"A WHOLE AND CONTINUAT HISTORIE": GENERAL HISTORIES IN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO RICHARD KNOLLES'S *THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE TURKS* AND HIS PATRON PETER MANWOOD

A Ph.D. Dissertation

by
SEDA ERKOÇ

Department of History
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara
February 2016

To Harun

“A WHOLE AND CONTINUAT HISTORIE”: GENERAL HISTORIES IN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO RICHARD KNOLLES’S *THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE TURKS* AND HIS PATRON PETER MANWOOD

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

SEDA ERKOÇ

In Partial Fullfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

February 2016

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Ayşe Çelikkol
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. David Thornton
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Özlem Çaykent
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Evrim Türkçelik
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Halime Demirkan
Director

ABSTRACT

"A WHOLE AND CONTINUAT HISTORIE":
GENERAL HISTORIES IN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO RICHARD KNOLLES'S *THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE TURKS* AND HIS PATRON PETER MANWOOD

Erkoç, Seda

Ph.D., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer

February 2016

This thesis presents an assessment of the famous work of Richard Knolles, *The General History of the Turks* (1603) [hereafter *GH*] as a production of the intellectual atmosphere of the age in which it was produced. Despite its importance as the first major history of the Ottomans written in English, present literature on Knolles's work does not evaluate it as a history book in its own right; it is analyzed either only partially or in connection with some other works gathered for very particular uses. It has often been seen, though without explanation, as somewhat ambiguous in its treatment of the Turks. Trying to attain a better understanding of Knolles's *GH*, the present study initially discusses the changes in the historiography of the sixteenth century and contextualizes the emergence of a genre of "general history" in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century within the wider spectrum of history writing in

early modern England and Europe. Some common features, detailed here for the first time, which would help to group general histories as a distinct and new genre, are identified through an evaluation of those that were printed in England in the course of the seventeenth century. This thesis argues that *GH* has to be evaluated in connection with those "general histories", and analyses the features of Knolles's work alongside those other general histories. This contextualization also indicates the importance of the role of the patron of this monumental work, his influence on the actual process of composition and his instrumental role in causing the work to be a general history. Assessing *GH* as a project that was realized through the shared efforts of the patron and the writer, and considering the intellectual background of the patron of the work, as well as the motives for his support, it suggests reasons for the ambiguity that Knolles's text has presented for modern historians, reasons that are grounded in the work's transformation into a general history. Besides, the detailed study here of the political orientation of the patron, Sir Peter Manwood, reveals some points, both political and intellectual, that aid a better understanding of his motivations in patronizing Knolles.

Keywords: Richard Knolles, Sir Peter Manwood, general history, seventeenth-century English historiography

ÖZET

"BÜTÜN VE KESİNTİSİZ BİR TARİH": RICHARD KNOLLES'UN *THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE TURKS* ESERİ VE HÂMİSİ PETER MANWOOD ÜZERİNDEN ONYEDİNCİ YÜZYIL İNGİLTERE'SİNDE GENEL TARİH METİNLERİ

Erkoç, Seda

Doktora, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Paul Latimer

Şubat 2016

Bu tez, Richard Knolles'un *The General History of the Turks* (1603) [buradan itibaren *GH*] başlıklı ünlü eserinin ortaya çıktığı dönemin entelektüel atmosferinin bir ürünü olarak analizini sunar. İngilizce yazılan ilk temel Osmanlı tarihi olması açısından önemine karşın, Knolles'un çalışması hakkındaki mevcut literatür, söz konusu eseri kendi başına bir tarih kitabı olarak değerlendirmez, ya kısmî olarak ele alır ya da belli bir maksatla başka eserlerle bağlantılı olarak inceler. Knolles'un *GH* eserini daha doğru değerlendirebilmek için, bu çalışma ilk olarak on altıncı yüzyıl tarihyazımındaki değişimleri tartışmakta ve "genel tarih" türünün ortaya çıkışını erken modern İngiltere'si tarihyazımınının geniş çeşitliliği çerçevesinde bir bağlama oturtur. İkinci olarak ise bu tez on yedinci yüzyıl boyunca İngiltere'de basılmış genel tarihleri inceleyerek bu grubu bağımsız ve yeni bir tür olarak sınıflandırmaya yarayacak belli ortak nitelikleri saptar. Knolles'un *GH* eserini on yedinci yüzyıl İngiltere'sindeki tarih yazımı

akımları çerçevesinde tartışan bu tez, *GH* kitabının yine aynı dönemlerde ortaya çıkmış "genel tarihler" ile bağlantılı olarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini savunur ve Knolles'un çalışmasının diğer genel tarihlerle ortak niteliklerini gösterir. Bu bağlamsallaştırma, söz konusu görkemli eserin hâmisinin rolü ile eserin bir metin olarak oluşturulma sürecine etkisine de işaret etmektedir. Çalışma, *GH* kitabını, hâmi ile yazarın ortak çabaları ile gerçekleştirilmiş bir proje olarak değerlendirerek ve hâminin entellektüel alt yapısı ile desteğinin dürtülerini göz önüne alarak, Knolles'un metninin günümüz tarihçilerine sunduğu muğlaklığa kimi sebepler önermektedir. Ayrıca, burada Sör Peter Manwood'un politik yönelimine dair yapılan detaylı tetkik, Knolles'a hâmilik yapması konusundaki motivasyonunun daha iyi anlaşılmasına yardımcı olarak kimi noktaları da açıklığa kavuşturmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Richard Knolles, Peter Manwood, genel tarih, on yedinci yüzyıl İngiliz tarih yazımı.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research, while an individual work, has come into existence with the support of several people. First and foremost I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Paul Latimer, with whom I had the chance to work since 2004. Without his guidance, encouragement and support, this thesis could not have been realized. His valuable suggestions, attentive warnings, and insightful opinions played an important role at every stage of this study. I would like to express my gratitude to Cadoc Leighton, to whom I had the chance to consult whenever I needed. He has always been kind enough to share his time generously.

I was truly honoured to have Ayşe Çelikkol among my dissertation committee members. I am grateful to her for her interest in my work. I should also thank to other committee members Evrim Türkçelik, David Thornton and Özlem Çaykent for their keen interest in my study and their valuable comments and corrections.

I would also like to thank Henry Woudhuysen and Gerald Maclean for their great help about archival material and sources. Through their help I managed to make the most of my three month-research visit to the libraries and archives in London. Professor Woudhuysen was also generous enough to share with me his notes on Sir Peter Manwood's collection, which added much to my study.

I extend my sincere thanks to all members of the Department of History, İ. D. Bilkent University, not only for their courses which have contributed a good deal to my training as a historian but also for their constant support. Oktay Özel deserves my deepest gratitude for he provided me with the comfort I needed at the hardest times of this study and did his best to encourage and cheer me up when I felt most desperate.

I have also received a great deal of help and support from some other institutions and individuals. I am deeply grateful to James M. Gibson, Rochester Bridge Trust archivist, for sharing Sir Roger Manwood's notes with me. I am also grateful to all administrative and academic staff of the Social Sciences University of Ankara for their constant support. I would also like to thank Ömer Demir, the former rector of the Social Sciences University of Ankara, specifically for his thoughtful advice and encouragements.

My thanks are also due to all my friends, graduate life would be unbearable without them. Thank you all for listening, offering me advice, and supporting me through this entire process.

Without the support of all members of my family, I would never finish this thesis and I would never find the courage to overcome all the difficulties during this work. This dissertation is heartily dedicated to Harun Yeni, whose constant support enabled me to materialize it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to attain a better understanding of the famous work of Richard Knolles, *The General History of the Turks* (1603) [*GH*], through contextualizing it within the history-writing trends of seventeenth-century England and through an evaluation of the process by which it was composed, focusing on the aims and motivations of both the author and the patron of the work, Sir Peter Manwood.[1] Present literature on *GH* has tended to evaluate it partially, within a group of works that are gathered for the particular use of that specific study. One of the main aims of this thesis is to discuss Knolles's work as a history book, as a production of the intellectual environment of its age. Thus, this thesis argues that *GH* should be evaluated in connection with some other "general histories" that were written, translated and read around the same time, and with the common characteristics of this distinct, if variegated kind of history. This contextualization helps us to see the role of the patron of this

[1] Richard Knolles, *The generall historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the rising of the Othoman familie: with all the notable expeditions of the Christian princes against them. Together with the liues and conquests of the Othoman kings and emperours faithfullie collected out of the- best histories, both auntient and moderne, and digested into one continuat historie vntill this present yeare 1603*, London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1603.

monumental work and his influence on the actual process of composition. Thorough an evaluation of the educational and intellectual background of Sir Peter Manwood, this thesis tries to see the points of collaboration as well as some disagreement between the patron and the author, the two parties involved. Besides, the detailed study here of the political orientation of Sir Peter Manwood reveals some points that aid a better understanding of his motivations in patronizing Knolles.

The studies on the historiography of early modern England took off around the mid-twentieth century, promising revision of existing notions of the topic. The earlier theory, that could be associated mainly with Collingwood, claimed that the most distinguishing elements of modern historiography could be seen only from the late seventeenth century, and more so in the eighteenth century.[2] Those who criticized this earlier theory, on the other hand, came up with numerous sources that would stand as proofs of the "modern" attitudes of sixteenth-century historians. Smith Fussner set the tone of the discussions that followed him. There happened an historical revolution in England, according to Fussner, in the years between 1580 and 1640. The "historical attitudes and questionings that we recognize as our own" came into being as a result of this revolution. The overall change in the methods of history writing, Fussner stated in *Tudor History and the Historians*, was a result of "broad based humanistic scholarship in the sixteenth century", which made critical turns in many fields

[2] Robin George Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946, 5.

such as philology, diplomatics or geography possible.[3] Arthur B. Ferguson shared Fussner's aim of a search for the origins of some approaches that were accepted as the most outstanding characteristics of modern historical thought. His studies, however, indicated that some features of modern historiography, such as "a willingness to look for processes of development in the history of a society" or "a feeling for the uniqueness and organic unity of periods and for the relativity of customs, institutions and values" were not prominent aspects of sixteenth-century historiography, despite numerous methodological developments that added a modern vein to the historiography of the period.[4]

In short, studies that discussed early modern historiography in England rejected Collingwood's idea univocally and traced the roots of the developments of modern history writing back to the sixteenth century. While Fussner used the discourse of a radical turn, using the term revolution, Levy was more on the side of a gradual development over time, while still arguing that the medieval structure of history writing had been totally changed under the influence of new ideas.[5] Fussner discussed the general scope of historiography at the beginning of his work, focusing on individual authors, Ralegh, Camden, Stow, Bacon, and Selden, in each chapter as the representatives of each phase of change in early modern English historiography. His book's clear-cut organization was criticized almost as harshly as his use of the word "revolution", denoting a clear-cut radical change.[6] Levy's discussion, which begins with the late medieval

[3] F. Smith Fussner, *Tudor History and the Historians*, New York: Basic Books, 1970, 285.
[4] Arthur B. Ferguson, *Clio unbound: perception of the social and cultural past in Renaissance England*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1979, xi.
[5] F. J. Levy, *Tudor historical thought*, San Marino, California: Huntington Library Press, 1967, 33.
[6] For rejections of the "historical revolution" thesis, see Joseph M. Levine, "Ancients, Modems and the Continuity of English Historical Writing in the Later Seventeenth Century" in Joseph M.

chronicles and ends in the early Stuart period, emphasized a gradual change rather than a radical break and still made it clearer that things had changed to a great extent during the sixteenth century. Since these initial works, it has become clear that a discussion of early modern English historiography was impossible without references to the influence of continental ideas.

The changes emerged as a result of two distinct influences that came from the continent: Italian humanism and French jurisprudence. The challenge that came with Italian humanism, according to Fussner, was more evident in the writing of history than in philosophy or literature. The impact of this wave resulted in a series of changes in Augustinian modes of thought as well as in methodology.[7] Levy, similarly, discussed the impact of humanist ideas on the historiography of sixteenth-century England in a separate chapter. The influence of humanism, according to Levy, stood out as the most important "new influence" on the history-writing trends of the age, when compared to the roles of growing national consciousness or the new religion.[8] The most important thing that humanism introduced was the concept of anachronism. The idea that the past was different from the present would shake the medieval tradition of reaching a synthesis of concepts that came from different ages. The second novelty that reached England with the import of humanism was the new "purpose" of the historian. The emphasis on "the active role of the individual in his society" and the importance of his education, was the beginning the

Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modem English Historiography*, New York: Ithaca, 1987, pp. 155-177; Joseph H. Preston, "Was There an Historical Revolution?," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1977), pp. 353-364.

[7] F. Smith Fussner, *The historical revolution; English historical writing and thought, 1580-1640*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1962, 7; see his discussion of the "European Background" through 1-17.

[8] Levy, *Tudor historical thought*, 33; see the discussion on "The Advent of Humanism", 33-78.

popularization of history. The diverse forms in which continental humanist ideas reached England and the processes through which they were absorbed influenced both the nature and the pace of change in English historiography.[9]

For others, the changes in the actual methodology of history writing, as well as the understanding of history, was changing due to certain developments in French law schools. Starting with Julian Franklin's *Jean Bodin and the Sixteenth-Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History*, the impact of the developments in juristic studies on history writing on the continent as well as in England were discussed in the works of George Huppert, Beatrice Reynolds, Keith Thomas, Donald Kelley, Leonard F. Dean and J. G. A. Pocock.[10] Dating "the rise of modern historiography" to the sixteenth century Pocock stated that this was the period in which "the historian's art took on the characteristic, which has ever since distinguished it, of reconstructing the institutions of society in the past and using them as a context in which, and by means of which, to interpret the actions, words and thoughts of the men who lived at that time".[11] Trying to "discover how the notion of reconstructing the past began to dominate the minds of historians", Pocock refers to "the paradox" of humanism, that it aimed to revive a culture that was essentially different from

[9] F. J. Levy, "Hayward, Daniel and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Winter, 1987), p. 3-5.
[10] George Huppert, *The idea of perfect history; historical erudition and historical philosophy in Renaissance France*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970; Beatrice Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Oct., 1953), pp. 471-492; Keith Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England : the Creighton Trust lecture 1983, delivered before the University of London on Monday 21 November 1983*, London: University of London, 1983; Donald Kelley, "Historia Integra: Francois Baudouin and his Conception of History," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1964), 35-57; Leonard F. Dean, "Tudor Theories of History Writing," University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, 1 (1947); J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, pp. 1-29.
[11] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution*, 1.

the present one. And through this paradox came the idea of contextualizing the ancient laws, and thus some new methods of critical reading were developed in the French schools of law.[12]

More recent contributions to the field have followed in the footsteps of the previous works, but with an initial diversion. Almost all studies since Fussner have indicated that the changes in history-writing trends of the period were the results of the combined effect of new ideas and technical improvements. Fussner discussed the importance of a changing world view in two sub-sections of the first chapter of *Historical Revolution*, under the titles of "Renaissance Climate of Opinion" and "Reformation Politics and Religion".[13] Levy summarized his ideas about the influence of religious conflicts on the developments of the concept of anachronism, as well as the use of authentic sources and national perspectives on history in his Preface.[14] Despite their discussions of the changes in the ideas that influenced history writing, the focus of these works on the actual changes in the methodology of history limited their arguments to technical advance. More recent studies, however, diverted the focus of research from history-writing to an evaluation of the understanding of history at the sixteenth and seventeeth centuries. Thus Daniel Woolf summarized the point that would differentiate his studies from earlier ones by making a distinction between "historical writing" and "historical thought". "Historical writing", which had a more restricted meaning, denoted the formal historiography produced in a particular era. "Historical thought", however,

[12] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution*, 2.
[13] Fussner, *The historical revolution*, 1, 12.
[14] Levy, *Tudor historical thought*, x-xi.

"involves perceptions of, reflections on and utterances about virtually any aspect of the past, and it can be found in just about any written document of any period".[15] Establishing this difference helps us to see that some changes in methodology do not necessarily mean a total change in the overall understanding of history. The impact of newly acquired tools such as chronology, antiquarian sources, critical reading on the understanding of history in the sixteenth century had to be reconsidered.

As mentioned above, Woolf essentially followed the steps of Levy in stating that the early modern period was a time of change. He suggested that, "beginning in the early seventeenth century, history as a literary form on the one hand, and that type of philological or antiquarian knowledge which can broadly fit under the rubric of 'erudition' on the other, grew more familiar with each other, both in practice and in theory", and the meaning of the word "history" turned into "something more recognizably modern" as a result of this change.[16] In a later study, Woolf would explain the details of a series of transitions that happened from 1500 to 1700, which created a completely new understanding of history at the end of the period.[17] Changing the focus of his work from the achievements of particular historians towards an overall evaluation of the mentality — the process of thought in dealing with any material that is related to the past — Woolf manages to analyze the historical

[15] D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990, ix.
[16] Woolf, *The Idea of History*, xii
[17] D. R. Woolf, "From hystories to the historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past: 1500-1700," in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press, 2006, 31-68.

thought, as well as social changes, that led to the emergence of new methodological tools that changed the history writing of the period.

These ideas have not, however, received universal acceptance. In a recent article, David Womersley divides the broad historiography of history writing in early modern England into two: the earlier studies that set the birth of some modern features of history-writing to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the revisionists, who traced the same lines back to sixteenth. Setting the focal point of the discussion as the development of the historical-mindedness peculiar to our culture, both the earlier studies and the revisionists created a teleological approach, which ended in a series of "misrepresentations" of Tudor historiography. Quoting Peter Burke, Womersley pointed out that, according to the revisionists' arguments, the sense of anachronism, the adoption of a critical approach to sources and an interest in causation were the three points that differentiated modern historiography from the medieval. The techniques they mastered, Womersley states, led historians of the seventeenth century to be more objective, and thus less prone to shape the past according to the need that the present imposed, according to revisionists. The revisionist narrative of sixteenth-century historiography, thus focused on a "steady evacuation of ideology –and in particular of religious ideology- from historiography of the period".[18] The rest of Womersley's article is devoted to a discussion of the "damage" that the revisionist theory had done to the assessment of the role of religious belief on the texts produced by the historians of the seventeenth century.

[18] David Womersley, "Against the Teolology of Technique" in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press, 2006, pp. 90-95.

With these discussions in mind, the second chapter of the present thesis evaluates the changes in historiography of the sixteenth century and contextualizes the emergence of the sub-genre of 'general history' within the wide spectrum of history writing in early modern England. The chapter mostly follows the line of thought of the revisionists in terms of the reasons for and the results of the changes that occurred in the historiography of the period. Discussing the methodological changes that influenced the nature of the actual work of the historian, the chapter also summarizes the changes in the historical thought of the period, trying to see the overall changes in the production and the use of history as a whole. Thus the sub-chapters of this part are arranged in a way to follow the change of ideas, rather than to track specific technical changes that were the results of these ideas. These do not pretend or intend to be an exhaustive evaluation of sixteenth- or seventeenth-century historiography. The changes in the historiography are summarized selectively, emphasizing those veins of thoughts that might have been connected to the reasons for writing general histories. The growing importance of the accuracy of histories, the moves towards developing a hierarchy of sources and the gradually increasing importance of causation are discussed in relation with the ideas that underlay these developments.

While accepting the changes in the nature of what was seen as historical causation, this thesis does not try to promote the idea that sixteenth-century history texts were freed from the religious ideas of the authors that produced them. The changes in sixteenth-century historiography ended in a more down-to-earth and less 'providential' causation in the historical texts that were within the scope of this study. A focus on the actual causation of worldly events,

however, does not necessarily mean that histories were written with purely secular intentions. As the discussions in the overall organization of Knolles's *GH* indicate, a history could be written with a general religious motive in mind, but this did not mean that the historian referred to the will of God in explaining the development of events. Most of the historians that are discussed in this thesis were keen to differentiate the causes "from above" from the other causes that they want to discuss. And in this sense they were more secular in terms of their attribution of causation compared to most medieval chroniclers. As with Bodin's division of history into divine, human and natural, the authors of general histories tend to divide the reasons for events into divine and worldly and the latter are discussed more frequently. The last chapter that evaluates the influence of Peter Manwood, the patron of Knolles's *GH*, moreover, reveals the importance of the religio-political stance of not only the author but also the patron on the histories that were produced in that period.

Trying to contextualize the work of Knolles within the varied historiography of the period, one notices the lack of interest from modern historians in general histories. Christina Woodhead mentions the existence of many other "general histories" of foreign states that were being circulated around the time Knolles was working on his history and states that "no study exists on the "generall historie" genre of the early 17th century".[19] In her discussion of Knolles's text, however, she differentiates Knolles's work from others, stating that in contrast to other general histories of contemporary foreign states that were written around the same time Knolles's history was not

[19] Christina Woodhead, "The History of an Historie: Richard Knolles' *General Historie of the Turkes*, 1603-1700," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 350.

a mere translation but a "genuine attempt" to write a chronological account of Ottoman history, and "to understand how - and why - the Ottoman state" became what it then was.[20]

Daniel Woolf mentions the necessity of grouping histories of contemporary foreign nations as a specific genre, although he excludes them from his own study. A note explains the reason for this exclusion:

> These works constitute a genre unto themselves and the absence of a number of them on the same subject would render any conclusions tenuous at best. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the word "general" in these titles denotes the authors' coverage of their subjects from ancient origins to modern times; these are not "general" in the sense of including aspects of the non-political past.[21]

Huppert makes a similar explanation in the introduction of his study, stating that the histories he included in his study all focus on the "distant past", as he believes that "the chief technical and philosophical difficulties which face the historian of the past simply do not exist for the historian of the present, who has his own difficulties to contend with".[22] It is for this reason that Huppert leaves "the writers of contemporary history" out of the scope of his study.

This present study attempts to evaluate general histories that were printed in England in the course of the seventeenth century, in order to identify some common features that would help to group them as a distinct and new genre. Accepting the validity of Huppert's argument that the issues that historians of contemporary foreign nations had to deal with were somehow different from the difficulties of the historians of the distant past, the discussion

[20] Woodhead, "The History of an Historie," p. 351.
[21] D. R. Woolf, "Change and continuity in English historical thought, c. 1590-1640." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oxford, 1983, 21.
[22] Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History*, 9.

of the second chapter of this thesis indicates that the authors of the general histories had to deal with both groups of problems, as their work had a dual nature. They were working on an integral chronology; that is a continuous history of a city or a nation from the very beginning till the present day, covering basically everything in between. Thus, the most important aspect of the general histories was their promise of a critical reading of the existing material on the subject, and an accurate and continuous presentation of the material to their readers. This focus on the re-interpretation of the relevant material, with a critical and clearly selective reading of the sources, was the main difference of the general histories from the other sorts of histories that were written in the seventeenth century.

Present discussion of the general histories written in England or that reached England through translations indicates that Woolf's explanation on the definition of the word "general" is rather narrow. Trying to understand what the term "general history" meant for the historians of the seventeenth century, this thesis focuses on the paratexts of these histories, those parts which turned mere texts into books, the parts which presented them to the readers.[23] In order to understand how the authors and translators of general histories defined their works within the broad selection of historical writing in the seventeenth century, the present study goes through the lengthy, and most of the time quite informative, introductions and/or prefaces of these works. In the case of translations, a translation of the original author's introduction is included as well as the translator's own introduction, allowing us to see relatively clearly

[23] Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, 1.

the possible discrepancies between the approaches of both the original author and the translator. Discussing the common qualities of general histories that would distinguish them from other types of histories through the words of the authors of these works, this chapter tries to reach a better understating of the term "general" for the intellectuals of the seventeenth century. Trying to reach a definition through the words of the authors or the translators of these histories, the present study also tries to describe the intellectual atmosphere which turned general histories into popular works of their times. Working mainly through the internal textual evidence for the definition as well as for the intended use of the general histories, this study overcomes the lack of opportunity to compare texts with similar subject matters, which Woolf saw as making the drawing of conclusions about them difficult.

Any sort of practice of history writing in the seventeenth century can only be discussed within the limitations of belonging to an age of transition, and the discussion that this thesis presents is not immune from these limitations. The idea of a "general history" had been available since Polybius's definition of the term as opposed to the "particular histories" of his age.[24] The revival of the idea started together with the historical theories of French jurists. When the idea reached England, mainly through translations, the peculiar features of general histories were not as sharp as they would be a few decades later. This thesis does not try to reach an ultimate formal definition of the genre with the group of sources it covers. What I hope to attain here is rather a sketch of some common features of general histories as they show themselves in some very

[24] For Polybius's definition, see Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton, London: Harward University Press, 1998. Vol. I, p. 12-13.

prominent examples of the group, at a time when this type of history was rather popular. The features that are discussed in the third chapter of this thesis were prone to change in the course of the seventeenth century. Two curious sources that revealed the way general histories were perceived by the intellectuals, *The English Historical Library* and "Proposals for Printing a General History of England" represented the refined and crystallized understanding of general histories by the end of the century.[25]

This thesis argues that Richard Knolles's *GH*, "the first major history in English of the Ottoman Turks"[26] should be evaluated as a part of the group of "general histories" that were circulating in England after the turn of the seventeenth century. The discussion in the fourth chapter of this study presents the common features of Knolles's work alongside the other general histories. Setting Knolles's work within the trends in history-writing of the period in which it was produced helps us understand some basic aspects of Knolles's work. Moreover, evaluating Knolles's work as a project that was realized through the shared efforts of the patron of the writer, and considering the intellectual background of the patron of the work as well as the motives for his support, suggests some reasons for the ambiguity that Knolles's text presents for the modern historians. The last chapter of this study, therefore, analyses the role of Knolles's patron in his history writing.

[25] John Dunton, "Proposals for Printing a General History of England," reprinted at the end of the index to the *Present State of Europe*, vol. 5, licensed Jan. 3, 1695; William Nicolson, *The English Historical Library; or, A Short View and Character of most of the Writers now extant either in Print or Manuscript which may be Serviceable to the Undertaking of a General History of this Kingdom.* London: 1696.
[26] Woodhead, "The History of an Historie," 349.

Richard Knolles was probably born in Cold Ashby, Northamptonshire, in the early 1540s. He was educated at Lincoln College, Oxford and he received a bachelor's degree in 1565. According to college documents, Knolles received an MA degree in 1570, and he was in contact with his college until his appointment as the Master of the Free School at Sandwich in Kent, founded by Sir Roger Manwood in 1572.[27] The latter made it clear in the statutes of the grammar school that the masters of the school should be chosen from Lincoln College. He had also established scholarships at Lincoln College in 1568.[28] Richard Knolles must have met Roger Manwood through these connections. Knolles worked for the Manwood family until his death, for almost 40 years. Sandwich did not only give him a quiet and steady life, but it also provided him with a lively intellectual environment.

As Knolles clearly stated, it would have been impossible for him to compose such a lengthy work as *GH* without the "encouragement" his patron, Sir Peter Manwood, provided him with. Considering the troubled times of the "long and painefull trauell" that Knolles passed through in the extensive process of writing his book, it seems that Peter Manwood's help was real and far beyond mere encouragement.[29] Knolles's position in the grammar school was scarcely enough, even something of an obstacle. It was a place that "affoorded no meanes

[27] Christine Woodhead, "Knolles, Richard (late 1540s–1610)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[28] Woodhead, "Knolles, Richard (late 1540s–1610)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752, accessed 11 Feb 2016]; Nicholas Carlisle, *A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales*. London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1818.
[29] Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication]

or comfort to proceed in so great a worke", according to Knolles.[30] In 1602, when Knolles was just about to finish the first version of his masterpiece, he was having serious problems with the school:

> mr. Richard Knolles now master is found not to have intended the same with that diligence as was meet he should, it was by his honour thought convenient, for the better education of the youth of this town, that a more industrious master should be appointed for the said school and that mr. Knolles being dismissed, … should be allowed a yearly stipend of twelve pounds during his life.[31]

A later document of 1606, however, indicates that he did not leave at least for another four years. With this document, it is agreed for a second time that "for employing a more industrious schoolmaster hereafter, the said Richard Knolles in respect of his departure, being first placed there by the founder, shall have an annuity of twelve pounds during his natural life out of the treasury of the town".[32] It is possible that the initial decision was postponed by Peter Manwood, who was the head of the school after the death of his father in 1592. Besides, considering the wide range of materials Knolles consulted while writing *GH*, his references to numerous sources that he could reach only through the connections of his patron and to documents that reveals Peter Manwood's actual involvement in collecting some official reports of English ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire indicates that Peter, as the patron of this history, was active all throughout the production process.

[30] Knolles, *GH*, "The Avuthors Indvction to the Christian Reader vnto the Historie of the Turkes following", unpaginated.
[31] as quoted in Vernon J. Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, ed. By Salih Özbaran. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003, 3.
[32] Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, 3.

By the last decades of the sixteenth century the Manwoods were an influential family in Sandwich, Kent. Sir Roger Manwood, born in 1525, is the best known member of the family. He was educated at the Thomas Ellis Chantry School, Sandwich.[33] He was called to the Inner Temple in 1545, at the age of 20, and was admitted to the Inner Temple in February 1548. He was already the legal representative for the Cinque Ports by July 1553 and became a Member of Parliament for Hastings in 1555, later representing Sandwich in parliament after 1558. According to his biographer Roger was a new member of the gentry who "had a vested interest in maintaining the Reformation settlement."[34] In 1563 Roger Manwood established the grammar school in Sandwich that Knolles would head after 1572.[35] Subsequently Roger became steward of the archiepiscopal liberties to Archbishop Parker and steward in the archiepiscopal chancery and at the admiralty court of the warden at Dover.[36] On 14 October 1572, Roger became a justice of the Common Pleas[37] but even before this had clearly prospered, accumulating considerable estates, worth approximately £475 a year.[38] Besides these official duties, Roger also supported intellectual pursuits of numerous men through patronizing their works as well as

[33] Sybil M. Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[34] John K. Cavell, Brian Kennett, *A history of Sir Roger Manwood's School, Sandwich, 1563-1963: with a life of the founder*, Published for the Governors by Cory, Adams and Mackay, 1963, 13.
[35] William Boys, *Collections for an history of Sandwich in Kent: With notices of the other Cinque Ports and members, and of Richborough,* Canterbury, 1792, 199-205.
[36] Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[37] Edward Foss. *Biographia Juridica: A Biographical Dictionary of the Judges of England from the Conquest to the Present Time, 1066-1870*, London: J. Murray, 1870, 429-30.
[38] Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]

establishing scholarships at Oxford and Cambridge. His name appeared as a patron in the famous *The Discouerie of Witchcraft* written by Reginald Scott.[39]

After Roger Manwood's death in 1592, his son and heir Peter Manwood (1571–1625) inherited his estates. Peter was born at Hackington, Kent, in 1571. He became a student at the Inner Temple in 1583, arranged by his father, and he maintained his connections with the place almost all his life. He continually pursued antiquarian interests, and had his own four sons specially admitted to the Inner Temple. In 1588-9 he became the senior MP for Sandwich and in 1614 for Kent.[40] It is hard to say that he was particularly influential as an MP. Though he sat in parliament and became a member of certain committees concerned with legislation, we do not have much information on his participation in the ongoing debates. He held many official positions, such as commander of Dover Haven by 1591; deputy lieutenant of the Cinque Ports (1600), and of Kent (1601); sheriff of Kent (1602–3). He was knighted at the coronation of James I on 25 July 1603, and as his biographer states, he was the only one of three Elizabethan local governors still prominent in Kent by the 1620s.[41]

Peter Manwood was rather more important as a patron of intellectual activities, and he was himself a relatively important antiquarian. His collections were rich in notes on English affairs from Edward the Confessor to Henry VIII. He kept transcripts of state papers between 1564 and 1618, and gathered

[39] for a discussion of the image of Sir Roger Manwood as a "godly governor", see Claire Bartram, "'Melancholic Imaginations' Witchcraft and the Politics of Melancholia in Elizabethan Kent," *Journal of European Studies*, 2003 no. 33: 203-211.
[40] Louis A. Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[41] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]

political tracts on Ireland, France, the Low Countries, North Africa and Asia Minor. He was twice granted a licence to travel beyond the seas, "for his increase in good knowledge and learning".[42] The destination of his journeys is not known, though. He was in touch with numerous intellectuals of the early seventeenth century, such as Stow, Camden, Cotton and Heywood; he patronized the translations of Edward Grimstone and caused the publication of a previously unknown manuscript of the Welsh soldier and military theorist Sir Roger Williams (1539/40–1595).[43] His commonplace books, his collections and his scholarly activities indicate his genuine interest in history in general and in Oriental history in particular. Peter became a member of the Society of Antiquaries in 1617. Most of his collections and his books were given to the Bodleian Library in 1620, before his death in 1625.[44]

GH, the first major history of the Ottomans in English, was composed at a time when English interest in the Ottomans was at its peak. The Mediterranean, and the Ottoman world in particular, had started to occupy a central place in the consciousness of the English due to the increase in commerce after the mid-sixteenth century.[45] The English were interested in almost all aspects of the lives of the Ottomans, as after the 1580s, the "Turke" was not just an exotic other, but also a commercial partner, as well as a threat apparently encroaching by the day. According to Matthias A. Shaaber, more news was printed in

---

[42] Robert Lemon, Mary Anne Everett Green, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-[1625]: 1598-1601: Elizabeth,* London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1869, 132.

[43] see Appendix II, "A list of Sir Peter Manwood's books and manuscripts".

[44] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]

[45] Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624*. (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005), 22.

England about the Turks between 1476 and 1622 than in any other country with the exception of France and the Low Countries.[46] Anders Ingram's careful study of the *Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, where printers registered their ownership and right to print copies of books, also indicates that after the 1590s there was a huge increase in the publication of materials related to the Ottomans in one way or another.[47] The timing was certainly right commercially. But still, when Knolles's work first appeared in 1603, those interested in Ottoman history already had a fair collection of material that they could consult. Why then was it necessary to compose a new history of the Ottomans and what was the motivation of Peter Manwood for patronizing a work that took more than ten years to compose?

In order to see the impact of Knolles's work at the beginning of the seventeenth century, one needs to consider its reception by the initial audience of the text. A simple search on Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership database returns more than sixty references to Knolles's *GH* in over twenty books that were printed in the seventeenth century.[48] The variety of works that at some point referred to the *GH* is impressive. It seems that numerous famous preachers, playwrights, theologians and collectors of curiosities used Knolles's work, as well as historians that were writing on the history of the world, of the Ottomans, of the crusades or of any particular war that was related in some way to the Ottoman Empire. *GH* was an immensely

[46] As quoted in Suheyla Artemel. "'The great Turk's Particular Inclination to Red Herring': The Popular Image of the Turk during the Renaissance England," Journal of Mediterranean Studies 5 no. 2. (1995): 189.
[47] Anders Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Durham, 2009, 79.
[48] http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup/

popular work in its first few decades. Between 1603 and 1638 there were five additions made to it.[49] Martha Pan Conant describes Knolles's work as a "result of the new interest in Turkey … and itself a notable factor in extending that interest for years to come".[50] Reaching far beyond its own time, *GH* was used by Lady Mary Montagu and Byron as a reference book to check for certain information.[51]

It is important to note that Knolles's work was frequently used by authors who did not necessarily share Knolles's opinion on certain aspects of history. Thomas Fuller, for instance, referred to Knolles for an account of the kingdom of the Seljuk Turks, although his view of the crusades was radically different from that of Knolles. While Knolles describes the crusades as "notable expecditions of the Christians", Fuller, a Protestant polemicist writing in the context of the Reformation, regarded them as a private plan of the Pope "to make the Eastern Church a Chapell of ease to the Mother-Church of Rome" and as "a house of Correction", where the "sturdie and stubborn enemies" of the Pope were sent "to be tamed".[52] This and other similar examples of the use of Knolles's work by authors that had different ideological stances, according to Ingram, "point to the place which Knolles's work came to occupy as a definitive English authority on the Ottoman Turks".[53] It also reveals the difference of

[49] Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 16.
[50] Martha Pike Conant*, The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century*, New York: Octagon Books, 1966, xxi.
[51] Filiz Turhan, *The Other Empire, British Romantic Writings about the Ottoman Empire*, New York: Routledge, 2003, 15.
[52] Knolles, *GH*, 2; Thomas Fuller, *The historie of the holy vvarre,* Cambridge, 1639. Chapter 11, "The private ends and profits of the Pope, which he is charged by authours to have had in this Holy warre," 16.
[53] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 185.

Knolles's history from numerous other histories of the Turks that had been circulating around at the time it was published. Its use as a reference book indicates that Knolles's general history was accepted to be accurate in terms of the information it conveyed. It was a successful example of general history, its content approved of by the majority of its readers and it represented the goal the authors of "Proposals for Printing a General History of England" (1695) would set: a good and widely approved history.[54]

Despite its importance as the first complete history of the Ottomans composed in English, modern studies that deal with *GH* as a history book in its own right are scarce.[55] It might be argued that the length of the work has been one of the main obstacles to an overall analysis. As Schmuck puts it, numerous studies evaluate Knolles's work within "necessarily tight limits".[56] Ingram's recent book, which discusses *GH* within the general literature of "turcica", accepts its difference from other accounts of Ottoman history that were available to the English intellectuals of the seventeenth century, but finds it hard to set Knolles's work within the historiography of the period. Referring to previous comments by Fussner on Knolles's adherence to the traditional chronicle format of annual structure of lives and years, Ingram emphasizes that Knolles's work managed to assimilate different accounts into "one stylistically

[54] John Dunton, "Proposals for Printing a General History of England," reprinted at the end of the index to *The Present State of Europe*, vol. 5, licensed Jan. 3, 1695.
[55] Samuel C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1937; Reprint. New York: Octagon Press, 1965; Barbour, *Before Orientalism*; Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006; Woodhead, "'The History of an Historie'", Fussner, *The historical revolution*; Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes* (Aldershot, 2005); Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York, 2003); Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks".
[56] Stephan Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety: The imago turci in early modern English prose, c. 1550 – 1620", unpublished diss, 20.

coherent and definitive" piece.[57] And according to Ingram, within this enthusiasm for composing a "comprehensive and edifying" history, lies the difference of Knolles. For this reason Ingram suggests grouping Knolles's work together with those works which lie on the borders between history and chronicle.[58] However, these works that were somewhere between history and chronicle, had a rather "abrupt and dry" narrative style, and at least in this aspect Knolles's *GH* was of a higher standard. Thus Ingram concludes, *GH* might be accepted as a part of a small group of historical works that were neither chronicles nor histories, but only if one ignores Knolles's lively and eloquent narrative.[59]

It is certain that Knolles's history was not one of its kind. On the contrary, from many aspects it was a traditional work. Knolles kept the classical "lives of" format in following the reigns of the Ottoman Sultans as the main building blocks of his structure. However, the "General history" section at the beginning, which is more than 120 pages, and the final section where Knolles discusses the reasons for the success of the Ottoman Empire, are certainly organized differently. Moreover, as the discussion in the fourth chapter of this thesis indicates, Knolles's narrative of events and his structure of causation surpass the traditional annalistic structure, which the second part of the work, "The Lives" seem to follow. The tripartite structure of this lengthy work and the lively

[57] Anders Ingram, '"The glorious empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world': Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and the background to an early modern commonplace' in *Explorations in Cultural History*, D. Smith and H. Philsooph, eds., (Aberdeen: BPR Publishers, 2010), 197-216, 209.
[58] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 127; D. R. Woolf, "Genre into Artifact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 19, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), 329.
[59] Ingram, "The glorious empire of the Turkes," 209.

and easy to read style of the author, therefore, presents an ambiguity in terms of style.

Knolles's text is an ambivalent one in many respects and its ambivalence has become the main point of discussions about it. The present literature on Knolles's work focus on the ambiguity of *GH* in terms of its representation of the Ottomans. The range of feelings contained, from fear to admiration, has been accepted as a prominent feature of the work and according to Barbour, this ambivalence was inescapable. Linda McJanneth's discussion of Knolles's work also reveals that the overall "proto-orientalist" look of the work is not seen in specific sections. In general, McJanneth concludes, the representation is more complex in the main body of the text than in the paratexts.[60] Schmuck, on the other hand, emphasizes that some of Knolles's text "complicates, if not undermines" the ideology he wants to promote, by confronting a completely negative image of the Turks.[61]

Accepting the validity of all these points that the present literature on *GH* discusses, this thesis tries to turn the trajectory of the study of Knolles's work from the text to the process of production and the parties involved in this process, with the aim of indicating some important points that would help us explain the reasons for the book's complexities and ambiguities. Thus, the final chapter of this thesis analyses the educational and intellectual backgrounds of the author and the patron, as they are the main parties that might have influenced the process of writing. This final chapter argues that, other than the internal evidence that groups Knolles's work with the rest of the general

[60] McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*, 140.
[61] Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety," 22.

histories, the patronage of Peter Manwood also provides a direct connection between the genre of general histories and Knolles's work. The library of Peter Manwood and some other works that he patronized reveals his ardent interest in general histories. It is only natural that Peter Manwood was the one who noticed the references to the need for a general history of the Ottomans and thus he encouraged Knolles to compose one.

Peter Manwood's interest in the popular intellectual discussions of his time, his genuine curiosity for matters related to the eastern world and his personal intellectual and political connections might suggest a better explanation for his motivations in patronizing Knolles's *GH* than the present literature offers. The overall boom in Ottoman histories after the 1590s might be explained through the Levant trade or the long war of 1563-1606.[62] These, however, fall short in explaining the motivation of the patron, considering that Knolles does not refer to Anglo-Ottoman trade in his text. This thesis ends with a suggestion on the possible political motivations of the patron. The second part of the last chapter is devoted to a discussion of Peter Manwood's political orientation and some suggestions that would explain the overly negative tone of Knolles's work.

[62] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 348; Woodhead, "Knolles, Richard (late 1540s–1610)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752, accessed 11 Feb 2016]

CHAPTER II

ON TRENDS IN HISTORY WRITING, IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

The period from the late sixteenth to the early eighteenth century was a period of change in terms of history writing in England.[63] The reasons for and the scope of this change, as well as the results of this process, have already been an issue of scholarly interest for some time.[64] An overview of numerous works that explain the sense of history for the sixteenth-century intellectual, the scope and style of histories, and the ongoing intellectual debates on the nature of history writing in the period, indicates the main strands of changes as well as

[63] D. R. Woolf, "From hystories to the historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past: 1500-1700," in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press: 2006, 34; Leonard F. Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947, 2; F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution; English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1962, xxii. All three suggest slightly different periodization, though.

[64] An quick list would be: Smith F. Fussner. *The Historical Revolution; English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640.* London: Routledge and Paul, 1962; Leonard F. Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947; F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*. San Marino, Calif: Huntington Library, 1967; Keith Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England : the Creighton Trust lecture 1983, delivered before the University of London on Monday 21 November 1983*, London: University of London, 1983; D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990; and Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, San Marino, California: University of California Press, 2006.

revealing the atmosphere in which the ideas on history writing were shaped. Initially, it is necessary to state that, as in almost all periods of transitions in history, the changes that occurred in history-writing trends from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries were not systematic. What happened in these two centuries was rather a slow and complex development of some new notions on history that could be called a transition from one mode of thought to another.

The literature on the historiography of the period identified mainly two interconnected intellectual paradigms that had their influence on both the sense and the method of history writing. Italian humanist tradition, according to Fussner, had a modernizing and liberating force on English humanism.[65] Certain developments in French jurisprudence, on the other hand, have been accepted as the beginning of a movement to formulate both a methodology and a general theory for historical criticism.[66] The approach of the jurists that focused on the "the detection of facts" had set the basics of the "method of the future historians", according to Huppert. The importance of the original and authentic sources and the professed methods of textual criticism that they had acquired through their humanist education led them to enlarge the scope of their studies from juristic to literary and non-literary historical sources.[67] While their efforts to understand Roman law sharpened their views on the ever-changing nature of

[65] Fussner, *The Historical Revolution*, 1-12.

[66] John L Brown, *The Methodus Ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem of Jean Bodin; A Critical Study*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1939, 29-46; George Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History; Historical Erudition and Historical Philosophy in Renaissance France*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970, 24; Donald R Kelley, "Historia Integra: Francois Baudouin and his conception of History," *Journal of History of Ideas*, vol. 25, no. 1, (1964): 36.

[67] Huppert, *The idea of Perfect History*, 24.

law and language, this understanding of gradual change and development pushed them away from the classical cyclical notion of history.[68]

New triggers for this transition has been pointed to recently. Trying to explain the main reasons for this change, one needs to see beyond the histories and the historians who composed them, according to Woolf. The shift in the sense of history, and the emergence of new methods that would help historians compose new types of histories, were the results of greater changes in society, such as the scope of the circulation of historical material and knowledge in society, the effectiveness of means that circulated the historical knowledge, i.e. books and other types of published material, the interactions among different parties involved — authors, readers, publishers, patrons — and their roles in the changing political contexts. The social and political atmosphere of early modern England, as well as the dynamics of the intellectual sphere, shaped the conditions that led to change from "hystories to historical".[69] Womersley, on the other hand, refuted the idea of depicting the changes in early modern historiography as a secularization process and turned the trajectory to the role of religion and ongoing religo-political debates on the histories produced at that time.[70]

At the turn of the sixteenth century, the sources of historical knowledge were the histories that were written before. Huge medieval chronicles, classical

---

[68] George Huppert, "The Renaissance Background of Historicism," *History and Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1966), pp. 48-60, 51-52; see also J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

[69] Woolf, "From hystories to the historical," 37.

[70] David Womersley, "Against the Teolology of Technique" in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press, 2006, 92-95.

histories and the Bible were the sources of information for historical details. These authoritative sources were used and abused, by certain groups, as the past was believed to be contained in already written books, waiting to be connected or reshaped according to the necessities of the present. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, however, the details about the past were much more widely disseminated. Histories that were in the old books now could easily circulate textually or verbally amongst a broader group of people. This new context of "frequency and velocity" made it possible, according to Woolf, for the accumulation of knowledge that enabled people to think "historically".[71] This new mode of thought brought in new types of histories presented to the readers in new styles and genres. This chapter will present a brief outline of the ongoing changes in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historiography to explain the intellectual atmosphere in which general histories were produced and received.

2.1. Some important aspects of history writing in late fifteenth- early sixteenth-century England

The rise of modern historiography, according to Pocock, might be dated from the sixteenth century. From the beginning of the sixteenth century onwards, the task of historian started to be understood as to create an image of the main institutions of a society in the past in order to interpret the words or

[71] Woolf, "From hystories to the historical," 34.

thoughts of men who lived in that society, as well as their actions.[72] For the sixteenth-century intellectual, however, history was mainly useful for the "story" it conveyed. The readers of histories were expected to learn from the examples the histories presented and therefore it was not the history but the characters and the main story that conveyed the message that mattered.[73] The readers, in line with this idea, read not for accurate information about the details but for a broader, general knowledge that would point to the virtue that the story tried to convey. After the sixteenth century, with the gradual changes in the sense and the use of history, the knowledge of historical facts and information became at least as valuable as the moral code the story conveyed and historical information ceased to be a form of knowledge related to relatively small group of the society.[74] Before getting into the changing notions of history, it would be useful to start with a short overview of some important aspects of history writing in late fifteenth- early sixteenth-century England.

The ideas of the intellectuals on history writing in renaissance England could be considered as a local variation of continental views according to Pocock. These views were shaped through three main veins of tradition: Christian, Classical, and national.[75] Under the influence of the Christian tradition, histories were providential, paying little attention to the actual human actions and their influence on the events. All events of the biblical history were considered to be within the scope of histories: the creation of the world and of

[72] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, 1.

[73] Woolf, "From hystories to the historical," 34.

[74] Woolf, "From hystories to the historical," 34.

[75] J. G. A. Pocock, "The Sense of History in Renaissance England," in John F Andrews ed. *William Shakespeare: his world, his work, his influence*, New York: Scribner, 1985, 143.

man, the fall, the birth of Jesus, the crucifixion and the times of the apostles. In all these, and those other issues that followed, the focal point was to explain God's actions and plans about the world. Through the second vein came the information on the history, jurisprudence and mythology of the Roman and Greek worlds, together with their ideas on the form and style of histories. The classical rhetorical style was highly valued and favoured, and the scope of history was limited to political and military aspects of human endeavour. Thus classical histories provided Englishmen not only with information on the Roman and Greek worlds, but stood as proper sources of ideas in terms of aesthetics, morals and politics. These texts therefore, had to be copied in terms of form, content and style. And finally, there was the national histories composed with the help of monastic chronicles, not without criticising them severely, that tried to explain the post-classical roots of the British nation.[76] These three veins of tradition and their variations summarize what was going on in the sphere of history writing in renaissance England.

The dual influence of the classical-Latin and Christian traditions, however, ended in an understanding of time that left little room for development. The Christian tradition taught that all events proceeded, from the Creation to the Apocalypse, in a straight line. The classical tradition, however, favoured a pattern of cyclical turns in terms of both nature and human societies.[77] Synthesizing these two views, humanists observed the rise and fall of individuals, cities and empires within the greater plan of God and as a result of his divine providence. The traditional prophetic scheme of four monarchies

[76] Pocock, "The Sense of History in Renaissance England," 143-150.
[77] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 5.

that rose and fell one after another, in a constant degeneration, set the main divisions until Bodin's harsh criticism of the idea of the Golden Age, and persisted even after him.[78] In this view of a series of cycles in the course of human history, which could only be explained through the providence of God, time was a "closed system" in the mind of the Elizabethan historian, "in which man's actions affect only man and not the ultimate outcome of events, except insofar as they are immediate instruments of a higher plan".[79] The influence of man on his own destiny and the impact of his own efforts to change and develop necessitated a more pragmatic and secular use of history, which meant a new motivation for the study of history.

The main motivation behind studying history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was its relation to its use in the present. As Thomas states, "the only respectable justification for the study of the past was that it could be of service to the present".[80] History was perceived as a pool of stories and characters, both good and bad, out of which numerous lessons could be chosen to set as examples for the readers. This concern was influential in any context: through religious themes the acts of God and the results of his wrath were explained, through moral themes the importance of virtuous behaviour was set and through political themes the knowledge on state issues was presented.[81]

As the aim of the historian was to teach moral and political lessons, his tone had to be clear. He was specifically expected to emphasize and clarify the

[78] Huppert, "The Renaissance Background of Historicism," 56.
[79] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 6.
[80] Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 1.
[81] Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 1.

didactic story that he narrated, making his personal comments and conclusions especially important. The information that he conveyed was only of secondary importance when compared to this didactic purpose and this idea gave him the right to manipulate some information for the sake of emphasizing the most necessary moral lesson. One of the most frequently employed rhetorical manipulations of the sources were the invented speeches that were mainly used to increase the dramatic intensity.[82] Historians did not hesitate to fill their texts with made-up speeches of the main heroes of their stories.

This rhetorical sleight of hand was not the only sacrifice made for the sake of the concerns related to the present. The direct link between the past and the present and the practical use of historical information in sixteenth-century society made historical fictions quite popular. As Thomas states, "there was a well-developed trade in the forgery of so called 'old deeds' … and spurious genealogies were ubiquitous".[83] The glorious pedigrees that traced the ruler's descent from classical origins or the genealogies of Tudor families which traced them back to some knight that watched Christ's sepulchre were not unheard of. It was certain that when the foundation of Cambridge University was dated "three hundred and seventy five years before the incarnation of Christ", the moral value or the charm of the myth was taken much more seriously than the historical accuracy of the information conveyed.[84]

Although the "Ciceronian tradition" of history as a morally educative *magistra vitae* dominated the discussions of its scope all throughout the

[82] Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 4.

[83] Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 2.

[84] Downing Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (1950), 26, as quoted in Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 2.

sixteenth century, there were some more relevant contexts for historical inquiry that started to be important as well. These contexts determined the aspects of history that needed to be studied. The history of ancient laws and customs of England was studied, as it was important for both the king and the gentry to figure out some legitimate source for the distribution of power among them. Most of the studies therefore focused on the questions of jurisdiction and precedence to provide the landed gentry with the genealogies and pedigrees they needed. Historians also focused on the glorious stories of the national past that would fuel patriotism and loyalty as well as other approved political behaviours. The origins of the nation, the Church and the common law were also fashionable topics of the time.[85]

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century histories were still predominantly Aristotelian in terms of their conceptual framework for causation, despite the revival of Platonism and the development of new logics such as Ramism, according to Woolf.[86] The Aristotelian scheme divided the causes of events into four: efficient, material, formal, and final causes. While the material cause of an event was as the factual cause that activated the doer for that specific deed, the formal cause was explained as "the meanes and maner of doing". The efficient cause was the actor himself and the final cause was the overall motive or the general end for which a historical event was believed to be taking place. Beyond all these causes, out of which the final cause was thought to be the most important one, was the initial cause of everything, God's will.[87] The Christian-

[85] Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 3-6.
[86] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 9.
[87] Thomas Blundeville, *The true order and method of wryting a reading hystories*. [London: 1574].

scholastic adaptation of the Aristotelian scheme set the providence of God and his great plan for humanity above all other causes. These lines of thought in terms of causation were not stated explicitly. However, it was clear that the narratives were organized in this manner, and the causation led the readers to concentrate on the focal point of narrative, that is the explanation of the providence of God. The siege of Vienna, for instance, was an event which needed to be seen as an indication of "how and after what maner Gods blessing goeth with the true reformers of his religion".[88] This teleological view of history, which assumed that single events build up for a final cause, forced Tudor historians to work from outcomes towards the causes, thus the cause and effect link was set in reverse order.[89] This structure that focused on the final cause that events flow towards did not require an explanation of the down-to-earth motives behind human actions in detail, although the characters and their actions were described within the causes.

The use of history also set the borders of its scope. Histories in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were expected to deal with mainly political and military events. Tudor chronicles were filled with stories of kings and nobles, wars and dynasties. Besides these, topographies and county histories were also written that mainly told the stories of landed gentries, their estates, and their families.[90] Unlike medieval chronicles, histories written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were more selective in the issues they covered. Historians would now chose to focus on the "illustrious things" rather

[88] John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church*, [London: 1583], 750.

[89] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 9-10.

[90] Thomas, *The perception of the past in early modern England*, 2.

than unimportant issues of everyday life, and this focus on certain types of events would force them to be more particular about the geographies and periods they covered. Histories started with Adam, but the events related to the nation, country or period of the historian's choice was dealt with in more detail.[91]

An overview of some basic aspects of history writing in sixteenth-century England indicates that it was a blend of medieval tradition with some more contemporary notions that came with humanist education. Sixteenth-century historians were already feeling confident enough to criticise medieval chronicles for their dull annalistic structure and dry narratives, as well as their scope that let in trivial issues of everyday life.[92] As Reynolds states, the "annalistic method did not appeal to rhetoricians versed in Cicero and Quintilian, who had learned to regard stories of the past as a publicist's useful tools".[93] Accepting classical histories and historians as a better example for themselves, historians of the sixteenth century were structuring their histories within the scope of political and military history and were making greater efforts to explain the connections between events, that is creating a better narrative that contained the reasons and the results as well as the dates and names.

Despite this criticism of the medieval tradition, history writing in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England was "more late-medieval

[91] Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 3.

[92] Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 5.

[93] Beatrice Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14/4 (1953), 471.

than early modern in character" according to Pocock.[94] Although the humanist idea of taking Greek and Roman histories as a model was introduced into England at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the influence of those ideas remained basically at the level of style and structure. Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia* or Thomas More's *Richard III* looked like classical histories in terms of form and style, and they contained materials borrowed from the classical histories. In terms of the sense of history they represent, however, they were more medieval than humanist as they did not employ new ideas such as change through time or the independence of human actions from divine providence.[95] Thus history as a term continued to be used for a wide group of kinds of works that remained fundamentally different from each other throughout the sixteenth century.

While these essentially medieval notions of history were still prominent in England, side by side with a relatively more contemporary version of it that resulted from a blend of medieval ideas with the classical ones, humanist historiography was taking a new turn on the Continent. With the works of Guicciardini and Machievelli certain aspects of humanist historiography were becoming dominant elements of it. With the urge to analyse and understand what was going on in their countries, and the hope of offering a solution to the problems at hand, historians started to focus more on political causation, the reasons for and the results of the doings of the rulers, the role of fortune in

[94] Pocock, "The Sense of History in Renaissance England," 143.

[95] F. J. Levy, "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50/1 (1987), 3.

history, the limits of predicting the future and the role of men in shaping it.[96] If history was to teach practical political lessons, it had to be both accurate and down to earth. The providence of God was totally irrelevant for this new use of history. These new interests necessitated a methodology that would turn history into a meaningful body of literature that would be useful in providing practical information for the present and thus brought forth new questions on how and to what end to teach history.[97] Thus, as Levy puts it, early humanist historiography was under attack even before the English had a chance to absorb it properly.[98] This rapid change and constant flux of ideas coming from the Continent turned English historiography of the period into a complex mixture of medieval, Italian humanist and finally the more methodologically oriented northern humanist notions. The rest of this chapter will focus on the influence of French law schools and their new methods of studying history as a prominent factor that effected the historiographical activities within which general histories were composed.

2.2. Historia Integra

France, a place that was considered to be the best for the study of law in those times, produced many works that discussed themes such as the

[96] Levy, "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," 3-5.

[97] Zachary Sayre Schiffman, "The Origins of Early Modern Historical Consciousness" in David Lee Rubin ed. *Signs of the Early Modern: 15th and 16th centuries*, Virginia: Rookwood Press, 1996, 85.

[98] Levy, "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," 4.

connection of humanist and legal studies, the teaching of law, the methodology of legal studies, and the close connection between the latter and history. Harsh criticisms of medieval chronicles were already in circulation and new paths for historians in terms of both their styles and their methods of using sources were being suggested. The last decades of the sixteenth century, as Beatrice Reynolds puts it, "witnessed frequent attempts to analyse the nature of history and to set a standard for historiography".[99] The renewed interest of renaissance scholars in the classical histories of the ancient writers ended in a completely new approach to history, starting from Italy and gradually moving all around Europe. This movement, the stimulator of which was the study of classical history according to Reynolds, set the main borders of the discussions on history as the connection between history and truth in terms of content, the connection of history and poetry in terms of style and the use of history.[100] Around these three points, however, almost all aspects of historiography were discussed, in terms of both form and content. Initial attacks on the Italian humanist tradition came from a group of French jurists whose aim of handling history in a more practical way actually resulted from their ambition to make studies of law and history closer. Thus the main lines of these discussions can be followed in the texts produced by these men, which were widely read, translated and copied in England throughout the sixteenth century.

Ancient historians were quite successful in composing narratives about contemporary foreign societies and they could observe the differences of their

[99] Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism," 471.

[100] Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism," 471-80; Levy, "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England," 5.

institutions from their own. As Pocock puts it, the historical sense in the ancient writers "developed in the exploration of their own world and its comparison with the contemporary foreign societies".[101] This line of thought, which is apparently horizontal, rather than vertical, did not necessitate the tools that one would describe as historians' tools used to dig for information. With the refashioning of the classical histories by the translations of the humanists, some changes took place in this form of thought. The humanists' emphasis on the imitation of Roman culture and their continuous efforts to learn more about it forced them to study the sources directly, which ended in new methods of textual analysis. The more accurately the Greek and Roman societies were imagined, the more apparent it became that Roman society was quite different from societies in the sixteenth century.[102]

The works of French humanists therefore raised the question of the relation between the past and the present and their ways of answering this kind of question came to shape the methods of historical research in the sixteenth century. These methods were mainly discovered and developed in French universities as a reaction to the works of Bartolus. Instead of working on adaptations of Roman terms and principles to present conditions as Bartolus did, French jurists tried to understand what each term meant for the people who had written them in the first place. For such an endeavour, legal texts were not enough. Thus jurists were forced to include other narrative texts in their studies, to see what terms really meant in their authentic contexts in a

[101] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution,* 3.
[102] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution,* 10-11.

comparative way.[103] Thus, the first deliberate effort of historical criticism took place in the law schools of France, in the form of "grammar". In order to understand the language of the Roman law, they first had to reconstruct the Roman world in the light of the information that the texts presented. Their difference from the Bartolists was firstly in trying understand the Roman institutions in order to understand their law in that context rather than stretching the terms of the Romans to make them suitable for use in the present. This way, actually, the legal humanists of France became historians and their efforts to explain the necessary method for studying history were compiled in the various *ars historica* they composed.[104]

Jean Bodin, the famous lawyer, natural philosopher, economist and political theorist of sixteenth-century France, was also one of the most influential historians of his age. His well-known contribution to the field of history, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History* (*Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*), was published in 1566 and became one of the most widely read and referenced sources within the scope of the debates about history in his age.[105] Bodin was not the only one who was concerned with the method of studying law or history or the connection between these two fields of learning. The works of Valla and Lato inspired the Italian Angelo Poliziano and many others to direct their studies of Roman law towards gaining erudition on Ancient Greek and Roman cultures and societies. Melancthon, on the German

[103] Brown, *The Methodus Ad Facilem*, 29-38.
[104] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution,* 10.
[105] Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism", 471.

side, asked for a methodological reform of the study of law so that jurisprudence could be fitted into a definite system.[106] So what Bodin was trying to do through studying history was nothing unprecedented. On the contrary, Bodin was following the trends of his age in this aspect.

The only work that was composed before *Methodus*, however, that sets out a complete historical methodology was the *De Institutione Historiae* of Baudouin, which shared many ideas with the *Methodus*. Baudouin, who is known to have insisted on the union of legal and historical studies all throughout his career, believed that each could be better done with an understanding of the other.[107] For the general audience of the time, *Methodus* was one of the best examples of this genre, as Wolf would indicate in the introduction of his collection of *ars historica*, also calling Bodin "optimus author".[108] *Methodus* was well received and became one of the most consulted sources of its age, in terms of both political theory and historical method. According to the study of Sara Miglietti, between 1566 and 1650 it was printed thirteen times in four different countries: France, Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands, and "there are now no fewer than 779 extant copies, scattered among a wide range of European countries". Among these, the United Kingdom is the only country where all thirteen editions of the *Methodus* are found and it has "the richest and most complete collections of all."[109] English readers, however, were also the ones who received the book most purely as a piece of

[106] Brown, *The Methodus Ad Facilem*, 31.
[107] Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations od Modern Historical Scholarship. Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance*, New York: Colombia University Press, 1970, 119.
[108] Johann Wolf, *Artis Historicae Penvs Octodecim* [*Treasury of the Art of History*] [Basle, 1579], as quoted in Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism", 471.
[109] Sara Miglietti, "Reading from the Margins: Some insights into the early reception of Bodin's Methodus", in *The Reception of Bodin* ed. Howell A. Lloyd. Leiden: Brill, 2013: 198

ars historica and they used it mainly as a text book for historical studies.[110] Thus, it would not be misleading to refer to some prominent ideas that are discussed in the influential representatives of the genre of *ars historica* in order to follow some changes and shifts in terms of the ideas on history writing in that period.

2.3. On the accuracy of histories

The accuracy of the information conveyed in histories was one of the most important points of discussion in the genre of *ars historica*. As mentioned above, for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century intellectuals history was not an independent field of study. It was rather seen as a grey area somewhere between rhetoric and poetry, and histories were primarily seen as a means to convey stories that would exemplify some moral-philosophical precepts. But humanist inquiries into the past did not only shape the form and the style of histories, they also determined the role of the historian in society as well. The approved use of history, that is to provide narratives that would work as didactic and mimetic texts, defined the role of the historian as identical to that of a rhetorician, a poet, a counsellor or a philosopher.[111] Soon the variety of these roles started to cause problems. Historians were expected to be factual. Truth was the light of history, as numerous historical works stated. But the value of the lesson that the historian was expected to teach did not depend on the

[110] Miglietti, "Reading from the Margins," 208.
[111] Pocock, "The Sense of History in Renaissance England," 146.

factuality of the text. If the historians were to teach morals, that is if history meant something more than factual information, then historians needed to use narrative and rhetorical tools to create the intended moral lesson. Thus the ties between history and accuracy remained rather loose, letting numerous works that were factual, probable or even completely fictional to be labelled as histories.[112] And this blurred line between history and fiction resulted in an uncertainty about the past, and thus presented "a widespread challenge to the integrity of classical sources".[113]

Initial refutations of the accuracy of ancient histories were fierce. The aggressive challenges of Bodin and Baudouin made it clear that ancient historians could also have been misled by their prejudices and thus might have provided a distorted view of the ancient world.[114] For Baudouin, it was impossible to acquire accurate knowledge of the past without reading histories in constant awareness of the reasons of historians for exaggeration or misrepresentation. The need to read and compose histories in a critical manner, always keeping an eye on the accuracy of their sources, was emphasized. For both Bodin and Baudouin, for instance, the excellence of Polybius as an ancient historian, as well as the excellence of Guicciardini as a modern one, depended on their success in basing their histories on official documents and other reliable sources.[115]

---

[112] For a discussion of Sir Philip Sydney's ideas, for instance, see F. J. Levy, "Sir Philip Sidney and the Idea of History," *Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, XXVI (1964), 608-617. For Sidney's own discussion, see Philip Sidney, *An apology for poetry, or, the defence of posey*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd, London: Thomason Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1965.

[113] Nicholas Popper, "An Ocean of Lies: The Problem of Historical Evidence in the Sixteenth Century" *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 3 (September 2011), 376.

[114] Popper, "An Ocean of Lies," 384

[115] Anthony Grafton, *What was History?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 32.

The idea of a hierarchy of sources as well had its roots in these discussions of the accuracy of history. In contrast to the narrative tone that humanist tradition supported, Bodin praised Polybius for his factual exactness and his accuracy in writing down the events that took place in his lifetime. Contrasting him to a contemporary author, Paul Jovius, Bodin states:

> Polybius traveled over a great part of Europe and the shores of Africa and Asia Minor that he might study the customs of the people, but Paul Jovius, as he himself boasted, remained in the Vatican for thirty-seven years. The other was the director and the companion of Scipio Africanus in his wars everywhere; but this one was the daily companion of the popes.[116]

Baudouin stated clearly that he "would prefer" those historians that narrated only events that they saw, and "in which they took part".[117] Polybius's mental distance from his subject matter was also his strength according to both Bodin and Baudouin. Polybius was a better historian than Plutarch, Dionysus or Dio as he could be relied upon "because he wrote, not of his own state, but of another".[118]

At this point, it should be stated that one's distance from one's subject matter, or one's participation in the events narrated were criteria for an evaluation of one's writings, were accepted as factors that increased the reliability of the author for the sixteenth-century readers. It would not be true to say, on the other hand, that French *ars historicas* looked unfavourably on the study of distant past. On the contrary, the perfect/integral history was set as a final goal that should be achieved by contemporary historians. Although a

[116] Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. Beatrice Reynolds, (New York, 1969), 59.

[117] Grafton, *What was History?*, 63.

[118] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 59.

proper discussion of the term would be beyond the limits of this chapter, mentioning some aspects of integral history would be revealing in terms of the developments that led to the general histories.

As mentioned above, there were diverse lines of thought and traditions that shaped sixteenth-century historical thought. Greek and Roman traditions of history writing and the humanist tradition that admired those, philological and linguistic approaches that developed through the study of law, ancient political philosophy that was defined as "pragmatic history" by Polybius and the idea of universal history, which was also introduced by Polybius and employed by medieval chronicles, were among the most prominent of those lines.[119] Unlike their predecessors, neither Bodin nor Baudouin rejected the validity of these diverse traditions as a whole. Their aim was to reach a synthesis that combined the strength of all these approaches, with the aim of reaching a perfect history.[120]

The idea of integrity was one of the most important aspects of the historical thought of Baudouin. According to Kelly, the "perfect", "integral" or "universal" history did mean something more than a compilation of national histories according to an Augustinian world-plan. It was rather "a synthesized – and synchronized- view of history which could only be achieved by the philosophic scholar trained in the techniques of encyclopaedic humanism".[121] One of the main motives behind praising this sort of a unified and catholic history of humankind was certainly the involvement of both Bodin and

[119] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 37.
[120] Grafton, *What was History?*, 47
[121] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 51

Baudouin in the Irenic movement, which aimed to repair the divisions among the Christians.[122] The theme of the integrity of history, as Kelly puts it, also reflected Baudouin's "commitment to the integrity of Christendom".[123]

Baudouin explains the universality of history in different levels. History has to be universal, according to Baudouin, in terms of the times, places, and actions.[124] The chronological universality of history was necessary because of the semi-biological nature of history. Historical events could only be understood in a complete chronology, starting from the very beginning of an idea or an institution and through following their development in time. Integral chronology would let readers see the gradual development over time. Besides, chronological arrangement of events would also be useful in demonstration of cause and effect links. Any measurement of change through time would also be possible through analysing an event in time.[125]

The comprehension of events that occurred in different places at the same time was an important aspect of chronological integrity in Bodin's thought. This notion of "non-linear chronology" is something quite different from anachronism. Here the idea is not the misdating of events or making chronological errors. It is not, on the other hand, about the ability of constructing a chronological list of events in the way ancient world histories or

[122] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, x. France was entering into an even more turbulent period after the death of Francis I, as the parliament was accepting a less and less tolerant attitude towards non-conformity. When Bodin was about to move from Toulouse to Paris, the country was also at the point of civil war. The contemporary situation of France and Bodin's analysis of the situation as a broad issue of sovereignty ended in devoting a great part of his work to the discussion of the different forms of governments and the ideas on sovereignty, Reynolds explains.

[123] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 37.

[124] Grafton, *What was History?*, 32.

[125] Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship. Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1970, 153.

medieval chroniclers did. The understanding of parallel chronologies of events occurring in different parts of the world was a totally new aspect of historical thought.[126] Bodin was specifically interested in world chronology, because it was necessary for him to work on a set chronology so that he could speculate on the external reasons for the rise and fall of states. Besides, Bodin had very pragmatic reasons for studying chronology, such as figuring out "the discrepancy which appears among historians concerning the antiquity and the succession of events".[127] Comparing chronologies of different histories was fruitful in terms of indicating the errors. Establishing the chronology of all events through a reading of universal histories would help the readers to see the unity of history while they were reading the histories of specific nations, cities or states, and this would unite the particulars with the whole, unified through time.[128]

History had to be universal in terms of geography as well. Both Baudouin and Bodin encouraged those who studied history to expand their interests beyond the traditional territories of historical knowledge, which was the histories of Greece and Rome.[129] As well as the national histories of the Christian world, the histories of non-European nations had to be considered as a part of the universal history. It was impossible to understand the history of Europe "without that of the so-called barbarians", according to Baudouin:

> If we are French, or British, or German, or Spanish, or Italian, we cannot speak of our countrymen if we do not know the history of the Franks, the Angles, the Saxons, the Goths, the

[126] Woolf, D. R. "From hystories to the historical," 37-41.
[127] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 301.
[128] Schiffman, "The Origins of Early Modern Historical Consciousness," 85.
[129] Grafton, *What was History?*, 68.

> Lombards. And since our countrymen have often encountered Saracens and Turks, we dare not be ignorant of Saracen and Turkish history.[130]

The lack of complete histories of the Arabs and the Turks was also criticised by Bodin.[131] Baudouin praised the history of Polybius, accepting his work as a universal history because the Romans were synonymous with civilization at his time. In the sixteenth century, however, universal history had to include those parts of the world that were unknown a while ago.[132]

Another aspect of integral history was related to the scope of histories. According to Baudouin, history had to cover ecclesiastical as well as political and military matters. Integral history was expected to describe and analyse the history of the Church, and the analysis Baudouin mentioned here was something far beyond providing the lists of popes, prelates and heresies. Baudouin expected the integral history to "describe the ceremonies, discipline, order and governance of the Church, century by century".[133] Every aspect of human actions, especially the development of law and institutions of a society were seen as the main issues of history.[134] In *Methodus*, Bodin summed up the issue of the scope of history as human society in its broadest sense, including the rise and fall of states as well as the growth and decline of different cultures and technology.[135]

---

[130] As quoted in Grafton, *What was History?*, 117.
[131] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 3.
[132] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 53.
[133] Grafton, *What was History?*, 105
[134] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 54.
[135] Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History*, 102.

2.4. The comparative approach

Both Bodin and Baudouin were critical of the invented speeches that were included into historical narratives for their rhetorical impact. Such material was found to be neither necessary nor factual. This refutation of invented speeches, however, did not necessarily turn ancient histories into mere stories. Accepting that even the greatest historians had prejudices and clear error that tainted their works in terms of accuracy, both Bodin and Baudouin accepted that all historians provided some information that was of great importance. Thus they had to create a method for the study of history that would provide certain rules for reading those imperfect histories. What they suggested was not waiting for some imaginary perfect history, but instead, reading the historians that existed in the present in a comparative way. Thus, Bodin wrote:

> Let it seem madness to hope for better historians than those we have, criminal even to wish for them. I do not see any point in the work of those who create for themselves an ideal of a perfect historian, of a kind that has never existed and never can exist, but ignore the ones that we actually read and reread.[136]

This focus on the use of already existing material ended in a comparative reading method. The method of comparative reading suggested in the *ars historicas* had various levels. Initially a comparison of different histories was necessary. Through reading different narratives of the same event, readers would have a chance to compare different accounts to figure out the most probable version. Combining these readings of ancient historians with other

[136] As quoted in Grafton, *What was History?*, 47.

sorts of materials, or "things that talk", was the second level of comparison. Histories had to be crosschecked with the information collected from a vast range of other texts. Cicero's letters, orations, and other writings, for instance, would offer a considerable "correction" to Roman history according to Baudouin. Besides, he added that

> testimonies on many points that now escape us could be derived from other writers, even if they do not claim to be historians. Therefore I must rebuke the negligence of those who do not look in this direction when they are seeking histories. And why confine myself to books and parchments? Everywhere ancient statues and paintings, and inscriptions carved on stone slabs and coins, and woven into tapestries and coverings, provide us with historical materials of every kind.[137]

The third point of comparison was of content. Bodin, who was above all a jurisconsult, perceived history as a useful tool for legal studies and as a source of "universal law".[138] Thus he made it clear, in both his *Methodus* and his *Six Books of the Republic*, that the most important questions one could ask in reading historians were related to constitutional and political issues. The systematic compilation and analysis of knowledge would lead to a better understanding of the most complex concepts. Quoting Plato, for instance, Bodin stated that "there was one way to establish law and govern a state", and that was setting a group of wise men "to bring together and compare" the legal framework of all states, "or of the more famous states", through which "the best kind" would easily be selected.[139] In defining the state, Bodin asserts that he has "compared the arguments of Aristotle, Polybius, Dionysius, and the jurisconsults, with the whole history of states" and he concluded that "the

[137] As quoted in Grafton, *What was History?*, 94-5.
[138] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 8.
[139] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 10.

sovereign part of the state consists in five parts". Collecting and comparing histories would help readers to reach new models of thought as well as presenting them with "widely scattered statutes of ancient peoples".[140]

2.5. History and antiquarian studies

The aim of discerning the less erroneous version of history out of already existing ones, by correcting the information conveyed through these sources with some non-traditional historical and antiquarian material, brought historians closer to antiquarians. Antiquarianism was born out of a humanist interest in every aspect of ancient life. Humanist concern to recover Latin sources evolved in time into an inquiry into the material remnants of classical cities, and thus antiquarianism emerged as an independent field of study. Antiquaries were concerned mainly with the non-political aspects of the past, such as laws, institutions, languages, monuments and cultures, as a distinction from historians.[141] The antiquarian-historian distinction and its validity for the early modern period has been controversial in modern historiography for some time. For Momigliano, while those who were studying the antiquities of Latin and Greek societies considered themselves to be antiquarians rather than historians, those who were focusing on the antiquities of Britain or France, for instance, were only "formally distinguishable" from the historians that studied the same subjects, and they tended to forget the distinction. Thus, Momigliano

[140] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 153-4.
[141] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 13.

stated that "there were both antiquarians and historians for the non-classical and post-classical world, but only antiquarians for the classical world".[142] Pocock on the other hand introduced a different grouping by putting "the scholars and antiquarians" on one side and "the literary historians" on the other. According to Pocock "there was a great divorce" between these two groups and the critical techniques that were developed by the scholars or erudite men of French law schools were not being employed by the literary historians.[143] More recently Woolf pointed out that

> Not only did historians and antiquaries remain virtually oblivious of each other's existence, or perversely unwilling (as it seems to us) to help each other in writing what the French historian La Popeliniere had craved at the end of the sixteenth century, an "histoire accomplie"; they did not even recognize that they were all essentially doing, in different ways, a subject called history.[144]

Contemporaries, Woolf concluded, did not have any doubts on the point that whatever histories were, they did not have much room for antiquarian writings.[145]

The critical distinction that Pocock points to, between the scholars and literary historians is revealing though. The new critical reading methods that were developed by French jurists did not only encourage the use of initially antiquarian materials by the readers of histories, as mentioned above, but also brought the two fields closer in terms of style and scope. According to Bodin, "there are three proofs in the light of which origins can be known and evaluated

---

[142] Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 13, No. 3/4 (1950), 293-4.

[143] Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution,* 6.

[144] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 15.

[145] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 13.

when reported by historians: first, in the proved reliability of the writer; second, in traces of language; third, in the situation and character of the region." Instead of focusing on the skilfully crafted genealogies of the time, Bodin insisted on the importance of the linguistic, historical and geographical facts in determining a nation's roots and continuity. At the end of his discussion, he concluded that many historians of his age did not utilize the right tools for determining the origins of peoples, losing out against the power of their feeling for their nations. The new critical reading methods that Bodin and Baudouin favoured, thus, were not only a development in the field of legal studies, but a synthesis of legal, philological and antiquarian scholarship that would turn into a new approach to written sources. It was for this reason that Baudouin defined history as "an interdisciplinary task that required not only artistic composition, but systematic assembly and interpretation of the evidence".[146] One of the most striking features of the new history was its openness to making use of both the tools and the information produced by different areas of study, such as geography, chronology, ecclesiology, law and political thought.[147]

2.6. Style of history

The emphasis on the eloquence of style and the generally approved connection between historian and orator were refuted harshly by Bodin and Baudouin. According to Bodin, "by no means can it happen that one and the

[146] Grafton, *What was History?*, 96
[147] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 37.

same man fills the office of good orator and that of good historian". As the main aim of the orator is to influence people through his narration, it is certain that he would need to polish some parts of his narration and add some details that would not be factual, in the end tainting the scientific nature of history, which was given great importance by Bodin. His ideas on historians stating their judgments on the events that they discuss are not clear though. The way he presents contrasting ideas of previous authorities and stays silent and thus, mostly out of uncertainty, impartial on the issue, is a unique feature of his work in general:

> But grave doubts trouble me whether historians ought to praise or to vituperate and to express judgments about the matter under discussion, or whether they should leave to the reader the formation of an unbiased opinion. As this bears closely on the choice of historians, I will bring forward the essential argument on each side and leave the matter to individual judgment.[148]

For Baudouin, the past had to be read "without any interpolation". Any stylistic addition to the historical material, such as invented speeches or the restructuring of events for dramatic effect, would make history "faulty and mendacious", as history needed to be pragmatic rather than dramatic.[149]

The overall organization of the existing histories were also under attack. Medieval and Tudor chronicles were quite different from the histories that were praised in the works of Bodin and Baudouin. Tudor chroniclers did not have a concept of writing selectively and thus they tend to include immense amounts of random information in their works.[150] Chronicles did not re-organize the series

[148] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 51.
[149] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 48.
[150] Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 168.

of events according to their subject matter. They only report the events of the past in the order in which they occurred, as the main issue for them was not the quality but the quantity of information they conveyed. The events were listed chronologically and in a way that would make it rather difficult for the readers to see the links of cause and effect between them.

Bodin was suggesting a better organized method for reading as well as writing histories; and his method, according to Grafton aimed at "transforming the rudimentary text-processing systems of the rhetorical tradition into a distinctive method - an automatic interpretation machine".[151] According to Bodin's suggestions on the "proper arrangement of historical material" historical material should be divided into three: divine, natural, and human history. These three had sub-categories; for the human history, for instance, the sub-categories would be various human affairs such as counsels, sayings, and facts etc. The nature of the affair would also be noted, such as honourable, shameful, or indifferent next to each entry. Then, Bodin makes a crucial distinction:

> Or if anyone-repudiating the teaching of the Stoics-prefers to separate honorable from useful, base from useless, I shall not quarrel with him. Then he will establish four types-base, honorable, useful, and useless. For example, the plan of Themistocles about burning the ships, which on behalf of the state at the command of the people he had communicated to Aristides-since it seemed useful to Aristides, yet not honorable, we shall place this subject under the heading, "concerning plans taken on behalf of the state," having added in the margin the letters "C.T.V.," that is, a base, but useful plan (consilium turpe utile).[152]

[151] Grafton, *What was History?*, 214.
[152] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 36.

Two points stand out here. First of all, the structure that Bodin suggests organizes events according to their aims and results, thus changing the structure of the arrangement of historical material from chronological to causal. This sort of an organization, therefore, had to be selective, leaving numerous irrelevant or unnecessary events out of the texts. It is true that the main source of historical information was still being "compiled" or "gathered" from previous chronicles or histories, but this time the way historians organized the raw material and the process by which they decided on the use of it was different. Thus, histories were becoming something different than the reports of the events of the past in the order in which they occurred. Besides, as mentioned above, processing the material and representing it to the readers in the right form was almost as important as the process of compiling information from the previous sources.

Secondly, Bodin's suggestion of dividing base and honourable actions into two, as useful and useless ones, indicates a change in the lessons that histories expected to teach. Medieval chronicles were being criticised from three main aspects. Firstly, the Latin of those chronicles were found corrupt. Secondly, chronicles and annals were found defective in terms of objectivity, as they were mainly written by religious men. And finally, the annals and chronicles were thought to be paying attention only to the event, without any reference to the conditions that led to that event, or the results of it. Chronicle narratives did not attempt to connect events to each other.[153] Like Polybius, one

[153] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 65.

of his favourite historians, Baudouin demanded a history that would be called "pragmatic":

> The ancients applied the term 'pragmatic' to the form of history that exerts itself to explain and wisely and usefully demonstrates what it narrates, so that it describes not only events, but their causes, and gives events with their counsels.[154]

Histories were expected to explain the causal links between the events, but still, the question of the use of history; that is whether history would teach moral or political lessons was being discussed.

Sir Philip Sidney's evaluation of the connection between poetry and history in *Defense of Poesy* is revealing on this point.[155] Sidney argued for the superiority of the former. Both history and poetry intended to be didactic. However, poetry was certainly better in this as history was "so tyed, not to what shoulde bee, but to what is, to the particuler truth of things, and not to the generall reason of things, that hys example draweth no necessary consequence, and therefore a lesse fruitelesse doctrine".[156] While the poet could invent stories that would be plausible, the historian was obliged to sacrifice either the accuracy or the moral value of the story that he conveyed. These arguments of Sidney were his reflections on an ongoing debate on the use of history since Machievelli's and Gucciardini's criticisms of the moral value of history.[157] Politic histories, according to Levy, were composed with the aim of teaching political wisdom. In explaining the reasons for the events, providence was still the ultimate cause, but the pragmatic use of history necessitated it to be seen

[154] As quoted in Grafton, *What was History?*, 71-2.
[155] Phillip Sidney, *An apologie for poetrie. VVritten by the right noble, vertuous, and learned, Sir Phillip Sidney, Knight*, London: 1595.
[156] Sidney, *An apologie for poetrie.*
[157] on their views on political use of history, see Felix Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: politics and history in sixteenth-century Florence,* New York: W.W.Norton and Co., 1984.

something less important than the actual, worldly causes.[158] And as Bodin's explanations suggest, now histories were expected to set examples of not only honourable actions but also base but useful actions.

This chapter has summarized some aspects of seventeenth-century historiography with an emphasis on the change in ideas of why and how history should be written. It should be stated, however, that the historiography of the seventeenth century cannot be seen as a radical break from the earlier practices of history writing. Besides, it can be suggested that some aspects of the seventeenth-century histories could be traced back to ancient histories, without a break in between. Thus this chapter has focused on the shifts of emphasis rather than the emergence of completely new ideas or methods. Accepting that there would be medieval chronicles that would seem similar to seventeenth-century histories in some aspects, what is important to note here is that from the end of the fifteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth centuries the outlook of the histories changed to a considerable extent, together with the ideas on what history was and how it should be used. These changes in historical thought ended in changes in the forms in which histories were written. The next chapter, thus, will discuss the specific features of the genre of general histories, trying to connect the new features of these histories to the changing ideas in the reading and comprehending of histories.

[158] Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 237.

CHAPTER III

THE IDEA OF "GENERAL HISTORY"

A two-page advertisement for printing a general history of England was published in the *London Gazette* on 21 November, 1694. "Proposals for Printing a General History of England", composed by John Dunton, is a valuable source that explains neatly the necessity for and the suggested use of a general history of England.[159] Dunton's comments on the previous attempts at such an undertaking and his way of explaining the method and the sources of the particular proposed work summarizes what general history meant to intellectuals at the end of the seventeenth century. Another source that could inform us on what general history meant at the turn of the century is *The English Historical Library: or, A Short View and Character of most of the Writers Now Extant, either in Print or Manuscript; which may be Serviceable to the Undertakers of a General History of this Kingdom*.[160] Published in 1696, William

[159] John Dunton, "Proposals for Printing a General History of England," reprinted at the end of the index to the *Present State of Europe*, vol. 5, licensed Jan. 3, 1695.

[160] William Nicolson, *The English Historical Library; or, A Short View and Character of most of the Writers now extant either in Print or Manuscript which may be Serviceable to the Undertaking of a General History of this Kingdom* (London, 1696). The second part that appeared in 1697 was entitled *The English Historical Library Part II, Giving a Catalogue of the most of our Ecclesiastical Historians and some Critical Reflections upon the Chief of Them* and the third part, *The English Historical Library Part III, Giving an account of our records, Law- Books and Coins, from the*

Nicolson's work is as an annotated bibliography as well as a critical commentary on the main source materials of English history. It is prepared for use by those who would write a general history of England, as the title suggests. Nicolson's work attracted great attention from intellectuals as a reference work that would be a "good manual to inform the generality of mankind what has been done in English affairs, whether Topographical or Historical".[161] It provides us a sketch of the wide scope of general histories. Besides, his comments on the existing histories of England and his approach to the project of writing a general history reveals what general history meant to him and how it is differentiated from other histories.

Starting with an evaluation of the ideas presented in these two curious sources, the first part of this chapter tries to set the final point toward which the idea of general history was evolving throughout the seventeenth century. Then, in the second part, the general histories that were circulating in England before 1700 will be discussed to point out some shared features of these works. Focusing mainly on the explanations of the authors or the translators of general histories, in the way that they are presented to us in the paratexts of these works, this chapter tries to grasp contemporary ideas on the method of writing and on the anticipated use of this specific group of histories.

Conquest to the End of Queen Elizabeth's Reign appeared in 1699. In 1736 a revised edition that included the Scots and the Irish was published.

[161] Joseph M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age,* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994, 288.

John Dunton (1659–1733), a bookseller and author, was also the editor of the popular journal titled *Athenian Mercury*.[162] The journal was prepared for the general public and aimed at answering questions such as "Which do you esteem the greatest Artists in Painting, the Ancient or the Modern?", "Whether the Ancients were as Skill'd in Shipping and Navigation as the Moderns are?" or "Whether the Queen of Sheba, if now living, might not receive as ample Satisfaction from our Modern Writers . . . as she did from Solomon?"[163] This enthusiastic project did not last long though. The *Athenian Mercury* was published weekly from 17 March 1689–90 to 8 Feb. 1695–6. Afterwards, a selection called *The Athenian Oracle* was published in three volumes.[164] It seems that Dunton decided to undertake a new project of publishing a general history of England around mid-1690s. In this pursuit, he got in touch with Sir William Temple, who was one of the authors in the previous project of the *Athenian Mercury*, and he got a reply stating that

> the best and readiest way to compile a good Generall History of England will be to take in all those parts of it which have allready been written by any approved and esteemed Authours. And to write nothing new besides those Parts which have not yet been touched by any authors of name and estimation.[165]

Temple also mentioned that although it would be a compilation of the writings of a group of different authors, this quality would make the project more feasible and more agreeable for the readers and it would not be a defect for the

---

[162] Leslie Stephen, "John Dunton," *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, Volume 16, 236.
[163] Levine, *The Battle of the Books*, 29-30.
[164] Stephen, "John Dunton," 237; for the "ancients and moderns" discourse of the period, see Joseph M. Levine,
The Battle of the Books, History and Literature in the Augustan Age, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991, 374-413.
[165] As quoted in Levine, *The Battle of the Books,* 304

overall narrative.[166] This sort of a compilation of existing histories through the combined efforts of a group of historians was also suggested in the *The English Historical Library* by Nicolson.[167]

The history that Dunton wanted to publish was planned to have an integral chronology:

> Proposals for Printing a General History of England From the flood, according to the best Traditional Account, to Julius Caesar, and from thence out of the most Ancient Record, Manuscripts and Historians, down to the reign of their Present Majesties King William and Queen Mary … [168]

Dunton explains the need for such a work, referring to others who had already mentioned this necessity. According to Dunton, complaints expressed by Sir William Temple in his introduction to *The History of England*, or by Francis Walsingham in the "Prologue" of his *History* had made it "well known" among those who "converse with Learned men or books" that England does not have "any good or approved General History". The words of William Temple, also repeated in the advertisement, make it clear why it was so important to have such a "general history" when there were already numerous histories of England, both old and new. Dunton refers to Temple's "judicious reflection" as follows:

> That as it is a shame to be ignorant in the affairs of our own Country, so 'tis hardly worth the Time and Pains (and we shall add Expence) to be informed, since for that end a Man must read over a Library, rather than a book, does unanswerably evince the necessity of such an undertaking.

---

[166] As quoted in Levine, *The Battle of the Books,* 304
[167] Nicolson, *The English Historical Library*, "The Preface"
[168] For all quotations from Dunton's see, "Proposals for Printing a General History of England," [1695]

A few points should be mentioned here. Temple, as quoted by Dunton, sees a general history as a compilation specially designed to be a practical, single work for those who want to learn their nation's history. As will be discussed in the second part of this chapter, the initial audience of general histories was a wider group that would include people other than historians: lawyers, members of the gentry or local rulers were all targeted. This wider audience, who would not care much to cope with the abundance of books that existed, had to be approached differently. Thus, general histories were written for those who wanted information that is already processed, compiled and presented neatly.

After a few paragraphs, Dunton re-emphasizes the necessity of a general history of England, this time explaining the need from a more practical point of view:

> to convince any man of the great Usefulness of such an Undertaking; and therefore shall add, as a further Argument, that the Scarcity of several of the Authors whom we design to Consult, is such, that they are not to be purchas'd with Money, but reserv'd as Jewels of great Value by those who posses them, which of it self is enough to demonstrate the Advantage of this Design.

The aim was to make sure that the readers who were interested in history could easily follow the complete history of England by reading the proposed general history, without "put[ing] himself to the Expence of Buying, and fatigue of Reading all our Histories [then] Extant". These ideas summarise the use of general histories for the intellectuals of the seventeenth century.

The third point in the advertisement that is important for us is Dunton's explanation of the sources that will be consulted for this project. He assures the prospective readers that the books which they "intend to consult" include English and foreign "historians of reputation (both Latin and English)" who

treat of English affairs. To this, he goes on, a huge collection of primary sources will be added, gathered with the help of "Persons of Eminent Quality" and "divers Learned Men". The process of production, as Dunton explains, seems to continue on two different levels: the primary and secondary sources are gathered, through the connections explained above, and then they are processed and united for a new narrative. At this point, the readers of this advertisement are also encouraged to take part in it:

> we do hereby invite all Ingenious and Learned Persons, and true Lovers of their Country, to communicate to us any Manuscript, Memoirs, or Corrections which they have made in the Histories of England already published, and we do assure them that that shall be carefully perus'd, and made use off for the Improvement of the Work, and faithfully and gratefully restored.

This cooperative attitude, to be discussed further in the second part of this chapter, where authors call on their readers to communicate possible errors or differences of analysis to them, so that the histories would evolve into something better, is also seen here, at the very beginning of an attempt to prepare a general history.

The conclusion of all this effort would be a fully corrected history of England that would be "approved" by everyone. Dunton assures future readers:

> And for the further satisfaction of the Public, we think fit to inform them, that the Learned Gentlemen who has undertaken this Province, will take care that all Defects of former Authors be supplied, that nothing unworthy of the Noble Title of History be inserted, and that all manner of Partiality and Passion be avoided.

As will be seen in the prefaces of the authors of general histories, the idea of "correcting" or "purifying" history books, while creating a new version of history, is important for the undertakers of this project. The authors of general

histories, therefore, state that they have omitted “myths and fables” and the advertisement of a general history assures the readers that the necessary measures will be taken to exclude anything in the sources that is “unworthy of the Noble Title of History”. Thus the authors not only compile a new narrative, but also re-shape the material they use, according to the needs of their times. This is exactly what the new readers of this new history expect from them.

In terms of its style and scope, Dunton makes it clear that the forthcoming work will follow the patterns of “celebrated historians” such as Mezeray or Buchanan and will take in “the history of the church in conjunction with that of the state”. Dunton finishes this informative part of the advertisement with a specific, but apparently crucial note to the readers: the book will “take notice of the variations and changes” in both the state and the Church, “by way of Corallary at the end of each Century”. This final note, referring to the reader-friendly quality of general histories, indicates the importance of tools such as the diagrams, summaries, lists or comparative charts given at the beginning or the end of the chapters. Dunton’s words do not only tell us that all these little additions are done to make it easier for the readers to follow the “variations and changes”. This actually refers to the process in which authors make the comparison for the readers and provide them with an easy-to-follow summary of the processed information. Dunton’s care in putting these qualities of the proposed work into its advertisement also shows us the importance of these additions for the public, as these qualities are used as a part of marketing process.

Dunton’s advertisement summarized some basic qualities of general histories. His aim is the preparation of a chronologically unified history of

England, both civil and ecclesiastical, composed out of histories old and new, as well as from a large group of primary sources, read and corrected by the author and presented to the readers as a unified narrative, a text that aims to inform them on history and provide them with valuable notes or summaries that would make it easy for them to follow the changes that have occurred over the centuries.

Nicolson starts the preface of *The English Library* in a similar way to Dunton, by stating that there is an increasing "desire" of the "learned men" of England for a general history of "this kingdom", which he finds very "sensible". The demand of the intellectuals is so "earnest" that according to Nicolson, there have been "attempts" that would aim at pleasing this "prevailing Humour of the Times".[169] Very much like John de Serres, who explains that he was encouraged by the "judgement of his learned friends" to prepare a general history of France, or Dunton, who discuss the necessity for such a work through references to other intellectuals who have indicated this need, Nicolson's words reveal that he considered general histories to be a dominant genre/type of history that was "sensibly" in demand. Nicolson, however, is quite pessimistic about the actual process of composing such as work, as according to him, "the due observance of all the rules which Father Le Moyne, and others, have laid down for the carrying on of such a work, require so many accomplishments" that it is almost impossible to find a historian that would be suitable for the duty.[170]

[169] For all quotes, see Nicolson, *The English Historical Library*, "The Preface"
[170] Nicolson refers to Pierre Le Moyne (1602-1671), the author of *Of the art both of writing & judging of history with reflections upon ancient as well as modern historians, shewing through*

What were those accomplishments that would be expected from the suitable author for a general history? Nicolson explains that a historian suitable for such a huge project should be, like Polybius, "a soldier, a statesmen and a philosopher". He should also be "a divine, a lawyer, an Orator, a poet, and a downright, honest country gentlemen". To these, Nicolson adds some qualities, such as being "plentifully stocked with wit, or an universal disposition and unbounded spirit that comprehends all that's great and glorious in the several states and empires of the whole world". On top of these "intellectual endowments", Nicolson adds "the great Moral one", that is the author of a general history should be a "Philalethes, a person of that just integrity as not to be biased by passion or interest".

Before Nicolson's proposed solution to the problem of the impossibility of finding a historian that would fit this definition, one needs to say a few words on what can be concluded from such a definition of a historian. First of all, Nicolson's connection of the idea of general history to Polybius, referring firstly to him as a good example, is quite suggestive. Considering Bodin's praises of Polybius's works in terms of method and content and Jean Francis Petit's reference to the work of Polybius in explaining what general history meant for him, it would not be hard to think that Polybius's *Histories* were seen as the root and the best examples of general histories. The main list of intellectual qualities that the author of a general history should have simply draws the boundaries of the expected scope of such a work. The author who would write a general history of England was expected to be a soldier, a statesmen, a philosopher and

---

what defects there are so few good, and that it is impossible there should be many so much as tolerable. (London: 1695)

a divine, as he was expected to consider military, political, intellectual and religious aspects of the history of England while writing. Nicolson's emphasis on the qualities of being an orator and a poet, on the other hand, might be taken as an indicator of his concern for the style of the histories, as well as the content. The "universal disposition" of the author, explained as a quality that would enable him to comprehend the "great and glorious" in various states and empires, reveals an expected comparative attitude from the work that he would produce. Although his task would be writing a general history of England, he was expected to be able to reflect on various different countries.

Nicolson, after stating the necessary accomplishments of the future author of a general history of England, makes an evaluation of the existing works, that might be accepted as "advances" made in this way. The first three authors, Leland, Bale and Josceline, Nicolson believes, could not finish their undertaking because they realized the "frailties in themselves". Selden or Camden were not suitable for such a task according to Nicolson. Milton's and William Temple's English histories are not general histories according to Nicolson, as they are "only" abridgements of English history.

Describing the current situation as such, Nicolson's proposed solution to the problem is to form a "club of men of parts and learning" that would consist of men specialized in ancient and modern languages, British, Roman, Saxon and Danish documents and histories, geography of these regions and the law of these peoples. This group of men together with the third part of the *English Historical Library* (1699) which is mainly a survey of the "Records, Law-Books and Coins from the Conquest to the end of Queen Elizabeth's Reign so far as they are serviceable to History" indicates Nicolson's wish to include antiquarian

knowledge into the general history of England. According to Nicolson, all this documentary and antiquarian material had to be a part of the complete general history of England.

Some men of this group should be "bred at court" and others "in Camp", according to Nicolson. Only when every member of this imaginary group of men finish their tasks and share their results with the rest of the group, to be inspected and approved by them, Nicolson argues, would there be a possibility of composing a general history of England. Nicolson's emphasis on a group of authors specialized in different fields indicates the importance to him of the scope of general histories. General histories were not only expected to deal with a range of issues, but they were also expected to be some sort of reference source that has been approved by intellectuals specialized in different fields.

As Dunton also mentioned in his *Proposal for a General History*, general histories were expected to obtain the general approval of intellectuals, as general histories were meant to be some sort of corrected version of existing histories. This idea of general histories being the most perfect and corrected version of existing histories on a specific subject is also mentioned by Nicolson. According to Nicolson,

> A general *Examen*, a sort of an universal *Index Expurgatorius*, that points at the mistakes and errors of every page in our several historians, is chiefly what we want; and what must be the result of the joint Labours of a Society of English Antiquaries and Historians as well as the General History it selfe.

After stating this particular aim of a general history, Nicolson goes on to explain the main reasons for such a need, with reference to the "miserably abused" condition of the "printed" histories of England. These sources, which Nicolson

claims to have been damaged either in the process of transcription or printing, would be corrected though a general history.

As will be discussed in the second part of this chapter, the whole idea of writing chronologically integral, factual histories that contained not only political history, but also information on religion, state, society, language, custom and law, was an outcome of the great effort of putting existing histories at the service of present needs, turning them into bodies of literature where the origins and developments of any aspect of human society might be traced. General histories, which can be seen as products of this new understanding and usage of history, were composed and presented to the readers in order to let them see history as a whole and thus comprehend the changes that had occurred over time. All the "variations and changes", as Dunton puts it, would help people to understand the present conditions of their laws and customs and evaluate them within a historical perspective. Dunton states this overall unifying aim in his advertisement more than once, through his references to the use of general histories for those who want to understand the laws of England better. According to Dunton, by reading a general history of England "the Reader may have a better View of [English] History and Constitution, the Prerogatives of the King, and the Rights and Liberties of the People than [one] can have at present". While expressing the qualities of the proposed work in comparison to the existing histories, Dunton restates this argument, that "not only [English] History, but the Constitution of [English] Government shall be better understood by this work, than by any other yet Extant" and indicates his expectation of interest in this work "as the bare Description of [England], viz.

Camden's Britannia, has deservedly found so much encouragement, the General History of the same shall not meet with less".

3.1. General Histories

In order to understand how the authors and translators of general histories position their works within the history-writing trends of the seventeenth century, one needs to go through the lengthy, and most of the time quite informative, introductions or prefaces that they prepared for their works. In the case of translations, some of them, particularly helpful for us, contain a translation of the original author's introduction as well as the translator's own introduction, allowing us to see relatively clearly the possible discrepancies between the approaches of both the author and the translator. In these introductions and prefaces we also find information on the basic qualities of general histories that would distinguish them from other histories: the importance of integral chronology; the details of the methodology of compiling histories; the comparative approach of the authors; the use of these histories and explanations of issues on style and scope of these works. This section will go through almost all the general histories published in England before 1700 in order to arrive at a sketch outlining the main points that justify the recognition of general history as a distinct genre for contemporaries as well as for modern historians.

3.2. Chronology: "From the first foundation thereof until this present"

The prime sources of information on the distinct qualities of general histories are their paratexts. The titles, dedications, introductory pieces, and in some cases additional information provided by the translators, provide us with the necessary information to understand the important and unique aspects of these books. Several studies have shown the importance of the lengthy titles of early modern works, pointing to the fact that the title, the way is appears on the printed page and the details that are included in it worked as an advertisement for prospective readers. The points that are included in the titles, thus, meant a lot to the publishers as well as the authors and the readers. The titles of early modern books did not only set the name of the work but also mentioned its genre, gave some information on the scope and the style of the work and mentioned some of its specific qualities.[171]

As it appears from the title pages of numerous general histories that were published in the early seventeenth century, the first interesting aspect of general histories is the wide time span they cover, usually "from the beginnings" of a nation, state, city, science, profession or invention, and ending at what is the present day at the time of composition, or what occasionally is seen as "the end" of the subject at hand, such as the *General History of the Reformation*. This aspect of general histories repeated in almost every title page:

[171] Ceri Sullivan, "Disposable Elements? Indications of Genre in Early Modern Titles" *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 102, No. 3 (July, 2007), 641.

A
GENERALL HISTO-
RIE OF THE NETHER-
LANDS:

VVith the genealogie and memo-
rable acts of the Earls of Holland, Zeeland, and
west-Friseland, from Thierry of Aquitaine the
first Earle, successiuely vnto Philip the
third King of Spaine:

Continued vnto this present yeare of
our Lord 1608, out of the best authors
that haue written of that subiect:

by ED. GRIMESTON.

A
GENERAL
INUENTORIE
OF
THE HISTORY OF FRANCE
from the beginning of that MONARCHIE,
vnto the Trea-
tie of VERUINS, *in the year* 1598.
Written by IHON DE SERRES.
And continued vnto these times, out off the best Au-
thors which haue written of that subiect.
Translated out of FRENCH *into* ENGLISH,
by EDWARD GRIMESTON Gentleman[172]

[172] This title was changed as "The General History of France" as will be discussed later on.

THE
GENERALL
HISTORIE OF
SPAINE,

Containing all the memo-
rable things that have past in the
Realmes of Castille, Leon, Nauarre, Arragon,
Portugall, Granado, etc. and by what means
they were united, and so continue under
Philip the third, King of Spaine,
now raigning;

Written in French by LEWIS DE
MAYERNE TURQUET, unto the
yeare 1583:

Translated into English, and continued unto these times
by EDWARD GRIMESTON,
Esquire.

THE
GENERALL
HISTORIE OF THE MAGNIFICENT
STATE OF VENICE.
FROM THE FIRST FOUN-
DATION THEREOF VNTILL
THIS PRESENT.

Collected by Thomas de Fougasses, gentleman of Auignon,
out of
all Authors, both Ancient and Moderne, that haue
written of that subiect.

Englished by VV. SHUTE. Gent.

THE
GENERALL HISTORIE OF

Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles: with the names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours from their first beginning An^{0}: 1584. to this present 1624.

WITH THE PROCEDINGS OF THOSE SEVERALL COLONIES and the accidents that befell them in all their Journyes and Discoveries.

Also the Maps and Descriptions of all those Countryes, their Commodities, people, Government, Customes, and Religion yet knowne.

DIVIDED INTO SIXE BOOKES.

By Captaine IOHN SMITH sometymes Governour in those countryes & Admirall of New England.

THE
General History
OF THE
REFORMATION
OF THE
CHURCH,
From the Errors and Corruptions of the
Church of ROME:
Begun in GERMANY
By Martin Luther,
With the Progress thereof in all Parts of *Christendom*,
From the Year 1517, to the Year 1556.

Written in LATIN By **John Sleidan**, L. L. D.
And faithfully Englished.

To which is Added,
A CONTINUATION
To the End of the Council of Trent, in the Year 1562.

By EDMUND BOHUN, Esq

The last two titles in the list, in great contrast to the first four, cover a fairly short span of time dictated by the recent origin of their subject, and in final case the perceived earlier end of the topic. These two examples actually help reveal the main reason for the lengthy timespan of many general histories. Almost all general histories have a particular attitude to the "unity of chronology", trying to get back to the very beginnings of the subject matter and to bring it down to its end or the present. In this respect these works reflect a point that was a crucial part of the discussions in that era about history writing.

As the discussions of Baudouin and Bodin indicate, the idea that history had to be *ab ovo*, that is, it had to start from the very beginning of the subject

matter, and had to follow its "lifespan" until the very present, was a popular one in early modern historical-writing. States, cities, sciences or any other subject matter were likened to biological entities; so the proper point to start the history of something was its origin.[173] Bodin, in his *Methodus*, openly stated that what he calls "universal history" had to embrace "the affairs of all, or of the most famous peoples, or of those whose deeds in war and in peace have been handed down to us from an early stage of their national growth". For him, there was "such great cohesion of the parts and of the whole" that if they were divided, it would be impossible for them to stand alone.[174]

According to Kelley, the most important themes of Baudouin's historical thought could be grouped under the heading of "the idea of integrity", which can also be defined as "unity", "universality", or "continuity".[175] The perfect or integral history, in the minds of the French theorists, did not simply mean a narrative that added histories of nations one after another to fit them into a universal chronology, or "an Augustinian world-plan". The integral history actually meant a historical synthesis of an enormous number of events into a continuous narrative. And in this sense, general histories were extensive attempts to reach chronological integrity around a specific subject matter as, according to Baudouin, "it was on chronology above all else that the *individuitas*, the indivisibility, of history depended."[176]

Thus whatever the subject matter was, general histories started from the very beginning of it and continued the narrative normally until the present day.

[173] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 52.
[174] Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, 21.
[175] Kelley, "Historia Integra," 51.
[176] Kelley, "Integral history," 51.

As a result of this approach of "from the first foundation until this present", some general histories had to cover thousands of years, while some others that focused on the Americas or the Reformation conflicts focused on a fairly short time span. Chronological comprehensiveness was important for the authors in two aspects: firstly, as the discussion below would indicate, general histories were written as reference books, which contained as much relevant information as possible. As the explanations on the necessity of a general history of England point out, the rapid popularization of history and the increasing number of histories that appeared burdened intellectuals with almost an impossible task of gathering all these books and finding time and means to read all of them.[177] Thus, one of the main aims of the authors of general histories was to present their subject as fully as possible. Secondly, chronological completeness was becoming more and more necessary for historians who were now more interested in the gradual development of customs and institutions than in their specific conditions at a specific point at time, or in the actual reasons that initiated the chain reaction of events rather than the unique qualities of the historical characters.[178] In order to present to their readers gradual changes that happened in societies, or overarching developments of institutions in time, historians needed to start from the very beginning.

The unity of chronology that the authors of general histories supplied was not only a justification for the preparation of the new history book on a topic, on which it was possible to find numerous books, but it was also presented as a distinct feature of their work by the authors and/or translators

[177] Dunton, "Proposals for Printing a General History of England"
[178] Woolf, "From hystories to the historical," 41.

in the prefaces they penned for their works. Jean Francis Petit, the author *A Generall Historie of Netherlands*, supplies us with a clear explanation on what general history was and how it differed what he calls "private history". The very first paragraph of the "to the reader" section of his works reads:

> Polybius a Greek writer (courteous reader) said, that such as think **a private history** sufficient for the knowledge of **the general**, do no less (in his opinion) err from the truth, than he which seeing the members of a goodly creature divided, doth thereby judge of his perfection: but if you take these distinct and divided parts, and make it a perfect creature, giving it life and form, and then show it him again, without doubt he will confess his own error and say he was like unto them that dream.[179]

The reference to Polybius does not only indicate that for the historians of the late sixteenth century a history book that was written on a "private" period of time failed to provide its reader with sufficient "knowledge of the general", but it also reminds us of the semi-biological character of history for these authors, through the metaphor of individual members of a body compared to whole creature. As history itself has to be a "perfect creature" that is made up of all its various members, books that do not present a chronological integrity are actually seen as born with serious defects. Thus although they help us in comprehending the whole through the parts, according to Petit, "it is impossible

[179] Jean François Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands: with the genealogie and memorable acts of the Earls of Holland, Zeeland, and West-Friseland, from Thierry of Aquitaine the first earle, successiuely vnto Philip the Third, King of Spaine: continued vnto this present yeare of our Lord 1608, out of the best authors that haue written of that subiect.* trans. Edward Grimeston. London: 1608. Original Polybius quote reads: "However, it is only by having observed closely (=katopteusas), moving from the intertwining and juxtaposition of particulars with one another, and moreover through their likeness and difference, that one may aim at and be able to gain at the same time both what is useful and what is delightful from history." Here *katopteusas* (κατοπτάω), past participle of the verb *katopteuoo* means spy out, reconnoitre or observe closely.

to have any certain knowledge" through "private", that is chronologically partial histories.

He further explains:

> I do herein concur with Polybius and say moreover, that he which thinks to understand perfectly the modern story of any country or state, without knowledge of the ancient, drawn from the spring, manners, and gests of their ancestors, whose actions he pretends to write, is like unto him, that says he knows men for that he hath seen him, or heard him speak, and yet cannot say of whence he is, what his parents were, nor from whence he is descended.[180]

Petit's explanation here brings in the second aspect of the importance of the unity of chronology: gradual change in time. In order to understand and explain the present conditions of the states, one needs to follow the changes in time, to explain the previous, if possible initial conditions of those nations.

The translator of the work, Edward Grimeston, also mentions the author's explanations in his own "to the reader" part, which he added as an introduction to his translation:

> therefore I have planted his own preface or apology in the front of this book, where you may both see his reasons for the course of the history, …, beginning with the earles of Holland and Zeeland, …[181]

Grimeston's reference to the author's explanations on the issue of the chronological coverage of the work indicates the importance of the issue for him as well. Besides, he explains his own efforts to bring the work up to date. The translator's caution to "advertise" to the readers that he needed some help "to make this history more perfect, and to continue it unto these times" not only

[180] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, 1.

[181] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "the translator to the reader," 1.

explains the importance of a complete chronology for the translator, but also gives a hint on the expectations of the readers. Grimeston's continuation is seen as a contribution towards the perfection of the history, which should continue as long as the entity whose history is being described, if appropriate, up to the present day.

Another title helps us at this point to clarify the meaning of the words "general" and "private". Davis Hume's *A General History of Scotland together with a Particular History of the Houses of Douglas and Angus* actually has a misleading title. Although entitled a general history of Scotland, Hume's work actually deals with the history of two prominent Scottish families, Douglas and Angus. Confusingly, both the general and the particular parts of the work are about the families, and the general history part is only nine pages, presented under the title of "the preface". The small contents section at the beginning of "the preface", however, is revealing:

> The Preface.
> Of the Douglasses in general: that is, Of their 1 Antiquity, (to which is joined their Originall) 2 Nobility and Descent, 3 Greatness 4 and Valour of the Familie and Name of Douglas.[182]

This list simply sets the scope of the "general history" part of the book; that is the first nine pages right before the "Lives", in which the life of each member of the family is told in detail. What the title of the work reveals — ignoring the confusing inclusion of Scotland —is the difference between the "general history" and the "particular" one. The general history, although quite short, gives a sum of the history of the families, starting from their origins and antiquity and makes

[182] David Hume, *A general history of Scotland together with a particular history of the Houses of Douglas and Angus*. Edinburg: 1648 – 1657.

a list of all the important names. This part presents a chronologically whole history of the families, from their origins to the present. The "particular history" on the other hand, deals with the lives of the members of the families one by one. As seen in Petit's explanation of "general" vs. "private" history; Hume's usage of general-particular dichotomy denotes a difference in the mind of the author.

John de Serres, the author of *Inventaire general de l'histoire de France* whose work would be translated into English by Edward Grimeston, firstly as *A general inuentorie of the history of France* and then with its new and more fashionable title, *A generall historie of France,* in 1611, gives hints of the fairly well-established demand for an integral chronology in such works while explaining the lengthy timespan of his work:

> And expecting an end of this great masse, my intent was only (as may easily appear by the Table of the third race) to set before your eyes (as in one Mappe) a Summarie of the ancient History, … But the judgement of my learned friends, hath made mee to take a new course, that the length of so tedious a paiment might not be troublesome unto you, in giving you the whole History unto this day, fashioned of this meane and base stature, …[183]

In the very first section of his work, which is entitled "A Plot or Disseine of the Whole Historie", Serres also explains his overall approach: "to make our Frenchmen see a modell of this great building reducing it to the first foundation, according to the proportion of the subject and the order of times", which again

[183] Jean de Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France from the beginning of that monarchie, vnto the treatie of Veruins, in the year 1598. Written by Ihon de Serres. And continued vnto these times, out off the best authors which haue written of that subiect.* trans. Edward Grimeston. London: 1607, "Touching the use of this his Inuentorie". In the second edition the title is changed *to A generall historie of France, written by Iohn de Serres vnto the yeare. 1598. Much augmented and continued vnto this present, out of the most approoued authors that haue written of that subiect. By Ed: Grimeston. Esquire* [1611].

refers to the contemporary idea of creating a historical narrative that would not leave anything out within the timespan of the subject.

One of the clearest explanations of the features and use of general histories comes from a Cambridge scholar, William Howel, who published his *An Institution of General History, from the beginning of the world to the Monarchy of Constantine the Great* in 1661. After an explanation of what history is and its use for us in general, the author turns to acknowledging the worth of this work. One of the most important points that makes this work unique is explained as follows:

> The success of this Author hath sufficiently recompenced his worthy pains: I dare confidently affirm, No modern Pen hath yet carried it on with so great light from the Original of the Citie to the time of Constantine.[184]

A comparison of the timespan of this work with the others that deal with the same topic also re-emphasizes the overall "quality" of the work as a book of history:

> Sr. Walter Raleigh (never to be mentioned without honor) concludes his History with the end of the Macedonian War …. much about the same time we are forsaken by our Guide Livy, whose Decads from the Captivity of Perseus to the time of Octavius Caesar (whose Contemporary he was) are wholly lost.[185]

This author compensates for the "Defects of Livy" and continues Roman History "five hundred years beyond Sir Walter Raleigh". Moreover, he "vindicates" the antiquity of Britain's first discovery by the Phoenicians as well. All these points, the exceptional emphasis on the origins of Rome, the first discovery of Britain,

---

[184] William Howell, *An institution of general history: from the beginning of the vvorld to the monarchy of Constantine the Great*. London: 1661, "To the reader", 3.

[185] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface".

as well as the expansion of the timespan, although far from to the present, makes his work a better history than the previous ones for the author.

General histories were expected to be up-to-date. The end of the chronology was as important as the beginning of it, and thus the books had to be "continued" for each edition. The translator of general histories, Edward Grimeston, mentions this point in the section delivered "to the reader" of his translation of *General History of Spain*, written by Lewis de Mayerne Turquet in 1583. Grimeston's explanation of his part as the translator of the work indicates the importance of the general histories' up-to-date character:

> This Historie comes but to the winning of the Terceres, which was in the yeare 1583; he hath finished the rest unto these times, I myself have seen it in his studie at Paris, but he hath not yet put it to the Presse, so as I have beene constrained, in the continuance thereof, to helpe my selfe out of the best that have written of these later times.[186]

Although knowing that the author of the work had been working on a continuation, Grimeston felt obliged to continue the work himself for the publication of the translation in 1612. Grimeston's explanation on the necessity of preparing a continuation himself reveals the idea that an "out of date" general history was not acceptable at all, even when there was a possibility of a continuation, almost ready, from the original author himself. In this sense general histories were ongoing projects that did not usually have a fixed end. This can be easily seen through the several publications of most of such works, appearing as second, third and fourth editions, or as translations into different

[186] Louis Turquet de Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine, containing all the memorable things that haue past in the realmes of Castille, Leon, Nauarre, Arragon, Portugall, Granado, etc., and by what means they were vnited, and so continue vnder Philip the Third, king of Spaine, now raigning; by Louis Turquet de Mayerne.* trans. Edward Grimeston, London, 1612, "To the reader," 1.

languages with additions. The extent of the work visibly grows with each edition or, sometimes, with each translator.

Writing chronologically integral histories was one of the most prominent concerns of the authors of general histories, by which they differentiated their work from other histories of their time. This was not a brand new idea, though. It was stated in Thomas Blundeville's *ars historica*, an abridged translation of the works of Francesco Patrizzi and Giacomo Aconcio, *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Histories*, that the history of a city or a country should proceed from its beginning to its end because everything has its "beginning, augmentation, state, declination and ende".[187] As historical change occurred in cycles, very much like the course of human life, the state was expected to be treated as an organic body and historian had to be its biographer. This idea was certainly in the air and general histories, in this sense, were not trying to practice something unheard of.

Criticism by the authors of general histories of other, contemporary, histories, however, indicates their disappointment of the existing histories in terms of their lack of chronological unity. Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, for instance, covered the period from the creation till the second Macedonian war and therefore thought to be "defected" in this sense.[188] Samuel Daniel's *English History* was mainly devoted to the period after the Norman Conquest as the author was sceptical about the possibility of recovering the remote past.[189] Apart from this pragmatic reason for its effective starting point, Daniel chose to

[187] Thomas Blundeville, *The true order and method of wryting a reading hystories*. London: 1574, 1.
[188] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "To the reader," 3.
[189] Samuel Daniel, *The collection of the history of England*, London: 1626.

end his history in 1377 as he felt that he had done what he needed to do as a historian, as he believed that "most of the crucial historical developments … had come earlier. There was thus no need to repeat the dismal tale of the Civil Wars, because what concerned him now was the constitutional and legal settlement of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, not the later dynastic struggle for the crown".[190] Daniel perceived the issues of law and state building as so immense that "more ordinary political events" seemed to be unimportant for him. He thus felt the need to justify the work's rather early end.

John Clapham wrote his *History of England* firstly to cover the period from Julius Caesar's invasion of the island to the fifth century AD. In 1606, however, he reprinted the first section together with an expansion up to the reign of Egbert, the first Saxon king to rule a united England. With and addition of a preface, this version was entitled *Historie of Great Britannie*. This extension, according to Woolf, was done at the right time to grasp the mode of the day, the discussions over the union of England and Scotland.[191] Clapham's decision to end his work with Egbert, who had "ordained that the inhabitants (who had been a long time distinguished by divers names), should be made an entire nation, and being governed by one prince, should bear jointly one name" fits well both to the aim of the historian as well as the political discussions of the age. This point, the historian implies, could be seen as the starting point of the absolute rule of the English kings. Writing with a specific aim in mind, it is certain that Clapham did not care about the idea of chronological unity for his

[190] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 95.
[191] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, 56.

work. As in the case of Daniel, he had made his point, and found it enough to end his work at a time that was meaningful for the point he was trying to make.

In conclusion, the explanations of the timespans of these works, from the pens of either the authors or the translators, make it clear that the integrity of chronology was a specific quality of general histories, which differentiated them from other works on similar subjects. Chronological integrity was an achievement to be stated and justified and it was a quality that made a work "more perfect".

3.3. Sources

Because of the integral chronology of general histories, the books have a dual nature: almost all of them are history books that talk about events that happened hundreds of years before, together with very contemporary events and everything in between. This dual nature of the works forced authors to employ different approaches: for the distant past, they worked as "collectors". They gathered as many accounts as possible and created a new narrative out of them, according to criteria they tended to mention in the prefaces of their works. Together with reading existing material with a critical eye, the authors of general histories also incorporated new types of material to enrich and continue their narrative, especially for more recent events. Thus, together with more traditional sources such as historical accounts and state documents, they used pamphlets, news literature or rare manuscripts as their sources.

In terms of methodology, they differed significantly from the late medieval or Tudor chronicles. The explanations of the authors in the paratexts, as well as the main result of their actual work, indicate that one of the main concerns of the authors was to present information selectively. General histories, unlike chronicles, did not try to include as much information as possible, with all the variations. Rather, the authors excluded materials that they thought to be unreliable or simply inappropriate. Even when various or conflicting accounts on a specific issue are presented, the authors made a choice and explained their refutation of the rest.

3.3.1 General Qualities of Sources

In contrast to late medieval chronicles, general histories tended to use a variety of sources that were not always readily accepted as the materials of an historian. Together with the more traditionally approved material, such as the previous accounts and documents, the authors of general histories incorporate some new materials such as pamphlets, personal accounts and geography sources into their narratives. While the author of the *General History of Netherlands* referred to some pamphlets in explaining how the prince of Parma tried to reach a reconciliation between the towns of Flanders and the king of Spain, the author of the *General History of Virginia* referred to numerous geographical accounts stating that "as Geography without History seemeth a carkasse without motion, so History without Geography, wandreth as a Vagrant

without a certaine habitation".[192] Besides, personal notes of numerous captains and other travellers to Virginia are added to the narrative in pieces, giving details about the actual trip to Virginia or the conditions of life there.[193] At the beginning of the *General history of Scotland*, Hume states that in explaining the "antiquity and Originall" he will use the information

> so far as we can learn and* find either in History, or Monument, by evident or tradition, which we will set down here in order of time, as we have gathered and collected them.[194]

In the following passage, Hume refers to the "publike Monument" in front of the Monastery of Icolmekill, stating that those "were the Registers of those times". Moreover, the translators and continuators also enjoyed the freedom of adding new sources either to enrich or to continue the original. Edward Grimeston, the translator of the *General History of Netherlands*, incorporated the manuscript account of Roger Williams, which was given to him by Peter Manwood, into the work of Le Petit.[195]

In contrast to late Tudor histories, general histories had an aim of producing new information or correcting the existing information on a certain subject by a meticulous study in the archives. Through comprehending the oldest accounts on a topic or especially in cases when the subject matter is closer to the contemporary times, the authors and the translators were happy to pronounce that their works contained information that was not available to the

---

[192] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, 833; John Smith, *The generall historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles with the names of the adventurers, planters, and governours from their first beginning. an[0]: 1584. to this present 1624.* London, 1624, 169.

[193] See, for insatnce, the part entitled "The Observations of Mr. Thomas Heriot in this Voyage," in Smith, *The generall historie of Virginia*, 10-15.

[194] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* "The Preface"

[195] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "The Translator to the Reader"

readers previously. The translator of the *General History of the Reformation*, for instance, praises Sleiden for his hard work in the archives and comparing his work to other accounts on the same topic, he states that

> without the Assistance of Sleidan, very few Men have or ever will be able to Write any thing of those times worth the Reading. For how, I pray, was it possible for him to Lye, who hath spent the greatest part of his History of the Reformation in meer Transcripts, out of the Publick Re|cords word for word, to the wearying of many of his Readers who are in too much haste to see the event[196]

The histories produced by those who did not consult the relevant materials in the archives are defined as "light things, and silly reports" by the translator. The author of the *General History of France* similarly mentions his hard work among numerous sources out of which he could gather an account of Spanish war of Charlemagne:

> I haue reported this in one discourse, to represēt as a table, what hath chanced most memorable, the which can hardly be gathered without some direction in the confusion of so long and obscure reports, wherewith this historie of Charlemagne is intangled.[197]

Presenting a group of sources that were previously not accessible to the readers in a single continuous narrative was another aim of general histories. John Smith, the author of *The General History of Virginia* was familiar with the geography that was the stage of his history and this first-hand experience made him, according to himself, a keener reader of the relevant source material:

> my care hath beene that my Relations should giue every man they concerne, their due. But had I not discovered and liued in the most of those parts, I could not possibly haue collected the

[196] John Sleiden, *The general history of the Reformation of the Church from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome,* London, 1689, "The Author of the Continuation to the Reader"
[197] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 80.

> substantiall truth from such a num|ber of variable Relations, that would haue made a Volume at least of a thousand sheets.[198]

The history he created was again a re-organization of the existing material, processed through a critical evaluation, and his particular relation to the field he was studying turned his evaluation of the sources into something more valuable.

Although the authors of general history were inclined to incorporate primary sources into their main structure, there was a certain limit to that, which mainly differentiated their work from an "inventory" of sources. This difference is clearly mentioned by Edward Grimeston, who, while translating Serres's history of France, was also turning it into something more of a "general history" and less of an "inventory". Grimeston states that de Serres mentioned events "briefly and succinctlie" and referred the readers to the original materials and thus "left them in suspence", who are expected to be "desirous to know the manner, as the matter". Thus, as the translator he

> endeavoured in this edition to ease the Reader of this labor and charge, and have (out of the most approved Authors that have written of this subject) added the reasons and circumstances of many things, which [de Serres] did but only touch at, … [so that] the reader may not only see what things were done, but may also know the reasons, and upon what grounds they were concluded.[199]

[198] Smith, *The generall historie of Virginia*, "A Preface of foure Poynts"

[199] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "An advertisement to the reader," 1.

3.3.2 Methodology: "A collaborate effort of the best authors"

It is certain that the number and the variety of sources that were used was also important for general histories. One of the points most commonly referred to in introductions or prefaces of general histories was that they were "collected" out of the ancient and modern sources written on the subject matter. Important references to this quality of this collection is also given in the extended titles. The title of the *General History of the Netherlands*, for example, states that this work was gathered "out of the best authors that have written of that subject".[200] The title of the *General History of France* also mentions that it was "Much augmented and continued unto this present out of the most approved authors that have written of that subject."[201] The author of the latter, John de Serres, mentions this "collected" quality of his work in the introductory section, which is entitled "The use of this Inventorie", stating that he has "made a just collection of all the substance that may serve for the building of a perfect Historie, from the beginning". The translator Grimeston repeats de Serres: "[de Serres] hath digested into one Worke whatsoeuer hath beene written by many, touching the French History, since the beginning of their Monarchie".[202]

[200] Full title in 1608 edition reads: "A generall historie of the Netherlands: with the genealogie and memorable acts of the Earls of Holland, Zeeland, and West-Friseland, from Thierry of Aquitaine the first earle, successiuely vnto Philip the Third, King of Spaine: continued vnto this present yeare of our Lord 1608, out of the best authors that haue written of that subiect. trans. Edward Grimeston. London: Printed by A. Islip and G. Eld, anno Dom. 1608".
[201] Full title in 1611 is: "A generall historie of France, written by Iohn de Serres vnto the yeare. 1598. Much augmented and continued vnto this present, out of the most approoued authors that haue written of that subiect. By Ed: Grimeston. Esquire"
[202] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "To the Reader"

In some other cases, the collected quality of the work becomes so important that the titles introduce the authors of the works as "collectors" rather than "writers":

> *The General Historie of the Magnificent State of Venice. From the First Foundation thereof until this present. Collected by Thomas de Fourgasses, Gentlemen of Avignon, out of all Authors, both ancient and modern that have written of that subject.*[203]

The History of Spain, similarly, is entitled *A General Historie of Spaine: Collected out of divers Authors, as well ancient and modern*.[204] Edward Grimeston, the translator, mentions this quality of the work in the dedication while explaining the nature of the book:

> It is a general Historie of all the Continent of Spaine, wherein the several Histories of the severall Kingdomes, as they were in former times distinctly divided and governed by divers Princes, are united; being collected out of all the best authors that have written of that subject.[205]

Also, in his "to the reader" Grimeston states openly that the original of this work was "no translation, but a collection out of the best writers that have treated of that subject".[206]

The author of *An Institution of General History* openly criticized one of the historians he had consulted for the history of Rome, for "paying his readers with a mere translation of Florus".[207] General histories were not expected to rewrite or translate existing histories in pieces, rather they were expected to present a

[203] London: Printed by G. Eld, and W. Stansby, 1612.
[204] Full title of 1612 edition: "The general historie of Spaine, containing all the memorable things that haue past in the realmes of Castille, Leon, Nauarre, Arragon, Portugall, Granado, etc., and by what means they were vnited, and so continue vnder Philip the Third, king of Spaine, now raigning; by Louis Turquet de Mayerne"
[205] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, "dedication".
[206] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, "To the reader"
[207] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface"

collection gathered out of different sources. The same author almost repeated the sentences of Grimeston in the Preface of his work:

> this Author has furnished you with a general description of Greece, its ancient Kingdoms and Commonwealths, from the first Originals, … each of them deduced from the best Historians.

For him, the novelty of this work did not stem from the information it conveyed, which was "collected with great diligence from the Fathers of Roman history", but rather from the way the information was presented; as this material was never collected out of different sources and "never given us in one body, by ancient Authors, or by any of later days."[208] According to him, writing a general history starts with comparative reading of histories, and continues into the process of

> weave[ing] these several Arguments and loose pieces into one entire Loom, which I the rather mind the Reader of, because it is not easily perceived by every ordinary capacity, for the uniformity of the style, and the unbroken order of the whole is such, that they only who are conversant in Antiquities are able to judge what travel and study were required to it."[209]

Presentation of the material as a continuous narrative, connecting all bits and pieces "in one body" would supply the readers with a great work that is distilled out of many and that would ease the process of studying to a great extent.

The methods of the authors in compiling reliable and relevant material for their "collections" are described in the prefaces or in addresses to readers of their works. Jean Francis Petit, the author of *A General History of Netherlands*, states that he has "purposely omitted" many "idle and ridiculous things" in the Dutch Chronicle, as they were "more like the Romans of the Rose, or the Legend

[208] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface"
[209] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface"

of Lyes, then a true history".[210] Similarly, the author of *An Institution of General History* feels obliged to "confess" that he had read a French historian whose work gave him "the greatest satisfaction of any men" yet even that author could not refrain from including parts to "amuse himself" as some "bad Chroniclers" did. Those parts "of small concernment", which were "below the dignity of an historian", were certainly left out.[211]

John de Serres, in a more elaborate way, explains how he prepared the general history of France for his countrymen:

> in presuming to beautifie this History, I haue taken for the onely obiect of my aime, To seeke the truth with the vse thereof, and to giue you some cause of content. Regard not my tongue, I offer you the simple truth without painting, the which I haue curiously searched for in many good Bookes, which my necessary aboade here hath giuen me meanes to obtaine.[212]

Here Serres explains that he has worked through "many good Books" he had a chance to consult; and compiled "the truth" out of them for his readers. Thus he studied history in the way Bodin and Baudouin recommend, and created a new narrative out of his studies, that would satisfy the needs of the wider public who most probably would not have a chance to consult the material he had covered.

Sometimes the works of the authors were extended by the additions of the translators, who found the narrative of the author somehow not covering enough material. Edward Grimeston, for example, in his translation of Lewis de Mayerne Turquet's *General History of Spain*, which covered the history of Spain until 1583, did not follow the original text "from the yeare 1530" and "inserted divers things out of other Authors, whereof [the author] makes no mention" for

[210] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "To the courteous Reader"
[211] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface,"
[212] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "Touching the use of this his Inuentorie"

the better satisfaction of his readers.[213] Grimeston, as the translator of the text, adds material that is left out by the author, in a way continuing the process of creating the "perfect history" that was best made out of the relevant, credible pieces of different histories that passed the test of the critical eye of the compiler.

General histories, due to the nature of the endeavour, were histories that could never be completed, other than temporarily. As explained in the previous section, almost all general histories had continuations added to the main text, either by the original author, or by a translator. As a result of the bold attempt to present a subject within a chronological unity, books turned into ongoing projects, in which the part concerning contemporary history was kept up to date through the efforts of various parties, whether it be the original author or others. Similarly, general histories were ongoing projects also due to the nature of the work undertaken by the authors of these histories. The authors of the newly composed narratives, who could do this through being critical readers of already existing material, were always open to criticism. Most of the general histories inserted lengthy primary sources into the text, in order to let their readers see the actual material that they had worked with, and the open-minded authors made it clear that they were ready to accept that with the cooperation of the readers it was possible to create a more perfect history:

> I have ever fought the truth in all things carefully …: where I find it assured, I have set it down confidently; where I thought there was some reason to doubt, … leaving place to thee, if thou knowest more or better. Which if thou doest, impart and communicate it; for so thou should do, and so it truth brought to light, ... My pains and travel in it have been greater then

[213] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, "To the reader"

> every one would think, in correcting my errors; thine will not be so much. And both of us may furnish matter for a third man to find out the truth more exactly, than either of us hath yet done.[214]

3.4. The comparative approach

General histories supplied their readers with the necessary chronological integrity for making comparisons of ancient and modern laws and the customs of different nations. A theme of change and gradual development is seen in almost all general histories.[215] This in turn helped readers to see continuities and changes, which connected general histories to the overall idea of learning about laws and customs in their proper historical context. Besides these overarching comparisons the authors of general histories employed the method of comparison in evaluating their sources, in order to explain and correct some common mistakes in histories. Another important point of comparison lay in shifting the trajectory of the narrative from one geography to another, in order to discuss events happening around the same time. This method widened the view of the narrator as well the reader, and thus helped them follow seemingly disconnected events, having the authors explain the previously obscure connections. Together with supplying their readers with the necessary scope and timespan that would help them analyse the connections of events that were taking place in different countries, these books also helped readers in a more

[214] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* "To the reader," 2.

[215] See, for instance, Sleiden, *The general history of the Reformation*, 301; Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 190; Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 549.

practical way, through presenting relevant diagrams, lists of rulers and magistrates, or schematic chronologies. Thus, two strands of comparison stand out. Firstly, general histories themselves, as new narratives that were composed out of existing histories, were an outcome of the comparative approach of the authors. The authors read and compared sometimes conflicting narratives with the object of producing a perfectly unified narrative, filled with only the "truth" as reflected in the material and perceived by the authors. Secondly, the readers of general histories were expected to employ a comparative method, in order "to reap the excellent fruits of history".[216]

Then-versus-now comparisons were frequently used by the authors of general histories, especially when talking about the foundation and growth of cities. The author of the *General History of Netherlands*, for instance, tells about the foundation of the city of Wyckterduyrstede, and compares its present situation to its ancient condition:

> Prince Battus hauing settled his abode in Batauia, he began to build a town, which in suc|cession of time was growne great and mightie; the which by his name he called Batauodu|rum,* at this present Wyckterduyrstede, … It is at this day but a small towne, whereas in auncieut times it was wont to bee 3 miles in circuit, and to haue sixe and thirtie parish churches.[217]

Fougasses, the author of the history of Venice, on the other hand, corrects some points about the city of Malamoc and its name. "Malamoc which is seene at this daie, (on the left hand) going to the Citie from Chioggia" Fourgasses states, "is

[216] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "The use of this inventory," 4.

[217] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "A Chronology of the Earles of Holland and Zeeland, their number, descent, and genealogie; together with their gouernours, regents, and rulers of their common weales,"

not that ancient one which the first Venetians did build". The ruins of that ancient "one are to be seene in the* middest of the Sea". Then he adds,

> Whereby may be coniectured, how much ground the Sea hath deuoured since that time. I dare moreouer affirme, that that place was in the be|ginning called Medoac, and since by the Modernes named Malamoc, by corrupti|on of the language like vnto diuers others.[218]

Here, Fourgasses references geographical as well as linguistic changes, revealing the different types of information that the authors of general histories wanted to convey to their readers.

Comparisons of later rulers to the earlier ones, generally pointing to the degeneration that had taken place were also common. The author of the *General History of France* compares Philip II to his father and grandfathers and states that "he was disloyall, couetous, louing nothing but his owne profit, pittilesse, ingrate" as he "degenerated from the vertues" of his elders.[219] In *The General History of Scotland*, Hume assigns a specific subchapter for a comparative narrative of the Houses of Douglas and Angus:

> And first, we will consider them without any comparison in themselves simply, and absolutely, then we will compare them with others both within, and without the Countrey; and so I hope the truth of our assertion shall appear clear and evident unto the eyes of all those, that will not ob|stinately shut their eyes against so bright shining a light.[220]

The result that he expects from this comparative narrative is revealing. The comparative method is used for the clarification, as well as justification, of the ideas presented by the author in relation to the antiquity, nobility, greatness and valour of these two houses.

---

[218] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 24.

[219] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 141.

[220] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* "The Preface".

Comparing numerous sources that give information on the same historical event also gave the authors of general histories a chance to detect errors in the accounts and to correct them. Fourgasse's rejection of a point that is repeated in the histories of Venice reveals the importance of this method:

> I finde almost to agree in e|uery point with the rest who haue written the same Historie, except in this, where they are of opinion that the Huns entred twice into Italy. I suppose that this er|ror proceeded from that they did reade, that in the time of the Huns they did twice retire themselues from the firme Land to those Islands, and that they would not else haue done so, had not the enemies come vpon them. But wee will heereafter set downe what wee thinke thereof: For from thence in a manner proceeded all the diuersitie in opinions about the originall of the Cittie, so as some affirme it to bee built at one time, some at an other.[221]

Similarly, Hume narrates some "strange, tyrannicall, barbarous, and monstrous facts" that had been "suppressed in the Histories of England, and buried in silence" as they were "being capable neither of defence nor excuse". Thus comparing his sources to the English histories he could compose a better history in which the truth is not "adulterated or suppressed".[222]

Another, and a more significant aspect of the comparative attitude of the authors of general histories is seen in their way of intertwining parallel chronologies of numerous geographies in their works. General histories were not loosely organized works, as will be explained below. However, the authors did not hesitate to shift their trajectory from one geography, city or kingdom to another, in order to discuss some issues that are specifically related to that region. Following a chronological line of events, but managing to incorporate events that were happening at the same time, in different geographies into their

[221] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 3.
[222] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* 57.

narratives, and connecting these events through the links of cause and effect was a prominent aspect of these works. After a lengthy narrative of the great schism and the wars between England and France, de Serres reminds his readers of the necessity of considering the events in the Eastern part of the world:

> But alas, during these cruell confusions of the westerne Church, the Christians of the East (who had endured much) were now vtterly ruined. We left them in very poore estate vnder the raigne of Charles the 6. in the yeare 1396. In fifty yeares (during the scandall of this miserable Schisme and the willfull warres of France and England) there happened a greater alteration.*[223]

After this note, the author starts his narrative of the decline of the Byzantine Empire and the fall of Constantinople. It is important to note that specific events in different countries are not told for their own sake, but within a unity created by the link between cause and effect. Here the connection that the author wants his readers to see is clearly the one between internal discord among the Christian princes and its results, in this case the loss of Constantinople. His narrative of the events in the Eastern Empire ends with a notice for the readers as well:

> But hauing wan|dred ouer so many strange Countries; Let vs returne to France, from whence ha|uing expelled the English and restored this Monarchie to her auncient beautie, by the meanes of our Charles, wee must nowe see the last act of his raigne and life.[224]

In a similar manner, Fourgasse reminds his readers where he left the narrative by saying, "Let vs now returne to that which happened after the peace in Lombardie, which seemeth to be worthy the noting because that armes being

[223] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 209.
[224] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 214.

scarce laied down, a new war had like to haue entangled the Venetians at their doors", at the end of a long digression from the main storyline that explains Ottoman-Venetian relations.[225] The aim of the authors of the general histories was not to follow a single line of events anymore; they wanted to present all the events happening in different geographies that were in some way related to their main focus, as if they were mapping the history.

The diagrams, chronological lists of rulers and magistrates, maps or schematic chronologies supplied the readers of general histories with a number of useful tools. These additions turned general histories into frequently used reference books to which the readers could turn for information as well as the stories conveyed. Petit's history of the Netherlands, for example, starts with a short prefatory chapter entitled, "A Chronology of the Earls of Holland, Zeeland, and their number, descent, and genealogy, together with their governors, regents, and rulers of their commonweales". The author provides the readers with necessary information on "the beginning of the inhabitants, the situations, greatness and ancient manners of those provinces". This short chapter allows Petit's readers to get an idea of ancient times as a whole, leading on to the point where the actual narrative starts.[226] At the beginning of each chapter there is a list of rulers, as well as the important events that occurred in their times, given under the title of "The argument of this book". These summary contents at the beginning of the chapters, together with the detailed side notes, certainly helped readers to find the exact event, office or custom that they wanted to learn about.

[225] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 427.
[226] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, unnumbered sections.

John de Serres's *General History of France* starts with an introductory chapter entitled, "A Plot or Disseine of the whole History". This small chapter provides the readers with an overall outline of the book, which Serres defines as a "goodly and excellent" history. Serres writes that the chapter is inserted to

> set down in general terms what shall be handled in the particular throughout the whole discourse, and lay before our eyes (as in a table by the most clear and soundest proofs that may be drawn from likelyhoods of so obscure antiquity) the beginning and continuance, with the greatest appearance of truth, the increase, with the divers events and success of this state such as now it is.[227]

The chapter ends with "A Generall Diagramme" that "notes the names of the kings of France according to the order and succession of the three Races".

Similarly, *A General History of Scotland* starts with a short piece entitled "A Catalogue of the Lives Contained in this history".[228] The author of *The General History of Spain*, in a more elaborate way, ends his book with a variety of lists, such as the list of all the chief cities in Spain, a catalogue of archbishops in Spain and a lengthy and detailed catalogue of "the princes which have reigned in Spain, since the eversion of the Roman Empire, with their Alliances and successions".[229] This meticulously detailed final list gives the dates of each reign, the names of legitimate and illegitimate children, and of wives and concubines, for each prince that ruled Spain until the present. This idea of providing an overall outlook of the general scope of the work, or of providing diagrams, lists or catalogues, or of the marginal notes described below, can be connected to one of the main qualities of general histories. As mentioned above, these are lengthy

[227] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "A plot or dissaine," 1.
[228] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* unnumbered section.
[229] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, 1344.

works, but as such they are designed for ease of use and reading the book from front to back, word by word, was not the only way they could be used.

3.5. Style of history

The eclectic nature of general histories and the idea behind this, that is creating a previously unwritten "perfect" history out of material collected from already circulating "ancient and modern" works on the subject, required a new form in which to present the results of the lengthy research of the authors. The authors of general histories presented the outcome of their "educated readings" in the form of a book, which had, however, special "reader- friendly" qualities that helped the readers to find their way around these lengthy works and to cope with the eclectic, document-based, but still narrative style. Some authors felt obliged to mention this "unique" character of their book in the section addressed "to the reader", while others just left it to their readers, who were most probably familiar with similar styles, to figure out the best way to make use of their book. Still, general histories stand as distinct from the rest of the historical literature in terms of their stylistic qualities in terms of structure, language and the useful tools they provided for their readers.

General histories did not follow an annalistic structure, although the authors tend to use the reigns of the rulers as the basic units of their chronological narratives. Numerous digressions were added to the basic chronological structure in order to narrate events within their own unity. De Serres's narration of the fall of Constantinople, a digression in his account of

French history, was a well-structured complete history of the event together with the reasons for it and its results. The narrative was not broken into yearly events.[230] His explanation of his choice of structure reveals that his primary aim was to explain events clearly, rather than simply following a chronological line:

> I will note what happe|ned, rather according to the subiect, then the order of times; for that the matters are so confused, as I cannot represent the dates distinctly, without repetition and tediousnesse.[231]

As explaining the "manner, as well as the matter" was one of the main aims of the authors of general histories, they did not hesitate to structure their works accordingly.

One of the most visible qualities of general histories were the marginal-notes, which were meticulously added by the authors and were expected to help the readers in two main respects. Firstly these notes were there to help the reader find the parts that they were particularly interested in:

> as it were united and tied together the discourse of all these realms with a continued style … yet hath he so distinguished them, as seeing them all, you may easily read one severally by itself, by the direction of notes and inscriptions set in the margent at every section or breach, whereby you may choose what belongs to Navarre, Portugall, Castille, or to any other of those realms, and read the Historie apart from the beginning to the end.[232]

Grimeston's explanation here tells us that general histories, being books designed as continuous narratives, also could function as encyclopaedic works for their readers, who were interested in specific parts of the chronologically integrated text, through the notes in the margins. These notes, which were no

---

[230] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 81-90.

[231] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 38

[232] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, "To the reader," 1.

longer than a few words in general, worked as tiny side-titles, stating the content of the paragraph or following few paragraphs that they were attached to.

The author of *An Institution of General History*, on the other hand, refers to a different use of these marginal notes, to refer the reader to the original source or secondary material that was employed in composing that specific part. One of the unique qualities of his work, according to the author of *An Institution of General History* was that

> this author has furnished you with a general description of Greece … deduced from the best historians, whom you still find quoted in the Margent; this, as it hath never been entirely performed by any Author heretofore.[233]

The marginal notes that worked as references helped the readers to get back to the originals, as we would use footnotes or other referencing systems today. References to the primary and secondary material indicated the scope of the research done by the author. Both of these uses of marginal notes would prove popular long after the general histories themselves. As the aim was to create "the perfect image", a complete image, in the mind of the reader, the more material the author covered, the more perfect the outcome would look. For this reason then too, the authors of general histories either indicated their sources in the margins, as the author of *An Institution of General History* did, or they mentioned the variety of sources they had consulted in an appropriate part of

[233] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface," 2.

the text, as did the authors of *The General History of Spain* and *The General History of Netherlands*.[234]

That the relevant material could be referenced in the margins also opened the way for possible new interpretations that could be made by the readers themselves. David Hume, who claims to be open to any criticism by his readers, also states that in terms of the "form and manner" of his work, he made this choice deliberately, "all things being laid open and exposed [to the readers'] view", so that they might choose to see the originals; and at some points where the author cannot "resolve a doubt", the reader might "have some means to solve it better".[235] De Serres made a similar comment about his work:

> I haue therefore resolued to vndertake a labour that should not bee vnprofitable, in preparing you a way to learne your Historie in the origi|nalls … If I may perswade the Reader to conferre this my labour with the writings of others vpon this subiect (both old and new) I shall not then need to put in caution, but be of an assured hope to obtaine a testimonie of my fidelitie, And it may be in time, of some diligence, at the least I bring nothing, that hath not beene well purified and applyed to the vse.[236]

General histories tend to be more well-organized than most of the medieval chronicles. Authors of general histories, while not averse to all digressions, were very keen on keeping their narrative focused on the main topic of the history they were writing. Grimeston mentioned this in his introduction by stating that his aim was "to make it a particular Hystorie of the Netherlands". Thus, he "not willingly inserted any thing, which doth not directly

---

[234] Mayerne, *The general historie of Spaine*, "To the reader," 1; Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "The preface," 3.

[235] Hume, *A general history of Scotland,* "To the reader," 2.

[236] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "Touching the use of this Inventory"

concerne the prince or the prouinces".[237] Similar explanatory sentences that come before or after digressions from the main subject, or repetitions designed to reassert the main narrative, reveal the importance given to the continuous structure of the text. At the beginning of the section on the death of Philip II, Grimeston excuses himself for the repetitive discourse:

> I hope the curious reader will not hold it tedious nor impertinent (if beeing related at large in the French inuentorie) I should here againe make a new discourse of the same subiect, and in a manner in the same tearmes, beeing so written by mine author. I am very loath to distast the iudicious reader with any idle or needlesse repetition, but this beeing a matter which doth so much concerne the subiect of this historie, I should wrong mine author (who might be condemned of great negligence and indiscretion) if I should omit to relate the ca|tastrophe and end of that great king …[238]

This concern for keeping the material limited was related to the idea of writing manageable histories. Instead of loosely organized, voluminous and repetitive chronicles, general histories were planned to be as simple and well-organized as possible. The authors wanted to present the complex material in a well-structured and easy to follow manner, as this was what the readers wanted. Besides, Grimeston's references to his previous translation for events that he excluded from the history of the Netherlands also indicates that general histories were expected to be read in series by the curious reader to complete the points that were left out in a volume.[239]

Almost all authors of general histories mentioned the plainness of their style and some even commented explicitly on their rejection of eloquence in history books. Planned to be used as a reference book where necessary

[237] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "The translator to the Reader"
[238] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, 1177.
[239] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "The translator to the Reader"

information is presented in a well-organized and continuous manner, general histories did not care much for the eloquence of their style. De Serres stated that he offers "the simple truth without painting"[240], and Fourgasse states that he did not want to make his style "so high, but that the lowest vnderstanding may get ouer, nor affected any thing so much, as not to affect". This way, Fourgasse concludes, he accomplished his great ambition "that my lines might rather be fit to crowne my Rea|ders braine, than hang in his eare, and make him a Man, than a Parrot".[241] In contrast to the Italian humanist tradition, plainness of style and simplicity of the language used was the result of the deliberate choice of the authors, as the accuracy of the information contained and the sources used were much more important for both authors and readers than the charm of the stories narrated.

3.6. Causation

Changes in the procedures of reasoning was one of the most remarkable shifts in history-writing practices of the early modern period. The tendency of historians towards a more causal reasoning, rather than a discussion of events through providential explanations, was the result of the complete change of ideas in terms of the use of history, the importance of chronological details and accuracy. Facing the explosion of information that was coming through all sorts of sources, historians were finally able to fill their works with a great amount of

[240] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "Touching the use of this Inventory"
[241] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, "To the reader"

detail while maintaining the importance of the stories they narrated for educating through examples from history. The more detailed the histories got, the more precisely the causal relationship between events could be expressed. Following this, it became easier to explain events through a more worldly set of causes than the providence of God.

It has been argued that history continued to be a repository of examples in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. The main service expected from histories was certainly to give some moral and political examples for the readers. There were, however, some changes in the nature of what were seen as useful examples. Politic histories of the seventeenth century did not try to answer the question "how men should act so as to pass the tests of moral behaviour; instead, they asked what would work in a secular, political society".[242] This new point of view, coupled with the more detailed and accurate narratives of historians of the early modern period necessitated a more down to earth reasoning that would teach the readers how their predecessors acted in certain situations and what resulted from their actions. Worldly affairs and down to earth causal narratives were necessary. As Bolton stated, when historians turn to God to explain the reasons for events, they neglect to inform their readers on the human side of affairs.[243] According to Concio the perfect history was the one which presented the readers with the fullest record of

[242] Fussner, *The Historical Revolution*, xi

[243] Edmund Bolton, *Hypercritica: or a Rule of Judgement for writing or reading histories* (1618). Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 12. For a detailed discussion of the work, see D.R.Woolf, "Edmund Bolton, Francis Bacon and the Making of the Hypercritica, 1618-1621," *Bodleian Library Record* 11 no 3 (1983) 162-8.

causes and circumstances.[244] And Bacon would also agree with the idea that a detailed exposition of causes was necessary.[245] This sort of a change did not occur all at once. It is possible to see that the authors of general histories had God and his plan for this world in mind while they were composing their works. The preordained nature of the events was still a point of reference for them.

It is clear that general histories were primarily written for those who were, or expected to be, in charge of state affairs at one level or another and most of the authors advert to this kind of use. Jean Francois Petit made it clear that his readers "may gather good instructions" out of his work, "as well for matter of religion and government, as for exploits of war", which is "most necessary for all sorts of men to know at this present time, especially for such men as are employed in the managing of any of these three estates".[246] De Serres, the author of the history of France, also defines his work as a "guide" through those troubled days of "uncivil wars".[247]

Starting with the aim of teaching through examples that can really be useful, the causal relations that the authors of general histories explain tend to be more pragmatic and secular. De Serres's explanations on the life of Chilperic is revealing. According to De Serres "the motiues and instruments to expell *Chilperic*" were the common unrest that was caused by the taxes and charges imposed "contrary to custome".[248] Fourgasse, on the other hand explains "sundrie occasions moued Frederick to warre on the Venetians" as his

[244] Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 12.
[245] Dean, *Tudor theories of history writing*, 12.
[246] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, "To the reader," 2-3
[247] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, "Touching the use of this Inventory"
[248] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 14.

aim to "reuenge the iniurie that hee had receiued, by the burning of his Barze"; and his anger towards Venetians after they "made a league with the Pope"; and his fear that the great numbers of Paduans who "were reti|red to Venice for refuge" would cause a change in the side of the Citie of Padua". As a result of this final concern, Fourgasse explains, Frederick "carried thence with him the chiefest and richest Citizens [of Padua], vnder colour of sending them to the warres, confi|ning them farre from home".[249] Fourgasse's detailed account of the fall of Constantinople, similarly, was narrated in an almost completely worldly manner, explaining all the details of the armies, manoeuvres and the causes of the loss on the Christian side.[250]

A more revealing passage is included in *The General History of the Netherlands*. While explaining the efforts of the Estates to find an ally against the Spanish, the author states that, in addition to approaching the French:

> The Estates sent also M. Paul Buys aduocate of the particular Estates of Holland, and some other deputies, vnto the Queene of England, to make the same request; to the end, that if they could not persuade both to succour them, yet at the least that neither of them might bee opposite vnto them: yet it seemed they were more inclined to the English, by reason of the neighbourhood, and the ancient alliances betwixt both countries, and also for that they were stronger at sea than the French.[251]

The author's choice in explaining the reasons for the closeness of the English and the Estates of Holland without a reference to their religious identities indicates his concern to reveal the actual, pragmatic causes of state relations. Geographical proximity, common history and the sea power of the English,

---

[249] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 140.
[250] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 422-7.
[251] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, 862.

rather than their support of the Protestant cause, according to the author, were the reasons that brought them closer to the Estates.

3.7. Scope of history

As mentioned above, the authors of general histories were quite strict about the boundaries of their works, including the material that they thought to be relevant, and leaving out the parts that they thought to be repetitive or irrelevant for their histories. Almost all general histories were mainly a narrative of the political and military history of the country, nation or state at hand, tailored according to the needs of their primary audience. Considering the explanations of the authors in terms of the use of their histories and the general trends of history writing in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, it is not hard to understand their motivations in focusing on political and military issues.

A closer look at these lengthy works, however, indicates that the authors of general histories did not hesitate to include social and cultural aspects of the countries or nations that they were speaking of in their narratives. Fourgasse, for instance, gives a detailed explanation of the coins used in Thessalonica and the history of some buildings in the city:

> At the same time two sorts of monies were coined in the Citie; that of most value was worth eight souls, and the lesser, two. There was likewise a Bridge built of white stone neere to the Church of the Fryers Minors. It is moreouer recorded, That the wa|ters* round about the Citie were so frozen, as men went drie-foote from the Citie to Tourcelles, Malamoc, and (that which is more strange) to Chioggia. It is reported that a bride was

> brought from Mestre to Venice in a waggon, the which before that time was neuer seene.[252]

Grimeston, as the translator of the *General History of the Netherlands*, explains the author's diversion from the main topic for a while to "shew what the Estates bee, and what their authority is" as "it is a very materiall point to be vnderstood, and a great question in this history".[253] In the general history of France, numerous ancient customs are explained together with their origins:

> He was called Le Cheuelu, or hayrie, for that he made a lawe, that none but Kings and their children, with the Princes of the bloud, should weare long hayre,* in token of command: after the Romaine maner, who shaued the heads of their slaues and ser|uants, and left the Periwig onely to the Patriciens, and the head bare. This custome, confi•med by the law of Clodion, hath beene long time obserued in France …[254]

The author of *An Institution of General History* specifically mentioned that the history of the "kingdoms and commonwealths" of Greece were given "from their first originals" and without "omitting the most considerable Customs, Laws and Antiquities of each of them".[255] The contents of these works indicate the importance of issues such as marriage customs, religion and language, and the power and nature of the ruling elite, as well as issues more normal in a work of political history.

As the discussion above suggests, from its first examples to the initial attempts to compose a general history of England, general histories evolved into all-encompassing, easy-to-use and most of the time authoritative histories that

---

[252] Fougasses, *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice*, 327

[253] Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, 978.

[254] Serres, *A general inuentorie of the history of France*, 8.

[255] Howell, *An institution of general history*, "Preface," 2.

could be used as reference sources as well as a long, complete narrative. Numerous editions and translations of general histories of contemporary foreign counties indicate how popular they were among the intellectuals of the seventeenth-century England. During the course of this outpouring of general histories, Knolles's *History* appeared at the right time in terms of both its genre and the subject matter of the work. The following chapter will discuss *GH* to point out the features of this work that made it a general history.

CHAPTER IV

KNOLLES'S WORK AS A GENERAL HISTORY

Being 1200 folio pages in its first edition that appeared in 1603, Richard Knolles's *GH* is a lengthy book. It is divided into three parts, by the author: "[t]he General Historie of the Tvrkes, before the Rising of the Othoman familie" (pages 1-128); "[t]he Lives of the Othoman Kings and Emperors" (128-1152) and a "brief discourse of the greatnesse of the Turkish Empire" (not paginated). It might be argued that the length of the work has been one of the main reasons for the only partial analysis of it by modern historians, within "necessarily tight limits", as Schmuck puts it.[256] Considering the modern works that refer to *GH*, what one notices is the lack of a detailed study that have dealt with *GH* fully, as a complete history book.[257]

---

[256] Stephan Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety: The imago turci in early modern English prose, c. 1550 – 1620", unpublished diss, 20.

[257] Chew, Samuel C. *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1937; Reprint. New York: Octagon Press, 1965; Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576–1626.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003; McJannet, Linda. *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006; Woodhead, Christine, 'The History of an Historie: Richard Knolles' General Historie of the Turkes, 1603-1700.' *Journal of Turkish Studies*, (Cambridge, 2002), 349-57., Fussner, F. Smith, *The historical revolution: English historical writing and thought, 1580-1640* (London, 1962); Dimmock, Matthew, *New Turkes* (Aldershot, 2005); Vitkus, Daniel J., *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural*

Although Samuel Chew defined *GH* as "the first English prose history of the Ottoman Turks" Knolles's work has attracted little attention as a history book.[258] The numerous studies which referred to *GH* partially or dealt with it as one of the sources grouped according to the main objectives of a particular study did not discuss *GH* as a history book, read it through the history-writing trends of its age or compare it to the other histories that were being produced at the same time. Although Christina Woodhead mentions the existence of many other "general histories" of foreign states produced around the time of Knolles's work, she tends to isolate Knolles's work from others stating that in contrast to "other 'generall histories' of foreign states published around 1600" which were mere translations of "one text with other information added to bring coverage up to date" Knolles's *GH* "was a genuine attempt not just to narrate his own chronological account, but to also understand how - and why - the Ottoman state 'is from a small beginning become the greatest terrour of the world'".[259] This argument, as the previous chapter has shown, is based on an erroneous evaluation of general histories. The authors of general histories rejected the idea of making a simple collage of already existing texts univocally and emphasized the importance of assessing and interpreting the relevant material as well as collecting it in the process of reaching a synthesized narrative that they wanted to compose. Writing a general history certainly meant an effort of elimination and correction as well as organization, for these men. This concern

Mediterranean, 1570-1630 (New York, 2003); Ingram, Anders, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries", 2009, unpublished diss.

[258] Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose,* 111.

[259] Woodhead, "The History of an Historie," 350.

for a well-organized, unified narrative was actually one of the points that distinguished general histories from late medieval chronicles.

Smith Fussner, on the other hand, considered *GH* to be a "national history", which denotes a sub-group under the broad title of "territorial histories", as the representation of the history of the Ottoman Empire through its rulers was considered to be the main unit of Knolles's work. Emphasizing the concerns of the seventeenth-century historians for the immediate need for historical information and their intention of composing "brief" and "readable" histories Fussner assesses national historians as "popularizers" rather than authors of original works. Being "one of the most popular national histories of the seventeenth century" Knolles's work, according to Fussner, was an achievement as it was "readable", despite its little scholarly value.[260]

Mainly accepting Fussner's comments that Knolles follows a "classical chronicle format of lives and years", Ingram emphasizes that Knolles's work assimilates different accounts into "one stylistically coherent and definitive" piece.[261] His enthusiasm in terms of composing a "comprehensive and edifying" history of the Ottomans, makes his work a different "kind" of book according to Ingram. For him, it is more suitable to group Knolles's work together with those works which Daniel Woolf has identified as "the borderland between history and chronicle". These works that were being produced in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries had an "abrupt and dry" narrative; they were much

[260] Fussner, *Historical Revolution*, 127-8.

[261] Anders Ingram, ''The glorious empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world': Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and the background to an early modern commonplace' in *Explorations in Cultural History*, D. Smith and H. Philsooph, eds., (Aberdeen: BPR Publishers, 2010), 197-216, 209.

more detailed and they mainly relied on a greater variety of sources than the Tudor chronicles. Still, Woolf concludes, they fall within the boundaries of the same genre.[262] *GH* fits into this group of borderline chronicles/histories to a great extent, according to Ingram, except for Knolles's lively and eloquent narrative.[263]

Although Knolles seems to keep the classical lives format in following the reigns of Ottoman Sultans as the main units of his structure, it is certain that he had an overarching, supreme narrative that relies on the broader issue of Muslim-Christian conflict. Besides, the "general history" section at the beginning, which is more than 120 pages, and the final section where Knolles discusses the reasons for the success of the Ottoman Empire, are certainly organized in different ways. Although the lives seemingly follow an annalistic structure with the years given in the margins, it is certain that Knolles's narrative of events or wars surpasses this yearly structure. As will be discussed below, the years in the margins do not maintain the structure of the narrative but rather work as a guide for the readers.

As an answer to the question of where to put the work of Knolles, in terms of the history- writing trends of the age, I argue that Knolles's work has considerable connections with the genre of "general history" that was primarily imported to England through translations of continental works. As discussed in the previous chapter, it is possible to distinguish general histories from other types of history books that were produced around the same time, in terms of

[262] D. R. Woolf, "Genre into Artifact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century", *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 19, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), 321-354, 329.
[263] Ingram, "Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie,*" 209.

their aim and usage as well as their methodology and my analysis indicates that Knolles's work might appropriately be considered within this group. Other than the internal evidence that groups *GH* with the rest, the patronage of Peter Manwood also provides a connection between *GH* and the genre of general histories. The library of Peter Manwood and some other works that Manwood patronized indicates that he was an ardent collector of general histories. The need for a "general history" of the Ottomans was clear and it was only natural that Peter Manwood wanted Knolles to compose a work that would fit into his collection. This chapter will go over the paratexts where Knolles explains his ideas on his work and his methodology, together with the text itself, to see how his work can be assessed among other works of his time.

4.1. Chronology

As discussed in the previous chapter, one of the main qualities of general histories was their chronological comprehensiveness. The authors of general histories, as is reflected in their introductions, not only saw the chronological unity of their works as important, but they also differentiated their work from other histories written on similar subjects through references to the completeness of their work. The chronological unity of general histories was necessary in two aspects. Firstly, these works were composed as reference books that would be read and used by a larger group than that of historians and thus they aimed at covering everything about the chosen topic. Secondly, shifting the focus of their work from smaller units such as years or reigns of

rulers towards larger spans of time helped the authors of general histories to show the development, change or progress of nations, institutions, law or customs over time, as it was one of the aims of these histories.

Looking at its title, the chronological completeness of Knolles's work appears as one of its main qualities:

THE
GENERAL HISTORIE
of the Turkes, from The *first*
beginning of that Nation to the rising
of the Othoman *Familie*: *with*
all the notable expeditions
of the Christian
Princes against them.

Together with
THE LIVES AND CON-
quests of the OTHOMAN
Kings and Emperours
Faithfullie collected out of the
best Histories, both auntient and mo-
derne, and digested into one continu-
at Historie until this present
yeare 1603:
By Richard Knolles

Lengthy titles were by no means unusual for early modern books and the way the title page was organized was as important as the actual title. The structure of the title pages, fonts, lines and depictions reveal much about the book that it has been argued that the modern transcriptions of these lengthy titles actually "misrepresent" them. The standard spelling and typography used in the transcriptions of the titles, or omission of parts of a lengthy title makes it harder for modern scholars to notice that the titles were of crucial importance for the

early modern books.[264] These lengthy titles, mainly presenting some qualities of the work together with its name, aimed at not only attracting the attention of the readers but also announced the genre of the work.[265] Thus, the titles were specifically organized to inform the readers of the content and specific parts of the book or to state the book's particular aspects for a specific use or area of study.[266] Therefore, among all the paratexts of a printed book, the title-page was the only one which is primarily under the control of the publisher, not the author.[267]

Looking at the title page of *GH*, what one notices first is the capitalized titles of "The General History" and "The Lives and Conquests". These two titles stand out as two books, the first one explained as the part in which the pre-Ottoman era of Turkish history and the history of the Crusades is narrated; and then comes "The Lives and Conquests" which is organized around the reigns of the Ottoman rulers. This dual nature of the *GH*, as it is presented in the title page, will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. For now, what is important for us is the explanation that comes right after the short title of "The General History", which explains the chronological unity of the work as one of its main features. Following theories about the aim of the title of an early modern book, it would not be wrong to say that the complete chronology, stated as the very first quality of this work that should be mentioned, appears to be

---

[264] Bradin Cormack, Carla Mazzio. *Book Use, Book Theory: 1500-1700.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005, 49; Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, 32-3.

[265] Ceri Sullivan, "Disposable Elements? Indications of Genre in Early Modern Titles" *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 102, No. 3 (July, 2007), p. 641.

[266] Cormack and Mazzio, *Book Use, Book Theory*, 49.

[267] Smith, Margaret M. *The Title-Page: Its Early Development 1460–1510.* London & New Castle: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2000, 11; Genette, *Paratexts*, 16.

quite important for the publisher, as well as being a point of attraction for the readers.

The chronological completeness of *GH* seems to be as important for Knolles, as it was for his publisher. Very much like Petit or de Serres, Knolles mentions the integral chronology of his work as one of the main qualities that defines it. In the dedication, in the very first sentence where he defines his work, the adjectives he uses are revealing:

> Which to doe, I was also the more desirous, seeing **diuers little volumes** and **small parts of the Historie** presented vnto the greatest Princes:… all filling me vvith good hope, that this whole and continuat Historie of that Northerne and warlike Nation … drawne euen from the first beginning thereof, and continued vnto this present yeare (not together to my know|ledge by any one before written) should with your most noble Maiestie find no lesse grace and fauour…[268]

The comparison Knolles employs in this paragraph is important. Referring to previous works as "little volumes" and "small parts of histories" strengthens the effect of the adjectives "whole and continuat" he uses for his work. Knolles's parenthetical expression also states that unique aspect of his work.

His words in the dedication are not the only instance where Knolles mentions of the chronological unity of his work as a quality that makes it unique. He repeats this idea in "The Author's Induction to the Christian Reader", while he is explaining the difficulty of this project. As Knolles's aim was to present the history of the Turks "as it were under one view and at one shew, to lay open unto the Cristian Reader", the extent of the project was enormous. Such a project was

[268] Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication]

> a worke so long and laborious as might well haue deterred a right resolute and constant mind from the vn|dertaking thereof, being as yet to my knowledge not vndergone or performed by any [269]

There were certainly many other histories of the Ottoman Empire available at the time, but they were not of the same sort. The uniqueness of Knolles's project deprived him of a proper guide:

> I saw not any (among so many as had taken this argument in hand) whom I might as a sure guide or loadstarre long follow in the course of this so great an Historie: many right wor|thie and learned men … contenting themselues to haue with their lear|ned pennes, … some, one great expedition or action, some another, as in their times they •ell out [270]

His words above, not only justify his own work, but also points out that the previous histories written by many great names were all partial, dealing with a specific event that took place at or around the time of composition. Similar comparisons of their own works to the existing histories were made by almost all authors of general histories.

Referring to *GH* as "one orderly and continuat Historie", Knolles restates his aim of creating a single narrative of Ottoman history that would cover it from the very beginning to the present. As Barbour also pointed out, the aim of being up-to-date left general histories as incomplete projects; "resolved to make a single history of the Ottoman Empire Knolles and his successors find the cultural logistic of the project, however inclusive the product, always, exhaustingly, incomplete".[271] Being an unfinished project was actually a common "issue" for almost all general histories, if it might be called so. Almost

[269] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction to the Christian Reader vnto the Historie of the Turkes following"
[270] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[271] Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, 21.

all general histories had continuations, written by the first authors, the translators, or by completely new authors who were either chosen by the patron or the publisher of the work and *GH* was no different. In the dedication of the very first edition of his work, Knolles gave hints of a continuation stating that he would gladly "proceed to amend what shall be found amisse, and adde what future times", for the "perfection" of his work, if he would be "comforted & encouraged" with the help of the dedicatee.[272]

Knolles died in 1610 after he completed the extended second edition.[273] His addition of the last part, entitled "Here followeth a continuation of the Historie with the occrrents during the residue of the rainge of Mahomet the third, and the beginning of the raigne of Achmat the emperour that now liveth" was aimed keeping the work up-to-date. The remaining four editions of the *GH* until the end of seventeenth century were done by Edward Grimeston (1621), an unidentified M.B. (1631), Sir Thomas Roe (1638) and finally by Sir Roger Manley (1687).[274] The aim of being up-to-date was a necessity of the genre of general histories which aimed at presenting the subject matter in its entirety, and in this sense it was about the nature of the work rather than a specific problem that needed to be addressed. Chronological integrity was an achievement that should be maintained; it was a quality that made a work "more perfect" for the authors and the readers of the general histories.

[272] Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication].
[273] Christine Woodhead, "Knolles, Richard (late 1540s–1610)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[274] See Appendix I for a list of all editions and continuations of Knolles's work.

4.2. Sources

4.2.1. General Qualities of Knolles's sources

It has been discussed in the previous chapter that the aim of creating a chronologically comprehensive narrative that covers everything from the very beginning until the contemporary events forced authors of these works to work with different kinds of source. For the contemporary or near contemporary parts of their histories, authors worked chiefly as historians, using sources to create well-organized, original narratives. For the distant past, however, they had to work through already existing secondary material, previous histories written on the similar subject; to collect, assess and synthesize different narratives into a continuous history. The main aim of the authors was to collect as many histories as possible, to gather information that would help them to create the "perfect" continuous narrative that was impossible to find in any single book of history that was used as a source. The number of the histories consulted as well as their variety mattered here, as general histories were composed for those who would have neither the time nor the means to read all the material for themselves.

It is apparent that providing his readers with a great variety of sources that would otherwise be inaccessible for them was one of Knolles's main aims in composing *GH*. Knolles mainly uses textual sources from the continent. Both McJanneth and Ingram have pointed out that Knolles did not use any English sources, although numerous histories dealing with the Ottomans in one way or

another had appeared around the same time.[275] As the brief overview of the sources Knolles mentions in the introduction of *GH* indicates, he uses a great variety of sources. He turned to historical narratives, chronicles and geography books for the earlier periods of the history of the Turks and used news, pamphlets and various travel writings for the parts that dealt with more contemporary events. Although Knolles has been considered as a traditional and conservative author in terms of history writing, his inclusion of relatively uncommon materials such as geography books and quite recent news, pamphlets and travel literature in his sources indicates that he follows the necessities of the genre.[276] Knolles also made great use of Latin chronicles, which were theselves compilations of different sources, and in this way multiplied the material he worked with.

A couple of inferences can be made from Knolles's choice of sources. First of all, as emphatically mentioned in the title page of *GH*, Knolles made use of a huge collection of books, "*both auntient and modern"* a quality that was mentioned by almost all authors of general histories. This eclectic nature of the work is restated by that author in the introduction of his work; mentioning "the dispersed works of many right worthie men" that he made use of. He also makes it clear that he managed to "set downe one orderly and contuniat Historie" of the Ottomans.[277] It is certain that Knolles could reach out for numerous books on Ottoman history through the connections of his patron, Peter Manwood, to the owners of the great libraries of his time. As noted by V. J. Parry, Manwood

[275] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 131; McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 120.
[276] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 113.
[277] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

used his connections to scholars like Cotton and Camden to gather the sources Knolles would need in writing his history.[278] Knolles himself wrote to Cotton once, about a book he borrowed from his library, and his letter indicated previous help from Cotton as well.[279] In his preface, Knolles specifically refers to several Byzantine Greek sources, such as Nicephoras Gregoras, Leonardus Chiensis, and Theodorus Spanduginus, that were not yet in circulation in England.[280] Through his work Knolles presented these sources to readers who would most probably not have a chance to read them otherwise.

GH not only made numerous histories available to the English readers, but it also made them available in the vernacular. Knolles presented all his narrative, together with the primary sources he included into his work, in English. This attempt to present the whole material in English was certainly connected to the idea of creating a manageable and easy to use history to those who were interested. This aim also explains Knolles distance from English sources.[281] Foxe's *History and Tyranny of the Turks* was not among Knolles's sources, although it quite possible that Knolles had read it.[282] As the main focus was on reading and assessing the material which was not readily available for the use of his audience, Knolles could have simply left the English books out, which were relatively easy to reach for the English audience.

---

[278] Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, 13.

[279] Cotton MS. Julius C.3 fol. 225 / actually the letter is dated 22 January 1609. So the help of Cotton was for the second edition.

[280] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

[281] Schmuck mentions the ironic point that, except McJanneth, no one examined continental material in terms of the representation of the Turks in England. People just worked on the English material, which was a problem in itself, as the actual themes and commonplaces of representation of the Turks was coming from the continent. See Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety," 41.

[282] John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church*, London, 1583.

Besides, as he mentions in his introduction, Knolles's choice of mainly continental histories was a result of another, more practical issue:

> propounding vnto my selfe no other marke to aime at than the very truth of the Historie; as that which is it selfe of power to giue life vnto the dead letter,* and to couer the faults escaped in the homely penning or compiling thereof.[283]

The process of working through a collection of histories certainly had an aspect of elimination and correction. One of the main points that differentiated general histories from late Tudor chronicles was the main concern of the authors of general histories to write selectively. Searching for the very truth of history, Knolles did his best to "correct" the existing English histories of the Ottoman Empire. Although it has been argued that Knolles did not attempt to "reassess the Ottoman history, or discover new information" his words above assert that he wanted to do something more than "shaping existing material into a coherent narrative".[284]

A group of sources that Knolles refers to in the introduction deserves specific attention. As McJanneth puts it, despite Knolles's lack of firsthand experience of the eastern world he describes, he was "the beneficiary of significant east-west textual exchange".[285] The large group of sources he worked through for his history included some originally eastern accounts. Knolles listed Laonikos Chalkokondyles' account, which was mainly based on the Turkish sources, among the sources that he "especially" used. Inclusion of such sources into his history turned *GH* into a richer and a more complicated account of the history of the Ottomans than the existing European historiography offered. And

[283] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[284] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 129.
[285] McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 119.

this, most of all, made Knolles's account a general history that would be the most prominent English historical narrative of the Ottomans.

Using numerous sources and going over them again and again, to choose the most plausible version, to reconcile conflicting accounts or to correct the existing mistakes in the English histories, Knolles had to follow a specific methodology and like many other authors of general histories he explained the basic principles he employed in dealing with this huge collection of histories in the introductory piece he wrote. After discussing some important aspects of the materials he worked on, now we can turn to his methodology.

4.2.2. Methodology

Knolles followed some main principles in dealing with previous histories and those principles are clearly explained in this introduction. First of all he stated that he perfected his account of the Turkish history by "still supplying with the perfections of the better, what I found wanting or defectiue in the weaker".[286] Thus as a historian he had to create his own account by going over good and bad histories, not contenting himself with one single account. This practice of evaluating the sources to see their strengths and weaknesses indicates that Knolles did not do the job of a mere chronicler; that is to add up the narratives of different authors through mere translation. Knolles

[286] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

approached his sources with a critical mind, with an aim of completing or correcting the existing version to reach a perfect history.

The second part of Knolles's introduction starts with a short evaluation of the already existing material on the history of the Turks. Explaining the difficulty of working without a proper guide for his history, Knolles divides the examples in front of him into two categories. The first group were the short histories written by many "right worthy and learned men". These were short pieces in which authors contented themselves to one expedition or action and thus they were by no means proper guides for Knolles, who aimed at perfecting them. The second group of sources were the Turkish histories and chronicles, from whom Knolles expected "the greatest light for the continuation of History". These "sparing and short" sources, however did not help him at all, as they were nothing more than "rather short rude notes than iust Histories" which did nothing more than "pointing things out".[287] Another huge problem of this second group of sources, according to Knolles, was that they "[change] the ancient and useful names" of the kingdoms, cities, towns and provinces, "and oftentimes of men themselves, into other strange and barbarous names of their own devising".[288] This made these sources quite difficult texts, which "deprived" the reader "of the pleasure together with the profit he might otherwise expect by the reading thereof"; and for Knolles it required quite a lot "to giue order, perspicuitie, and light" to these sources.[289] By this sentence Knolles also explains his duties as an author of general history; that is "to study" the sources

[287] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[288] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[289] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

that would yield important information for his readers, who would have neither the time nor the skills to do that.

Knolles sticks to his promise all throughout his text. His reading of the eastern sources helps him identify some Turkish/Muslim characters which helps him to correct some simple mistakes in the western historiography. For instance, explaining that Murad I did not fight against his own grandfather in the Caramanian war, Knolles states that

> The Latine histories mistaking the man, report that this Caramanian warre, to haue been fought a|gainst the king of CARAMANIA, Amurath his owne grandfather by the mothers side; and that he was by Amurath then spoiled of a great part of his kingdom: but it agreeth not with the Tur|kish histories, which make Amurath to be the sonne of Orchanes and Lulufer, the daughter of the gouernour of the castle of IARCHISER, as is before declared in the life of Othoman; which Lulu|•er [L] lieth buried by her husband Orchanes, in PRUSA.[290]

It is certain that identifying such mistakes that resulted from identical names would not be easy for an ordinary reader of history. Knolles's critical eye and the meticulous work on the sources becomes clear by such instances.

As studied carefully by McJanneth, Knolles uses the Turkish sources in order to correct some common mistakes in the existing western literature about the Ottomans.[291] Knolles's use of the eastern sources of Turkish history indicates that Knolles employs these sources in three distinct ways:

1. he corrects some mistakes in the western literature;

2. he narrates both eastern and western versions of events only to reject the narrative in the eastern sources;

---

[290] Knolles, *GH*, 196.

[291] McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 132-40.

3. he uses the narrative in an eastern source to infuse it with negative comments about the Turks.

Knolles accepts the authority of the Turkish sources in issues like the foundation of the Janissary troops, reports the information given in the Turkish sources for war casualties or cites the sorrow of the people as it is mentioned by the Turkish histories and all these indicate that he accepts their authority as histories although he refers to them as "rude notes" rather than just histories. Besides, in contrast to McJanneth's argument of Knolles's following of Turkish accounts "in matters that are not sensitive from a western point of view"; Knolles corrects some aspects of Western historiography on some delicate issues such as the practice of fratricide. Narrating the events at the beginning of Orchanes's [Orhan's] reign, Knolles states:

> Some Latine Historiographers otherwise report this beginning of Orchanes his raigne; as that Othoman should haue three sonnes, and that Orchanes the youngest obtained the kingdome by murthering of his other brethren. A practise of late much vsed amongst the Turkish prin|ces, but not before the time of Bajazet the first of that name, who first of the Turkish mo|narchs embrued his hands with his brothers bloud: where before, they vsed all brotherly •oue one to another, as the most probable histories collected out of the Turkes owne Chroni|cles affirme.[292]

Considering how emphatically Knolles criticized this practice of fratricide as "most execrable and inhumane murthers they couer with the pretended safetie of their state"[293], it is striking that he granted the first few Ottoman Sultan freedom of this guilt. Here Knolles accepted the authority of the sources, although this meant undermining his own ideological stand to represent Turks negatively.

---

[292] Knolles, *GH,* 179.

[293] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

Knolles describes the main principles he employed in working on the collected materials in his introduction. Mainly dealing with various narrative sources, Knolles has a clear hierarchy of sources in mind. He primarily evaluated histories according to certain qualities of the authors that composed them. The main categories he differentiates are histories composed by those who had taken an active role in the events that they narrated; histories that were composed by those who had access to the primary sources about the events that were being narrated; histories that were written by authors who had some sort of first-hand experience in the lands of the Turks. Then came the fourth group, of narrative sources that were written by "other learned and credible authours, as of whose integritie and faithfulnesse the world" would not doubt.[294]

Knolles explains his first preference for eye-witness accounts, composed by the actors of the events:

> I collected so much of the Historie as possibly I could, out of the writings of such as were them|selues present and as it were eye-witnesses of the greatest part of that they writ, and so as of all others best able, most like also to haue left vnto vs the very truth.[295]

Authors such as Marinus Barletius, who was "an Epirot, and in all those trouble|some times then liuing in Scodra"; Leonardus Chiensis, the Archbishop of Mity|lene, who was present when Constantinople was sacked by the Turks, and was there taken prisoner or Augerius Busbequius who was the ambassador for the Emperor Ferdinand at Constantinople had a certain advantage of not only being eye-witnesses to the events that they wrote about, but they also had

[294] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[295] Knolles, *GH,* "The Authors Induction"

the means to get involved in those events. It has been argued that Knolles's statement about the credibility of the histories written by the actors of the narrated events seems to be ironic, considering that Knolles himself is the author of a book about the history of a nation with which he has no connection.[296] Here it is necessary to make an important distinction. Knolles, as well as many other authors of general histories, is using this criteria to choose better histories. Here the focus is not on writing, but on selecting histories to read and comprehend. Seeing all those previous histories as raw material that needs to be worked on to extract the perfect history out of them, Knolles applies the criteria that were actually suggested by Bodin.[297]

"But for as much as euery great and famous action had not the fortune to haue in it a Caesar, such as both could and would commend vnto posteritie by writing" Knolles had to turn to the second group which was composed of historians

> as being themselues men of great place, and well acquainted with the great and worthie personages of their time, might from their mouths as from certain Oracles report the vndoubted truth of many most famous exploits done both by themselues and others …[298]

Among this second group of sources Knolles mentions Pau. Io|uius who had the chance of listening to the events he narrated "from the mouth of Muleasses king of Tunes, from Vastius the great Generall, from Auria the prince of Melphis, Charles the Emperour his Admirall". And finally the third group of authors within the primary material were those who "were themselues great trauellers

[296] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 131.

[297] It has been discussed in the previous chapter that Bodin's criteria for good histories and historians are used by many authors of general histories.

[298] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

into the Turkes dominions, and withall diligent obseruers of their affaires and state"[299], such as Pantaleon, Minadoie, and Leunclauius.

All this detailed information on his methods of evaluating his sources reveals the importance of the credibility of his sources for Knolles. The truth of history has always been an issue for both authors and readers. Still, much had changed between the authors of late medieval chronicles, who felt the urge to include almost everything into their compilations as it was very difficult for them to decide what the truth was, and highly selective, strictly organized, general histories. These books aimed, first and foremost, to be of manageable length. Developments in the methods of textual criticism, moreover, gave the authors the necessary tools to be able to choose the most plausible version among many. Knolles felt the need to discuss his method of choosing among existing material, the detailed explanation on the grouping of the histories he used being the first step of this explanation. Thus, ending his list of classes of histories, Knolles concludes that "Thus much [he] thought good to set downe, to persuade the Christian Reader of the truth of the Historie following".[300]

Choosing the best and the most credible histories was not enough though. Thus Knolles still had to analyse the conflicting accounts to choose the most probable version of events according to his simple judgement.[301] It was almost in the nature of the endeavour to receive criticism. Knolles, very much like other authors of general histories, makes it clear in his introduction that he is open to nourishing his work through some sort of feedback from the reader.

[299] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[300] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[301] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

He uses the most credible accounts according to his own criteria and either reconciles or chooses one of the conflicting narratives according to his judgement as the author of the work, but still "wherein if the reader find not himselfe so fully satisfied as he could desire", Knolles is open to "be better enformed, as being no lesse desirous of others to learn the truth of that I know not, than willing to impart vnto others that little which I know".[302]

As mentioned before, the chronological unity of general histories forced their authors to work with a variety of sources ranging from earlier narrative histories to archival material. It is certain that Knolles gathered much of his history from narrative histories that were composed before him, but still he indicated the value of primary material throughout his history. Explaining the importance of the letters of Teuffenbach, Knolles states that he chose to insert those texts directly into his history as "they containe many particularities and circumstances of this battell".[303] Knolles makes similar explanations for numerous other primary sources that he reproduced in his history.[304] Either by inserting full-text documents or by directing the readers to the original texts with references, the authors of general histories fulfilled their mission as intermediaries between the huge corpus on any specific subject and those who were interested in, or in need of learning about it. It is for this reason that Knolles, at the end of his introduction, could "leaue it" to the choice of his

[302] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[303] Knolles, *GH*, 1033.
[304] For other letters, see Knolles, *GH*, 295, 789, 804.

readers "in such diuersitie of re|ports to follow that which may seeme vnto [them] most true".[305]

Getting closer to contemporary times in their narratives, the authors of general histories had to work as actual historians: that is working directly with archival material to compose their own narratives. Instead of "collecting" their material from already existing narratives, here the authors had to work hard to gather necessary documents such as ambassadors' reports, letters, state documents etc.; and in this pursuit their patrons were also working with them. Although it has been argued that Knolles relied solely on secondary sources, both archival material that reveals Peter Manwood's efforts to get access to some documents for Knolles, and Knolles's own comments on the difficulties of collecting the primary materials necessary for his book indicates the contrary.[306] Even where he failed, it was not for want of trying or for lack of desire to consult primary sources. His desperate words, in the introduction to his history, about the need to obtain archival material, finding it "follie" to seek after the main causes of the Turkish success, which are "for the most part shut vp in the counsels of the Great", sounds like a failed attempt. Again, his dedication requests the help of the dedicatee, Peter Manwood, for the continuation and perfection of the first edition.[307] It seems that the necessary help was not granted to him, as two years later, in the dedication of his translation of Bodin's *Republique*, Knolles mentions that it has not been possible

[305] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

[306] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 131.

[307] "Accept them I beseech you most mightie Monarch into your gratious protection, so shall I (if God spare life) be comforted & encouraged vnder so mightie a fauor to proceed to amend what shall be found amisse, and adde what future times and better helpe shall descrie and minister vnto me for the perfection of this Historie …" Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication]

for him to "gather" the material to "continue" the Turkish history as he could not get hold of the records:

> finding nothing hetherto worthy the writing, more than matters common: such having been the policies of latter times, as to keepe secret the reasons and certaine knowledge of the doings of great Estates, that if some of the most wise, mightie, and Honorable, sitting at the helmes of Commonweales, doe not shew the way, posteritie will be defrauded of the most, excellent things that many ages have before brought forth.[308]

The deputy keeper's records indicates that Knolles's complaints are well-grounded:

> I have ben often requested by two gent: to lett them have certayne ltrs: [letters] out of the office of yor matyes papers my answer hath alwayse ben that both by my oth and yor matyes comand I am bound to let nothing goe out of the papers place nor be seen or read wthout yor matyes licence or chreson [?] …[309]

In the same letter to James I, the deputy keeper also passes on Peter Manwood's request to the king, stating that Peter Manwood "who hath ben att the charge of causing the turkish history to be written and nowe for the continuance thereof is desyrous to see the lrs: of our late Ambassrs from Constantinople". It was not all failure though. An additional record entitled "A note of papers delivered to S^{r} Peeter Manwhood concerning Turkey from 1588 till 1612" lists the documents that Knolles could use for the continuation of his history.[310] These sources, mainly the letters of English ambassadors in Turkey (Harborne, Barton and Lello), were used by Knolles to compose the additional hundred and fifty pages of the 1610 edition of *GH*. The meticulous search for and use of this material

---

[308] Jean Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale. VVritten by I. Bodin a famous lawyer, and a man of great experience in matters of state. Out of the French and Latine copies, done into English.* trans. Riclard Knolles. London: [Printed by Adam Islip] impensis G. Bishop, 1606, "To the reader," 1.

[309] TNA MS SPO Vol. 1, no. 11.

[310] TNA MS SPO Vol. 1, no. 11.

indicates that both the authors and the patrons had a genuine interest in keeping general histories up to date, as well as incorporating authentic primary sources into the narratives.

Gathering all these sources and evaluating them according to their credibility, Knolles worked through them, one by one, to create an "orderly and contuniat Historie". The way he explains his actual work on the sources made a clear distinction between general histories and late Tudor chronicles. Knolles's explanations of actual work on the sources gives the impression that instead of collecting information in a linear way across the sources, adding up piece after piece of material; he went over the whole chronological span numerous times, filling in the gaps through each "travel" passing through "the sea and world of matter".[311] He first went over the eye-witness accounts to gather as much of the narrative as he could from these sources. This way he could set the main structure of his narrative on what he regarded as the most credible sources he had. The material he collected was "perfected" with the second group of sources. And finally he went over the continental material to expand his narrative and to insert more details. Working over his sources to incorporate the missing parts, Knolles managed to create a well-structured account. His method also enabled him to cross check the material he included.

[311] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

4.3. Comparative Approach

As with most of the other general histories, *GH* had a particular comparative attitude. As an outcome of a comparative reading of the previous histories, Knolles's comparative attitude in writing *GH* reaches beyond his use of sources. Again like many other general histories, *GH* has a strong underlining theme of change through time. Knolles discusses the "uncertainty of the worldly things" in his introduction while talking about the causes of the rise of Ottoman Empire:

> the vncertainetie of worldly things, which subiect to perpetuall change cannot long stay in one state, but as the sea is with the wind, so are they in like sort tossed vp and downe with the continuall surges and waues of alteration and change; so that being once growne to their height, they there stay not long, but fall againe as fast as euer they rise, and so in time come to nothing: As we see the greatest Monarchies that euer yet were vpon earth haue done, their course being run; ouer whom, Time now triumpheth, ...[312]

From the very beginning onward Knolles sets the tone of his work as one that is talking mainly about a change over time. Comparing the "poor beginning" of this nation from "obscure" origins to the power of their world empire, Knolles gives hints of his aim of telling a story of a gradual change over time.

In line with this theme of the rise and fall of empires, the first pages of the "Lives" start with a lengthy discourse on the fallen empires:

> WHAT small assurance there is in mens affaires, and how subject vnto change euen those things are wherein we for the most part repose our greatest felicitie and blisse, … nothing doth more plainely manifest the same, than the heauie euents and wofull destructions of the greatest kingdomes and em|pires: which founded vpon great fortunes, encreased with

[312] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

> perpetuall successe, exalted by exceeding power, establi|shed with most puissant armies, wholesome lawes, and deepe counsels; haue yet growne old, and in time come to naught[313]

Giving a list of numerous great empires that are now in the pages of the history books, such as the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Athenians, Lacedaemonians and Thebans, Knolles's account of the life of the first Ottoman sultan starts with a very strong emphasis on the idea that worldly things are never permanent. At the end of his *Lives*, in the little discourse about the reasons for the success of the Ottoman Empire, Knolles turns back to this theme for a second time, stating that the Ottoman Empire "laboureth with nothing more than the weightinesse of it selfe, it must needs (after the manner of wordly things) of it selfe fall, and againe come to nought".[314]

Framing his long narrative in this way, around the idea of change and deterioration over time, it is not surprising that Knolles employs a "then versus now" comparison all throughout the text. Focusing on both the foundation and development of institutions, Knolles's comparative attitude becomes clear in his discussion of the institution of the Janissaries. After explaining the education, activities and the manner of life of these soldiers, whose obedience to ancient military discipline Knolles praised in his introduction, Knolles states that

> This warlike order of souldiors is in these our daies much embased: for now naturall Turkes are taken in for Ianizaries, as are al|so the people of ASIA; whereas in former times none were admitted into that order, but the Christians of EVROPE onely: beside that, they marrie wiues also, contrarie to their antient cu|stome, which is not now forbidden them. And because of their long lying still at CONSTAN|TINOPLE (a citie

[313] Knolles, *GH*, 132.

[314] Knolles, *GH*, "A briefe discourse of the greatnesse of the Turkish empire": as also wherein the greatest strength thereof consisteth, and of what power the bordering princes, as well Mahometanes as Chri|stians are in comparison of it."

> abounding with all manner of pleasure) they are become much more effemi|nate and slouthfull, but withall most insolent, or more truly to say intollerable.[315]

Similarly, Knolles denotes a degeneration in every aspect of the Ottoman state. The rulers themselves are "degenerating from their warlike progenitors", soldiers "giving themselves to vnwonted pleasures" and Islam, "their superstitition", not with "so much zeale as of old regar|ded".[316] These, according to Knolles are the signs of a declining state. Numerous other instances indicate Knolles's willingness to make implied references to the current condition of the Ottoman State.[317]

Together with this overarching comparison of the past and the present situation of the Ottoman state, Knolles uses compare and contrast type of narratives to explain the reasons for the success or the failure of a party. In the passage where he compares "two great and mightie princes", Tamerlane and Baiazet, both "being the fourth in discent" of honorable progenitors. Knolles actually reveals the reasons for the great loss on the Ottoman side. Both princes were of "like spirit, wise, hardie, painefull, resolute, and most skilfull in martiall affaires; but ambitious aboue measure". "The great vertues and other the honourable qualities of Baiazet", however,

> were in him by his chollericke and waiward nature much obscured: which made him to exceed both in crueltie and pride: being also much more handfast than were his ho|nourable predecessors. … For which causes he was much feared and lesse beloued of his souldiors and men of warre in generall, and of them at his most need forsaken.[318]

---

[315] Knolles, *GH*, "A briefe discourse"
[316] Knolles, *GH*, "A briefe discourse"
[317] Knolles, *GH*, 179, 201.
[318] Knolles, *GH*, 227.

Tamerlane, on the other hand, "was graced with" many other "vertues", in addition to those that were mentioned above:

> no man being vnto his friends more courteous or kind, either vnto his enemies more dreadfull or terrible. The good seruice of his seruants hee neuer forgot, either left the same long vnrewarded:[319]

Another, more prominent aspect of Knolles's comparative attitude is seen in his way of shifting his trajectory from one geography, city or kingdom to another, in order to cover some issues that are specifically related to that region. As mentioned in the previous chapter, following a chronological line of events, but managing to incorporate events that were happening at the same time, in different geographies into their narratives, was an outcome of the hard-work of early modern historians on the field of chronology. The aim of the authors of the general histories was not to follow a single line of events anymore, they wanted to present all the events that were in a way related to their main focus, happening in different geographies, as if they were mapping history. Paying great attention not to confuse his readers by going back and forth in the narrative, Knolles still manages to incorporate the situation in the Greek world at the time of the foundation of the Ottoman Empire, to set a clear picture of what was going on in the region then:

> Now happily might the considerat reader (and not without just cause) meruaile, what dead sleepe had ouerwhelmed the Greeke emperours of those times; first Michaell Paleologus, and af|terward his sonne Andronicus, both men of great valour, and still resiant at CONSTANTINO|PE, thus to suffer the Turkes (not Othoman, for he as yet bare no sway, but others the sharers of Sultan Aladins kingdome) to take their cities, … But let him, with me, here as in a most conuenient place but breath a little,

[319] Knolles, *GH*, 227.

> and consider the troubled estate of that declining empire, now hasting to an end; and he shall plainely see the causes of the decay thereof, and how like an old diseased bodie quite ouerthrowne and sicke to death, it became at length a prey vnto the aspiring Turks.[320]

Breaking his narrative in this way, Knolles makes a long summary of the reigns of Michael Paleologus and his son, dealing with their affairs in detail. After all the information about the reigns of Michael and Andronicus Paleologus, Knolles makes an evaluation of the causes of the loss of power on the Greek side, which should, according to Knolles "now by that [he] haue alreadie written, is easily to be seene".[321] Noting the "innouation and change of their antient Reli|gion and ceremonies"; "Enuie, the ruine of the great"; "False suspect, the looser of friends"; "Ambition, honours ouerthrow"; "Distrust, the great minds torment"; and "Forreine aid, the empires vnfaithfull porter"[322] as the basic causes of the fall of the Greek empire, Knolles turned back to his narrative of the foundation of the Ottoman State saying:

> But againe to returne vnto *Othoman* himselfe, who all this while (that old *Andronicus* the Greeke emperour was thus troubled) had with his sonne *Orchanes* sought by all meanes on euerie side to inlarge his kingdome …[323]

It is important to note that Knolles does not simply narrate events that were happening in the Greek and the Ottoman sides as random events that are going on at the same time, but he connects them together by a cause and effect link. Even more than that, he expects his readers to comprehend all these developments as the parts of a single narrative.

---

[320] Knolles, *GH*, 144.
[321] Knolles, *GH*, 159.
[322] Knolles, *GH*, 159.
[323] Knolles, *GH*, 176.

This aim of comprehending seemingly disconnected events happening in different geographies as parts of a single, unified history is best seen in Knolles's lists of rulers that he presents to his readers at the end of each section. As he explains, these lists do not "seeke the exact computation vnto a moneth or day (as not much materiall to our Historie, or any part of our purpose)" but only sets a "view of the great princes of the forepas|sed times, as they liued in ages together".[324] These diagrams that display many European rulers that were ruling at the same time with a specific Ottoman Sultan, according to Barbour, "puts that monarch, the ruler of a separate world, in equal counterpoise to them all".[325] This way, Knolles finds another way to stress the discord among the European ruler in comparison to the unity on the Turkish side. But more important than that, Knolles's diagrams help his readers to combine their knowledge coming from different history books, by visually setting those rulers next to each other. Different chronologies of various nations unite in Knolles's diagrams.

4.4. Style of history

The comparative attitude of general histories does not make them books with a loose structure. On the contrary, it is certain that Knolles had clear boundaries for his work and to these boundaries he referred numerous times in the text. Like many other authors of general histories the first aim of Knolles

[324] Knolles, *GH*, 178.
[325] Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, 36.

was to keep his focus on the main subject of the work. Although he goes into the details of the pre-Ottoman history of the Turks, Knolles clearly states that "the cheife object of this Historie" is the "Otho|man monarchie".[326] Right before starting his *Lives*, which is apparently the main body of his history, Knolles explains the need to unite the life of Osman, the first king of the Ottomans, to the narrative preceding it:

> But for as much as the greatnesse of the rest of the Otho|man kings tooke their beginning from this woorthy and war-like Othoman, with whose life and doings we purpose to begin this part of our Historie, it shall not be amisse both for the continuation of that we haue in hand, with that we haue already writ|ten, and for the more manifesting of that which hereafter followeth, a little farther to fet his race and discent also …[327]

There are certainly instances in which Knolles gives information on a specific group or event that seems to be a diversion from the main line of narrative. For instance, narrating how Osman enlarged his lands little by little by victories gained against the Greek, Knolles mentions that Michael Palaeologus turns to the Spanish for help. Telling the story of the Cathalonians (Catalans), Knolles turns back to his narrative with apologetic sentences; "Where leauing them with whom we happely haue too long straied from our purpose, let vs againe returne vnto the Turks and Turcopuli their companions".[328]

In other instances, however, Knolles explains his reasons for including certain material into the text, although it seems irrelevant. Talking about the unfortunate end of Amesa, Knolles excuses himself for going on with the same

---

[326] Knolles, *GH*, 133
[327] Knolles, *GH*, 155-6
[328] Knolles, *GH*, 383

subject for a while. Amesa was charged with treason and condemned to "perpetuall prison". "What became afterward of this Amesa", as Knolles explicitly states, "con|cerneth not much the course of our historie" but still, he chose to "stray a little out of the way", as he thought it would "satisfie the desirous". Considering the unity of the narration of the story of Amesa, it is wise of Knolles to end the story somehow, not leaving it open-ended. The death of Amesa, after being poisoned by Mahomet, gave Knolles another instance of a didactic end, presenting a perfect example of "the wofull end of this noble and valiant man" who prepared his own end by "his haughtie thoughts soared too high with the desire of soueraignetie".[329]

Although he uses similar little diversions from the main storyline to enrich his examples of virtues or follies, Knolles's concern for keeping unnecessary bits out of the text dominates the narrative. From time to time he passes over issues, as they have been dealt with in detail, in different, most probably well-known accounts of his day. For instance he cuts the events pertaining to the histories of other branches of the Turkish Empire short, stating that "the full discourse" of these was "inrolled in the antient records of fame" by others. Thus, Knolles chooses "not at large to follow, but in briefe to touch, for the orderly continuation of the present historie".[330] In other cases, Knolles simply leaves some material out of his history, as he finds it completely irrelevant:

> … a peace for a yeare was agreed vpon betwixt *Mahomet* and *Scanderbeg.* In which time he passed ouer into APVLIA, and there notably aided king *Ferdinand* against the French, the

[329] Knolles, *GH*, 383
[330] Knolles, *GH*, 13

> proceeding wherein, as not pertinent to our historie, I of purpose passe ouer.[331]

Other similar omissions of material are explained by either stating that it is completely outside the scope of his history, or it is "impertinent" to declare.[332]

Knolles's concern to create a well-organized, easy to follow history book differentiates his understating of history writing from his predecessors. He is working mainly on the narrative materials, but his main concern is certainly not the amount of information he includes into his text. His emphasis is on the structure of his work, stylistically as well as in terms of scope. Numerous reader-friendly aspects of his text indicate his concern to produce a text that would be easy to follow and comprehend. Although Knolles does not specifically comment on the use of his marginal notes, the years given in the margins or of the lists of Ottoman rulers in the part in his introduction entitled "Brief Discourse", it would not be wrong to assume that, as many other authors of general histories did, Knolles wanted to make it easy for his readers to find the specific parts of the history that they were looking for, or to let them comprehend the overall structure of the Ottoman Empire easily thorough this apparatus.

A closer look at the narrative of Knolles clearly indicates that his history is not structured through a year by year division, even while it might seem so because of the years given in the margins. As is the case with many general histories, the years are given in the margins for the easy use of the readers, who would most probably use them to read about the events of that specific year or

[331] Knolles, *GH*, 383
[332] Knolles, *GH*, 690, 726.

the years around a specific event. The narrative of the author, however, does not follow the yearly structure and goes beyond an annalistic style. In Knolles's text, it is certain that his narrative takes units of events, rather than the years as main structural element. Going over the years stated in the margins it is not hard to see that there are numerous missing ones. The narrative of the reign of Süleyman, for instance, starts with 1522, and the next year given in the margin is 1526, which is followed by 1530.

Following the course of an event, one realizes that Knolles's structure is based on a set of events that are the parts of a single narrative unit, most of the time connected to each other with a cause and effect relation. The part where Knolles tells the death of Şehzade Mustafa indicates Knolles's way of structuring his work clearly. Going over the side notes that are given in his narrative of the death of Şehzade Mustafa, it is not hard to see that Knolles's narrative starts with the introduction of the main characters of his story. Şehzade Mustafa, the eldest son of Süleyman, is introduced as a successful ruler; after that, the events around the marriage of Süleyman to Hürrem, Hürrem's conspiracies against Mustafa together with Rüstem, Süleyman's plot to kill his son, the death of Mustafa in Amasya and the result of this unexpected decision and the unrest in the army are narrated. These events that happened over the course of at least 20 years are concluded with the death of Ahmet Paşa in 1555, who was appointed as vizier after Rüstem. The conclusion of the storyline with the death of Ahmet Paşa, which seems only indirectly related to the death of Şehzade Mustafa, but is actually an outcome of the events after Süleyman's decision to order the execution of his son, indicates how Knolles connect events to each

other, and follows a reasoning by cause and effect rather than an annalistic chronological structure.

Making lists of anything from the local rulers in some period to the books one owned was a practice enthusiastically followed by almost all early modern intellectuals. Most of the time, the lists, diagrams or tables included in texts helped readers to visualize the information presented verbally, in a more comprehensive way. Any sort of visualized information presented in a rightly categorized manner was thought to be highly useful, and thus this method was employed by many authors of general histories. The reason for making the lists of "Beglerbegs or great Commanders" while discussing the greatness of the Ottoman Empire, is explained by Knolles as follows:

> I haue thought good here briefe|ly to set downe all the said Beglerbegs with their Sanzackes and Timariots, and as neere as I [H] could (either by reading or the credible relation of others well trauelled in those countries) toge|ther, and as it were at one shew set forth the whole strength and power of this so mightie an em|pire, as also in what countries and prouinces the same is especially placed.[333]

Checking Knolles's tables would not only help his readers to grasp all unfamiliar Turkish names and titles in a quick look, but it would also help them understand the ruling mechanism in the vast Ottoman lands, both geographically and in terms of the structure of authority. The detailed index at the end of the work, little explanatory notes in the margins, meticulous references to the original sources of the information provided, and lists and tables provided in the last section turned Knolles's history into a reference book which would enable the readers to both check specific events or dates, or search

[333] Knolles, *GH*, "A briefe discourse"

through the lengthy history of the Ottoman Empire for any instance of particular interest.

4.5. Causation

As discussed in the previous chapter, one of the most prominent aspects of the general histories was the authors' tendency towards more causal reasoning, rather than a discussion of events through providential explanations. Historians who were able to fill in their works with an enormous amount of detail and maintaining their aim of educating through examples from history had the means of and felt the need to explain causal relationships between events more precisely than just stating that everything was a part of God's plan. In the end, the clearer the details around an event became, the more chances the authors had to explain them through worldly circumstances. This kind of a shift in terms of understating and presenting history did not take place all at once though. It is certain that the authors of general histories had God and his plan for this world in mind while composing their works, and still referred to the preordained nature of events in explaining things. However, with causal reasoning becoming more and more dominant in the texts, the role of providence and fate lessened, restricting the influence of divine power to rhetoric statements.

As mentioned in previous studies, Knolles did place Turkish history within a "grand providential meta-narrative".[334] The paratexts that wrap the main body of *GH* are dominated by a useful unifying moral rhetoric. The biblical quotation that opens the introduction establishes the moral-providential tone of the text full-force. Knolles's prayer-like concluding remarks at the end of the life of Mahomet III, right before the final section of the history, repeats similar ideas:

> beseeching his omnipotent majestie, for his onely Sonne our Sauiour Christ his sake, in mercie to turne the hearts of this mightie and froward people vnto the knowledge of his Sonne crucified … or otherwise in his ju|stice … to root out their most bloud-thirstie and wicked empire, with all the rest of the blasphemous Mahometanes; so by proofe to confirme the truth of that hath long agoe been foretold, and for many ages beleeued …[335]

Accepting the validity of the importance of this moralizing providential rhetoric for Knolles, it is hard to argue that this providential rhetoric is used throughout *History*, as a way of explaining the reasons for, or the results of, events that Knolles narrates. From the very beginning onwards Knolles employs this rhetoric as a tool that would work as an overarching unifying aspect of his history; as an all-embracing idea that would set the history of Muslim-Christian conflicts into perspective. A close reading of Knolles's narrative, however, suggests that the way he referred to God's providence is more on a symbolic level rather than a prominent or relevant cause that shapes the events.

Knolles's *GH* was certainly not the only work that deals with Turkish history or culture at the turn of the seventeenth century. On the contrary, as has

[334] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 323.
[335] Knolles, *GH*, 1153

been stated before, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw an explosion of Ottoman-related works that were greatly varied in terms of opinions and concerns, as well as genres and forms. Being mere translations of the continental narratives, or new compositions that were based on the same accounts, none of these English works achieved the authoritative tone of *GH*, which made it the standard English text on the history of a the Ottomans for a long while to come. Knolles's *GH* was not drastically different from all other histories that were circulating in England. What differentiated Knolles's history from the rest was his more down-to-earth, more secular reasoning that appealed to his readers, who were keen to hear something more than the will of God.

A plain comparison of the way Knolles chose to explain the reasons for Ottoman success to the similar narratives that were circulating in England at that time reveals his overall tone in *GH*. Knolles divides the causes of Ottoman success into two in his introduction. The first group he calls "causes from above"; among which Knolles counts the "just and secret judgement of the Almightie" and "the uncertainty of worldly things, which subject to perpetuall change cannot long stay in one state".[336] Right after this standard reference to God, Knolles gets into a detailed discussion of the "other" reasons for the overall success of the Ottomans against Europe. Here the reasons are again divided into two, as those related to the Christian side, and those that are related to the Turks themselves. In the first group, one by one, Knolles goes over points like the discord among the Christian princes and the "small care" they show to the

[336] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

conditions of the Christians under the Turkish yoke; the evil choice of soldiers that fought against the Turk, who "serued rather for shew and the filling vp of number, than for vse" and the great need of the Christian armies for the "ancient martiall discipline".[337] Throughout the lengthy passage, each point is explained and examples are provided when necessary.

After these Knolles passes on to the second group, the causes "more proper vnto [Turks], as not depending of the improuident carelesnesse, weaknesse, discord, or imperfections of others".[338] The ardent desire of sovereignty, the unity among their people as a nation, the watchfulness in taking advantage of any opportunity to better their state, the prudence in diet and life style and unconditioned obedience to their rulers are counted as the strong qualities of the Ottomans, making them successful at the expense of Christians. Besides these qualities of the people, Knolles also counts two more specific reasons for the success of the Turkish state in particular: the success of the system in giving praise to "vertue and valour", which opens the way "for euery common person", without the requirement of noble blood, and the ability of the Ottoman sultans to reward the good and to punish the offender appropriately, no matter what rank they occupied.

Knolles's detailed discussion of the reasons for the Ottoman success becomes more revealing when it is compared to the similar discussions in other histories that are published before *GH*. Richard Grafton's *The Order of the great Turckes Court*, the first descriptive history of the Turks published in England in

[337] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[338] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

the sixteenth century, for instance, discusses the current situation of the Ottoman State and concludes that

> in [Turkish] campe there are a greate nombre of Christyanes. That hys armyes on the sea bene euyll furnysshed bothe of menne and good shyppes, that he is not accompanied but with pages and slaues, that hys princypall coun|treyes are inhabyted of Christya|nes, of whome he maketh his war¦ryers, … Wherfore, it is to be thoughte that hys strengthe is permytted of God, whyche for oure synnes sufferethe thys estate so farre swaruynge frome all good pollycie: so to preuayle and not that it is maynteyned by their wisdom, strength, or ver|tue.[339]

Grafton's main source for his work is Antoine Geuffroy's *L'Etat de la court du gran Turc* (1542). However, Grafton repeats Geuffroy's ideas in the introduction which he penned as the translator of the text. For him as well, it was mainly because of the sinfulness of the Christians that "this cruell woolfe hath been suffered so piteouslye to haue stai|ned his mouthe with Christian blood".[340] The success of the Ottomans was merely a result of the sinfulness of the Christians. The solution to this problem, therefore, lay in prayer.

John Foxe's "History and Tyranny of the Turks", included in the second edition of *The Acts and Monuments* is based on some of the sources that Knolles also used. Foxe's text went over the lives of the Ottoman Sultans one by one and dealt with the events in the reign of each sultan briefly. Foxe's history does not have a specific discussion of the reasons for the Ottoman success. However, his comments on the necessity of composing such a history are revealing. According to Foxe, English readers needed to know about the history of the Turks

[339] Antoine Geuffroy, *The order of the greate Turckes courte, of hys menne of warre, and of all hys conquestes, with the summe of Mahumetes doctryne*. Translated out of Frenche. 1524 [sic], lxxviii

[340] Geuffroy, *The Order of the great Turckes Court*, "To the reader"

primarily "for the better explayning of the Prophecies of the new Testament".[341] Then he lists, "to lament" for the decay of the "Christian faith" through the Turks; "to ponder" about "the corrupt doctrines" and numerous other sins of the Christians that ended in this "scourge of God", to see the necessity of unity among the Christians and to learn about the victories of the Turks to be aware of their doings. He sees these as other uses of a history of the Turks. Foxe's comments on the final point indicate his ideas on the main reason for the Ottoman success:

> .... First we must cōsider, that the whole power of Sathan ye prince of this world, goeth with the Turkes. Whiche to resist, no strēgth of mans arme, is sufficient, but onely the name, spi|rite, and power of our Lord Iesus the sonne of god, going with vs in our battels ...[342]

After this little break of an explanation, Foxe goes on with the last reason for the importance of a Turkish history for English readers, stating that reading Turkish history might help them imagine what might happen to them if they do not make necessary "invocation to the Almighty God". The main reason for the Ottoman success is clear:

> Now how we haue fought these many yeres agaynst the Turke: though storyes keep silence, yet ye successe declareth. We fight agaynst a persecu|tour, being no lesse persecutours our selues. We wrastle a|gainst a bloudy tyraunt, and our handes be as full of bloud as his. He killeth Christes people with the sword: and we burne them with fire. ... But nei|ther hee nor we seeke our iustification as we shoulde, that is, by fayth onely in the sonne of God.[343]

---

[341] John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church.* London, 1583, 740.

[342] Foxe, *Actes and monuments*, 740.

[343] Foxe, *Actes and monuments*, 741.

The way Grafton and Foxe set the general providential tone of their works, in Foxe's case apocalyptic as well, seems to be far more detailed than Knolles's references to the idea of the "scourage of God". It is certain that Knolles employed this commonplace of seeing Muslim victories over Christians as a punishment of God. However, the way he explains the Ottoman success goes much beyond Foxe's numerous religious invocations all throughout his history. The word "providence" appears 16 times in the 40,825-word history of the Turks that Foxe composed, and every single time that it is used, it explains the reasons behind the events that were being narrated. In Knolles's 1,021,120-word *Lives* section of *GH* the same word appears only 12 times: 5 in the quoted speeches of some rulers (2 of them being Ottoman sultans), and 7 in the comments of the author, and never to explain the reasons for the event that was being narrated. While Foxe's account explains the unsuccessful sieges of Belgrade by Murat II and Vienna by Suleyman the wars between the Turks and the Persians that kept the Turks busy and the pestilences in the Turkish army, both events brought on them by God's providence, Knolles's narrative of these events are far more secular in tone.

It has been argued that the providential strain of Knolles's and Foxe's works put them in the same group, as opposed to the works of historians that followed classical models closely and "saw primarily secular forces (fortune and virtù) at work in human events".[344] The discussion of the providential tone of Knolles's work, together with his main concerns in terms of reasoning, however, indicates that *GH* was much more a political text than that of Foxe's. It is clear

[344] McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 11.

that Knolles's references to the rhetoric of Turkish threat and the scourge of God helped him to unify his narrative around these overarching ideas. His work, on the other hand, was composed with a certain aim of providing his readers with information on the history and the current state of the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, Knolles's text did not advertise a passive reception of events, but argued for an active involvement of the Christians in the war against the Turk, through learning their ways of war and statecraft.

From what he produced, it is not hard to argue that Knolles would not support Foxe's furious sentences that explain all Turkish history as an ongoing war between Satan and the Christians; he would rather approve the words of Lazaro Soranzo (whom Knolles listed among his frequently used sources), who stated that histories are written "to the end we may learne how to gouerne and manage mat|ters, aswell present as to come, by vnderstanding and rea|ding how things haue fallen out, that haue beene hereto|fore recorded in particularitie".[345] Knolles was sincere in his aim of explaining the Ottoman ways to the Christian readers, with the hope that the history he presented to them would be helpful in "prouiding remedies in time", although his sincere effort did not fit well into the real politic of the Anglo-Ottoman relations of his times.

[345] Abraham Hartwell, *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo VVherein is deliuered aswell a full and perfect report of the might and power of Mahamet the third, great Emperour of the Turkes now raigning: together with the interestes and dealinges which he hath with sondrie other princes, what hee is plotting against the state of Christendome, and on the other side what we may practise and put in execution against him to his great damage and annoyaunce.* 1553, "The Preface".

4.6. Scope of history

As mentioned before, Knolles was very strict about the boundaries of his work, including the material that he thought to be relevant, and excluding the material that he considered, for one reason or another, unnecessary to present to his readers. Knolles's *GH* was mainly a political and military history of the Turks, with a greater focus on the "notable expeditions of Christian princes" against them. Considering Knolles's aim in writing this history, as clearly stated both in his dedication and introduction, and the general trends of history writing through the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, it is not hard to understand his motivations in focusing on the political and military success of the Turkish states. In his dedication to James I, Knolles explains his reasons for dedicating this history specifically to him as follows:

> Besides that, the matter and argument of this Historie and such like … of right vnto none so properly belongeth, as vnto your most excellent Maiestie, with the rest of the Christian princes, sitting at the helme of your Estates; who onely by your vnited forces … are able to giue remedie thereunto: in the chiefest ranke of whom, your sacred Maiestie for glorie, honour, strength and power … is now second vnto none.[346]

Explaining the suitability of the dedicatee for such a work, Knolles makes the use of his history clear in the following sentences by stating that his work can "serve" as "faire warnings unto such great ones", if not in any other way, who have the power to interfere with events, for "the good government and defence of [God's] church and people".[347] This aim of warning Christian princes of the greatness of the Turkish threat and encouraging them to unite to fight against

[346] Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication]
[347] Knolles, *GH,* [Dedication]

them had a certain impact on the work. Turkish history was an exemplary piece that would inform those that were faced with this danger now through a narration of the affairs and the wars of the same parties.

The aim of the history is also repeated in the introduction part, with a little change in emphasis. Explaining his sources and methodology in detail, to persuade his reader of the truth of his history, Knolles passes on to the use of it:

> [the reader] shall find matter enough to wonder at, and no lesse strange than that whatsoeuer it is that is written of the greatest monarchies of auntient time, … But so much the more worthy our consideration than they, for that their periods alreadie run, and so their furie ouerpast, this in our time so flourisheth, and at this pre|sent so mightily swelleth, as if it would ouerflow all, were it not by the mercie of God first, and then by the for|ces of some few of the Christian princes neerest vnto so great a danger with their great charge to their im|mortall glorie and benefit of the Christian commonweale mightily checked and kept within some bounds and compasse.[348]

Without the emphasis on the duty of taking action against the Turks *per se*, Knolles explains the relevance of the topic to this wider group of readers. The material he presents is certainly interesting, but more important than that, it is closely related to what is going on in world politics in the early seventeenth century. Although they might not have a direct influence on the events, Knolles believes that his readers might find "interesting" information in his history, which they would like to learn about as the intellectuals of their age. This second group, that is the actual readers of the work, were certainly eager to learn about the political and military history of the Christian-Muslim conflict. Living in the age of travels, discoveries of new lands, peoples and cultures, however, they were also interested in anything that was connected to any

[348] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

aspect of Turkish life and culture. This interest as well, Knolles tried to satisfy in his *GH*.

Going over *GH* in detail, one quickly notices Knolles's effort to include the details related to Turkish and/or Muslim culture in his history. The way Knolles describes the houses of the Turks in Constantinople, for instance, does not only give details about the simplicity and plainness of the houses of the ordinary men, but also explains the reason behind this, with a reference to their own sayings:

> the Turkes priuat houses in this so great and imperiall a citie, so much renowned through the world, are for the most part low and base, after the Turkish fashion, built some of wood, some of stone, and some of vnburnt bricke, layd with clay and dyrt, which quickly decaieth againe: they after their homely manner (by long custome receiued) neuer building anything sumptuously for their owne priuate vse, but contenting themselues with their simple cottages, how meane soeuer, commonly saying them to be good inough for the short time of their pilgri|mage:[349]

In contrast to this modest attitude in terms of housing, Knolles comments, Turks do not "spare for any cost vpon the publicke buildings and ornaments of the com|monwealth", which are built "with great majestie and pompe".

Knolles also provides his readers with information on details of the religious life of the Ottomans, whenever possible. His comments on the mosques, their ornamentation, and buildings attached to them for different uses[350]; his explanations on the Turkish attitude towards pictures within temples[351] and the details about the origins of religious practices such as

[349] Knolles, *GH,* 342.
[350] Knolles, *GH,*183.
[351] Knolles, *GH,* 342.

circumcision[352] are included. Far more interesting than these issues, which appeared in almost any source about the Turks/Muslims in general, Knolles also has much other curious information on the clothing of the Turks or their particular habits. For instance, Knolles explains that the "white caps" that Janissaries "used at this day" were first introduced by Orhan to differentiate his men from others "which commonly wore red".[353] Knolles goes on with his comments on the general outlook of the Turks as follows:

> The Turks also in Orchanes raign, & long time after, vsed not to cut or shaue their beards, but did weare them long: so that if the king would disgrace any man, he would in his displeasure commaund his beard to be cut or shauen. The manner of cutting and shauing their beards, which they now vse, they learned of the Italians: of whom they haue also borrowed many other fashions, not onely differing, but quite contrarie to their antient maners & customes.[354]

Knolles gives similar details on the clothes of Turkish rulers, on palace life or on the halls and rooms where the state affairs are discussed[355], enriching his narrative with explanations of "strange" Ottoman habits or rules from time to time[356].

Another curious story that Knolles includes explains the origin of a saying that was used among Janissaries. According to the story, a Janissary took two Asapis, who happened to be his slaves, to a restaurant and offered to sell them to the cook in return for a meal. The cook did not want these "unnecessary servants" and declined the offer. Janissary, filled with anger, "swore many a great oath" to cut off the heads of poor Asapis, if the cook would not redeem

[352] Knolles, *GH,* 1051.
[353] Knolles, *GH,* 183.
[354] Knolles, *GH,* 183.
[355] For instance, Knolles, *GH,* 831.
[356] Knolles, *GH,* 923, 838, 709-10.

them. Without a choice, the cook gave Janissary a sheep's head and the Janissary, who was content now, commented that the cook "had giuen for the more than indeed they were worth". Knolles concludes this story by stating that this "disgrace" that has been done to the Asapis "is yet oftentimes by way of reproch in great contempt, by the masterfull and insolent Ianizaries, objected vnto the whole bodie of the Asapi (the greatest part of the Turks huge armies) of whom for all that the proud Ianizaries make small reckoning, accounting them scarcely for men, & in their rage oftentimes telling them, That two of them are not worth a sodden sheepes head".[357] This story does not only help Knolles point to a severe crack in the Ottoman army, but also enriched his narrative with a cultural element.

Considering all this, it would not be wrong to say that the history Knolles composed distinguished itself from numerous other Ottoman histories that were available to seventeenth-century readers. It is hard to say, however, that Knolles achieved all this alone. On the contrary, it would be almost impossible for him to write such a lengthy history of the Ottomans while he was in Sandwich, and very busy as the Master of the grammar school. The discussion of the next chapter, therefore, will try to evaluate the role of the patron of this work, Sir Peter Manwood, in the actual process of writing as well as on the general structure of the work. What turned Knolles's history into a general history, what moved him to compose such a huge project should be sought for in his connection with Sir Peter Manwood.

[357] Knolles, *GH*, 256.

CHAPTER V

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PATRON

Knolles's text is an ambivalent one and its ambivalence has become the main point of discussion of *GH*. The present literature on Knolles's work focuses on the ambiguity of the text in terms of its representation of the Ottomans. A range of feelings from fear to admiration is the character of the work, and according to Barbour, this ambivalence was inescapable.[358] McJanneth approves of the overall "proto-orientalist" look of the work, indicating that the representation is more complex in the text than in the paratexts.[359] Schmuck as well emphasizes that Knolles' text "complicates, if not undermines" the ideology he wants to promote by obscuring a completely negative image of the Turks.[360] Accepting the validity of all these points, I argue that turning from the trajectory of the text to one of the process of production and to the parties involved might reveal important information that would help us explain the reasons for the ambivalence. Thus, this chapter will try to analyse the ideas of the patron, Sir Peter Manwood, as he is one of the main parties that might have influenced the process of writing.

[358] Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, 18.
[359] McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 139-40.
[360] Schmuck, "Politics of Anxeity," 22.

It has been argued that Knolles had the idea of writing a Turkish history, even before he started working at the grammar school of Sir Roger Manwood.[361] Knolles's explanations in his introduction, however, indicate that his aim of being "profitable to the Christian commonweale" after his graduation from Lincoln College, did not mean anything more than a "desire to know":

> I long since (as many others haue) entered into the heauie consideration thereof, … afterwards led with a more earnest desire to know the strange and fatall mutations, by this barbarous nation in former time … yet without purpose euer to haue commended the same or any part thereof vnto the remembrance of posteritie.[362]

Although he wanted to learn about the history of the Ottomans, writing a history of this nation was a goal "too high a reach, and fitter for some more happie wit, better furnished with such helpes both of nature and art, as are of necessitie requisit for the vndertaking of so great a charge" according to Knolles.[363] The main encouragement to undertake such a huge task came from Peter Manwood, whom Knolles refers to as "the first moouer of me to take this great Worke in hand". After bringing his work to "some perfection", Knolles laid it aside for a second time "like ynough euen as an abortiue fruit to haue perished in the birth before it was growne to perfection". The work was finally "perfected" and thus got ready for publication after a last effort that came with the encouragement of Peter Manwood, "in whose keeping it so for the most part many yeares in safetie rested".[364]

[361] Hugh G. Dick, "'Tamburlaine' Sources Once More," *Studies in Philology*. 46, no. 2 (1949), 160.
[362] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction".
[363] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[364] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

Considering Knolles's workload at Sandwich as a schoolmaster it is hard to imagine that he had plenty of time for himself. His actual employer at Sandwich, the founder of the grammar school, Roger Manwood was quite strict about the performance of the schoolmaster's duties. The statues of the school, prepared by Roger himself, require the master to spend most of his time in the classroom teaching.[365] Together with administrative work, Knolles's schedule did not leave much room for his own studies. Parry's examination of the sources that Knolles consulted, and the earliest dates those sources might have been used by Knolles, reveals that the major part of *GH* was written after 1591.[366] Together with the availability of the sources, one needs to consider the availability of Knolles himself as the author for such a demanding work, which might have occurred only after the death of Roger Manwood in 1592. So it would not be hard to imagine that, having a greater say in matters concerning the grammar school after his father's death, Peter Manwood, as now employer and patron, could encourage Knolles to spend more time on *GH*.

It has been stated before that Peter Manwood inherited close connections with both lay and ecclesiastic circles of power in Kent. His father, Roger Manwood, had served as the steward of the liberties to Archbishop Parker for a while.[367] The notes in Peter Manwood's commonplace book

[365] Nicholas Carlisle, *A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales*, London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1818, 602-3.
[366] Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, 17-18.
[367] Sybil M. Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592),"*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]

indicates that he knew Archbishop Whitgift quite well.[368] Peter Manwood was a member of the Society of Antiquaries and attended discussions of this group, held initially by Parker and later on by Whitgift.[369] Peter Manwood also befriended intellectuals of his time such as Cotton, Camden, Stow, Hartwell and many others. Besides, as Parry notes, he was included in private meetings of Whitgift and his entourage, who at least once discussed issues concerning the Ottomans.[370]

Not only Whitgift and his secretary Abraham Hartwell, whom Peter Manwood must have known closely, but also his lifelong friend Edward de la Zouche and his friend and neighbour Sir Moile Finche, a Kentish knight who was present in the house of Whitgift while Ottoman matters were discussed, showed an interest in the history of the Ottomans to some extent.[371] Besides, some curious documents in Peter Manwood's own collections and his commonplace book reveals his genuine interested in the contemporary affairs of the Ottoman Empire as well as in its history.[372] Knolles's apologetic tone in his translation of Bodin's *Republic* also reveals how demanding Peter Manwood was for a continuation of the *GH*, as well as for a completely new project, namely the *General History of the Sarasins* [Saracens]. This indicates that Peter Manwood's interest in the east was not limited to the Turks. As Knolles states, Peter

[368] British Library Add. MS. 38139, f. 58, f. 254b. A letter in *Calendar of Salisbury Mss*, VIII, 496 from Archbishop Whitgift to Sir Robert Cecil reminds him to issue the travel licence for Peter Manwood.
[369] Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, 7.
[370] Louis A. Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[371] Parry, *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, 13.
[372] British Library Add. MS. 38139, f. 15, f15b, f16b.

Manwood wanted to learn more about "the laws and customes" of eastern nations.[373]

Knolles's explicit comments on his patron's encouragements and help from the very beginning of the project of *GH* and his comments on some future projects Peter Manwood asked him to deal with indicates Peter Manwood's important role in the composition of *GH*. The general interest in the Ottomans and their way of life within the circles that Peter Manwood was a member of, and the remnants of Peter Manwood's own intellectual life, such as his collection of documents and his library, might help us not only in explaining the reasons for Peter Manwood's determined patronage of *GH* but also in analysing his impact on the actual work. His intellectual pursuits as well as his political alliances indicate that Peter Manwood's concerns were as important as Knolles's ideas in shaping both the form and the tone of *GH*. Before a discussion of these points, we must now deal with the life and ideas of the patron in more detail.

5.1. Sir Peter Manwood

Nothing much has been said on Peter Manwood, the patron of the first English history of the Ottomans, other than small biographical accounts. Sir Peter Manwood (1571–1625) was born at Hackington, Kent and he was the

[373] Jean Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale. VVritten by I. Bodin a famous lawyer, and a man of great experience in matters of state. Out of the French and Latine copies, done into English.* trans. Riclard Knolles. London: [Printed by Adam Islip] impensis G. Bishop, 1606, [Dedication]

eldest son of Sir Roger Manwood (1524/5–1592).[374] His father was an influential man; born in 1525 and educated at the Inner Temple. Sir Roger Manwood was called to the bar in 1548 and he was already the lawyer responsible for the Cinque Ports by July 1553, at the age of 29. After becoming an MP for Hastings in 1555, Roger also represented Sandwich in parliament after 1558. According to his biographer Sybil M. Jack, it is possible to see Roger "as a new member of the gentry, as a man who, during Elizabeth's reign, had a vested interest in maintaining the Reformation settlement."[375] In 1563 Roger managed to arrange the necessities for the establishment a grammar school in Sandwich, through which, later on, Peter Manwood would meet Knolles.[376] Just like numerous men of his time and of his social status, Roger supported intellectual pursuits through patronizing literary men as well as establishing scholarships at Oxford and Cambridge. His name appeared as a patron, in the works of Barnabe Googe, Thomas Twyne and Reginald Scot.[377]

Peter Manwood followed in his father's intellectual pursuits; leaving Roger's passion for his profession of law aside. Peter Manwood remained at Hackington, the family house rebuilt by his father, living the life of a country gentleman. He was entered as a student of the Inner Temple, in 1583 and he spent years at the Inner Temple, of which his father was a distinguished member. After his graduation, Peter Manwood served as steward of the Christmas feast at the Inner Temple five times between 1615 and 1623, and

[374] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[375] Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[376] Carlisle, *Endowed Grammar Schools*, 595.
[377] Claire Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," unpub. diss., Canterbury: University of Kent, 2005, 8.

four of his sons were all specially admitted to the Temple. He never became a member of the bar, though.[378] He received licences to travel abroad twice, firstly on 12 December 1598, for three years to "increase in good knowledge and learning" and secondly on 27 August 1604, for one year.[379]

Peter Manwood played an important part in the administration of the county and represent Sandwich in Parliament numerous times. He was appointed commander of Dover in 1591; a commissioner for grain in 1596, for musters by 1597, and for the oyster fisheries in 1598; deputy lieutenant of the Cinque Ports (1600), deputy lieutenant of Kent (1601); sheriff of Kent (1602–3) and mayor of Canterbury (1605). He was elected senior MP for Sandwich in 1588–9, 1592–3, 1597, and 1601; for Saltash, Cornwall, in 1603–4 and for Kent in 1614. In parliament he was appointed to committees concerned with legislation.[380] Despite his extensive involvement in parliament and administration, he was and is more noted for his intellectual pursuits. Mentioning St. Stephens, the chapel of the palace of Westminster, Camden described Roger Manwood as "Knight, L. cheife Baron of the Exchequer, a man of exquisite knowledge in our common lawes, (unto whom for his bounteous liberalitie the poore inhabitants are much beholding)" but when referring to

[378] Peter Lefevre, "Manwood, Sir Peter, of Hales Place, Hackington alias St. Stephens, Kent, Ford Place, Hothe, Kent and St. Bartholomew the Great, London," *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, online edn. 2010. [http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/15581603/member/manwood-peter-1571-1625, accessed 11 Febr. 2016]

[379] Robert Lemon, Mary Anne Everett Green, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-[1625]: 1598-1601: Elizabeth,* London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1869, 132; British Library Add. MS 29759, f.159v.

[380] Lefevre, "Manwood, Sir Peter," [http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/15581603/member/manwood-peter-1571-1625. Accessed 11 Febr. 2016]

Roger's son Peter, he identified him as "Knight of the Bath, whom I cannot but mention when as he is a favourer of vertue, and learning".[381]

Peter Manwood's connexion with his father's school, through which he met Knolles, continued all throughout his life. By the early 1620s he had to flee abroad briefly, as he was heavily in debt. He could come back to Sandwich in 1624, after some arrangements with his creditors, mostly through the help of his friend Lord Zouche. The latter wrote to Secretary Conway requesting "his influence with the King for a protection of old Sir Peter Manwood, who has returned from abroad, and wishes to be able to talk with his creditors, that he may obtain respite to pay his debts, and end his days in his own country".[382] Peter Manwood died in 1625 leaving his family fortunes to his eldest son John, courtier and lieutenant of Dover castle, who sat as an MP for Sandwich in 1640.[383]

Considering the social implications of being a member of one of the Inns of Court, Roger Manwood's ambition to secure his son's position there was quite understandable. First of all, Inns of Court were the places where "the best or better sort of gentlemen" met.[384] They were basically more exclusive universities and getting into one of them was all about being able to pay the

[381] William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adjoining* …, London: 1637, 339.
[382] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]; Mary Anne Everett Green, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I: 1623-1625*, London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1859: 213.
[383] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[384] A. R. Ingpen, *Master Worsley's book on the history and constitution of the honourable Society of the Middle Temple*, London: Printed at the Chiswick press and pub. by order of the Masters of the bench, 1910, 43.

necessary amount, for which no scholarships were offered. Besides, these institutions accepted students only through the reference of a former member of the particular Inn. Thus, it is possible that Roger wanted his son to "obtain social cachet so avidly sought by the rising gentry of the Elizabethan England" in such an exclusive place of education.[385] Besides, as Roger himself was a member of the Inner Temple, his son was registered as a "special admission .... without payment".[386]

It is certain that, after the mid-sixteenth century, there was a rising demand among the landed gentry for a "training which both fitted them for local or central office, and enabled them to hold their own in the company of virtuosi around a dinner table".[387] Inns of courts were not formal schools of law; they were places where one could also learn "courtly arts" such as "dancing and all the games proper for nobles as those brought up in the King's household are accustomed to practice."[388] Thus it was not surprising that many young members of the gentry felt obliged to attend only to acquire good manners, even if they would not pursue a legal career. Members could also study on a variety of subjects such as astronomy, geography, history and theology. In this sense Inns of Court did not only help young men coming from the country to gain a glimpse of the social and intellectual life in London, where they could enjoy a wide range of fashionable activities, but they also acted as humanistic academies for young English gentlemen. As Fortescue stated, the Inns of Court were some sort of an

[385] Wilfrid Prest, "Legal Education of the Gentry at the Inns of Court, 1560-1640," *Past and Present*, No. 38 (Dec., 1967), 21.
[386] F. A. Inderwick, *A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records*, London: Order of the Masters of the Bench, 1896, 327.
[387] Lawrence Stone, "The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640," *Past and Present*, No. 28 (Jul., 1964), 41.
[388] John Fortescue, *De laudibus legum Angliæ*, London, 1616, 114-5.

academy fit for upper class men where they "apply themselves to the study of law … and they employ themselves in the study of sacred and profane history".[389]

It is quite possible that Peter Manwood's education in the Inner Temple had an impact on his life-long intellectual pursuits. There is no doubt that many students at the Inns of Court had a humanistic interest in the classics and in history in general. The methods of studying law encouraged a study of history, at least implicitly. He contacted numerous important men of his time most probably through his membership of the Inner Temple. Besides the important members of the Inner Temple such as Coke and the Beaumonts, Christopher Hatton and John Selden, numerous historians and intellectuals of the early seventeenth century, such as Lambarde, Spelman, Donne, Egerton, Camden, Twysden and D'Ewes, were related to the Inns of Court in one way or another.[390] Most of these men, and many others, could also pursue antiquarian interests in the extensive libraries of the Inns of Court. More than two-thirds of the forty-three members of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries were members of the Inns of Court.[391]

[389] John Fortescue, *De laudibus legum Angliæ*, London, 1616, 116.
[390] Anton-Hermann Chroust, "Beginning, Flourishing and Decline of the Inns of Court: The Consolidation of the English Legal Profession after 1400," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 10 (1956), 114.
[391] R. J. Schoeck, "Early Anglo-Saxon Studies and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. 5 (1958), 104.

5.2. The intellectual atmosphere in Kent in late fifteen- and early sixteenth century:

Apart from his education, the lively intellectual life in Kent put Peter Manwood in a close web of writers, patrons and antiquarians. The economic prosperity of the county in the sixteenth century had a certain impact on the educational opportunities of the gentry, who not only could make use of better schooling opportunities but also benefited from a greater access to books and wider opportunities of travelling abroad. The chance of getting a better education and being connected to the world through well-established channels resulted in a group of men with higher political and social awareness, as well as self-confidence, together with rising political and economic ambitions.[392]

From the mid-sixteenth century Kentish men became ardent authors or patrons and their activities increased throughout the first decades of the seventeenth. Claire Bartram's detailed study of the writing and reading practices of Kentish gentry in the late sixteenth century reveals the influence of the ideology of the gentry on their "self-conscious conceptualisation of their role in society".[393] Bartram's study, which discusses different aspects of an ideal member of the Kentish gentry through an analysis of "the linguistic and conceptual means through which they expressed their identity in different social conditions", shows that

[392] Peter Clark, *English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution*, Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1977, 216.
[393] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 2. Ideas on the self-perception of the Kentish gentry in the late sixteenth century follows Bartram's line of thought in her introduction closely. For a full discussion, see Bartram, introduction, 3-20.

> the hospitable, charitable gentleman at home, the spiritual gentleman who reformed himself and acted as a godly husbandman or shepherd to the wider community, the godly Justice who ensured order and equity, the great deeds of the gentleman worthy of historical record and the gentleman as military commander[394]

were among the main discourses that the texts produced or patronized by Kentish gentlemen at the turn of the century employed.

The group that were called gentry in sixteenth-century Kent consisted of men from different social and economic backgrounds. There were newcomers, for whom establishing familial and kin ties with resident families was of great importance; for the well-established families, on the other hand, it was crucial to re-state the longevity of their family name, while new members of the gentry felt the need to emphasize the importance of "ability and education over and above inherited right".[395] These men relied on different discourses to secure their social status as the governors of Kent.

Gentility was something much more than wealth, it was rather related to being a part of a group of men through accepting a set of subjective values and through the acknowledgement of a large group of people, from both within and outside of the gentry itself.[396] Being "godly governors", "godly Justices" or "godly husbandmen"; a concept that was closely connected to the puritan notion of the "godly magistrate" as a man of high responsibility in terms of religious, political and social duties towards his community, was a way of justifying the authority

[394] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 2
[395] William Lambarde, *A perambulation of Kent conteining the description, hystorie, and customes of that* shyre, London, 1576, 6-7.
[396] see A.J. Fletcher "Honour, Reputation and Local Officeholding in Elizabethan and Stuart England," in *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* eds. A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, 92-115.

over the rest of the community in the sixteenth century.[397] This religious sense of a fatherly duty towards the wider society and the civic duties of the gentlemen that were conveyed to him through humanist education were the two prominent aspects of the self-fashioning strategies of the Kentish gentlemen. Under the influence of both puritan and humanist ideas, Kentish gentlemen "promoted a corporate identity as elect, literate governors".[398]

This identity did not only involve an increasing concern for the overall economic and social welfare of their community, but it also brought the spiritual and educational needs of the society to the fore. The belief that knowledge could be used practically for the welfare of the society was strong. The educational background and the pragmatic interest in intellectual activities did not only make it possible for a member of the gentry to be in touch with central government, to impose law and order or to represent the county in parliament, but it also turned him into an intellectual. His status was reinforced by the manuscripts and printed books written, patronised, bought and borrowed by him.[399] Being a part of this process of gathering and circulating knowledge was an important aspect of county life in Kent, and Peter Manwood was born into this world of intellectual networks. Kentish families of the early seventeenth century were productive writers and generous patrons. Sir Edwin Sandys was the patron of Hooker and the author of *A Relation of the State Religion* (1605); Sir Norton Knatchbull was a productive theologian himself. The political

[397] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 12.
[398] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 13.
[399] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 14.

theorist Sir Robert Filmer was the author of *Patriarcha*; Robert Fludd, and Thomas and Cheyney Culpepers wrote numerous political tracts.[400]

If we were to make a list of the particular subjects that Kentish gentlemen showed an intellectual capacity and interest in, history would be among the first few on the list. First of all, the county of Kent had an old tradition of monastic chronicles and annals because of its unique religious and historical importance. In the sixteenth century the knowledge of history, and particularly of the classics, constituted quite an important part of a gentleman's military education and thus was directly related to his career as a governor. These Kentish men, who specifically needed an education in history, were certainly those on whose "good judgement and service" the future of the estate of England depended.[401] This should be the sense of history that Peter Manwood acquired through his education.

For the Kentish gentry history-writing was also a process of recording and thus preserving. Sir Roger Manwood was well aware of the fact that keeping the records of the repair of Rochester Bridge would carry this initiative to the status of a memorable enterprise, and thus would add to his own reputation as a governor.[402] Considering this aspect of history-writing, as recording events worthy of remembrance, indicates that, for Kentish intellectuals, history was not something that was limited to the form of chronicle. Rather it appeared in various forms such as the funeral monuments of the respected members of the

[400] Clark, *Provincial Society*, 217.
[401] Clark, *Provincial Society*, 215-8.
[402] Sir Roger Manwood, *A True Discourse of the Auncyent wodden and present stoned bridge at Rochester and of the landes proper & contributorie therto and of the verie causes of the decaye of the said stone bridge & for the course taken for reformaton therin* (1586), Rochester Bridge Wardens Trust.

community, the family trees recorded in commonplace books or the copies of land deeds or testamentary material among family papers. These were all histories that demonstrated and preserved the social status of an Elizabethan gentleman in Kent.

It is not surprising that, thus, Kent was a centre for antiquarians in the sixteenth century. The second part of that century has been identified as a period of substantial shifts in history writing and, even more than that, in the sense and use of history for a broader audience. As has been noted by previous studies, the circle that formed around Archbishop Parker, which would in time be the nucleus of the Society of Antiquaries, was one of the most important focal points of scholarly activity in the fields of history and antiquarianism.[403] This, together with the humanist education provided by the Inns of Courts and the influence of the legal professionals on the field of history, had profound effects, and this interest in history and antiquarianism, according to Bartram, was connected to the peculiar protestant identity of the Kentish gentry:

> Revealing the 'fonde dreames of doting monkes and fabling friars,' protestant writers intended to 'open the plain truth of times lying long hid in obscure darkness of antiquity' not just by employing the 'fire and fan of judgement and discretion' in their reading of histories but in unearthing and examining manuscript material. Such an approach impacted on the means through which historical truth was validated.[404]

This concern for reaching authentic source material and evaluating manuscript accounts, documents or older histories critically, to form a better history extracted out of the existing material is seen in Roger Manwood's account of the

[403] see Linda Van Norden, "The Elizabethan College of Antiquaries," unpub. Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1946
[404] Bartram, "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," 126.

history of Rochester Bridge. Being a natural heir of these intellectual activities in Kent, it is hard to imagine that Peter Manwood would be far from these new critical methods and ideas of incorporating antiquarian sources into historical studies. A closer look to his personal connections with these intellectual circles and his own activities as an intellectual of the early seventeenth century reveals his ideas on history and politics more clearly.

5.3. Sir Peter Manwood's intellectual and political ideas as indicated by his library, works and friends

Peter Manwood's historical collections and library indicate his deep and genuine interest in history, and in general histories above all. As a member of the Inner Temple and the Society of Antiquaries, as a benefactor of colleges in both Oxford and Cambridge universities and as a relatively well-known member of the Kentish gentry, there is nothing surprising about Peter Manwood's interest in history. Both his educational background and the intellectual circles he moved in shaped his scholarly interest. As mentioned above, the Kentish gentry was well known for its high opinion of history and antiquarian studies, especially of the antiquities of Kent. It is not strange then that Peter Manwood was familiar with the ongoing changes in history-writing at the turn of the century. Indeed he was within the circle of men who were producing or supporting the production of historical narratives that would be in line with the new developments in the field. A glimpse of the works that were produced by

the historians that were in close contact with Peter Manwood and an overview of his own library reveal the fact that Peter Manwood was following the latest developments in the history writing closely and was familiar with the works of continental theorists such as Jean Bodin. Besides, his interest in travel writing and geography, as well as his studies as an antiquarian, must have been influential on his ideas about how histories should be written. A close look at Peter Manwood's commonplace book and some other manuscripts that he preserved also gives us an idea about the political circles he was in touch with, and thus let us suggest some reasons for his interest in Ottoman history.

Other than belonging to the same circles as numerous other Kentish intellectuals and antiquarians, Peter Manwood was personally in touch with William Camden. Peter Manwood owned a copy of the 1594 edition of Camden's *Britannia*, and he commissioned a translation of the work by Richard Knolles, a copy of which was found in Camden's library at his death.[405] Another partial copy of the same translation was also among the manuscripts of John Stow, under the title "A Translation of Camden's History of Ireland, 1609, by Mr. Knollis presented to Peter Manwood, Esq.".[406] Another manuscript that Peter Manwood donated to the Bodleian, "Historical collections relating to the claims of English kings to the French crown in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" had notes in Camden's hand. Camden's words on both Roger and Peter Manwood in *Britannia* also reveal their long lasting friendship. Camden's

[405] Herschel Clay Baker, *The Later Renaissance in England: nondramatic verse and prose, 1600-1660*, Houghton Mifflin, 1975, 836.
[406] Charles O'Conor, John Stow, *Bibliotheca Ms. Stowensis: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Stowe Library*, J. Seeley, 1818, 210.

Britannia was one of the most important works of his age and as a historian he represented a break from two distinct strands of his time. He was beyond both the literary and fictitious rhetoric of the humanist tradition and the providential tone of the ecclesiastical tradition.[407] His *Britannia*, as Fussner puts it, was "original, serviceable, and characteristic of the new scholarship".[408]

Peter Manwood shared his books with Sir Robert Cotton and used Cotton's library for his own studies. Two manuscripts in Peter Manwood's collections, "Tracts relating to English claims to France under Edward III and Henry V" and "Whether it be better to suppresse Popish practices" contained notes in Cotton's hand.[409] A volume of a collection of "letters for reading on Sundays and Saints' days", which belonged to Peter Manwood, was acquired by Cotton.[410] In a letter dated July 6, 1606 Peter Manwood asks Cotton to send him the *Life of Henry VIII* together with some certain notes.[411] Sir Robert Cotton's impressive antiquarian collection and library, and the excitement of the modern scholars working on this huge collection and its users, while emphasizing the importance of Cotton as an antiquarian and a collector of books, has overshadowed Cotton the historian. Some have even questioned if Cotton's historical works were of any particular importance.[412] However, recent studies that have evaluated the historical works of Cotton indicate his importance as a

[407] Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Renaissance Essays*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 135.
[408] Fussner, *The Historical Revolution*, 217.
[409] SC 3033, Falconer Madan, H. H. E. Craster, *Summary Catalogue of Western manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922, vol. II., 573.
[410] James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, 207.
[411] British Library Lansdowne MS 89, *Catalogue of the Lansdowne Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 1819, 174, n.95
[412] Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 294.

politic historian. Beyond his activities as an antiquarian or as a historian, Cotton's real contribution to the field of history was in his methodology. As Woolf puts it, very much like Camden, Cotton also "distinguished in theory between history and the study of antiquities, though by using the same sources in both pursuits and by encouraging other to do so he also contributed to the dissolution of this dichotomy".[413] Besides, Cotton's preoccupation with the realities of political life rather than with the moral lessons that should be conveyed to the readers is evident in his *Henry III*.

Peter Manwood was also in touch with John Stow. A manuscript of miscellaneous papers that Peter Manwood presented to the Bodleian in 1620 included Cavendish's *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, which was copied from one once owned by John Stow. Stow was also the owner of the manuscript of the life of *Henry V*, by the translator Titus Livius, and Peter Manwood noted that he had his copy of the book made from Stow's and that he received it on 19 May 1601 at London.[414] John Stow's *Annales* (1600) in Peter Manwood's library bears the note "This booke was gyven mee by my freinde John Stow Pe: Manwood The 24th of fe: 1600" and on his copy of *A suruay of London* (1598) Peter Manwood noted that the book was sent to him by Stow, "Presently after hs settinge of itt fourthe" but the copy was delivered to Peter Manwood before "17 day of November 1598".[415]

Another historian that Peter Manwood was in touch with was John Hayward (1564?–1627), a controversial figure whose earliest work, *The First*

[413] Woolf, *The Idea of History*, 160.
[414] Henry Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 131; also see Blair Worden, "Historians and Poets," in *Paulina Kewes, The Uses of History in Early Modern England,* University of California Press, 2006, 87
[415] see Appendix II – a list of books in the Library of Peter Manwood.

Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII (1599) was thought to be encouraging the political ambitions of the earl of Essex.[416] The political implications of the text were noticed by Elizabeth I and it was examined by Francis Bacon under her command. Despite Bacon's verdict that declined to make accusations of treason, the second edition of the work was seized and burned in June 1599, and Hayward was interrogated about his motives in writing it after Essex's downfall, remaining in the Tower until the death of Elizabeth.[417] What made Hayward an important historian of his time was not these controversial parts of his work though. *Henrie IIII* has been accepted as "the first historical narrative in English to adapt to British material a Tacitean emphasis upon the personal character and behaviour of the participants as the important causal element that lay behind affairs of state".[418] One of the earliest examples of politic history in England, this work also was an example of "the developing influence of more recent continental historiographers, notably Machiavelli, Guicciardini, and Bodin" on English historians, according to Manning.[419]

After three years in prison, Hayward's fate started to change with the death of Elizabeth. He was released after the accession of James I and his new work was sent to the publisher within two weeks. After a few years, in 1610, he was appointed as the official historiographer of the king's new college in

[416] John J. Manning, "Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12794, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[417] Manning, "Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12794, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[418] Manning, "Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12794, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[419] Manning, "Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12794, accessed 11 Feb 2016]

Chelsea, where he worked with Camden, and from 1613 onwards he started working closely with Cotton on a private commission.[420] It is either through his connections to Cotton and Camden, who were within the same circles as Peter Manwood, or through his membership of the Society of Antiquaries in 1617 that he met Peter Manwood for the curious project of the publication of Roger Williams's *The Actions of the Low Countries* (1618).

Roger Williams (1539/40-1595) was prominent soldier who fought in numerous wars after the middle of the sixteenth century; against the French in the Low Countries, with the Huguenots in the French wars of religion (1562-3, 1567-70) and against Philip II in the Netherlands throughout the 1570s and early 1580s. He was a lieutenant-colonel in the English army under the control of Norris when in 1585 the English government decided to make war on Spain. In 1588, Williams was in England, helping with the preparations for the Armada, and in 1589 he was distanced from the court when he helped the earl of Essex to leave with his ship, despite Elizabeth's strict orders to stay on shore. After this event he became a devoted follower of the earl of Essex, who in Williams's will of 19 June 1589 was described as "the errle of Essex my gret prince".[421] As his biographer states, he was never genuinely liked by Elizabeth, but rather tolerated because of his military skills, and his close connection to the earl.[422] He died in 1595 and his funeral was organized on his patron Lord Essex's instructions and at his expense, as Williams requested in his will, and was used

[420] Manning, "Hayward, Sir John (1564?–1627),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12794, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[421] D. J. B. Trim, "Williams, Sir Roger (1539/40–1595)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29543, accessed 26 Aug 2015]
[422] Trim, "Williams, Sir Roger (1539/40–1595),"
[http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29543, accessed 26 Aug 2015]

by the earl as a means to remind everyone of the heroic fights of England against Catholicism.[423]

The link that connects Peter Manwood to the lost manuscript of Roger Williams's *A Brief Discourse of Warre* (1590) is not clear, although it has been argued that Peter Manwood might have obtained Williams's notes after the dispersal of Essex's own papers after his death in 1601, as it is quite probable that Williams's notes were left to Essex at his death in 1595.[424] Whatever the truth was, Williams's explanations in the dedication to *A Brief Discourse of Warre* indicate that the manuscript that ended in the hands of Peter Manwood was written as a part of that work:

> In troth, but for the negligence of a seruant that lost part of my discourses, I would not haue printed any thing without the whole; wherefore I haue taken boldnes to present your Lordship with some of my lost papers, …[425]

It is certain that Williams's manuscript was in Peter Manwood's hands before the publication of Edward Grimeston's *A General History of the Netherlands* in 1608, as the author mentions that Peter Manwood made him use the manuscript:

> And I haue had some obseruations in written hand, by the meanes of that worthy knight, sir Peter Manwood, the which were gathered by sir Roger Williams, when he first bore armes vnder Iulian Romero, a Spa|niard in the great Commanders time …[426]

---

[423] Walter Bourchier Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., 1540-1646*, J. Murray, 1853, Volume 1, 317
[424] Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585*-1597, Cambridge University Press, 1999, 237 n. 206
[425] Roger Williams, *A briefe discourse of vvarre. VVritten by Sir Roger VVilliams Knight; vvith his opinion concerning some parts of the martiall discipline*, London, 1590, [Dedication].
[426] Petit, *A General History of the Netherlands*, "The translator to the reader"

Peter Manwood's explanations in the dedication of the printed version of Williams's work that he finally decided to publish — "This is part of Historie, hauing lyen a long time by mee" — strengthens the possibility that he received the manuscript after the death of Essex and from among his papers.[427]

The path Peter Manwood followed to publish this manuscript is much more curious than the way he acquired it. Deciding to prepare the work for publication, Peter Manwood wanted it to be edited and corrected by a historian, as it was "in a rag|ged hand, much maimed, both in sense, and in phrase".[428] Thus, stating Williams's long relationship with Essex, "best known and best documented" of those among Essex's loose entourage, Peter Manwood handed the work to the former follower of Essex, John Hayward. The book was "restored" to its initial condition by Hayward in terms of both "the stile and meaning of the Authour" and it was published with a dedication by Peter Manwood himself to another former Essex supporter, and historian, Sir Francis Bacon.[429] Peter Manwood's words in this dedication on his decision to present the work to Bacon indicate that he was sure of Bacon's appreciation of the historical value of the work, as well as the "honou|rable estimation which still remaineth of the Authour".[430] Peter Manwood's aim to prevent this manuscript "either perish, or hereafter be set forth by others as their own" not only indicates his concern for the preservation of manuscripts, but also reveals the close links that tied him to people from the Essex circle.

[427] Roger Williams, *The actions of the Lowe Countries*, London, 1618, [Dedication]
[428] Williams, *The actions of the Lowe Countries*, "To the reader"
[429] Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 10
[430] Williams, *The actions of the Lowe Countries*, [Dedication].

Peter Manwood had other connections with the Essex circle. Joshuah Sylvester (1563–1618), poet and the famous translator of famous Huguenot courtier and poet Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas (1544-1590), dedicated his translation of "A Glimpse of Heavenly Joyes: or the New Hiervsalem in an Old Hymne extracted from the most Divine St. Avgvstine" to Peter Manwood, as it appears in his collection of 1617.[431] Sylvester's connections to the earl of Essex were well known, not only from the dedication of his initial translations of the works of Du Bartas to Essex, but also from two letters penned by Lord Essex on his behalf to help him get a position. Losing his hope of protection under the earl of Essex after 1601, Sylvester moved to Lambourn to work as a tutor and only continued to work on publications of his translations after the accession of James I, who was also an admirer of Du Bartas.[432]

Another historian and old Essex client that Peter Manwood was in touch with was Samuel Daniel (1562/3–1619). As a poet-historian Daniel was closely linked to the Pembroke family and the Essex circle. Fulke Greville, a close friend and supporter of the earl of Essex, not only did his best to help Daniel financially, even by writing a letter to Cecil in 1595, to obtain a parsonage for Daniel, but also encouraged him to continue writing poetry in the late 1590s, when the discussions around his *Musophilus* almost forced him to quit writing.[433] Daniel's experience of disgrace due to parallels –despite rejections by the author- between the downfall of its hero and that of the earl of Essex had

[431] Alexander B. Grosart, *The Complete Works of Joshuah Sylvester: For the First Time Collected and Edited* …, 1880, vol. II, 257.
[432] Josuah Sylvester, *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste, Sieur Du Bartas,* edt. Susan Snyder, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 18-19
[433] John Pitcher, "Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7120, accessed 26 Aug 2015]

quite an impact on his ideas of how and for whom history should be written. Knowing that there is a possibility of being misinterpreted for any work that deals with history, Daniel not only decided to write in prose, but he also chose to speak to a select group rather than to all. Thus the *First Part of the Historie of England* (1612) was published privately as a limited edition to be sent to a selected group of intellectuals including Camden, Cotton and Peter Manwood.[434] The title page of the copy of Daniel's work in Peter Manwood's collection bears the inscription "the first day of July. 1612. sent mee by Mr Danyel my good ffreinde," together with the signature of Peter Manwood, as Daniel did not sign his books.[435] Considering the huge impact of Bodin's *Methodus* on Daniel's ideas of both history writing and politics, and that Daniel has been accepted as the very first historian that attempted "to write a history of England which incorporated an idea of gradual, step-by-step, constitutional progress", the importance of seeing Peter Manwood's name on his list of selected intellectuals, together with Camden and Cotton becomes more revealing.[436] Although Peter Manwood did not produce anything of great importance, he was certainly related to a group of historians that were dominant figures that influenced the trends in history writing of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and Daniel's decision to send a copy of his book to Peter Manwood indicates that his ideas, as well as his collection of manuscripts, were of value for those men.

[434] Pitcher, "Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7120, accessed 26 Aug 2015]
[435] John Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1984), p. 60 n1.
[436] Woolf, *The Idea of History*, 104.

5.3.1. Sir Peter Manwood's collection

As Woudhuysen stated, "No group of people was more aware of the value of a manuscript culture and of the importance of its survival than these antiquaries, heralds, and scholars" and Peter Manwood was a notable one among these.[437] Peter Manwood's father, Roger compiled a volume that contained customs and precedents which included a copy of the Sandwich Custumal as well as some partial records of the Pleas of the Exchequer from the fourteenth century and details of the customs of the Cinque Ports 1503-4.[438] Another impressive 500-folio volume of documents that contains a collection of statues from Magna Carta to the time of Henry VI might also have belonged to the Manwoods.[439] Although this sort of interest in the records of the town of Sandwich might be connected to the offices the Manwoods held, it is certain that collecting such material necessitated a certain sense of history that would appreciate the importance of record keeping. Roger Manwood's account of the renovation of the Rochester Bridge and his individual study for this account indicates his use of records in order to compose as historical narrative as well as collecting them. Roger explains that he "fownde and copyed" a group of documents concerning the "landes of auncyent tyme contributary to the repaire of the former wodden bridge by terme and custome" among "the recordes of the

[437] Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts*, 129.
[438] Sandwich Borough Records, East Kent Archives SA/LC4.
[439] *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cotton Library Deposited in the British Museum*, 1802, Appendix XVI; Philip Lawson*, Parliament and the Atlantic Empire, Volume 14,* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995, 131.

Tower", and adds that he also examined some "auncyent bookes of the monastory churches and cathedrall churches of Canterburye and Rochester".[440] Roger was certainly incorporating the newly emerging ideas about the methods for historical research into his own practice of writing a historical account.

Roger Manwood was hardly an exception in his interest in incorporating antiquarian materials into history writing. Numerous scholars that were connected to Kentish intellectual circles, such as William Lambarde, Francis Thynne, Robert Bowyer, Robert Cotton, John Spelman, Henry Finch, and John Dodderidge were known to be following the philological, legal, and historical studies of continental jurists, and soon they employed the knowledge they had gained to examine the origins and development of their own native laws and institutions.[441] The necessary material for such studies was also collected, preserved and copied by these men. Peter Manwood's donation of four manuscript collections to the Bodleian and the contents of these volumes reveal much about his antiquarian interests, as well as giving some hints about his political ideas.

Bodley MSS. 710 and 875 are basically various copies and translations of the collection of papers in Bodley MS. 885, mainly related to the claims of the king of England over France, written by various scribes of the 15th and 16th centuries.[442] A note by Peter Manwood on Bodley MS. 885 fol. 99 states that this volume was "the beste book" he had, and it was rebound in 1605. The same folio

[440] Manwood, *A True Discourse of the Auncyent wodden and present stoned bridge at Rochester.*
[441] Clark, *Provincial Society*, 217.
[442] Copies of this manuscript found in British Library, Lansdowne MS. 223; Cambridge University Library, MS Ee.II10; LPL MS. 713; and HOLKham Hall Library MS. 683, together with the two copies that are mentioned here indicates the popularity of this record on fifteenth century diplomatic records as well as the scarcity of documents on the issue.

also bears a note in Camden's hand. Bodley MS. 710 contains "Arguments for the succession of the king of England", signed "J. H." and the letter to Prince Charles, "From St. Stephens this 24 daye of Maye 1615" explains that this copy was made by a friend of the writer from; a "manuscript of auncyent Charecterye". This "auncient" manuscript should be the one that is mentioned in Canterbury Cathedral Library, MS. C19 by Peter Manwood, as "the feames weare partly confumed, and the letters dimmed, and allmoft worne out by time the devourer of all things." Besides, Peter Manwood also noted that he "intereated a special friend to extract *Certain Disputations*" out of this manuscript.[443] This special friend of Peter Manwood was probably the historian John Hayward, to whom he turned for the edition of Roger Williams's text. If so, this text that discusses the claims of Edward III of England and Philip VI of France for the right to rule in France, about 1340, would be the second cooperation for the preservation of a manuscript between the antiquary and the historian.

Bodley MS. 966, another collection of papers written about 1610 and donated by Peter Manwood to the Bodleian collection in 1620 contains copies of about fifty documents mainly related to the history of England in the sixteenth century. Copies of historical biographies such as "A Life of Henry V" based on the translation of Titus Livius, "The Life of Cardinal Wolsey" by George Cavendish and "The Life of Sir Thomas More" by William Roper were copied in this volume together with the accounts of the trials of the duke of Norfolk (1571), the earl of Arundel (1589), Sir Walter Raleigh (1603), and the earls of Essex and Southampton (1601). Some papers about Spanish affairs, some letters

[443] See Appendix II for detailed descriptions of these documents.

of the Duke of Norfolk and Earl of Arundel to Elizabeth I, papers about Mary queen of Scots, an account of the election of Pope Gregory XIV in 1591, a treatise entitled "The forme and manner of keepinge of the Parliament of England" and a piece by Robert Cotton, "Whether it be better to suppresse Popish practices" were also among the papers collected and copied by Peter Manwood. This volume of texts related to contemporary issues of Church and state not only gives an idea of the issues Peter Manwood thought of worthy of note but also reflects the political side of his antiquarian scholarship.

Another collection of documents known as the commonplace book of Peter Manwood, British Library MS. Add. 38139, consists mainly of copies and translations of state papers from 1564 to 1618 and specifically for the years 1603-1605. Most of documents in this volume are noted as "examined" by Peter Manwood and they are generally appended or prefixed in his hand. As has been stated above, curious documents such as "Letter from the Sultan of Turkey [Mohammed III?] to 'Radulphus,' King of Hungary", "The commandment of Shaw Greate Sophir of Persia", declaring his dominions open to Christians; "The commission of Shawe Greate Sophir of Persia" that expresses the Persian Shah's trust in Sherly, and a "Project for the conquest of Morocco", addressed to James I by Captain Henry Roberts are copied into Peter Manwood's commonplace book. They demonstrate a substantial interest in the East. Coupled with a series of letters such as "Letter of advice from [Sir] Thomas Egerton, [Lord Keeper], to [Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of] Essex" and the reply of the latter, and abstracts of various letters from Sherly to Bacon and Essex, all these documents on Persia and the Ottomans might be seen also as evidence of Peter Manwood's interest in the foreign affairs of the Essex circle and the Sherlys in particular. Remembering

that Peter Manwood was a student at the Inner Temple together with the Sherlys and was in touch with numerous men who were in the entourage of Lord Essex, it would not be hard to imagine that he was interested in the projects of the group in the East.[444] Numerous other documents in the Peter Manwood's historical collection also indicate his general interest in the history of parliament, Church history and heraldic studies.

Some books in Peter Manwood's collection provide further proof of his interest in general histories, travel writing and in matters related to the Ottomans. Peter Manwood had Edward Grimeston's translations of J. De Serres's *A generall historie of France* (1611), two copies of *A generall historie of the Netherlands* (1608), together with three copies of Knolles's *GH*. In 1609, Edward Grimeston, dedicated his translation of Petit's *The Low Country Commonwealth*, *containing an exact description of the Eight united Provinces now made free* (1609) to Peter Manwood, stating that after his translation of the history of the Netherlands he was interested in translating this one, as this book described the United Provinces, "which are now under the government of the Confederate Estates".[445] According to Grimeston, this book was prepared through Petit's "particular survey of all the Provinces, townes and forts". Thus he suggests this work to be printed as "an Appendix to the History". Although it is hard to link Peter Manwood to Grimeston's numerous translations of historical narratives as the one who commissioned any of them, the way the translator ends his dedication of 1609 with a statement on the long lasting relationship between

[444] *Students admitted to the Inner temple, 1571-1625,* ed. by W. H. Cooke, 1868, 43, 45.
[445] see Appendix II. Edward Grimeston, *The Low Country Commonwealth, containing an exact description of the Eight united Provinces now made free*, London, 1609, [Dedication].

the two, and Peter Manwood's decision to work with him on continuations of *GH* after the death of Knolles, indicates that they got on well and had a close relationship.

Another translation dedicated to Peter Manwood was Richard Lynche's translation of Giovanni Nanni's *An historical treatise of the travels of Noah into Europe containing the first inhabitation and peopling thereof. As also a breefe recapitulation of the kings, governors, and rulers commanding in the same, even untill the first building of Troy by Dardanus* (1601). In his dedication, Lynche states that "being wholly unfurnished of any other means to testify" Peter Manwood's "many kindnesses" towards him, and "thinking it unfit that they so long should sleepe obscured or publickly unacknowledged" he decided to dedicate this work to him.[446] Although these words of the translator give us a hint of a long-lasting friendship, we do not know much about the details of this relationship. This dedication, together with two other books that Peter Manwood had in his collection, Sir Thomas Palmer's *An essay of the meanes how to make our trauailes, into forraine countries, the more profitable* (1606) and Samuel Lewkenor's *A discourse not altogether vnprofitable, nor vnpleasant for such as are desirous to know the situation and customes of forraine cities* (1600), reveal Peter Manwood's interest in the law and customs of foreign nations as well as in travel writing.

[446] Richard Lynche, *An historical treatise of the travels of Noah into Europe containing the first inhabitation and peopling thereof. As also a breefe recapitulation of the kings, governors, and rulers commanding in the same, even untill the first building of Troy by Dardanus*, London, 1601, [Dedication].

It is known that Peter Manwood was granted a license to travel outside England twice.[447] His interest in the history and the contemporary situation of the foreign nations might be explained thorough the growing awareness and the interest of the Kentish gentry in the wider world outside the country.[448] On the other hand Peter Manwood's overall interest in the histories, laws and customs of contemporary foreign nations might also be related to his understanding of the study of history. The idea that the world could be best understood as a collection of small units, and by means of a combination of various fields such as geography and law, was in the air all throughout the sixteenth century. It would not be surprising to see that Peter Manwood followed this idea in the books he collected, as well as commissioned. He owned two books of Lodowick Lloyd, the famous author of compilations of curiosities from Biblical, classical, and British antiquities.[449] In 1602, Peter Manwood acquired Lloyd's *A briefe conference of diuers lawes: diuided into certaine regiments*, in which Lloyd summarized everything that he thought to be important in the Old Testament, classical literature and civil law, together with the laws of the "Gaules", Egyptians, Israelites and Athenians. Through this study of "divers laws" Lloyd was trying to see the imperfections and faults of the laws of foreign nations, which in turn would give a description of the perfect order.[450] Peter Manwood's interest in the laws and customs of foreign nations was actually deep enough to concern Knolles, whose explanations in the dedication of his translation of Bodin's

[447] British Library Add. MS 29759, f.159v.
[448] Clark, *Provincial Society*, 216.
[449] John James Jones, "Lloyd, Ludovic (1573-1610)," *Dictionary of Welsh Biography*, online edn. 2009, [http://yba.llgc.org.uk/en/s-LLOY-LUD-1573.html, accessed 11 Febr. 2016]
[450] Jones, "Lloyd, Ludovic (1573-1610)," [http://yba.llgc.org.uk/en/s-LLOY-LUD-1573.html, accessed 11 Febr. 2016]

Republic indicate not only his unwillingness to compose another general history, of the "Sarasins" [Saracens] this time, but also his advice to Peter Manwood to focus on the laws and customs of England rather than those of other nations.[451]

Another interesting volume in Peter Manwood's library contains his own translation of "Precepts of Government", an essay in Plutarch's *Moralia*, which seems to be prepared for publication, but was never sent.[452] Plutarch's *Moralia* has been accepted as one of the most popular classical works in Tudor England.[453] According to Shackford, English men read Plutarch "partly because they met there details of art, geography, setting, customs, and manners fascinating to the Age increasingly devoted to archaeology".[454] Numerous works that appeared throughout the century, from Elyot's *The Book of the Governour* (1531) to Sydney's *Defense of Poesy* and *Arcadia*, from Fulke Greville's *Life of Sydney* to Samuel Daniels' plays *Cleopatra* and *Philotas*, were greatly indebted to Plutarch in terms of style and subject matter, often using historical details on antiquities provided by Plutarch's narrative to fill out their texts. Plutarch became especially popular towards the end of the century, after the publication of Francis Bacon's *Essays* in 1597, which had subjects almost identical to Plutarch's *Morals*. Successive editions of the work shows that Bacon was a committed reader of Plutarch.[455] It is also known that Queen Elizabeth read

[451] Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale*, [Dedication]
[452] British Library Add. MS 19052. "Plutach's præcepts of Government," English translation, by Peter Manwood, transcribed by Henry Chrispe. Paper; 17th cent. 23 Folio.
[453] Fred Schurink "Print, Patronage, and Occasion: Translations of Plutarch's 'Moralia' in Tudor England" *The Yearbook of English Studies* Vol. 38, No. 1/2, Tudor Literature (2008), 88.
[454] Martha Hale Shackford, *Plutarch in renaissance England, with special reference to Shakespeare*, p. 18
[455] Shackford, *Plutarch in renaissance England*, 33.

Plutarch and she translated "On Curiosity" from the *Moralia* in 1598.[456] However, the best-known and only full translation of Plutarch's *Moralia* in the period appeared in 1603, increasing the popularity of the work even more.[457]

Explaining the scope of this essay as Plutarch's "good instructions to every man that entreth into the managing of State-affairs", Holland argues that this essay would be of great use for magistrates, and the "notable arguments, sentences, similitudes and examples" at the end of the essay would be helpful to "those especially who have the command of others, and yet besides, to appeare before the throne of their sovereigne, the examination, trial and fearfull judgement of whom, they cannot avoid".[458] Such content must have been quite appealing for Peter Manwood, who was a part of the ruling elite in Kent. We do not know when or for what reason Peter Manwood decided to translate this piece though. As Schurink's study has shown, Tudor translations were not primarily prepared for the general readers. Although numerous translated works that reached print soon became bestsellers, writers often translated works to acquire a reward or to attract the attention of a patron. Presenting translations of individual practical-philosophical pieces out of huge compilations, as in the case of "Precepts of Government", to patrons on particular occasions was common at the end of the sixteenth century.[459] Considering the neatly prepared manuscripts of the translation, written by one

[456] Schurink "Print, Patronage, and Occasion," 100.
[457] Philemon Holland, *The Philosophie, commonly called, the Morals, written by the learned Philosopher, Plutarch of Chæronea*. (London: A. Hatfield, 1603),
[458] Philemon Holland, *The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals vvritten by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chæronea. Translated out of Greeke into English, and conferred with the Latine translations and the French, by Philemon Holland of Coventrie, Doctor in Physicke. VVhereunto are annexed the summaries necessary to be read before every treatise*, London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield, 1603, 285-6.
[459] Schurink "Print, Patronage, and Occasion," 89.

of the scribes that was working for Peter Manwood, it is possible to argue that it was prepared for some patron, although the lack of a proper dedication or introduction do not help us in making suggestions on the occasion of such a gift.

As this sketch of his life, interests and collections indicate, Peter Manwood was an intellectual that grew up among one of the most flourishing intellectual environments of early modern England. He was in touch with numerous historians of his age: he sat in parliament with them, he befriended them in the Society of Antiquaries and he exchanged books and manuscripts with them. His education at the Inner Temple would have made him familiar with the changes of the period in history writing and his ideas on newly composed historical works were considered seriously. He was in touch with the two most important authors of the politic histories of the age, Daniels and Hayward. It is not surprising then, to see that Peter Manwood's interests in history, travel writing and the Ottomans were united in the monumental work that he patronised.

It would not be wrong to say that Richard Knolles was far more conservative than his patron in terms of history writing. Knolles was educated in the traditional and Catholic atmosphere of Lincoln College, and he received his MA degree in 1570, a year before Peter Manwood was born.[460] While Knolles was a student at Lincoln, the institution underwent a period of re-orientation to the new religio-political structure of the Elizabethan reign.[461] John Bridewater, who was the rector when Knolles was a student there, left to take refuge on the

[460] Christine Woodhead, "Knolles, Richard (late 1540s–1610)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752, accessed 11 Feb 2016]
[461] G.R. Evans, *The University of Oxford, A New History*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2010, 155-162.

Continent before Knolles graduated and soon became a Jesuit. Almost all students of the College other than Knolles left for English Roman Catholic College at Douai as a result of the changes in the school environment.[462] Knolles was left in the middle of religious clashes, but still he stayed at Lincoln and managed to be one of the few students who were granted a degree in the first few years of the new administration. Thus it seems that whatever his previous religious affiliations were, he was able to cope with the more reformed atmosphere of the college.

After his graduation from Lincoln, either in or soon after 1572, Knolles started working for Sir Roger Manwood who was known to be a committed protestant.[463] The rules of the grammar school, which were written by the founder Roger Manwood himself required candidates for the position of school Master to be evaluated according to their education, character and their "right understanding of God's true religion".[464] Thus Knolles must have appeared as Protestant as was needed to satisfy his new patron. However, Knolles's discussion of the Crusades in *GH* is too even handed to be that of a Protestant extremist.[465]

According to McRae, two main features of Knolles's works, both the translation of Bodin's *Republic* and *GH*, are conservatism and respect for

[462] Jean Bodin, *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale. A Facsimile reprint of the English Translation of 1606, Corrected and supplemented in the light of a new comparison with the French and Latin texts,* ed. Kenneth Douglas McRae, 53-4.
[463] Jack, "Manwood, Sir Roger (1524/5–1592)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18014, accessed 27 Oct 2011]
[464] Carlisle, *A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools,* 602.
[465] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries", 123.

traditional figures of authority.[466] As her detailed analysis of Knolles's translation of Bodin's work indicates, Knolles omits some politically sensitive content such as the trial of Thomas More, the discussion of female rule or numerous references to the problem of finding a successor for Elizabeth in his translation. Together with this quite understandable effort to stay away from problematic content, Knolles also excludes some parts where Bodin criticizes Aristotle, praises Plato or argues against the scholastic method. This second group of omissions, according to McRae, are the result of the philosophical disagreement between Knolles and the actual author.[467] While Bodin was deeply influenced by Peter Ramus and his pedagogical methods, Knolles received a quite traditionalist education at Lincoln. Thus Bodin's criticism of authorities such as Aristotle was too much for Knolles. At some points Knolles disassociates himself from the text with marginal notes that he added, and in some of these notes he openly criticizes Bodin's comments. On legal matters and the theoretical discussions that filled Bodin's work, Knolles acts primarily as a historian and ignores terminological precision.

Overall, it would not be wrong to conclude that Bodin's *Republic* was more of a text that Peter Manwood would enjoy, and this was probably the reason for Knolles's translation. The apologetic tone in Knolles's dedication also indicates that this work might have been done as compensation for his failure to meet other expectations of his patron. The dedication opens with an explanation of the delay of the continuation of *GH*. Knolles states that although he wants to

[466] Bodin, *Commonweale. A Facsimile,* 61.
[467] Bodin, *Commonweale. A Facsimile,* 59-62.

write the continuation, he cannot due to lack of material "worthy the writing".[468] Then comes another apologetic piece in which Knolles explains his unwillingness to compose a general history of the Saracens. Knolles states firstly that this "Sarasin Historie" cannot be composed "without the light of their owne Chronicles, and the stories of many other countries by them conquered and possessed". Secondly, he mentions the weakness of his body for such a huge work and makes a suggestion, so as apparently not to refuse the request of his patron:

> Besides the difficulty of the labour to so weake a body, apace declining, … by experience of so many years spent in the former (and the beginning of this, which you have long since seene) I must write it shortly, as I did the general History to my Lives. In the meane time having had some leisure, …, I thought good to translate these six books of Bodin his Commonwealth, which I here commned unto you.[469]

The sentences above indicates firstly that Knolles does not really want to start a new project as huge as or even more huge than *GH*. Secondly, his words reveals that the second part of Knolles's work, entitled "the liues and conquests of the Othoman kings and emperours" was written before the first section of *GH*, "The generall historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the rising of the Othoman familie". And finally Knolles's quite simple introduction of the work he has translated shows that it was chosen according to the intellectual taste of his patron. The dedication ends with a cautious remark by Knolles:

> But Sir, … if beside the divers forms of Commonweales, and such other worthie matter, as is here by the Author set downe, you wish also to see by what lawes and customes they have

[468] Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale,* [Dedcation]
[469] Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale,* [Dedcation]

> been also gouerned, a thin infinite; I in stead of all referre you unto the reading of the common law of this Realme, which without all doubt in the auntient puritie thereof, for religious sinceritie, wisdom, power and equall upright iustice, excelleth all the laws of men that ever yet were, and a knowledge best besteeming the noble gentrie of this land.[470]

According to McRae this eulogy to the English law mainly emphasizes Knolles's indifference to Roman law jurisprudence in general.[471] This little passage also indicates the differences of educational formation and interests of the author and the patron of *GH*.

Knolles was 25 years older than Peter Manwood. He was educated in one of the most traditional-minded institutions of the country following a rather old-fashioned curriculum. Although he became a part of the intellectual circle of his patron, and thus could follow the changes in terms of scholarly methods, he was rather traditional in his own works. The earliest piece of *GH* that he composed, the Lives, was rather traditional stylistically, following numerous examples of "lives" since Plutarch. It was Peter Manwood who was more open to the new methods and styles in terms of history writing, and most probably it was after his request that the first part of *GH*, "The generall historie of the Turkes" was written. The ambiguity of the text in terms of style might well have resulted from the different ideas of the author and the patron.

As mentioned before, Knolles's explanation on the composition of *GH* indicates that he went over all the content of the book a few times, filling in the gaps through each "travel" passing through "the sea and world of matter".[472] As

[470] Bodin, *The six bookes of a common-weale,* [Dedication]
[471] Bodin, *Commonweale. A Facsimile,* 60.
[472] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"

Knolles explains, *GH* went through a final revision after being "brought to some good perfection" with the encouragement of:

> my especiall good friend Sir Peter Manwood … (in whose keeping it so for the most part many yeares in safetie rested) beene still comforted and as it were againe reuiued, and now finally encouraged to take it in hand, and so at length as I might to perfect it.[473]

It is not possible to reach conclusive ideas on the nature of these final revisions of *GH*, which had been waiting in the hands of Peter Manwood for a while, as we do not have a draft version of the text. Considering the process of production, however, there is a strong possibility that the two smaller sections of the work, "The generall historie of the Turkes" and "A briefe discourse" were added to the initial "Lives" at the request of Peter Manwood, who wanted this work to be a general history rather than an ordinary history book.

5.3.2. Sir Peter Manwood and the Ottomans

As a figure of importance and influence in the county, Peter Manwood was also active in daily politics. During the distressing atmosphere of the 1590s, he was torn, like other such figures, between the demands of the government and the local community's unwillingness to cooperate. In 1600, he noted that he and his colleagues "stand upon slippery ground, subject to all men's censures and open to the displeasures of our friends and enemies".[474] The more settled

[473] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[474] As quoted in Clark, *Provincial Society*, 257.

James I's government became, the more alienated the former members of the Kentish gentry felt. As with others who were not associated closely with the Jacobean court, Peter Manwood also had economic problems due to the excessive demands of the government from the 1590s onwards.[475] There are conflicting ideas on Peter Manwood's political orientation. While his biographer Knafla, described his political allegiance as "anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish, and pro-puritan", Peter Clark stated that Peter Manwood was a Catholic when he returned Kent after making an agreement with his creditors. This fact, according to Clark, ruined the family name and robbed his son John of a chance to succeed to his father's positions in Kent.[476] Considering the openly anti-Spanish sentiments of Peter Manwood's friend and supporter, Edward de la Zouche, who helped Peter Manwood to sort out the problems with his creditors and asked the Secretary of State Conway to help Peter after his return, it would not be hard to imagine that Peter Manwood was closer to the anti-Catholic group.[477] His intellectual activities as a patron and his association with the former Essex supporters strengthens this argument. Two political treatises by John Atkins, on the advantages of preserving an alliance with the Netherlands against Spain, and on the expediency of making peace or war with Spain, which Peter Manwood commissioned his scribe John Crispe to copy for him before 1610, indicates his genuine interest on the foreign relations at that period, if not his support for the Protestants of the Low Countries. The first of these treatises is

[475] Clark, *Provincial Society*, 310.
[476] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]; Clark, *Provincial Society*, 380.
[477] Knafla, "Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)," [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013, accessed 27 Oct 2011]

entered in the Calendar of State Paters in 1603, as a letter from John Atkins to the King introducing "a discourse persuading him to join in amity with the Hollanders and to set upon Spain".[478]

It has already been mentioned that Peter Manwood knew Archbishop Whitgift personally. His criticism of a lampoon against Whitgift and numerous other documents that were noted as examined in the archbishop's presence among Peter Manwood's manuscripts indicates that he knew him well. Besides, a note in Thomas Fuller's Church history shows that Peter Manwood had some letters of Whitgift, which later on passed onto Fuller.[479] Peter Manwood's interest in oriental matters was probably connected to people with whom he was in touch. Abraham Hartwell, who was Archbishop Whitgift's secretary and whom Peter Manwood knew personally, was a member of the Society of Antiquaries and an ecclesiastical censor that approved the publication of books in the name of the Archbishop.[480] Hartwell was also the translator of two works about the Ottomans, Minadoi's *The history of the vvarres betvveene the Turkes and the Persians* (1595) and Lazzaro Soranzo's *The Ottoman* (1603). Hartwell's explanations in the dedications of these two works reveal the interest of the group around Archbishop Whitgift in issues such as the laws and customs of the Turks and the Ottoman expansion in Europe. In the dedication of Minadoi's work, Hartwell mentions a delay in the publication of the work:

---

[478] Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts*, 132.
[479] British Library Add. MS 38139, f. 58, f. 254b; Thomas Fuller, *The church-history of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII* the note on the margins of page 71 reads "Taken out of the manu|script of Bp. Whitgifts Letters, be|longing to Sir Peter Manwood, and since in my possession."
[480] Christina DeCoursey, "Society of Antiquaries (act. 1586–1607)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2015 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72906, accessed 11 Feb 2016]

> Sondry reasons there were that at the first, about three yeares agoe, moued me to begin the translation thereof, but because they are such as concerne matter of estate, where withall I list not to meddle for feare of burning my fin|gers, I thought it good rather to con|ceale them, then in printe to publish them.[481]

Only after Sir Moile Finche's speech "about the great preparations of the Turke agaynst Christendome, and the huge victories that he had atchieued vpon his enemies that sought to weaken him" in the summer of 1594, in a meeting at Archbishop's house, in his presence, did Hartwell decide to publish this work, as the "Graue iudgement" of Sir Moile Finche at that meeting, and his "verie highly commende" of both the book and the author forced him to do so, "after so long time hauing layed it a|side".[482]

A similar apologetic explanation is also seen in the dedication of Hartwell's translation of Soranzo's work. After a question of the archbishop on "the Bas|saes and Visiers belonging to the Turkish Court, and whether the chiefe Visier were promoted … accor¦ding to his priority of time and an|tiquity of his being Bassa, or accor|ding to the good pleasure and elec|tion of the Graund Turke himselfe" in September 1602, Hartwell decided to publish "this Discourse which hauing been by me translated out of the Italian tongue, had passed the Print, & had lyen by me these two years not pub¦lished to the viewe of this English world, vpon some speciall conside|rations, that moued me for the time to conceale the same".[483] These "special considerations" that forced Hartwell to

---

[481] Abraham Hartwell, *The history of the vvarres betvveene the Turkes and the Persians. Written in Italian by Iohn-Thomas Minadoi, and translated into English by Abraham Hartvvell. Containing the description of all such matters, as pertaine to the religion, to the forces to the gouernement, and to the countries of the kingdome of the Persians.* London, 1595, [Dedication].
[482] Hartwell, *The history of the vvarres betvveene the Turkes and the Persians*, [Dedication].
[483] Abraham Hartwell, *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo VVherein is deliuered aswell a full and perfect report of the might and power of Mahamet the third, great Emperour of the Turkes now raigning* … London, 1603, [Dedication]

hide this work from the public must have been connected to the Essex Rebellion and the execution of Robert Devereux, "matters that had contemporary analogies in Turkish affairs" according to Bland.[484]

As has been stated above, the 1590s was a period when the then general interest of the public on Ottoman related matters grew enormously as a result of the Ottoman-Habsburg wars and the newly developing Levant trade. Going over the dedications of these works what one notices, on the other hand, is that most of the time the main motivation for the publication of these works came from the powerful patrons that were prominent intellectuals of the age. Hartwell's explanations on the occasion of the publication of his translations; Knolles's reference to Manwood as the "first mouver" of him to "take this great Worke in hand"; the dedication of the author of *The History of the troubles of Hungary* to Cecil, and John Pory's words about Hakluyt all indicate that these works were composed on the initiative of the patrons.[485] This encouragement from the patrons forces us to consider their motivations in supporting and encouraging the composition or translation of Ottoman-related works, rather than focusing solely on the authors, whose main motive was most probably to please and inform their patrons.

The motivations of the patrons in supporting the publication of any sort of writing on the Ottomans towards the last decades of the sixteenth century would be varied though. Although the establishment of the Levant trade seems to be a clear explanation for the great increase in the publication of works on the Ottomans in the last decade of the sixteenth century, Ingram's study

[484] Mark Bland, *A guide to early printed books and manuscripts*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2013, 195.
[485] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 94-5.

indicates that "of the fifty four records of turcica in the Registers for 1591 to 1610, twenty two relate either directly to the 'long war' of 1593 to 1606, the state of Hungary, or Ottoman-Habsburg conflict".[486] Besides, several works of the period — including Knolles's — give recent events in Europe as an explanation for writing on the Ottomans.[487]

As has been discussed by both Vitkus and Dimmock, there was more than one strategy in representing the Ottomans in early modern English writing and the representations were not necessarily based on the perception of English "self" and the Ottoman "other".[488] The image of the Turk was a rather a useful tool that could be employed around the Turk/Muslim/Eastern, European/Catholic/Western and English/Protestant triangle, as the study of Schmuck indicates.

> As a trope, the Turk was flexible enough to accommodate positions on both sides of the schism in order to articulate dissident positions along each group's respective lines; indeed, the permutations and combinations were endless. However, the underlying assumption shared by all Christian writers is that the Turk is external to their own religious beliefs.[489]

In numerous texts, Protestant doctrine is identified with being a Turk, and represented as a danger that can end England's unity with the Catholic Church. *A Declaration of the true Causes of the Great Trovbles, Presvpposed to be Intended against the Realme of England*, for instance, claimed that England was brought into enmity with the Church of God and with all old allies and friends, to set

---

[486] Ingram, "English literature on the Ottoman Turks," 91.
[487] Knolles, *GH*, "The Authors Induction"
[488] Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk. English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630*, Hampshire, 2003, 1-25, Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England*, Ashgate, 2005, 1-20.
[489] Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety," 74.

"new confederates" with the Turks, the "professed enemies of Christ."[490] On the other hand, there were texts that supported England's break with the Catholic Church, claiming that the Catholic refusal of salvation through faith alone makes the Catholic Church even worse than the Turks. The complexities of the formulations around the triangle were clear to all, but still all these positions were employed, as the "Turco-Papisimo" controversies of the late 1590s and early 1600s indicate.[491]

As mentioned above, Knolles's narrative of Ottoman history is mainly set within a providential meta-narrative, with a strong emphasis on the necessity of unity among the Christians against the common enemy, the Turk. Although Knolles repeats his warnings against the Turkish threat all throughout his text, this overarching aim does not stop him from quoting a letter of Murad III, which reveals England's strategic moves towards the Ottomans as well as its enmity with Spain.[492] As mentioned by both Barbour and Schmuck, Spain's exclusion from the lists of rulers at the end of each chapter, indicates the scope of Christian unity for Knolles.[493] Knolles's explicit reference to James I's heroic poem Lepanto, which commemorates a mainly Catholic victory against the Ottomans, and his consistent use of the word "Christians", without any reference to different sects indicates his treatment of Spain is completely different from other countries that were also Catholic. Although Knolles's 1200 folio pages argued for unity against the Turkish threat, Spain was obviously

[490] Richard Verstegan, *A declaration of the true causes of the great troubles, presupposed to be intended against the realme of England VVherein the indifferent reader shall manifestly perceaue, by whome, and by what means, the realme is broughte into these pretented perills. Seene and allowed*, Antwerp: 1592, 48.
[491] Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety," 106.
[492] Knolles, *GH*, 1007.
[493] Knolles, *GH*, [Dedication]

another, and a closer threat for him. And the reason for this seemingly contradictory position of Knolles might be found in possible political motivations of his patron Peter Manwood, in patronizing *GH*.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Through an examination of a number of general histories printed in England in the seventeenth century, this thesis has described the genre of general history as it was understood by the intellectuals of the period, and has evaluated the place of this genre in the changing historiography of the time. This thesis has also demonstrated that the genre of general history is important for understanding and contextualizing Richard Knolles's *GH* as a history book. Considering Knolles's *GH* as the final outcome of the combined efforts of the author and the patron, this thesis has revealed the influence of the intellectual interests of Sir Peter Manwood on Knolles's decision to write the book in the genre that it is.

When the focus is transferred from the writer, Knolles, to the patron, Sir Peter Manwood, one realizes that his ideas on the history of the Ottomans and the current situation of wider European/Christian-Ottoman/Muslim relations were formed under the influence of the intellectual and political pursuits of the men he was in touch with. The two main circles with which Peter Manwood was in

touch, the Essex circle and the intellectuals gathered around Archbishop Whitgift, both employed the useful topos of the divided body of Christendom and the menace of the Turk in the 1590s, and especially after 1595. As mentioned by previous works, the earl of Essex was persuaded to refine his anti-Spanish policies in a way so as not to distance Catholics from supporting him. Anthony Standen, the Catholic spy who returned to England in 1593, specifically emphasized the importance of binding all the Catholics of Christendom to the earl, if he had any plans to "enter substantially into the matters of toleration for the catholiques at home".[494] It was around this time that the Essex circle started to define the earl's anti-Spanish policy as a purely secular attack on an irreligious tyrant, rather than as a matter of Catholic-Protestant conflict, in order to establish a political ground for the Catholics in England on which they could prove their loyalty to the country.[495]

While the Essex circle was trying to pull the anti-Spanish foreign policy on to more secular ground, their opponents took up the issue of a much wider religious conflict on which to attack Elizabeth's government and its policies. The Jesuit Robert Parsons appropriated the topos of the divided body of Christendom and its exacerbation of the menace of the Turk in order to criticize the late Elizabethan foreign policy that was dominated by the anti-Spanish stance. A few treatises printed in the early 1590s, such as *A Declaration of the true causes of the great troubles, presupposed to be intended against the realm of England* (1592), argued that it was the English government that had shattered the unity of Christendom by giving up the friendship of Philip II and by

[494] Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, 85.
[495] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, 85.

provoking a rebellion in the Low Countries. Robert Parsons's own support of this idea came thorough his *Newes from Spayne, and Holland* (1593), in which he specifically emphasized Elizabeth's "open dealing with the Turke the publique enemye of al christian profession".[496]

As a response to these attacks, men known to be close to Essex prepared works that detailed the tyrannical ways of Philip II and warned Catholics of England against the expansion of Philip II's secular tyranny into the Low Countries. *The State of Christendom*, written in 1594-5 by a group of men from the Essex circle, for instance, was an apology for the Elizabethan foreign policy that tried to turn Parson's argument on its head.[497] According to the work's narrator, it was Philip II, not Elizabeth, who was the "common and only perturber of Christian peace and tranquilility" by continuously working to expand his power. Thus it was only natural to fight against him and his unjust, tyrannical ways. It is also in this treatise that Essex's ideas are put forward on the necessity for an all-inclusive, pan-European alliance of Christian princes that might win against the Turk.[498] The Essex circle was trying to defend both the public image of Lord Essex and to stand against the general criticism of Elizabethan foreign policy, which around this time was predominantly being shaped by Essex. The two main arguments of their defence were the secular and

[496] Robert Parsons, *Newes from Spayne and Holland . . . Written by a Gentleman travelour bourne in the low countries, and brought up from a child in Ingland . . .* (1592), 15.
[497] *The state of Christendom. Or, a most exact and curious discovery of many secret passages, and hidden mysteries of the time* (1657). The treatise was initially attributed to Henry Wotton who was Essex's secretary and a close associate of Lord Zouche, Gajda challenged this argument successfully in "*The State of Christendom*: history, political thought and the Essex circle," *Historical Research*, 81/213 (2008), 423–46.
[498] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, 90.

just causes of war against Philip II and the emphasis on the necessity of Christian unity against the growing danger of the Turk.

It seems that the Essex circle had their own difficulties in advocating Lord Essex's ideas. Despite their preference to use the word "state" rather than "commonwealth", they did not hesitate to refer to the topos of unified body of Christendom and the Turkish threat when necessary.[499] Their references to this rhetoric, however, turned it into an argument for war with Spain, necessary because the main reason for the weakness of Christendom was the Spanish and their king's presumptuous desire to be a universal monarch. The financial and military strength of the Christian princes were being used to combat Philip II's ambitions, and only after his defeat could they be used against the real enemy, the Turk. Stopping Philip had to be the first step before launching a war against the Turk, and each and every account of the expansion of the Ottomans would remind people how urgently they should act to stop Spanish aggression against Christian Princes. It was for this reason that Henry Hawkins, one of Essex's agents in Venice, proposed to Essex that he should publish some accounts of the progress of the Ottomans "especially inveyaling agaynst the Ambition of Spayne, who hathe spent so many millions in vexing injustly Christian Princes, which should have been imployed agaynst the common Ennemy of Christendom".[500] Thus it was not a contradiction for the Essex circle to argue that the Ottomans should be encouraged in a war against the Spanish on the one hand and to argue for the necessity of Christian unity on the other. This would drain the power of both the Spanish and the Ottomans, and after taming Philip II's ambitions, it

[499] Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, 79.
[500] LPL MS 660, f. 251r, 1 November 1596; as quoted in Gajda, *The Earl of Essex*, 79.

would be a lot easier to achieve a unity among Christian princes, who would then turn to fight with the Turk.

Archbishop Whitgift's interest in and curiosity about the Ottoman state system and expansion is mentioned clearly in Hartwell's dedications. First of all, it should be mentioned that Archbishop Whitgift was such a "firm and marvailous" friend of Lord Essex that Essex's misfortunes "drew upon the Archbishop the great discontentment and severest reprehension from her Majestie that he had ever before undergone in all his life".[501] Besides, the Bacon brothers, who were the most prominent and productive members of the Essex circle, and whose scholarship focused on strengthening Essex's hand by connecting him to the loyal Catholics, and in line with that justifying his vision of the war throughout the 1590s, were former students of Whitgift at Cambridge.[502] It is quite natural, thus, that the expansion of the Ottomans in Europe was a frequent matter of discussion within the Whitgift circle, together with interest in the details of the Ottoman state structure and military system. Sir Moile Finche's "grave iudgements" about the growth of Ottoman power at a meeting held in 1594, which prompted Hartwell's reconsideration of publishing Minadoi's translation *The history of the vvarres betvveene the Turkes and the Persians* (1595), might have been expressed in the context of the employment of the rhetoric of the Ottoman menace as a reminder of the Spanish damage to

[501] George Paule, *The life of the most reuerend and religious prelate John Whitgift, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1612), 91-4.
[502] Alan Stewart, "Bacon, Anthony (1558–1601)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/988, accessed 11 Feb 2016]; Markku Peltonen, "Bacon, Francis, Viscount St Alban (1561–1626)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2007 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/990, accessed 11 Feb 2016]

Christian unity. Hartwell's pessimistic thoughts on the current situation refers to the divisions within "Christendome in the West":

> … and the power of the Turkes growe so huge and infinite; and their enemies so diuided and weakened, that vnlesse God come downe as it were out of an Engine, to protect the Gospel of his Sonne Iesus Christ, …, I feare greatly that the halfe Moone which now ruleth & rai|gneth almost ouer all the East, wil grow to the full, and breede such an Inunda|tion as will vtterly drowne al Christen|dome in the West.[503]

All of these connections between writers, patrons and particular political groupings in late Elizabethan and early Stuart England are quite important and interesting and certainly deserve more research.

It is quite possible that Peter Manwood's encouragement of Knolles to undertake the enormous task of preparing a general history of the Ottomans came around or a little before 1592, at a time when the intellectual interest in the Ottomans was coupled with the necessity of employing the rhetoric of the Turkish menace to justify English foreign policy against the Spanish. This aim of the patron for Knolles's work might have especially been influential on the first and the last section of the work, and rather less so, if at all, on the thirteen central books of the "Lives" section. This can explain the previously noted ambiguity in Knolles's representation of the Ottomans in his work. As McJanneth states, the representation in the "Lives" "contradict the generalizations of [Knolles's] opening and closing treatises". In the central section, Knolles is more "open to include episodes and details from the Turks'

[503] Hartwell, *The history of the vvarres betvveene the Turkes and the Persians*, [Dedication].

own chronicles that reflect positively on individual sultans and challenge a western Christian's perspective on the world".[504]

GH was a huge work that was composed over a period longer than a decade. And this decade, the 1590s, was a time of shifting alliances and quite quickly changing political atmosphere. Written mostly during the last decade of Elizabeth's reign and influenced by the rhetorical commonplaces of the leading political circles of that day, *GH* was published in the first year of James I's reign. After waiting so many years in the hands of Peter Manwood, it was born into a world that was quite different from that of the time it was composed. Still, Knolles's Dedication that brought some crucial points into the picture, such as the responsibility of the rulers for dealing with the Ottoman threat, or question of the controversial work of King James on Lepanto, written when he was only James VI of Scotland, managed to make it still relevant to a great extent to its date of publication. In the end, *GH* was something more than the political context in which it was produced and as the first general history written in English, what made *GH* an immediate success was its style and content rather than its political agenda.

[504] McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, 340.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources:

British Library, Add. MS 29759

British Library Add. MS 38139

British Library Lansdowne MS 89

British Library Lansdowne MS 223

British Library Cotton MS Julius C.3

Cambridge University Library, MS Ee.III0

Lambeth Palace Library MS 713

Printed Sources:

"Manwood and Kettle Families" *Notes and Queries* (1897) s8-XII(297): 188-h-188 doi:10.1093/nq/s8XII.297.188-h

"Marlowe's 'Epitaph on Sir Roger Manwood.'" *Notes and Queries* (1910) s11-II(28): 24-a-24 doi:10.1093/nq/s11-II.28.24-a.

"Peter Manwood," History of the Parliament Online, http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/15581603/member/manwood-peter-1571-1625

"Peter Manwood: Roger Williams" *Notes and Queries* (1863) s3-IV(102): 477-a-477 doi:10.1093/nq/s3-IV.102.477a

Alsop, J D. "William Fleetwood and Elizabethan Historical Scholarship." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. 25/1 (1994): 155-176.

Baker, Herschel Clay. *The Later Renaissance in England : nondramatic verse and prose, 1600-1660*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bartram, Claire. "The Reading and Writing Practices of the Kentish Gentry," unpub. diss., Canterbury: University of Kent, 2005.

Bauduin, François, André Wechel, and Toussain Sybille. *De institutione historiae universae, et eius cum jurisprudentia conjunctione, "prolegomen_on" libri II*. Parisiis: apud Andream Wechelum, 1561.

Blair, Ann. "Authorial Strategies in Jean Bodin" in *The Reception of Bodin*, ed. Howell A. Lloyd (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

Blundeville, Thomas. *The true order and method of wryting a reading hystories*. London: Seres, 1574.

Bodin, Jean. *The six bookes of a common-weale. VVritten by I. Bodin a famous lawyer, and a man of great experience in matters of state. Out of the French and Latine copies, done into English.* trans. Riclard Knolles. London: [Printed by Adam Islip] impensis G. Bishop, 1606.

Bodin, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. trans. Beatrice Reynolds. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Brown, John L. *The Methodus Ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem of Jean Bodin; A Critical Study*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1939.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I: 1623-1625: 213.

Camden, William. *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adjoyning, out of the depth of antiquitie beautified vvith mappes of the severall shires of England: vvritten first in Latine by William Camden Clarenceux K. of A.* trans. Philemon Holland. London: Printed by F. K[ingston] R. Y[oung] and I. L[egatt] for George Latham, 1637.

Carlisle, Nicholas. *A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales*. London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1818.

Chew, Samuel C. *The Crescent and the Rose; Islam and England During the Renaissance*. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

Chroust, Anton-Hermann. “The beginning, flourishing and decline of the inns of court: The consolidation of the English legal profession after 1400” – 1956.

Clark, Peter. *English provincial society from the Reformation to the Revolution: religion, politics and society in Kent, 1500-1640*. Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1977.

Cormack, Bradin and Carla Mazzio. *Book Use, Book Theory: 1500-1700.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005

Couzinet, Marie-Dominique. “On Bodin’s Method”, in *The Reception of Bodin*, ed. Howell A. Lloyd (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

Daybell, James. *The material letter in early modern England : manuscript letters and the culture and practices of letter-writing, 1512-1635*. Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Dean, Leonard F., *Tudor theories of history writing*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947.

Devereux, Walter Bourchier. *Lives and letters of the Devereux, earls of Essex, in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., 1540-1646*. London: J. Murray, 1853.

Dick, Hugh G. 1949. ""Tamburlaine" Sources Once More". *Studies in Philology.* 46, no. 2 (1949): pp. 154-166.

Dimmock, Matthew. *New Turkes* (Aldershot, 2005); Vitkus, Daniel J., *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York, 2003);

Ellis, Sir Henry and Francis Douce. *A catalogue of the Lansdowne manuscripts in the British Museum : with indexes of persons, places, and matters*. [England]: Printed by command of His Majesty King George III, 1819

Fougasses, Thomas de. *The generall historie of the magnificent state of Venice From the first foundation thereof vntill this present. Collected by Thomas de Fougasses, gentleman of Auignon, out of all authors, both ancient and moderne, that haue written of that subiect*. trans. W. Shute. London: Printed by G. Eld, and W. Stansby, 1612.

Foxe, John. *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church. with an vniuersall history of the same, wherein is set forth at large the whole race and course of the Church, from the primitiue age to these latter tymes of ours, with the bloudy times, horrible troubles, and great persecutions agaynst the true martyrs of Christ, sought and wrought as well by heathen emperours, as nowe lately practised by Romish prelates, especially in this realme of England and Scotland*. London: Imprinted by Iohn Daye, 1583.

Franklin, Julian "Introduction", in *Jean Bodin* ed. Julian Franklin, (Aldershot: Ashgate 2006).

Fussner, F. Smith. *The Historical Revolution; English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1962.

Gajda, Alexandra. *The Earl of Essex and late Elizabethan political culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Gajda, Alexandra. "The State of Christendom: history, political thought and the Essex circle," Historical Research, 81/213 (2008), 423–46.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Grafton, Anthony. *What was History?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hammer, Paul E. J. *The polarisation of Elizabethan politics: the political career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England the Classical Contemporary Account of Tudor Social Life,* ed. Georges Edelen. Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell University Press: Ithaca, 1968. Print.

Hartwell, Abraham. *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo VVherein is deliuered aswell a full and perfect report of the might and power of Mahamet the third, great Emperour of the Turkes now raigning: together with the interestes and dealinges which he hath with sondrie other princes, what hee is plotting against the state of Christendome, and on the other side what we may practise and put in execution against him to his great damage and annoyaunce.* 1553.

Hotman, François, and Antonius Gryphius. *Franc. Hotomani iurisconsulti Commentarius in quatuor libros Institutionum iuris ciuilis*. Lugduni: Apud Antonium Gryphium, 1567.

Howell, William. *An institution of general history: from the beginning of the vvorld to the monarchy of Constantine the Great*. London: Printed for Henry Herringman, 1661

Howes, Edmund, *Annales, or, a generall chronicle of England. Begun by Iohn Stow: continued and augmented with matters forraigne and domestique, ancient and moderne, vnto the end of this present yeere*, 1631.

Hume, David. *A general history of Scotland together with a particular history of the Houses of Douglas and Angus*. Edinburg: Printed by Evan Tyler.

Hunt, R. W. and H. H. E. Craster; Noel Denholm-Young; Falconer Madan. *A summary catalogue of Western manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, which have not hitherto been catalogued in the quarto series : with references to the Oriental and other manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895-1953.

Huppert, George. *The Idea of Perfect History; Historical Erudition and Historical Philosophy in Renaissance France*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Huppert, George. "The Renaissance Background of Historicism," *History and Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1966), pp. 48-60.

Inderwick, F. A and Richard Arthur Roberts. *A calendar of the Inner Temple records*. London: Pub. by order of the masters of the Bench, and sold by H. Sotheran and Co., 1896-19.

Ingram, Anders. ''The glorious empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world': Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and the background to an early modern commonplace' in *Explorations in Cultural History*, D. Smith and H. Philsooph, eds., (Aberdeen: BPR Publishers, 2010), 197-216, 209.

Ingram, Anders. "English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Durham, 2009.

John Pitcher, "Samuel Daniel's Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter, 1984), 60.

Jones, Helen Dorothy. "The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries Reassessed." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1988.

Kelley, Donald R. "Historia Integra: Francois Baudouin and his conception of History", *Journal of History of Ideas*, vol. 25, no. 1, (1964): 35-57.

Kelley, Donald R. *Foundations od Modern Historical Scholarship. Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Kewes, Paulina; Ian W Archer; Felicity Heal, *The Oxford handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2013.

Kewes, Paulina, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, San Marino, California: University of California Press, 2006.

Knafla, Louis A. *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Koops, E., and Willem Jans Zwalve. *Law & Equity: Approaches in Roman Law and Common Law*. 2014. <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1576651>.

Levy, F. J. *Tudor Historical Thought*. San Marino, Calif: Huntington Library, 1967.

Levy, F. J.. "Hayward, Daniel, and the Beginnings of Politic History in England". *Huntington Library Quarterly* 50/1 (1987): 1–34.

Lloyd, Howell A. "Introduction" in Reception of Bodin, *The Reception of Bodin*, ed. Howell A. Lloyd. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Manwood, Sir Roger. *A True Discourse of the Auncyent wodden and present stoned bridge at Rochester and of the landes proper & contributorie therto and of the verie causes of the decaye of the said stone bridge & for the course taken for reformaton therin* (1586), Rochester Bridge Wardens Trust.

Mayerne, Louis Turquet de. *The general historie of Spaine, containing all the memorable things that haue past in the realmes of Castille, Leon, Nauarre, Arragon, Portugall, Granado, etc., and by what means they were vnited, and so continue vnder Philip the Third, king of Spaine, now raigning; by Louis Turquet de Mayerne*. trans. Edward Grimeston, London, Printed by A. Islip and G. Eld, 1612.

McJannet, Linda. *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Miglietti, Sara. "Reading from the Margins: Some insights into the early reception of Bodin's Methodus", in *The Reception of Bodin*, ed. Howell A. Lloyd (Leiden: Brill, 2013): pp. 193-218.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 13, No. 3/4 (1950), pp. 285-315

Nicolson, William. *The English Historical Library Part II, Giving a Catalogue of the most of our Ecclesiastical Historians and some Critical Reflections upon the Chief of Them*. London: 1697.

Nicolson, William. *The English Historical Library Part III, Giving an account of our records, Law- Books and Coins, from the Conquest to the End of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.* London: 1699.

Nicolson, William. *The English Historical Library; or, A Short View and Character of most of the Writers now extant either in Print or Manuscript which may be Serviceable to the Undertaking of a General History of this Kingdom*. London: 1696.

O'Conor, Charles. *Bibliotheca ms. Stowensis. A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the Stowe Library.* Buckingham: J. Seeley, 1818-1819.

Pocock, J. G. A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, pp. 1-29.

Pocock, J. G. A. "The Sense of History in Renaissance England," in John F Andrews ed. *William Shakespeare : his world, his work, his influence*, New York : Scribner, 1985, 143-157.

Popper Nicholas. "An Ocean of Lies: The Problem of Historical Evidence in the Sixteenth Century" *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 3 (September 2011), pp. 375-400.

Parry, G. J. R. *A Protestant Vision: William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Parry, Vernon J. *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks*, ed. By Salih Özbaran. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003.

Petit, Jean François Le. *A generall historie of the Netherlands : with the genealogie and memorable acts of the Earls of Holland, Zeeland, and West-Friseland, from Thierry of Aquitaine the first earle, successiuely vnto Philip the Third, King of Spaine : continued vnto this present yeare of our Lord 1608, out of the best authors that haue written of that subiect.* trans. Edward Grimeston. London : Printed by A. Islip and G. Eld, anno Dom. 1608.

Reynolds, Beatrice. "Introduction", in Bodin, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. Beatrice Reynolds, (New York, 1969).

Reynolds, Beatrice. "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism". *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14/4 (1953): pp. 471–492.

Schiffman, Zachary Sayre. "The Origins of Early Modern Historical Consciousness" in David Lee Rubin ed. *Signs of the Early Modern: 15th and 16th centuries*. Virginia: Rookwood Press, 1996, 79-100.

Schmuck, Stephan. "Politics of Anxiety: The imago turci in early modern English prose, c.1550-1620," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation., Aberystwyth University. 2007.

Schoeck, R. J. "Early Anglo-Saxon Studies and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. 5 (1958).

Serres, Jean de. *A general inuentorie of the history of France from the beginning of that monarchie, vnto the treatie of Veruins, in the year 1598. Written by Ihon de Serres. And continued vnto these times, out off the best authors which haue written of that subiect.* trans. Edward Grimeston. London: by George Eld: 1607.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping early modern England : the culture of seventeenth-century politics* Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Sherman, William H. *John Dee : the politics of reading and writing in the English Renaissance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.

Sidney, Philip, *Sir Philip Sidney: selected prose and poetry*, ed. Robert Kimbrough, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.

Sleidanus, Johannes, *The general history of the Reformation of the Church from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, begun in Germany by Martin Luther with the progress thereof in all parts of Christendom from the year 1517 to the year 1556*

Smith, John. *The generall historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles with the names of the adventurers, planters, and governours from their first beginning. an^{0}: 1584. to this present 1624*. London: Printed for Michael Sparkes, 1624.

Smith, Margaret M. *The Title-Page: Its Early Development 1460–1510.* London, New Castle: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2000,

Stillman, Robert E. *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2008.

Stone, L. "The educational revolution in England, 1560-1640," *Past and Present*, 28 (1964), 41-80.

Sullivan, Ceri. "Disposable Elements? Indications of Genre in Early Modern Titles" *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 102, No. 3 (July, 2007).

Thomas, Keith. *The perception of the past in early modern England : the Creighton Trust lecture 1983, delivered before the University of London on Monday 21 November 1983*, London: University of London, 1983

Trevor-Roper, H. R. *Renaissance essays.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Turchetti, Mario, "Jean Bodin", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/bodin/>.

Womersley, David, “Against the Teolology of Technique” in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press, 2006, pp. 90-95.

Woodhead, Christine “’The History of an Historie: Richard Knolles’ Generall Historie of the Turkes, 1603-1700”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26 (2002): pp. 349-57.

Woolf, D. R. “Change and continuity in English historical thought, c. 1590-1640.” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oxford, 1983.

Woolf, D. R. “From hystories to the historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past: 1500-1700,” in Paulina Kewes, *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, University of California Press, 2006, 31-68.

Woolf, D. R. “Genre into Artifact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century”, *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 19, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), 321-354, 329.

Woolf, D. R. *Reading history in early modern England*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Woolf, D. R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Worsley, Charles. *Master Worsley's book on the history and constitution of the honourable Society of the Middle Temple*. ed. A. R. Ingpen. London : Printed at the Chiswick Press, 1910.

Woudhuysen, Henry. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

APPENDIX I

A list of general histories printed in England in the seventeenth century

	Title	**Author**	**Imprint**	**Date**	**Bib Name / Number**
1a	*The herball or Generall historie of **plantes**. Gathered by Iohn Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie*	Gerard, John.	London: by [Edm. Bollifant for [Bonham Norton and] Iohn Norton, 1597.	1597	STC (2nd ed.) / 11750
1b	The herball or Generall historie of **plantes**. Gathered by Iohn Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie very much enlarged and amended by Thomas Iohnson citizen and apothecarye of London	Gerard, John	London: Printed by Adam Islip Ioice Norton and Richard Whitakers, anno 1633	1633	STC (2nd ed.) / 11751
1c	The herball or Generall historie of **plantes**. Gathered by Iohn Gerarde of London Master in Chirurgerie very much enlarged and amended by Thomas Iohnson citizen and apothecarye of London	Gerard, John	London: Printed by Adam Islip Ioice Norton and Richard Whitakers, anno 1636	1636	STC (2nd ed.) / 11752
2a	*The generall historie of the **Turkes***	Knolles, Richard.	London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1603	1603	STC (2nd ed.) / 15051
2b	*[The generall historie of the **Turkes**...]*	Knolles, Richard.	London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1610.	1610	STC (2nd ed.) / 15052
2c	*The generall historie of the **Turkes***	Knolles, Richard.	London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1610	1610	STC (2nd ed.) / 15052
2d	*The lives of the **Othoman** kings and emperors*	Knolles, Richard.	London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1609	1610	STC (2nd ed.) /

					15052
2e	*The generall historie of the **Turkes***	Knolles, Richard.	[London]:Printed by Adam Islip, 1621	1621	STC (2nd ed.) / 15053
2f	The generall historie of the **Turkes**	Knolles, Richard	[London]: Printed by Adam Islip, 1638	1638	STC (2nd ed.) / 15055
3a	*A generall historie of the **Netherlands***	Le Petit, Jean François.	London: Printed by A. Islip, and G. Eld, Anno Dom. 1608	1608	STC (2nd ed.) / 12374
3b	*A generall historie of the **Netherlands***	Le Petit, Jean François.	London: Printed by A. Islip, and G. Eld, Anno Dom. 1609	1609	STC (2nd ed.) / 12375
4a	*A generall historie of **France**, written by Iohn de Serres vnto the yeare. 1598. Much augmented and continued vnto this present, out of the most approoued authors that haue written of that subiect. By Ed: Grimeston. Esquire*	Serres, Jean de.	London: Imprinted by George Eld, 1611	1611	STC (2nd ed.) / 22245
4b	A generall historie of **France**	Serres, Jean de	[London]: Imprinted by G. Eld & M. Flesher, 1624	1624	STC (2nd ed.) / 22246
4c	A continuation of the generall historie of **France**	Serres, Jean de	London: Printed by G. Eld and M. Flesher., 1624	1624	STC (2nd ed.) / 22246.5
5a	*The generall historie of **Spaine***	Mayerne, Louis Turquet de.	London: Printed by A. Islip, and G. Eld, anno Dom. 1612	1612	STC (2nd ed.) / 17747
6	*The generall historie of the magnificent state of **Venice***	Fougasses, Thomas de.	London:Printed by G. Eld, and W. Stansby, 1612	1612	STC (2nd ed.) / 11207
7a	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Michael Sparkes, 1624	1624	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790 ; Sabin 82823
7b	The generall historie of **Virginia**, Nevv-England, and the Summer Iles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Michael Sparkes, 1625	1625	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790a; Sabin 82823
7c	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Michael Sparkes, 1626	1626	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790b ; Sabin 82823
7d	The true travels, adventures, and observations of Captaine Iohn Smith, in Europe, Asia, Affrica, and America, from anno	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] H[aviland] for Thomas Slater, and are to bee sold [by Michael Sparke] at the Blew Bible in Greene Arbour,	1630	STC (2nd ed.) / 22796 ; Sabin 82871

	Domini 1593. to 1629		1630		
7e	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I.D. and I.H. for Michael Sparkes, 1631	1631	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790c.5
7f	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Edward Blackmore, 1632	1632	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790d ; Sabin 82823.
7g	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Michael Sparkes, 1627	1627	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790c ; Sabin 82823
7h	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I.D. and I.H. for Michael Sparkes, 1631	1631	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790c.5
7i	The generall historie of **Virginia**, New-England, and the Summer Isles	Smith, John	London: Printed by I[ohn] D[awson] and I[ohn] H[aviland] for Edward Blackmore, 1632	1632	STC (2nd ed.) / 22790d ; Sabin 82823
8a	A general history of **Scotland**	Hume, David	Edinburgh: Printed by Evan Tyler, [between 1648 and 1657]	1648	Wing / H3656
8b	A generall history of **Scotland**, from the year 767 to the death of King James	Hume, David	London: Printed for Simon Miller ..., 1657.	1657	Wing / H3657
9a	The generall history of **vvomen**	Heywood, Thomas	London: Printed by W.H. for W.H. ..., 1657	1657	Wing / H1784
9b	The wonders of the female world, or a general history of **women**	Anon	London: Pried [sic] by J.H. for Thomas Malthus, the Sun in the Poultrey, 1683	1683	Wing (2nd ed.) / W3379A
10a	An institution of general history –**world**	Howell, William	London: Printed for Henry Herringman, and are to be sold in his shop ..., 1662	1662	Wing / H3137
10b	An institution of general history, or, The history of the **world**	Howell, William	London: Printed for Henry Herringman, Thomas Bassett ... William Crook ... and William Cademan ..., 1680-1685	1680	Wing / H3138 ; Wing / H3139
11a	The wonders of the little world, or, A general history of **man**	Wanley, Nathaniel	London: Printed for T. Basset ..., R. Cheswel ..., J. Wright ..., and T. Sawbridge ..., 1673.	1673	Wing / W709
11b	The wonders of the little world, or, A general history of **man**	Wanley, Nathaniel	London: Printed for T. Basset ..., R. Cheswel ..., J. Wright ..., and T. Sawbridge ..., 1673.	1673	Wing / W709
12a	The general history of **the Reformation of the Church** from the errors and corruptions of the	Sleidanus, Johannes	London: Printed for Abel Swall at the Unicorn, Henry Bonwick at the Red	1689	

	Church of Rome		Lyon, in St. Pauls Church-Yard, and Samuel Ravenshaw at the Blew Anchor in Duck-Lane., MDCLXXXIX [1689]		
13	The general history of the **air**	Boyle, Robert	London: Printed for Awnsham and John Churchill ..., 1692	1692	Wing / B3981 ; Arber's Term cat. / II, 467 ; Fulton, J. Bibl. of Robert Boyle / 194
14	The general history of **earthquakes**	R. B.	London: Printed for Nath. Crouch ..., 1694	1694	Wing / C7328
15	The general history of the **Quakers**	Croese, Gerardus	London: Printed for John Dunton ..., 1696	1696	Wing / C6965
16a	The general history of **England**, as well ecclesiastical as civil.	Tyrrell, James,	London: Printed for Henry Rhodes [and 3 others], MDCXCVI [1696]	1696	Wing / T3585
16b	The general history of **England**, as well ecclesiastical as civil.	Tyrrell, James	London: Printed for Henry Rhodes [and 3 others], MDCXCVI [1696]	1696	Wing / T3585
16c	The general history of **England**, both ecclesiastical and civil.	Tyrrell, James	London: Printed and are to be sold by W. Rogers [etc.], 1697	1697	Wing / T3586
16d	The general history of **England**, both ecclesiastical and civil	Tyrrell, James	London: Printed and are to be sold by W. Rogers ..., J. Harris ..., R. Knaplock ..., A. Bell ..., and T. Cockerill ..., MDCICVIII [1698]	1698	Wing / T3587 Variant
16e	The general history of **England**, both ecclesiastical and civil.	Tyrrell, James,	London: Printed for W. Rogers ..., Robert Knaplock ..., Andrew Bell ... and Thomas Cockerill ..., MDCC [1700]	1700	Wing / T3589
16f	The general history of **England**, both ecclesiastical and civil	Tyrrell, James	London: Printed, and are to be sold by W. Rogers ... R. Knaplock ... A. Bell ... T. Cockerill ..., MDCC [1700]	1700	Wing / T3588
17	An essay towards a general history of **whoring**	Anon.	London: printed for Richard Baldwin, at the Oxford Arms in Warwick-Lane, 1697.	1697	Wing (2nd ed., 1994) / E3296A

APPENDIX II

Collection of Sir Peter Manwood

1. Sir Peter Manwood[505]

For his book stamps, see
http://armorial.library.utoronto.ca/search/armorial_search/peter%20manwood
Arms: Two pallets on a chief a demi lion issuant Crest Out of a ducal coronet a lion's head gardant Helmet of an Esquire

2. Printed books

J.J. Boissard, *Vitae et icones sultanorum*, Frankfurt, 1596. 4º.
Tp: 'The 9th day of februarie boughte 1599. 42 El. Pe: Manwood pretium £1:9:6.'
Gilt armorial on boards, dated 1600 on both covers.
Cambridge, Queens' College, H.7.9

William Camden, *Britannia*, London, 1594. 4º.
Upper endpaper: 'Thomas Menfeilde me suum vendicat ex dono Mri Petri Manwood armig: amici imprimis mei'; sig A7r: 'Sum liber Thomae Menfeilde ex dono Mri Petri Manwood armig: Maecenatis mei optimi'.
Maggs, catalogue 1121 (1990) item 15 for £350, reproducing the second inscription.

[505] I am grateful to Prof. Henry Woudhuysen for sharing with me his notes on Sir Peter Manwood's collection.

Thomas Danett, *A continuation of the historie of France from Charles the eight till Henry the second*, London, 1600. 4º.
Tp: 'My soun John Manwood his booke vltim. Aug. 1605. Pe. Manwoo[d]', and the number 23. Initials: WL.
Bought in 1916 from Neale, catalogue 9 (19??), item 507.
Modern quarter morocco.
Folger Library STC6234 copy 2

Samuel Daniel, *The first parte of the historie of England*, London, 1612
Wants sigs. 2G2-4
Tp: 'The first day of July 1612. sent mee by Mr Danyel my good ffreinde Pe: Manwo[od]'
Logical phrases in 17th?-century hand/s on t. (trimmed), including 'omne rationale est risibile omnis homo [est] risibilis', one also including name 'Hirst'. Trimmed marginal notes throughout, in two 17th-century hands; list of rulers from Henry II to Charles II, in a 17th-century hand, on 2G1 recto; sketches (house) on pp. 148-9. Brief note, upside down, on lower endpaper [unread]. Erased inscription on t.p. (unread) with date 1631. Trimmed inscription on t.p., in a 17th-century hand: 'Mark [H...?] $6.^{0}$ Dec. [...] possidet h[unc] libru[m] ex [dono?] Caroli Hir[st?]'. Inscription on upper flyleaf, in a 19th-century hand: 'L.H. Butler /Orphan of China /Alexander the great /Zarae'. Inscription on upper flyleaf: 'S. B. Best From Harriett Bridge Sep. 19th 1900'.
Bent Juel-Jensen, 'Daniel's *First Part of the Historie of England*, 1612, and *Collection*, ?1618', *Library*, 4 (1982), 425
Contemporary limp vellum.
Bodleian, Juel-Jensen e.14

J. De Serres, *A generall historie of France*, London, 1611
Presented by PM in 1611.
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, D.9.1

Sir Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the governour*, London, 1580. 8º.
Tp: 'The .4. of September .1595. 37 Pe. Manwood. pretium 18d.'
Nineteenth-century calf.
Folger Library STC7642 copy 1

Edward Grimston, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, London, 1609.
Presented by PM in 1611
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, K.17.14

Edward Grimston, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, London, 1609.
Lincoln College, Oxford SLOM2

Richard Knolles, *A general historie of the Turkes*, London, 1603
Bound in goatskin tooled in gold with elaborate gold tooled corners: stamp 2.
J. Pearson & Co, *Catalogue of Very Choice Books Including an Extremely Important Series of Historical Bindings*, Part 1, (nd.), item 150.

Richard Knolles, *The general historie of the Turkes*, London, 1610. Fol.
Foot of tp : 'Ex dono Petri Manwood, Militis Balnei 1611^{o}'
David Pearson, 'Two London Bindings 1610-20', *Book Collector*, 40 (1991), 223-7 ; illustrated in plate 2, p. 226.
Contemporary centre-piece gilt binding.
Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, L.17.40

Richard Knolles, *The general historie of the Turkes*, London, 1610. Fol.
Presented to the College by PM in 1612; the presentation inscription by PM is not in his hand.
Oxford, Lincoln College, SLOM 2

William Lambarde, *A perambulation of Kent*, London, 1576. 4^{o}.
Signature dated 1590.
W. C Hazlitt, *Roll of Honour*; Hazlitt's own annotated copy (BL 1655/4), opposite p.149

Samuel Lewkenor, *A discourse not altogether vnprofitable, nor vnpleasant for such as are desirous to know the situation and customes of forraine cities*, London, 1600.
Gold-stamped arms of PM on both covers, with his inscription on the title-page (1599): 'The .9th. of fe.' 1599. 42. El. Peter Manwood pretiu*m* 2^{s}.'
Gift of Henry Paman (manuscript book-label); College bookplate, 1700.
See:
http://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/library/special_collections/early_books/pix/provenance/manwood/manwood.htm
Bound in calf with stamp 2 in gold on both covers.
Cambridge, St John's College, D.9.28

Lodowick Lloyd, *A briefe conference of diuers lawes: diuided into certaine regiments*, London, 1602.
Inscription of PM; College bookplate, 1700.
Cambridge, St John's College, D.10.40(2)

Lodowick Lloyd, *The stratagems of Ierusalem*, London, 1602.
Inscription of PM; College bookplate, 1700.
Cambridge, St John's College, D.10.40(1)

Sir Thomas Palmer, *An essay of the meanes how to make our trauailes, into forraine countries, the more profitable*, London, 1606. 4^{o}.
Tp: 'The fyft day of Iulie. 1606. Pe: Manwood. pret. 2s.'
Original limp vellum, gilt; green ties.
Quaritch, catalogue 369 (1922), item 832 for £31 10*s.*; 433 (1930), item 572* for £35; 436 (1930), item 1334 for £35; 449 (1931), item 371 for £30; 526 (1936), item 166 for £18

John Stow, *Annales*, London, 1600. 4^{o}.

Tp: 'This booke was gyven mee by my freinde John Stow Pe: Manwood The 24th of fe: 1600. 43. R E. pret ... binding ...'.
Tp verso: 'Edward Younge his Booke June ye 9th [16]63. James Cale his Booke 1670 August 6th. Ann Garner June th.26: 1773'. On p. 9: 'John Jenkinson His Booke 1672'.
Lacks sig. c4 of the index.
Bound in calf with stamp 2 and the date 1600 in gold.
London, National Art Library, V&A, Clements Drawer 4

John Stow, *A suruay of London*, London, 1598. 4o.
Tp (trimmed): The 17 day of November 1598 ... by my freinde John Stow. Pr*e*sently after hs settinge of itt fourthe but ... d*elivere*d vnto mee before this day – at St Stephens Pe. Manwood'.
Simon Scarliff. Samuel Darby. C. Dale. 6s.
Booklabel of Sir Leicester Harmsworth.
Sotheby's, 12 November 1929, lot 329 to Quaritch.
18th-century calf.
Washington, Folger Library STC 23341 copy 1

Johann Huyghen Van Linschoten, *Iohn Huyghen van Linsxhoten his discours of voyages into the Easte & West Indies*, London, 1598.
Calf; stamp 1.
Sotheby's, 25 July 1924, lot 139

Sir Roger Williams, *The actions of the Lowe Countries*, 1618
Presentation copy from PM to John Tradescant
Christie's South Kensington, 14 July 1995, lot 40 with plate

Signed and dated 1601.
Cambridge, St John's College, Ashb. 1758

3. MSS

3.1. British Library

Additional MS 19052
Plutarch's Præcepts of Gover*n*ment; tr. PM,
On fol. 1r, number 246. Signed by PM at the end, fol. 23, with 'Henry Chrispe his writinge'.
Red ruled frame, foliated at the foot of the page perhaps by Crisp. Watermark of a coat of arms with a tower.
Written in the same hand as MS Bodley 966

Modern binding.

Additional MS 29759
Register of documents relating to the estates and business transactions of Sir Roger Manwood, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, 1579-1593, and his son, Sir Peter Manwood, of Hackington, co.
Kent; 1551-1619. 4^{o}.
Many of the documents are certified by PM, John Crisp (e.g. fol. 79r) and others.
At fol. 26b is a pedigree of Manwood and at f. 153b a table of the descendants of 'Justice Martyn' [? John Martyn, Justice of the Common Pleas, 1422-1436].
On fol. 2r, signed and dated by PM '20th August 1594'.
Bookplate of Miss Mary Barbara Hales.
Purchased from her, 10 April 1875.

Additional MS 34219
John Atkins or John Atkinson, two political treatoses: (a) on the advantages of pre-serving an alliance with the Netherlands as against Spain, and (b) on the expediency of making peace or war with Spain.
Of the first there is another copy in Harley MS 168, f. 208, where it is ascribed to John Askham. In the *Calendar of State Papers,* 1603-1610, p. 18, under the date June (?) 1603, is a letter from John Atkinson to the King introducing 'a discourse porsuading him to join in amity with the Hollanders and to set upon Spain'. This is probably identical with the first
treatise.
On fol. 24v, PM: 'My man, Crispe his hande. Pe: Manwood'. On fol. 1, 'The price of binding 4^{s}.
17th of Marche, 1610'. Red ruled frames.
Vellum covers, with gilt centre-piece.
Purchased from Christie's, 18 July 1892.

Additional MS 38139
Historical collections of Sir Peter Manwood, of Hackington, Kent, consisting mainly of transcripts and translations of state papers, 1564-1618, especially for the years 1603-5.
Most of the documents are marked as 'examinat.' or 'examined', and to many of them notes in PM's hand are appended or prefixed (see especially fols 192, 201).
Much is in the same hand as Add. MS 34219.
On fol. 88r, the heads of the Anglo-Spanish treaty of 18 August 1604 were 'translated by Mr. Knolles for mee'. Fols 217r, 239r are endorsed: 'Examined by Mr Iames Hathwaye and my sealf Wal: Drurye'.
Bookplate of arms of Rogers Ruding, the numismatist (d. 1820).
Benjamin Heywood Bright; sold Sotheby's, 3 June 1844, lot 133, £17 to Payne.
Sir Thomas Phillipps, no. 11754; osld Sotheby's 1911, lot 673.
Modern binding.

Lansdowne MS 89, fol. 185r
Letter to Robert Cotton, from St Stephen's [Hackington], 6 July 1606.
Asking for material concerning Henry VIII.

3.2. Lambeth Palace Library

MS 138, item VI. 10, fols 214-277
The life of Henry V by the translator of Titus Livius.
On fol. 277v: 'The coppy oute of w*hi*ch this was wrytten I borroweed of my freinde Iohn Stowe, and itt seemed he made an end of writinge his coppy the .14. of Apryll 1569. § This booke Henry Cryspe (elder brother to my searvante Iohn Crispe) wrytt for mee & d*elivere*d itt vnto mee the .19.th day of May 1601. 43 El. Regina att London. Pe: Manwood'. On fol. 287r Henry Crisp signed the MS. On fol. 289r: 'I haue Titus Livius in Lattyn at large and surely here is not th'one halfe hereof Translated.' And in another hand: 'As I remember Stowe toulde mee this was Sir Walter Cope's hand to whome he had lente his booke. I entreated Sr Walter to lend me the booke, but he hath itt not, hauinge lent itt longe synce to my Lo: Staffourde wheare itt was lost. Mr Camden I think once sawe itt. Itt is a booke wourthy the recovery.' It seems likely that Holinshed had also seen it.
This copy was transcribed into MS Bodley 966, from which it was edited by C.L. Kingsford as *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth* (Oxford, 1911), see esp. pp. v-ix.

MS 179, item IV, fols 246-313
George Cavendish, Life of Wolsey
'my book. An^{o}: 16 1598./'
See Richard S. Sylvester's edition, EETS, OS 243 (1959), p. 285 and Ro. Ba's life f More (bound in this MS, fols 199-243), for which see E.V. Hitchcock and P.E. Hallett's editions, EETS, OS 222 (1950), p. xii and frontispiece.
On fol. 313v: 'My book. An^{o}: [16] 1598./ Pe: Manwood.' and in Stowe's hand: 'Wrytten by my man Rich. I borrowed the originall of Mr Iohn Burrowes Iohn Stow/'.

3.3. Bodleian Library

MS Ashmole 34
John Hardyng, *Chronicles*
At the end of the last verse: 'bought the 14th day of februarie. 1604. pretiu*m* – 20s. Pe: Manwood'.
The inserted woodcut facing the chronicle's opening is of Georg der Gottselige, Furst von Anhalt by Lucas Cranach.
Pächt and Alexander, 3.1069.
Seventeenth-century calf.

MS Ashmole 849
William Camden, *Britannia*, tr. Richard Knolles
On fol. 1r, below the title: 'This being M^{r} William Camdens manuscript found

\in/ his owne library lock't in a cupbord as a treasuer he much estemed and sinc his death sufferd to se light'.
At the end of the introductory section before Cornwall (p. 185) PM has written: 'Thus far M^{r} Knolles hys owne hand, the resedewe my man Iohn Crispes & on of Sandwich to ease M^{r} Knolles who yett first wrott itt all hym selfe Pe: Manwood.' At the end of the section on Northumberland, PM has signed his name and the scribe has dated his work, '1598 Sext. Cal. Iul.' The scribe has signed it again at the end of the section on Ireland. There, the number 58 occurs within the scribe's flourish.
In the second sequence, fols. 59v-61r are in a different hand, with marginalia in a third hand.
The volume includes engravings of Romano-British coins in Robert Cotton's collection, possibly cut from Hubert Goltzius's 'Numinis Britannorum', pp. 62-9.
Watermarks of a crown, initials NB, and a bunch of grapes. On the lower paste-down: 'Rich. Champion his book 1657'. At the passage on Hackington in Kent (fol. 93v), the sidenotes have been deleted. They read: 'Neither att att this daye is his sonn S^{ir} Peter manwood Knight of the Bath any less: of whom for as much as he honoureth vertue and cherisheth learning and learned men, I cannot but wth. honoure remember.' Cf. Camden's Britannia, tr. Philemon Holland (London, 1610), p. 339: 'and even so is his son at this day Sir Peter Manwood Knight of the Bath, whom I cannot but mention when as hee is a favorer of vertue, and learning'.
PM may not have owned but borrowed this MS.
Seventeenth-century gilt centrepiece binding, rebacked.

MS Ashmole 1511
Bestiary, thirteenth century, ?Peterborough or Lincoln
On an endpaper: 'This booke was gyven mee by my good ffreinde William Man Esquire this thirde day of August 1609. Pe: Manwood'. On the verso of the final leaf, monogram AD. On fol. 8r erased inscription, 'Liber Willm Wryght vicarii de Chepynge Wycombe et theologiae professoris anno salutis 1550'. Owned in 1623 by John Tradescant the elder.
Facsimile with a commentary by Xenia Mnratova and Daniel Poirion, 2 vols (Paris, 1984).
Pächt and Alexander, 3.334.

MS Bodley 710 (SC 2951)
Tracts relating to English claims to France under Edward III and Henry V.
Copies of four first-person narratoves of the exploits of Sir Francis Vere, 1596-1600. Folio.
On fol. Iii, a letter, not in PM's hand, dedicating the first part of the MS to Prince Charles, dated from St Stephen's [Hackington], 24 May 1615. the second series of texts are in one hand, not apparently connected to PM. On fol. 60r, in the margin: 'Here Mr Iohn Lig: beginneth to write'. There are other marginal notes throughout the volume in Robert Cotton's hand. Some of the texts in this MS are translated from MS Bodley 885 and are copied from MS Bodley 710 into MS

Bodley 875.
Contemporary vellum, gilt; a different binding from that of MS Bodley 875.
Presented by PM in 1620

MS Bodley 875 (SC 2959)
Copies of four tracts (not all complete: on fol. 10r: 'This worke is vnperfect for want of tyme') from MS Bodley 710 relating to English claims to the French crown under Edward III and Henry V. on fol. 13r, there is a refernce in a hand which is not that of the scribe to Thomas Walsingham. Folio.
Contemporary vellum, gilt, ties missing, all edges gilt; a different binding from that of MS Bodley 710.
Presented by PM in 1613-14

MS Bodley 885 (SC 2952)
Historical collections relating to the claims of English kings to the French crown in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Late fifteenth to early sixteenth century. Some of the tracts were translated in MS Bodley 710 and from there into MS Bodley 875.
On fol. 38r, there is an addition to the genealogy of the French kings in Camden's hand. On fol. 99r: 'founde the 26th of March .1605. on of my fathers bookes. The .22.th day of Marche .1605./ 3. of Iames or soveraygne Lord & Kinge. Newe bownde because the velome redd lever was \very/ oulde & unsaffe to keepe itt in & ye leaves in sum places ... lose./ have. especially for two or thee [sic] thinges conserninge the kinge his title & right to ye crowne of ffrance (& wch noe man had any coppy of but from mee, that ever I could heare of.' At some point he has underlined 'but from mee' and added 'but of a briffe abstracte of sum parte from mee' below it.
Early sixteenth-century calf with gilt centrepiece, ties missing, all edges gilt.
Presented by PM in 1620, having been promised by him in 1613, see Library Records Day Book (1613-20), LR e. 9, fol. 17v.

MS Bodley 966 (SC 3033)
Historical collections of state papers, including: William Roper's life of More (pp. 193-219), for which, see the edition by E.V. Hitchcock, EETS, OS 197 (1935), p. xvii; Cavendish's life of Wolsey (pp. 93-193), for which, see the edition by Richard S. Sylvester, EETS, OS 243 (1959), p. 278; and a transcript (pp. 1-91) of the first English life of Henry V.
On pp. 527-43 there are marginal notes in Robert Cotton's hand.
Contemporary red morocco, gilt; see Giles Barber, 'Notes on some English Centre- and Corner-Piece Bindings *c*. 1600', *Library*, 5/17 (1962), 93-5
Presented by PM 1620

[MS Eng. misc. c. 139 (SC 43575)
Miscellany, associated with PM and owned by William Crispe in 1612
Dobell, catalogue 20 (1923), item 130 for £3 3*s*.
Purchased 1928.]

3.4. Pierpont Morgan Library

MS B.11
Mubashshir ibn Fātik, Abū al-Wafā, [Dictes and sayings of the philosophers].
74 leaves.
At the end of the manuscript: 'Wrytten oute for mee by my man John May in May 1621. 19th Jacobi Regis. Pe. Manwood'.
Sir Peter Manwood completed 19 May 1621; written by John May.
Walter Wilson Greg; purchased by Curt F. Bühler in January 1942 from E.P. Goldschmidt, catalogue 65, item 76.
See *Twenty-first report to the Fellows of the Pierpont Morgan Library, 1984-1986*, ed. Charles Ryskamp (New York, 1989), p. 30
Curt F. Bühler, 'New Manuscripts of the "Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers"', *Modern Language Notes*, 63 (1948), 26-30, pp. 28-30
Red half-morocco by 'Stoakley, late Hawes'.
Bequest of Curt F. Bühler, 1985

3.5. Washington DC, Folger Shakespeare Library

MS V.b.335
Letter book relating to the oyster fishery at Whitstable, Kent, 1581-1669. 49 leaves (mostly blank)
Documents numbered 1-18. Items 1-15 are in the same hand; item 16 in Walsingham's hand; items 17-18 are in another hand(s).
PM became commissioner for the oyster fisheries in 1598. Contains copies of 15 letters, most of them dated from 1598, 1601 and 1608, with 13 of them sent or received by Sir Peter Manwood as commissioner, along with other officials, including John Boys. Other correspondents and recipients include John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Earl of Nottingham, Lord Cobham, Earl of Salisbury, Earl of Northampton, Duke of Buckingham (1624?), Sir Thomas Walsingham (1624?), Duke of York (1669) and the Privy Council. Also includes 3 other documents: a copy of a Petition to the Privy Council from residents of Whitstable, undated; a copy of an 'Award for the liberty of Whitstable', 18 December 1608, signed by Manwood and others; and a copy of a Memorandum concerning Whitstable, October 1581.
Original vellum wrapper with some manuscript waste.
Acquired from Samuel Gedge in 2008.

3.6. Unlocated

Arms of the nobility of England from William the Conqueror to Queen Elizabeth, c.1600
96 leves; coloured coats of arms.
Watermark: small bunch of grapes with AG beneath them. Paper used for large coats of arms is a pot. Third stock used in blazon glossary.

PM signatures dated 1582.
Henry Bull signature dated 1587 with three Latin mottoes; Edward Taylor signature and dates 1682-5; George, Lord Macartney (1737-1806) with his bookplate.
Sotheby's, 22 June 1925, lot 507.
Maggs, catalogue 477, part 1 (1926), item 829 and plate xxix; 493 (1927), item 602 and plate xlviii for £31 10*s*.
Sale, 22 May 1978 with the library of Fowberry Tower, Chatton, Northumberland.
Nineteenth-century gilt morocco: rebound in 1878 by Stephen Tucker, explaining that the original binding had 'Manwood's name'.
Christie's, 26 June 1996, lot 21.