mid-sixteenth century, the anonymous *Leicester's Commonwealth* (1584) and the Marprelate tracts (1588-1591). Understandably, the writers of these works concealed their identity to avoid government retribution.²

At the same time, it seems that some publications were covertly commissioned by the government; the Marprelate tracts were answered by anonymous pamphlets written by government supporters such as John Lyly and Thomas Nashe.³ On a much larger scale, the *Chronicles* of Hall and Holinshed – written by "insiders" – are notably propagandistic in following an official agenda by supporting the Protestant reformation and endorsing the Tudors' claim to the Crown. In particular, it is argued that William Cecil, Lord Burghley (named Cecil throughout this paper), was involved in the covert commissioning of these works, not only to provide a quasi-official account of the legitimacy of the Tudor dynasty but also to invent a Protestant English history. Shakespeare's plays, by contrast, seem to exhibit both "outsider" criticism (e.g., of the Queen by depicting the infatuation

of Titania with a buffoon) and “insider” propaganda (e.g., an ahistorical portrayal of the murderous Richard III). Cecil may have been sufficiently stung by such effective criticism as to bring the playwright “inside the tent” and direct his venomous wit at outsiders. In this context, it is likely that an author would publish anonymously as happened with the plays of Shakespeare until 1598, and thereafter (as many believe) under the pseudonym of William Shakespeare.

Increasing Anonymity Among Bible Translators

The only works of greater importance than the chronicles during the Tudor period were the Bibles in English. Those who prepared the translations increasingly withheld their identities during the period 1525-1611, either by use of a pseudonym or through group authorship.⁴ The tetracentenary of the publication of the King James Bible was celebrated in 2011. We know that from the time of the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, it took seven years to complete. The King himself said that he

... could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst. I wish some special pains were taken for an uniform translation, which should be done by the best learned men in both Universities, then reviewed by the Bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly ratified by the Royal authority, to be read in the whole Church, and none other.⁵

In other words, the King did not trust any *one* person with the translation, but ordained groups of scholars to translate and approve this new authorized version. About forty-seven translators were known to have taken part and they were organized into six committees, meeting variously at Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford. The work was carefully reviewed, prepared for printing, and dedicated in very obsequious terms to King James. Its translators, however, remained anonymous: we only know that John Bois was involved in part of the final revision from a manuscript in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford;⁶ the only indication that the final revision and dedication were written by Miles Smith is contained in another work published in 1632.⁷ Clearly, it was possible to contribute to this great work and yet remain invisible to the average reader.

Returning to the earliest printed translations of the scriptures, William Tyndale published his translation of the New Testament in 1525 in Cologne and Worms. In 1530, he published his translation of the Pentateuch in Antwerp. Tyndale remained in hiding and was working on the next books of the Old Testament when he was arrested in 1534. After being handed over to the local authorities, he was executed for heresy in 1536. Tyndale acquired fame indeed, but at a terrible price.

By this time, of course, Henry VIII had broken with Rome and allowed Miles Coverdale to print the first complete Bible in the English language, known as the

Coverdale Bible. Coverdale was a friend and disciple of Tyndale and he too spent much of his adult life abroad. After the arrest of his mentor, Coverdale supervised the printing of the first complete Bible in English in 1535, probably in Antwerp. Coverdale, however, remained on the continent for much of his adult life. He returned to England under Edward VI and was appointed Bishop of Exeter; under Mary, he was stripped of his bishopric and went into exile, spending some time in Geneva. Soon after Elizabeth came to the throne, Coverdale returned to England and lived in obscurity until his death in 1569.⁸

The second complete translation, the Matthew Bible, came out in 1537, under the name of Thomas Matthew, a pseudonym for John Rogers, the actual editor and translator, who had been another friend and disciple of Tyndale. Having witnessed the persecution of Tyndale, Rogers found it prudent to obscure his own role in the translation. Like Coverdale, he returned to England and gained preferment under Edward VI. Unlike Coverdale, he did not escape the Marian persecutions and was to become the first Protestant martyr under Bloody Mary. Rogers had worked on his translation in exile and published it under a pseudonym.⁹

The Matthew Bible was well received and Henry VIII's minister, Thomas Cromwell, commissioned Miles Coverdale to use the Matthew Bible as a basis for the Great Bible, so called because of its large size. Cromwell sent an order to all parish priests, saying that a copy of the Great Bible was to be placed in every church and made available to parishioners. Shortly afterwards Cromwell fell from power; among the charges against him was heresy. He was executed in 1540. The Great Bible was also known as Cranmer's Bible because Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote a preface to the second edition. However, with the accession of Mary, Cranmer was arrested and eventually executed at Oxford in 1556.¹⁰

Subsequent Bibles were prepared by committee; no single figure was associated with their translation. The Geneva Bible, published in the "City of Saints" in 1560, was apparently translated and edited primarily by William Whittingham, who returned to England but was not known for this work. Similarly with the Bishops' Bible of 1568, produced at the instigation of the Queen under the watchful eyes of Archbishop Parker and William Cecil, no one person was associated with the entire translation. According to Bruce, Parker tried to ensure that the bishops would initial their own contribution "to make [the translators] more diligent, as answerable for their doings."¹¹ However, they did not always follow this practice to the letter. Protected by the near anonymity of the committee approach, biblical translators could sleep soundly in their beds – and die there. However, those political figures who had been involved in the commissioning and publication of the work, Cecil and Leicester, allowed themselves the luxury of including their portraits in the Bible.¹² The Douay-Rheims Bible, published in 1610, was the collaborative work of English Catholics in exile in France. The King James or Authorised Version of the Bible was prepared by groups of scholars and published anonymously in 1611.

To recap, we can see that being famous for Biblical translations was most injurious to one's physical health: Tyndale, Rogers, and Cranmer were all executed; Rogers had lived in exile and used a pseudonym. Miles Coverdale managed to escape

the stake by living in exile and obscurity. From 1560, Bibles were prepared and edited anonymously by groups of people.

Tudor Historians: Polydore Vergil and John Foxe

Whereas the history of the Bible in English displays the rise of the anonymous translator, Tudor chroniclers seemed happy to proclaim their authorship of historical works. Before the reign of Elizabeth, two major historians lived abroad and published some of their works on the continent. The earliest Tudor historian, Polydore Vergil, was an Italian writer who first came to England about 1501.¹³ He was approached by Henry VIII to write *Historia Anglica* (A History of England) in Latin and had close contact with the King. The work appeared in three distinct versions. The first, which was not published until 1534 (Text A),¹⁴ covered events up to 1509. A displeased Henry VIII ordered many changes. Having seen the rise and fall of favorites such as Cardinal Wolsey and Thomas More, Vergil returned to Italy in 1538, where he prepared a revised edition of his work, published again in Basel in 1546 (Text B). Aware that he would antagonize one faction or another when writing a history of England during the turbulent break with Rome, Vergil remained in Italy until his death in 1555. During this time, he prepared a third version (Text C), taking events in England up to 1537. This third version was with the publisher in Basel when he died and was published posthumously.

Apart from withholding a chronicle until close to death (as is generally believed to be the case with Vergil's 1555 third edition), an author might avoid the enmity of the authorities by publishing abroad. Tyndale remained in the Low Countries, not far enough to avoid the reaches of Henry VIII's commissioners. Vergil withdrew to Italy and published in the Swiss Cantons. Likewise, John Foxe – author of *History of the English Church* (later known as the *Acts and Monuments*) – fled the country under duress and published abroad. Having started *Acts and Monuments* in England under Edward VI, the rise of Mary Tudor in 1533 forced him to flee to Strasbourg, where he published the work in 1554 in Latin. A longer Latin version was published in 1559 in Basel.

Foxe's work was enthusiastically received by Elizabeth, so he returned to England; starting in 1563 he published four further, expanded editions, now in English and licensed by the Queen.¹⁵ Like the *Chronicles* of Hall and Holinshed, Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* was really an agglomeration of works by other writers (collaborators, correspondents, reporters, and transcribers of eyewitness reports) with Foxe acting as compiler and editor. Foxe must have felt secure in the protection of the Queen and her secretary, Cecil, as he did not conceal his name on the work.¹⁶ He died of natural causes at the age of seventy in 1587.

Foxe's work was printed in England by John Day, another man of strong Protestant persuasion. Unlike Foxe, Day did not flee abroad during the reign of Mary, but at first withdrew to Lincolnshire. There he published many anti-Catholic polemics trying to hide his identity under the pseudonym "Michael Wood."¹⁷ These seditious

works were thought at the time to have been published on the continent. However, a passage in *Acts and Monuments* (1563: 1681) refers to a clandestine press set up by Day in Stamford, Lincolnshire, on which he had printed *De vera obedientia* (October 1553, STC 11585), a polemic against Archbishop Gardiner. Foxe writes:

So also coming to Stamford, I might just have the occasion to say of W. Cooke, who not only sustained trouble but was also committed to vyle prison, for that he suffered this oure printer [John Day] to print the book of Wint *De vera obedientia Obed.*

According to Foxe, John Day actually spent time in prison with the biblical translator John Rogers, who was executed in February 1555. Shortly afterwards Day was released from prison and allowed to work as a printer in London, possibly because of the shortage of printers caused by the large numbers who had gone into exile.¹⁸

Day's clandestine printing activities in Lincolnshire must have involved William Cooke's brother-in-law, William Cecil. Cecil owned land in Lincolnshire and rented a cottage and two acres to John Day in the village of Barholm, about five miles northeast of Stamford.¹⁹ John Day was known by 1547 as a printer specializing in Protestant tracts. During the reign of Edward VI, his reputation rose as he gained patents to print bibles and catechisms. William Cecil would have first known Day when Cecil became a junior counselor to Henry VIII. In May 1547, Cecil had become secretary to the Lord Protector Somerset and then Secretary of State. He signed Edward VI's *Devise for the Succession*, which nominated Lady Jane Grey as Edward's successor, but later obtained a pardon from Mary. He declined a role in the Marian government before withdrawing to his home in Stamford.²⁰ Cecil seems to have invited Day with him as Day had no other known contact with Lincolnshire. Cecil and Day seem to have colluded in anti-Marian propagandea, but in such a secret manner that they avoided the suspicions of Mary's commissioners. Soon after Elizabeth's accession Day was established as a master printer, earning a good living. He published Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* in 1563 and gained a lucrative contract to print the expanded second edition which Cecil ordered in 1571 to be purchased by every parish church in England.

Cecil was ready and available to take over as personal secretary to the new queen.

Edward Hall's *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families.*

Apart from withholding a publication until the approach of death (as is generally believed with Vergil) or avoiding making enemies by living and publishing abroad (as Vergil, Foxe and various biblical translators tried), it is my contention that two major chronicles were published under false names: that Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed were used to "front" the publications of others.

In 1548, Richard Grafton published the chronicle attributed to his deceased friend, Edward Hall, under the title *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke*.²¹ This work, commonly known as Hall's *Chronicle*, appeared a year after Hall died and was reissued in 1550. In narrating the course of the Wars of the Roses, with much moralizing against the evils of civil dissension, Hall has been described as a staunch supporter of Henry VIII and of the Tudor Dynasty.²² The *Chronicle* is also seen as an attempt to invent a strong Protestant history of England.²³

In the dedicatory epistle to Edward VI, Hall writes that his chronicle starts with the reign of Henry IV, "the beginnyng and rote of the great discord and deuision" and continues up until the marriage of Henry VII to Elizabeth of York, "the godly matrimony, the final ende of all discensions, titles and debates" which took place in January 1486. It seems that this marriage would be the logical end of a history detailing *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke*, although it could stretch to the death of Elizabeth of York in 1503 or even to the death of Henry VII in 1509. Clearly, however, the addition of a lengthy chapter on the "triumphant reigne" of Henry VIII, which added half as much again to the work, went far beyond the original purpose and invites explanation by its contradiction of the epistle.

But who was Edward Hall and why was his work published posthumously? Born around 1498, Hall had attended Eton College. John Stow (in his Preface to *Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles*, 1570) describes how the author

... after certaine yeares spent in the Kings Colledge of Cambridge, was admitted felow of Grayes Inne at London, where he profited so much in the lawes of the Realme, that he was chose under-sheriffe of ye Citie. *At that time (being stired up by men of Authorities) he writ with a lustye and flourishing stile the union of the houses of Lancaster and Yorke.*

Stow did not mention that Hall was also a Member of Parliament and common serjeant of London in 1533. Hall clearly had sufficient Latin to read Polydore Vergil's 1534 edition of *Anglica Historia*, upon which the earlier part of the *Chronicle* relied, but, as he approached his own times, it is said that he added his own accounts, particularly of London scenes. Hall was compiling his chronicle after 1543, since he reported verbatim Grafton's *History of Richard III*, which was published that year in his continuation of John Hardyng's *Chronicle*. In his will, Hall asked that his chronicle be published, but we do not know how much Hall actually wrote, to what extent the published work was Hall's own efforts or how far he might have collaborated.

To add to the doubt that Hall was responsible for all of the *Chronicle*, there is no contemporary document suggesting that Hall had particular access to archive material or other histories. He wrote no other history and was not known as a pamphleteer. Furthermore, it is unclear why the author should have wanted to extend his original intention of chronicling the *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre*

Families of Lancastre and Yorke beyond its logical conclusion at the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in January 1486. The Union of the two Houses was certainly achieved by the time of Henry VIII's accession in 1509, rendering superfluous any account of the reign of Henry VIII.

In fact, the word "FINIS" ends the account of the Reign of Henry VII and appears to signal the end of the book as a whole. That word does not conclude any other chapter and is not used at the end of the section on Henry VIII. In other words, it seems clear that the entire *Chronicle* was planned to finish in 1509, and that the additional account of "the triumphant reigne of king Henry viij" (which increased the work substantially) was not part of the original plan.

Hall's work was published by Richard Grafton (c. 1511-1573), like John Day, a highly skilled printer of strong Protestant persuasion who had established himself in the 1540s. He was appointed personal printer to Prince Edward and in due course became the King's Printer. Grafton claims to have been merely the printer of Hall's work (not the editor as we might conceive it), admitting only to writing up Hall's notes on events post-1533. In his preface to the reader, Grafton explains:

I professe that I haue as nere as in me lay, nether altered nor added any thyng of my selfe in the whole woorke, otherwise the~ [than] the aucthor writ thesame. But this is to be noted, that the Aucthor therof, . . . writt this historie no farther then to the foure and twentie yere of kyng Henry the eight [1533]: the rest he left noted in diuers and many pamphletes and papers, whych so digently & truly as I coulde, I gathered thesame together, & haue in suchewise compiled them, as may after thesaied yeres, apere in this woorke.

Grafton reinforces the point when he adds: "but vtterly without any addicion of myne."

That Grafton was the actual author, at least of the History of Henry VIII, is not an original idea; it was argued by Robert Smith in 1918, who noted a marked change in style from that part of the *Chronicle* which dealt with events up until 1509 (being dense with Latinate terms, obscure legal expressions, balanced words, phrases and speeches). According to Smith, Hall "introduces every reign with a grand flourish of imposing sentences, and then proceeds copying the texts of his sources but frequently interrupting it with sententious moralising." In contrast, a more restrained and prosaic style is used to describe events during Henry VIII's reign. Unlike the earlier part, the account of Henry VIII is full of interest in the pageants of the court as well as in the life and gossip of the people of London. According to Smith, this was due to a change in authorship from Hall to Grafton.²⁴

It is my contention that Richard Grafton, as printer to Edward VI, was keen to publish a version of Henry VIII's reign with a favorable inclination towards the boy king and to the Protestant Reformation; such an account would be to the detriment of the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth. Grafton would have been aware of the dangers of associating with one party. He had been involved with the printing

and selling of the Matthew Bible in 1537 and of the Great Bible in 1540. Soon after Thomas Cromwell fell from favor, Grafton printed a famous sermon by Thomas Wimbleton from about 1387 as a means of invoking an imaginary Protestant past and maintaining the Protestant reformation.²⁵ He was arrested and spent six weeks in prison for publishing excessively Protestant material (probably Wimbleton's sermon). He was arrested again, this time for breaking the 1539 Act of Six Articles, which reaffirmed some important Catholic doctrines such as transubstantiation. Upon his release, he started publishing histories: Fabyan's *Chronicle* (1542) and John Harding's *Chronicle* (1543), to which he openly appended his own prose "continuacion of the storie in prose to this our tyme, now first imprinted, gathered out of diuerse and sondery autours yt haue write[n] of the affaires of Englander." He was arrested again in 1543 with other evangelical protestants "for printing off such bokes as wer thought to be unlawfull."²⁶ He was released and appointed printer to Prince Edward in the mid-1540s. In 1547 he was granted sole right to printing the statutes and acts of Parliament. He printed the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549 and enjoyed a very successful time as a printer to King Edward VI.

Grafton therefore could appreciate better than most the dangers inherent in writing any account of Henry VIII's reign, since it would have to interpret the question of his marriages and his children's legitimacy, and would offend more people than it would impress. There were many political and religious works at the time where the authors are clearly worried for their safety. Lambeth Palace contains a similar work of Protestant persuasion; Richard Tracy's *Supplicacion to our moste soveraigne lorde Kynge Henry the eyght* (Antwerp, 1544) begs for a more thorough reformation of the Church than Henry VIII would allow. About this work the librarian at Lambeth Palace states that "the author wisely published the work anonymously, and abroad."²⁷ Similarly threatened, Grafton would find it much safer to conceal his role by appending his account of Henry VIII's reign to Hall's *Chronicle* and passing off the Protestant inclinations to an author who had recently died.

Even a pseudonym, however, did not protect Grafton from retribution. When Mary came to the throne, Hall's work was publicly burned. In 1555, Mary issued a proclamation against heresy, prohibiting "seditious and Heretical Books," including the works of Hugh Latimer, John Bale, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, Miles Coverdale and "the book commonly called *Hall's Chronicle*."²⁸ The wording clearly indicates confusion as to the actual author. Grafton was imprisoned for a short time for printing Edward VI's proclamation naming Lady Jane Grey as Edward's successor; he may have avoided execution only because he had also printed the proclamation announcing the accession of Mary (or possibly because Mary was short of high quality printers; see note 12). And yet, if Grafton had been named as the author of Hall's *Chronicle* and not just the printer, he would almost certainly have been executed along with Latimer, Cranmer and about 290 other Protestant martyrs.

While in prison, Grafton began to prepare *An abridgement of the chronicles of England, gathered by Richard Grafton, citizen of London. Anno Do. 1563. Perused and allowed, according to an order taken* (dedicated to Leicester in 1563) which left out many rhetorical speeches and obscure words that had been characteristic of Hall's

style. In 1568 Grafton published *A chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of Englande and kinges of the same deduced from the Creation of the vvorlde, vnto the first habitation of thys islande: and so by contynuanee vnto the first yere of the reigne of our most deere and souereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth: collected out of sundry aucthors, whose names are expressed in the next page of this leafe*, dedicated to William Cecil.²⁹ By this time, Grafton was able to publish these potentially controversial works under his own name, presumably because he had the open support of both Leicester and Cecil, the two most powerful men in England. As he had fallen on hard times, Grafton was doubtless glad of the publicity to help him survive his poverty. In the 1560s John Stow began to publish his own chronicles and accused Grafton of what we would call plagiarism. Grafton answers Stow's complaint in the preface to the 1570 and 1572 editions, saying that "the greatest parte of the same [Hall's *Chronicle*] was myne owne chronicle and written with myne owne hand." In a manuscript note elsewhere, it is said of Grafton that he "composed the greatest parte of Halles chronicle, contenting himself with the paynes, yealding unto Hall the prayse." *Catalogue of Harleian Mss.* 1812, I, 212, no 367(9).

It is almost certain that Grafton had obtained the permission of the Lord Protector Somerset to publish Hall's *Chronicle* in 1548 and again in 1550. Somerset relied on a favorable interpretation of Henry VIII's marriages for his own position. He also wished to pursue a more Puritan reformation of the church than had been achieved under Henry. Somerset's personal secretary at this time was a young lawyer named William Cecil. It is highly likely that Cecil had considerable input into the content of Hall's *Chronicle*, especially the section dealing with Henry VIII's marriages and children.

Apart from managing Somerset's day-to-day business, Cecil was involved in publishing material which supported Somerset's Protectorate and the Protestant reformation. In 1549 the Book of Common Prayer was published, which many conservative nobles resented. Cecil's role in controlling the publishing industry was confirmed in August 1549, shortly after the first appearance of Hall's *Chronicle*, when he was named as one of the censors of all English books.³⁰ At this time appeared the pseudonymous publication of *Lamentations of a Sinner*, apparently by Henry VIII's widow, Catherine Parr (1547).³¹ This work, which was reissued in 1548 and 1563, advocated an "evangelical programme" [of ecclesiastical reform], which had cost several people their lives as late as 1546. By writing the introduction and arranging the printing, D. M. Loades infers that Cecil announced that he "was of the same persuasion."³²

Cecil's rather pompous preface begins thus:

Wiliam Cicill hauing taken muche profit by y^e reading of this treatyse folowing, wisheth vnto euery christian by y^e reading therof like profit with increase from god.

Moste gentle & Christian reader, yf matiers shoulde be rather confirmed by their reporters, than the reportes, warraunted by the maters, I might iustely bewayle our tyme wherin euil deades be well woorded, and good actes euill cleped.

Throughout his time in government, Cecil continued to license publications of key works. He helped draft the Royal Injunctions of 1559, which made comprehensive provision for licensing by the queen herself, six members of the Privy Council, the two archbishops and the local bishop (a responsibility that was eventually transferred to the two archbishops and the Bishop of London in 1586). Cecil (or his office) approved the publication of Grafton's *Abridgement*, which was "perused and allowed, according to an order taken" and of Grafton's *Chronicle at large* (dedicated to Cecil, 1568). Cecil also worked as a censor to prohibit certain books: in 1573, Elizabeth issued a proclamation for the "Destruction of Seditious Books," which Patterson believes was aimed primarily not at works criticizing Elizabeth herself but at those attacking Cecil. *A Treatise of Treason* (1572)³³ did not name Cecil or the Lord Keeper, but was clearly aimed at them. The pamphlet had been written in French by Belleforest and translated into English, perhaps by Henry Howard.³⁴ Cecil was attacked for the treatment of the Duke of Norfolk, who had been executed the previous year, and it was claimed that Cecil was the architect of Elizabeth's religious policy and therefore guilty of torture and treason. Cecil himself could also publish anonymously. In 1569 he seems to have authorized John Day to publish *A Discourse touching the Pretended Match between the Duke of Norfolk and the Queen of Scots*. This work (probably composed by Thomas Norton and printed anonymously, without the name or location of the printer) clearly served Cecil's own purpose in deflecting public opinion against the Duke of Norfolk.³⁵

In 1583, Cecil issued his own anonymous tract, *The Execution of Justice*.³⁶ This work, which also appeared in Latin and in Dutch, attempted to defend the state against charges of torture and wrongful application of the law of treason against certain publishers. Furthermore, Cecil can be seen as a commissioner of suitable works. His involvement with the Bishops' Bible (1568) against the Geneva Bible has been noted. Following the deaths of Richard Grafton and Reynier Wolfe in 1573, Cecil (perhaps together with Leicester and Cobham) seems to have commissioned a longer work on the history of England than had hitherto appeared, to which would be added histories of Ireland and Scotland. This work would uphold the Tudor regime and promote the Protestant Reformation. In this, Cecil was the unseen mover of a major publication which generally supported the government, but sometimes promoted even his own minority view against the rest of the Privy Council.

Holinshed's Chronicles

In 1577 Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* was published, containing a far larger history of England (from the earliest times until 1572), along with a history of Ireland (to 1547) and a history of Scotland (to 1571) than had appeared in any previous historical publication.³⁷ Holinshed's *Chronicles* was a substantial publishing enterprise of 2,835 small folio pages as well as preliminaries and indices. While the work has been described as polyvocal and inclusive, it is very supportive of the status quo in England, both politically and religiously. However,

it was also very controversial in its treatment of Scotland, then a foreign country, whose queen, Mary Stuart, had been held in English “protective custody” for almost a decade, and who was widely believed to be responsible for various plots against Elizabeth’s life. Although the title page gave the credit for the work to Raphael Holinshed, the *Chronicles* seems to have been a joint production by about eight authors. The editors of *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed’s Chronicles* believe that Holinshed was overall editor of, and the major contributor to, the first edition, but died before the revisions for the second edition were made.³⁸

The work is dedicated to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, with the usual apologies of unworthiness. In his dedicatory epistle, Holinshed explains:

Where as therefore, that worthie Citizen *Reginald Wolfe* late Printer to the Queenes Maiestie, a man well knowen and beholden to your Honour, meant in his life time to publish an vniuersall Cosmographie of the whole worlde, and therewith also certaine perticular Histories of euery knowen nation, . . . , it pleased God to call him to his mercie, after .xxv. yeares trauell spent therein,
I therefore moste humbly beseeche your Honour to accept these Chronicles of Englande vnder your protection.

In this preface Holinshed claims to have worked for Reyner (or Reginald) Wolfe, the Queen’s printer, who had died in 1573 without completing his universal history. A year later, Wolfe’s widow died and in her will she assigned to Holinshed the “benefit profit and commoditie” promised by her husband “concerning the translating and prynting of a certaine Crownacle.” Few people notice that Wolfe’s planned *Universal Cosmographie* was changed into a far different set of *Chronicles* of England, Ireland and Scotland.

Annabel Patterson³⁹ has suggested that *Chronicles* was “clearly not presented as a state history,” citing the opening address to Cecil in the 1577 edition:

Confidering with my selfe, right Honorable and my singlar good Lorde, how ready (no doubt) many wil be to accuse me of vayne presumptiō, for enterprising to deale in this so weighty a worke, and so farre about my reache to accomplish: I haue thought good to aduertise your Honour, by what occasion I was first induced to vndertake the same, although the cause that moued mee thereto, hath (in parte) ere this, bene signified vnto your good Lordshippe.

Holinshed asserts, apparently in an address to Cecil but really for the wider audience, that he is now bringing this work to publication out of deference to his friend. Patterson also claims that Holinshed’s *Chronicles* was a private enterprise, involving the personal finance of John Harrison, Lucas Harrison and George Bishop.

I argue that not only was Holinshed’s *Chronicles* politically motivated and

approved, but also that Raphael Holinshed was a front man, his name being in effect a pseudonym, intended to deflect criticism and reaction away from the actual authors and from Cecil, who had promoted it. Firstly, its authors repeatedly draw attention to the difficulties inherent in being associated with such a publication; Stanihurst, for example, calls it a “dangerous” task, especially when the parties are now living.⁴⁰ It would therefore be most helpful to their purpose to put someone else’s name to the whole book.

A second reason for believing that Holinshed’s *Chronicles* was commissioned derives from the astonishing range of sources consulted, amounting to about 600. By contrast, Grafton had listed only about 70 authorities for his *Chronicle at Large*. At the beginning, Holinshed’s *Chronicle* lists about 185 sources used by the authors (the same list appears at the beginning of both editions). Another 200 sources are named within the text and a further 200 anonymous sources are mentioned, sometimes in the margin. Most of these sources are in Latin or French; many were in manuscript. The question immediately arises as to where the authors could have gained access to so many texts. Since the work is dedicated to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the authors are likely to have used Cecil’s extensive personal collection of books and manuscripts as sources. Since Leicester and Cobham are co-dedicatees, their libraries may also have been used. If so, these political figures would have insisted on some kind of editorial control.

A third reason for believing that the *Chronicles* must have been sanctioned was that Cecil was the minister ultimately responsible for all publications in the kingdom. The work was not printed by a clandestine press or a second-rate printer, but by Henry Bynneman, who held the royal prerogative to print “all Dictionaries in all tongues, all Chronicles and histories whatsoever.”⁴¹ Bynneman could not have printed this work without some kind of approval. Nevertheless, Holinshed’s *Chronicles* seems to have appeared without the permission of the Privy Council, who wrote to the Bishop of London, John Ayler, in December 1577 noting that a History of Ireland by one Stanihurst had been published with false records. The bishop was to summon the printer, question him and withhold further copies. Thirdly, the earl of Kildare was ordered to send Stanihurst to the Privy Council. Finally, *Chronicles* was not registered until July 1578, after printing had been completed (the imprint states 1577).

In short, it seems most likely that Cecil commissioned, assisted and financed the project, perhaps without the full knowledge of the Privy Council. While the preface states that the publication had “beene signified to your good Lordship,” Cecil was content to maintain a notional distance from it.

Who Was Holinshed?

Who was this writer who took over Wolfe’s great enterprise and changed it from a universal cosmography into an insular history? The editors of the Oxford Handbook suggest that he “probably originated in Cheshire, where the surname proliferated, and may have been the son of Ralph Holinshed of Copshurst, a hamlet

of Sutton Downes, north-east of Macclesfield.”⁴¹ Such uncertainty shows that there is scant independent documentary reference to Holinshed.

There is little corroboration that he ever worked with Reyner Wolfe, apart from the dedicatory epistle. Shortly after the publication of this great work, with a greater, more comprehensive work to follow, Holinshed was acting as steward on a small estate to a little-known landowner, Thomas Burdet of Bramcote in Warwickshire, as stated in Holinshed’s will of April 1582. Nevertheless, the second, expanded edition (1587) continued to bear Holinshed’s name, thus showing how a name could be very useful posthumously.⁴² Apart from the *Chronicles*, however, Holinshed was unknown to his contemporaries as a writer.

After relating the few “facts” inferred from the *Chronicles*, especially from the dedication, the editors of the Holinshed Project give very detailed biographies of the other writers, all of whom are known independently as writers. Chief among them were William Harrison,⁴³ who later became a radical Protestant, and two writers who later became militant Catholics, Richard Stanihurst and Edmund Campion.⁴⁴ It is now generally agreed that the second edition, which came out in 1587, was edited and expanded mainly by Abraham Fleming with help from John Stow, William Patten and Francis Thynne.⁴⁵ All of these contributors have extensive records documenting their writing activities and their interest in antiquity. Holinshed stands out as someone who left no record of any interest in literary or historical matters.

I contend that Raphael Holinshed had little or nothing to do with the project and was chosen by Cecil to “front” the publication precisely because he was unknown.⁴⁶ In promoting a Protestant view of history, Cecil would ensure that his own view of orthodoxy would be disseminated. By choosing an otherwise unknown person as the “author,” Cecil could always deny his own interest in the project. Such a front man would guarantee the safety of the actual authors from future retribution and avoid personal animosities such as had been publicly aired between Grafton and Stow.⁴⁷

Patterson has shown that Cecil’s own interest was served throughout the later stages of the *Chronicles*, especially in the account of Parliamentary proceedings between 1566 and 1571. Holinshed makes no mention in his record of the 1566 Parliament of Wentworth which intertwined “the problems of the succession with the grant of the subsidy.”⁴⁸ The report of the 1571 session of Parliament is limited to one sentence, omitting reference to Richard Bell’s speech (advocating the withholding of a subsidy until certain licenses were withdrawn) or William Stickland’s demand for a reformed prayer book, for which Stickland appeared before the Privy Council and was temporarily forbidden from attending the House of Commons. For 1572, Holinshed’s account merely mentions the creations of certain baronies and legislation against vagabonds; there is no mention of the anonymous *Admonitions to Parliament*, which caused a great stir.

As we have seen, Cecil actually had a record of assisting in pseudonymous or clandestine publishing. He had promoted *Lamentations of a Sinner* in 1547 and the many anti-Catholic tracts from the press of “Michael Wood” during the Marian period. Earlier, it has been argued that Cecil was instrumental in the preparation

and publication of Hall's *Chronicle*. Like many others during the turbulent years of Elizabeth's reign, Cecil himself was not above writing pamphlets and publishing them anonymously. He issued the anonymous *Execution of Justice in England* (1583), which appeared verbatim in the second edition of the *Chronicles*, and which might be taken, as Patterson suggests, as "proof of the political, and religious loyalty of the chroniclers."⁴⁹ While *Chronicles* allows some opposing views to controversial issues, it sets the limit for debate. William Allen responded to *The Execution of Justice* with *A True, Sincere and Modest Defense of English Catholics* (Rouen, 1584, STC 373), but Allen's response was not included in the second edition.

It is quite possible, even likely, that the 1577 *Chronicles* was commissioned secretly by Cecil with the support of Leicester and Lord Cobham (joint dedicatees) without the knowledge or permission of the rest of the Privy Council. Clearly, it was most helpful to name an insignificant person as the author. So who really prepared the first edition? Certainly, *Chronicles* was not written by Cecil himself, as he would have been too busy with affairs of state. On present evidence, we don't know. Perhaps John Stow, whose *Summarie of Englyshe chronicles* (first published in 1565, but later reprinted) seems to have anticipated the range of material in Holinshed without going into the same degree of detail. An argument against Stow's involvement in the project is his complaint that his own great work, the *Annales*, was "prevented by Printing and reprinting without warrant, or well liking) of Raigne Wolfe's collection." Stow owned many manuscripts (he had bought Wolfe's collection in 1573) and in the *Annales* claims to have lent divers manuscripts to Holinshed.⁵⁰ Another good candidate would be William Harrison, author of the *Description of England*.

Shakespearean Plays

The publication of the Shakespeare plays was originally anonymous and, according to Oxfordians, after 1598 pseudonymous. The plays present interesting possibilities; some are clearly "outsider" publications critical of the government, others are "insider" publications, supportive of the government. Either way, it would be advantageous to conceal the identity of the author.⁵¹

The earliest Shakespeare play to be published was probably *Titus Andronicus*, which appeared anonymously in 1594. *Titus* presents a picture of the past greatness of Rome with its current decadence – an obvious reference to Spain. The play in particular seems to depict the horrors of the Sack of Antwerp, known as the Spanish Fury, committed by Spanish Catholics against the Dutch Protestants, which began on 4 November 1576. Saturninus is clearly to be identified with Philip II of Spain and Tamora as Mary Stuart. Lavinia represents both Queen Elizabeth and the city of Antwerp, ravished "within its walls and in its low-lying situation" by the Spanish Fury. The play seems intended to enlist sympathy for the Dutch even if it antagonized Philip II. Clearly, if Oxford and Cecil were known in diplomatic circles to be behind this play, it would reduce impact on the Queen and court who would have seen it. It might even prove very awkward for Cecil to maintain his position as Elizabeth's

counselor.

A more important play in this regard was *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, first published in 1600. While it is usually assigned to a year in the mid 1590s, it seems to have openly satirized Queen Elizabeth as Titania for dallying with a fool, Bottom, representing the Duc d'Alençon. Although not published until 1600, this work clearly militates against Elizabeth's proposed marriage with Alençon in 1579-80. In 1579, John Stubbs had expressed similar sentiments in a work called *Gaping Gulf*. For this, both he and his printer had been condemned to lose their right hands, yet the stated author of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was never brought to book.

Similarly, in *Hamlet*, published in 1603 but likely to have been written much earlier, the resonance with the trial and execution of Mary Queen of Scots was unmistakable. While a printer named William Carter had been hanged, drawn and quartered for printing *A Treatise of Schism* in 1583, the author of a work openly critical of the Queen's treatment of Mary went unpunished. Furthermore, the satire of Cecil (portrayed as Polonius) and his son (portrayed as Laertes) was apparent, especially as the first quarto referred to the King's counselor as Corambis, which was changed in the second quarto to Polonius. Cecil's motto was COR UNUM VIA UNA, "one heart, one way." Other playwrights were punished for presenting matter which was hostile to the government: for the play *Isle of Dogs*, Ben Jonson was imprisoned in 1597. Yet the author of *Hamlet* remained unscathed. Pseudonymous writing was clearly essential to avoid the wrath of the Queen and of her main minister (from 1598), Sir Robert Cecil.

Most seriously, however, there was the anonymous publication of *Richard II* in 1597. Although the deposition scene was omitted from the published text, the play dealt with the deposition of a king and the accession of a usurper, neither of which was palatable to an aging and heirless Queen. It was an historical fact that Richard II had been deposed, but like Hall's *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke* (published fifty years earlier, apparently with Cecil's support), it showed that the consequences of the usurpation of the throne by Henry IV were disastrous for the country. When the second edition of the play came out the following year, it was attributed to William Shake-speare, a member of the theater group. The play was performed on the night before the Essex rebellion in 1601; the Privy Council interviewed many people regarding that performance, but unaccountably failed to question the author. The only likely explanation is that "William Shake-speare" was a pseudonym and that the play *Richard II* had received a covert imprimatur from the man ultimately responsible for licensing printed works, William Cecil.

Conclusion

There are many reasons why a politically motivated dramatist (as we believe Oxford to have been) would avoid having plays attributed to him in print. Many Bible translators were executed, resulting in the move towards anonymous publication

during the Tudor period. Many historians had seen fit to hide their identities and pass off their reworkings of history as belonging to someone who had just died or to an unknown author. Similarly, it is possible that Oxford was sensible enough to withhold his name from the publication of these plays, not only to protect himself against possible recriminations but also to increase the impact of the work on the intended audience.

Endnotes

- ¹ A shorter version of this paper was read at the De Vere Society meeting at Oxford University in April 2011 and at the Joint SOS / SF Conference in Washington D.C. in October 2011. I would like to thank Ms. Aliyah Norrish for careful reading of the paper to avoid many errors and others who made helpful suggestions, including Eddi Jolly, Roger Stritmatter and Robert Detobel.
- ² A recent review of anonymity in the period, concentrating on literature and pamphlets, may be found in *Anonymity in Early modern England; What's in a Name?* Eds. Janet Wright Starnes and Barbara Howard Traister (2011).
- ³ See *The Martin Marprelate tracts: a modernized and annotated edition* by Joseph Laurence Black (2008).
- ⁴ The account of the Bible translations follows F. F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English* (1978; 2002); Gerald Hammond, *The Making of the English Bible* (1982); David Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (2003); See also William Paul, *English Language Bible Translators* (2009).
- ⁵ Quoted widely, e.g., by Bruce, 96.
- ⁶ John Bois's notes appear in Manuscript C. C. C. 312 of the Fulman Collection, Corpus Christi College Library, Oxford. See *Translating for King James* by Ward Allen (1969).
- ⁷ The biographical preface to the 1632 edition of Miles Smith's published sermons (STC 22808) states:

He began with the first, and was the last man of the translators in the work: for after the task of translation was finished by the whole number set apart for that business, being some few above forty, it was revised by a dozen selected ones of them, and at length referred to the final examination of the learned Bishop of Winchester [Thomas Bilson] and Doctor Smith, who happily concluded that worthy labour. Which being so ended he [Smith] was commanded to write a Preface, and so he did in the name of all the translators, being the same that now is extant in our church Bible, the original whereof I have seen under his own hand.

- ⁸ Coverdale lived abroad at least during the following periods: 1528-1535, 1540-1547 and 1553-1559.

- ⁹ For further details on John Roger's edition of the Bible and subsequent execution, see F.F. Bruce (64-6) and Daniel (191-7).
- ¹⁰ Foxe's martyrologies contain descriptions of the executions of Cromwell, Rogers and Cranmer. For details of Thomas Cromwell, Thomas Cranmer and the Great Bible, see Bruce (69-72; 84) and Caniell (199-204).
- ¹¹ Bruce, 93.
- ¹² The engraving of Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester precedes the Book of Joshua, while the engraving of William Cecil was placed at the beginning of the Psalter. The engravings were included in the second edition but omitted from subsequent editions.
- ¹³ The following account derives from Denys Hay's *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (1952).
- ¹⁴ The first edition of Vergil's *Historia Anglica* was published in Basel, probably because English printers were unequal to the task. The Great Bible was published in Paris for the same reason.
- ¹⁵ Editions of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* appeared in 1563 (STC 11222), 1570 (an expanded edition, STC 11223), 1576 (a reissue, STC 11224) and extensively revised 1583 (STC 11225).
- ¹⁶ See J. N. King, *Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs' and Early modern Print Culture* (2002, 21-69).
- ¹⁷ For John Day's pamphlets issued under the imprint of Michael Wood, see Elizabeth Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage* (2008, 29-37).
- ¹⁸ The number of printers in London was reduced by half, from eighty to forty-one, according to Patricia Took, "Government and the Printing Trade," cited by Evenden, *Patents* (2008, 40).
- ¹⁹ National Archives, State Papers 11/9, no. 71, quoted by Evenden, *Patents* (2008, 32).
- ²⁰ William Cecil's life is well documented, e.g., Conyers Read, *Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (1955) and *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (1960), or more succinctly by David Loades, *The Cecils* (2009).
- ²¹ The suggestion that there was an earlier 1542 edition, published by Berthelet, has now been discredited. G. Pollard's "The Bibliography of Hall's Chronicle," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 10: 28 (1932), 12-17. Pollard mentions the fact that Hall enjoined Grafton in his will to print his chronicle and the statement by Stow that Hall's account of Sir John Oldcastle was not in print by 1544.
- ²² Stuart Gillespie, *Shakespeare's Books* (2002: 223).
- ²³ See Felicity Heal, "Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past," in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68: 1-2 (March 2005), 109-32.
- ²⁴ Grafton's authorship of the Henry VIII section of Hall's *Chronicle* was suggested by George Krapp in "Henry VIII in Hall's *Chronicle*," *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 31: 3 (Mar. 1916), 135-38, and argued by Robert Smith in "The Date and Authorship of Hall's *Chronicle*," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 17:2 (Apr. 1918), 252-66.

- ²⁵ Grafton's *A sermon no lesse fruteful then famous made in the yeare of our Lorde God M.CCC.lxxxvij in these oure latter dayes moost necessary to be knowen nether addyng to, neyther demynshynge fro, saue tholde and rude Englysh ther of mended here and there*. 1540 (STC 25823). For the purpose behind this publication, see Alexandra Walsham, "Inventing the Lollard Past," in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58 (2007), 628-55.
- ²⁶ J. A. Kingdon, *Richard Grafton: mercer and printer* (1901), 91.
- ²⁷ Cited in the *Lambeth Palace Library Research Guide King Henry VIII (1491-1547)*, 14.
- ²⁸ Hampton Court, 13 June 1555, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary; cited by Patterson (1994, 235) and by J. A. Young, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (1976, 199).
- ²⁹ Grafton had come into conflict with John Stow. At the request of Archbishop Parker (who died in 1575), Stow compiled a "farre larger volume," a history of Britain, but "circumstances were unfavourable to its publication and the manuscript was lost." Stow's *Chronicles of England* (STC 23333) did not appear until 1580 and his most famous work, *Survey of London*, was not published until 1598.
- ³⁰ D. M. Loades, "The Press under the Early Tudors: A Study in Censorship and Sedition," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4 (1964-5) 29-50.
- ³¹ The full title is: *The lamentacion of a synner, made by ye most vertuous Ladie, Quene Caterin, bewayling the ignoraunce of her blind life: set furth and put in print at the instaunt desire of the righte gracious ladie Caterin duchesse of Suffolke, [and] the earnest requeste of the right honourable Lord, William Parre, Marquesse of North Hampton*.
- ³² Loades, *The Cecils* (2009, 31).
- ³³ Patterson, 255, cites *Tudor Royal Proclamations* 2,376-79.
- ³⁴ Cecil's reaction has been recorded by Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (190, 95-96). The possible involvement of Henry Howard, younger brother to Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, was suggested by B. M. Ward in *The seventeenth Earl of Oxford* (1928, 131).
- ³⁵ Cecil's involvement is inferred as the tract clearly supports the Privy Council's agenda. See Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (2005, 153) who refers to the work as "little more than government propaganda."
- ³⁶ The full title of the forty-page pamphlet is: *The execution of iustice in England for maintenaunce of publique and Christian peace, against certeine stirrers of sedition, and adherents to the traytors and enemies of the realme, without any persecution of them for questions of religion, as is falsely reported and published by the fautors and fosterers of their treasons*.
- ³⁷ For most of this section, I have used as invaluable guides both Annabel Patterson's *Reading Holinshed's Chronicle* (1994) and *The Holinshed Project*, ed. Felicity Heal et al, online at www.cems.ox.ac.uk/holinshed. The *Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicle* (2012) edited by Palina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and

Felicity Heal, was published after this article went to press and confirms that Holinshed's known contribution was small compared to those made by other writers. They do not seem to have considered the possibility, as argued here, that Holinshed was chosen as a front man to help protect the actual writers and the main backers.

³⁸ The opening chapter of *The Oxford Handbook* outlines the involvement of various writers in both editions. The full title of the second edition was: *The first and second volume of Chronicles, comprising 1 the description and historie of England, 2 The description and historie of Ireland, 3 The description and historie of Scotland: first collected and published by Raphaell Holinshead, William Harrison and others: now newlie augmented and continued (with manifold matters of singular note and worthie memorie) to the yeare 1586 by Iohn Hooker alias Vowell gent. And others. With conuient tables at the end of these volumes.*

³⁹ Patterson, 10-15.

⁴⁰ "For (as Terence saith) faire words and soothing speches bréed fréendship, but plaine telling of truth makes enimies. Wherefore it is a dangerous thing to speake euill against him, though the occasi | on be neuer so iust, as who can foorthwith auenge the same. And it is a matter more dangerous, and he aduentureth himselfe verie far, which will contend in manie words against him, who in one or few words can wreake the same. It were suerlie a verie happie thing, and that which I confesse passeth my reach, if a man intreating of princes causes might tell the truth in euerie thing, and yet not offend them in anie thing." Richard Stanihurst in his introduction to the *Description of Ireland* (Holinshed, 1587, III 29).

⁴¹ *Oxford Handbook*, 701.

⁴² Holinshed's will was proven on 24 April 1582. For the little that is known about Holinshed, see Henry Summerson, "Raphael Holinshed: new light on a shadowy life," *Oxford Handbook*, 701-6.

⁴³ According to the editors of the Holinshed Project, William Harrison (1535-1593) was a Londoner who studied at Oxford and developed strong Puritan ideas. Harrison contributed a long and interesting "Description of Britain" in three books which prefaced the historical narrative.

⁴⁴ According to the editors of the Holinshed Project, the scholar and future Jesuit martyr Edmund Campion (1540-1581) had studied at Oxford and wrote a history of Ireland with the help of Richard Stanihurst (1547-1618). Stanihurst later revised the History of Ireland and added a "Description of Ireland." Stanihurst later became a militant Catholic refugee.

⁴⁵ According to Patterson, Francis Thynne had spent over two years in prison for debt and had appealed to Cecil for assistance. For the 1587 edition, he prepared four massive catalogues, listing the Archbishops of Canterbury, the earls of Leicester, the House of Cobham and the Lord wardens of the Cinque Ports. All of these lists were deleted at the insistence of the Privy Council.

⁴⁶ Another historical reference to Raphael Holinshed was claimed by Alan Nelson in *Monstrous Adversary*. In 1567, a man named Rudolph Holinshed served

on a jury of seventeen men who heard the case of the death of Thomas Brinknell, an under-cook at Cecil House. The jury decided that Brinknell had committed suicide. According to Oxford's biographer, Alan Nelson, Cecil had an uneasy conscience for influencing the jury to find that the unfortunate cook committed suicide by deliberately running onto the point of the sword. Nelson (*Monstrous Adversary*, 2003, 46-47), quotes from a translation of the coroner's report (originally in Latin) but seems to have misread Rudolph for Raphael. The closeness of the Christian names and the unusual surname might indicate that a Holinshed family was attached to Cecil's household.

⁴⁷ In 1565 Grafton published *A Manuell of Ye Chronicles of England from ye creacion of ye World tyll anno 1565* and claimed he had been "abused by one who counterfeited my volume, and hath made my travail to pass under his name." Grafton was referring to Stow's *Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles* which had appeared in 1565 (STC 23319) under license of the Stationers and of the Archbishop. The Stationers' Company summoned both Stow and Grafton to hear their case but apparently Grafton refused to attend.

⁴⁸ Patterson (124) derives knowledge of the Parliaments from Jennifer Loach, *Parliament under the Tudors* (1991).

⁴⁹ Patterson, 130.

⁵⁰ According to the *ODNB*, Stow was a prolific manuscript collector whose interests included chronicles, charters, ecclesiastical and municipal records, wills, literary works, and learned treatises. It is likely that Stow was the most knowledgeable record collector of the sixteenth century. Stow claimed in the *Annales* to have contributed much to the second edition of Holinshed, such that it was previously thought that he had been the editor of the second edition. However, it seems to be well established that Fleming edited the second edition.

⁵¹ Oxfordians, asserting that the plays of Shakespeare were really written by Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, argue that some of the plays, mainly the histories, were composed at the instigation of Oxford's father-in-law, William Cecil, Lord Burghley. According to this view, Oxford was writing history plays, drawing on Hall and Holinshed, during the 1580s at exactly the same time as the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* was being prepared.