

[This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of a chapter accepted for publication in *The Oxford History of Poetry in English*. Volume 5. Seventeenth-Century British Poetry. OUP 2024. Edited by Laura L. Knoppers, following peer review. The version of record is available one here: <https://academic.oup.com/book/57639/chapter-abstract/469548795?redirectedFrom=fulltext> DOI [10.1093/9780198930259.003.0009](https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198930259.003.0009)]

CHAPTER 6

POETRY, PUBLISHERS, AND PRINT¹

EMMA DEPLEDGE

Scholars sometimes name the publishers of poems in passing, without further comment, as if it were a mere fact to be repeated without consideration of exactly what ‘printed for’ Humphrey Moseley, Henry Herringman, Jacob Tonson, and others, signified for seventeenth-century consumers, or the impact that house styles and individual publishing projects had on the ways in which a given text or author was perceived and received. Stationers helped to craft the canon of English poetry through what they published, the material forms in which it circulated, and also through what they chose not to publish. They could influence a text and author’s reputation in life and after death not simply by selecting a given author or poem and investing in the rights in copy required to legally print them – though print publication, crucially, brought them to the attention of a wide range of consumers, and their presence alongside other writers on a bookseller’s shelves certainly impacted reception – but also through the material form in which they presented them. A book’s format, *mis-en-page*, typeface, paratexts, price, contents, paper, and the arrangement of poetic texts within it all shape meaning, access, and collection habits in important ways.

One sees reference to Ben Jonson, Aemilia Lanyer, John Milton, or other poets *publishing* their poems,² but it is important to note that authors did not publish poems, not in the commercial sense of the word, even if some poets did work alongside publishers. As a general rule, publishers bought the rights from a poet, entered said rights in a record book known as the Stationers' Register, purchased paper and employed a printer and other stationers to help them produce an edition. Few seventeenth-century poets had any say in the material form in which their works circulated as, once sold, the rights to a given poem were transferred to a publisher for life.³ Some stationers published unauthorised editions of poems, meaning that they published them illegally without obtaining the rights in copy. Others purchased the rights to publish poems and entered this copyright in the Stationers' Register but decided against publishing them. Further, it appears that a mutually dependent relationship existed whereby texts and authors were not simply selected for publication on the basis of perceived demand but also to correspond to the professional strategies and ambitions of individual publishers. In helping to canonise specific authors and poems, publishers often sought not simply to make money but also to shape their own reputation and legacy. It is thus important to recognise the complex, at times complicit and at others fraught, relationships that poets had with publishers. Indeed, a number of publishers of poetry also made appearances within poems and it is impossible to comprehend the history of seventeenth-century poetry in print without adhering to the ways in which it was shaped by – and helped to shape – the book trade.

The 1645 edition of Milton's *Poems*, published by Moseley, offers a famous example of conflicting aims being recorded in the same volume. The frontispiece portrait of Milton in *Poems* can be seen to elevate Milton through association with the gentlemen poets whose works were usually prefaced by author portraits. The Milton portrait has, however, been described as depicting a 'harsh, crabbed' man,⁴ 'a grim, gaunt, stolid gentleman of middle

age’,⁵ in direct contrast to the Latin inscription which suggests that the portrait is of Milton at only twenty-one years of age. Some critics instead see the portrait as providing a positive portrayal of Milton as a complex author, ‘the very summation of temporal asynchrony, his flesh in one temporal framework and his mind in another’.⁶ Whichever way we read the image and its impact on Milton’s posthumous reputation,⁷ the Greek inscription Milton prepared for William Marshall, the engraver, to etch onto the plate underneath the portrait makes it clear that he did not appreciate the image: ‘You would say, perhaps, that this picture was drawn by an ignorant hand, when you looked at the form that nature made. Since you do not recognize the man portrayed, my friends, laugh at this rotten picture of a rotten artist’.⁸ That Marshall engraved Milton’s lines makes it clear that he had no Greek. Indeed, the lines enable Milton to make a private joke to be enjoyed only by those who can read Greek, inviting them to laugh at Marshall whose hand is ignorant both because he fails to capture ‘the form that nature made’, i.e., a true likeness to Milton, and because he lacks the knowledge to comprehend the words he engraves. The image aims to put a face to Milton’s name and strives for fixity and permanence, but Milton’s text undermines the authority of both the image and the image maker. The example of the 1645 frontispiece therefore highlights how stationers and poets could work both together and against each other in the same publication.⁹

Even poets who worked closely with publishers could not control the ways in which books as material objects were made to carry meaning. This was the case with John Dryden’s translation of Virgil’s *Works*, published by Tonson in 1697. The poet and his publisher disagreed over whether or not to use the volume to honour William III. Dryden’s loyalties remained with the deposed James II so he refused to dedicate the volume to William, despite Tonson’s pleas. Eager to flatter the King in what was to be his finest book, Tonson got around Dryden’s objections by arranging for the *Aeneid* to be furnished with illustrations in

which Aeneas was made to resemble the reigning King, thus visually equating William with the quintessential Roman hero.¹⁰

Publishers influenced access to, and the meaning of, poetic texts through price, format, and through the addition of material features like illustrations and keys, to name but a few examples, and in doing so they sometimes worked with poets and sometimes worked against the wishes of poets. Indeed, some worked without the consent or knowledge of those poets. For example, Henry Hills Junior, best-known as ‘Pirate Hills’, illegally produced cheap copies of texts to which he did not have the rights. Hills advertised that he was undercutting the prices of his competitors by using the imprint ‘printed and sold by H. Hills, in Black-Fryars, near the Water-Side. For the benefit of the poor’. As John Velz notes, Hills’ imprints basically informed consumers that a given book was ‘pirated by Hills and sold for a penny, rather than for the sixpence their true proprietors were charging’.¹¹ Although irritating for other stationers, Hills’ strategy will have made many poetry books more financially accessible. The cheapness of the editions, however, will likely have impacted the perception of the text.

The expense undertaken by a publisher in the production of a book has a significant impact on the meaning and reception of a text. For example, Hills’ 1708 edition of Dryden’s poem, *Absalom and Achitophel*, whose rights in copy were owned by Tonson, was cheaply produced and it showed. Hills’ edition was an octavo, a type of book formed by folding a piece of paper three times. It runs to only twelve leaves (twenty-four pages) of low-quality paper, and appears like a flimsy pamphlet. The poem is presented in continuous text with a single column per page except on page twenty-two (C3v), when it switches to two columns because Hills was running out of space but did not want to go to the expense of using extra paper. By contrast, Tonson’s 1681 first edition was a folio, a format made from sheets of paper that had been folded only once, thereby producing two leaves (i.e., four pages). It is a

much larger book, the paper is of high quality, the pages offer wide margins, and the text, which is in a single column throughout, is generously spaced, with breaks also inserted between stanzas. This spacing both implies a generous budget for paper, and anticipates an intellectual readership that may wish for space for marginal notes. Like prices, format conveyed meaning, with folios associated with prestige and quality. Their ‘size suggests a completeness and authority that distinguishes them from pamphlets and such “riff raff”’.¹² By publishing literary texts in folio, a format usually reserved for serious books like theological texts, reference works, and the works of classical writers, publishers could also stake a claim for the literary value of a given text.

While the Tonson edition leaves room for readerly annotation and engagement, Hills published his edition of *Absalom and Achitophel* with a ‘key’ claiming to reveal the historical figures represented by characters in the allegorical poem (e.g. it states ‘David, King Charles II, Absalom, D. Monmouth’, and so on). Keys were frequently added to late seventeenth-century political poems and they at times landed poets in hot water. Whilst these guides were at times inaccurate and predominantly added without the poet’s approval, they too will have impacted accessibility, with unknowing readers arguably feeling better informed and empowered when provided with a key.

Other material features, such as the use of paratexts, the ordering and selection of texts within a volume, subscription publication, and serialisation also profoundly impacted the reception of seventeenth-century English poets and poetry, and publishers of the seventeenth century were increasingly associated with recognisable house styles. It is to the three most prestigious literary publishers of the mid-late seventeenth century – Humphrey Moseley (d. 1661), Henry Herringman (d. 1704) and Jacob Tonson, the elder (d. 1736) – that I now wish to turn.

Moseley, Herringman and Tonson

Moseley, Herringman and Tonson were all bookseller-publishers, meaning that they purchased the rights in copy from authors and financed the publication of texts but also sold various titles, including those published by other stationers, from their shops.¹³ Each was required to complete an apprenticeship before being admitted to the freedom of the Stationers' Company,¹⁴ and each set up his own shop in or around London. Moseley initially traded alongside Nicholas Fussell at the Ball in St Paul's Churchyard, but in 1634 began trading independently from the sign of the Three Kings, before moving across St. Paul's Churchyard in 1638 to establish the Prince's Arms. Herringman's shop was the Blue Anchor in the New Exchange, and Tonson sold his wares from the Judge's Head in Chancery Lane, near Fleet Street, before moving to Gray's Inn Gate in 1700, when his nephew, Jacob Tonson the younger (1682-1735), began working with him. He settled in the Strand, opposite St Catherine's Street, in 1710, and changed his shop name to 'Shakespeare's Head'. The Shakespeare's head shop sign, like the infamous Sir Godfrey Kneller portrait he commissioned in which he sits holding a copy of his edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, reflects both Tonson's intense investment in specific authors, and how he fashioned himself as the maker of great English literature. After Tonson the elder's death, the family dynasty, or 'cartel', to borrow Andrew Murphy's label,¹⁵ continued to dominate literary publishing for another two generations.

Moseley, an important model for Tonson's later activities, established himself as 'the most prestigious literary publisher of the time' by issuing single-author editions of the work of leading poets and dramatists.¹⁶ His serial publications of pocket-sized play and poetry books encouraged both reading-on-the-go, and the collection and binding together of specific groups of authors, thereby laying the foundations for canons in the respective genres.¹⁷ His poetry series began with a book of Edmund Waller's poems in 1645, and he went on to

publish Milton's *Poems* the same year, before following suit with books of poetry by the likes of Thomas Carew (1651), Abraham Cowley (1647), Richard Crashaw (1646 and 1648), James Shirley (1646), John Suckling (1646, 1648 and 1658) and Henry Vaughan (1651). These books helped to establish his reputation as 'the main publisher of royalist literary works in the middle two decades of the seventeenth century'.¹⁸ As Peter Lindenbaum has argued, Moseley's poetry books were 'made to look like a series: Moseley's English Poets'; they resembled each other physically, with a familiar style established through size and format, prefaces from the stationer to the reader and, in some editions, via frontispiece portraits.¹⁹ Indeed, consumers were encouraged to 'buy more than one volume, perhaps even the entire series',²⁰ and the success of Moseley's attempts to encourage collection is evidenced by second-hand book catalogues like *A Choice Catalogue of the Library of John Parsons* (London, 1682), which shows that Parsons owned copies of both Moseley's Carew and his Milton.²¹

Moseley's construction of a personal brand was mutually exclusive with his selection and promotion of particular authors. He built a reputation as an arbiter of taste and, in his addresses to readers, praised the quality of the authors he published. He also depicted himself as a benevolent benefactor, publishing texts for the delight of his 'Countrey' and promoting the 'reputation' of his authors.²² This is not, however, to say that he was particularly concerned about the rights or wishes of the poets he published. In his Vaughan edition of 1651, he acknowledged that he did not have the poet's 'Approbation' (Vaughan wished for the manuscript to *Olor Iscanus* to be destroyed), but insisted that he did have the legal right to publish Vaughan ('I have Law on my side').²³ Moseley was elected one of the Wardens of the Stationers' Company in 1659 and enjoyed a very successful career. When he died in 1661, he was wealthy enough to bequeath money to his apprentices and did so on the condition that they help his wife, Anne, who continued his business until 1664.²⁴ After his

death, much of Moseley's stock was acquired by Herringman, who likewise brought out editions of Cowley, Crashaw, Donne, Suckling, and Waller.²⁵

It has been suggested that Herringman owed much of his early success to the fact that his shop, situated away from those of the majority of his rivals around St Paul's Churchyard, escaped the clutches of the Great Fire of London, a catastrophic event that decimated not only bookshops but also publishers' warehoused stock held within the city walls.²⁶ With the Blue Anchor untouched, Herringman would have been in a position to exploit the demand for books that his rivals were unable to satisfy in the immediate aftermath, but his career was long and illustrious, and his many achievements, like the prestigious position he went on to occupy within the Stationers' Company, were down to far more than sheer luck.²⁷ Herringman was an astute businessman who forged important relationships with contemporary poets, whom he helped to establish as the foremost poets of the late seventeenth century. The books Herringman published in turn helped to make him a very wealthy man. By the 1680s he had purchased a coat of arms, in 1684 he became a wholesale publisher, the first 'London Wholesale Publisher, in the modern sense of those words',²⁸ and by 1685 he had been named Master of the Stationers' Company.²⁹

It was in the late 1660s and 70s that Herringman acquired his reputation and the 'first position as the publisher of contemporary plays and verse',³⁰ and helped to establish the reputations of writers like William Davenant, Dryden, Cowley, Katherine Philips and others. Herringman's working relationship with Dryden is well known, and he appears to have also enjoyed close relationships with Davenant and Cowley,³¹ among others, with his shop functioning as an important hub for those seeking literary and cultural news and gossip.³² Unlike Moseley, Herringman did not tend to write prefaces or notes for inclusion in the titles he published. He instead appended prefaces by the poets themselves or else by other writers

he published – Dryden in particular – and, in doing so, helped to circulate early literary criticism.

Tonson is the most famous of the three publishers under consideration but it must be noted that his reputation today is largely based on his monopoly over Shakespeare publishing in the eighteenth century.³³ He only completed his apprenticeship (with Thomas Basset) in 1678, so when we talk of Tonson's seventeenth-century career it is important to remember that he was then still young, his business in its fledgling stage. Indeed, Tonson was only twenty-four years of age when he took over from Herringman as Dryden's publisher in 1679. By contrast, Dryden, already poet laureate since 1668, was forty-eight. Dryden and Tonson's collaboration had important implications for both men's careers and for the history of poetry more generally, a landmark publication being *Ovid's Epistles* (1680), verse translations 'by several hands'. It was the first major Dryden-Tonson collaboration and it not only proved commercially successful,³⁴ but also seems to have set in motion both Tonson's use of the 'by several hands' and 'most eminent hands' formulae and Dryden's increased output as a translator.³⁵ Tonson published and promoted individual authors – such as Milton, John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester, and Aphra Behn – but his greatest contribution to the history of poetry was the verse miscellany, an important genre that enabled him to also showcase (and help to preserve) the work of emerging and less prolific poets for whom a collected edition was an unlikely prospect.

Dryden and Tonson co-produced *Miscellany Poems*, an octavo volume which mixed translations of Virgil, Ovid, Horace and others with 'original poems' by the 'most Eminent Hands', in 1684 and *Sylvae: or, the Second Part of Poetical Miscellanies* a year later. A third part, *Examen Poeticum* appeared in 1693, and a fourth, *The Annual Miscellany: for the Year 1694*, in 1694. These were followed by a further two volumes in the early eighteenth century.³⁶ It is hard to overstate the significance of the Tonson miscellanies, 'the entire six-

volume collection stood as the apex of contemporary literary culture, and remained read and valued well into the following century'.³⁷ William Wycherley dubbed Tonson the 'Gentleman usher to the muses' and,³⁸ as the publisher himself noted, annual miscellanies offered the ideal way to 'preserve ev'ry choice copy [i.e., poem] that appears'.³⁹ The miscellanies did much to showcase Dryden's work as a writer and editor, but the volumes also helped both to preserve individual poems that may otherwise have been lost to posterity and to provide new reading contexts and audiences for poems that had previously circulated individually.

The three publishers thus played a crucial role in the transformation of individual texts into early modern classics and the canonisation of select poets, and a direct line of descent exists between Moseley, the earliest, and Tonson, the latest. Herringman at times collaborated with Moseley and, as mentioned above, purchased much of his stock and rights in copy after his death. Tonson likewise collaborated with Herringman on some projects and went on to acquire Herringman's stock. Each publisher is known for different innovations in the publication of *belles lettres*, and the stationers published many of the same poets, thereby allowing for direct comparison of the ways in which they presented specific titles and oeuvres to the book-buying public.

Making Milton

Herringman did not publish Milton, but Moseley and Tonson helped to make Milton's poems into prestigious works of literature, distancing their author from his mid-century reputation as the author of divorce tracts and a controversial supporter of the regicide, and transforming him into one of the foremost writers of the age. The Milton that emerges from Moseley's *Poems* (1645), a pocket-sized volume, is less a polemicist and more a writer of 'peculiar excellency', a poet first and foremost,⁴⁰ and one worthy of a place amongst the group of writers mentioned above, whom Moseley went on to dub 'the best Wits of our, and Foreign

Nations'.⁴¹ The volume has also been seen to transform Milton into a Royalist writer through association due to the fact that *Poems* physically resembled material books in the series of Royalist poets Moseley published in the 1640s and 50s.⁴²

Poems promoted Milton in the material form that was to become the hallmark of Moseley's house style: an octavo poetry book, featuring an author portrait, Latin epigraph and title-page endorsement through association with Henry Lawes, claims that the poems were printed from 'true copies', and the presentation of poems alongside a masque.⁴³ The aforementioned frontispiece portrait depicts Milton accompanied by the four muses. The title page states that these are the poems 'of Mr John Milton' and informs consumers that Milton wrote in both English and Latin, before referencing Milton's collaboration with Henry Lawes, 'Gentleman of the Kings Chappel, and one of his MAIESTIES Private Musick'. The contents, which include English and Latin verse in a range of forms, from odes and hymns to sonnets and occasional poems, and *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle*, present Milton as a versatile author, adept at writing in different genres. The order of the texts, which is roughly chronological, begins with what is known as Milton's coming-of-age poem, 'On the morning of CHRIST'S Nativity. Compos'd 1629'. Alongside this, the title-page's reference to these texts being 'Compos'd at several times', hints at authorial development over time. The epigraph from Virgil's seventh eclogue ('Bind my forehead with foxglove, lest evil tongues harm the future Bard') has even been read as a promise that more is to come from Milton as an emerging poet.⁴⁴ More was indeed to come as the collection went through new editions in 1673 (for Thomas Dring) and 1695 (for Tonson), with translations added and the number of sonnets almost doubled.

Tonson took over the mantle from Moseley and continued to canonise Milton through the book trade, beginning with a folio edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1688. Tonson first showed interest in publishing Milton during his apprenticeship,⁴⁵ but it would be some time before he

could obtain the financial acumen to allow him to do so. He purchased half of the rights in copy for *Paradise Lost* in 1683 and managed to finance his folio edition by negotiating with the owner of the other half, collaborating with Richard Bentley, with whom he had financed other projects, and through subscription publication. Subscription publication involved selling advanced copies of a text to customers willing to pay upfront in exchange for their names appearing in a prestigious subscribers list that enabled them to showcase both their wealth and their status as investors in important publishing ventures. Tonson's lack of funds had a positive impact on Milton's posthumous reputation as the use of subscriptions brought his poem in line with 'large learned books' previously financed in this way,⁴⁶ and led to his poem being publicly associated and endorsed by members of 'the nobility and gentry' from across the political spectrum.

Milton's *Paradise Lost* was by no means the household name it is today when Tonson decided to invest in a lavish folio edition replete with illustrations. It had been published by Samuel Simmons in quarto format (a sheet of paper folded twice) in 1667 and in octavo format in 1674 and 1678. Although innovative in its insertion of line numbers, the text of the first edition was cramped and there was no pagination. The first issue of the 1667 edition did not have any paratexts, nor did it include the now infamous explanation from Milton as to why the poem does not rhyme, but later issues of the first edition, in which the poem was divided into ten books, added fourteen pages worth of paratexts, including Milton's explanation and arguments detailing the action of each book, thereby helping to appease contemporary readers accustomed to heroic works, and emphasising the poem's epic genre. Simmons did not, however, go to the expense of resetting the type, so he could not situate each argument before the respective book, nor did he insert page breaks between the arguments. This meant that the arguments followed sequentially, with readers offered a synopsis of the entire epic before beginning the poem. It seems Simmons was willing to try to improve on his edition but that he

did not think he would make enough of a financial return to justify resetting the type until seven years later when he published the second edition.⁴⁷

In highlighting the impact of Tonson's *Paradise Lost* I do not wish to suggest that it was more significant than earlier editions because it came later or that its importance was due to the use of new techniques. It is instead exceptional in that Tonson chose to go above and beyond his predecessor's efforts – and beyond what anyone observing Milton and the poem's low popularity in 1688 might have expected – to provide a superior edition with the specific aim of elevating Milton to the rungs usually occupied by classical authors. Each edition of a given poem or poet's works creates meaning and shapes reception, and later editions are by no means always improvements on earlier printings. When the second and third editions of *Paradise Lost* appeared, they did so in smaller format and, while the arguments were now more usefully situated before each book – the poem now divided into twelve books – and commendatory poems were added, other material features made them less appealing than the first edition. As Don-John Dugas has argued, the 1674 edition was 'much less attractive' than the first because of 'the poor quality of its type'.⁴⁸ Concerning the third edition, cheap paper led to text bleeding through from recto to verso and vice versa and 'compositorial errors, chiefly foul case and omission' were introduced in this printing.⁴⁹ Sales of the first three editions also appear to have been slow,⁵⁰ and it is thus important to recognise that there was nothing inevitable about Tonson's decision to publish Milton in 1688.

Tonson's *Paradise Lost* folio was of exceptional quality and looked as though no expense had been spared. Robert B. Hamm Jr. rightly states that books published in folio format 'proclaimed their own merit, whether or not public opinion had yet deemed them worthy of such celebration', and this is especially true of Tonson's *Paradise Lost*, which smacked of prestige despite the lukewarm reception given to earlier editions of the poem.⁵¹ The volume, which sold for twelve to fifteen shillings (four times the price of the previous three editions of

the poem),⁵² featured an engraved portrait of Milton accompanied by a Dryden epigram that fashioned him as England's national poet and heir to Homer and Virgil. High-quality paper was adorned with clear type and detailed engravings were added to illustrate each book of the poem, with wide margins on every page inviting the annotations of a learned readership. In sum, the edition 'functioned as a material witness attesting to the quality of Milton's work [and] Tonson (and Bentley's) house style': it was an elite book presented as the work of an elite English author named John Milton.⁵³

Significantly, it was not until after the release and success of the 1688 folio that Tonson was able to purchase the other half of the rights in copy for *Paradise Lost*, a clear indication of how, in helping to elevate Milton's literary prestige, Tonson was able to increase his own financial worth. This in turn led Tonson to further invest in Milton editions.⁵⁴ Tonson and Bentley brought out a second folio edition in 1691 and Tonson purchased the rights of more of Milton's works so that he could independently publish a third folio edition with critical commentary by the scholar, Patrick Hume – an important landmark in English literary criticism – and a collection entitled *The Poetical Works of John Milton* in 1695.⁵⁵ Thus, in 1688 Tonson took a financial risk and was willing to go to great lengths to produce his *Paradise Lost* folio, and the project was greatly beneficial for both Tonson's career and for Milton's rise to cultural prominence.

Paper Shadows: Katherine Philips in Print

Earlier in the Restoration period, Herringman achieved a similar feat of authorial refashioning to those which Moseley and Tonson achieved with Milton. Herringman's 1667 folio edition of Philips helped to canonise her whilst – ironically – protecting her from the stigma of print publication and what she termed a 'false' edition. His folio edition appeared three years after Richard Marriot's unauthorised edition (1664), and shortly after the

appearance of her poems in a 1663 Dublin quarto miscellany, entitled *Poems by Several Persons*. Philips' works – rarely (and always anonymously) printed during her lifetime – predominantly circulated in manuscript form, with the poet keen to avoid the shame attached to print exposure, particularly for female poets of her social standing.⁵⁶ She died three years before Herringman's edition but lived long enough to express her great annoyance over Marriot's in a letter to Charles II's Master of Ceremonies, Sir Charles Cotterell.⁵⁷ Part of that letter was reproduced in Herringman's preface to the 1667 edition, thereby offering readers access to her description of herself as 'that unfortunate person that cannot so much as think in private, that must have [their] imaginations rifled and exposed to play the Mountebanks, and dance upon the ropes to entertain the rabble', and her concerns lest she be suspected of having given 'secret consent' to Marriot (A1v). Marriot's edition – titled '*Poems By the Incomparable Mrs K. P.*' – made the poet feel violated because, the letter / Herringman's preface suggests, it was printed 'absolutely against her consent', 'exposed' her (A1r), and reduced her not simply to the level of the public playhouses – a possible comment on the quarto format of Marriot's volume, which was usually reserved for playbooks – but even to the depths of unlicensed street and fairground performers.

By contrast, Herringman's volume – entitled *Poems by the Most Deservedly Admired Mrs. Katherine Philips The Matchless Orinda To which is added, Monsieur Corneille's Pompey and Horace, Tragedies. With several other Translations out of French* (1667) – helped to promote Philips' authorial legacy as a prestigious poet and translator. Like the folio format Herringman used, the volume's frontispiece portrait, produced by William Faithorne, placed Philips on a pedestal. For Peter Beal, 'the very gown draped around [Philips'] shoulders has a classical look, and implicit in the image of a niche is the idea of a classical pantheon of fame, in which all the most distinguished personages of history take their immortal place'.⁵⁸ It lent a face to 'Orinda', Philips' pen name, but also insisted that it was

not a true likeness, ‘only a poor paper shadow’ (a2r), and that her poems offer a far superior representation of her mind. It thus is and is not Philips, and one must lift the cover to see more of her, just as her poems are presented to readers as deeply private, carefully guarded and hidden texts that are available for consumption by those who purchase and open Herringman’s folio.

Accurate or not, the portrait is nonetheless a form of memorialisation further cemented by the inclusion of no fewer than seven commendatory poems by the Earl of Orrery, Abraham Cowley, the Earl of Roscommon and others in which Philips is praised for her character and her skills as a poet and translator. The poems stress her prestigious connections and also praise her as outdoing great poets like Orrery, despite her sex (‘In me it does not the least trouble breed, / That your fair Sex does Ours in Verse exceed’, b1r). She is even grouped with Cowley in James Tyrell’s poem which laments ‘What by Pindaricks can be done’ following the deaths of ‘*Pindar*’s greater son’ (i.e., Cowley) and ‘*Orinda*’ (i.e., Philips), asking ‘What Name like theirs shall we now call upon?’ (c1r). The authors of the commendatory poems included well-known aristocrats and the use of such paratexts, coupled with the collection’s opening poem, ‘On the Double Murder of Charles I’, mark this collection – and Philips by extension – as Royalist.⁵⁹ Herringman’s folio thus helped to memorialise the late author and influence subsequent perceptions of her talents and political allegiance.

Herringman’s volume has been described as a landmark publication not just in Philips’ afterlife, but also in the history of women’s writing more generally; as a posthumous edition it enabled her to be celebrated in print, without the ‘social stigma of a coterie member’ who *allowed* her work to be published.⁶⁰ Herringman’s use of Philips’ letter in his preface allows her the opportunity to publicly denounce the 1664 edition as published against her will, and to defend herself as one who ‘never writ any line in [her] life with an intention

to have it printed' (A1v). Philips also justifies how she came to appear in print in a way that (indirectly) praises her work: her friends made her 'so much believe they did not dislike [her poems], that [she] was betray'd to permit some copies for their divertissement' and this has resulted in 'worthy persons' of her entourage being 'expos'd' against her will (A2v). It was not her fault; she did not intend for print exposure to take place.

The preface's allusion to Philips' friends managing to 'suppress' the illegitimate volume also portrays her as 'well-connected socially', and speaks both to her 'social standing ... and [to her] virtuous reputation among her peers'.⁶¹ The physical make-up of Herringman's folio and the fashioning of Philips' clear opposition to print publication enable him to canonise her both as a prestigious and talented poet and as an 'incomparable lady'. For Susan L. Stafinbil, the folio 'set a precedent for the emblematic nature of Philips, or rather *The Matchless Orinda*, as the idealized female poet and the location of seventeenth-century female literary authority'.⁶² It may in this sense be argued that Herringman's Philips folio helped to create a new model of female poetic authorship, but it should also be noted that the manipulation of Philips' posthumous prefatory voice simultaneously enabled Herringman to portray himself as a reputable, trustworthy stationer keen to defend not only authors' rights, but more specifically the rights and reputations of female poets.

As many of the above examples show, poets did not always see eye-to-eye with publishers and other stationers when it came to payment or the material forms in which their works circulated, and a number of authors had their authorial reputations shaped by publishers after their death. Publishers were keen to promote their own legacy within the books they produced but poets in turn used their craft to undermine the personae publishers wished to fashion for themselves. Dryden evidently enjoyed a close working relationship with Herringman and then with Tonson, with whom it could even be said that he enjoyed a friendship. But disputes between poets and stationers sometimes spilled over into the real

world, and arguments between poets and publishers saw the worlds of poetry, print and publication merge. Dryden attacked Herringman and his bookshop in *MacFlecknoe*, depicting him as ‘Captain of the Guard’ during the coronation of Dryden’s rival, Thomas Shadwell, an author Herringman published, as the king of dull verse. Herringman’s shop is described as dusty, his authors and their books as ‘martyrs of Pies, and Reliques of the Bum’, i.e., destined not for longevity and canonisation but instead to see the paper on which they are printed recycled as pie wrappings and toilet paper.⁶³ Dryden also offered an unfavourable depiction of Tonson as ‘bullfac’d, and Freckled fair’ and apparently did so due to a dispute over payment.⁶⁴ Dryden (‘the old Satyrick bard’) and his unflattering description of Tonson then found their way into other poems, such as William Shippen’s *Faction Display’d* (London, 1704). Here, the attack on Tonson as *Bibliopolo* goes beyond his physical appearance to also include his political status as a Whig and his reputation as the leading publisher of poetic miscellanies. In Shippen’s poem, *Bibliopolo*, ‘With leering looks, Bullfac’d, and Freckled fair, / With two left legs, and Judas-colour’d Hair,’ stands ‘sweating and puffing’, before breaking out with an insult:

“I am the touchstone of all Modern Wit,
Without my Stamp, in vain your poets write.
Those only purchase everlasting Fame,
That in my Miscellany plant their Name.”

Bibliopolo boasts that he is ‘the founder of your love’d Kit-Kat’, where youth have been taught ‘to talk Prophane, and Laugh at Sacred truth. / ... to Tost, and Rhime and Bite, / To sleep away the Day, and drink away the Night’ (C4r). This Tonson is far from the literary connoisseur of the aforementioned Kneller portrait, with his prestigious *Paradise Lost* folio in hand, but the satirical statement the caricature makes would only work if Tonson really was seen by many as the yardstick by which poets were judged, his miscellany poetry

volumes as passports to cultural prominence and longevity. This literary example helped to inscribe or ‘plant’ Tonson’s ‘everlasting fame’ just as Tonson’s miscellanies (among other publications) helped to preserve and promote the work of numerous seventeenth-century poets. The appearance of publishers within poems takes us full circle and once again highlights the mutually dependent relationship that existed between the worlds of seventeenth-century poetry, print and publishing.

¹ I am grateful to Laura Knoppers and Maria Shmygol for their helpful feedback on this essay, and to the Swiss National Science Foundation for supporting my research.

² See, for example, Thomas Corns’ account in ‘Milton’s Quest for Respectability’, *Modern Language Notes*, 78 (1982), 769-79. On the tendency to ‘overemphasize Milton’s agency’, see Stephen B. Dobranski, who rightly counters such readings by emphasising the collaborative process of book production (*Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge 1999), Chs 1 and 4).

³ On the history of copyright in England, see John Feather, *Publishing, Piracy, and Politics: An Historical Study of Copyright in Britain* (New York, 1994).

⁴ Louis Lohr Martz, *Milton: Poet of Exile* (New Haven, 1986), 33.

⁵ David Masson, *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Times*, 6 vols. (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1965), 3: 458.

⁶ Carolyn Dinshaw, *How Soon is Now? Medieval Texts, Amateur Readers, and the Queerness of Time* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 135.

⁷ See also Richard M. Johnson, ‘The Politics of Publication: Misrepresentation in Milton’s 1645 *Poems*’, *Criticism*, 36 (1994), 45-71.

⁸ See Gordon Campbell and Thomas Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford, 2008), 182.

⁹ See Emma Depledge, John Garrison and Marissa Nicosia, ‘What Made Milton?’ in *Making Milton*.

¹⁰ Tonson also allowed subscribers to have their names engraved under illustrations of other heroes in the same volume. See Estella Choenberg, ‘Seventeenth-Century Propaganda in English Book Illustration’, *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, 25 (1992), 1-24.

¹¹ “‘Pirate Hills’ and the Quartos of *Julius Caesar*”, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 65 (1969), 177-94, 187-8.

¹² Francis X. Connor, *Literary Folios and ideas of the Book in Early Modern England* (New York, 2014), 2.

¹³ Some publishers were printer-publishers, meaning that they had their own print house and financed publications. Moseley, Herringman and Tonson were not printer-publishers.

¹⁴ Moseley served his apprenticeship with Matthew Lownes and gained his freedom in 1627; Henry Herringman began an apprenticeship under Abel Roper in 1644 and gained his freedom in 1652; and Tonson was apprenticed to Thomas Basset and gained his freedom in 1678.

¹⁵ *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 2021), 110.

¹⁶ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge, 1989), 19-22, 20. See also, Arthur F. Marotti *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca, 1995), 259-65; and on playbooks see Paulina Kewes, “‘Give me the sociable pocket-books’: Humphrey Moseley’s serial publication of octavo play collections”, *Publishing History*, 38 (1995), 5-21.

¹⁷ On his playbooks series, see Kewes.

¹⁸ Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric*, 262.

¹⁹ ‘Milton’s Contract’, *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, X (1992), 451-52.

²⁰ See David Scott Kastan, ‘Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature’, in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies After Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, (eds), Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin (Amherst, Massachusetts, 2007), 105-24, 114.

- ²¹ Lots 388, 20 and 294, 18 respectively. See Emma Depledge, John Garrison and Marissa Nicosia, 'What Made Milton?' in *Making Milton*, 4, n.13. For examples of libraries holding sammelbande of Moseley's playbooks, see Kewes, 19, n.37.
- ²² 'To the Reader', in Abraham Cowley, *The Mistress* (London, 1647), A2r.
- ²³ [a]1r. See also Kastan, 'Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature', 117.
- ²⁴ R. Wilcher, 'Moseley, Humphrey (d. 1661), bookseller'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Retrieved 1 Jun. 2022, from <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-19390>.
- ²⁵ William C. Miller, 'Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 42 (1948), 292-306.
- ²⁶ See Don-John Dugas, *Marketing the Bard: Shakespeare in Performance and Print, 1660-1740* (Columbia, 2006), 111.
- ²⁷ Dugas states that the fire destroyed 'about 83 percent of everything between the Chancery Lane and the Tower of London'. See *Marketing the Bard*, 111.
- ²⁸ Edward Arber, *The Term Catalogues* (London, 1905), II, 642. Feather, *A History of British Publishing*, 2nd edn. (London, 1988), 56-7 and Miller 'Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher', 302-03. He at this point handed his shop and stock over to Francis Saunders and Joseph Knight.
- ²⁹ C. Ferdinand, 'Herringman, Henry (bap. 1628, d. 1704), bookseller'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Retrieved 1 Jun. 2022, from <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37538>.
- ³⁰ 'Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher', 296.
- ³¹ See, for example, his prefatory note to his Davenant folio.
- ³² See, for example, Samuel Pepys, October 5, 1665, in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, 1666*, Robert Latham and William Matthews eds (London, 1996), 380.
- ³³ On Tonson's Shakespeare publications, see Murphy, *Shakespeare in Print*, Chs. 3 and 4.
- ³⁴ It went through new editions in 1681, 1683, 1688 and 1693. See Stuart Gillespie, 'The Early Years of the Dryden-Tonson Partnership: The Background to Their Composite Translations and Miscellanies of the 1680s', *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, 12 (1988) 10-19, 12.
- ³⁵ See Stuart Gillespie, 'The Early Years of the Dryden-Tonson Partnership'; and Paul Hammond, who notes that Tonson provided 'Dryden with a financial incentive to pursue that side of his interest' and publishing formats that 'allowed Dryden to be selective in his translating, and to concentrate on those mutually complementary and contrasting portions of the classics which appealed to his philosophical interests' ('The Circulation of Dryden's Poetry', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 86 (1992), 379-409, 385-86).
- ³⁶ A further two Tonson miscellany volumes, edited by Nicholas Rowe, were published in 1704 and 1709.
- ³⁷ Barbara M. Benedict, 'Choice Reading: Anthologies, Reading Practices and the Canon, 1680-1800', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 45 (2015), 35-55, 40.
- ³⁸ Quoted in Kathleen M. Lynch, *Jacob Tonson, Kit-Kat Publisher* (Knoxville, 1971), 67.
- ³⁹ 'The Bookseller to the Reader', in *Examen Poeticum*, B7v.
- ⁴⁰ 'The Stationer to the Reader', a4r.
- ⁴¹ The quotation, an act of mutual promotion, comes from an epistle prefacing Suckling's *The Last Remains* of 1659, by when Moseley felt able to claim to be an astute judge of taste, because he had '(for many years) annually published the Productions of the best Wits...' (A3r).
- ⁴² See, for example, Warren Chernaik, 'Books as Memorials: The Politics of Consolation', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 207-17.
- ⁴³ As mentioned above (n.1), Milton's biographers have at times overstated Milton's agency in the production of *Poems*. Moseley's preface, 'The Stationer to the Reader' states that he was also the instigator behind the project as he claims to have solicited Milton's papers from him (*Poems*, a4r).
- ⁴⁴ 'Baccare frontem / Cingite, ne vati noceat mala lingua futuro'. See Stella P. Revard, ed., *John Milton Complete Shorter Poems* (Oxford, 2009), 1.
- ⁴⁵ See Lynch, *Jacob Tonson: Kit-Kat Publisher*, 13.
- ⁴⁶ John Barnard, 'London Publishing, 1640-1660: Crisis, Continuity and Innovation', *Book History*, 4 (2001), 1-16, 11. This was the first work of imaginative literature to be published by subscription.
- ⁴⁷ See R. G. Moyles, *The Text of Paradise Lost: A Study in Editorial Procedure* (Toronto, 1985) and Milton, *Authorship, and the Book Trade*, 35-36.
- ⁴⁸ *Marketing the Bard*, 77.
- ⁴⁹ Moyles, *The Text of Paradise Lost*, 32.
- ⁵⁰ See Kerry MacLennan, 'John Milton's Contract for *Paradise Lost*: A Commercial Reading', *Milton Quarterly*, 44 (2010), 221-30.
- ⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² See John Barnard, 'Large- and Small-Paper Copies of Dryden's *The Works of Virgil* (1697): Jacob Tonson's Investment and profits and the Example of *Paradise Lost* (1688), *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 92 (1998), 259-71, 270.

⁵³ Emma Depledge, 'Repackaging Milton for the Late Seventeenth-Century Book Trade: Jacob Tonson, and John Dryden's *The State of Innocence*', in *Making Milton*, 42-52, 49.

⁵⁴ Milton claimed that the folio was his most lucrative publication. See Barnard, 'Large- and Small-Paper Copies'.

⁵⁵ See Marcus Walsh, 'Literary Annotation and Biblical Commentary: The Case of Patrick Hume's 'Annotations' on *Paradise Lost*', *Milton Quarterly*, 22 (1988), 109-14.

⁵⁶ See Marie-Louise Coolahan, "'We Live by Chance, and Slip into Events': Occasionality and the Manuscript Verse of Katherine Philips', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland / Iris an Dá Chultúr*, 18 (2003), 9-23.

⁵⁷ Patrick H. Thomas, (ed.), *The Collected Works of Katherine Philips: The Matchless Orinda*, Volume II: The Letters (Stump Cross, 1992), 124.

⁵⁸ *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998), 175-6.

⁵⁹ Philips' royalism was also clear from many manuscript poems but, as with any collection, the order in which Philips' poems were presented in print had an impact on the ways in which she was perceived by consumers and produces an image of Philips that differs from the poet that emerges from consultation of her manuscript poems. See Elizabeth H. Hegerman 'Making a Good Impression: Early Texts of Poems and Letters by Katherine Philips, the "Matchless Orinda"', *South Central Review*, 11 (1994), 39-65, 43.

⁶⁰ Susan L. Stafinbil, 'The Matchless Orinda and the Imprint of Virtue: Locating Katherine Philips' Literary Authority in the 1667 Folio Edition of her Work', *Restoration: Studies in English literary Culture, 1660-1700*, 40 (2016), 45-66, 48, emphasis mine.

⁶¹ Stafinbil, 'The Matchless Orinda', 47.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Dryden, *Mac Flecknoe, or, A Satyr upon the True-Blew-Protestant Poet, T.S.* (London: for Jacob Tonson, 1682), A4r.

⁶⁴ See Hammond and David Hopkins (eds), *The Poems of John Dryden*, vol. 5, 1697-1700 (Harlow, 2005), 26.