

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF  
THE FIRST PRINTING OF HOLY LIVING

by

WILLIAM PROCTOR WILLIAMS

B. A. Kansas State University, 1961

---

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

Approved by:



Major Professor

LD  
2468  
R4  
1964  
W728  
C2

CONTENTS

A Bibliographic and Historical Study of  
the First Printing of Holy Living ..... Page 1

Appendix A ..... Page 25

Appendix B ..... Page 26

Notes ..... Page 29

Bibliography ..... Page 33

A Bibliographical and Historical Study of  
the First Printing of Holy Living

Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living was certainly first published in 1650, but there are two different imprints found on its title-page. One imprint reads, "LONDON, / Printed for Richard Royston at the / Angel in Ivie-lane. / MDCL." the other "LONDON, / Printed for Francis Ash, Book- / Seller in Worcester. / MDCL." This variation has led to a welter of misunderstandings about the first edition of Holy Living, for everyone has assumed that Royston, Taylor's usual publisher, must have published the first edition and that Ash then published a second edition. The fact has been overlooked that it was not unusual for seventeenth-century books to have several imprints in a single edition. Since the title-page was actually an advertisement telling where the book was to be sold, there could be as many imprints on copies of one edition as there were book-sellers who had agreed to sell the book. Neither has the fact that the first edition of Holy Dying, printed only one year later, exhibits at least four imprints ever been brought to bear on the problem.

Even the barest sort of historical study of the book's publication has been neglected. The discovery that Francis Ash, not Richard Royston, entered Holy Living in the Stationers Register forced me to make a reappraisal of the whole subject of the first edition of Holy Living. Earlier bibliographical studies, such as those by Lowndes and Allibone,<sup>1</sup> offer no explanation of the matter. Reginald Heber, in his standard edition of Taylor's works, chose to reprint a Royston copy.<sup>2</sup> Robert Gathorne-Hardy, after comparing the title-pages and very briefly examining the copies, tentatively concluded that all the copies printed in 1650 were of the same

edition. However, his work is so brief that he offers no evidence, aside from the title-pages, for his conclusion.<sup>3</sup> Donald Wing, in his Short-Title Catalogue of Books, 1641-1700, considers the first edition to consist of the copies bearing the Royston imprint and those bearing the Ash imprint to be of another.<sup>4</sup>

I have now compared in detail a microfilm of a copy bearing the Ash imprint from the Houghton Library at Harvard with a microfilm of a copy bearing the Royston imprint from the Huntington Library; there can be little doubt that both copies were printed from the same setting of type and belong to the same edition. My study, however, uncovered some previously unknown, or unnoted variants, which indicated that more than just a passing mention would be needed to account for them.

The first section of my paper will have a twofold purpose. Initially I will present that evidence which shows all the copies of 1650 to be of one edition. An auxiliary consideration is those variants which seem to indicate that more than a simple and uneventful printing is involved. Some of the variants suggest an extra-bibliographical explanation, and the second section of my paper will treat the historical background of the printing of Holy Living in an attempt to account for these variants.

Three tests and studies performed on the two copies of the 1650 printing of Holy Living demonstrate conclusively that both FA and RR<sup>5</sup> are of the same edition. The McKerrow "Ruler Test" was applied to every page of the book. McKerrow describes the test in this way:

Take any page of the book and find in it two full stops at a distance of some ten or a dozen lines apart (if possible the lines should be towards the centre of the page.) Note of course the page and the words before the stops so as to identify them. Now lay a ruler on the page from one of these stops to the other and note the letters or parts of letters that it

cuts. If a rule placed in a similar position in the other copy cuts the same letters, the chances are many hundreds to one that the two pages were printed from the same setting-up of type; for however carefully a compositor followed his original, the irregularity in the casting of type and spaces would almost inevitably prevent the two prints corresponding in this respect.<sup>6</sup>

This test showed only two variants, both stop-press corrections, which will be dealt with later.

The second test was to compare the last few words of each line on the right hand side of the type page on the recto of every leaf.<sup>7</sup> Because of the irregularities of the type it would have been very difficult for a compositor, even following an already printed copy of the same format, to set the book line for line. The test, of course, overlapped the "Ruler Test" and it turned up nothing that the earlier test had not found.

In the third test a comparison of the signatures, marginal material, and other material external to the type page was made to check on its relation to the type page. For example, the signatures were compared to see if they were in the same position on each leaf, relative to the type page, in both copies. This test also indicated that FA and RR were identical. Besides these three tests, a casual check of wrong font letters, broken types, and irregularities was made. This showed that whenever one of these items occurred in one copy, the other copy was identical.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to the tests, sixty four pages of the book were fully collated.<sup>9</sup> No new variants were discovered, but many broken types, wrong fonts, and similar items were found. The occurrences of these irregularities were identical in both copies and some of the types were found to reoccur throughout the book. For example, one broken n is found in both copies on page 2, line 24; page 237, line 16; and page 393, line 32. A

broken horizontal rule occurs in both copies on pages 45, 67, 173, 229, and 260. An ornamental rule with a wide space in the center is found on pages 1, 60, 180, and 227.<sup>10</sup>

There are several instances of misnumbered pages and errors in setting the running heads, but the same errors, with one exception, are found in all copies. Seventeenth century printers were not greatly concerned with accuracy of page numbering, except under special circumstances, and they would not normally stop their presses to change a pagination error. Of the seven numbering errors, only one has been corrected. The error is in the copy of Holy Living owned by Robert Gathorne-Hardy, and has page 273 misnumbered as 173. The two copies that I worked with had this page correctly numbered. There is, however, a fairly simple explanation of the proof-reader's concern for page 273. The 1650 edition of Holy Living is printed in duodecimo. These gatherings were usually produced, says McKerrow, by cutting off the bottom one third of the perfected sheet and then folding this portion twice while the remainder was folded as an octavo. Since the printer would be creating another sheet by cutting each sheet into two parts, he would be more careful than usual, making sure that the part to be cut away was clearly identified. Page 273 occurs as the verso (the unsigned side) of I5, which is the first leaf in the cut away portion of the forme. The page number would occur, in this case, at the outside edge of the forme and thus in an easy position to correct. It is likely that the proof-reader, or the pressmen, noticed this error after a few sheets had been printed and corrected it.

It is not surprising that only one of the six remaining pagination errors occurs in the portion of the forme that was cut away: page 224 or I5. The misnumbering of this page was probably unimportant, since 224

is the recto of I5, a signed page, and therefore, quite easily identifiable. The five remaining errors all occur in the octavo portion of the forme where the normal signatures were identification enough. Except for the single instance, both copies share the same pagination errors.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, an obvious and usually overlooked piece of information indicating that these copies are part of one edition is the fly title-page. It is found in both FA and RR, but the imprint in both copies reads "LONDON printed for R: Royston / in Ivy lane. 1650". The plate used to print the fly title-page was surely owned by Royston, since it appears in later editions of Holy Living printed for him. However, the type in the plate was not fixed, because the date in the imprint is changed in each subsequent edition. Since the type in the imprint could be changed, why weren't some of these fly title-pages printed with Ash's name on them? The answer is that the printers and Francis Ash, for reasons I will treat later, were not greatly concerned with the fly title-page's imprint. They were only concerned with the title-page and did not bother to change the type to print off some copies with Ash's name on them. Furthermore, an examination of the paper that the fly title-page is printed on and the way the preliminary gathering is bound in the book<sup>13</sup> indicates that this page was not printed separately, but was part of the printing process for the gathering. Since we find the fly title-page printed in the same forme with the title-page and the other material in the 4<sup>th</sup> gathering, this is but another indication that FA and RR are of the same edition.

There are some variants, however, which might cause us to think that FA and RR are not of the same edition, but these too are most logically explained if we assume that both copies are of the same edition. These variants fall into two categories which I have chosen to designate as "certain" and "probable" variants.

The most obvious variants occur on the title-page. The first state, State I, is as follows:

THE RVLE / AND / EXERCISES / OF / HOLY LIVING. / In which  
are described / The MEANS and INSTRUMENTS / of obtaining  
every Vertue, and the / Remedies against every Vice, and /  
Considerations serving to the / resisting all temptations. /  
Together with / Prayers containing the whole duty of / a  
Christian, and the parts of Devotion / fitted to all Occasions,  
and furnish'd / for all Necessities. / [single rule] /  
[flower design enclosed in a box of fleurs de lis, centered] /  
[single rule] / LONDON, / Printed for Francis Ash, Book- /  
Seller in Worcester. / MDCL.

State II, which I have not been able to look at, is described by Robert Gathorne-Hardy in this way:

THE RVLE / AND / EXERCISES / OF / HOLY LIVING. / In which  
are described / The MEANS and INSTRUMENTS / of obtaining  
every Vertue, and the / Remedies against every Vice, and /  
Considerations serving to the / resisting all temptations. /  
Together with / Prayers containing the whole duty of / A  
Christian, and the parts of Devotion / fitted to all Occasions,  
and furnish'd / for all Necessities. / [single rule] /  
[flower design enclosed in a box of fleurs de lis, centered] /  
[single rule] / LONDON, / Printed for, Francis Ash, Book- /  
Seller in Worcester. / MDCL.<sup>14</sup>

The sixth line, "In which are described," is here set in italics rather than roman. The initial letter of the thirteenth line is set as upper case rather than lower case. State III is identical to State II except for the imprint:

THE RVLE / AND / EXERCISES / OF / HOLY LIVING. / In which are  
described / The MEANS and INSTRUMENTS / of botaining every  
Vertue and the / Remedies against every Vice, and / Consider-  
ations serving to the / resisting all temptations. / Together  
with / Prayers containing the whole duty of / A Christian,  
and the parts of Devotion / fitted to all Occasions, and  
furnish'd / for all Necessities / [single rule] / [flower  
design enclosed in a box of fleurs de lis, centered] / [single  
rule] / LONDON, / Printed for Richard Rovston at the / Angel  
in Ivrie-lane. / MDCL.

In attempting an explanation of the three states of the title-page there are essentially two problems. The variants in lines six and thirteen must have some technical explanation if both FA and RR have the same title-



page. The variant imprints themselves are a much less important problem, since it is quite possible for copies of the same edition to have different imprints on their title-pages.<sup>15</sup> These two imprints, in fact, suggest that we are dealing with variant states of the same edition quite as much as they suggest two editions.

The variants in lines six and thirteen would seem to indicate that the printers had stopped printing the forme containing the title-page and reset only those two lines. Printers were not usually so concerned with minute points of typography that they would stop printing merely to substitute a line of italic type for a line of roman. Therefore, it is not likely that these variants were introduced intentionally to correct or change a reading on the title-page since we have no evidence that either lines six or thirteen were ever incorrectly set. The resetting could not have benefitted anyone and it would have cost the printer a little something in wasted labor. The variants must have been introduced, therefore, by an accident of some sort, and there are at least two possible explanations. First, the variants were both introduced at the same time, because of the same accident. Second, the variants were introduced at different times, because of separate accidents. A careful examination of States I and III<sup>16</sup> shows that they are similar in every detail except for lines six and thirteen, and the imprint. Furthermore, the italic types in State III are in exactly the same position, relative to the other types in the title-page, as the roman types in State I. This renders the first explanation virtually impossible, since any accident large enough to affect both lines six and thirteen would certainly have displaced other types on the page. In considering the second explanation, we must remember that if the variants were introduced at different times, then we have created

another state of the title-page, State IA, which is apparently not extant. This is a bibliographical phantom which I do not care to conjure up. What does seem probable is that because of some accident, such as breakage of type, the sixth line of the title-page was reset, in italic rather than roman type for some unknown reason. Perhaps the italic case was easier for the compositor to reach than the roman case, but the real reason for the compositor's use of italic is known only to him. For some reason unrelated to line six, the printer decided to change the initial letter in line thirteen while the forme was unlocked. Perhaps the lower case a was not printing clearly and the compositor decided to change it now and avoid a future delay. The substitution of upper for lower case was probably a matter of convenience, not style.

The variant imprints on the title-page need little explanation. The "Ruler Test" shows that the second and third lines from the bottom of the page (the lines containing the imprint) were the only lines altered in changing the imprint. It was changed for a very obvious reason. The printer had to print some copies for Ash and some for Royston. The title-page variants, therefore, point to a resetting of the title-page in the same edition rather than to two editions. It is not likely that two title-pages could be set which otherwise conformed so closely in all respects.

The second major variant, the "Appendix," contains prayers for the King and it is found only in FA, on S2 and S3, S3<sup>v</sup> being blank. The prayers have page and line numbers indicating their intended place in the book.<sup>17</sup> The places for their use are marked in the text by asterisks in both FA and RR. In FA the colophon is on S4, which is unsigned; it reads "LONDON, / Printed by R. Norton. / MDCL." RR lacks the "Appendix" and it ends with an identical colophon on an unsigned leaf, S2, in the RR copy.<sup>18</sup> Since the

"Appendix" only takes up two leaves, the final gathering in FA is a duodecimo in fours. The operation of adding or cancelling leaves in such a gathering would be fairly simple. If the leaves were to be added, the "Appendix" would have been printed on a sheet one sixth the size of the other duodecimo sheets of this volume, and then would have been folded once and slipped inside the already existing S1 (containing the last leaf of regular text) and the unsigned leaf containing the colophon. If S2 and S3 were cancelled, the bolts would have been cut and the two center leaves removed. Since tests on the colophon<sup>19</sup> prove that the one in FA is identical to the one in RR, even to the same broken ornamental rule, then S2 in RR and S4 in FA, which are both unsigned, are the same leaves.

There are at least two stop-press corrections in the book. Both occur in the preliminary gathering, signed T7, and both are in the dedication. The first variant is found on T7, lines 5 and 6 FA reads " . . . with all; and they that do . . ." and RR reads " . . . with all men; and they that / do . . .". The reading in FA appears to be the earlier state of the text. The second variant occurs on T8, lines 14 and 15. FA reads ". . . let / them serve . . ." while RR reads " . . . let / let them serve . . .". Here RR has the earlier state of the text. T7 is part of the outer forme and T8 is part of the inner forme. Hence, FA has the earlier state of the outer forme and the later state of the inner forme, while RR has just the reverse. This sort of situation comes about either when only part of the stack of sheets already printed on one side is turned over to begin the perfecting process, or when the printer has hung or spread out the sheets to dry. In other words, it can occur only when the normal order of the sheets is disturbed during perfecting. Since the inner forme and outer formes of the T7 gathering were obviously perfected in this way, both FA

and RR are made up of sheets coming from the same stack--the same setting of type.<sup>20</sup>

There are several "possible" variants which also indicate that FA and RR were put together from the same sheets. These have to do with printing "furniture" which the pressmen have noticed and adjusted so that they no longer print. Sometimes FA will have the corrected state and at other times RR will have the corrected state. The movement of the states of the text in both directions (from FA to RR and from RR to FA), just as was the case with the stop-press corrections, shows that both copies were made up from the same stack of sheets.<sup>21</sup>

It should be apparent by this time that the various copies of Holy Living printed for Francis Ash and Richard Royston in 1650 are all of the same edition--the first. The only two variants which are important are the title-page and the "Appendix," because they may have more than merely technical reasons for their existence. Why was Francis Ash, of all people, involved in the publishing of the book? Why would Royston, Taylor's publisher, allow Ash to share in the publication of Holy Living? Why do only the Royston copies of Holy Living lack the "Appendix"? And why, since Royston had the opportunity to know about the book first, did Francis Ash register Holy Living in the Stationers' Register? It is to these questions that the next section of the paper is addressed.

## II

The Stationers Company, which had been a tool of the Tudor monarchs, became the Long Parliament's cudgel. Censorship had been repressive under Elizabeth, with book burnings and various restrictions on the number of presses and printers that could legally operate. It was a suppression

sought, however, by the "worshipful Company of Stationers," because the smaller the number of book dealers, the greater the profits for those few who held virtual monopoly over it. The voices raised in protest against the repressive measures among the members of the Company were few indeed.

In the early 1630's, however, Archbishop Laud became increasingly concerned about the large number of Puritan pamphlets and books that were being published, and he enforced stricter censorship to stop the printing of such books. The 1637 Decree of the Star Chamber, passed at Laud's instigation, gave the Stationers' Company sweeping powers of search.<sup>22</sup> Naturally the Laudian and Royalist segments of the Company were the individuals doing the searching, and Company members of different persuasions were the people being searched. As the political and religious tensions built up within the nation, the printers of "seditious" (a term whose definition varied according to the group using it) books and pamphlets were thrown into prison, their property was confiscated, and the Laudian elements of the book-trade enjoyed full control over the industry. Michael Sparke, one of the most vocal Puritans in the Company, was badly treated and fined by the Star Chamber.<sup>23</sup> Among the endeavours which caused Sparke's difficulties with "my lord of Canterbury" and the Star Chamber were pamphlets crying out against the papistical pictures used in the Edinburgh edition of the authorized version of the Bible, printed by Robert Young in 1633 in honor of Charles I's Scottish coronation.<sup>24</sup>

Robert Young was the King's Printer for Scotland and had formerly been a printer and book-seller in London. He was a member of the Royalist faction of the Stationers' Company and was an influential member of the trade. Before his appointment to Scotland, on April 12, 1632, he had been in partnership with Miles Fletcher, who had obtained favors from Archbishop

Abbott and seems to have been an equally important stationer. Young chose to purchase some pictures for the 1633 Bible from Francis Ash, whom Sparke had called "a strong and secret Papist [who had developed a good business, dealing in Catholic pictures] . . . and the like." Ash had taken the pictures to France, where he had purchased more Catholic pictures and had some of his collection engraved by a Mr. Holland.<sup>25</sup> When the Bible appeared, Sparke and the other Roundheads were quick to accuse Ash of Popery and to condemn the 1633 Bible as heretical.<sup>26</sup> As early as 1633, Ash was probably known to some of the members of the Royalist circle of printers and book-sellers.

Ash is a rather elusive character. He took up his freedom in the Stationers' Company on August 10, 1627,<sup>27</sup> and then slipped from our view until 1633. In 1644 he took Francis Rea of Worcester as an apprentice.<sup>28</sup> Five years later he again appeared, this time as the publisher of Taylor's The Great Exemplar.<sup>29</sup>

In the meantime, the Long Parliament had come into session, and suddenly the domination of the book-trade passed from the Royalists to the Puritans. At first the Parliament sought to ease the censorship restrictions. At the same time, however, it took reprisals against the Royalist stationers for their earlier maltreatment of the Puritans in the Company. Parliament appointed a Committee for Religion, which heard the complaints of Puritans who had been abused under Laud and meted out punishment to their tormentors. At the same time there was a Committee of Printing, which heard cases and repaid printers and book-sellers who had been fined or damaged by the former regime.<sup>30</sup>

Eventually the Parliament found itself criticized in print, just as the King and the bishops had been earlier, and it resorted to the same

measures. First it employed polemicists, one of whom was John Milton, to defend the Parliament. However, rather than stopping the criticism of the Parliament, such writers only stirred up more abusive comment by the Royalist-high church authors. It became clear that the only methods that would work would be the old ones. The first Ordinance against the book-trade was passed on March 9, 164 $\frac{2}{3}$ . It gave the Committee of Examination powers to appoint searchers for the investigation of the printing of "scandalous and lying pamphlets."<sup>31</sup> Emotions were now running at full tide and the Ordinance did not appear to help much, since just three months later, on June 14, 1643, another Ordinance was passed. This Ordinance was concerned with the failure of the Royalist members of the Company to respect monopolies on certain kinds of books, such as law books, held by Puritans, and the total disregard, by Royalists, of the need to have a book approved by Parliament and registered in the Stationers' Register before it was printed. To stop this sort of high handed operation, the Ordinance stipulated that "no book, pamphlet, or paper, should be printed, bound, stitched, or put to sale without the licence of the person appointed by the Parliament to licence it and without being entered in the Registers of the Company."<sup>32</sup> The Company of Stationers, the Sergeant of the Commons, Justices of the Peace, and Constables were given the right to search anyone suspected of such an offense, and they were empowered to commit anyone to prison who was found to be violating this Ordinance.<sup>33</sup>

The Company was at war within itself, as England was at war within itself. The dominant group, the Roundheads, registered almost everything that they intended to print and were quite high handed in dealing with lucrative books, such as law books and school texts.<sup>34</sup> The Royalists either did not register at all, or registered only a few of the titles that they

were planning to print. With increased powers of search invested in the Parliamentary faction of the Company, even extending to people outside the Company, stationers who were printing "seditious" books found it increasingly more difficult to circumvent the law.

In 1643 and 1644 a rift began to develop in the Parliamentary Party between the Presbyterian and Independent branches. Perhaps because of this, and because as the war continued it became more and more obvious that the Parliamentary forces were winning, the period between 1643 and 1647 was marked by an easing of the censorship restrictions.

During the period from 1640 to 1645, Taylor, who had just left his post as Laud's Chaplain, was beneficed to Uppingham in Rutland. Sometime in 1640 or 1641 he was appointed as the King's Chaplain in Ordinarie. He was with Charles I by August 1642, and remained with the King until 1645, when Taylor turned up in South Wales.<sup>35</sup> Just why he had left the King is not clear. He might have seen that the King's fight against Parliament was doomed to failure and have decided to flee the wrath to come as so many Royalists did toward the end of the Civil War. In the 1640's Taylor had written and published three treatises defending high church views, and he may have been seeking refuge from the blow which might fall on him as he had seen it fall on his old patron, Archbishop William Laud. In the dedication to The Liberty of Propheying, printed for Richard Royston in 1647, Taylor says, "I am engaged in the defence of a great truth, and I would willingly find a shroud to cover myself from danger and calumny."<sup>36</sup>

If safety was Taylor's goal in going to South Wales, he was not at first successful, for the war followed him and he was taken prisoner when the Royalist forces were defeated before Cardigan Castle. He was soon released, however, and became the chaplain to Lord Vaughan, Earl of Carbery.



Carbery was strong enough to insure Taylor's protection, and it was at Carbery's home, Golden Grove, that Taylor lived during most of the Protectorate Period. He seems to have had sufficient contact with the outside world to know of the events going on in the rest of England, and he journeyed to London at least once to see Charles I before his execution.<sup>37</sup>

Richard Royston, one of the leading figures in the Royalist faction of the Stationers' Company, had begun to print Taylor's works in the early 1640's. Although Taylor was a popular author and the financial aspect of such publications had probably influenced Royston, it is not likely that such works as The Liberty of Propheying and The Episcopacy Asserted were undertaken by Royston for profit only. He was book-seller to Charles I, and later to Charles II and James II, and was so completely devoted to the Anglican faith that he stipulated in his will that whoever became holder of his copyrights after his death had to be a member of the Church of England.<sup>38</sup> In 1645 he was accused by the Parliament of being a factor in printing and selling scandalous books and pamphlets, and was imprisoned.

In late 1648 and early 1649, Taylor and Royston were deeply involved in getting the King's Eikon Basilike through the press. Taylor is supposed to have suggested the title on the assumption that the censors would not be familiar enough with Greek to understand from the title what the work was about.<sup>39</sup> The book appeared in 1649 with Royston listed as publisher; shortly thereafter, September 20, 1649, the Parliament passed another Ordinance against the trade. The passage of the Ordinance was brought about by the furor which occurred when Charles I was executed on January 30, 164<sup>8</sup>/<sub>9</sub>, and the publication of Charles' book posthumously did nothing to calm things. Many of the Roundheads were quick to dissociate themselves from the act, and the royalists were equally quick and bitter in attacking the

"crime" in print. The Ordinance of 1649 read very much like the Act of the Star Chamber in 1637. Every publication had to be approved by the Clerk of the Parliament and registered in the Company's Registers. All bundles of printed matter were subject to inspection, including all things sent by post or carrier, and there was a fine of forty shillings for every illegal copy found. All printing, except for the university printers, a press in York, and a press in Finsbury, was restricted to the City of London, and every printer was required to enter into a bond of £300 to insure his good behavior. Furthermore, no printer could refit his shop without first telling the Company (meaning Parliament) of his intentions. Although the state of the book-trade after 1650 is not our concern in this paper, it should be pointed out that after the rise of Cromwell to Lord Protector, the repression of the industry became less severe.<sup>40</sup>

Only one month after the Parliament passed its Ordinance against the book-trade, Royston and John Grismond were called before the Committee for Suppressing Scandalous Pamphlets. The Committee was to "examine Rich. Royston, stationer, and Jno. Grismond, printer, as to printing a virulent and scandalous pamphlet." One week later, October 31, 1649, Royston was forced into a bond of £500 (£200 more than that required by law) with two sure ties of £500 each, "on condition that [he would] appear when required and [would] not ... print or sell any unlicensed book or pamphlets in the meantime."<sup>41</sup> It is evident from this information, that the searchers were at Royston's shoulder constantly. He would surely have been careful when such great sums of money were involved.

Another man who would probably have borne watching was Roger Norton. He was the son of Bonham Norton, King's Printer from 1596 until 1635. Bonham Norton's successor was not his son, but Robert Barker, because Barker

held a mortgage on the King's printing house. Roger Norton certainly did not lack cheek, for he, with his brother John, broke into the King's printing house which Barker had foreclosed on and was now occupying, and carried off the whole stock of type and printing materials.<sup>42</sup> We cannot tell if this is the way Roger set himself up in the printing business, but by the mid-1640's he was quite regularly the printer for Royston's publishing ventures.

As the fifth decade of the century began to draw to a close the lives of those involved in the printing of Holy Living began to revolve in ever-converging orbits. Ash was probably brought into the Royston group, which consisted of printers and book-sellers who were associated with Royston through business, politics,<sup>43</sup> or both, by Robert Young's son, James. It will be remembered that Miles Fletcher and Robert Young had been partners before the latter's appointment as King's Printer for Scotland, and since then Fletcher had bought an interest in the King's printing house, thus connecting him with Roger Norton, who still thought of himself as the King's Printer,<sup>44</sup> and with Royston.<sup>45</sup> When Robert Young died in 1643, leaving his business to his son, James went into the printing trade in London and was apparently part of Royston's group since he printed Taylor and Wyatt's A New and Easie Institution of Grammar for Royston in 1647. James inherited all of his father's copyrights and other dealings probably among which were some transactions with Ash.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, the attacks on Ash's pictures in the 1633 Edinburgh edition of the Bible could hardly have kept from making Ash's name a general subject for discussion among the Royalist and Anglican stationers. Whether or not Ash was physically present in London in the late 1640's, his name and reputation were well known to all.

By late 1646 or early 1647, Royston was publishing everything that Taylor wrote. In 1647 he took over the publication of A Discourse

Concerning Prayer Ex-tempore which had been printed privately in 1646, and he bought up the unsold sheets of Of The Sacred Order, and Offices of Episcopacy and issued them under a new title-page. He also published in this year, the first editions of The Liberty of Prophesying and A New and Easie Institution of Grammar. In 1648 Royston bought up the unsold copies of A Sermon Preached In Saint Maries Church in Oxford Upon the Anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason and bound them up with copies of The Liberty of Prophesying, Prayer Ex-tempore, and The Sacred Order, and Offices of Episcopacy in one volume under the title of Treatises. Taylor had, in the meantime, revised Prayer Ex-tempore, expanded it, and had written a dedication to Charles I. This revised edition was published by Royston in 1649 under the new title of An Apology for Authorised and Set Forms of Liturgie.<sup>47</sup> This work was a bitter attack on The Directory for Public Worship, which had been issued by the Parliament to replace the Prayer Book.<sup>48</sup> In fact, the only book of Taylor's, by this time, that was not a specific defense of the Anglican position and an argument against the Roundheads was the grammar book.

Royston was beginning to feel the hot breath of the "searchers" on his neck by 1648, for not only was he printing books by Taylor (who was still called the King's Chaplain in ordinarie on the title-pages) that might be considered "scandalous and lying" by the censor, but he was involved, in 1648, with printing the King's Eikon Bosilike. It may very well be that Royston's examination before the Committee for Suppressing Scandalous Pamphlets was due to his publication of one or several of these books.

On October 26, 1648 Francis Ash entered The Great Exemplar, Taylor's next publication, in the Stationers' Register.<sup>49</sup> Just how Ash could have

gotten the manuscript and permission to publish it from Taylor is a little obscure. Ash had a shop in Worcester and there is no record of his having any establishment in London, or of Taylor's having been to Worcester. Ash had never undertaken the publication of books before, and in 1648 he had been a book-seller for twenty-one years. Taylor was in London in the summer of 1648 and Ash might have come to London to register the book, assuming he knew he was going to publish it, and to make arrangements for its printing, so it is not impossible to put the two men in the same place at the same time. While Taylor was in London, however, he was being consulted by his printer, Royston, about the publication of Eikon Basilike<sup>50</sup> and it is strange that he would not have given Royston the opportunity to publish his most recent work, but rather have committed it to the hands of the "papistical" Francis Ash who had never acted as a publisher before.

There is obviously more here than meets the eye. Possibly Royston just did not want to publish The Great Exemplar. This seems rather strange, since he had made a concerted effort to publish everything that Taylor had written so far. Perhaps Royston was too busy to publish the book and suggested that Taylor find someone else but this seems equally improbable. First, it is improbable that Taylor would have chosen Ash, and second, that Royston would not have taken the manuscript and published it later when he had more time. What does seem likely is that Royston was using Ash's name, with or without Ash's knowledge, as a device to keep the censors away, since Ash's registry of the title made him legally responsible for the book getting into print. Not many people in the Parliament or the Stationers' Company would know Francis Ash, the Worcester book-seller, by sight, even if they knew him by reputation. Hence, it would be possible for Royston to hire someone to impersonate Ash and get the book registered. Of course, Ash

may have registered the book himself, but probably not without the instigation of Royston. Ash had one further advantage: he was already a notorious individual, and he lived in a section of the country not yet totally under the thumb of the Parliament. Therefore, he would not be subject to as speedy and sure an arrest as would Royston dwelling in the very heart of London.

The Great Exemolar was published in 1649 and has the three following imprints. "LONDON, / Printed by R. N. for Francis Ash. 1649."; "printed by R. N. for Francis Ash. 1649."; and "LONDON, / Printed by R. N. for Francis Ash, and are to be sold at the Three Pigeons in / S. Pauls Church-yard. 1649."<sup>51</sup> No mention is made of Worcester in any of the imprints and the Three Pigeons in Saint Paul's Church-yard was at this time, the shop of Humphrey Robinson.<sup>52</sup> Not only was there no connection between Ash and Robinson, but Robinson's partner, Joshua Kirton, was a Roundhead, and this may indicate what Robinson's religious views were as well.<sup>53</sup> Obviously, there was no small amount of trickery involved in the publication of The Great Exemolar.

On March 7, 1649=50 The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living was entered in the Stationers' Register by Francis Ash.<sup>54</sup> Royston was again not able, for some reason, to publish Taylor's next book openly. Only six months before, Royston had been bound in sureties by the Parliament and was certainly being watched very closely. However, we can tell that Royston had not given up his claims as Taylor's publisher, for in 1650 he published A Funerall Sermon Preached At the Obsequies of the Right Honorable and Most Vertuous Lady, The Lady Frances, Countesse of Carbery.<sup>55</sup> This was not a controversial work, and it seems to have proceeded into Royston's hands for publication as a matter of course as did most of Taylor's other

writings, such as Holy Dying and The Real Presence, until after the Restoration. But in the case of The Great Exemplar, and more importantly, in the case of Holy Living, Royston had partially removed himself from the process.

It must be remembered that 1649 and 1650 were the years of the most violent censorship of the printing trade. Furthermore, Royston had felt the sting of the censor twice in the last four years, first in 1645 and very recently in 1649; moreover, the £500 of his bond was a sum he could ill afford to lose. Therefore, a book by the late King's Chaplain in Ordinary was an item that Royston would be wary of openly publishing.

Ash may again have been a device used by Royston to avoid arrest. This device had been used successfully, we assume, in 1649 with The Great Exemplar, and perhaps Royston had decided to try it again. By recording the book in the Stationers' Register, probably with the unofficial backing of Royston, Ash became, technically, the owner of the book and thus legally responsible for it. By this first step of the subterfuge Royston was placed a comfortable distance from the censors. Holy Living appeared in 1650 and, rather than being censored, as Royston probably feared and as some of the contents might suggest, the work evidently enjoyed a great vogue. This might have been due to the easing of censorship in 1651.<sup>56</sup> A second edition was issued in 1651 and two more editions appeared before the Restoration, all under the auspices of Richard Royston.

The "Appendix" and the fly title-page implicate Royston even more deeply in the publication process than the points we have just been dealing with. The "Appendix" contains prayers for the King, meaning at this time Charles II, and Royston would have a pretty good idea about the way these prayers would sound to the Parliamentary censor. The Parliament had yet

to deal with Charles and send him into exile, as it did one year later at the battle of Worcester,<sup>57</sup> and prayers for him, in 1650, would quite probably have been considered treasonable. Therefore, the prayers were put in a position in the book so that they could easily be removed in those copies that Royston was to handle.<sup>58</sup> That the "Appendix" was originally intended for all copies and then was left out of Royston's is certain because of the rubric which occurs on page 221 in all copies. "Prayers for Kings and all magistrates, for our Parents Spiritual and natural, are in the following Letanies at the end of the fourth Chapter." The end of Chapter Four is the end of the book and without the "Appendix," which is missing in Royston copies, the prayers for the King do not appear.<sup>59</sup> Surface matters--Ash registering the book, and having his name on the title-page--would seem to indicate that Ash, the publisher, was merely letting Royston have some copies of the book to sell. If this had been the case, it is not likely that Royston would have had a plate engraved for use as a fly title-page, nor would Royston's name have been the only one on that page in all the copies of the edition. What the fly title page seems to imply is that Royston was rather deeply involved in the printing of Holy Living. It is well to note that all the various safeguards against the censor are for the protection of Royston, not Ash. Certainly Ash may have sold copies of Holy Living at his shop in Worcester, but this was probably as close as he came to the actual publication process.

If we have shown an effort to deceive, we must also show some reason for it. The very opening section of the dedication of Holy Living is a fair example of what Royston was trying to publish and avoid responsibility for.

I have lived to see Religion painted upon Banners, and thrust out of Churches, and the Temple turned into a



Tabernacle, and that Tabernacle made ambulatory, and covered with skins of Beasts and torn Curtains, and God to be worshipped, not as he is the Father of our Lord Jesus (an afflicted Prince, the King of sufferings) nor, as the God of peace. (which appellatives God newly took upon him in the New Testament, and glories in for ever:) but he is owned now rather as the Lord of Hosts, which title he was pleased to lay aside, when the Kingdom of the Gospel was preached by the Prince of peace. (¶ 4r)<sup>60</sup>

This blast against the Puritan faith would not be taken kindly by the Puritan censor. The two following passages are also examples of why Richard Royston may have felt called upon to take unusual care in getting this book into print.

The sin of Rebellion, though it be a spiritual sin and imitable by Devils, yet it is of that disorder, unreasonableness and impossibility amongst intelligent spirits, that they never murmured or mutined in their lower stations against their Superiours. (p. 191, sect. 1, item 12.)

A Prayer to be said by Subjects, when their Land is invaded and overrun by barbarous or wicked people, enemies of the Religion, or the Government.

O Eternal God, thou alone rulest in the Kingdoms of men, . . . now at least be pleased to let the light of thy countenance, and the effects of a glorious mercy, & a gracious pardon return to this Land. . . . let not the defenders of a righteous cause go away ashamed, nor our counsels be for ever confounded, nor our parties defeated, nor religion suppressed, nor learning discountenanced, and we be spoiled of all the exterior ornaments, instruments and advantages of piety, which thou has been pleased formerly to minister to our infirmities, for the interests of learning and religion. Amen. (p. 221.)

This, needless to say, coupled with the prayers found in the "Appendix,"<sup>61</sup> would almost compel Royston to circumvent the Parliament's censor.

What, then, can we conclude about the first edition of Holy Living? We can first conclude that the various copies of 1650 are all of the first edition. The problems of the variants are, in the end, an argument for this conclusion. The variants are reconcilable either because of strictly bibliographical explanations, such as the sixth and thirteenth lines of the title-page, or, in the instance of the "Appendix," because of the

historical and political situation in the last five years of the 1640's. From this conclusion we can suggest how the different variants would aid Royston in his attempt to avoid further difficulties with the authorities.

The most important result, however, is the information that this gives us about one of Taylor's most popular works. We need no longer assume that because Royston was Taylor's publisher his copy is the first edition and the only one with any authority. We can now see that editing Holy Living involves a study of all the copies of 1650 and that any study of controversial works of this period, by Taylor or any other writer, entails more than a mere title-page transcription. It must encompass both the bibliographical and historical facts of the work and its age.

## APPENDIX A

The following are collations of copies of the first edition of Holy Living. The Ash copy is given first and the Royston copy second.

12 mo.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$  A-R  $S^{12}$   $S^4$ , 220 leaves.

$\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^{r\&v}$ , blank.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^v$ , engraved fly title-page.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^v$ , blank.  
 $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^r$ , title-page.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^v$ , blank.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $4^r$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $10^r$ , "The Epistle  
 Dedicatory".  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $10^v$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $12^v$ , "The Table".  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^r$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^v$ ,  
 text (pages 1-410).  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^r$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^r$ , "The Appendix".  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^v$ ,  
 blank.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $4^r$ , colophon.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $4^v$ , blank.

12 mo.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$  A-R  $S^{12}$   $S^4$ , 218 leaves.

$\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^{r\&v}$ , blank.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^r$ , engraved fly title-page.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^v$ , blank.  
 $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^r$ , title-page.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $3^v$ , blank.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $4^r$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $10^r$ , "The Epistle  
 Dedicatory".  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $10^v$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $12^v$ , "The Table".  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^r$  --  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $1^v$ , text  
 (pages 1-410).  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^r$ , colophon.  $\mathcal{A}^{12}$   $2^v$ , blank.

APPENDIX B

The following is a transcription of the "Appendix" which occurs on F2 and F3 of FA. All notes, and page line numbers are Taylor's.

The Appendix.

Folio 44. Line 6.

For the King, etc.

\* In mercy remember the King, preserve his person in health and honour, his crown in wealth and dignity, his kingdoms in peace and plenty, the Churches under his protection in piety and knowledge, and a strict and holy religion: keep him perpetually in the fear and favour, and crown him with glory and immortality. Amen.

Folio 152. Line 23.

And when thy little misfortune troubles thee, remember that thou hast known the best of Kings, and the best of Men put to death publicly by his own subjects.

Folio 223. after line 8.

III

Place a Guard of Angels about the person of the King, and immure him with the defence of the right hand, that no unhallowed arme may do violence to him. Support him with aids from Heaven in all his battels, trials and dangers, that he may in every instant of his temptation become dearer to thee, and do thou return to him with mercy and deliverance. Give unto him the hearts of all his people, and put into his hand a prevailing rod of iron, a scepter of power, and a sword of justice; and enable him to defend and comfort the Churches under his protection.

IV.

Esse all his Friends, Relatives, Confederates and Lieges; direct

their Counsels, unite their hearts, strengthen their hands, blesse their actions: Give unto them holiness of intention, that they may with much candour and ingenuity pursue the cause of God and the King: Sanctifie all the means and instruments of their purposes, that they may not with cruelty, injustice, or oppression proceed towards the end of their just desires; and do thou crown all their endeavours with a prosperous event, that all may cooperate to, and actually produce those great mercies which we beg of thee; Honour and safety to our Sovereign, defence of his just rights, peace to his people, establishment and promotion to religion, advantages and encouragement to learning and holy living, deliverance to all the oppressed, comfort to all they faithful people; and from all these, glory to they holy Name. Grant this O KING of Kings, for his sake, by whom thou hast consigned us to all thy mercies and promises, and to whom thou hast given all power in Heaven and Earth, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Amen.

A Prayer to be said by Kings or Magistrates, for themselves and their People.

O my God and King, thou rulest in the Kingdoms of men; by thee Kings reign and Princes decree justice; thou hast appointed <sup>\*These words to be</sup> added by a delegate or inferiour. me under thy self\* [and under my Prince] to govern this portion of thy church according to the Laws of Religion and the Common-wealth. O Lord, I am but an infirme man, and know not how to decree certain sentences without erring in judgement; but do thou give to thy servant an understanding heart to judge his people, that I may discern between good and evil. Cause me to walk before thee and all the people in truth and righteousness, and in sincerity of heart, that I may not regard the person of the mighty, nor be afraid of his terrour, nor despise the person of the poor, and reject his petition; but that doing justice to all men, I and my people may receive

mercy of thee, peace and plenty in our dayes, and mutual love, duty and correspondence that there be no leading into captivity, no complaining in our streets; but we may see the Church in prosperity all our dayes, and religion established and increasing. Do thou establish the house of thy servant, and bring me to a participation of the glories of thy kingdom, for his sake who is my Lord and King, the holy and ever blessed Saviour of the world, our Redeemer Jesus. Amen.

Pare 389. Line. 12.  
III.

O Holy and ever blessed spirit, who didst overshadow the holy Virgin-Mother of our Lord, and causedst her to conceive by a miraculous & mysterious manner: be pleased to overshadow my soul, and enlighten my spirit, that I may conceive the holy Jesus in my heart, and may bear him in my minde, and may grow up to the fulnesse of the stature of Christ, to be a perfect man in Christ Jesus. Amen.

---

FINIS.

---

## NOTES

- 1 William T. Lowndes, The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature, IV (London, 1834); and S. Austin Allibone, A Critical Dictionary of English Literature, III (Philadelphia, 1858-71).
- 2 The Whole Works of Jeremy Taylor, ed. Reginald Heber, IV (London, 1847-52).
- 3 Robert Gathorne-Hardy, "Some Notes on the Bibliography of Jeremy Taylor," The Library, fifth series, II (1947-8), 233-36; and Robert Gathorne-Hardy, "A Bibliography of Jeremy Taylor," The Golden Grove, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith (Oxford, 1930), pp. 303-4.
- 4 Donald Wing, Short-Title Catalogue of Books, 1641-1700, III (New York, 1945-51), p. 326.
- 5 FA will be used in this paper to indicate the copy of Holy Living bearing the Ash imprint, and RR will indicate the copy bearing the Royston imprint.
- 6 Ronald B. McKerrow, An Introduction to Bibliography, (Oxford, 1928, p. 183.
- 7 Ibid., pp. 181-2.
- 8 The following is a partial list of the wrong font settings found to be identical in both copies. Italic C ¶6<sup>v</sup>, 345, 357, 358, 397, 399. Italic I ¶5, ¶6, ¶7<sup>v</sup>, ¶10, 242, 397.
- 9 The whole of the dedication was collated and one page each of the inner and outer forme of every gathering. Because of the method by which duodecimo was produced in the seventeenth century one page of the lower third of the forme was also collated in every gathering. The pages collated were 4- ¶10, A1, A2, A8, B3, B1<sup>v</sup>, B8<sup>v</sup>, C2<sup>v</sup>, C3<sup>v</sup>, C6, D4<sup>r&v</sup>, D6<sup>v</sup>, E9<sup>r&v</sup>, E7, F10<sup>r&v</sup>, F7<sup>v</sup>, G11<sup>r&v</sup>, G5, H12<sup>r&v</sup>, H5<sup>v</sup>, I1, 12, 18, K3, K1<sup>v</sup>, K8<sup>v</sup>, L2<sup>v</sup>, L3<sup>v</sup>, L6, M4<sup>r&v</sup>, M6<sup>v</sup>, N9<sup>r&v</sup>, N7, O10<sup>r&v</sup>, O7<sup>v</sup>, P11<sup>r&v</sup>, P5, Q12<sup>r&v</sup>, Q5<sup>v</sup>, R1, R2, R8, S1.
- 10 The types, exclusive of the three mentioned in the paper are: broken o pp. 134 and 326, broken m pp. 1, 59, 244, broken w p. 238, broken h p. 221, faulty 2 in the signature on p. 3, broken i on p. 384, broken d on p. 397, broken Q on p. 43, faulty N on title-page, broken H on the title-page.
- 11 McKerrow, p. 170.
- 12 The page numbering errors are page 65 misnumbered as 95, page numbers on 70 and 71 reversed, page 224 misnumbered as 124 (this occurs in the cut away portion of the forme), page 243 misnumbered as 143, page numbers on 263 and 264 reversed, and page 379 misnumbered as 332.

13 My thanks to Professor Richard Adamany who provided me with this bit of evidence when he visited the Huntington Library and was able to examine the actual book.

14 Gathorne-Hardy, "Some Notes," pp. 233-6 and "A Bibliography," p. 303.

15 McKerrow, p. 96.

16 Since I have not been able to see State II, I am assuming that lines six and thirteen are identical in States II and III. This is what Gathorne-Hardy says, and he has seen all three states.

17 The "Appendix" is reprinted in Appendix B of this paper.

18 The copy of Holy Living in the British Museum also has the Royston imprint and lacks the "Appendix," and according to Gathorne-Hardy all the other copies he has seen with the Royston imprint lack the "Appendix."

19 McKerrow, p. 183.

20 For examples of this kind of perfecting and technical explanations of the process see McKerrow, pp. 205-13; and Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, I (Oxford, 1963), pp. 232-3.

21 The "possible" variants are the following: p. 45, FA reads "Chap. I:" and RR reads "Chap. I.:"; p. 56, line 19, FA reads "i" and RR reads "I"; p. 118, line 37, FA reads "e ntin terest" and RR reads "e ntnterest"; p. 242, line 23, FA reads "Omnipotent." and RR reads "Omnipotent, "; p. 246, line 30, FA reads "Law." and RR read "Law".

22 Henry R. Plomer, A Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers, 1641 to 1667 (London, 1907), p. xi.

23 Ibid., pp. xi ff.

24 T. H. Darlow and H. F. Monle, Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society (London, 1903), p. 171.

25 Ibid.

26 A rabid Puritan, such as Michael Sparke, was quite likely to call anything that seemed only faintly Roman Catholic "papistical," so Ash could easily have been an high church Anglican. Sparke attacked Ash in various pamphlets, the most notorious of which was A Second Beacon Fired to Scintilla, 1652.

27 Edward Arber, A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers, 1554-1640, III (London, 1875-94), p. 686.

28 Plomer, p. 7.



29 G. E. B. Eyre, A transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640 to 1708 A.D., I (London, 1913-4), p. 303.

30 Plomer, pp. xii-xiii.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid., pp. xiii-xiv ff.

34 "Roger Norton brought [an action] against the Company for striking out of the Register certain grammatical books, which were his copyright. Roger Norton was a Royalist, and the prevailing party in the Company at that time were Roundheads." Plomer, p. xiv.

35 C. J. Stranks, The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor (London, 1952), p. 53 ff.

36 The Whole Works, V, 9.

37 Stranks, pp. 55-66.

38 Plomer, pp. 58-9.

39 Edmund Gosse, Jeremy Taylor (London, 1904), pp. 64-5.

40 Plomer, pp. xiv-xvii.

41 Calendar of Domestic State Papers, 1649-50 (London, 1875), pp. 362 and 524.

42 Plomer, p. 139.

43 The members of Royston's group were the following men, although we cannot determine just how closely each was involved in the actions of the Royalist stationers: Royston, Roger Norton, John Grismond, Miles Fletcher, Giles Fletcher (the relationship between the two Fletchers is unknown), Henry Featherston, Robert Young, James Young, and perhaps Francis Ash. Two literary men who were also intimate in this circle were Taylor and John Evelyn. Plomer, passim, Stranks, passim, and Gosse, passim.

44 "At the Restoration he [Roger Norton] petitioned to be appointed King's printer on the grounds that . . . he had been of service to His Majesty during the late troubles, both by printing letters and papers and by sheltering those who came from abroad on His Majesty's service. His claim was not allowed." Plomer, p. 139.

45 Plomer, pp. 139, 159, and 199.

46 Ibid., p. 199.

47 "A Bibliography," pp. 298-303.

48 Stranks, pp. 89-91.

49 Eyre, I, 303.

50 Gosse, loc. cit.

51 R. N. stands for Roger Norton, since this seems to be his usual method of initialing. Norton was doing printing jobs for Royston at this time and, as we have seen earlier, he was not the sort of man who would back away from a task because it was risky.

52 Plomer, pp. 155-6.

53 Historical Catalogue, p. 171.

54 Eyre, I, 339.

55 "A Bibliography," p. 303.

56 Plomer, p. xviii.

57 "Ash is believed to have died either during, or soon after the siege of Worcester (September, 1651)." Plomer, p. 7.

58 See the treatment of Royston's difficulties above.

59 Most nineteenth century editors of Holy Living, even Heber, whose edition is the standard, chose to accept Royston's copies as the first edition and ignored Ash's copies. Consequently, they printed the rubric directing the reader to the prayers for the King but, because they were using the Royston copy which lacked these prayers, they failed to print the prayers.

60 I am using FA for these citations.

61 See Appendix B below.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allibone, S. Austin. A Critical Dictionary of English Literature.  
3 vols. Philadelphia, 1858-71.
- Arber, Edward. A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers, 1554-1640. 5 vols. London, 1875-94.
- Bowers, Fredson. Principles of Bibliographical Description. Princeton, 1949.
- Calendar of Domestic State Papers, 1649-50. London, 1875.
- Darlow, T. H. and H. F. Monle. Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society. London, 1903.
- Eyre, G. E. B. A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640 to 1708 A. D. 3 vols. London, 1913-4.
- Gathorne-Hardy, Robert. "A Bibliography of Jeremy Taylor," The Golden Grove. ed. Logan Pearsal Smith. Oxford, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Notes on the Bibliography of Jeremy Taylor," The Library, fifth series, II (1947-8), 233-249.
- Gosse, Edmund. Jeremy Taylor. London, 1904.
- Hinman, Charlton. The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Oxford, 1963.
- Lowndes, William T. The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature. 4 vols. London, 1834.
- McKerrow, Ronald B. An Introduction to Bibliography. Oxford, 1928.
- Plomer, Henry R. A Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers, 1641 to 1667. London, 1907.
- Stranks, C. J. The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor. London, 1952.
- Taylor, Jeremy. The Whole Works. ed. Reginald Heber. 15 vols. London, 1847-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Great Exemplar of Sanctity. London, 1649.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living. London, 1650.

Taylor, Jeremy. The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying. London, 1651.

Wing, Donald. Short-Title Catalogue of Books, 1641-1700. 3 vols.  
New York, 1945-51.

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF  
THE FIRST PRINTING OF HOLY LIVING

by

WILLIAM PROCTOR WILLIAMS

B.A. Kansas State University, 1961

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

The 1650 printing of Holy Living was issued under two imprints, one for Richard Royston, Taylor's usual publisher, and one for Francis Ash. Moreover, the Royston copies lack the "Appendix" contained in the Ash copies. The title-page also has two variants, aside from the imprint. Consequently, there arose the question of the order of the Royston and Ash copies. Are these two copies of one edition or are there two editions of Holy Living in 1650? Some scholars have assumed that the Royston copy is the first edition, while others have thought that both copies are parts of the first edition, but there has been no close examination of the books. The present study is an attempt to answer this question.

The application of various bibliographical tests, such as the McKerrow "Ruler Test," and the collation of sixty four pages of the text demonstrated conclusively that these two copies were printed from the same setting of type. These tests also uncovered two stop-press corrections, hitherto unknown or unnoted. Furthermore, many pieces of evidence, such as broken types, were found to be identical in both copies. This information necessitated an explanation of the variants to show how they could be accounted for if both copies were members of the first edition. Most of the variants, such as the stop-press corrections, were explained on bibliographical grounds, but some variants, such as the fact that the "Appendix" is missing in all the Royston copies, indicated that an historical, as well as bibliographical, explanation was involved.

An investigation of the historical background of the period and the lives of those involved in the 1650 printing of Holy Living explained most of the variants and uncovered some neglected information, such as Ash's registry of Holy Living. The censorship imposed by the Long Parliament struck hard at the Royalist stationers, one of whom was Richard Royston.

Ash was not closely connected with the London book-trade, although he was involved in a well publicized sale of pictures to be used in the 1633 Edinburgh edition of the Bible. These pictures were called papistical, and so was Ash. Taylor had been Archbishop Laud's chaplain and later chaplain to Charles I during the Civil War and his writings were, no doubt, considered suspect by the Parliament.

In 1649 and 1650 the censorship of the press reached its peak. Royston, who had been imprisoned earlier for printing seditious books, was called before a Parliamentary committee and forced into a £500 bond to insure that he would not print any more unauthorized books. Ash registered both The Great Exemplar, in 1648, and Holy Living, in 1649, which made him legally responsible for them, and the Royston copies of this edition lack the "Appendix"; both of these things were devices to protect Royston from the censor. The peculiarities in the publication history of Holy Living only protected Royston. Royston was involved in the publication, however, since both the Ash and Royston copies have a fly title-page with Royston's name on it. Ash's part in the publication process may only have been that of a decoy. Holy Living had material in it which would have caused Royston to feel that it might be censored. The "Appendix" had prayers for Charles II, and such prayers would probably have been considered treasonable by the Parliament. The unusual variants in the 1650 printing are a result of Royston's attempt to avoid further trouble with the Parliament.

All the known variants can be accounted for by either bibliographical or historical evidence, and certainly all the copies of Holy Living printed in 1650 are of the first edition. Therefore, any text of this work must be based on a study of all the copies of 1650 and not just on the Royston copies, as has been the practice in the past.