

Introduction

'To the great Variety of Readers'

When Shakespeare's First Folio reached the bookstalls in 1623, it became the first collection printed in the prestigious folio format to feature plays exclusively from the commercial stages.¹ It was also the first collection to construct and advertise history as a clearly defined dramatic genre. The Folio divides its plays – eighteen of which had not been printed before – into three theatrical genres, which are indicated by the 'Catalogue' (omitting *Troilus and Cressida*) and also by the title of the collection – *Master William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies*. The Folio selectively collects its 'Histories', excluding, for example, the Scottish history of *Macbeth* and classical histories, such as *Julius Caesar*, and arranges them according to the historical order of English kings, rather than the plays' order of composition. By doing so, the collection effectively publishes its own statement about the parameters of the genre: the history play's proper subject is English monarchical history after the Conquest.

This design was not, of course, undertaken by Shakespeare, who died in 1616. It was the product of a collaboration between Shakespeare's former colleagues John Heminges and Henry Condell and the syndicate of stationers who invested in the project – William and Isaac Jaggard, Edward Blount, William Aspley, and John Smethwick. The Folio categories are therefore a retrospective division propelled by the publication process – and specifically by *this* publication venture, which has had an immense (and sometimes unproductive) influence on critical approaches to early modern history plays. Rather than revealing something inherent about the form, style, subject, or ideology of Shakespeare's plays that dramatize the past, the Folio division offers a *reading* of them, and its construction reflects the interests and strategies of those who took part in its publication. The impact of this venture cannot be overstated: the Folio's design has subsequently entrenched critical expectations about the generic

¹ Ben Jonson's *Works* (1616) contains poetry, masques, and entertainments, alongside his plays.

2 Introduction: ‘To the great Variety of Readers’

identity of Shakespeare’s plays and those of other early modern dramatists. *Publishing the History Play in the Time of Shakespeare* aims to show that the publication process, rather than simply reflecting established views and exempla of dramatic genres, has played a crucial role in constructing them. Publication agents have defined, shaped, and marketed history plays in ways that have affected the experiences of ‘the great Variety of Readers’ – from early modern to modern.²

A key premise of this study is that genre offers mediating frameworks through which writers and readers create meaning, but it involves a kind of participation that, as Jacques Derrida proposes, ‘never amounts to belonging’.³ Statements about genre are part of the ‘aftermarket’ of plays in print and are subject to revision and reappraisal.⁴ Many of the Folio ‘Histories’, such as *Richard II*, are described as tragedies in their earliest single-text editions, which demonstrates the mutability of genre labels. The cultural capital that Shakespeare and his plays subsequently accrued, however, has led to the 1623 Folio being used uncritically as a touchstone, rather than as a single and not necessarily representative example of participation in categorizing dramatic ‘kinds’. Andy Kesson proposes that the Folio has standardized generic expectations of comedies, with the effect of marginalizing and problematizing the plays of other dramatists.⁵ Similarly, in relation to its ‘Histories’, Gary Taylor argues that the ‘posthumous Shakespeare folio [has] retrospectively conquered, solidified, legitimized and singularized the genre’.⁶ Many history-play studies have concentrated on the plays listed in the Folio’s catalogue, defined the genre (explicitly or implicitly) as the dramatization of English monarchical history, and developed a rise-and-fall narrative trajectory that is tied to Shakespeare’s *oeuvre* and typically identifies the 1590s as the heyday of the history play, arguing

² William Shakespeare, *Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies* (London, 1623; STC 22273), A3r.

³ Jacques Derrida, ‘The Law of Genre’, trans. Avital Ronell, *Critical Inquiry*, 7:1 (1980), 55–81 (p. 65).

⁴ Peter Berek, ‘Genres, Early Modern Theatrical Title Pages, and the Authority of Print’, in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), pp. 159–75 (p. 160).

⁵ Andy Kesson, ‘Was Comedy a Genre in English Early Modern Drama?’, *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 54:2 (2014), 213–25.

⁶ Gary Taylor, ‘History, Plays, Genre, Games’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Thomas Middleton*, ed. Gary Taylor and Trish Thomas Henley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 47–63 (p. 51). See also Adam G. Hooks, ‘Making Histories: or, Shakespeare’s Ring’, in *The Book in History, the Book as History: New Intersections of the Material Text*, ed. Heidi Brayman, Jesse M. Lander, and Zachary Lesser (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), pp. 341–74.

Introduction: 'To the great Variety of Readers'

3

for its swift decline in the early seventeenth century.⁷ Lawrence Danson claims, for example, that 'it would only be a small exaggeration to say that "history play" is the only genre [Shakespeare] actually invented'.⁸ Insightful reappraisals in chapters and collections by Michael Hattaway, Richard Helgerson, Paulina Kewes, Teresa Grant, Barbara Ravelhofer, Gary Taylor, and Adam Hooks have challenged the enduring critical emphasis on Shakespeare's English histories and assumptions about the uses and ideology of history plays.⁹ However, no study has yet concentrated on publication and the fact that the ways in which plays make books of themselves encourage particular interpretations of them and their genres.¹⁰

Publishing the History Play in the Time of Shakespeare is the first book-length study of history plays to examine the genre through the publication process, an approach that crucially recovers evidence for early readings of these plays and their position within the period's historical culture and the geopolitics of the book trade. In doing so, it draws on the methodologies of genre criticism and book history, bringing together two areas of study that are often considered separately. This method is vital for history plays because of the overlooked and outsized influence of the publication process in creating expectations for a dramatic genre that, unlike the

⁷ See E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1944); Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's 'Histories': Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1947); Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare's History* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1985); Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990); Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare Recycled: The Making of Historical Drama* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992); Paola Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996); John W. Velz (ed.), *Shakespeare's English Histories: A Quest for Form and Genre* (Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1996); Neema Parvini, *Shakespeare's History Plays: Rethinking Historicism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012); Ralf Hertel, *Staging England in the Elizabethan History Play: Performing National Identity* (London: Routledge, 2014).

⁸ Lawrence Danson, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Genres* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 87.

⁹ Michael Hattaway, 'The Shakespearean History Play', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's History Plays*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 3–24; Richard Helgerson, 'Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists of History', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volume II: The Histories*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 26–47; Paulina Kewes, 'The Elizabethan History Play: A True Genre?' in *Companion to Shakespeare's Works*, ed. Dutton and Howard, pp. 170–93; Teresa Grant and Barbara Ravelhofer (eds.), *English Historical Drama, 1500–1660: Forms outside the Canon* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Taylor, 'History'; and Hooks, 'Making Histories'.

¹⁰ For other ways of approaching Shakespeare's genres, from the early modern period through to contemporary performance, see Anthony R. Guneratne, *Shakespeare and Genre: From Early Modern Inheritances to Postmodern Legacies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). For a linguistic analysis of genre using DocuScope, see Jonathan Hope and Michael Witmore, 'The Hundredth Psalm to the Tune of "Green Sleeves": Digital Approaches to Shakespeare's Language of Genre', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 61:3 (2010), 357–90.

4 Introduction: ‘To the great Variety of Readers’

classically derived comedy and tragedy, lacks established discursive parameters. Indeed, the term ‘history play’ was not in use during the period, the preferred descriptor being ‘a history’ or ‘histories’. Because of the overlap between ‘history’ as a dramatic category and as an emerging field of enquiry about the past, the over-dominance of the Shakespearean model of English history inhibits our access to the period’s historical culture, including the evidence of trans-temporal and transnational exchanges that take place within and across publications (including plays) that address some kind of historical past.

This book concentrates on the publication of history plays from the commercial stages during Shakespeare’s ‘time’ – that is, from the early 1590s (when his working career in London was beginning) to the publication of the Folio in 1623. The reasons for this time frame are twofold: first, to re-evaluate the generic markers of Shakespeare’s plays in print, showing how they are part of competing discourses of genre, rather than reflecting clear-cut perspectives; and second, to contrast these playbooks with the evidence of other dramatists’ history plays – both in print and on the stage.¹¹ The emphasis on commercial plays is sustained further to reappraise modern critical accounts of history plays, which typically concentrate on those performed on public stages in front of paying audiences, but also because publication patterns suggest that stationers developed different strategies for commercial and non-commercial plays during the late Elizabethan and Jacobean periods.¹² This book proposes that publication agents have actively defined and shaped the printed history play through two interlinked agendas: strategies of selection (seen through print contexts) and strategies of presentation (seen through print paratexts). By choosing to invest in certain history plays, publication agents determined, to a considerable degree, the survival of plays from the commercial stages, and this selection process also suggests how stationers read the plays alongside their wider output and the interests of the reading public. Through the preparation of paratextual materials (such as title pages, woodcut ornaments, contents pages, and addresses to readers), the

¹¹ For clarity, it is worth pointing out that I reserve the term ‘playbook’ exclusively for the book of the play produced through the publication process, and not in application to any playscripts.

¹² I use the terms ‘professional’ and ‘commercial’ for plays performed by adult and boys’ companies in front of paying audiences, whereas I use ‘non-professional’ or ‘non-commercial’ for plays that were written and staged at universities or Inns of Court, as well as closet plays, translations, and other forms of entertainment, including pageants and masques. Because they emphasize the different economies of staging plays for paying audiences and do not carry an additional evaluative judgement, I favour the terms ‘commercial’ and ‘non-commercial’.

Defining Histories: What's in a Name?

5

publication process also shapes the presentation of plays as books, which both discloses and directs how history plays were used and categorized. In turn, these practices shed light on three kinds of readings: those of publication agents who oversaw the process; those of early modern readers who encountered history plays as books; and those of modern readers, who have been significantly influenced by some early uses (such as Shakespeare's Folio), but not others (such as the play catalogues issued by booksellers in the seventeenth century, including Edward Archer's 1656 list of 'all the Plaies that were ever printed', that sometimes included an assessment of genre).¹³

Through four chronological case studies, this book argues that the twinned acts of selection and presentation have led, in conjunction with Shakespeare's emerging cultural capital, to a narrow definition of the 'history play' that is not only detrimental for understanding Shakespeare's *oeuvre* but actually distorts the evidence of performance and print, which reveals that historical drama existed in a variety of forms and contexts. By concentrating on stationers' investment patterns, this book shows that history plays, alongside non-dramatic texts about the past, were a vital part of the period's historical culture. It demonstrates that stage and print patterns for history plays differed considerably, and that a thorough understanding of the publication process is necessary for determining what can – and cannot – be claimed about theatrical repertoires. Despite the tendency of history-play studies to group together plays on the same historical past, this book argues that plays dramatizing different temporal and national histories were read together, a practice which should be reflected in our own critical approaches. To clarify the parameters and methodologies of this study, the Introduction first considers early modern ideas of history and history plays, and how the publication process contributes to this discourse. It then explores in more detail the print contexts and print paratexts that reveal how publication agents participate in and shape history as a genre.

Defining Histories: What's in a Name?

- H: The plaies that they plaie in England, are nor right comedies.
 T: Yet they doo nothing else but plaie euery daye.
 H: Yea but they are neither right comedies, nor right tragedies.

¹³ Archer's catalogue is appended to Philip Massinger, Thomas Middleton, and William Rowley's *The Old Law* (London, 1656; Wing M1048), a1r–b4v.

6 Introduction: ‘To the great Variety of Readers’

G: How would you name them then?

H: Representations of histories, without any decorum.

John Florio, *Florio's Second Fruits* (1591)¹⁴

Many history-play studies have concentrated on Shakespeare's English histories as if they define and largely constitute the genre, rather than reflecting the critical dominance of the 1623 Folio's design. Graham Holderness, for example, claims that accepting the Folio's division of plays and parameters for its histories presents ‘few problems of a generic kind’.¹⁵ The genre has been seen as synonymous with medieval English monarchical history in studies by Phyllis Rackin (1990), Benjamin Griffin (2001), and Ralf Hertel (2014). A terminological slipperiness can be witnessed in accounts that use ‘history play’ and ‘English history play’ interchangeably, which marginalizes – or indeed effaces – plays featuring non-English pasts.¹⁶ This narrow definition and the influence of Shakespeare's Folio have also constructed a rise-and-fall trajectory for the genre – one that erases large chunks of theatre history and is too neatly linked to Shakespeare's *oeuvre* during the 1590s.¹⁷ Such studies, as Kewes summarizes, have propagated ‘the myth that there is a definable dramatic genre called the history play, which is distinct from both comedy and tragedy, which features the “English” past, and which reaches its artistic maturity with Shakespeare, swiftly declining thereafter’.¹⁸ In *Stages of History*, for example, Rackin connects the (English) history play to a teleological narrative of historiographical development, suggesting that the genre died out when history became a clearly defined autonomous discipline by the early seventeenth century.¹⁹ This approach overlooks enduring diversity in both dramatic and non-dramatic historical writing and closely follows the plays of Shakespeare, which move away from English history by the early Jacobean period. Ivo Kamps does not follow Rackin's Shakespearean emphasis, but similarly develops a rise-and-fall narrative that connects the history play with patterns in historiography, delaying the genre's

¹⁴ *Florio's Second Fruits* (London, 1591; STC 11097), D4r.

¹⁵ Holderness, *Shakespeare Recycled*, p. 1.

¹⁶ Kewes, ‘Elizabethan’, pp. 170–93. See also Helgerson (‘Shakespeare’, p. 26), who argues that the cultural and critical emphasis on Shakespeare has resulted in ‘a considerable narrowing in our understanding of the variety of perspectives on the English past – and thus on the English nation – that were available to Elizabethan theatregoers’.

¹⁷ Accounts that offer rise-and-fall narratives include: Holderness, *Shakespeare Recycled*; Rackin, *Stages of History*; Ivo Kamps, *Historiography and Ideology in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Benjamin Griffin, *Playing the Past: Approaches to English Historical Drama, 1385–1600* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 2001).

¹⁸ Kewes, ‘Elizabethan’, p. 187. ¹⁹ Rackin, *Stages of History*, pp. 21–32.

decline until the Stuart era. Kamps tends to dismiss non-dramatic historical sources as inferior to the history play: 'dramatists often show themselves to be better expositors of history than the historians; they show themselves to possess a clearer understanding of historiography's literary origins and its limitations as a knowledge-producing practice'.²⁰ This kind of approach, while rooted in discussions of historiography, reveals a relatively static reading of the connection between plays and their sources, depending on an assumption that plays are more sophisticated than other forms of historical writing and that there is some consensus about the purposes of history during the period, neither of which can be comfortably supported.²¹

As this study considers throughout, there is little evidence to suggest that Shakespeare's approach to history on stage neatly reflected the practices of other dramatists, that the strategies of the publication agents involved in the 1623 Folio offered representative ways of defining the genre, or that 'history' as a 'kind' of play was ever precisely or consistently defined. The term 'history', of course, applied to both dramatic and non-dramatic texts (that is, as Gérard Genette describes, to different 'modes of enunciation').²² While tragedy and comedy also had non-dramatic traditions, they nevertheless had a classical heritage as dramatic categories, and, in particular, 'tragedy', as Tamara Atkin discusses, seems to have been used on printed title pages by the mid-sixteenth century to invoke a 'direct or suggestive association with classical drama'.²³ Setting aside the issue of mode, 'history' carried a wide range of meanings, including, as the *OED* outlines, a sequence of past events – real or imaginary – such as those relating to the life of an individual, group of people, or nation; a branch of knowledge and enquiry into past events; and any account of such events.²⁴ 'History' is, as David Scott Kastan describes, a 'radically ambiguous' term

²⁰ Kamps, *Historiography*, p. 13.

²¹ See also Holderness, *Shakespeare Recycled*; Pugliatti, *Shakespeare the Historian*. Irving Ribner's *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*, rev. ed. (London: Methuen, 1965), first published in 1957, acknowledges the artificiality of a Shakespeare-centric evaluation of the history play and examines a much wider range of plays. However, Ribner's account is still driven by, in common with his contemporaries Tillyard and Campbell, an assumption that history has a clearly defined aim (to 'use the past for didactic purposes') and that plays about the past having 'little historical sense' or neglecting the 'legitimate purposes' of history must not be confused with the 'true history play', criteria which cannot be properly upheld or proposed (pp. 8, 25).

²² Gérard Genette, *The Architext: An Introduction*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 61–64.

²³ Tamara Atkin, *Reading Drama in Tudor England* (London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 33–35.

²⁴ See 'history, n.', *OED Online* (revised March 2021; accessed 12 April 2021).

8 Introduction: ‘To the great Variety of Readers’

that applies both to past events and to accounts of them.²⁵ It does not refer exclusively or self-evidently to those based on historical records or an accepted historical tradition (which is, however, the emphasis of this study), but also applies to entirely fictional events in a range of forms. The terms ‘history’ and ‘story’ were used interchangeably, and one of the dominant meanings of ‘story’ during the period was a narrative of events that were believed to have taken place in the past, an application that further limits the precision and usefulness of these terms in isolation.²⁶ For these reasons, understanding ‘history’ is a process of understanding how certain people have preferred to use and treat it. A discussion of historical drama involves both the modern critic’s choice of how to define the genre and early modern forms of ‘participation’ – which, in this study, concentrate on the publication process and the way it continually reshapes the parameters and purposes of the history play through stationers’ strategies of selection and presentation. Before addressing the print contexts and paratexts that reveal this negotiation, this section explores in more detail the semantic flexibility of history during the period and then clarifies this study’s use of the term ‘history play’.

Early modern discourses on genre – or, more accurately, on ‘kinds’ – confirm that history as a dramatic form did not have fixed parameters.²⁷ An interest in defining dramatic kinds is suggested by the extract from *Florio’s Second Fruits* quoted above, but the exchange remains tantalizingly elusive. The characters in Florio’s dialogue seem concerned with generic purity. Histories from the commercial stages are said to lack decorum: they are not part of a ‘pure’ or classical genre like comedy and tragedy, but no further indication of subject, style, or theme is suggested. Indeed, the dialogue does not make it clear whether ‘history’ is being used to refer to an account of the past or one of fictional events. In *A Survey of London* (1598), John Stow describes London’s playhouses as offering ‘Comedies, Tragedies, enterludes, and histories, both true and fayned’, which attempts a generic distinction, but provides no firm sense of history’s scope or expectations.²⁸ Stow seems to differentiate between plays that have a certain degree of historical veracity and those that are imagined or distorted, having a tenuous connection to a recognizable past. He nevertheless includes both forms within the category of ‘history’.

²⁵ David Scott Kastan, *Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1982), p. 11.

²⁶ See ‘story, n.’, *OED Online* (revised March 2021; accessed 12 April 2021).

²⁷ See also Kewes, ‘Elizabethan’; Janette Dillon, ‘The Early Tudor History Play’, in *English Historical Drama*, ed. Grant and Ravelhofer, pp. 32–57.

²⁸ John Stow, *A Survey of London* (London, 1598; STC 23341), F3r.

Similarly, Thomas Heywood includes mythological subjects that can be presented 'in the fashion of a History' as part of his *Apology for Actors* (written c.1608, published 1612). In contrast to Stow, Heywood constructs 'Hystories' as a theatrical genre with classical origins: 'I will begin with the antiquity of Acting Comedies, Tragedies, and Hystories.'²⁹ The genre seems to feature the worthy and memorable acts of individuals from the past, but further clarification proves difficult. Heywood separately discusses 'our domesticke hystories' (including *Edward III* and *Henry V*, B4r) and 'forreigne History' (involving 'the liues of Romans, Grecians, or others', F3v). He makes distinctions between histories of different national origins, but includes them all within the category of 'History'. For Heywood, the history play is not synonymous with English history. He aims instead to associate 'History' with as many profitable and laudable attributes as possible, which serves the *Apology's* purpose of offering a defence of the theatre: 'there is neither Tragedy, History, Comedy, Morrall or Pastorall, from which an infinite vse cannot be gathered' (F4r). If any overarching consensus can be detected in the *Apology* it would be that the history play typically engages with some kind of recognizable past, whether native or foreign, true or feigned, recent or deriving from ancient or legendary history.

Plays from the period also directly explore ideas of dramatic genre. One of the most sustained examples appears in *A Warning for Fair Women*, which presents history as a character on stage.³⁰ This anonymous play from the Chamberlain's Men, written between 1596 and 1599 and published by William Aspley in 1599, dramatizes the murder of a London merchant, George Sanders, which took place in 1573, and includes an induction featuring 'Tragedie', 'Comedie', and 'Hystorie'.³¹ Hystorie is presented with the attributes of a 'Drum and Ensigne', which suggests that the genre is dominated by battles, military subjects, and concerns of state. Tragedie is initially presented with a whip and a knife and identified with stories of revenge, murder, violence, and punishment, while Comedie favours material that is 'but slight and childish' (A2v). Grant and Ravelhofer suggest that the induction helps us to understand what contemporaries thought about these three dramatic kinds, but, to my mind, the distinctions are elided as the scene progresses and the personified

²⁹ Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London, 1612; STC 13309), B3r.

³⁰ See also Robert Wilson's *The Coblers Propbesie* (London, 1594; STC 25781), which features a scene (C1v–C3v) involving the classical muses Thalia (Comedy), Clio (History), and Melpomine (Tragedy).

³¹ *A Warning for Faire Women* (London, 1599; STC 25089), A2r.

10 Introduction: ‘To the great Variety of Readers’

genres appear to overlap.³² Descriptions of Tragedie merge with features that had seemed to be unique to Hystorie: Tragedie also involves accounts of monarchs and tyrants who strive ‘to obtaine a crowne’ (A2v). When Tragedie is declared the victorious genre for the play, the summary of its action recalls the concerns and attributes of Hystorie:

My Sceane is London, natiue and your owne,
 I sigh to thinke, my subiect too well knowne,
 I am not faind: many now in this round,
 Once to behold me in sad teares were drown'd.
 (A3r–v)

The subject matter of the play is ‘not faind’: it is based on a recognizable, ‘too well knowne’ historical past, and it blends the characteristics of tragedy and history. The fact that the actors playing the parts of Comedie, Hystorie, and Tragedie would have reappeared in other roles within the main action could serve as a reminder, in performance, of the interplay of different genres in one text and the impossibility of clear-cut categories.

The participation that is part of defining, using, and negotiating history as a dramatic form reflects the similar processes involved in approaching history as a branch of knowledge and subject of enquiry about the past. The history play transverses the categories of history and poetry that Philip Sidney discusses in his *Defence of Poesy* (published in 1595, but written during the early 1580s). The *Defence* proposes, in theory, clear distinctions for history, philosophy, and poetry (which is ‘subdiuided into sundry more speciaall denominations’ and includes drama); but the treatise is informed, as Blair Worden points out, by Sidney’s agenda to defend poetry as the superior form.³³ Poetry aims ‘to teach and delight’ (which echoes Horace’s *Ars Poetica*) and involves invention: it borrows ‘nothing of what is, hath bin, or shall be’ (*Defence*, C2v). In contrast, history is ‘so tied, not to what should be, but to what is, to the particular truth of things’ and is therefore ‘lesse fruitfull’ (D1r–v), while philosophy ‘teacheth obscurely’ (D2v). The examples Sidney gives and the discussions he offers elsewhere, however, demonstrate that these ‘pure’ genres or kinds are impossible in practice. Sidney acknowledges that plays – which he largely divides into the two

³² Grant and Ravelhofer, ‘Introduction’, in *English Historical Drama*, ed. Grant and Ravelhofer, pp. 1–31 (pp. 12–15). See also Emma Whipday, *Shakespeare’s Domestic Tragedies: Violence in the Early Modern Home* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 14–15.

³³ Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie* (London, 1595; STC 22535), C2v; Blair Worden, ‘Historians and Poets’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68:1–2 (2005), 71–93 (pp. 81–82).