The Publication History of Anthony Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva

LA LITERATURA de temática caballerescas disfrutó de una notable popularidad en Inglaterra durante la etapa tardomedieval que tuvo continuidad tras la introducción de la imprenta a finales del siglo xv. Este cambio tecnológico, sin embargo, privó al género del dinamismo y vitalidad que lo habían caracterizado en la etapa anterior de difusión manuscrita, como demuestra que los impresores fueran incapaces de renovar el catálogo de títulos con obras nuevas. Tal es así que a principios de la década de 1570 el valor comercial de los romances caballerescos ingleses había quedado prácticamente agotado, pero no el interés del público por consumir literatura caballeresca. Para seguir explotando el tirón comercial de esta temática literaria, los impresores apostaron por diversificar la oferta de textos y empezaron a publicar traducciones inglesas de los libros de caballerías castellanos. Una de las primeras traducciones en aparecer fue la del Palmerin de Olivia (Salamanca 1511), realizada por Anthony Munday a partir de la versión francesa de Jean Maugin (París 1546) y publicada en Londres en 1588. Este artículo reconstruye la historia impresa del Palmerin de Olivia inglés, texto que fue reeditado en tres ocasiones a lo largo de los cincuenta años siguientes (1597, 1615/1616, 1637), pero que ha quedado sumido en el olvido desde entonces. Aquí estudio cada una de las ediciones del texto de Munday, aclaro la relación textual entre ellas y rescato las circunstancias históricas de su producción.

THE LONGEST-LASTING GENRE in English literary history is chivalric romance, composed in England at least since the twelfth century and popular throughout the early modern period. At the end of the Middle Ages the advent of the printing press played an important role in guaranteeing the dissemination of the medieval romances of chivalry. On the one hand, print contributed to increasing the genre’s popularity by having confidence in its commercial viability. Suffice it to say that after William Caxton’s death the early English printers, led by Wynkyn de Worde, published a total of seventeen traditional metrical romances between circa 1497 and circa 1533. On the other hand, the printing press also limited the vitality and diversity of the genre, since only romances contained in manuscripts with London circulation stood any chance of obtaining printed distribution. Thus, the second generation of English printers simply reissued the same romance titles published by their predecessors and, consequently, by the end of the 1560s, the commercial value of the traditional verse romances became exhausted, though not the taste for chivalric material. In order to satisfy and continue exploiting such appetite for chivalric literature, printers diversified their range of romance contents by making available to the English public the Iberian romances of chivalry, which had already taken the Continent by storm. The first Spanish romance to
appear in English was book I of Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Príncipes y Cavalleros*, translated by Margaret Tyler and published in 1578 (RSTC 18859). But the person most directly responsible for Englishing the Iberian romances was Anthony Munday (d. 1633), translator of *Amadis de Gaule, Palladine of England, Palmendos, Palmerin d'Oliva, Palmerin of England*, and *Primaleon of Greece*. This article centers on *Palmerin d'Oliva*, the founding text of the *Palmerin* cycle and the earliest surviving textual witness of Munday's translations of Iberian romances. The publication history of Munday's *Palmerin d'Oliva* has received scant scholarly attention to date, since it is discussed in part only in a 1925 article by Gerald Hayes. Based on wider bibliographical evidence than Hayes, I reconstruct the fifty-year publication history of this romance from its inception before 1588 until its last print appearance in 1637, analyzing all extant editions and their textual relation, and exploring
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the possible cause for this text's premature passage into oblivion.

In all likelihood, the earliest allusion to Anthony Munday's translation of Palmerin d'Oliva was made in the now lost editio princeps of his Palmerin of England. The postscript of the 1596 edition of the second part of Palmerin of England (henceforth Palmerin of England ii), most probably a word for word reprint of the original postscript, reads:

9 Quoted in HAYES (see note 8), p. 76. Previously, in chapter 64 of Palmerin of England, Munday states, "I entent (God ayying me) to publish it (i.e., Palmerin d'Oliva) shortly"; quoted in HAYES, loc. cit. Cf. THOMAS (see note 4), pp. 257-258. For a discussion of this kind of paratextual promise, see LOUISE WILSON: Serial Publication and Romance. In: The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England. Eds. ANDY BESSON and EMMA SMITH. Farnham 2013 (Material Readings in Early Modern Culture), pp. 213-221.

10 EDWARD ARBER: A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 AD. London 1875-94, vol. 2, p. 388. Note, however, that HAMILTON (see note 7), seems to question that such edition was ever printed, although her arguments seem unconvincing, and WILLIAM EDWARD PURSER: Palmerin of England: Some Remarks on This Romance and on the Controversy Concerning Its Authorship. Dublin 1904, p. 391, is "not altogether satisfied that there was any edition of the first two parts of Palmerin of England before 1609." Cf. note 12 below for positive evidence that an edition of Palmerin of England was printed before 1586.

11 The epistle dedicated to Munday's patron Edward de Vere reads, "Not long it will be before [...] the renowned Palmerin of England with all speede shall be sent you," in Zelauto, the Fontaine of Fame. Ed. JACK STILLINGER. Carbondale 1963, p. 6.

12 See HENRY R. PLOMER: Some Elizabethan Book Sales. In: The Library, 3rd ser. 7 (1916), pp. 318-329, here p. 328. I agree with CRANE (see note 1), when, in relation to this item, he argues, "as no edition of Palmerin d'Oliva appeared before 1588, the reference here must be to Palmerin of England." (p. 39). The book was sold for 25/4d. Edward Wingfield in 1576 had been admitted to Furnival's Inn and later to Lincoln's Inn, although rather than a lawyer he preferred to become a soldier. For more biographical information, see R. C. SIMMONS: Wingfield, Edward Maria (b. 1550, d. in or after 1619). In: ODNB (see note 6), vol. LXI, p. 728. For information on Marsham, see JOSÉ MANUEL LUCÍA MECÍAS: Imprenta y libros de caballerías. Madrid 2000, pp. 41-3. A propos of the Medina del Campo's edition, LUCÍA MECÍAS has argued, "una serie de decisiones relacionadas con el texto (división en libros) o con su forma externa (calidad del papel y tinta, uso de tipos góticos y de tacos xilográficos desgastados)" sitúan este Palmerin de Oliva en la frontera editorial entre los libros de caballerías en folio y las historias caballerescas en cuarto, con la evidente intención de aprovechar un amplio mercado de compradores a quienes le sería imposible acceder a los libros de caballerías extensos, mejor editados y, por tanto, mucho más caros." (p. 43). See also LUCÍA MECÍAS: Catálogo descriptivo de libros de caballerías hispánicos. VII. Un Palmerin de Oliva recuperado: Toledo, Juli Ferrer?, 1555 (n. del Palacio Real: 1 c. 91). Ig: Vez y Letra. 6 (1995), pp. 41-57. For the French editions of Palmerin d'Oliva, see French Vernacular Books: Books Published in the French Language before 1601. Eds. ANDREW PETTIGREW, MALCOLM MALABY, AND ALEXANDER WILKINSON. Leiden 2008, no. 40395-93, 40403-8, 40413-6.
As for the Historie of Palmerin d'Oliva, which [...] should have bin translated before this, or Primaleon of Greece, because they are the originall of all the other stories, which after I have ended the third part of this worthy History [i.e., Palmerin of England] [...] you shall have very speedily. 9

It seems that Munday fulfilled his promise but not entirely, since he translated the two parts of Palmerin d'Oliva without having completed his Palmerin of England II, which came out in 1602 (rsc 19165). In Palmerin d'Oliva I's prefatory epistle to his readers, Munday reiterates the part of the promise he did fulfil: "When I finished my seconde parte of Palmerin of England, I promised this worke of Palmerin D'Oliua" (sig. *4r). In any event, the publication of Palmerin of England II represents the terminus post quem for the beginning of Munday's translation of Palmerin d'Oliva. Palmerin of England was licensed to John Charlewood on February 13, 1581, 10 but in 1580 its translation was at an advanced stage as Munday states in his Zelauto. 11 In all probability the editio princeps of Palmerin of England was produced in 1581, although the only historical evidence we have that it was published before Palmerin d'Oliva comes from a list, dated 1585, of books sold to Edward Wingfield by the London printer and bookseller Thomas Marshe containing the following reference: "'Palmeryng' [sic!], 2 parts," which can apply only to Palmerin of England. 12 This allusion can be taken as the terminus ante quem for the start of Munday's translation of Palmerin d'Oliva. In view of his intense literary activity during the years 1581, 1582 and 1584, it appears that Munday must have been busy translating Palmerin d'Oliva in the period 1585-87, with special priority in 1586 until the work was completed sometime in 1587.

The editio princeps of Palmerin d'Oliva went on sale in 1588. Anthony Munday's epistle to the reader in the first part (rsc 19157) reads, "with the new yeere I send him [i.e., the book] abroad" (sig. *4r), enabling us to determine the publication date as January 1, 1588. 13 On the same page Munday announces that "The second parte goes forward on the Printers presse, and I hope shalbe with you sooner than you expect" (sig. *4v). Unfortunately no copy of the first edition of Palmerin d'Oliva II has survived. 14 It seems, however, that the preface to the readers of the 1616 third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva II (rsc 19159a) duplicates that of the editio princeps and includes the original date of composition: "From my house at Cripple-gate this ninth of March. 1588." (sig.A4v). 15 Therefore, there was an approximately two-month interval between the publication of the first and second part of the first edition, the time required to complete the impression of a text of this length. 16

The division of the text of Palmerin d'Oliva into two separate volumes was adopted for the English market, since this work had been published on the Continent as a single volume ever since its first appearance in Spain in 1511 (ib 16737). 17 Instead of hiding this new bibliographic arrangement, Munday devotes the greater part of the prefatory epistle to the readers to explain the advantages in bringing out the romance in two volumes. The
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main benefit of this textual segmentation to Munday’s readers derives from the fragmentation of payments, since “a man grutcheth not so much at a little mony, payd at severall times, as he doth at once” (sig. *4r). Munday admits that there is also one advantage to him, namely, “that a little pause dooth well in so long a labour” (sig. *4r), probably an allusion to the over two months required for the printing of the second part. In fact, it is more an excuse than a point of real advantage, since the production time of the whole romance was the same whether it was published separately or not.

Some modern scholars, however, have reacted with unwarranted hostility to Munday on account of the division of this romance. Patchell comments, “Although the original [...] from which he translated had been
in one volume, *his mercenary instincts* led him to publish it in two parts several months apart" (emphasis mine). In this criticism not only does Patchell show prejudice against Munday, but together with other scholars fails to consider the two-volume publication of this text within the wider context of chivalric romance printing in Elizabethan England. In fact, the textual segmentation of this work is just one of the bibliographical choices made as part of the process of adapting a foreign text to England's print culture and its sociocultural milieu. While *Palmerin d'Oliva* appeared in England as two quarto volumes printed in black letter, the French original from which Munday worked was published not only as a single volume, but also in folio size using roman type. Obviously publishing books in quarto reduced production costs, thus allowing a wider distribution among the middle classes, the cornerstone of the romance book trade in early modern England.19 Aware of the need to market his translation inclusively to middle-class readers, Munday wanted to engage them from the very title page, in which he addressed "the inferiour sorte" [fig. 1].20 As regards the choice of font, even though after 1580 roman type was increasingly adopted in England for certain literary modes, black letter remained the preferred option for popular genres including romance.21 As a matter of fact, these same bibliographical features apply to the English metrical romances — i.e., slender quarto-sized volumes in black letter — published throughout the better part of the sixteenth century and catering to a similar readership. It seems reasonable, therefore, to consider the textual division of *Palmerin d'Oliva* as part of a marketing strategy to clothe a foreign product — the Iberian prose romances — with features associated with an already existing product — the native metrical romances — and recognizable by the same target audience. Although Munday claims responsibility for the decision of dividing the text of *Palmerin d'Oliva* into two parts ("I now deuide it twaine," sig. *4r*), the choices affecting the format, font and segmentation of the work would have been made systematically by printers and publishers, since they were adopted in England for the entire corpus of Iberian romances.22

---

18 Patchell (see note 7), p. 19. Munday's "mercenary instincts" had been previously adduced by Thomas (see note 4), p. 249. Tracey Hill: Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London 1580-1613. Manchester 2004, in a discussion of Munday's epistle to the reader, argues that Munday "makes no pretence that his aim is not to offer his readers one text for the price of two, as it were" (p. 46; cf. Turner [see note 7], p. 78), although we have no evidence that this was the case, since Munday states that "the cost is as great, as though it had come altogether" (sig. *4r*). Helen Hackett: Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance. Cambridge 2000, inaccurately states, "Munday's epistle to the reader in Palmerin d'Oliva explains that he has divided the multi-volume original into even smaller sections" (p. 62; emphasis added).


22 I agree with Joshua Phillips: English
The publication of Palmerin d’Oliva, as the title page suggests (fig. 1), was initiated by the publisher and bookseller William Wright (active 1579-1603).23 Although there is no entry in the register of the Stationers’ Company stating the exact date when Wright obtained the licence to print Palmerin d’Oliva, we learn from a 1596 entry (see below) that he was the legal licence holder. Sometime in 1587 Wright must have commissioned John Charlewood (d. 1593) to print Munday’s translation.24 Charlewood had an early association with Munday, as he had already printed the

Fictions of Communal Identity, 1485-1603. Farnham 2010, when he states, “Munday and his stationers planned and instituted these breaks as part of a publication strategy” (p. 147). Publication decisions belong not to authors but to printers/publishers, a clear example being Munday’s Zelauto, which he was prevailed upon to publish in its unfinished state as Munday explains in the prefatory epistle: “The last part of this worke remaineth unfinished, the which for breuitie of time, and speedines in the Imprinting: I was constrained to permit” (p. 6). Besides, we must not forget that the now lost editio princeps of Palmerin of England would have already been published as two volumes (see note 12 above).


33 For more biographical information on Charlewood, see H. R. TEDDER: Charlewood, John (d. 1593). In: ODNB, vol. XI, pp. 176/7.


35 Here are two instances of stop-press corrections: on sig. E 1 the Folger copy reads, “be… before”, an error corrected in the BL copy as “before”;- the phrase “to welcome” (Folger L 4 copy; sig. E1v) is emended to “so welcome” (BL copy).


37 Cf. PERCY SIMPSON: Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. London 1935, pp. 1-45. This edition also retains to a significant extent some of the spelling features identified with Munday, thus suggesting his personal involvement in the preparation of this edition; see M. ST. CLARE BYRNE: Anthony Munday’s Spelling as a Literary Clue. In: The Library. 4th ser. 4 (1923), pp. 9-24.

38 To locate the exact whereabouts of Wright’s shop, see RSTC, vol. 3, p. 252 (0.1).


40 HOLGER SCHOTT SYME: Thomas Creede, William Bailey, and the Venture of Printing Plays. In: Shakespeare’s Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography. Ed. MARTA STRANZICKY. Philadelphia 2013, pp. 28-46, has recently shown how potentially lucrative the publication of the long chivalric romances could have been for Creede (pp. 41-5). In 1596 Creede had printed Palmerin of England and 11 (RSTC 19161). Note that during the period 1593-1602 “he printed twice as many books for himself as for others,” as stated by AKIHIRO YAMADA: Thomas Creede: Printer to Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. Tokyo 1994, who prefers to describe Creede as “a printer-bookseller” (p. 41) for this period.

31 See note 10), vol. 3, p. 68. Thomas Sharlet was printer and publisher between 1590-96 (Arber, vol. 5, p. 263).

32 For biographical information, see DAVID L. GANTS: Creede, Thomas (b. in or before 1554, d. 1610). In: ODNB, vol. XIV, pp. 128/29; see also YAMADA (see note 31), pp. 3-12. In order to locate his premises on a London map, see YAMADA, p. 16, and RSTC, vol. 3, p. 255 (T. 5).

33 Note that in May 1597 Creede obtained a loan of five pounds from the Stationers’ Company most likely to finance the publication of this lengthy text, as SYME has argued (see note 31), p. 44 and p. 34 note 44. The second edition survives in two imperfect copies: BL c.56.d.7 and Henry E. Huntington L. 330331.

34 For information on the earl, see ALAN NELSON: Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford. Liverpool 2003. Munday signed the 1588 dedicatory epistle “Sometime your Honour[s] i. e. Edward de Vere’s servant” (sig. *2*), thus suggesting that de Vere was no longer his patron.

35 Although the prefatory material pertaining to the second edition of Palmerin d’Oliva has not survived, the 1615 edition preserves the dedication that presumably appeared in 1597. We have no historical information about the identity of the Youngs, but LOUISE WILSON: Playful Paratexts: The Front Matter of Anthony Munday’s Iberian Romance Transl.-ations. In: Renaissance Paratexts. Eds. HELEN SMITH and LOUISE WILSON. Cambridge 2011, pp. 121-33, states that Francis Young was a merchant (p. 126). Note that the change of patron was also recorded in other romance translations by Munday published in 1596 and 1597: Palmerin of England and 11 (RSTC 19161), and possibly the non-existent Palmerin of England 111 (1597) and Primalone 111 (1596; RSTC 20366); and possibly the non-existent Palmerin of England 111 (1597) and Primalone 111 (1597); cf. TURNER (see note 7), p. 182.

36 As regards the second edition of Palmerin d’Oliva in the BL, HAYES (see note 8) erroneously conjectures that “this copy appears more probably the original edition of 1588” (p. 66). HAYES (see note 15), p. 35, himself later rectifies this error of judgment.
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latter's first publication in 1577 (RSTC 18269.5). Furthermore, the geographical proximity of Charlewood's premises and Munday's home, both located in Cripplegate, must have facilitated their long-lived professional relationship. Such physical proximity was particularly convenient for Munday, who could thus more easily see his book through the press, not an unlikely possibility considering the small number of errors of wording and misprints and the existence of stop-press corrections in Charlewood's edition. Note, additionally, that Munday expressed elsewhere his concern with the textual accuracy of his works and his will to erase all errors from them. For instance, in the postscript to Palladine of England (RSTC 5541) Munday regrets that "Diuers foule faultes are escaped in the imprinting, in some places words mistaken [...] and diuers other by mishap left out, and partly by want of my attendance to read the proues." While acknowledging the textual deterioration of his work, Munday accepts partial responsibility for it, since he failed to detect and emend all corrupt readings at the proofreading stage. Considering that Palladine of England was published on April 23, 1588, just a few weeks after the appearance of Palmerin d'Oliva I, the absence of a note of this kind in our romance is all the more telling. This absence together with Charlewood's careful printing suggests that Munday may have corrected the proofs of Palmerin d'Oliva, a practice not at all unusual in this period. Once printed, the book could be purchased at Wright's shop "adioyning to S. Mildreds Church in the Poultrie, the middle Shoppe in the rowe." On August 9, 1596, the Stationers' Register records that Palmerin d'Oliva I and II "were assigned from William wright to Thomas Scarlet and from Thomas Scarlet to [...] Thomas Crede." Therefore, the copyright of Palmerin d'Oliva was transferred not to a bookseller but a printer, thus suggesting that Creede, despite not being necessarily as cognizant of the literary preferences of contemporary readers as booksellers, was confident in the market value and financial possibilities of the Palmerin romances. Creede, whose printing house was located at the sign of the Catherine Wheel near the Old Swan in Thames Street, printed the second edition of Palmerin d'Oliva (RSTC 19158) in 1597, the second part appearing on August 1, 1597, as Munday states in the dedication: "I humbly take my leaue, this first of August" (sig. A3v). Creede was fortunate to enlist the help of Munday in producing the reprint of our romance, though the latter failed to take the opportunity to thoroughly revise the text or make any significant improvement to it. All substantive variants are of no narrative import and thus equally attributable either to Munday or to the compositors and correctors. Instead, Munday is certainly responsible for making changes to the prefatory material. While he had dedicated the first edition of Palmerin d'Oliva I and II to Edward de Vere, seventeenth earl of Oxford, for the second edition Munday found new patrons, namely, Francis Young of Brent-Pelham, Hertford, and his wife Susan. Except for the prefatory material, Creede's 1597 presents a line-by-line
reprint of the 1588 edition, with minimal compositorial interventions correcting obvious mistakes in the printer's copy and introducing minor textual variants.

On December 4, 1615, we learn from the Stationers' Register that Richard Heggenbotham "Entred for his Copie by order of a Court, and Consent of Thomas Creede The first and second partes of Palmeryn d'Oliva." Palmérin d'Oliva is only the second book whose copyright was obtained by Richard Higgenbotham (also spelt Heggenbotham, Higenbotham, and Higginbotham), a London bookseller that had taken his liberty of the Stationers' Company only on April 3, 1615. And before 1615 expired, Thomas Creede printed the third edition of Palmérin d'Oliva (rStC 19159), but with no reference to Higgenbotham on the title page or elsewhere (fig. 2).

It seems that with the new year the third edition was reissued (rStC 19159a) with a cancel title page containing more information about
this romance's publication: "Printed by T.C. [i.e., Thomas Creede] and B.A. [Bernard Alsop] for Richard Higgenbotham, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Cardinals Hat without Newgate" [fig. 3]. The change in wording of the cancel title page is attributable to Higgenbotham, who exercised his power as licence holder and financier of this printing project. While no reference to him appeared in the cancellando, now the cancellans gives prominence to the publisher, whose name is spelled out in full, and describes as was customary the location of his premises, probably not yet well-known due to his recent establishment as a bookseller. By contrast, those responsible for the actual printing of the text receive unequal treatment, as the new title page does not the full name of the printers, but their initials instead.

The cancel title page of this reissue has been instrumental in revealing that the third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva I was not produced exclusively by Creede and his employees, as the original title page states, but was a joint venture between Creede and his associate Bernard Alsop, a fact

37 The dedication in the 1597 edition of Palmerin d'Oliva I contains the following remark: "having sent ye the first [part of Palmerin d'Oliva], so likewise doe I now the seconde [part], and will make what speede I can in translating the third and last" (sig. A3' emphasis added); and in the epistle to the readers Munday again promises a third part. The dedication to the 1615 Palmerin d'Oliva I, probably the same that appeared in the 1597 edition, confirms that Munday had obtained a copy of the text supposedly corresponding to the third part: "the third and last [part] that I am now in hand" (sig. A3'). In the preface to the 1673 reprint of Don Bellianis of Greece (Wing 7779), Francis Kirkman mentions the existence of "Palmerin D'Oliva, in three Parts"; for a partial transcription of this preface, see Thomas (see note 4), pp. 250-61. There is, however, no bibliographical evidence that this third part was ever published as such. In any event, the continuation to the Spanish Palmerin de Oliveira is Primaleon, with the subtitle Libro segundo del emperador Palmerin. But it is unlikely that Munday was referring to this last work, since he had already translated the first thirty-two chapters of the French Primaleon (not the first twenty as stated by Thomas (see note 4), p. 250. I am grateful to Leticia Álvarez-Recio for pointing this detail to me in personal communication: e-mail message to author, November 25, 2013) and published them as Palmeudos in 1589 (STC 18064), and the rest in 1595 (Primaleon I; STC 20366) and 1596 (Primaleon II; STC 20366a). There is one other alternative continuation to Palmerin d'Oliva composed in Italy and published in 1560 as Il secondo libro di Palmirino di Oliva. Cf. Thomas (see note 4), pp. 186-7: Hugues Vaganay: Les Romans de chevalerie italiens d'inspiration espagnole. In: La Bibliofilia. 9 (1907), pp. 121-31, here p. 130. Gaetano Melli et al.: Bibliografia dei romanzi e poemi cavallereschi italiani. Milan, 1838, p. 343, n°792. Nothing prevents the assumption that Munday, who had lived in Rome during a few months in 1579, could translate directly from Italian as he did for Palmerin of England II; cf. Hayes (see note 8), p. 67. Nonetheless, in the absence of any corroborating evidence I agree with Hayes (see note 8), p. 35, in considering the identification of this Italian continuation with Munday's third part only a conjectural possibility. There is yet one further possibility. It can be that as part of the serialization strategy used for publishing the Iberian romances it was considered paramount to create the expectation of a forthcoming third part even if in the end this could not be delivered. Failing to fulfill such a promise would have no serious literary consequence, since it was not unusual in contemporary England to publish unfinished texts, as for example Spenser's The Faerie Queene, Sidney's New Arcadia, and Munday's Zelauto; cf. Phillips (see note 22), pp. 139-47, and cf. Louise Wilson (see note 9). For a meticulous discussion of Palmerin d'Oliva III, see Hayes (see note 8), pp. 63-7.

38 Arber (see note 10), vol. 3, p. 579.

39 See McKerrow (see note 23), p. 136.

40 The only existing copy of this issue of the third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva I is Lambeth Palace L, ARCE 73. 3b 18. The ESRC (accessed March 18, 2013) states that one leaf of this edition is preserved at Christ Church College, Oxford. Cristina Negri, librarian of Christ Church, has informed me in personal communication that no such fragment or record of it exists in their library, although she adds, "We are currently cataloguing the special collection [...] We may well have it in a binding and [it] will someday be rediscovered" (e-mail message to author, December 14, 2012).

41 In order to localize Higgenbotham's shop, see RSTC, vol. 3, p. 248 (n. 9). Of this issue of the third edition the following copies have survived: BL C. 56.d.8 (1 part), Lambeth Palace L (parts 1 only; see note 40), and Henry E. Huntington L, 330330 (2 parts).
that the former wanted to hide. The collaboration Creede-Alsop, which lasted a few more months until Creede's death in 1616, was necessary if the printing of Palmerin d'Oliva I started around December 4, 1615, and was finished before the year was over (cf. note 16). Considering that one printing press, at a standard rate of production, would have needed forty-seven working days to complete the first part, it was feasible to do the job in twenty-four days when two printers were engaged. In any event, the 1615 edition of the first part was printed on two presses and the text portioned out between the two print shops. The amount of text distributed to each one of the printers is still recoverable from the use...
of two distinguishable sets of black letter type: the part going from the beginning through signature F was printed using a battered set of type, whereas for the remainder of the book a newly cast set of type was used [fig. 4]. Bearing in mind that printing this section of Palmerin d'Oliva was in all likelihood Alsop's first commission, it seems reasonable to assign the newer type to him and thus attribute signatures G to Z to Alsop's printing press. Equally, after a twenty-two-year professional career and only months before his death, Creede was more likely to be using worn-out type. Printing the initial portion of the book, Creede would have also been responsible for designing the cancelled title page on which he appears as the sole creator of this edition [fig. 2].

From all these bits of information we can infer that Higgenbotham commissioned Creede to print the third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva, and then Creede contracted out part of the printing work to Alsop, possibly to meet some deadline. The agreement with the subcontractor did not stipulate that Alsop's name should appear on the title page, nor did it require an equal division of the workload, as the amount of text printed by Alsop nearly trebles that printed by Creede. On account of his well-established position in the London book trade, Creede took advantage of Alsop, who was still in need of making headway in the printing business. Once the job was finished, Creede handed over the sheets of the third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva to Higgenbotham, who was certainly disappointed with the final product. He could not have been pleased, first, with the title page originally produced by Creede, and second, with the obvious visual differences caused by the two sets of type used to print this edition. Consequently, Higgenbotham required Creede to replace the original title page with one adapted to the publisher's needs, as has been discussed [cf. figs. 2, 3], and decided that only Alsop's type should be used to print Palmerin d'Oliva II.45

The 1615 edition of Palmerin d'Oliva II derives from the second edition, which was printed by Creede in 1597. The genetic relation of the three editions of Palmerin d'Oliva I, therefore, corresponds to their chronological order and can be represented as 1588 → 1597 → 1615 (= 1616). Nevertheless, as McKerrow warns, "the genetic descent of editions [...] is not nec-

42 For more information about Alsop, see HENRY R. PLOMER: A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667. London 1907, pp. 3-4. Knowing that Alsop took part in the printing of RSC 159, published in 1595, we need to move forward the beginning of his printing career, dated to 1616 by other scholars; cf. ARBER (see note 10), vol. 5, p. 217, and PLOMER, loc. cit.
43 For a list of the books published by Creede in collaboration with Alsop, see YAMADA (see note 31), pp. 129/40, and cf. pp. 10/11.
44 In 1615 Creede was allowed to have one printing press only; cf. ARBER (see note 10), vol. 3, p. 699.
45 Maybe even the substitution of "1616" for "1615" on the new title page was caused not only by the actual change of year, but also to be coherent with the information included in the epistle to the reader, which still states that "with the new yeere I send him abroad" (sig. A3v). Thus the third edition would have gone on sale at the beginning of 1616. Notwithstanding all Higgenbotham's efforts to downplay the printers' role, the title page of the 1616 Palmerin d'Oliva II contains one of the devices Creede used in his books that would later be adopted by Alsop. See RONALD B. MCKERROW: Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland 1485-1640. London 1913, no. 339: "Device of a griffin seated on a stone (or a book?), under which is a ball with wings" (p. 132).
While historical collation shows that most of the readings in the 1597 edition agree with those in the 1615 edition, there is one particular case involving greater complexity. At the end of signature G2v the first edition reads, "as well might", and the same words appear in the third edition (sig. D6v), but are omitted in the second edition (sig. D6v). One could argue that the compositors were working from different copies belonging to different editions of the same text, but this possibility seems unlikely since the same signature contains variant readings in which the second and third editions agree against the first. I suggest instead that the textual omission was detected and stop-press corrected while the second edition was being produced, and then the compositors of the 1615 edition worked from a copy of the second edition with a corrected signature D6v, although no copy representing the corrected state of the forme survives. Yet this is not all. The compositors of the third edition reproduced the text of 1597 with just minor adjustments, except that from signature 15r a more interventionist compositor got involved at intervals. The first intervention of this compositor, working under Alsop, may be illustrative of his practice of making changes of expression with no narrative consequence: the phrase in his copy-text "make mee hide what you please" (sig. 15r) becomes "compell mee to hide whatsoeuer you shall please" (sig. 15r; my italics). This compositor makes his presence felt by adding new words, thus stopping the line-for-line correspondence with the previous edition, although he is very careful to bring the text into agreement at the end of each page to prevent any disruption with the work of his fellow compositors. As a result, the third edition of Palmerin d'Oliva presents a page-by-page reproduction of the 1597 edition with the kind of changes already mentioned.

Hayes states that the 1616 edition Palmerin d'Oliva II is based not on Creede's 1597 edition, as one would expect, but on the editio princeps of 1588. Unfortunately no copy of the first edition of Palmerin d'Oliva II is extant to corroborate Hayes's statement and he provides no evidence to support his position other than the fact that Monday's epistle to the friendly readers is dated March 9, 1588. Of course, this plausible date would not appear in the third edition without the compositors having consulted a copy of the editio princeps, since the date is not included in the 1597 edition. But one could still argue that the coincidence of the 1616 edition with that of 1588 as regards the date in the prefatory material represents only circumstantial evidence that is not enough to prove the textual descent of the 1616 edition from the editio princeps. Consequently, we need to substantiate Hayes's position by producing further proof of the third edition's textual derivation from the first. In chapter six, after Maurice, Prince of Pasmeria, marries King Lycomedes's daughter, thus betraying the Queen of Tharsus, the latter decides to take vengeance. With the help of a magician, she sends Maurice an enchanted crown that
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bursts into flames the moment he places it on his head. When Maurice’s envoys meet the queen asking her to be merciful and free the prince of the enchantment, she declines. These were the queen’s words to the envoys in Jean Maugin’s French version from which Munday translated: «Allez, & vuidez incontinent de mes terres: car vostre maistre est tant indigne de faieur, que ses gents en sont tous à haver.» It seems reasonable to expect that the editio princeps contained a correct translation of this French quotation. The second edition, however, presents a corrupt reading caused inadvertently by the compositors: “depart my Countrey, for your Maister is so worthie of fauour, as for his sake I hate his people” (sig. B6v; my italics). By contrast, this error is emended in the third edition, which instead of “worthie” reads “vnworthie” (sig. C2v). The reading in the 1616 edition reproduces the one most probably contained in the 1588. Even though the narrative context allows for the possibility of emending
the text without necessarily consulting the first edition, the composito-
rial practices in the third edition show consistency in not altering the
meaning of the source. Moreover, the use of a double o in the word "vn-
worthie" represents Munday's preferred spelling, which was already
perceived as old-fashioned in 1588 and therefore abandoned in 1597. 52
If the compositors of the 1616 edition had been working from a copy
of 1597 and decided to emend their source, they would not have decided
to impose an old-fashioned spelling but would have most probably
written "vnyworthie". So, in view of all this evidence, the compositors
seem not to be emending the 1597 edition, but rather copying from the
original version of 1588. In other words, this case of substantive textual
variation demonstrates the second and third editions' independent deri-
vation from the editio princeps.

In 1637, four years after Munday's death, the fourth edition (RSTC
19160) was printed "for [i.e., by] B. Alsop and T. Fawcet, dwelling in
Grub-street neere the lower Pumpe", as the title page reads. 53 When
Thomas Creede died in 1616 Alsop inherited his business and later
formed partnership with Thomas Fawcet, who took up his freedom on
May 7, 1621. 54 This edition retains the substantive variant readings in the
two parts of the third edition and agrees with it in departing from the 1588
and 1597 editions accordingly. 55 This edition's textual derivation is best
illustrated by the same examples used previously in the case of the third
dition: in part i, sig. 151, the fourth edition agrees substantively with
the third in reading, "compell me to hide whatsoever you shall please";
the same happens in part ii, sig. c117, which also agrees with the previous
edition and reads, "depart my Country: for your Master is so unworthy
of favour, as for his sake I hate his people" (c117). Note, however, that
the compositors make no attempt to follow page by page their copy-text.

52 Cf. Byrne (see note 28). See below how the spelling of this word is modernized in the 1637 edition.
53 The following copies of the fourth edition are known to exist in public repositories: Alicante
UL, FA/0112; BL G. 10484; Bodleian L, Douce PP 241 and Wood 348; Bristol UL, Restricted M; Cam-
bridge UL, SSS.26.8; Dulwich College, accession n° 1673-1674; Folger Shakespeare L, STC 19160
copy 1 and 2; Harvard UL, STC 19160; Henry E. Huntington L, 62839; UL of Illinois at Urbana-
Champaign, IUO9456; John Rylands UL of Manchester, n°14154; King's College, Cambridge,
a.7.19; LC P1 6419.P4 1637 English Print; Mith-
cell L, 781140; Newberry L, Case Y 1565.P166 and
Case Y 7265.P18 (part 1 only); Stanford UL, Rare
Books PC1637; Yale UL, 19 492.2 588g. The copy
in the John Rylands UL presents a variant
imprint to the title page of part i and replaces for
with by; cf. RSTC, vol. 2, p. 211. The staff of the
New York UL inform me that they hold no copy of
this book, contrary to the information in the
RSTC. For a facsimile of the title page, see Jordi
Sánchez-Martí: The University of Alicante
Copy of Palmerin d'Oliva (London, 1637): A Biblio-
graphical Description. In: Saderi: Yearbook of the
Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renais-
54 Arder (see note 10), vol. 3, pp. 685, 701. For
more information about Fawcet, see Plomer
(see note 42), p. 72.
55 Cf. Hayes (see note 8), p. 70. The informa-
tion Hayes presents in tabular form (pp. 75/6) is
confusing: it seems to suggest that the fourth
dition of Palmerin d'Oliva i is a reprint of the
second edition, and the fourth edition of Palme-
rin d'Oliva ii is a reprint of the first edition. It seems
more accurate to state that the 1637 edition is a
reprint of the third edition. See Table 1.
56 Hayes (see note 8), pp. 75/6.
57 For this passage, see Bale B. J. Randall
and Jackson C. Boswell: Cervantes in Seventeenth-
p. 43. This book contains an anthology of texts chronicling the reception of Cervantes's works in
England throughout the seventeenth century.
58 Randall and Boswell (see note 57), p. 59.
59 Randall and Boswell (see note 57), p. 151.
60 For an overview of the various English
translations of Don Quixote, see Julie Candler
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In his 1925 article Hayes included a table summarizing the publication history of Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva. I here follow his example avoiding the ambiguities and inaccuracies in Hayes's original table (table 1).

Here ends the publication history of Anthony Munday's Palmerin d'Oliva, which has never been reprinted since 1637. As a matter of fact, the founding text of the Palmerin cycle ceased to be available in print prematurely when compared with the publication of other Iberian romances translated by Munday. We have notice of the following seventeenth-century reprints of Munday's romance translations published after 1637: Palladine of England 1664 (Wing STC c5090), 1700? (Wing STC c5090a); Palmendos 1653 (Wing STC F377), 1663 (Wing STC F378); Palmerin of England 1639 (RSTC 19164), 1664 (Wing STC M2613A, M2613B), 1685 (Wing STC M2613C). Why is Palmerin d'Oliva not in the list? I contend that one possible cause can be found in Cervantes's Don Quixote (1605), which contains a severe condemnation of Palmerin d'Oliva expressed by the curate during the scrutiny of the eponymous hero's library. The relevant passage in Thomas Shelton’s 1612 translation (RSTC 4915) reads as follows:

And then opening another booke, he saw it was Palmerin de Oliva, neere vnto which stood another, intituled Palmerin of England: which the Licenciat perceiuing, said, let Oliva be presently rent in pieces, and burned in such sort, that evene the very ashes thereof may not be found: and let Palmerin of England be preserued, as a thing rarely delectable [...].

The effects of the curate's verdict were not felt immediately, although it seems to inform the views of some contemporary opinion-making voices. For instance, Robert Burton, in his The Anatomy of Melancholy (1621; RSTC 4159) warns against reading “Amadis de Gaul, the Knight of the Sun, the seaven Champians [sic!], Palmerin de Oliva, Huon of Burdeaux, &c.”

William Vaughan, in his The Golden Fleece (1626; RSTC 24609), criticizes “those prodigious, idle, and time-wasting Bookes, called the Mirror of Knighthood, the Knights of the Round Table, Palmerin de Oliva, and the like rabblement.” And Peter Heylyn, in his Cosmographie in Four Bookes (1652; Wing STC H1689), after mentioning The Mirror of Knighthood adds a list of titles including “Palmarin de Oliva [sic!], Primaiion, and Belianis of Greece, Parismus, the Romance of Romances, and [...] all that Rabble”.

These critical opinions about Palmerin d'Oliva and other chivalric texts, but significantly not about Palmerin of England, served to reinforce the original criticism contained in Don Quixote, whose English translation was printed repeatedly throughout the seventeenth century: in 1620 (RSTC 4916, 4917), 1652 (Wing STC c1776), 1675 (Wing STC c1777), 1686 (Wing STC c1772), 1687 (Wing STC c1774, c1774A), 1689 (Wing STC c1771), 1695? (Wing STC c1773), 1699 (Wing STC c1778), and 1700 (Wing STC c1773A, c1775).
**[Table 1]**

The publication history of *Palmerin d’Oliva* spanned fifty years and consisted of four editions, thus averaging a reprint every 12.5 years. This romance, therefore, belongs to the 18.8% of speculative first editions that in the Elizabethan period were reprinted within ten years (1588-97), and also to the 48.1% of works of prose fiction published from 1559 to 1591 that were reprinted within twenty years. The statistical framework supplied by Farmer and Lesser shows the above-average popularity of prose fiction and helps us confirm the individual popularity of *Palmerin d’Oliva* within the context of the early modern English book trade. Although we lack exact information about the press runs of the editions of our romance, it is worth reminding that in 1587 the Stationers’ Company agreed on a limit of between 1250 and 1500 copies per edition. Considering that a reprint was produced when the previous edition had sold out, we can estimate that possibly a maximum of between 10,000 and 12,000 volumes of *Palmerin*, or 5000 to 6000 complete sets, could have circulated in England from 1588 to 1637. By contrast, only a handful of copies...
have come down to us, although low survival rates tend to affect "the most heavily read titles," and are a further indication of a work's popularity. In the case of our romance, the record of surviving copies representing the first three editions is rather exiguous, thus possibly suggesting that it was heavily read; conversely, more copies of the fourth edition survive (see note 53). Notwithstanding the fact that temporal proximity favors material preservation, we cannot avoid wondering whether the previous interest in this romance decreased in part due to Cervantes's remarks. Therefore, it may well be that the death sentence imposed on Palmerin d'Oliva by Cervantes’s curate paradoxically contributed to the greater preservation of the 1637 edition. Be that as it may, probably as a result of Cervantes's censure, Palmerin d'Oliva has not seen the light of day ever since 1637, but thanks to the efforts of readers, antiquaries, bibliophiles, and librarians, Cervantes's condemnation had no retroactive effects and some copies were preserved to tell the story of this romance's publication history.