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ABSTRACT

Imitative Sequel Writing:

*Divine Breathings, Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*,

and the Case of T. S. (aka Thomas Sherman). (August 2007)

Christopher E. Garrett, B.A., Brigham Young University;

M.A., Oregon State University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Clinton Machann

During the period between 1640 and 1700, over forty works were produced by authors identifying themselves as “T. S.” In the field of early modern literary studies, one T. S. has been particularly important to scholars because of this author’s imitative version of John Bunyan’s popular allegory titled *The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (1682). This work by T. S., who has become known as Thomas Sherman, achieves minor success and prompts Bunyan to write his own authentic sequel. My research has uncovered an attribution history that identifies four additional texts—*Divine Breathings* (circa 1671); *Youth’s Tragedy* (1671); *Youth’s Comedy* (1680); *Divine Breathings, the Second Part* (1680)—and credits all of them to a Thomas Sherman. Of the five works attributed to this author, the most impressive printing history belongs to the earliest offering, *Divine Breathings, or a Pious Soul Thirsting after Christ in a Hundred Pathetical Meditations*, which appears in over 60 printings from 1671 to 1883 in England, Scotland, and North America. My research scrutinizes this attribution history and raises questions about identifying this T. S. as Thomas Sherman. Based on
internal and external evidence, I argue that T. S. is not the author of *Divine Breathings* but establishes his authorial identity as an imitative writer who actively participates in the genre of Protestant meditational literature by providing sequels (i.e., *Divine Breathings ...the Second Part* and *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*).
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Seventeenth-century writer T. S., typically identified as Thomas Sherman, a General Baptist, is known by many early modern scholars as the author of Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress (1682). Of the other works attributed to this author—Divine Breathings (4th ed., 1671), Youth’s Tragedy (1671), Youth’s Comedy (1680), Divine Breathings ... the Second Part (1680)—the bulk of scholarly attention has been given to his Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. This dissertation, however, will provide the first critical study of a text that merits equal attention, Divine Breathings.

It is important for scholars to be aware of the successful printing history of Divine Breathings, particularly its popularity in the seventeenth century, because it helps us understand T. S.’s authorial identity. My research suggests de-attributing Divine Breathings away from T. S. to Michael Renniger (1528/9-1609), a Church of England clergyman. Without Divine Breathings in his corpus of attributed works, we can then focus on T. S.’s role as an imitative sequel writer and see that this writer selected steady sellers (i.e., Divine Breathings and Pilgrim’s Progress) to critique, imitate, and sequelize. Whereas others have centered their attention primarily on T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress and his significance as an early critic of John Bunyan’s style, I propose that we step back and consider T. S.’s corpus of works in order to comprehend his literary career. T. S. writes Youth’s Tragedy, which was an immediate best seller—

This dissertation follows the MLA Style Manual.
four editions were issued in just two years—but then his poetic voice evidently turns silent. However, by 1680, he suddenly finds inspiration, offering a sequel, *Youth’s Comedy* (published by Bunyan’s printer, Nathaniel Ponder) as a follow-up to *Youth’s Tragedy*. That same year, T. S. produces a sequel to *Divine Breathings* titled *Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations...the Second Part* (also printed by Ponder), imitating the resolve form of meditative writing. Meditation continued to be a priority for T. S. as evident by his emphasis on the practice when he writes his “Supplyment” to Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*.

Anonymity presents a challenge to modern readers, one that tempts a certain type of engagement. As in the present case of T. S., the impulse for a scholar is to put on his detective hat and work at solving the mystery of the author’s identity. In this current project, I will not only raise questions about the author’s identity (who is he?) and his possible motives (why did he write?) but also consider the large picture of this author’s career (what he wrote and how he wrote). I will attempt to draw our attention back to his work and look at the larger context of his career in my argument that this author, even though we may not have assurance as to the proper name matching his identity, plays a notable role as an imitative sequel writer. We may do a disservice to this author and our students—modern readers—by insisting on unmasking his anonymity rather than honoring his identity as T. S. As Marcy North reports, “In most twentieth-century editions of early literature, initials that can be identified are replaced with names … *without consideration of how they might ask a text to be read*” (italics added, 68).
This dissertation is both a study of attribution and an attribution study. I have benefited greatly from Harold Love’s work, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction* (2002). According to Love, attributionists should reflect upon their personal biases for taking on projects: “The best way of dealing with bias in scholarship is to declare it. Where it is not declared the reader should always be alert for it” (217). Since I have nothing to hide, I shall candidly share my reasons for taking on this project.

In 2003 I first encountered T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* and recognized his importance as an early critic of Bunyan’s work. After learning that T. S. had been identified as Thomas Sherman, I became curious about attributions and how they occur. I wondered how T. S. became known as Thomas Sherman. So I began researching for answers and kept researching. After several years of work, I discovered that this attribution lacked a strong foundation: it depended upon what appears to be shaky or questionable scholarship. Although T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* was the text that initially drew me in, over time I discovered a neglected text—*Divine Breathings*—attributed to T. S., and its impressive reception history, and I became convinced that both the author and his work merited critical attention. After three years of probing into the case of T. S., examining extant editions of works attributed to this author found in rare book collections in the United States and England, and looking for biographical information about this author, I have formed the attribution narrative documented in Chapter II.

---

1 This is a term that I will frequently use and I am not sure whether or not it has been used before. By *attribution narrative* I mean the story behind the attribution (i.e., how this attribution occurred). It is the history of the scholarship and occurrences that explain how, in this case, T. S. became known as Thomas Sherman.
My project fits within the parameters of D. C. Greetham’s definition of textual scholarship because it pays special attention to “the social reception and revision of … text[s].” Furthermore, I “derive[] evidence from the previous history of the discipline” and place my “work in the context of that historical perspective, thereby filling out the features of what is essentially a narrative argument (a story—a history—with discoverable events in their proper sequence)” (Greetham 2). Hence, the method I employ in Chapter II is primarily historical—the attribution narrative is, for the most part, presented in a chronological manner. My rationale for doing so is that the reader will hopefully see the evolution of T. S.’s identification and how certain texts were attributed to this writer.

Those working within the field of attribution studies are concerned with two types of evidence: internal and external. In general terms, Love explains, “internal evidence is that from the work itself and external evidence that from the social world within which the work is created, promulgated, and read; but there will always be overlap” (51). More specifically, internal evidence includes: “1) stylistic evidence; 2) Self-reference and self-presentation within the work; 3) Evidence from the themes, ideas, beliefs and conceptions of genre manifested in the work” (Love 51). Some examples of external evidence include:

1) Contemporary attributions contained in incipits, explicits, titles, and from documents purporting to impart information about the circumstances of composition—especially diaries, correspondence, publishers’ records, and records of legal proceedings;
2) Biographical evidence, which would include information about a putative author’s allegiances, whereabouts, dates, personal ties, and political and religious affiliations;
3) The history of earlier attributions of the work and the circumstances under which they were made. (Love 51)

Until recently, attributionists have favored external evidence. The following statement of scholar Samuel Schoenbaum, recorded in 1960, is indicative of prior opinions: “External evidence can and often does provide incontestable proof; internal evidence can only support hypotheses or corroborate external evidence” (189). In a symposium held at Columbia University in 1958, Arthur Sherbo challenged the status quo by endorsing internal evidence, which he broadly categorized as “style and ideas.” Sherbo declared that “internal evidence deals with essentials while external evidence deals with accidentals. When expressed thus baldly it seems almost unnecessary to go on to say that, short of unequivocal acknowledgment by the author himself, the value of internal evidence outweighs any other” (7). Today, thanks in part to the increased popularity of stylometrics,2 “the balance of confidence has shifted back in favour of the internal” (Love, Attributing Authorship 54). My approach to the case of T. S. has been influenced by Love’s contention that “[n]either kind should be given priority by fiat”, so

---
I intend to examine both internal and external evidence which may lead to more convincing and accurate results.³

Chapter II focuses primarily on the external evidence I have discovered in my research on T. S., including an unpublished letter written in 1861 by George Offor, a Bunyan scholar and editor, found in the Newberry Library. One type of external evidence remains elusive: no extant biographical details have been located for a seventeenth-century English nonconformist writer named Thomas Sherman. As shall be presented at the end of Chapter II, I have discovered a previously neglected attribution published in 1881 which I found in an extremely rare copy of Divine Breathings held at the Bodleian Library: recorded in W. J. Loftie’s preface, J. L. Chester proposes that Michael Renniger is the author of Divine Breathings.

In Chapter III, our attention will turn to Divine Breathings and how it functions in the genre of meditational prose in seventeenth-century England, specifically as a type of resolve writing. As part of our exploration of internal evidence, we will carefully examine both textual and paratextual material found in Divine Breathings and Divine Breathings…the Second Part. Beyond my argument that we adopt Chester’s proposal that Renniger (and not T. S.) authored Divine Breathings, I assert in both Chapters III and IV that T. S. establishes his authorial identity as an imitative writer who actively participates in and pioneers ongoing discourse by providing sequels to steady sellers. To aid in that project, Chapter IV illustrates how T. S.’s sequel Second Part of the Pilgrim’s

Progress both emphasizes meditation and offers a critique of Bunyan’s use of imagination.
CHAPTER II

HOW T. S BECAME THOMAS SHERMAN:
AN ATTRIBUTION NARRATIVE

[L]iterary discourses came to be accepted only when endowed with the author-function. We now ask of each poetic or fictional text: from where does it come, who wrote it, when, under what circumstances, or beginning with what design? The meaning ascribed to it and the status or value accorded it depend upon the manner in which we answer these questions. And if a text should be discovered in a state of anonymity—whether as a consequence of an accident or the author’s explicit wish—the game becomes one of rediscovering the author. Since literary anonymity is not tolerable, we can accept it only in the guise of an enigma. As a result, the author-function today plays an important role in our view of literary works. (Foucault 149-150)

In the field of early modern literary studies, T. S. (aka Thomas Sherman) has been particularly important to scholars because of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (1682), the anonymous author’s sequel to John Bunyan’s popular allegory. However, this same T. S. has also been identified as the author of at least four additional texts—*Divine Breathings, or a Pious Soul Thirsting After Christ in One Hundred Pathetical Meditations* (c. 1671), *Youth’s Tragedy, a Poem* (1671), *Youth’s Comedy, or the Soul’s
Tryals and Triumph: A Dramatick Poem (1680), and Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations. The Second Part (1680)—and has been traditionally identified as Thomas Sherman. One of the purposes of this chapter will be to scrutinize and raise questions about the accuracy of that attribution. Before turning our attention to the case of T. S., we will first consider explanations for why anonymity occurs in seventeenth-century literature. Then we will briefly review how initials functioned and the challenges that they present to attributionists.

Anonymous authorship was the norm for centuries, and the early modern period in England was no exception. From her research on Renaissance literary history, Marcy North reports, “More than 800 known authors were published anonymously between 1475 and 1640, and to this figure one must add pseudonymous authors, those authors who are still unidentified, and those who penned the many anonymous poems and smaller items that appear in anthologies and miscellanies of the period” (3). That number is magnified even more when considering that “more than half of the items published in the 1600s were still printed anonymously” (Dobranski, Readers 8).

Early modern readers, it seems, had few qualms about unsigned books: “To see anonymity as mundane, familiar, and expected, as many early readers did, was to acknowledge its established role in defining early modern authorship,” North observes.

4 For this statistic North identifies the following as her source: Halkett and Laing’s Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Publications in the English Language, 3rd revised edition, 1475-1640, ed. John Horden et al. (Harlow: Longman, 1980).

“Anonymity’s status as an ordinary and commonplace textual condition was also one of its most functional characteristics” (91). That began to change, Michael Foucault argues, as the author-function began to consume perceptions regarding authorship and anonymity. According to Foucault, that “reversal” occurs in the seventeenth or eighteenth century (149). Foucault’s assertion that the author-function is a modern phenomenon has been shown to be premature or misleading: Roger Chartier’s research documents how the author-function existed in the Middle Ages.6

What has developed since Foucault is a “standard narrative,” writes Robert Griffin, “of identity emerging out of anonymity” that explains that by 1710, thanks to the origination of copyright laws, writers began (or at least sought), as the executors of their intellectual property, to exercise greater control over their published works ("Anonymity" 878). However, Griffin warns against assuming that a major shift suddenly occurred in the late early modern period and suggests that “Foucault’s large narrative about the connection between copyright and naming does not correspond to the historical record, at least in England” ("Introduction" 6). Even before copyright laws were enacted, some authors exhibited concern for their published works, claimed ownership of them, and challenged those who wished to capitalize on their success. For example, Joseph Loewenstein has revealed how Ben Jonson exercised persistent

---

6 Chartier, in his Order of Books, discusses Foucault’s author-function and declares, “the author was functional as early as the Middle Ages” (31). He also cautions against attempts “to reduce the construction of an author-function, understood as the major criterion for the attribution of texts, to oversimplified or too-univocal formulas. Nor can that construction be pinned down to one determining cause or a unique historical moment” (59).
possessiveness and authorial control over his publications, most notably his involvement in preparing texts for the 1616 and 1640 folio editions of his *Workes*.  

By the 1670s and 1680s, other examples of possessive authorship in England emerge. Mark Rose argues that John Milton was the first who perceived himself as an author in a proprietary manner in the literary marketplace (27-30). Like Jonson and Milton, John Bunyan not only opts for onymity but also exerts energy toward creating his own authorial persona. On title pages of works by other writers, the title of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* would be copied or imitated and, in some cases, parts of his name and initials as well (see Chapter IV of this study). In response to these attempts, Bunyan vigorously worked to establish and promote his authorial identity by consistently labeling his works with his name on the title pages and by attaching the titles of prior successful works to his name. In 1680, the by-line on the title page of *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman* functions as an advertisement: “By JOHN BUNYAN, the Author of the *Pilgrim’s Progress*.” Two years later, the title page of the first edition of *The Holy War* (1682) announces its source: “By JOHN BUNYAN, the Author of the *Pilgrim’s Progress*.”

---

7 See Joseph Loewenstein’s *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship*, especially the final chapter. For a summary of that account, see Loewenstein’s *Author’s Due*, pp. 82-88. In *Author’s Due*, Loewenstein provides George Wither as another example of an author who asserts control over his works (138-151). Brean Hammond also gravitates towards George Wither as an important author “whose career dramatizes the clash between the regulatory and the proprietary models of authorship during this era and who…becomes a fulcrum figure in the prehistory of professional writing” (25).

8 Gerard Genette creates the term onymity (to sign one’s legal name) and suggests that to reveal one’s identity is a “choice like any other” (*Paratexts* 39-40).

9 Surprisingly, most of the by-lines of Bunyan’s earlier works do not contain additional material or tags.
As illustrated in the case of Bunyan, the author’s name begins to be treated as “a kind of brand name, a recognizable sign that the cultural commodity will be of a certain kind and quality” (Rose 1-2).

My work in this chapter validates Foucault’s observation (as stated above in this chapter’s epigraph) that there is an impulse (at least in modern readers) toward wanting to (re)discover the anonymous author’s identity. The attribution narrative which shall be related below regarding how T. S. becomes known as Thomas Sherman details the extent to which that “game” has been played, especially among Victorian scholars and bibliographers. But, we must remember that this impulse is not a modern invention. As North reports, such attempts to identify the unknown author were made in the early modern period; there was “particular interest in cataloguing anonymous works and identifying their authors” which “developed in the seventeenth century” (259).11

Whereas authors like Jonson, Milton, and Bunyan practiced their craft anonymously and used their names as marketing tools, many writers in the seventeenth century published without signing. Why did authors conceal their names?12 Those who

---

10 Although he does not cite this example nor any from the 1600s, Griffin acknowledges that “the phrase ‘by the author of’ was in use by the late seventeenth century and had become standard practice by the middle of the eighteenth century” (“Anonymity and Authorship” 880). Griffin focuses more on those anonymous authors who use the phrase “by the author of.” As shall be documented later in this chapter, we find an example in the printing history of works by T. S. The title page of his first sequel, *Youth’s Comedy* (1680), declares: “By the author of Youth’s Tragedy.” Apparently, no scholarship has yet attempted to examine the origins of this phrase “by the author of” and the earliest examples of its usage.

11 For this declaration, North cites Taylor and Mosher’s *Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma*, pp. 75, 101.

12 For more on this question, see Margaret Ezell’s essay “Reading Pseudonyms in Seventeenth-Century English Coterie Literature,” wherein she argues, “The politics of using pseudonyms…are more complex” than the “methodology of literary detection” (14). Ezell and North both seem to agree that those who approach pseudonyms as riddles to be solved may be missing out on how anonymity invites a text to be read.
revised Halkett and Laing’s *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature* offer a prefatory section, “Notes on Anonymity and Pseudonymity,” which includes an attempt to explain the possible motives for anonymous authorship. According to these editors—James Kennedy, W. A. Smith, and A. F. Johnson—writers opt for anonymity either because of timidity or confidence. Among the reasons that timid authors suppress their identities are “a) diffidence, b) fear of consequences, and c) shame” (xi). Others who choose anonymity may actually be confident that by concealing their identity they can still succeed without the use of their authorial reputation (xii). Notice how these theories (published in 1926) all assume the writer’s volition regarding anonymity.

Although scholarship regarding anonymity—its historical prevalence and significance—continues to expand and evolve, scholars presently working in this area tend to explain the motivations for authorial anonymity in ways similar to those proffered by Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson. In an essay published in 1999, Griffin admits a variety of “motivations for publishing anonymously” exists, “but they have included an aristocratic or a gendered reticence, religious self-effacement, anxiety over public exposure, fear of prosecution, hope of an unprejudiced reception, and the desire to deceive (“Anonymity” 7). Some writers wished to “test the waters before revealing their identity in a second edition” (8).

---

13 In their twelve-page article, Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson expand their explanation of these various motives for choosing anonymity. They acknowledge that there are also cases where collaborative work is concealed under the guise of a single author (xxii).
Whereas Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson focused on the author’s volition for choosing anonymity, North challenges this assumption. For example, texts were sometimes “grabbed out of manuscript circulation and published, without permission, by a printer or publisher eager for new material in a tight market” (78). In such conditions authors often had little control over attribution decisions, signing or not signing. North asserts:

Printer-publishers…had greater control over attribution decisions than authors did, but they were not impervious to influence or constraint. Lack of access to an author’s name, anticipation of an author’s objections to an unauthorized edition, desire for political protection, pressure from a well-connected author, and demand from consumers could all determine a printer’s attribution decisions. (79)

The use of initials, which qualifies as anonymity under Griffin’s definition (“Anonymity” 879), is a popular print convention that serves as a sort of middle ground between identity and anonymity. “Sets of initials,” North states, “stand in the balance between naming and authorial discretion” (67). The tendency is to interpret initials strictly as an abbreviation of an author’s first and last name. However, this is not always a reliable practice. For example, the use of reverse initials (i.e., representing an author’s last and first names) occurred nearly two dozen times between 1475 and 1640. In addition, during that same period there are more than one hundred examples of spurious initials (67). Initials were originally used to minimize space and designate authorial identity. However, as the number of authors increased it became more challenging to
identify authors by their initials alone (North 70). Certain authors “earned the right to claim a certain set of initials.” As North observes, “To claim a set of initials through habit or frequent use was to replace their function as abbreviations with a signature function, to deny their expansion and insist that two or three letters can signify a single author” (73).14

The use of initials also creates intrigue. To illustrate this, North points us to George Gascoigne’s anthology, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowre*:

Gascoigne uses initials to designate the poet, the collector and narrator of the poet’s work, the man who borrows the collector’s manuscript, and the man who finally initiates printing. F. J.’s poems, we are told in several prefatory letters, reached the printer after passing from F. J. to the manuscript’s owner, G. T., to his friend, H. W., to the printer, A. B. (68)

The first edition of T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (1682) records a similar strategy employed in its prefatory material: the author is T. S., the endorsement of the book is signed by R. B., and the printer is T. H. As North explains, such examples illustrate how the use of initials “becomes a potential disguise, a gesture teasing the print audience, an affirmation of inside reader’s knowledge, or an author’s fiction” (North 68-69).

In the case of T. S., as I will argue, we have an author whose anonymity persists and resists identification. Other seventeenth-century writers began their literary careers

---

cloaked in anonymity but later their names were publicized with their works: by way of illustration, consider the career of B. K., an English dissenter. Regarding his literary ministry, B. K. openly declared that his intention was to reach “all sorts of Protestants, whether Conformists, or Nonconformists” and rejoiced when his books achieved that broad, interdenominational reception (*Progress of Sin* 1). Attempting to build upon the common ground shared with his Anglican neighbors, his writings addressed topics ranging from the recognition of sin to the dangers of Catholicism. To succeed in that endeavor, B. K. may have opted for anonymity so that readers could focus on his message rather than on his identity as a dissenter. For example, in 1666 the first edition of *Zion in Distress* appeared in London; both author and printer are omitted from the title page of this attack upon the Catholic Church—the paratext is completely void of names and initials.15 “[C]hiefly intended for the Instruction of the Younger sort,” the four earliest editions of *War with the Devil* issued 1673-1676 by Benjamin Harris all contained “B. K.” in the by-lines of the title pages.16 However, the title page of John Dunton’s 1684 edition of *Travels of True Godliness* claims that its author is “B. K. Author of *War with the Devil, and Sion in Distress.*”17 B. K.’s identity is revealed

---

15 The anonymous author’s address invites the “courteous reader” to “Diligently and impartially … peruse” its contents, warning against “censoriously jud[ing] or “prejudicially condemn[ing] the plain and simple-hearted Author” (A3-A3v). After multiple editions, by 1692 the text of *Zion in Distress* continued to remain void of any explicit information as to its authorship, but its new packaging included a unique, ornate emblem on the frontispiece along with instructions for interpreting the emblem on the verso of the title page. The significance of including emblematic frontispieces will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.

16 Likewise, Keach’s *The Glorious Lover* (1679) was poetry intended for young readers of both sexes; Sharon Achinstein calls it “an early modern bestseller, running to four editions in twenty years” (196).

17 B. K.’s notoriety as an author is certain, considering Dunton’s declaration that he printed 10,000 copies of *Travels of True Godliness*, a work of allegorical prose (Dunton 1: 175, 177). The popularity of
publicly when printer Benjamin Harris published *Mentis Humane Metamorphis* (1676), a poem by J. Mason; its title page explains that it provides “directions to readers of that Divine Poem, written by Benjamin Keach, intitled Warre with the Devil” and purports to show readers “how to Read the same Poem aright.”

Of the five works by T. S. attributed to Thomas Sherman, the most impressive printing history belongs to the earliest offering, *Divine Breathings*, which appears in over 60 printings from 1671 to 1883 (see Appendix A for a detailed printing history). The earliest extant copy of *Divine Breathings* is a fourth edition held at UCLA’s Clark Memorial Library. This book of meditations contains neither textual nor paratextual reference to T. S. and is presented to the reader courtesy of Christopher Perin, who signs the preface. Therein, Perin informs “the Christian Reader” that these “pious Ejaculations” were found “among the writings of an eminent Divine” and had previously been “communicated only to his dearest relations” (A2-verso).

In 1671, John Starkey and Francis Smith print the first edition of *Youth’s Tragedy, a Poem*. Its title page declares authorship “By T. S.”, includes both Latin and Keach’s *War with the Devil* seems to have been ignored in scholarship. Wilson’s sketch on Keach in *The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches* (1808-1814), for example, neglects to comment on the success of *War with the Devil*. Nearly two centuries later, a website titled *The Reformed Reader*, which claims to be “committed to historic Baptist beliefs,” fails to include *War with the Devil* in its list of 15 representative works authored by Keach. This is an unfortunate indication of unattentive scholarship because *War with the Devil* is the work by which B. K. was most readily identified as evident by the frequency of the title in his by-line tags. (Please also note that *Zion* was also occasionally spelled as *Sion*.)

---

18 Mason’s project illustrates how diverse early modern reading habits must have been. As Eugene Kintgen observes: “The very fact that an author recommends a particular strategy for reading indicates that someone was capable of reading that way; but the fact that he has to recommend it also suggests that many people, perhaps most, were not already reading that way” (13). Furthermore, the existence of a book such as Mason’s supports Stephen Dobranski’s contention that “both authors and readers gained considerable authority during the early modern period—and that the two phenomena were reciprocal. Early modern authors who developed individual identities did so by envisioning and, in some cases, trying to train active readers” (Dobranski, *Readers* 12).
Greek epigraphs, and advertises the poem as a “Dialogue between Youth. The Devil. Wisdome. The Nuncia. Time. Death. The Soul.” Intended “For the Caution, and Direction, of the Younger Sort,” according to the Prologue’s couplet, all are invited to examine its contents: “If thou art serious, then attend, and see, / If not, yet stay, that thou may’st serious bee” (1). If Sharon Achinstein is correct in calling Keach’s Glorious Lover (which was also directed toward young readers but did not appear for another eight years) “a bestseller” due to its four printings over the course of twenty years (196), then T. S.’s Youth’s Tragedy merits being labeled as a blockbuster: Starkey and Smith issued four editions in just two years.

In 1680, Nathaniel Ponder prints Youth’s Comedy, or the Souls Tryals and Triumph “By the Author of YOUTH’S TRAGEDY.”¹⁹ This “Dramatick POEM, with Divers Meditations intermixt upon several Subjects” is a sequel to Youth’s Tragedy, “Set forth to Help and Encourage those that are seeking a HEAVENLY COUNTERY.” Like Youth’s Tragedy, the title page includes both Latin and Greek epigraphs, and preceding the preface the author addresses “Especially the Younger Sort” of reader and signs as “Your Well-wisher T. S.” That same year, Ponder issues a sequel entitled Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations, in One Century, Tending to Promote Good Conversation in Christ, Comprizing in Brief Many of those Great Truths that are to be Known and Practised by a Christian. The Second Part (1680). Unlike the original Divine Breathings which was published unsigned, lacking both name and

¹⁹ See Appendix B for the printing history of Youth’s Comedy.
initials, T. S. avowed authorship of the sequel: his initials appear on the title page, and
the prefatory address to the reader is signed, “Well-wisher, T. S.” The title page also
includes a Latin epigraph credited to Horace.

There were many seventeenth-century writers who used the initials T. S. During
the period between 1640 and 1710, there were over forty works published in England by
authors identifying themselves with the initials “T. S.” (British Museum General
Catalogue 583-591). Some of the descriptive tags in the by-lines and in the titles of their
works include: “T. S., MD”; “T. S., layick of Church of England”; “T. S., Gentleman”;
“T. S., who loveth and could willingly serve any that loves our Lord Jesus in sincerity”;
“T. S. of Grays-Inne, Esq.”; “T. S. a weaver in London, who would have the nobility and
gentry of England have a true light into that affair”; “T. S. A True Lover of his
Countrey;” and “(Mr T. S.) An English Merchant” (Arber, Term Catalogues; Wing,
STC). Although many of the titles by T. S.s have been attributed to various authors, a
few have eluded identification, such as A Yoke for the Roman-Bulls (1666),21 The
Adventures of (Mr T. S.) an English Merchant (1670), The Horrid Sin of Man-Catching
(1681), and The History of the Loves of Lysander and Sabina, a Novel (1688) (Wing,
STC). Some of the names of those seventeenth-century T. S.’s to be identified include
Richard Neve, Thomas Scott, Thomas Seymour, Thomas Sheppey, Thomas Symonds

---

20 As shall be detailed later in this chapter, I suggest that the original Divine Breathings should be de-attributed from T. S. to Michael Renniger. Just as he never attempted to deceive readers into thinking he authored Pilgrim’s Progress, so T. S. never avowed authorship of the first part of Divine Breathings.

21 In 1860 J. O. proposed in Notes and Queries that A Yoke for the Roman-Bulls (1666) be added to the list of titles attributed to Thomas Sherman, noting that it, like the other texts he places with it, “all bear a strong family resemblance.” This proposal was apparently disregarded by bibliographers and cataloguers (“T. S.” 317).
(Simonds), Thomas Simpson, Thomas Smith, Thomas Spark, Thomas Spencer, Thomas Stanley, Thomas Stephens, and Thomas Swadlin (Wing, STC; Arber, Term Catalogues; Block and Stonehill).

However, the most celebrated seventeenth-century author who occasionally signed with the initials T. S. (and sometimes opted not to sign at all) is Thomas Shadwell. Awarded the honor of Poet Laureate in 1689, Shadwell wrote a poem dedicated To the Most Noble James, Earl of Annandale (1659) and also A Congratulatory Poem on His Highness the Prince of Orange His Coming into England (1689), attaching to both only his initials T. S. Unlike the title page of The Humorists, a Comedy (1671) which discloses that the work is “Written by THO. SHADWELL, Of the Middle Temple,” Shadwell chooses complete anonymity for The Royal Shepherdess. A Tragi-Comedy (1669), offering neither name nor initials. Is it possible that other T. S.s generating literary works at this time enjoyed signing their initials in order to confuse readers, perhaps causing them to at least consider their text as a possible product of the famous poet and playwright?22

The following attribution narrative shows how the T. S. we are concerned with became known as Thomas Sherman and exemplifies the quest of readers and scholars to unmask the hidden identity (or identities) of an otherwise anonymous author(s). As shall

---

22 When Dryden directs a satirical attack upon Shadwell, he employs the initials of his intended target in the title: Mac Flecknoe, or a Satyr upon the True-Blew-Protestant Poet, T. S., “By the Author of ABSALOM & ACHITOPHEL.” However, readers recognized both the victim and the assailant. For example, “When The Medal of John Bayes, a nasty satirical poem on Dryden, was printed anonymously in 1682,” Paul Hammond discovers, “Narcissus Luttrell wrote on his copy: ‘6d by Thomas Shadwell. Agt Mr Dryden. very severe. 15 May,’ while another reader inscribed the title page of his copy: ‘Shadwell is Run Mad’” (50). Luttrell was a bookcollector whose library eventually was “divided about equally between Dr. Richard Farmer and James Bindley” (De Ricci 30).
be illustrated below, the focus tends to be more on solving the mystery than considering possible motives for the author’s decision not to avow authorship. Paul Hammond aptly and succinctly formulates the question: “[I]nstead of regarding anonymity as a problem, can we not see it as a functional device, as a resource which enabled certain kinds of writing and reading, rather than a tiresome puzzle which obscures the real canon of those named poets in whom we are primarily interested?” (49).

The earliest record that shows an attempt to identify this particular T. S. is found in *A Catalogue of Books Continued, Printed and Published in London in Michaelmas-Term, 1694*. Printed by Roger Clavell in London during this period, this catalogue lists an advertisement for an edition of *Youth’s Comedy* sold by J. Taylor, and it implies that the title page reads: “By Mr. Tho. Sherwin Author of *Youth’s Comedy* and *Divine Breathings*.”23 Some readers have guessed at the author’s identity and registered their attempts by annotating their books. For example, one reader of *Youth’s Tragedy* penned “Thomas Shoemaker” in a copy of the 1672 edition held at the Folger Library.24

The quest for authorial identification and details regarding T. S. has been intensely pursued by bibliographers, an activity particularly popular in the Victorian era. During the nineteenth century, the popularity of the anonymously written *Divine Breathings* peaks, with over thirty printings issued in England, Scotland, and the United

---

23 There is no printed pagination for this volume, but this advertisement is labeled as entry number 18 and appears under the heading of “Reprinted” books. The British Library holds a copy of this volume in its rare books collection. This series of catalogues was reprinted by Edward Arber in the early years of the twentieth century under the title *Term Catalogues*.

24 This is not unusual, as Hammond notes: “Readers…may add their conjectural attributions…of anonymously printed pamphlets” (50). As an example see footnote 6 describing two readers who identify Dryden and Shadwell by making notes in their texts.
States, and a keen interest in identifying T. S. simultaneously develops. However, the attention of bibliographers and book collectors initially focused on *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy*. For example, John Ker, 3rd Duke of Roxburghe’s collection includes both of these works, and the 1812 auction catalogue for his collection renders the authorship for *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* as simply “T. S.”²⁵ One of the most significant moments in the attribution history (perhaps the most critical in this study) occurs in 1820. James Bindley (1739-1818), commissioner of stamps, was an avid book collector, an “incurable bibliomaniac” and “a stalwart of the Society of Antiquaries” (Champion 118; de Chantilly 744). An “Old Carthusian” who attended the Charterhouse School and a Fellow of the Royal Society, Bindley obtained an M.A. from Cambridge in 1762 (Venn 263). After his death, his “curious and extensive library” was auctioned in four parts from 1818 through 1820. In the fourth volume of the auction catalogue (which, according to its title page, contains “rare old poetry, pageants, curious tracts, and rarities in every department of literature”), lot number 709 offers three titles: “*A Satyr against Hypocrites, a Poem*, 1655. Sherman’s *Youth’s Tragedy, a Poem*, 1672. Tunstall’s *Carmen Genethliacum*, 1723” (33). The margins contain the prices and purchasers noted in manuscript, and this particular lot was purchased by Thomas Rodd. Mr. Evans, when compiling the collection catalogues for the sale, may have seen a notation on Bindley’s copy of *Youth’s Tragedy*, perhaps handwriting on the title page, that identified “Sherman” as author of the poem. Listed as Lot 901 is “Youth’s Comedy

---
²⁵ The copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* previously owned by John Ker, Duke of Roxburghe, which bears his stamp on the verso of the title-leaf is held at the Bodleian Library as part of the Malone collection.
or the Soul’s Tryals and Triumph, 1680”, which is sold to Richard Heber. Although the title page of this edition bears the claim “By the Author of Youth’s Tragedy,” there is no authorship rendered in Bindley’s catalogue for *Youth’s Comedy*.

Published in 1834, William Thomas Lowndes’ *Bibliographer’s Manual of English Literature* includes entries for T. S.—listing and documenting the copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* sold in the Roxburghe auction—and also for “Sherman, T.”; Bindley’s catalogue is cited as a source, and his copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* are identified. Although Bindley’s catalogue only lists “Sherman’s Youth’s Tragedy” and, as mentioned above, there is no authorship rendered for *Youth’s Comedy*, Lowndes must have examined a copy of *Youth’s Comedy* and noticed that the title page proclaims it to be written “By the Author of Youth’s Tragedy.” Lowndes’ manual represents the first bibliographical reference source to identify T. S. as “T. Sherman” and attributes authorship of both *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* to “T. Sherman” (1674).²⁷

Ironically, many Victorians who attempted to solve the mystery of T. S.’s identity did so anonymously. The upstart journal *Notes and Queries* serves as the “Medium of Inter-Communication” for bibliographers interested in problems regarding authorship and anonymity. In its inaugural issue in November 1849 editor William J. Thoms candidly provides guidelines for those interested in participating: “We do not anticipate any holding back by those whose ‘NOTES’ are most worth having, or any

---

²⁶ According to Seymour de Ricci, Heber was “the main purchaser” of Bindley’s library and that the “sale catalogues are very inadequate and hardly give a fair idea of the wealth of the collection described” (94).

²⁷ The information listed by Lowndes for the Bindley catalogue is incorrect; it should read volume four and not volume two.
want of ‘QUERIES’ from those best able to answer them” (2). Following the encouragement of editor Thoms, most contributors to *Notes and Queries* (including those who registered interests in T. S.) during the mid-nineteenth century signed their submissions with initials (Leary 72). Occasionally, there were debates among the contributors about whether or not they should attach their names to their articles. One who signs as “C” writes that if all contributors identified themselves it would lead eventually [to] the ruin of the undertaking. Those who please may, and many do sign, and others who give no name are as well known as if they did; but as a general rule the absence of the name is, I am satisfied, best. It tends to brevity—it obviates personalities—it allows a freer communication of opinion and criticism. […] If we were all to give our names “N. & Q.” would, in three weeks, be a cock-pit! (457)

Most contributors complied with the editor’s advice by signing with initials, either their own or pseudonymously, or providing no name or initials. While some chose initials randomly, such as the contributor signing as “X. Y. Z.” (444), others used initials that matched their names. Still, there were writers who openly identified themselves, perhaps to establish their credibility or capitalize on their reputation. Repeatedly, the editor Thoms established guidelines for contributors, including pleas for them to “keep their messages brief; to endeavor to write more legibly… to consult common works of reference before posting a query; and to choose as their pseudonyms initials some other letters of the alphabet than A, B, or C” (Leary 72). Anonymity allowed a “sense of freedom from the inhibiting considerations of privilege and deference” which existed “in
the world outside” (Leary 71). However, while many contributed anonymously, “the identities behind some initials and pseudonyms were widely known within the antiquarian community” (Leary 71).

One of the most popular topics discussed in *Notes and Queries* during its first fifty years was anonymous works, with over 3,000 references (Francis 373). This statistic shows how conversations about authorship and anonymity were a common topic of discussion in *Notes and Queries*, evidence that the author-function as defined by Foucault was extremely important in the Victorian age. Among the most active of the contributors to *Notes and Queries* was “R. J.”, the individual who initially poses the question to the readership about the identity of T. S. In the May 5, 1855 issue, two separate entries are published by “R. J.” One entry requests information about Thomas Morrison (whose name appears in a list of Oxford graduates during the early 1700s) and the other petitions for biographical details about T. S. In the latter entry R. J. identifies the titles of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* and then states: “According to Lowndes, the author’s name was Sherman; but some of your readers may perhaps be able to give me some farther information concerning him” (“Youth’s Tragedy” 342).

In response to R. J.’s query, J. O., another of the most frequently published contributors in *Notes and Queries* during this period, replies in the June 16, 1855 issue and speculates that “Lowndes has…but copied Bindley’s *Catalogue*, in assigning the initials ‘T. S.,’ upon the title of *Youth’s Tragedy*, 1671, to Thomas Sherman” (“Youth’s Tragedy” 476). In his opening sentence, J. O. has subtly not only endorsed but also amended an attribution that had rapidly evolved in three phases: Bindley’s *Catalogue* in
1820 labels T. S. as “Sherman”; Lowndes alters that slightly to “T. Sherman”; and now inexplicably, J. O. calls T. S. “Thomas Sherman.”28 Although explicitly addressing R. J., J. O.’s next statement appears to have affected future generations of scholars regarding this attribution: “I fear your correspondent must rest content with this simple identification…with a name otherwise unknown” (476). According to J. O., “Sherman” is the only name scholars have to work with for this author even though no biographical details nor even a record of his mortal existence had been found for this “Thomas Sherman.” The entry continues with J. O. noting how well-received *Youth’s Tragedy* was in its day and that it “seems to have been popular with the younger sort”; by doing so J. O. is musing on what appears on the title page and assumes that since it went through four editions in two years its readership must have been the youth whom it was intended to be read by.29

Prior to entering the discussion in *Notes and Queries* about the identity of T. S., George Offor had recently completed compiling and editing *The Works of John Bunyan*, published in three volumes in 1856.30 In the third volume of Bunyan’s writings categorized as “Allegorical, Figurative, and Symbolical,” Offor provides an introduction

---

28 It appears that J. O. may have arbitrarily selected “Thomas” as a first name for Sherman. Granted, “Thomas” is a popular first name that begins with “T” in 17th-Century England. However, “Timothy” is also an option; at least the record of one individual living in Restoration England, Dr. Timothy Shircross, proves it to be so (Wilson II.516).

29 Shortly thereafter, in 1857, W. K. Tweedie provides an editorial note to a reprint of *Devout Breathings* and records that he is content to let the author remain anonymous. Whether or not he was privy to the discussions in *Notes and Queries* about the identity of T. S. is unknown. But as yet, *Divine Breathings* has not officially entered the attribution narrative.

30 George Offor gained valuable experience early in his professional career as a bookseller in London. He eventually studied Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. A Bunyan enthusiast and a devout Baptist, Offor amassed “a very large collection of early printed English Bibles, psalters, and testaments” (Goodwin 549).
to Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* and informs readers that “the great popularity of [Bunyan’s] work induced unworthy men to publish continuations, intended to cheat the public into a belief that they came from the pen of Bunyan” (56-57). As Offor declares and my research confirms, “No trace has been found of the book or books” that Bunyan claims “appeared before 1684, under Bunyan’s initials or half his name.” Instead, Offor reports that he has found and holds in his personal library a “counterfeit” and “forgery” written by T. S. entitled *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (57). He then offers the following statement, which proves to be profoundly prophetic: “Who the author of this *Pilgrim’s Progress* is, it may be difficult to ascertain” (57).

Attempting to continue his explorations into imitative and spurious versions of Bunyan’s writings, Offor writes a note that is prominently presented as the opening article in the October 22, 1859 issue of *Notes and Queries*. Titled “Forgeries of John Bunyan,” the note lists ten texts, and the first of these to be published was *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* by T. S. At the conclusion of his article, Offor poses the question that is often repeated in this attribution narrative: “Query, who was T. S.?” (321). Evidently unaware of the previous conversations in 1855 in *Notes and Queries* regarding the identity of T. S., Offor submits his query again about the identity of T. S. in a response published in the September 15, 1860 issue of *Notes and Queries* to an altogether different discussion thread about literary dedications to the Deity. The

---

31 According to the *Catalogue of the Important and Valuable Library of the Late George Offor* (1865), Offor owned two copies of the 1683 edition of T. S.’s *The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* printed by Tho. Malthus (184). At his death, his library also included a first edition copy of *Youth’s Comedy* (1680) by T. S. (290). Unfortunately, “Offor’s library, with nearly 4000 literary items and including more than 500 Bunyan rarities, was destined for sale at Sothebys…but much was lost in a fire at the auction rooms on 29 June [1865]” (Goodwin 549).
prominent Bunyanist provides a brief citation from the preface to *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* by T. S. which he calls “a pompous dedication” (216). He briefly mentions that it is a text similar to Bunyan’s and notes that its frontispiece features “two clergymen, one sleeping.” Offor ends by asking about the identity of T. S., and unlike the majority of other contemporary contributors to *Notes and Queries* he signs his full name (217).

Not surprisingly, within one month J. O. publicly answers Offor’s query and informs him of the previously published notes about T. S. J. O. points out that the text by T. S. which Offor has discovered, *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, is of “contemporary date” with *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy*. J. O. also adds another title for consideration, *A Yoke for the Roman Bulls* (1666), a “poetical tract” authored by T. S. and found in the British Museum. According to J. O., all four of these literary works “bear a strong family resemblance; and if Lowndes, following Bindley’s Catalogue, is right, they are the works of one Thomas Sherman, most likely a Dissenter” (“T. S.” 317). Unfortunately, J. O. does not specify what he sees as evidence of the “strong family resemblance” between these four texts. *Youth’s Comedy* and *Youth’s Tragedy* are works of dramatic poetry; *Yoke for the Roman Bulls* is a brief, anti-Catholic poetical tract; *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* is allegorical prose. J. O. claims that they deserve to be considered for attribution to the same author, T. S., and once again J. O. invokes Lowndes and Bindley as authoritative sources for identifying T. S. as Thomas Sherman. However, neither *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* nor *Yoke for the Roman Bulls* was attributed to Sherman by Lowndes, only *Youth’s Tragedy* and
Youth’s Comedy. Although the proposed addition of Yoke for the Roman Bulls to the list of works attributed to Thomas Sherman finds no future support and is ignored, thanks to J. O. three works have been at this stage in the narrative attributed to Thomas Sherman: Youth’s Tragedy, Youth’s Comedy, and Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress.

As Patrick Leary observes, “such replies appear to have spawned a large network of correspondence of all kinds that began in the journal and was carried on privately outside it” (72). Likewise, correspondence continued privately among those interested in solving the mystery of T. S.’s identity. For example, in an unpublished letter dated February 16, 1861 which I discovered inserted in a copy of Youth’s Tragedy by T. S. held at the Newberry Library, Offor shares his perplexity regarding the case of T. S. This letter apparently is a continuation of the discussion that had previously paused at the end of J. O.’s October 20, 1860 response to Offor’s question about the identity of T. S., which J. O. had concluded by “referring the Query back to Mr. Offor for confirmation and farther elucidation” (317). Evidently in an effort to assist Offor in that invitation, Alexander Gardyne lent two “pamphlets by T. S.” to Offor; we can assume that these were Gardyne’s copies of Youth’s Tragedy and Youth’s Comedy by T. S.32 Offor returns the pamphlets and encloses a letter to Gardyne wherein he admits to the perplexity surrounding the case of T. S. and declares that the identification of T. S. as Sherman depends upon the Bindley copy of Youth’s Tragedy.33

32 Copies of Youth’s Tragedy and Youth’s Comedy that contain Gardyne’s stamp are currently held at the Newberry Library and the University of Illinois Library.

33 I am indebted to both Lawrence Mitchell and Maura Ives for their assistance in deciphering the handwriting of George Offor.
Speculating that it is “very probably the same T. S. who published the Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress 1682” and that “[t]here’s some internal evidence that he was a Baptist,” Offor tends to agree with the proposal made in J. O.’s previous note that the writer of Youth’s Tragedy and Youth’s Comedy was also the author of Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. In response to J. O.’s prior assertion that “Sherman” was likely a Dissenter, Offor, who by this time has had the opportunity to examine these three literary works, believes that proof exists within these texts (“internal evidence”) that T. S. was a Baptist. In both this letter and in his brief expose in The Works of John Bunyan on this imitative allegory by T. S., Offor shows a particular fascination with the frontispiece and illustration included in the 1683 edition of Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. As he describes in his letter, the illustration (found on page 26 of T. S.’s text) depicts “a round dance wherein [persons] skip and jump [around a pit that leads to] Hell.” Offor also records where he has consulted or searched for Thomas Sherman: Edmund Calamy’s Register (which includes an “Edward Sherman”), Palmer (likely his Nonconformist Memorial), Brooks, and a directory of Dissenting Churches (perhaps by Walter Wilson); he notes that in the latter source he found an entry for a “John Sherman.”34 At the conclusion of the letter, Offor states, “The T. S. we seek was an English Divine or preacher…[not a] [Q]uaker [but] a noncon[formist] [and] a [B]aptist.” By examining the frontispiece, which features two clergymen—one sleeping and the other standing—Offor makes these assumptions, as he notes the importance of these

34 The “John Sherman” that Offor has mentioned resided in Dedham, Essex, and served as a rector in the Church of England. An MA graduate of Cambridge, John Sherman wrote a history of the nunnery of Harlton, Cambridgeshire, Historia Collegii Jesu Cantabrigiae, which was edited by J. O. Halliwell in 1840. By 1665 “he was admitted DD by royal mandate”; later “Sherman was appointed prebend and archdeacon of Sarum in 1670, [and] died in London on 27 March 1671” (Mullinger 329-330).
clergymen wearing “all black exc[cept] white band.” A careful examination of this frontispiece will be provided later in Chapter IV.

Although his letter acknowledges and considers the possibility that T. S. is “Sherman,” Offor cautiously refrains from openly endorsing this identification. After making the initial disclaimer that the identification depends on the “evidence of Bindley’s copy that it represents Sherman,” Offor merely considers those candidates bearing the last name of Sherman who lived in that era. His statement that “Sherman” is “very probably the same T. S.” who authors the imitative allegory is not rendered in a tone of confidence; in fact, he prefers for the remainder of the letter to use the initials T. S. when referring to the author in question. Perhaps most notable is his concluding sentence offered as a postscript to Gardyne: “Your pamphlets by T. S. are returned herewith.” Offor is apparently not convinced that T. S. should be labeled as Sherman since he has not had the opportunity to examine the Bindley copy and opts instead to wait for more reliable evidence before making a conclusion: “We may accidentally fall into [T. S.’s] company or some account of him…. ” Offor promises his correspondent that if that happens then he and Gardyne as partners in the venture “will share the spoils equally.” Unfortunately, no documentation in books, essays, or letters has been located showing any further work by Offor on this attribution; he died just three years later in 1864.

Another text by T. S. is introduced to the readers of Notes and Queries for consideration by William Maude in May of 1863. Announcing his intention to republish an edition of Divine Breathings… Second Part, originally printed by Nathaniel Ponder in
1680, Maude wants to know more about the author otherwise known only as T. S. He provides evidence of past interest in this Manual of Practical Contemplations by sharing an excerpt from an advertisement found in a 1775 edition of Sibbes’ Meditations which claims that readers in both the Gentleman’s and the Gospel Magazines have “inquired” about this text and that “many judicious persons wish it could be…republished.”

Maude also mentions that a version of the Manual of Practical Contemplations had previously been republished in 1815 by G. Lambert at Bristol and that Lambert claims in his “Address to the Reader” that he has discovered a lost text. At the conclusion of his note, perhaps in an attempt to understand T. S.’s choice to publish anonymously, Maude states, “Whoever the author may have been, he certainly had no need to be ashamed of his work” (429).

Not surprisingly, J. O. responds the following month in Notes and Queries to Maude’s inquiry and briefly highlights the past discussion in the journal about T. S.

Mr. Offor, for example, wants [T. S.] for the spurious Pilgrim’s Progress, Second Part, 1683. I seek to identify the author of Youth’s Comedy, or the Soul’s Tryals and Triumphs, 1680. The Address to the Reader in this last signed “T. S.”; and the book being printed by N. Ponder, little doubt is left that he is the party wanted by Mr. Maude for A Manual of Practical Contemplation. Your correspondent will find, by a reference to “N. & Q.” (2nd S. x. 317), that one Thomas Sherman is said to be the “T. S.” of

---

35 The only related reference discovered in either of these publications is an entry for an edition issued by Keith of Divine Breathings found in a “List of Books and Pamphlets published” in Gentleman’s Magazine, February 1750 (96).
the Youth’s Comedy; but as no such name has yet been found connected
with the literature of the period, it is hoped, with this cue Mr. Maude may
be more successful than J. O. (“Practical Contemplations” 498)

While J. O. admits that no biographical details have been found to verify the existence of
a seventeenth-century author named Thomas Sherman, this does not thwart him from
expanding the corpus of texts attributed to Thomas Sherman. Supposedly, because both
texts were printed by Nathaniel Ponder and avowed by [an] author[s] called T. S., J. O.
expresses extreme confidence (“little doubt is left”) in attributing Divine Breathings, or

Two years later in 1865, true to his word, Maude provides a new edition of
Divine Breathings: or, a Manual of Practical Contemplations by T. S., originally
published in 1680 by Nathaniel Ponder. As Maude notes in his preface, the text is
“presented to the reader in a new dress”; it is packaged under a new title, Aids to the
Divine Life in a Series of Practical Christian Contemplations, and the one hundred
contemplations are “digested under twenty-one general heads” (i, v). Attempting to
convince (potential) readers to buy and study this new edition, Maude cites the same,
aforementioned sources (namely the advertisement found in the 1775 edition of Sibbes’s
Meditations and the 1815 edition of Practical Contemplations republished by G.
Lambert) that he had referenced in his brief article published in Notes and Queries in
order to illustrate past interest in this text. Maude also suggests that the book’s brevity
matches nicely with the fast-paced lifestyles of Victorians: “in size small enough for the
pocket; in arrangement into portions, *short* enough to be read at any leisure moment; and yet in matter *weighty* enough to supply much food for profitable meditation” (iv).

Lambert and Maude acknowledge that the author, T. S., deserves credit for his wisdom, and both editors made attempts to identify him. In his address to the reader to the 1815 edition,\(^\text{36}\) Lambert writes, “[W]ho [T. S.] was I have not been able to learn; but from his work I venture to pronounce him a wise scribe, well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven” (qtd. by Maude iii). Likewise, Maude admits in a footnote: “Who ‘T. S.’ was is still a mystery; recent inquiries made by the writer, through the medium of ‘Notes and Queries,’ and other channels, hav[e] failed completely in identifying the author” (iii). It is important to note that in his preface Maude opts not to promulgate J. O.’s speculative attributions nor the proposed identification of T. S. as Thomas Sherman. Furthermore, based on how he cites the title of the text, it appears that Maude does not realize that what he has reprinted was published in 1680 as a sequel (perhaps he never examined the first edition but merely relies on Lambert’s 1815 reprint). The complete title of the original offering by T. S. is *Divine Breathings: or a Manual of Practical Contemplations, in One Century, Tending to Promote Gospel-Principles, and a Good Conversation in Christ. Comprizing in Brief Many of those Great Truths that are to be Known and Practiced by a Christian. The Second Part* (1680).

In our examination thus far regarding the case of T. S., we have discovered the active and significant role J. O. has played in attempting to identify T. S. and attribute

---

\(^{36}\) Unfortunately, the 1815 edition of *Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations* printed by Lambert that Maude is referring to has yet to be located. An extant copy has not been found in any of the collections held at the major research centers (e.g., Huntington, Newberry, Bodleian, British libraries) nor is it listed in OCLC WorldCat online.
texts to Thomas Sherman. Given his importance in this attribution narrative, it is necessary to ask about the identity of J. O. We know that J. O. was a frequent contributor to the *Notes and Queries* during this period and showed an interest in early modern texts and questions of authorship. Frequently, J. O. queries about biographical information on various authors. J. O. also has proposed other attributions. For example, in the December 15, 1855 issue of *Notes and Queries*, J. O. argues that the pseudonymous writer “Theophilus Philantrophus” is Robert Poole, M. D., “who must have been well known” in the eighteenth century, author of several books including *The Christian Convert* (468).

As noted earlier, according to Leary, the identities of some pseudonymous contributors were widely known by those within the antiquarian community. In a list that appears in *Notes and Queries* in 1899 of published obituary notices of contributors, only a handful of names are given with their respective pseudonyms (Thornton 374). J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps’s name appears, and because he is the only individual on the list whose name includes the initials of J. O he is an obvious candidate. The major argument against identifying Halliwell as J. O., however, is that in the September 4, 1852, issue of *Notes and Queries* he poses two questions about books related to Shakespearean studies. Two years later, J. O. replies to Halliwell’s query (“Shakespeare Queries” 454).³⁷

Perhaps the real J. O. wants readers to be confused and think of J. O. Halliwell-Phillips when he is actually somebody else. Or maybe J. O. is John Ogle, a bookseller in

³⁷ Furthermore, when Halliwell signed with initials he usually used those matching his full name: “J. O. H.” (Haynes 49; Cushing 447; Spevack, E-mail).
Edinburgh, or John Furniss Ogle, who edits an edition of *Practical Contemplations* in 1829. In fact, J. O. could be practically anybody and not necessarily someone whose name matches neatly with the initials but chooses to use them as a pseudonym. The most likely candidate is one who fits into that category: Alexander Gardyne, a bibliophile who sends tracts by T. S. to Offor to examine, signaling that Gardyne was interested in pursuing the case of T. S. Also, another hint is Offor’s admission that if they (i.e., he and Gardyne) happen to find more information about T. S., then they will both share in the spoils equally. If anyone deserves to “share in the spoils” of this attribution it would be J. O., who serves as the authoritative voice and driving force in *Notes and Queries* toward identifying and attributing texts to T. S. The way that J. O. writes it seems like he had ready access to copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy*; Gardyne owned copies of these “rare pamphlets” and lends them to Offor. At least three submissions were published in *Notes and Queries* signed by Gardyne using his full name (“Bulleyn’s Dialogue”; “God and the King”; “John Bunyan”). In 1874, for example, Gardyne wrote a scholarly note considering the possible influence John Davis’s translation (1670) of *The Tablet of Cebes* may have had on Bunyan’s writing *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678). This brief article shows that Gardyne was interested in Bunyan and other early modern writers (“John Bunyan” 162-163).

The strongest argument for identifying Gardyne as J. O. is that several items of evidence are found together in the same book—a copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* held at the
Newberry Library in Chicago that bears the stamp of Alexander Gardyne. Inside this book previously owned by Gardyne is the aforementioned letter written to him by George Offor. In addition, enclosed in the book are manuscript copies of notes which were eventually published in *Notes and Queries*; the notes are signed “Jo.” Therefore, it is quite possible that these are the manuscript notes for those submissions to *Notes and Queries* signed “J. o.” which are tucked into Gardyne’s copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* at the Newberry Library. After carefully comparing the handwriting of “J.O.” with documents held at the National Library of Scotland written by Alexander Gardyne, there are enough similarities to support rather than discount the possibility (Gardyne, “Povey’s Jottings”).

Returning now to the attribution narrative, by the mid-1860s, thanks largely to the work of J. O. (who may be Alexander Gardyne) publicized in *Notes and Queries*, T. S. has been named Thomas Sherman, and it has been suggested up to this point that T. S. receive credit for authoring at least four seventeenth-century texts: *Youth’s Tragedy,* *Youth’s Comedy,* *Divine Breathings…The Second Part,* and *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress.* While all four of these texts include the initials of T. S. on their title pages,

---


39 According to a notice published in 1879, those submissions not printed in *Notes and Queries* were not returned (“Notices to Correspondents” 240). The manuscript notes by J. O. were published so they were returned to him; J. O. then inserted them into the pamphlets he sent to George Offor to update Offor on his attribution proposals in *Notes and Queries.* Granted, it is also possible that Gardyne may have copied the notes published by J. O. in *Notes and Queries* and inserted them into his copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* as reference material.

40 Please see Appendix F for a further consideration of this proposal that Alexander Gardyne may be using the pseudonym J. O. in Notes & Queries correspondence. Appendix F also includes additional biographical information about Gardyne.
the next text added to the list of works attributed to Thomas Sherman, *Divine Breathings*, lacks both name and initials on its title page. W. C. B. (most likely the initials for a W. C. Bennett, see Thornton 374) describes a text he has discovered, lacking the title page, a compilation of religious writings, and the first section of approximately eighty pages bears the running title, “The Pious Soul’s Divine Breathings.” According to my research, W. C. B.’s description matches a text compiled by James Taylor, B. D. published in 1703 by J. Blare in London. According to Frank Mott Harrison, Blare was notorious for printing spurious texts (“Repudiable” 277-281). W. C. B. does not mention T. S. nor does he query about authorship. His observation that the text he has found “is not the same as *Practical Contemplations* … which was reprinted in 1803 under the title of *Divine Breathings*” exhibits an intuitive awareness; he rightly has compared the two but does not explicitly inform readers that *Practical Contemplations* was intended as a sequel or “Second Part” to the original *Divine Breathings* (W. C. B. 575).

When S. Austin Allibone publishes his *Critical Dictionary of English Literature* in 1872, he ignores prior discussions in *Notes and Queries* and, following Lowndes, conservatively attributes authorship of only *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* to “Sherman, T.” (II.2083). Even more caution is detected in the catalogue of Rev. Alexander Dyce’s collection (1875) and W. Carew Hazlitt’s *Collections and Notes* (1876): both include references to *Youth’s Tragedy* but simply identify the author by the initials T. S. as found on its title pages.

---

41 The only name found in the paratext of *Divine Breathings* is that of Christopher Perin, who writes the prefatory “To the Christian Reader.”
Although at least 57 printings of *Divine Breathings* were issued by 1870, the majority of the editions published during the nineteenth century had been produced in the United States. In 1879 Pickering and Company of London provides a reprint of the 15th edition published by G. Keith (London, 1775). This edition includes a preface by W. J. Loftie, who apologizes to the reader for his “failure” to ascertain the “history” of this book: “there is nothing to be recorded except that nothing has been recorded” (v). While Loftie is content to accept the author’s anonymity as an “eminent divine,” he is curious as to the identity of Christopher Perin[42] and records where he has looked for biographical details on Perin. One reference source, John Le Neve’s *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, records “that a Christopher Perin occupied a stall in Winchester Cathedral Church, and died before the year 1610, having held the prebend above twenty-seven years” (vi). Loftie offers two theories about Perin, but both consider him to assume the role of editor of the text and not its author (viii). Rather than dwell on the lack of historical details about the text (including its printing history, since at this point Loftie cannot locate any editions earlier than the fifteenth), Loftie claims, “It is much more pleasant to turn to the contents of the book itself; to observe how quietly it has done its work…not heedful of the sectarian strife, the so-called theologies, the warfare of books and tongues, the jangle of creeds and the tyranny of forms, but nestling…close to the heart of one pilgrim after another” (ix).

Pickering’s 1879 edition of *Divine Breathings* attracted considerable attention among Victorian readers and bibliographers. Shortly after its release, the “exquisite

---

[42] Christopher Perin claims as early as 1671 in his prefatory “To the Christian Reader” that he received a copy of the manuscript of *Divine Breathings*. 
reprint” receives glowing praise from an anonymous commentator in *Notes and Queries*. Focusing on the quality and value of its contents, the note in the March 22, 1879 issue claims that “nothing could be more delicious” than these meditations: “Beyond the charm of the unknown author’s characteristic style, no one can peruse and heed the contents of this little volume, which can be carried in one’s coat pocket, without being made both wiser and better” (“Divine Breathings” 240). Unlike Loftie’s acceptance of the author’s anonymity, this Victorian reader reveals the importance of the author-function: “It is to be hoped that the mysterious author may yet be successfully identified, and we are informed that this seems not quite improbable” (“Divine Breathings” 240).

One month later, in an issue of *Notes and Queries* dated April 26, 1879, J. O. informs readers that other extant editions of *Divine Breathings* have been located besides the fifteenth edition of 1775. He reports that he has examined the 1812 edition published by Baynes and that an associate of J. O.’s possesses a copy of the eleventh edition issued in 1764 (336). Shortly thereafter, Ch. Elkins Mathews writes in *Notes and Queries* about his recent discovery of a 1698 edition of *Divine Breathings* (418). In the next week’s issue of *Notes and Queries*, James Crossley describes a copy of the sixth edition (1678) of *Divine Breathings* he had recently acquired.43 Because it bears the signature of “D. Lechmere” on its title-page, Crossley wonders if Lechmere is the name

---

43 For more on Crossley’s career as an attributionist, see Furbank and Owens, *Canonisation of Daniel Defoe*. 
of the author or perhaps a previous owner of the book and speculates that the
“handwriting is…evidently contemporaneous with the book” (433-434). 44

Like other discussants interested in this text, Crossley cannot offer any
information about Christopher Perin nor the anonymous author: “It would be desirable to
ascertain, if possible, when the first edition was published, and whether any light can be
thrown upon the authorship” (434). Several weeks later, two additional notes are
published in Notes and Queries about Divine Breathings. One correspondent, J. R. S. C.
(perhaps James Crossley using initials), after studying and comparing both the preface
and text of Divine Breathings, concludes “that Christopher Perin, the introducer
(possibly reviser) of these meditations, was not the author” (478). The other note
published on the same topic, submitted by G. W. Napier, registers an entry found in “the
catalogue of the English portion of the library of Archdeacon Wrangham” which lists
“Perin’s Divine Breathings, 1767” (478).45 Although these discussions about Divine
Breathings in Notes and Queries signify interest in both its style and authorship, no
correspondent, including J. O., attempted to attribute authorship of these meditations to
T. S.

Due to the warm reception of the 1879 edition of Divine Breathings, Pickering
issues another printing in London in 1881. A casual inspection of the only extant copy

44 Crossley’s copy of the sixth edition of Divine Breathings (1678) is held by the University of Iowa and
can be examined on Early English Books Online.

45 I have been unsuccessful in confirming the accuracy of this entry; Wrangham’s Catalogue is extremely
rare. Harvard University’s Houghton Library holds a copy, and a librarian there searched but could not
find this entry in it. I examined a copy of the 1767 edition of Divine Breathings held at the British Library
but nothing extraordinary was discovered about this text in comparison to other editions that would
prompt a reader to label Perin as its author.
(held at the Bodleian Library) would suggest that Loftie’s preface is identical to the one offered in 1879. It would be easy to assume that such is the case since the title page does not indicate any changes to the book. However, the 1881 preface contains significant additional material that has been inserted into Loftie’s original article. In fact, Loftie provides seven new pages that articulate his awareness of the discussions in Notes and Queries about Divine Breathings, and then he outlines a theory proposed by Colonel J. L. Chester, historian of Anglican church history. Chester, the editor of The Marriage, Baptismal, and Burial Registers of the Collegiate Church or Abbey of St. Peter, Westminster, studied what Loftie had presented in the 1879 preface, specifically the information found in Le Neve’s Fasti about Christopher Perin, and then discovered additional biographical details.46 For example, according to Chester, Perin matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford, at the age of 27. In addition to being Prebend of Winchester by 1583, Perin obtained the Prebend of Salisbury. Perin “married Elizabeth, one of the daughters of a well-known Reformation divine, Michael Renniger, D. D., who was sub-Dean and Chancellor of Lincoln and Archdeacon of Winchester” (x). Chester admits that there were several descendants of Christopher Perin who were his namesakes who could be candidates for the editor of Divine Breathings, but he believes that the Perin who initially presents Divine Breathings to the public is Renniger’s son-in-law. After reminding readers about Perin’s preface which states that the original author was

46 Having examined its index, I can assert that the Registers edited by James Lemuel Chester contain no information about either Christopher Perin or Michael Renniger.
an “eminent divine,” and the writings were discovered by “a person of no mean degree” and “by him communicated only to his dearest relations,” Loftie cites Chester:

Now, Perin’s father-in-law was, we have seen, “an eminent divine,” namely, Michael Renniger, who died in 1609, leaving Dr. Ralph Hulton one of his executors. Hulton was “a person of no mean degree,” being a Prebendary of Salisbury. He inherited some of Renniger’s books, and no doubt communicated of the Breathings to his near relation, and brother-in-law, the other executor, Christopher Perin. (xii)

This theory seems so convincing to Loftie that he declares it is “almost certain that the ‘Divine Breathings’ were originally composed by Michael Renniger, Archdeacon of Winchester, in the early years of James I” (vi). After outlining Chester’s proposal, Loftie writes, “It fits so well together and yet is made up of such dry and meager facts, and so few of them, that one hardly knows which to admire most, the skill of the antiquary or the clearness of the results at which he has arrived” (xii). Loftie, as he desires to conclude his preface by turning the reader’s attention to the value of the work itself, makes what becomes a paradoxically prophetic statement: namely, that, thanks to Chester’s research, knowing the identity of the author of Divine Breathings “enhances, certainly it cannot diminish for anyone, the interest and value of the little book itself” (xii). A curious thing occurs: according to the printing history, two years later the final printing of Divine Breathings is issued. Was part of the prior, sustained success of this

---

47 Loftie does not inform readers of the medium for this information from Chester (i.e., in what form did Chester communicate his theory to Loftie: was it via personal conversation, a letter, or perhaps a published article?).
tiny book of meditations due to the intrigue of its anonymous authorship? Does the presentation of Chester’s “dry and meager facts” about the newly discovered author contradict Loftie’s assumption and do these “facts” actually “diminish” interest in *Divine Breathings*? If this was the case then apparently only general readers took notice of this revised preface because Chester’s theory, as shall be shown below, either goes undetected or is altogether ignored by bibliographers and compilers of major reference sources. It is also imperative to note that neither Chester nor Loftie acknowledge an awareness that Renniger published other literary works; the question is not raised by them. However, as shall be noted later in this chapter, Renniger authored at least three separate works.

When Suttaby of London produces a reprint of the 15th edition with additions in 1883, a note from the publisher emphasizes that questions about the author’s identity, Perin, and the first appearance of the book “are purely matters of conjecture” (Suttaby v). Although no explicit reference is made or credited to Loftie or Chester, their influence is detected in statements such as, “There are…reasons for supposing that the work was first printed in the reign of James I,” and “[t]here was a C. Perrin, Prebendary of Winchester …and to him this address [the preface] has, by some, been assigned” (v).

Over the next twenty-two years, from 1883 to 1903, very little attention is given to *Divine Breathings*. In his *Second Series of Bibliographical Collections and Notes on Early English Literature* issued in 1882, Hazlitt links the authorship of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (1683, 1684) to the writer of *Youth’s Comedy* (1680) (530), coupling these two works together but leaving *Love a la Mode. A Comedy* (1663) by T.
S. on its own. Hazlitt does not provide any notes as to his reason for this, but it is possible he is following J. O.’s speculation; however, unlike J. O., Hazlitt chooses not to label the author as Thomas Sherman but rather by the initials, T. S., found on the title pages of both works. Several years later, Henry G. Bohn’s 1885 edition of Lowndes’s Bibliographer’s Manual of English Literature claims to be a “Revised, Corrected, and Enlarged” version, yet there is little that he adds to the entries on T. S. and Thomas Sherman: a fourth edition of Youth’s Tragedy (1672); a reprint of Youth’s Tragedy titled Youth Undone (1709); and a reference to R. J.’s note on T. S. published in 1855 in Notes and Queries.⁴⁸

From the outset, beginning with its initial volume published in 1882, the work of Samuel Halkett and John Laing has been labeled as a “comprehensive Dictionary” of “anonymous and pseudonymous Literature” published in Great Britain (1). The fourth volume includes entries for Youth’s Tragedy and Youth’s Comedy, and the entries for both of these books render “[T. Sherman]” as the author; the source for this attribution given is Lowndes’ Bibliographers Manual (2851-2852). At the close of the nineteenth century, the British Museum perpetuated this trend in its Catalogue of Printed Books, listing “T. Sherman” as author of Youth’s Tragedy and Youth’s Comedy (vol. 50, 5). Divine Breathings: or A Manual of Practical Contemplations. The Second Part and Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress are listed with over 30 other items published in the seventeenth century by authors signing as T. S. (vol. 48, 157-164).

⁴⁸ Bohn provides an incorrect page reference: page 346 should be page 342.
In 1903, Professor Edward Arber, a Fellow of King’s College, London, privately printed the first of three volumes containing his edited version of *The Term Catalogues* described earlier in this chapter. Arber’s preface includes a brief historical summary regarding the development of the original catalogues compiled by Robert Clavell in the late seventeenth century.\(^{49}\) He reports that upon comparing the names of the authors listed in the original catalogues with those same names found in the British Museum Catalogue it was discovered that there were great discrepancies; Arber edited the names in his reprint using the British Museum Catalogue as his foundation. He also claims that the original “Editors often give an Author his initials only, when his full name occurs in the book.” Arber announces that those names discovered have been included in the Indexes Arber supplies to each of the three volumes of his *Term Catalogues*. Likewise, there are titles listed “as anonymous; when [the] Author’s names, or initials, occur in the books themselves. This, [the Editors’], crowning iniquity, seems to have arisen from sheer heedlessness.” Arber proudly states, “Indeed, it may be pointed out that the recovery in the Indexes of the Christian names in so many thousands of instances has only been a part of the arduousness of this Reprint” (I. xi).

Arber’s objective for the Title Index “is to remedy Robert Clavell’s bungling carelessness in omitting from the Titles in the Text, the Names or Initials of the Authors, Editors, etc. which are to be found in the books themselves. The recovery of this information has been a most arduous undertaking” (I. 519; II. 610; III. 681). The Index to Volume One contains significant attributions made by Arber. First of all, he is the

\(^{49}\) For more information, see “The Genesis of the Term Catalogues” by Cyprian Blagden.
first scholar to declare Thomas Sherman as the author of *Divine Breathings, or a Pious Soul Thirsting After Christ*. Second, he is the first since J. O. to label Thomas Sherman as the author of *Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations. The Second Part* (1680). By doing so, Arber has attributed four texts to Thomas Sherman, including *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy*; however, the evidence for making these monumental decisions is not explicit. The entries in the text for each of these works contain no obvious clues. It is possible that in the process of compiling this volume, after detailing the 1672 catalogue entry for the anonymous *Divine Breathings*, Arber noticed that Nathaniel Ponder printed in 1680 a sequel to *Divine Breathings* authored by T. S. Furthermore, since Ponder also published *Youth’s Comedy*, and the entry for that title immediately precedes *Divine Breathings. The Second Part* in the catalogue, this may have caught Arber’s attention. Certainly, Arber must have consulted one or more of the bibliographical reference sources listed earlier in this narrative (e.g., Lowndes, Halkett and Laing, the British Museum Catalogue) and ascertained Thomas Sherman to be the name of the author of *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy*. It would seem quite logical to assume that the same T. S. would be published by Ponder for two of his works in 1680 and that the writer of the sequel must also be credited as authoring the first part. However, if Arber made these assumptions then, to a certain degree, he is guilty of not carefully following his own guidelines. For example, in an introductory note to the Title Index, Arber claims, “There were, at that time, a good many resemblances of the Titles of successful Works: sometimes by Imitators, at other times by Antagonists” (I. 519; II. 610; III. 681). It is doubtful that Arber made these attributions based on a textual
discovery given the sheer magnitude of the project he had undertaken. There is no extant copy of the 1672 edition of *Divine Breathings* listed in *The Term Catalogues*.

Also, he admits in his preface to be relying heavily on the collections and catalogues of the British Museum, books that had been examined by other bibliographers.

Arber’s second volume issued in 1905 includes those catalogues for books printed and sold in London between 1683 and 1696. For the purposes of this study, the most significant entry is found in the Michaelmas Term of 1694 catalogue, item 18:

> Youth’s Comedy, or The Soul’s tryal and triumph. A dramatick Poem, with divers Meditations on several subjects, to help and encourage those that are seeking a Heavenly Country. By Mr. Thomas Sherwin, Author of ‘Youth’s Tragedy,’ and ‘Divine Breathings.’ Price 6d. (II. 530-531)

This book is listed along with Lily’s Grammar by William Walker, D. D. to be sold by J. Taylor at the Ship in St. Paul’s Courtyard. Having found this advertisement, Arber dutifully amends his earlier identification but maintains the same attribution of texts to the author previously referred to as Thomas Sherman; the Indexes found in Volume Two and subsequently in Volume Three (printed in 1906) credit Thomas Sherwin as the author of *Divine Breathings, Youth’s Tragedy, Youth’s Comedy, and Divine Breathings. The Second Part.*

As shall be shown hereafter in this attribution narrative, Arber’s discovery registered in volumes two and three of his reprinted *Term Catalogues* garners little attention from bibliographers producing dictionaries and library catalogues. In

---

50 Arber has taken the liberty of spelling out Sherwin’s first name instead of reprinting the abbreviated “Tho” found in the original entry in the 1694 catalogue compiled by Clavell.
attempting to answer why these bibliographers apparently ignored the identification of T. S. as Thomas Sherwin, it is important to note that first of all, there is no extant copy of that particular 1694 edition of *Youth’s Comedy* that supposedly includes Sherwin’s name on its title page. The only mention of this edition is found in *The Term Catalogues*. Secondly, it is quite possible that this 1694 edition never made it to print. This could be an advertisement promoting a product that never was produced. Arber, in his prefatory writings about the history of the catalogues, surmises that not all of the books listed had been printed when the catalogue appeared: “Evidently books were often inserted in this List from what we should now call a Proof Title Page, in advance of the actual publication of the book” (I. xi). It is important to note that *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* is one of several works labeled as authored by T. S.(s) to be left unattributed.

Several years after Arber’s reprint of the *Term Catalogues*, William Courtney, in his book *The Secrets of Our National Literature: Chapters in the History of the Anonymous and Pseudonymous Writings of our Countrymen* (1908), observes:

The first part of *Divine Breathings; or a Pious Soul Thirsting after Christ*, was published without any clue as to the authorship in 1672. Often has it been reprinted, and it was edited by Mr. W. J. Loftie in 1879. The second part came out as by T. S. in 1680, and these initials are said to stand for Thomas Sherman, but I have failed in my attempt to recover any biographical details about him. This too was many times reissued, and it
appears so recently as 1885. Strangely enough the separate parts seem
never to have been united in one volume. (142)

In this passage, Courtney’s identification of T. S. as Thomas Sherman seems dependent
upon Volume One of Arber’s *Term Catalogues* printed five years earlier; the primary
clue is his reference to the suppositious 1672 edition of *Divine Breathings*. Furthermore,
Arber stands alone at this stage as the pioneer in labeling Thomas Sherman as the author
of *Divine Breathings*. Both Arber and Courtney do not include the imitative allegory in
their attributions. Likewise, in *A Baptist Bibliography*, compiled by W. T. Whitley and
published in 1916, T. S. is included as the author of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s
Progress*; however, an important note of analysis is added, declaring that this text is “a
Baptist criticism of Bunyan” (115).

In 1926, Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson provide a new and enlarged edition of
Halkett and Laing’s *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature*. In
their preface, the editors promise, “Reference to authorities has been much more fully
introduced than in the previous edition.” However, they add, “In this connection it will
be at once evident that the authority cited for any particular book is not necessarily the
final authority for the attribution in question” (ix). Although this dictionary is “the
product of at least seventy-five years of unbroken research,” its editors confess that “it is
too much to hope that mistakes will not be found. A mistake in a standard work of
reference is a calamity. Makers of dictionaries borrow largely of one another’s wares;
and mistakes, if uncorrected, tend to reproduce themselves long after they are known to
be wrong” (x). As has been shown and as it will continue to be evident, this statement
proves to be an accurate summary of the attribution history regarding how T. S. became known as Thomas Sherman.

Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson insert entries for *Divine Breathings* (1672) and *Divine Breathings. The Second Part* (1680) in Volume Two and attribute both to Thomas Sherman, citing Arber’s first volume of *Term Catalogues* as the source of this attribution. Whereas there was room previously to speculate as to Arber’s reasoning for identifying Thomas Sherman as the author of *Divine Breathings*, Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson explicitly record their support for such a rationale: first, by listing both entries together, in consecutive order, and in the first entry presenting it as such: “Divine Breathings; or a pious soul thirsting after Christ. [By Thomas Sherman. Part I]...” (97). This item is followed by its sequel with “By T. S. [Thomas Sherman]” in the detailed entry. Although it may seem quite logical following these clues of external evidence to make such an assumption, as shall be examined in Chapter III, it is also necessary to consider the internal evidence in order to confirm or reject such reasoning. The *Dictionary*’s entry in Volume Four (1928) for the 1822 edition titled *A Manual of Practical Contemplations* proffers an intriguing amendment in its attribution: the “Rev. Thomas Sherman” (18). However, the entry erroneously assumes that the copy found in the British Museum is “a reprint of what was issued in London, 1672, with the title ‘Divine Breathings, or a pious soul thirsting after Christ’” (18). Having personally examined the British Library’s sole copy of the 1822 edition, I can report that this title is not a reprint of the first but rather a version of the second part by T. S.
The possible influence of Arber’s *Term Catalogues* on this particular attribution is detected in Volume Six (1932) of the revised edition of Halkett and Laing by Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson. The *Dictionary’s* entries for both *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* identify Thomas Sherman as author, and Arber is listed as the authoritative reference source (269-270). As in their previous references to Arber for these attributions, Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson cite Volume One of the edited *Term Catalogues*. *The Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature* continues to be a trusted source for attributionists and cataloguers. Harold Love points out that Halkett and Laing is frequently the “first port of call” when dealing with anonymous and pseudonymous works (*Attributing Authorship* 55). Library catalogues frequently cite Halkett and Laing for attributions. The Huntington Library’s online catalogue, for example, has an entry for *Divine Breathings* (a 1799 edition) which cites Halkett and Laing as the source for attributing authorship of this work to Thomas Sherman.

During 1928, which marked the tercentenary of Bunyan’s birth, in *The Baptist Times* T. R. Glover reviews the *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, claiming that one of only three extant editions of the text was housed in the Baptist Church House, and he suggests that this work is important because “it spurred Bunyan on to write his own Second Part” (252). The following year two notes appear in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* pertaining to the question of T. S.’s identity. The first article by James Rendel Harris calls T. S. “the most notable of all pseudo-Bunyans, for which we have to be most thankful, inasmuch as it put John [Bunyan] again on writing a second more
popular pilgrimage story” (“Bunyan Books” 124). Harris examined a 1682 copy found in the British Museum and compared it with the 1683 copy, formerly owned by the poet Southey, then located at the Baptist Church House in Bloomsbury. At the close of his brief article, he pointedly asks: “Who, then, was this T. S., this orthodox mournful of the end of the seventeenth century?” (126).

In response to Harris, Whitley provides an article “which deals with the writer of the fictitious ‘Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress,’” essentially relying on Arber’s intriguing offering in the Second Volume of the Term Catalogues (“T. S. and His Publishers” 231). By referring to Arber’s work and the 1694 advertisement in Clavell’s catalogue promoting the edition of Youth’s Comedy by J. Taylor, Whitley is the only scholar besides Arber to publish a reference that considers the possibility that T. S. is Thomas Sherwin. He rightly cautions against including the first Divine Breathings in the attribution but considers Sherwin as potential author of Youth’s Tragedy, Youth’s Comedy, Divine Breathings. The Second Part, and Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. He also quotes from a prefatory note found in Arber (I.xii) regarding the printer Francis Smith, who was a publisher for the Baptists; however, Whitley adds further clarification, declaring that Francis Smith (who published Youth’s Tragedy by T. S. in 1671) was a “General Baptist bookseller” (232). This statement by Whitley opens up an avenue of consideration for readers, namely that T. S. must therefore be a General Baptist since Francis Smith printed one of his books. This reasoning will later be adopted and incorporated by Bunyan scholars William York Tindall, Roger Sharrock, and Henri Talon. Nevertheless, Whitley, in his brief article, muses ambivalently and
unconvincingly that T. S. might be Thomas Sherwin and apparently assumes that Sherwin also authored *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. Whitley does not mention the possibility, as Arber previously had in Volume One of the *Term Catalogues*, that T. S. could be Thomas Sherman.

However, just three years later in *A History of British Baptists* (1932), Whitley changes his mind about naming this particular T. S. as Thomas Sherwin. Instead, he refers to the “Baptist, T. S., identified by some as Thomas Sherman” as author of *Youth’s Tragedy, Youth’s Comedy, and Divine Breathings* (133). Unfortunately, Whitley does not specify which part of *Divine Breathings* he is referring to nor does he reveal what bibliographical source has prompted him to alter his previous outlook on this attribution. Whitley chooses to refer to the author of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* simply by the initials T. S. (139) and, to complicate matters, adds “the *Song of Solomon* in metre” (133) to the list of works he attributes to Thomas Sherman.

Whitley’s aforementioned notation made in 1929 that Francis Smith was a General Baptist bookseller may help answer why Whitley chooses to add *The Book of the Song of Solomon in Meeter*, printed by Francis Smith in 1676 to the list of other works by the same T. S. he is now explicitly labeling as a Baptist writer. However, *Song of Solomon* can be readily dismissed from serious consideration in this particular attribution (and, in fact, it hereafter disappears altogether from our attribution narrative). Upon commencing a search for internal evidence, the very first line of the “Preface to the Reader” provides a clue that this cannot be the same author of *Youth’s Tragedy* because this T. S. admits: “This is the first time ever I came forth / To publique view” (A2).
Youth’s Tragedy had been published five years earlier; therefore Song of Solomon must be the literary debut of a different T. S.

As shall be briefly summarized below, the attention given to T. S. at this stage in our historical narrative shifts primarily to the imitative sequel, Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. Unsurprisingly, scholars working in Bunyan studies play an important role in adding this to the list of other works attributed to Thomas Sherman. By way of review, as early as 1856, Offor exhibits a scholarly interest in T. S.’s sequel, which he refers to as a “forgery” in his brief review of this work. “Who the author of this Pilgrim’s Progress is, it may be difficult to ascertain,” confesses Offor (“Introduction by the Editor” 57). In 1860, Offor enlists the help of fellow bibliographers in identifying T. S. (“Dedications” 216-217). J. O. answers that call for assistance, proposing in Notes and Queries that Thomas Sherman is the author of Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress (317). Offor admits in an unpublished correspondence with Alexander Gardyne that Sherman is “very probably the same T. S. who publishes the Second part of the Pilgrim’s Progress” (Letter). Although compilers of bibliographical reference sources like Arber and Halkett and Laing avoid identifying Thomas Sherman as the author of this imitative sequel, Hazlitt in 1882 links the authorship of Youth’s Comedy with the Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress.

What we have not yet carefully considered is Harris’s zealous attempt to “pull off from [T. S.] the white robe of his anonymity” (“Bunyan Books” 123). Harris’s 1929 essay examines the earliest editions of the Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress, specifically the two “Emblems” or “allegorical plates” (i.e., the illustrations), the
preface, and a dedication to the author (125). Most notable is Harris’s analysis of the
dedication directed “To the Ingenious Author of this Second Part of the Pilgrim’s
Progress” which is signed by “R. B.” Hopeful that this poetic address “may give us a
cue to the identification” of T. S., Harris calls attention to the stanzas’ two headings:
“Swain” and “Pilgrim.” After originally interpreting the poem to “be a dialogue
between two persons,” Harris claims, “[t]he same person is speaking in both parts”
(127). This prompts Harris to conjecture “that the Swain in question is meant for the
author T. S.” and encourages a concerted “search [in] the annals of contemporary
Nonconformity for the minister or layman of the name of Swain” (127). This proposal
evidently was never taken seriously. Perhaps the problem with Harris’s reading is that
he fails to consider that “Swain” is not a name but refers to a possible role that an author
or religious leader assumes, that of a servant, or more specifically in this case, a
shepherd or a farm labourer. The opening line of the stanza under “Swain” includes
reference to “labouring” and thereby seems to be more likely the way this word would
be used in the latter part of the seventeenth century (see “swain,” OED).

William York Tindall becomes a pioneer in our study because he is the first
scholar since J. O. in 1863 to publicly assert that Thomas Sherman authored Second Part
of the Pilgrim’s Progress. First published in 1934, Tindall’s John Bunyan, Mechanick
Preacher analyzes the “qualities of style for which Bunyan is esteemed today” and
contends that, in many ways, Bunyan’s writings resembled those of other lay preachers
(viii). In his study Tindall provides a landmark assertion:
The careful attention which Bunyan had devoted to evangelistic guidance in the first part of Pilgrim’s Progress appeared inadequate to Thomas Sherman, who wrote a sequel to that successful work. This captious Baptist permitted himself to say that Bunyan had neglected conversion and the preliminary state of sin, and pretended to improve upon his defective model. (40)

Although Tindall incorporates T. S. in other passages, his notes do not provide documentation for why he identifies Thomas Sherman as author of Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. Furthermore, since Arber’s Term Catalogues is not included in Tindall’s bibliography, we can only speculate that Arber may have served as a source for Tindall’s inspiration or that he studied another document which led to his assertion. However, he does credit Whitley’s Baptist Bibliography and History of British Baptists among those works consulted. It is probable that Tindall took Whitley’s statement—“another Baptist, T. S., identified by some as Thomas Sherman”—on page 133 of A History of the British Baptists and assumed that the T. S. mentioned six pages later is the same author. At times, Tindall seems unsure about how to identify this writer; this is seen in the inconsistency in the manner which Tindall refers to T. S. For example, in Chapter Three of John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher, Sherman is never mentioned; instead, Tindall opts to use the initials “T. S.” five times (64-65). Most notable is

51 It must be noted that whereas Tindall evidently relied on Whitley for this attribution, Bunyan bibliographer Frank Mott Harrison either refused to publicly acknowledge the attribution or had no awareness of it (considering his expertise in Bunyan studies, the latter is unlikely). In A Bibliography of the Works of John Bunyan (1932), Harrison includes a note regarding the “so-called spurious ed. of the Second Part of The Pilgrim’s Progress” which “was not intended to defraud” (49) and refers to its author as T. S. (50).
Tindall’s labeling of “T. S., [as] the General Baptist” (64). Whether or not Tindall is entering a door opened by Whitley (as mentioned earlier), who refers to Francis Smith (who prints and sells one of T. S.’s works) as a bookseller for the General Baptists, or simply blazing a trail of his own is open to speculation.52

In any case, Tindall’s assertion presumably persuades future Bunyan scholars, especially Roger Sharrock, who provides a revised version in 1960 of James Blanton Wharey’s critical edition of Pilgrim’s Progress. In what has become for scholars the standard edition of Bunyan’s allegory, Sharrock amends Wharey’s introduction that initially simply referred to the author of the imitative sequel as T. S., inserting the identification of the writer as “Thomas Sherman, a General Baptist, who set out to improve both Bunyan’s theology and his literary manners” (Sharrock, “Introduction” xcvii). While Sharrock does not document his source for this particular statement, it pieces together prior intimations recorded by Whitley and Tindall. Above all, it must be emphasized that for scholars working in the field of Bunyan studies, Sharrock’s revised offering of Wharey’s work has served as the definitive critical edition of Pilgrim’s Progress. Therefore, since 1960, numerous references have been made in Bunyan scholarship and beyond that repeat or at least echo Sharrock’s statement, tagging T. S. not only as Thomas Sherman, but also as a General Baptist (Talon 307; Albert Cook 13; Barnes 126; Forrest and Sharrock xi; Sharrock, John Bunyan 139; Owens 309-310; Davies 292; Lynch 83; Johnson 221)

52 The internal evidence of The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress will be examined and considered in Chapter IV with the objective of detecting the author’s religious convictions and denominational affiliation. Tindall’s study will be an important aid in that investigation.
Notwithstanding these confident proclamations by twentieth-century Bunyan scholars, most notably Tindall and Sharrock, their contemporary colleagues compiling bibliographical catalogues either were unaware of this attribution or ignored it. Consider, for example, Donald Wing’s *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*. In the three volumes printed between 1945 and 1951, Wing provides a continuation of the *Short-Title Catalogue* compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave listing those English books printed from 1475 to 1640. Wing’s work offers abridged entries of those books he located or examined, and Wing personally handled, he approximates, 90% of the works listed in his *Short-Title Catalogue*; the other 10% were provided by other libraries and individuals (vii). Originally printed for the Index Society which later transforms into the Index Committee of the Modern Language Association of America, Wing’s project expands with several revised editions and continues to serve as an authoritative reference source for both library cataloguers and early modern scholars (*STC*, revised vii). In his preface, Wing claims no responsibility for attributions but candidly places that burden on the British Museum catalogue (*STC* ix). Wing’s entries for *Divine Breathings, Divine Breathings ... the Second Part, Youth’s Tragedy, and Youth’s Comedy* credit the authorship of these works to Thomas Sherman (I.458; III.248, 520). As for the “(spurious)” *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, it remains assigned to the anonymous T. S. (III.222).

Although Wing includes Arber’s *Term Catalogues* in his list of “standard bibliographical works” consulted (I.ix), he utilizes only Arber’s first volume and
documents it in the entries for *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* (III.248). Having studied copies of his manuscript notes handwritten on 3x5 slips, I conclude that Wing had to make judgments about the accuracy of the information regarding T. S. which he gathered before determining what to include in the published entries. For example, Wing noticed Arber’s printed entry purporting T. S. to be Thomas Sherwin. In fact, John J. Morrison, the current editor of the Wing *STC* Revision Project, finds it interesting “the way [Wing] totally dismissed Arber’s ‘Thomas Sherwin’ attribution by crossing it out at the top of the slip. Donald Wing usually wrote: ‘attrib. John Smith?’ next to a reference or a location on a slip if he did not trust it or agree with it. There seemed to be no doubt in his mind that the ‘Thomas Sherwin’ attribution was an error” (Morrison, E-mail). According to Wing’s manuscript notes, he sought multiple reference sources in his research on these texts; for the entries listed above he consulted Whitley’s *Baptist Bibliography*, Lowndes, Hazlitt, Offor’s *Catalogue*, Allibone, and others. Furthermore, Wing records his awareness of two of the aforementioned notes by R. J. and J. O. regarding *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* published in *Notes and Queries* in 1855 (Wing, Manuscript Notes S3391, S3392, S3394).

Although Morrison doubts that Wing had any knowledge of the Thomas Sherman attribution for the *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (Morrison, E-mail), there are signs that indicate that he may have had an awareness of it. Wing leaves plenty of space at the top of his slips for the *Second Part* between the initials “S     , T”

---

53 Wing’s successors, however, knew of the *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* attribution to Sherman but chose not to include in their revised and corrected edition. On the side of MS slip S178 there is a note referencing Albert Cook’s 1977 essay published in *PBSA* which contains a reference to Thomas Sherman as author of the *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. 
as if considering the insertion of a name in the future (Manuscript notes S178-S182).

Most importantly, Wing’s notes show that he examined a copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* held at the Newberry Library; it is likely that he handled the same copy that contains Offor’s letter to Gardyne wherein Offor says it is probable that Sherman is the author of the *Second Part*; however, because of the enormity of his project, Wing may not have had the opportunity to study and consider the inserted documents.

One of the items conspicuously absent from Wing’s otherwise quite impressive and detailed research on this particular author is Bindley’s *Catalogue*. As Offor’s previously unpublished letter from 1861 implies and my research confirms, the attribution originates with and appears dependent upon a copy of the poem *Youth’s Tragedy* (1671) by T. S., once owned by James Bindley (1739-1818). Thus, in order to verify the accuracy of labeling T. S. as Thomas Sherman and attributing authorship of any literary works to such an individual, Bindley’s copy must be found and examined; however, this copy has proven to be elusive. Of all the extant copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* yet to be discovered and examined (see Appendix B), there is a unique copy at the University of Illinois with the name of “Sherman” handwritten on the title page in the margin just to the right of the title. Is it possible that this is Bindley’s copy?

Unfortunately, the textual signs indicate that it is not. First of all, the book is missing Bindley’s distinctive bookplate that would designate his ownership. Of course, it is possible that it could have been removed by a subsequent owner of the book. The aforementioned handwriting that appears on the title page is in pencil and appears to be twentieth century. Furthermore, a sample of Bindley’s handwriting from a letter he
penned on July 3, 1815 to Thomas Frognall Dibdin was compared to the handwriting found on the title page of the copy of *Youth’s Tragedy* held at the University of Illinois. Upon examining both it is evident that the handwriting is dissimilar. There is also found on the title page of *Youth’s Comedy* held at the University of Illinois the name “Sherman” handwritten in pencil. On both copies of *Youth’s Comedy* and *Youth’s Tragedy*, on the reverse title page there are call numbers penciled in that include “Sh”. Upon comparing the penciled handwritten “Sh” of the call number notations on the reverse title page with the penciled “Sh” of “Sherman” found on both title pages, it seems likely that both are the handwriting of the librarian who initially processed these copies upon the University of Illinois’s acquisition of both texts in 1910.

None of those copies of *Youth’s Tragedy* that have been identified and located can be identified as Bindley’s because they lack his distinctive nameplate and no record of his name appears in the recorded provenance histories.\(^5^4\) If it still exists, the Bindley copy has yet to be located, and until then the accuracy of this attribution cannot be confirmed nor totally dismissed.

Before presenting proposals, let us review the current status of this attribution. Sources such as Early English Books Online, English Short Title Catalogue, National Union Catalogue, Huntington Library, the British Library, and Morrison’s Revised STC have followed Wing, Halkett and Laing, and Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson, by attributing four texts—*Divine Breathings, Youth’s Tragedy, Youth’s Comedy*, and *Divine Breathings … the Second Part*—to Thomas Sherman. Following the lead of Tindall and

\(^{5^4}\) Please see Appendix B listing extant copies of *Youth’s Tragedy*, including those personally examined and those which librarians have examined on my behalf.
Sharrock, Bunyan scholars currently ascribe credit to Sherman for authoring *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (Johnson 221; Newey 29; J. Turner 91; Hammond, “Satire” 118; Keeble, “Bunyan” 245; Swaim 336; Owens 339-340; Lynch 83, 155; Greaves, *Glimpses* 498; Forrest and Sharrock xii).

There are several principles recommended by attribution scholars that we shall attempt to follow in our proposals. First of all, Harold Love states:

> we must remember that the identifications found in dictionaries of pseudonyms [e.g., Halkett and Laing] are not for the most part based on research but simply taken over from other sources, particularly library catalogues. (Library cataloguers are the hoplites or foot-soldiers of attribution studies.) So as a next step we should go directly to the standard scholarly bibliographies and the online catalogues of the world’s great libraries to see what they have to say about the text concerned.

*(Attributing Authorship 55)*

The detailed attribution narrative provided in this chapter has shown that cataloguers and bibliographers often depend on each other, but neither wants to take sole responsibility for their attributions. As stated earlier, Wing provides a disclaimer in the preface of his *Short Title Catalogue*, declaring that he assumes no accountability for attributions in his work but places that burden upon the British Library. British Library cataloguers, in turn, rely upon bibliographers for their attributions. It is a circular game that never ends. Unfortunately, as Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson admitted in 1926, “A mistake in a standard work of reference is a calamity. Makers of dictionaries borrow largely of one
another’s wares; and mistakes, if uncorrected, tend to reproduce themselves long after they are known to be wrong” (x). By considering the evolution of this attribution narrative and some of the pitfalls and dangers inherent in the business of attribution, hopefully attributionists will realize the tremendous and weighty responsibility that they must bear. It is imperative that attributionists provide documentation of their sources and evidence to support their claims. As shown in the attribution narrative above, problems occur when inaccurate information goes undetected and prior speculations are misinterpreted, perpetuated, and presented as facts.

According to Love, “The attributionist’s responsibility is to be open about the fullness and reliability of that evidence and not to try to make it appear any stronger, or weaker, than it actually is” (Attributing Authorship 78). In striving to be faithful to that responsibility, I will present several proposals and then test those proposals. Furthermore, whereas other attributionists tend to favor either internal or external evidence, I will utilize both methods before formulating a conclusive proposal.

Because of the nature of this particular case, Franklin B. Williams, Jr.’s work, “An Initiation into Initials,” is an essential resource to consider. Williams outlines some basic “standard operating procedures” for solving cases dealing with initials. These include considering the printer or bookseller’s initials, consulting the Stationers’ Register, and “watch[ing] for evidence within the volume itself” (171) for names listed which may include relatives: “Mention of specific kinship may enable one to identify a dedicatee or, conversely, an author” (172). Chester, as chronicled earlier in the attribution narrative, employs this strategy in his theory regarding the attribution of
Divine Breathings: by starting with Christopher Perin, he focuses on the clues found in Perin’s preface that lead to the identity of the “eminent divine,” Perin’s father-in-law, Michael Renniger. Likewise, the author of Love a la Mode, a Comedy (1663), who signs as T. S., was described as a “Person of Honour,” and by studying “some recommendatory verses prefixed,” details about the kinship of the author were provided, and the writer’s identity was discovered to be Thomas Southland (R. J., “Love a la Mode” 88).

Williams also advises to begin with a large list of names before making a determination: “In practice the solution of initials more often involves an appraisal of from two to twenty rival candidates in the light of probabilities and detectable links. The results range from certainty to complete frustration” (173). My list of proposals will attempt to follow this advice.

There is one problem detected in the logic of Williams’s essay that could prove dangerous if applied in our attribution case. He proposes that we can assume that when there are multiple works printed in the same year and avowed by an author with the same initials, then it is the same author. Williams offers the case of E. B., and three works claimed by E. B. in 1640 (175). This is not an effective principle to follow when dealing with T. S. later in the century. Multiple authors use the initials T. S. and thus works that are introduced in the same year are often produced by separate authors using the same initials.

First of all, who are the potential candidates for the authorship of the five texts in question? With the exception of Divine Breathings, these works are claimed by an
author or authors signing as T. S. As briefly presented earlier in this chapter, there are many individuals writing in the seventeenth century using the initials T. S., and at this stage a preliminary list of candidates could include many of them. However, based on the evidence provided in the attribution narrative, there are four primary candidates that merit immediate consideration: Thomas Shoemaker, Thomas Sherwin, Thomas Sherman, and Michael Renniger. Although Shoemaker’s name appears in the Folger copy of a 1672 edition of *Youth’s Tragedy*, this name has not been noticed previously nor are any further details known about a Thomas Shoemaker. Thomas Sherwin is listed in the original *Term Catalogues* of 1694 as the author of *Youth’s Comedy*, *Youth’s Tragedy*, and *Divine Breathings* (likely the *Second Part*). Arber notices Sherwin when compiling a reprint of the Term Catalogues. Sherwin’s candidacy weakens considerably because that edition of *Youth’s Comedy* may never have been printed in 1694; an extant copy has yet to be located. Furthermore, no biographical details have been found for a Thomas Sherwin living in seventeenth-century England.\(^{55}\)

As for Thomas Sherman, what biographical details can be gathered about this author, beyond the oft repeated label of “General Baptist”? Unfortunately, scholarship based on assumptions and speculations can eventually evolve into statements that promote false confidence. To wit, Albert B. Cook III asserts that “T. S., identified by Roger Sharrock and others as Thomas Sherman, leader of a General Baptist congregation in London [was] a man with whom Bunyan would likely have been

---

55 Thomas Sherwin is absent in the same nonconformist directories listed below for Thomas Sherman. He also is not included in the university records compiled by Joseph Foster and Venn.
acquainted” (13-14). Unfortunately, after having searched numerous directories, dictionaries, and other sources, I have found no records for a nonconformist minister known as Thomas Sherman (Bogue and Bennett; Burrage; Calamy; Crosby; Dictionary of National Biography; General Biographical Dictionary; Greaves and Zaller; Ivimey; Matthews, Calamy Revised; McBeth; Murch; Starr; Surman; Adam Taylor; G. Turner; Vaughan; Whitley, Baptists of London; Wilson). Both Surman’s index of Presbyterian and Congregational ministers—which contains information for over 26,000 ministers since the sixteenth century—and Whitley’s directory of Baptist ministers—an unpublished collection of manuscript note cards held at the Regents Park College Library in Oxford—were checked during a research trip to England in November 2006, yielding no information about Thomas Sherman. Sherman’s absence in Whitley’s directory is particularly noteworthy because Whitley includes Sherman in both his Baptist Bibliography and History of British Baptists. However, the most likely reason Whitley did not create a card for Sherman for his directory is because he never referred to him as a minister. Others have marked Sherman as such: Kennedy, Smith, and Johnson list him as “Rev. Thomas Sherman” (18); Albert Cook declares Sherman to have been a “leader of a General Baptist congregation in London” (13-14); W. R. Owens labels Sherman as “a General Baptist preacher” (309).

Because of the numerous speculations proffered regarding Sherman’s supposed Baptist affiliation, the attention of our search for traces of Sherman’s historical identity has been focused among dissenters. Is it possible, however, that Thomas Sherman could be found in the conformist camp? As shall be considered at greater length in Chapter
IV, hints of Anglicanism are found in the Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress, prompting at least one scholar, Susan Cook, to question Sherman’s assumed Baptist affiliation. There are two Thomas Shermans listed in Venn’s Alumni Cantabrigienses that lived during this period (63). The first earned his BA (1637-38) and MA (1641) at Cambridge. According to Venn, this Thomas Sherman56 was “[p]erhaps V[icar] of Silkstone, Yorks[hire], 1666-77” and was “buried there Nov. 30, 1677” (63). Considering the year of his decease, chronologically it is possible that this Sherman could have written Youth’s Tragedy (1671) but not Youths’s Comedy (1680) or Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress (1682). The other Thomas Sherman57 also received both his BA (1654-55) and MA (1658) at Cambridge, and it is possible, Venn states, that he served as Rector of St. Anthony, London (1662-1664) (63). Unfortunately, no death date is provided so we cannot accurately evaluate his candidacy since we do not know whether or not he was alive when the texts in question by T. S. were published.

According to A. G. Matthews’s Walker Revised, which contains brief entries summarizing biographical details of those Anglican clergy affected by the Grand Rebellion from 1642-1660, one Thomas Sherman58 served first as Vicar of Tuddenham (1609-1610) and then as Rector of Hintlesham (1611 to 1646). However, he dies in 1653, 18 years before the publication of the first edition of Youth’s Tragedy, 27 years prior to Youth’s Comedy, and 29 years before the imitative Second Part of the Pilgrim’s

56 We shall label him as Thomas Sherman-A.
57 We shall label him as Thomas Sherman-B.
58 We shall label him as Thomas Sherman-C.
Progress. Based on our analysis of these three Thomas Shermans, only one is a viable candidate, Thomas Sherman-B, but we do not even know if he was still alive when the works in question were published.

If T. S. is Thomas Sherman, an Anglican, why would he be writing under the initials of T. S. in 1670s with both the Church of England and the monarchy restored to power? It was nonconformists like Bunyan and their printers who were supposed to fear being caught writing and publishing things contrary to Anglicanism and the ruling monarch. Or is T. S., like B. K., trying to reach a broader Protestant audience by opting for anonymity?

As proposed by Chester in 1881, Renniger is a candidate for the authorship of Divine Breathings. Born in Hampshire, Michael Renniger (1528/9-1609) was a demy of Magdalen College, Oxford, and after graduating with a BA in 1546, he became a fellow. During his career at Oxford, he lectured in at least three fields—Greek, natural philosophy, and moral philosophy—and in 1549 received his MA. At the end of the following year he traveled to Zurich “for the sake of printing the English bible” and to deliver letters to his friend, Heinrich Bullinger (Robinson 425). In 1552 Renniger began serving as rector of Broughton; however, exiled by Mary’s accession, by April 1554 he had returned to Zurich and “was briefly in Strasborg, where in November 1554 he signed

59 John Walker’s An Attempt Towards Recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England (1714) contains a reference to John Whiting. Thomas Sherman’s successor at Hintlesham (406), but it does not include any entry for Thomas Sherman.

60 In their entries for Renniger, Venn and Joseph Foster provide alternate spellings of Renniger’s last name: Rennigar, Rynager, Riniger, Runniger, Rhanger (Joseph Foster 1245; Venn 441).
the letter to the congregation of Frankfurt deploring attempts to be purer liturgically than
the Marian martyrs” (Lock 488).

Renniger returned to England sometime after 1558, and he was eventually
installed by Elizabeth as a royal chaplain, as rector of Crawley, Hampshire, and
prebendary at Winchester Cathedral. Still a resident at court in 1561, Renniger preached
at Paul’s Cross in November. Although a proponent of liturgical reform, he continued
an impressive career in the Church of England, securing notable positions of influence:
chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral (1563); cathedral lecturer (1566); subdean of Lincoln
Cathedral (1568); archdeacon of Winchester (1575); rector of Chilbolton (1575); and
prebendary of Reculverland in St. Paul’s (1583) (Joseph Foster 1245; Venn 441; Hardy
II.41, 94; III.26, 33; Lock 489). Renniger, who received his Doctorate of Theology in
1573, also served as ecclesiastical commissioner for the dioceses of Winchester,
Lincoln, and Peterborough.

As mentioned previously, at least three works have been attributed to Renniger,
and as Julian Lock observes, he “sought to justify royal favour by his publications”
(489). His published works include: De Pii V et Gregori XIII Romanorum pontificum
furoribus contra...Elizabetham (1582); A Treatise Containing Two Parts: An
Exhortation to True Love, Loyaltie, and Fidelitie to Her Majesty, and A Treatise Against
Treasons, Rebellions, and Suchlike Disloyalties (1587); and Syntagma Hortationum
...ad...Regem Jacobum (1604). A brass memorial hangs on a wall in the church of St.
Mary, Crawley, describing how Renniger, the Marian exile, returned to serve as rector of
Crawley in 1860 (Page, “Parishes”).
In Chapters III and IV I will seek to identify any peculiar doctrines or teachings found in *Divine Breathings*, *Divine Breathings ... The Second Part*, and *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, considering the possible religious influences and affiliations in these writings which may aid us in attributing these works. As Harold Love states: “To identify a piece of writing as emanating from a particular discourse community [e.g., specific religious group or affiliation] may be an important part of the process of establishing an attribution” (*Attributing Authorship* 102).

An important question for us to keep in mind: Do all of these texts belong together in the same corpus? According to the paratextual evidence supplied in the by-lines found on the title pages of the earliest extant editions, *Youth’s Tragedy* and *Youth’s Comedy* belong to the same T. S. Adding any other texts is, at this stage in our study, purely speculative. Some may be tempted to assume that because Nathaniel Ponder printed and commenced selling two new titles in the same year (1680) both avowed by T. S., *Youth’s Comedy* and *Divine Breathings ... the Second Part*, therefore the author must be the same individual. That leap was apparently taken by Edward Arber in 1903. However, it is puzzling why Ponder himself chose not to do so. As evidence consider an advertisement of books offered by Ponder preceding the text of the *Life and Death of Mr. Badman* (1680). Therein *Divine Breathings ... the Second Part* is listed as authored by T. S. but the very next listing of *Youth’s Comedy* reads “By the Author of *Youth’s Tragedy*.” If all of these titles were by the same author, would not Ponder have opted to advertise that fact explicitly?
Based on the information presented above, I suggest that Chester’s proposal that *Divine Breathings* should be attributed to Michael Renniger be carefully considered.

Not since Loftie first presented Chester’s theory in 1883 has anyone recorded a response to the proposal that Renniger authored the original *Divine Breathings*. *Divine Breathings* has been lumped together with other texts ascribed to Thomas Sherman because of the sequel, *Divine Breathings ... the Second Part*, claimed by T. S. However, T. S. never avowed the original *Divine Breathings*, he only offered a sequel. If he had written the first part, why did he not go back to a printer, reveal his identity, claim authorship, and thereby capitalize on its success and further establish his authorial reputation? In the latter part of Chapter III, we will compare the internal evidence contained in T. S.’s sequel (*Divine Breathings ... the Second Part*) with *Divine Breathings*. By examining the internal evidence of both texts, we will consider this data in order to test Chester’s theory.

My argument in the following chapters is that *Divine Breathings ... the Second Part* and *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* are both by the same author, T. S., the imitative sequel writer who emphasizes meditation in his works. Whitley offers support for this argument: “In February, 1680, T. S. issued the second part of ‘Divine Breathings’: it is just conceivable at this stage that as T. S. issued a second part of ‘Pilgrim’s Progress’ not intending to claim the authorship of that, so T. S. issued a second part of ‘Divine Breathings’ without claiming authorship of the first part” (“T. S. and His Publishers” 231).
Furthermore, it is important for scholars to be aware of the successful printing history of *Divine Breathings*, particularly its popularity in the seventeenth century, because it helps us understand T. S.’s authorial identity. My research suggests de-attributing *Divine Breathings* away from T. S. to Michael Renniger (1528/9-1609), a Church of England clergyman. Without *Divine Breathings* in his corpus of attributed works, we can then focus on T. S.’s role as an imitative sequel writer and see that this writer selected steady sellers (i.e., *Divine Breathings* and *Pilgrim’s Progress*) to critique, imitate, and sequelize. T. S. writes *Youth’s Tragedy*, which was an immediate best seller—four editions were issued in just two years—but then his poetic voice turns silent. However, by 1680, he suddenly finds inspiration, offering a sequel, *Youth’s Comedy* (published by Bunyan’s printer, Nathaniel Ponder) as a follow-up to *Youth’s Tragedy*. That same year, T. S. produces a sequel to *Divine Breathings*, imitating the resolve form of meditative writing, titled *Divine Breathings, or a Manual of Practical Contemplations … the Second Part* (also printed by Ponder). Meditation continued to be a priority to T. S. as evident by his emphasis on the practice when he writes his “Supplyment” to Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*. 
CHAPTER III

DIVINE BREATHINGS: IMITATION AS GENRE,
PARATEXT, AND PERFORMANCE

Although the publication success of devotional steady sellers in early modern England and New England has been shown to surpass all contenders, including poetry, Renaissance plays, and reprints, meager attention has been given to these works (Stephen Foster 88-90; Green *passim*; Brown 68-69).

In his *PMLA* essay on early modern devotional literature published in 2006, Matthew P. Brown claims that “devotional steady sellers must be reckoned a—perhaps the—canon of popular reading in the early modern West” (69). This chapter focuses on a devotional steady seller titled *Divine Breathings, or a Pious Soul Thirsting After Christ in One Hundred Pathetical Meditations* (4th ed., 1671), a book which deservedly belongs among that “canon of popular reading” but has previously eluded significant scholarly analysis.

In *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*, Ian Green identifies *Divine Breathings* as a devotional steady seller but only briefly mentions it and summarizes the

---

61 David D. Hall introduces the term “steady sellers” in his book *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (1990): books qualified as steady sellers “in the sense of never passing out of print for many years—and ‘many’ could mean centuries” (49). Regarding their importance, Hall emphasizes that “steady sellers, with their story line of struggle against sin, seemed compelling to their readers. Steady sellers (and the Bible) were key vehicles of culture, transmitting to a general readership the essence of a cultural tradition; in their format, as in how they were appropriated, they both shaped and strengthened an interpretive community” (52). An extraordinary example of a devotional steady seller is Joseph Alleine’s *An Alarme to Unconverted Sinners* (1673), which reportedly had a single print run of nearly 30,000 copies (Green 339). Other scholars have utilized the term “steady seller” in their work: see chapters 4-6 in Ian Green’s *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (2000); Matthew Brown’s essay, “The Thick Style: Steady Sellers, Textual Aesthetics, and Early Modern Devotional Reading,” *PMLA* (2006).
work in one sentence. This chapter will remedy the previous oversight of this text by examining the content of *Divine Breathings* and attempting to explain the possible reasons for its appeal to a readership spanning three centuries. Before doing so, however, I will first provide a brief overview of Protestant meditational writing in seventeenth-century England in order to show how *Divine Breathings* fits within this genre and how this genre creates a devout reader. This will help us better understand how particular bibliographic codes function in *Divine Breathings* to both illustrate and invite imitation. With this framework established, I will argue that T. S. is not the author of *Divine Breathings* but is an imitative writer who actively participates in and pioneers an ongoing discourse by providing a sequel, *Divine Breathings: or a Manual of Practical Contemplations in One Century.... The Second Part* (1680).

Because *Divine Breathings* is packaged as “Pathetical Meditations,” we must first consider how contemporary writers defined both the practice and the literary genre of meditation. The terms *sermon* and *meditation* were essentially synonymous for many early modern Protestants (Lewalski 152). Frank Livingstone Huntley agrees, noting

---

62 In “What is Critical Editing?”, the second chapter of his book *The Textual Condition* (1991), Jerome McGann differentiates between linguistic codes and bibliographic codes. McGann argues that “[b]ibliographical signifiers...immediately call our attention to other styles and scales of symbolic exchange that every language event involves. Meaning is transmitted through bibliographical as well as linguistic codes” (57). Other scholars in textual studies have adopted the term; most notably Daniel Bornstein, who further clarifies the term: “Such bibliographic codes might include cover design, page layout, or spacing, among other factors. They might also include the other contents of the book or periodical in which the work appears, as well as prefaces, notes, or dedications that affect the reception and interpretation of the work” (6).

63 Granted, there are some differences between Catholics and Protestants regarding how meditation is explained and practiced; however, the way that they define it in similar terms, at least initially in their treatises, merits recognition. In a period where intensive splintering and fracturing occurs in seventeenth-century England, it may be worth considering how Catholics, Anglicans, and Dissenters share common
that “meditation became closely allied to the sermon,” and he detects in meditational prose a form similar to that of the sermon: “exposition of a text and theme, the application, and the final short prayer” (8, 9). Sermons represent the public transmission of preachers’ personal meditations; they were meant to be slowly digested by individuals, and meditation provided the process for doing that. Edmund Calamy emphasized the critical role of meditation in 1680:

The reason why all the Sermons we hear do us no more good, is for want of Divine meditation; for it is with Sermons as it is with meat, it is not the having of meat upon your table will feed you, but you must eat it; and not only eat it, but concoct it, and digest it, or else your meat will do you no good . . . . And one Sermon well digested, well meditated upon, is better than twenty Sermons without meditation.” (Art of Divine Meditation 31)

As part of that continuous process, meditation then led practitioners to prayer and contemplation.64

In Grave Counsels (1599), Richard Greenham defines meditation as “that exercise of the minde, whereby we calling to our remembrance that which wee know,

---

64 The terms contemplation and meditation sometimes seem interchangeable. However, as Arthur L. Clements emphasizes in his argument for a Poetry of Contemplation among the poets Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan, there is a distinction. Citing the anonymous Benedictine author of Medieval Mystical Tradition and Saint John of the Cross, Clements explains that there was “a scale or order, going from lowest to highest, of lectio divina [scripture study], meditation, prayer, contemplation. Contemplation was understood as ‘an experimental union with God which no meditation can produce, but for which a soul may pray’” (2-3). Joseph Hall’s biographer, T. F. Kinloch, proffers an alternate distinction between the two terms: contemplation is “commentary of a unique character” on scripture and meditation is the musing and discovering of spiritual lessons derived from various objects (80).
doe further debate of it, applie it to our selves, that wee might have some use of it in our practice” (37). Bishop Joseph Hall publishes seven years later in the *Art of Divine Meditation* (1606) what has become the classic definition: “divine meditation is nothing else but a bending of the mind upon some spiritual object, through divers forms of discourse, until our thoughts come to an issue; and this must needs be either extemporal and occasioned by outward occurrences offered to the mind; or deliberate and wrought out of our own heart” (*Arte* 72). Arthur Warwick in his *Spare-Minutes; or Resolved Meditations* (1634, 2nd ed.) adds:

> Meditation is a busie search in the store house of fantasie for some Idea’s of matters, to bee cast in the moulds of resolution into some formes of words or actions; In which search when I have used my greatest diligence, I finde this in the conclusion, that to meditate on the Best is the best of Meditations: and a resolution to make a good end is a good of my resolutions. (86-87)

In 1650, the year Louis Martz identifies as marking “a new direction in the development of English Puritanism” (21), Richard Baxter promotes a specific type of meditation which he describes as: “The set and solemn acting of all the powers of thy soul in meditation upon thy everlasting rest” (*Saints* 241). Essentially, it is self-talk, a self-directed sermon. Simply put, Baxter explains, a meditation is “pleading…with thyself” (271).
Some scholars argue for a distinctively Protestant form of meditational writing. Barbara Lewalski, for example, claims, “Two elements especially characterize Protestant meditation…: a focus upon the Bible…and a particular kind of application to the self, analogous to the ‘application’ so prominent in Protestant sermons of the period” (148). Huntley also sees distinct differences between Protestant and Catholic ways of writing meditatively. Describing the characteristics of Protestant meditation, Huntley observes that “philosophically it is Platonic, not Aristotelian; in psychology it is Augustinian, not Thomistic; its theology is Pauline-Calvinistic; though starting with the individual it finally becomes more public than private, and bears a greater similarity to the sermon than to penitential prayer; and it finds a greater variety of subject matter in God’s ‘three books’” (4-5). Unlike Catholic meditation, which focuses on the passion of Christ and the four eschatological topics of death, judgment, heaven, and hell, Protestants were free to widely explore the three books of God: the book of Scripture, the book of Creatures, and the book of the Soul. The meditations of Joseph Hall, for example, include attention

---

to these books, and his meditations can be categorized into these three areas (Huntley 9; 31-43).

Of the three books of God, Huntley observes, the Book of Scripture proves to be “central” for Protestant meditation, and of all the books in the Bible, the Psalms are extremely important in this genre of devotional writing (10). Protestants frequently cited David and the Psalms when writing meditatively or promoting the practice of meditation (Greenham 39). Puritan divine Richard Sibbes (1577-1635) explains the Psalms’ importance: they are “as it were, the anatomy of a holy man, which lay the insides of a truly devout man outward to the view of others” (Soul’s Conflict 1:130). Unlike other books of scripture, the Psalms are unique because, Sibbes notes, “holy men speak to God and their own hearts” (1:199). Furthermore, the Psalms provide more references to the words meditate and meditation “than in all the other books of the Bible put together” (Huntley 10). Another popular scripture that reinforces the need for the Christian to meditate is the precedent set by Isaac, who, as recorded in Genesis, “went out to

66 For more on the importance of the Psalms during this period, see Hannibal Hamlin’s Psalm Culture and Early Modern English Literature.

67 See Joan Webber’s discussion on how an Anglican meditative author, Thomas Traherne (1637-1674), discovers in David “a second self”, pp. 203-232.

68 The following are a representative sampling: “But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night” (Psalms 1:2); “Give ear to my words, O Lord, consider my meditation” (Psalms 5:1); “Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer” (Psalms 19:14); “My mouth shall speak of wisdom; and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding” (Psalms 49:3); “When I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches” (Psalms 63:6); “I will meditate also of all thy work, and talk of thy doings” (Psalms 77:12); “My meditation of him shall be sweet: I will be glad in the LORD” (Psalms 104:34); “I will meditate in thy precepts, and have respect unto thy ways” (Psalms 119:15); “O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day” (Psalms 119:97); “I have more understanding than all my teachers: for thy testimonies are my meditation” (Psalms 119:99).
meditate in the field at eventide.” Protestant meditative practitioners sought to imitate in their writings not only David but also Jesus. To assist others in that imitative exercise, Hall produces a handbook to encourage Christians to fulfill their duty. Part of his agenda in *Art of Divine Meditation*, Hall admits, is “to prescribe a method of meditation,” but he acknowledges that readers do not have to strictly follow his guidelines because there are cases where different paths can lead to the same destination (Hall 107). Not surprisingly, formulaic methods for devotions were shunned by Puritans. Likewise, Baxter also allows for flexibility among meditative practitioners, ultimately allowing them to do it their own way but with significant attention and diligence: “If thou canst not thus meditate methodically and fully, yet do it as thou canst; only be sure to do it seriously and frequently” (316). As Narveson observes, not even Hall strictly follows his own “method” in his meditations beyond *Arte*:

Hall’s own disinclination to apply the precepts of the *Arte* compels us to reexamine its influence on English Protestant devotion in general. Because the *Arte* was the only systematic Protestant manual of meditation in early Stuart England, it is natural that critics should look for evidence

---

69 This verse in Genesis 24:63 appears to be the epigraph found on the title page of Edmund Calamy’s *Art of Divine Meditation* (1680); however, upon closer inspection the scripture is actually the concluding part of the lengthy title, identified as the subject of “Several Sermons.”
that its precepts guided specific devotional works. But in fact, the Arte’s rules were rarely followed in published works before the mid-century. (“Sole-Talk” 152).

The practice of meditation is perceived to be an essential component of Christian life. Both Hall and Baxter refer to meditation as a “duty” which Christians tend to neglect (Hall, Art 107; Baxter 240). Baxter’s emphasis on this point is underscored both by his inclusion of “Duty” on the title page (“By the diligent practice of that Excellent unknown Duty of Heavenly Meditation”) and by placing it among the four primary duties of Christian: listening to sermons, praying, reading scriptures, and meditating on heaven (Baxter 243).

The intended audience for meditative writings is the subject of some debate. Although these works are frequently presented as introspective and intensely private, several scholars have suggested that meditational literature was produced in order to be shared and publicly distributed. Huntley states, “Protestant meditation is as public as it is private, intended not for the individual alone but for large numbers of people, congregations perhaps, of the devout” (Huntley 9). In the case of Donne’s Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions, Mary Arshagouni Papazian argues that “[t]he work is directed not inwardly toward the meditator but outwardly toward an external reader.”

---

70 This statement summarizes Papazian’s argument which she establishes in her 1988 dissertation, “John Donne’s Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions: A Puritan Reading” (see “Abstract”). In an essay published in 1991, “The Latin Stationes in John Donne’s Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions,” Papazian reiterates her observation that Donne in his Devotions “is preaching not just to himself, but also to his readers” (204-205, n. 10). For further study, see also Papazian’s essay, “Literary ‘Things Indifferent’: The Shared Augustinianism of Donne’s Devotions and Bunyan’s Grace Abounding,” in which she asserts that Donne and Bunyan share a common core “assurance” of God’s mercy, “a complete dependence on God,”
However, at least one kind of meditational writing labeled as “holy soliloquies” tended to be too sacred for Puritans to publish during the early part of the seventeenth century and up to the Restoration (Narveson, “Sole-Talk” 118). In contrast, conformists chose to publish meditations, particularly those “holy soliloquies,” because they could “be personal without being individual” and “because of their inner dynamic” (Narveson, “Sole-Talk” 122). Puritans, however, like Sibbes endorsed holy soliloquies as a form useful for individual, unpublished meditation (120).  

Hall, who had Puritan leanings, had no qualms about sharing his style of meditative writings. In his prefatory “To the Christian Reader” for Select Thoughts (1648) Hall reveals his motivation for publishing his work:

> The intent of this Labour is to put some good Thoughts (Reader) into thy minde, which would not otherwise, perhaps have tendered themselves to thee; such, as I hope may not a little further thee on thy journey to Heaven. And if in my Laboring thitherward, I shall, through Gods mercy, be a means of forwarding any soul, but some steps up that steep way, how happy am I? (8-9)

and that *Devotions* and *Grace Abounding* “do not reflect respectively, ‘the styles of two faiths,’ Anglican and Puritan” (343-344).

71 The term *holy soliloquies* will be discussed later in our examination of *Divine Breathings*.

72 Narveson discerns Hall’s style of meditative writings to be typically quite different from the categories outlined in the *Arte* (i.e., extemporal/occasional or deliberative). Instead, Narveson labels much of Hall’s meditative writings as “devout conduct books.” (“Godly” 149).
The way of disseminating such “good Thoughts” is to dispense to the community of “Christian Reader[s]” those worthy cogitations he has used for his own benefit. As Hall explains:

To which purpose, I know no means more effectual, then those Meditations which conduce to the animation and vigor of Christian practice: Such I have propounded to my Self, as most behooveful and necessary; especially for this Age, into which we are fallen; an Age of more brain than heart; and that hath almost lost Piety in the chase of some litigious Truths. (9-10)

Here, Hall informs readers that he has benefited by practicing meditation; in fact, he senses an obligation in his stewardship to publicize those thoughts that have been useful in animating his own piety. Hall is, in essence, offering himself as a meditative exemplar. An edition of *Select Thoughts* issued in 1654 packages his meditations with an additional subtitle: *A Century of Divine Breathings for a Ravished Soule, beholding the Excellencies of her Lord Jesus.*  

Hall’s usage of the phrase *A Century of Divine Breathings* is significant to our study since it signals possible imitation of or inspiration for the title of the devotional steady seller, *Divine Breathings.*  

---

73 An earlier edition dated 1648 offers the following to its title page: *Select Thoughts. One Century. Also, the Breathings of the Devout Soul.* The latter is the title of an additional work included in the book (which is also included in the 1654 edition).

74 A search of the Early English Books Online archive yielded five separate titles published in the 1650s that included the word *breathings.* According to this database, no titles of English works published in the seventeenth century before Hall’s 1648 edition, however, included *breathings.*
previously neglected theory proposed in 1881 that Michael Renniger, archdeacon of Winchester, authored *Divine Breathings*. Assuming the accuracy of Chester’s proposal, it is possible that *Divine Breathings* was first published by Renniger’s son-in-law, Christopher Perin, between 1609 (the year of Renniger’s death) and 1612 (the year of Perin’s death). Therefore, it is possible that if Perin published his father-in-law’s meditations during that period under the title of *Divine Breathings*, Hall may have been imitating this work by borrowing its title as a subtitle for a later edition of his *Select Thoughts*. Such appropriation was commonplace during the English Renaissance and rarely frowned upon; in fact, as one scholar has argued, most English writers from 1500 to 1625 believed “that originality of real worth is to be achieved only through creative imitation” (Harold White 202). Furthermore, Hall was one who frequently imitated and borrowed the ideas of others. Hall’s biographer, T. F. Kinloch, candidly admits that Hall “in all his innumerable pages…never expressed a single idea which some one greater than himself had not conceived long before he was born” (36).

What is also significant about taking Chester’s theory seriously is that it places the author of *Divine Breathings* as one of the pioneers rather than as a late straggler in a category of meditative writing labeled by John Lievsay as the “resolve.” This innovative genre of meditative prose emerges and then, according to Lievsay, rapidly declines over a period of approximately sixty years, with 1612 to 1634 representing the “heyday of the

---

75 I did not find any record of earlier editions of *Divine Breathings* in Pollard and Redgrave’s *Short-Title Catalogue, 1475-1640* and Arber’s *Transcript of the Stationer’s Register, 1554-1640*. 
resolve” (1, 5-6). According to Lievsay, the resolve is “less sophisticated and ritually elaborated” than other prose meditations but “is thus akin to those holy reflections, exclamations, observations, prayers, and vows which underly the process of the unspoken or unwritten meditation and its religious congener in verse” (1). This genre may have disappeared because it was not readily categorized then but appeared under various labels, including: meditations, resolutions, resolves, observations, vows, excogitations, flames, contemplations, and essays. As shall be shown later, we can also add “breathings” to that lengthy list of resolve labels.

An additional characteristic is that “the resolve formula” focuses on “a situation, either public or personal, adjudge[s] it to be either desirable or undesirable, and resolve[s] upon an appropriate course of action” (Lievsay 4). Typically, the writer disapproves of the situation. The resolution is easily detected by phrases such as “I will therefore,” perhaps the genre’s most common locution. The length of resolves varied: Hall’s *Meditations and Vows* illustrate the range, from one-liners to those covering several pages. Early resolvers like Hall and Daniel Tuvill were often aligned with “satirists, chiders, epigrammatists” (3). Although resolves may resemble essays in some respects—Cornwallis’s *Essayes*, for example, occasionally offer a resolve to take action—Lievsay emphasizes that “all resolves are meditations, but … not all meditations, or essays, are resolves. It is not in theme that the resolve is differentiated from the essay or the sermon, but in form” (5).

---

76 Understanding that during this period (1612-1634) was when the resolve was experiencing the height of its popularity further supports the theory that Renniger penned these meditations early in the century and that they were most likely first published during reign of King James I.
Divine Breathings shares in common many of the characteristics which Lievsay has identified as typically found in resolve writings. Most of the entries in Divine Breathings, for example, are brief, averaging about one-and-a-half pages in length. Most of these meditations conclude with phrases denoting resolution to be more devout and repentant (e.g., “I will,” “I shall,” “I will therefore,” “let me”). In Meditation 15, the speaker muses on the topic of the danger of prying too deeply into those inexplicable mysteries of God and then resolves: “I will carefully improve my self by what we have revealed, and not curiously enquire into or after what he hath reserved” (21-22). This same topic and the conclusive resolve pattern can also be detected in the following excerpt from Anthony Stafford’s Meditations and Resolutions, Moral, Divine, Politicall. Century I (1612):

When I consider in what estate man was created, I cannot but thinke of his folly; who, through false hope of knowing good and evill, lost the enough of good hee had and found too much evil. This makes mee call to minde the vaie ambition of those who seeke to prie into that unrevealed (and therefore inscrutable) knowledge of the Deity: upon whom God looking down, saies in a pitiful derision (as hee did to Adam) Beholde, the men are become as one of us. This meditation stretcheth-out it selfe, and biddes mee also consider the arrogancie of those who scorne to erre, or to bee reprehended for their errours, not-withstanding that they see man to have erred in the state of innocencie. I will therefore seeke to know my selfe (the next and surest way to knowe God) and by an humble
confession, begge remission of my faults. I say, I will confesse them unto
God; not boast of them to man. (1)

Like some other types of meditations, resolves were commonly packaged into
centuries when published (even though they were not always exactly one hundred). Hall
divides into two centuries his *Meditations and Vows* as does Anthony Stafford with his
*Meditations and Resolutions* (1612) and Owen Felltham in his *Resolves. A Duple
Century* (1628); *Divine Breathings* is similarly presented as “a hundred Pathetical
Meditations” on its title page (5th ed.).

Although some of these resolvers include meditations on “divine” subjects and
these are cited as such on the title pages, many of these writers do not focus solely on
biblical themes. In fact, Lievsay observes, “Of all the resolve writers, Tuvill comes
closest to making direct use of the Scriptures. His illustrations and supporting
arguments are strictly biblical” (24). Others, however, like Hall and Henry Tubbe,
provide both divine and moral meditations. Notice how the following entry by Hall
begins with an aphoristic statement,77 vows to increase his faith in Deity, and concludes
with a declaration of the trust that he has esteemed essential:

> “With men it is a good rule; To try first, and then to trust: with God it is
> contrary; I will first trust him (as most wise, omnipotent, mercifull) and

---

77 In the dedicatory epistle to his patron, Sir Robert Drury (who is notable since he also was a patron of
John Donne), Hall refers to his writings in *Meditations and Vowes, Divine and Morall. Serving for
Direction in Christian and Civill Practise* (1605) as aphorisms. According to Lievsay, “The intention of
the book is to make personal and practical application of the Christian aphorisms it contains. Many of
Hall’s resolves are so brief as to suggest either epigrams or moral maxims” (10). Notwithstanding their
brevity, they each contain a meditation followed by a vow or resolution.
try him afterwards. I know it is as impossible for him to deceive me, as
not to be” (*Meditations and Vowes*, Med.# 35)

In his work, *Meditations Divine and Morall* (1659), Tubbe offers moral meditations such
as the one below which focuses on vows regarding his relationships with and treatment
of his fellow men:

> I will be kinde and courteous to all, but familiar with none but my
intimate and equal friends: for the love of inferiours oftentimes
degenerates into contempt. […] I will not think my self too good to looke
upon any man; but I will be sure that he whom I receive into my bosome
acquaintance shall be at least as good a man as my selfe. (qtd. in Lievsay
174)

Whereas Hall and Tubbe both sought to provide both spiritual and moral
meditations, the entries in *Divine Breathings* are presented to readers as a model of
focused piety. *Divine Breathings* cannot be classified as simply a work of moral
meditations; rather, it is a religious text: 45 of the 100 meditations contain a total of 115
references to Jesus, Christ, or Jesus Christ. Grace is mentioned 34 times, holiness 6
times, and the Book of Election once. This concern with divinity and piety is
emphasized in the title. Although the fourth and fifth editions label each of the 100
entries as meditations, it is not until the sixth edition of 1678 that the full title takes
shape, a title which would endure relatively intact until the final printings in the late 19th
Century: *Divine Breathings: or, A Pious Soul Thirsting After Christ. In a Hundred
Pathetical Meditations.*
Unlike the fourth and fifth editions, the sixth edition presents each entry with a topical heading. The initial entry stresses the importance of meditation and prayer, comparing them to “the spies that went to search the Land of Canaan, the one views and the other cuts down, and both bring home a taste of the fairest and sweetest fruits of Heaven” (1-2). Meditation is described “like the eye,” as the way of seeing and in obtaining a glimpse of Heaven. This echoes the manner in which others, like Richard Greenham, describe one of the benefits of meditation: enabling one to “see more cleerely” (38).

The second entry of *Divine Breathings* appears to be a continuation of the author’s introductory explanation or perhaps defense of meditation. Whereas the first linked Meditation with Prayer, the second introduces the practice of Contemplation. Citing Saint Bernard’s comparison of it with an eagle, the speaker endorses contemplation because it allows for celestial communion. The similes used draw upon the Book of Creatures, incorporating animals that fly to explain the spiritually elevating influence of contemplation and meditation.

---

78 In similar fashion, Joseph Hall’s first entry in Book One of *Meditations and Vowes, Divine and Morall* (1605) is a meditation about the value of meditation. In his resolution statement he provides a hint of the definition of meditation that he would later provide in his *Arte of Divine Meditation* (1606): “In Meditation, those, which begin heavenly thoughts, & prosecute them not, are like those, which kindle a fire under greene wood, and leave it, so soone as it but begins to flame: leefing the hope of a good beginning, for want of seconding it with a suitable proceeding: when I set my self to meditate, I wil not give over till I come to an issue. […]” (1).

79 Both Richard Sibbes and Richard Baxter in their meditative writings also utilize this passage found in Numbers 13:1-33. (Please note that hereafter, unless otherwise specified, references to *Divine Breathings* will be from the sixth edition.)
The meditations contained in *Divine Breathings* explore the three books of God—the Book of Scriptures, the Book of Creatures, and the Book of the Conscience.\(^80\) These meditations show a definite concern about the Book of Conscience (which can also include the Soul or the Self) as illustrated by the speaker’s regular probing into the nature of his soul, the desires of his soul, and the differences between faithful Christians and unfaithful Worldlings. A meticulous search of the text yields six references to conscience and three to the *Book of Conscience*.

As we continue to examine the content of *Divine Breathings* we must also begin to consider possible explanations for its successful reception. Meditational literature was popular reading material in the seventeenth century. Between 1610 and 1620, for example, the titles of at least 18 works published in England contain the word meditation.\(^81\) By the 1640s, Green observes, there was a “growing interest in meditation” as noted by the decrease in output of published prayers by pious authors which “was due above all to a change in attitudes, sparked in part by a strong reaction against Laudian (and later, Sheldonian) insistence on the use of the *Book of Common Prayer* in full, but driven also, and much more positively, by the increasingly widely held conviction that extempore prayer was infinitely superior to fixed forms” (274). The interest among readers in meditative writings may, in part, explain why *Divine Breathings* was a steady seller in the seventeenth century.

---

\(^80\) As Owen Feltham in his *Resolves* (1628, 3rd ed.) writes: “God hath left three booke to the world, in each of which hee may easily be found: The Booke of the Creatures, the Booke of Conscience, and his written Word. The first shewes his Omnipotency. The second his Justice: The third his Mercy and Goodnesse” (407).

\(^81\) This figure was gathered by performing a search on Early English Books Online on May 22, 2007.
In any case, Perin’s decision to publish *Divine Breathings* yielded a text that experienced an exceptionally successful printing reception, a text that Green rightfully includes among those devotional steady sellers of the early modern era. No fewer than eight editions of *Divine Breathings* were published in London during the seventeenth century; at least three printings occurred in the 1670s. But what Green does not record is the enduring popularity of the text: my research has discovered that the printing history of *Divine Breathings* spans three centuries. Neither does Green classify *Divine Breathings* as a resolve (probably because he is not aware of such a category). Lievsay, when he compiled an anthology of resolves, was evidently not aware of *Divine Breathings* and its extraordinary printing history because it is conspicuously absent from his book, *The Seventeenth-Century Resolve*. Of the most successful resolves—by Hall, Feltham, and Rous, “the best of the Resolve writers” (3)—Lievsay declares Feltham’s *Resolves* to be the king.82 It appears in eleven editions between 1623 and 1696, one edition in 1709, continues with seven printings in the 1800s, and two in the 1900s—for a cumulative total of 21 printings.83 However, this pales in comparison with the printing history of the *Divine Breathings*: at least eight editions before 1700; no less than nineteen additional printings during the eighteenth century; and another thirty-three versions were published in the nineteenth century—for a cumulative total of at least 60

82 According to Lievsay: “Owen Feltham (Owin Fel/ham on the engraved title page of the first edition), 1604?-1688, is the prince of resolve writers; and his *Resolves*, as a minor masterpiece of seventeenth-century English literature, is the only representative of the form remembered and treasured today” (80).

83 For a partial printing history of Feltham’s *Resolves* see Lievsay, pp. 80-83. Electronic versions of early editions are included in the digital archives of Early English Books Online and Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Extant editions of the *Resolves* are also listed on OCLC First Search WorldCat online. For more on Felltham see Douglas Bush’s *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*, pp. 190-192.
Considering its superior printing history and how it fits within the category of the resolve, it is finally time to announce that the steady seller, *Divine Breathings*, rightfully deserves to be crowned as the new king of the resolve genre.

But the success of *Divine Breathings* may be due, in part, to the fact that it is not just a book of resolves but is a hybrid, combining other elements such as the holy soliloquy and ejaculations. *Divine Breathings* is an eclectic blend of various styles of meditation, but preachy and sermonic it is not, which may account for its enduring popularity among readers. In addition to the resolve style, *Divine Breathings* also, in some ways, resembles *holy soliloquies*. According to Narveson’s definition, “The ‘holy soliloquy’ was a soliloquizing confession of distress, love, and need, addressed to God by a first-person speaker” (“Sole-talk” 111). Although Donne’s *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* are extemporal or occasional meditations, Narveson also includes it in this category of *holy soliloquies*. “The general assumption,” Narveson notes, is “that the soliloquy was a particularly private sort of meditation in which the soul alone speaks to God and the self” (111).

Sir John Hayward’s *Sanctuarie of a Troubled Soule* (1601) serves as an example of a work of *holy soliloquies*, according to Narveson. In Hayward’s soliloquies, “Different stances—reasoning, conferring, chiding, entreating—often occur within one devotion, signaled by a shift in address. Hayward may, for instance, turn from self-exhortation to an appeal to God” (“Sole-talk” 114). However, there is no set pattern as to how these stances are presented. Narveson identifies in Hayward’s work “the English

---

84 See Appendix A.
Calvinist stress on sin as an ever-present condition without engendering the anxiety about election that troubles some Puritan writing” (114).

The holy soliloquy-style is prevalent in *Divine Breathings*; the speaker consistently and frequently alternates between addressing God and his soul. Nearly half (48) of the entries include a direct address to “Lord” in a prayer-like fashion, petitioning for some form of help, requesting a particular grace, or as part of resolution to repent. The introspective probing is often detected by frequent ejaculations of “Oh/O my soul!” a phrase utilized 19 times in 17 meditations. This is a common characteristic of other forms of Protestant meditations in which the speaker frequently addresses himself (Huntley 37). David establishes a precedent for this practice in the Psalms: “Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted in me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him for the help of his countenance” (Psalm: 42:5). Those meditative authors, such as Renniger, followed the pattern found in the Psalms by imitating David’s style of the holy soliloquy.

Although *Divine Breathings* may lack the extended confessional tone that we find in Hayward’s *Sanctuarie of a Troubled Soule*, the shift in address between self and God is similar. The brevity of the prayers resembles ejaculations. In fact, Perin, in his preface, describes his anonymous author’s style in exactly those terms, “pious Ejaculations” (A3). Michael Sparke provides an early modern definition of this term in his *Crums of Comfort* (1628, 8th ed.): “Besides our more speciall devotions at set times, we may use Ejaculations at all times, upon every occasion, which are short desires of the heart, lifted up to God with great fervencie” (A7). Frequently, in *Divine Breathings*
when the meditative author addresses God these statements are terse, direct, and personal; they correspond with Sparke’s definition as “short desires of the heart, lifted up to God with great fervencie.” Sometimes, the sense of urgency is signaled with an exclamation mark, as it is in the concluding statement of the sixth entry in Divine Breathings: “Lord! rather make me poor with a good heart, than rich with a bad conscience” (9-10). Although some modern readers may not be particularly stirred by these meditations, they were considered not only as pious ejaculations but as passionate writings. By 1675, for example, the title was extended by adding the label of “Pathetical Meditations” to describe this work. Thus, Divine Breathings fits as a type of deliberative meditation, which Joseph Hall defined as being “wrought out of [one’s] heart” to kindle the reader’s affections toward God (Art 72).

The intensely personal act of writing meditations is further escalated by the persistent use of “I.” However, as Joan Webber has masterfully shown, the employment of what she calls the “eloquent ‘I’” functions in a way that turns the private into communal involvement; the “I” is actually a tool that effectively invites and draws readers into the text. Typical of a seventeenth-century prose writer was “his habit of generalizing his ‘I’ into a representative of all Englishmen, or a cosmic personality symbolic of all men” (4). Here Webber’s statement may explain the great appeal that readers experienced when reading meditative works such as Divine Breathings. Even if they were not confident in creating their own meditative practices, by their efforts of active reading and by assuming the role of that symbolic “I” they were able to meditate through the author’s work.
As we ponder about the possible self-conscious manner in which the author of *Divine Breathings* writes and wonder about his intentions and objectives, consider the application of Webber’s statement, keeping in mind the proposal that the author of *Divine Breathings* is the Anglican (albeit with Puritan leanings) Renniger rather than a dissenter named Sherman:

Though the Anglican meditates upon himself in private, he is constantly aware that he may be overheard. He is aware that he is using a pen or pencil, and he knows that words committed to paper have a way of being read by others. Given his degree of self-consciousness, he is always aware of the possibility that he is only holding the pen because he wants to be read, of the possibility that they ought to be read…. On the one hand, he claims to have no desire to publish, pretends to be completely unaware of an audience; on the other hand, he prepares the manuscript for its readers as carefully as he can. (12)

As justification for publishing the manuscript, Renniger’s son-in-law wholeheartedly believes that his author intended these meditations to be shared in order to benefit others.

Without a doubt, Perin declares, his author “purposely penn’d these … pious Ejaculations, to leave them for Posterity, to be a furtherance in the Way to Bliss” (A3).

---

85 Ian Green poses the following question about the author’s motivation for writing *Divine Breathings*: was it “written in part as a response to the popularity (and perhaps perceived shortcomings too) of those earlier sets of uplifting thoughts, and also perhaps in response to a demand from a nonconformist laity who, because of their leaders’ distaste for set forms, were discouraged from reading full-length meditations and even shorter models in print?” (287). Unfortunately, Green does not acknowledge Christopher Perin’s role in publishing these meditations. Also, Green does not acknowledge that the work was published by an anonymous author but simply and confidently identifies the author as Thomas Sherman and assumes this author to be a dissenter. To Green’s credit, however, he is one of the few scholars over the past hundred years to signal (minimal as it is) scholarly attention to *Divine Breathings*.
As evidence for that statement, it is clear that the author of *Divine Breathings* had a much broader and global perspective beyond his own spiritual well-being. For example, in *Divine Breathings* there is a persistent concern with the soul: *soul* or *souls* appears 107 times; *my soul*, 18 times. Furthermore, the immortal nature of the soul is emphasized in *Divine Breathings*; and that knowledge has a profound and enduring influence on the speaker’s world-view. “The Soul of Man (saith the Philosopher) is the horison of time and eternity” (36).

A knowledge of the immortal soul leads to eschatological tensions. The verities of death, judgment, heaven, and hell create a persistent sense of urgency that pervades this collection of meditations. The speaker realizes that mortality is but a slice of eternity and that procrastination today may lead to a miserable post-mortral existence. In order to experience eternal happiness, repentance and work on earth are expected. Meditation 51, for example, begins by presenting three things—the “brevity” of life, work, eternity—which “should make the heart of a Christian to tremble” (69-70). Before death, there is work to be done “in this short inch of time”: “Great enemies to be conquered, Sons of Anak to be killed, Principalities and Powers to be over-powered, dear Lusts to be subdued, right eyes to be plucked out, right hands to be cut off, strict rules to be followed, a narrow way and strait gate to go through; to sum it up, a long race to be run with a short breath” (70). This meditation concludes by covertly quoting Ecclesiastes 9:10 (without providing the reference to the reader)—“whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might: for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge,

---

86 This concern with “think[ing] about eternity now, before it is too late,” notes Ian Green, is not uncommon among other devotional works in seventeenth-century England (284).
nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest.” Then the speaker turns to Deity and petitions for help with a firm resolution: “Oh Lord, help me so to work for thee, in this Moment of time, that I may for ever rest with thee, when time shall be no more” (71).

Elsewhere, the speaker makes a similar observation: “Our life is but a Moment of time; and yet in this Moment of time we sow the Seeds of Eternity, in this transitory hour I am framing to my self either a good or a bad Eternity” (43). In Meditation 49, the speaker imagines hearing six voices of warning. One voice is of a “dying man breathing out these groans, Oh, lose not a Moment of time, for thy time is but a Moment!” (65). Such concerns were commonly found in English devotional literature in the early seventeenth century. As Helen C. White observes:

> the judgment of god is an ever-present thought, one of the fundamentals never to be lost sight of however far one advance from his first beginnings in the religious life. And this judgment of God is no divine, far-off event but an ever immediately impendent possibility. For the religious of the time believed not only in the judgment of the world to come but in the immediate, almost daily, judgment of the life here and now. (193)

In other words, the Christian must worry about his choices in the present because they have eternal ramifications. To underscore this concern, in *Divine Breathings* eternity is referred to 35 times; work(s) 22 times, repent or repentance 8 times.

Notwithstanding an emphasis on works, the speaker cautions against acting without the proper motivation or attitude. Those who find “security” in their works or
spiritual life may be surprised at God’s response in the hereafter. These cover themselves with “formality” and the “surface of Religion” and “show their works, as if they would command it for their wages” (94, 95). Because they lacked “sincerity” Christ will reject them (96).

Although some seventeenth-century resolve writers such as Tuvill drew heavily (if not exclusively) on biblical sources for their arguments, English Protestant writers of meditative prose were not limited to the Book of Scripture. In the case of *Divine Breathings*, while the author does refer to Solomon, David, St. Paul, Adam, Moses, and Enoch, there are also many non-biblical sources cited: philosophers like Anaxagoras, Aristotle, Socrates, and Cicero; patristic authors such as Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Basil; Bernard and Aquinas. Alexander the Great is mentioned four times. Such a selection of authors supports the proposal that Renniger is the author of *Divine Breathings* because of his academic training and his five-year stint as lecturer of Greek, natural philosophy, and moral philosophy at Oxford. Perhaps the breadth and impressive array of such sources enhanced the chances for this work’s success? As R. Balfour Daniels asserts, “A moralizing and sententious essayist will attract readers in any age; and if he refers...to writers of classical antiquity, he will not be neglected by the scholars” (141-142). Moreover, the inclusion of non-biblical sources in meditative writing is not unusual: Hall draws on Augustine, Bernard, Bonaventura, plus Gerson and Origen (Huntley 26); Baxter includes Bernard, Gerson, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, Nierember, and Hall in his meditations (Martz 168).
Sometimes the author of *Divine Breathings* is subtle in his usage of non-biblical sources. As mentioned above, the author of *Divine Breathings* makes reference to “the Philosopher”—“The Soul of Man (saith the Philosopher) is the horizon of time and eternity” (36)—but does not disclose the identity of his source. The Philosopher referred to is Saint Aquinas, and the source of this excerpt is *Summa Contra Gentiles* (Book II, Chs. 80, 81). *Divine Breathings* alludes to various philosophers and finds their relevance to Christianity by appropriating and adapting various statements to fit within that meditation. In meditating on treasures, for example, the speaker cites Bias of Prience, “that princely Philosopher” who was, according to Greek tradition, included as one of the Seven Sages. When forced to flee his home, Bias was asked why he carried no baggage; he answered: “*Omnia mea mecum porto*, I carry all my riches with me; meaning his Wisdom and Virtues.” Next the author applies this aphorism to his Christian faith: “So a Christian, though you impoverish him, banish him, and cast him out of all, yet he is able to say still, *Omnia mea mecum porto*, I carry all my treasure with me, I have my Christ, my fullness” (62).

Even though he freely includes non-biblical sources, the author of *Divine Breathings* regularly alludes to and occasionally quotes scripture, but he never provides documentation of biblical references (i.e., directly, parenthetically, marginally). This is evidence toward arguing that T. S. is not the author of the original *Divine Breathings* because in his sequel, *Divine Breathings...the Second Part* (1680), T. S. constantly cites scripture in the text. The practice of not providing scriptural documentation is common among resolve writers: neither Anthony Stafford nor Owen Felltham provide
documentation for their biblical references; however, Hall’s 1605 edition of *Meditations and Vowes, Divine and Morall* includes them in the gloss. The reason some resolvers included such documentation cannot be simply a theological one. For example, not only Anglicans like Hall but also dissenters such as Bunyan cited the Bible in their meditative writings.

As we continue our examination of *Divine Breathings*, it is important to note what this work shares in common with other early modern meditational texts. For example, the imagery of ascending up a mountain to survey the promised land is a common metaphor employed by meditative writers. Lancelot Reynolds in his *Spiritual Intervals, or The Soules Exercise* (1641) asserts that in the exercise of meditation “the soule doth flye out of the body, and mounts aloft, being carried with all celerity on the wings of divine ejaculation. The Sunne is not so swift in his motion, as the soule in her progresse to that celestial Cannan” (sig. A3, v. [qtd in Jordan 389]). Baxter reminds his readers: “As Moses, before he died, went up into Mount Nebo, to take a survey of the land of Canaan; so the Christian ascends the mount of contemplation, and by faith surveys his rest” (*Saints Everlasting Rest* 318). The speaker in *Divine Breathings* admonishes himself to rise above sorrow with the following prescription: “Up upon the mount, and view the Land of Promise. … Up upon the wing, and take thy flight to Heaven: let thy thoughts be where thy happiness is, and let thy heart be where thy thoughts are; though thy habitation may be on Earth, yet thy conversation shall be in Heaven” (4).
In *Divine Breathings*, the author has his sights set on a celestial inheritance, and salvation is at the core of his theology. However, though heaven (and thus salvation) is a constant concern of the writer, the author of *Divine Breathings* presents the question that John Bunyan’s pilgrim will later ask in *Pilgrims’ Progress* (1678), “What shall I do to be saved?” and the Calvinist’s query “How do I know if I have been saved?” in a different manner. The question is directed as self-talk, addressed to the author’s soul, questioning the desires of the heart. This self-talk can be illustrated in the opening of the fourth entry of *Divine Breathings*: “What want’st thou? O my Soul!” (5). After considering various options—beauty, wealth, riches, honour, and pleasure—he determines that “Heaven, and the righteousness thereof, be the thing that thou doest seek” (7). The meditation concludes with a resolution formed as a prayer: “Lord, make me holy, and then I am sure I shall be happy!” (7). This book, *Divine Breathings*, shows a “pious soul” who seeks holiness in order to be worthy of heaven.

Another theological concern to consider in *Divine Breathings* is how the question of election is presented. Meditation 14 opens with the question: “Would st thou know whether thy name be written in the Book of Life?” (19). The answer is: “read what thou hast written in the Book of Conscience” (19). The Christian must internalize the Word of God in order to be assured of election. Note in the following passage the degree of confidence the author of *Divine Breathings* has and his belief that the Conscience is synonymous with the heart:

Thou needest not ask, who shall ascend up into Heaven, for to search the Records of Eternity; thou may’st but descend down into thine own heart,
and there read what thou art, and what thou shalt be. Though Gods Book of Election and Reprobation be closed and kept above with God; yet thy Book of Conscience, that is open, and kept below in thy very Bosom; and what thou writest here, thou shalt be sure to read there: If I write nothing in this Book, but the black lines of sin; I shall find nothing in Gods Book but the red lines of damnation: But if I write Gods Word in the Book of Conscience, I may be sure God hath written my Name in the Book of Life. At the great Day of Judgment, when all Books shall be opened, there I shall either read the sweetest or the sharpest lines; I will therefore so write here, that I may not be ashamed to read hereafter. (20-21)

As with the majority of the entries in *Divine Breathings*, this meditation ends with a resolution signaled by the frequently used phrase “I will therefore—.” The excerpt above illustrates the writer’s concern with election and reveals his Puritan leanings. That is further manifested by his use of the term *Puritan* which occurs twice in his meditations. In the meditation on the soul’s communion with Jesus, he writes, “He that is a precious Christian to the Lord, is a precise Puritan to the World: He that is glorious to an heavenly Saint, is odious to an earthly Spirit” (28). Elsewhere he uses the term Puritan again in a commendatory fashion:

All men would have happiness for their end, but few would have holiness for their way: All men would have the Kingdom of Heaven and the glory thereof, but few seek the Kingdom of Heaven, and the righteousness thereof. As that Noble Man being asked, What he thought the course of
precise Puritans (as the World terms them) or of the life of licentious Libertines? Answered, *Cum istis mallem vivere, cum illis mori mallem*: I had rather live with those, and dye with them. So most men had rather live with Ballam, but dye with Israel. They would willingly have the Libertines case, but the godly mans end. (55)

Similar to Hall’s resolves, the entries in *Divine Breathings* often begin with an aphoristic statement rather than a scripture verse on which to meditate. What typically is produced are expositions which resemble tightly written essays. As an example, note how Meditation 11 opens with an aphorism and then builds on that statement as its foundation:

Unsatiable desires in temporals, make a poor man in spirituals; a right Christian is only rich in outward things, when he is contented with what he hath. That man hath nothing of heavenly things, that thirsteth not after more. Worldly desires always leave us empty, either we get not what we covet, or else we are not satisfied with what we get; but he that thirsteth after heavenly things is always filled, and the more he receives, the more he desires. (16)

The author of *Divine Breathings* continually stresses the importance of establishing righteous habits of living now which will make the afterlife a natural continuation of an individual’s lifestyle chosen during mortality. The following passage summarizes well the author’s persistent exhortations in *Divine Breathings* to strive for holiness in the present: “If the Kingdom of God be not first in us, we shall never enter
into the Kingdom of God; no soul shall rest in Heaven hereafter, but those that walk in Heaven here; no soul shall enter the gates of felicity, but only that which treads the narrow paths of piety” (56). To assist in making daily decisions, the author proposes that an individual first ask: What would Jesus do?

Where any thing presents its self, think if Christ were now alive, would he do it? Or if I were now to dye, would I do it? I must walk as he hath walked, and I must live as I intend to dye; if it be not Christs Will, it is my sin, and if I dye in that sin, it will be my ruine: I will therefore in every action so carry my self, as if Christ were on the one hand, and Death on the other. (42-43)

Whether or not Charles Sheldon owned a copy of or had studied *Divine Breathings* has not yet been established, but as the above entry shows, the question “Where any thing presents its self, think if Christ were now alive, would he do it?” effectively sums up Sheldon’s thesis over two hundred years prior to the publication of *In His Steps*. What is significant to note is how once again the principle of imitation arises in our study; in this case, the reader is encouraged to make a concerted effort to consciously emulate Jesus in making daily decisions.

An examination of *Divine Breathings*’ paratexts reveals how the principle of imitation was modeled and promoted.\(^\text{87}\) Studying the paratexual matter illuminates how this book of meditations was packaged and presented to the reader. Issued no later than

---

\(^{87}\) *Paratext* is a term which refers to the front matter (e.g., title pages, frontispieces, epigraphs, dedications, prefaces), end matter (e.g., notes, postscripts), and additional material in the text (e.g., illustrations, chapter titles, epigraphs for chapters). See Kevin Jackson’s *Invisible Forms* and Gerard Genette’s *Paratext: Thresholds of Interpretation*. 
1671 as a duodecimo in a “fourth edition, very much Corrected,” the title page of *Divine Breathings: or a Pious Soul Thirsting After Christ* includes an epigraph in Latin—“Quid enim mihi est in Coelo, & a te quid volui Super terram”; although an Englished translation is not provided on the title page until the sixth edition (1678), this epigraph is a scripture found in Psalms 73:25: “Whom have I in Heaven but thee? And there is none upon Earth that I desire besides thee.”

This scripture and its yearning for the celestial Divine anticipates the heavenly contemplations to be found inside the text. Furthermore, the fact that of all the scriptures this one comes from the Psalms evidences the importance of David’s authority and influence in Protestant meditation. As mentioned earlier and as shall again be reiterated below, David’s Psalms represented a model meditative practitioners could follow. By way of punctuating that point, the adjacent frontispiece features an emblem focused on yet another Psalm: “When shall I come and appear before thee” (Psalms 42:2).

The frontispieces included in these early editions—specifically the fourth, fifth, seventh, and eighth—act as bibliographic codes, affecting how the text has been received and interpreted by readers. They function as bibliographic codes in at least two significant ways. First, these frontispieces implicitly invite imitation by sanctioning the practice: all of the frontispieces used in the fourth (1671) and fifth editions (1675)

---

88 In a devotional work written in Latin by Herm. Hugo and translated by Edm. Arwaker, *Pia Desideria: or Divine Addresses* (2nd ed., 1690), this Psalm is used not only as an epigraphical topic for a meditational poem but also as the subject of an emblem (180-181).

89 There is only a slight variation from the King James Version—“thee” is substituted for “God,” necessitated by the emblem’s message.

printed by Robert Pawlett as well as the seventh (1692) and eighth (1698) published by Edward Pawlett91 are imitative versions of the original engravings by Boethius à Bolswert published in Herman Hugo’s *Pia Desideria* (Antwerp, 1624).92 Artist William Simpson93 produced versions of Bolswert’s engravings which were included in Francis Quarles’ *Emblemes* (London, 1635). Because of the popularity of Quarles’ *Emblemes* readers likely discerned the source of those imitative frontispieces selected for *Divine Breathings*.94

The frontispiece featured in the fourth and fifth editions of *Divine Breathings* depicts a person (the gender is difficult to discern; probably female because of the hair length) sitting on the ground with outstretched arms, gazing into the sky where the Almighty King is at the top center, wearing a crown and holding a scepter, surrounded by a heavenly host of angels; two angels are pouring symbolic blessings down to earth. The earthly person exclaims, “Oh how amiable.”95 The scriptural citation or motto in

---


92 See McQueen, p. i.

93 Although Simpson’s name appears in those particular emblems identified and analyzed in Quarles in this chapter, Peter Daly extends credit to other illustrators, in addition to Simpson, for those which appear in *Emblemes*: William Marshall, Robert Vaughan, and John Payne (21).

94 According to Charles Moseley: “Francis Quarles’ *Emblemes* (1635) went through three editions before 1640, and the last…was large—apparently 3000 copies, of which none is known to survive. This argues not only a considerable publishing success, but that the copies were literally read to bits. […] His book is the first of its type to be produced in England. It is heavily indebted to the developments of the emblem form abroad under mainly Jesuit influence. Hugo’s *Pia Desideria* (Antwerp, 1624) and the *Typus Mundi* (Antwerp, 1627)…are the major sources” (25). Furthermore, Peter Daly declares that the emblem was more than just a “fad” or a “secondary cultural phenomenon”: in Europe “at least 5,300 emblem-books [were printed] during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” (204).

95 An identical frontispiece appears in the fifth edition printed in 1675.
the frontispiece caption reads: “When shall I come and appear before thee.” 96 This icon appears in the English emblem books by Quarles and Edmund Arwaker accompanied by the motto: “How amiable are thy Tabernacles O Lord of Hosts, my Soule longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord” (Psalms 84:1). 97

In the seventh edition of *Divine Breathings* (1692), the frontispiece illustrates an angel standing next to a human who is holding something which catches the gaze of the angel. The sun sheds forth its rays upon a tall sunflower 98 towering to the left of the mortal figure. Although there is no motto found in the caption, the number “134” is placed in the lower right corner. According to Huston Diehl’s *Index of Icons*, the person is holding a lodestone which “points to Divine Love” (122). The interpretation, Diehl notes, is that “[a]s the heliotrope turns toward the sun and the lodestone’s needle points to the north, so men turn to God” (122). The scriptural motto for this emblem published

---

96 In explaining these emblematic frontispieces, I am adapting terminology detailed in Peter Daly’s *Literature in the Light of the Emblem* (2nd ed., 1998). Daly explains that “the emblem is composed of three parts, for which the Latin names seem most useful: *inscriptio*, *pictura*, and *subscriptio*. A short motto or quotation introduces the emblem [*inscriptio*]… The *pictura* itself may depict one or several objects, persons, events, or actions, in some instances set against an imaginary or real background…. Beneath the *pictura* comes a prose or verse quotation from some learned source or from the emblematist himself [*subscriptio*] (7).

97 Quarles, p. 296; Arwaker, Book 3, No. 14. See also Diehl, p. 121.

98 Although utilizing emblems as frontispieces fell out of practice among editors of *Divine Breathings* beyond the seventeenth century, a token revival has been detected. In Pickering’s 1879 reprint of Keith’s 1775 edition, a frontispiece illustration is included of a withering flower. At first glance, it looks like an unhealthy sunflower; in any case, it is a withering plant. On the verso of the title page is another illustration of a flower, still bent over, but looking healthier. On the verso of the final page of the preface is yet another plant, more upright than preceding two plants; it contains two stems: the one on the right is in full bloom and the one on the left is still budding, with the promise of opening soon. Whether or not the publisher is intentionally imitating the image of sunflower found in the emblem of the 1692 edition is not discernible. However, during the nineteenth century it was common to use the language of plants in books. Interpretations varied from book to book. As a bibliographic code, this series of images depicting a flower progressively becoming stronger, healthier, more vibrant and straight, reaching heavenward toward the sun, reveals an attempt by the publisher to advertise a perceived benefit offered to those who study this book: increased spiritual health and strength.
in Quarles and Arwaker is Song of Solomon 7:10: “I am my Beloveds, and his desire is towards me.”

The imitative emblem published as the frontispiece to the eighth edition of *Divine Breathings* (1698) depicts a human figure kneeling on the earth, holding open his robe to expose his breast and an arrow sticking out of his chest. A bow rests on his lap; he gazes heavenward where above him is the All-Seeing Eye, two ears, and below those symbols are three arrows, each labeled with individually attached banners. The frontispiece lacks the scriptural citation that accompanies Simpson’s version of the icon in Quarles’ *Emblemes*: “Lord all my Desire is before Thee, & my groaning is not hid from Thee” (Psalm 38:9). In comparing the emblems, Simpson’s rendition has much more detail—including a wooded landscape and a mask on the ground—compared to the version found in *Divine Breathings*. Diehl registers the following as the icon’s epigram: “The groans of the soul are like shafts which pierce the eye and ears of God” (184).

The second way in which these frontispieces function as bibliographic codes is that they encourage a particular type of reading. The inclusion of these emblems as frontispieces may be further direction on how to read the text. By definition, Quarles asserts, “An Embleme is but a silent Parable” (A3). The decision to equate emblems

---

99 Quarles, p. 256; Arwaker, Book 3, p. 4. Canticles is the label used in Quarles for the Song of Solomon.  
100 Emblem scholar Peter Daly questions the reliability of a definition of emblems: “Loosely speaking, the emblem is a form of allegorical or symbolical expression, but its relation to allegory, symbolism, metaphor, and conceit is difficult to establish. This is partly because the same terms have been used with different things in mind: allegory and symbol have been discussed in their aesthetic, rhetorical, ontological, semantic, cultural, social linguistic, and grammatical contexts. Confusion tends to arise when a writer uses one of these image terms without making explicit the frame of reference, so that, for example, the reader is not sure whether ‘simile’ is intended rhetorically or semantically. The difference may be important, because a rhetorician’s simile is not necessarily a semanticist’s, and *vice versa*” (4).
with parables represents the degree of risk involved: Jesus taught in parables so that only those faithful disciples who diligently desired to discern his message would find it. Therefore, emblems encouraged a particular type of reading: a careful, methodical, un rushed consideration of the image presented. Emblems provided a way “to lead into the text, to the richness of its associations,”¹⁰¹ and by utilizing emblems as frontispieces they anticipate the kind of deliberate, persistent, assiduous reading required in studying meditative writings. Matthew Brown’s description of devotional reading would make it analogous to interpreting emblems: both “promote literacy habits that are, on the one hand, deep and sustained and, on the other, interrupted with pauses, interjections, and extratextual performances.” What is expected is “an intensive reading style, characterized by repetitive consultation and internal meditation” (72).

As we continue to entertain reasons for the success of Divine Breathings, I reiterate the importance of bibliographic codes in the text, encouraging readers’ active participation and inviting them to imitate the pious meditations of its anonymous author. Although Divine Breathings lacks an author on its title page, the prefatory “To the Christian Reader” signed by Christopher Perin serves as another bibliographic code begging attention. Perin, who explains why the “Authors Name is not prefix’d,”¹⁰² reveals that these “Heavenly Breathings” were “found by a Person of no mean Degree among the Writings of an Eminent Divine.” Only the author’s “dearest Relations” knew of these writings; Perin, after having received a copy, desired to publish it “for the good

¹⁰¹ “Introduction,” English Emblem Book Project.
¹⁰² As illustrated earlier by the references to Joseph Hall’s similarly entitled preface, epistles addressed “To the Christian Reader” were common in 17th Century texts including those found in Divine Breathings and in Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress. See also Dobranski, Readers and Authorship, pp. 37-38.
of others.” However, prior to sharing this information, Perin establishes the credibility of his anonymous author by appealing to the Protestant reader’s appreciation of the Psalms:

We have in Holy Writ the Psalms of David left us for our example, wherein we read his Longing to be with God, desiring the wings of a Dove, that he might fly away and be at rest: and assimilating his thirsting after Christ to the Hart, *As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God!* [Psalm 42:1].

If one can call Joseph Hall an important meditative exemplar among early modern writers of prose (as I did earlier in this chapter), then King David of the Old Testament, considering his status among Protestants, must the meditative exemplar *par excellence*. David sets a pattern of meditation for others to follow and emulate. Hence, Perin’s next statement honors the distinction and authority he ascribes to his anonymous meditator:

Lo, here’s one that hath learn’d by Davids Rules, and fain would have thee learn by his; and doubtless, in imitation of that Heavenly Prophet, purposely penn’d these his pious Ejaculations, to leave them for Posterity, to be a furtherance in the Way to Bliss. (A3)

In this passage, Perin reveals and prescribes the pattern that may explain why *Divine Breathings* succeeds. Even as the author of *Divine Breathings* has expertly imitated

---

103 Abiezar Coppe reports an experience somewhat similar to Perin’s in his note directed “To the Reader” for I. F.’s *John the Divine’s Divinity* (1649): “moved” by the spirit, Coppe decides to “send [the work] abroad to thy view” (A3).
David’s meditative style, so also is the reader invited to imitate its anonymous author by practicing meditation (i.e., writing meditatively).

In addition to promoting imitation, producing a compelling preface was essential for Perin in establishing the credibility of his author. This is complicated by the fact that his author is anonymous but may induce even greater import to the delicate task of establishing his writer’s credibility without divulging his identity. As Dobranski notes:

> an audience’s participation could help to elevate, not erase, the author.

When booksellers appealed directly to readers in prefaces and notes, they were not merely introducing those individual texts but attempting to advance the authors’—and their own—authority. The immediate goal may have been profit-driven, but over time such rhetoric generated the name recognition that is at the core of the author’s emerging status.

*(Readers 50)*

While Perin, as shown above, strives to establish the authority of his author by relying on the comparison with David, he also seeks participation of the reader by requesting sympathy and charity. In the opening line of his preface, before revealing how he received the manuscript, Perin refers to this book of meditations as an “Orphan” being offered to the reader (A3). In other words, this orphaned text will need active and charitable care by the reader. In a similar way, note the measures which Stafford’s *Meditations, and Resolutions* (1612) employs in order to overtly invite participation and active reading. In the preface uniquely titled “To the Understanter,” Stafford concludes with the admonition “use mee wel” and then provides four blank pages for readers to
freely determine their method of engagement—to use the space to record notes, meditations, and/or register favorite entries and page numbers. One copy of *Divine Breathings* (6th ed., 1678), formerly owned by Anne Browne in 1680, shows the signs of an active reader: on the verso of the final page of text is a handwritten list of headings for seven selected entries along with the corresponding page numbers. It may be assumed that the reader had compiled this index of her favorite meditations, noting them and their location in the text for further study and reflection in the future.\(^{104}\)

Another example of how one reader registered her engagement with this book of meditations appears in a copy of the eighth edition of *Divine Breathings* (1698). After beginning a draft on the verso of the title page, Hannah Ling records the following handwritten message—both a pledge and prayerful request—on the recto of the front flyleaf:

Hannah Ling

Her Book god give

her grace therein to

look and not to look

but understand for

learning is better then

house and land

\(^{104}\) This copy of *Divine Breathings* is currently held by Cambridge University Library. Those entries included in the handwritten list: Book of Conscience; The Use of Riches; The Worldlings God; No Satisfaction in the Creature; Delay of Repentance Dangerous; A Christians Treasure; A Threefold Awakening Consideration. Although the name of “D. Lechmere” (?) appears inscribed in handwriting on the top of the title page, there is no date given for that name. On the verso of the flyleaf on the inside back cover of the book is the following nameplate: “Anne Browne, her booke. 1680.”
and when the bell
doth for her toll
lord Jesus Christ
receive her soul.

Although she is dealing with space restrictions on the small page of this duodecimo book, Ling is obviously shaping this personal entry into a verse-like format. Even though bell tolling at death was common during this period, the inclusion of the phrase “when the bell / doth for her toll” signals that Ling may have been familiar with Meditation 17 of Donne’s *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions* (1624). In addition to claiming ownership of the book, Ling in this note reveals her interest in and commitment to practicing meditation. This is illustrated by her concern about death and her mortality, and also by the fact that she paraphrases from one of Donne’s meditations. Furthermore, Ling reveals her desire not to just read (or “look” at) the text but pledges to strive to “understand” in order to learn.

As Webber has aptly stated, the venture of meditative writing is an “investigation [that] can seem shared.” Furthermore, she observes that

in a sense, the reader has to write the book himself—and in the process, he and the author become one, yet not one. The investigation can seem shared, too, because it is never finished. Not only does the meditative style itself suggest work-in-progress, but the whole form of the book is left open: Donne’s meditations are cyclic; Traherne invites his reader to add to what he has written. Thus, while on one level the reader seems to
have been ignored or rejected, on another the most significant kind of participation and communion is required. (13)

The next bibliographic code in *Divine Breathings* functions in ways similar to those described above by Webber. All of the extant editions published in the seventeenth-century include an unattributed postscript. Originally titled “Postscript by a Reader,” by the sixth edition it is renamed “Pious Reflections of a Devout Reader”; this section of over six pages provides not only a reader’s endorsement of the work but also creates further interest in the anonymous author by the use of ambiguous rhetoric directed to the mysterious writer: “And now being refreshed with these fragrant leaves, what shall I say? Blessed Author, art thou yet alive?” (153). If so, then “a Scribe so well instructed cannot have spent all”\(^ {105}\) but should “not hide, but improve thy talent” (153). The Devout Reader begs the anonymous author for more, opening the door for a sequel to *Divine Breathings*: “Thou hast begun well, who, what should hinder thee?” (154). The discourse makes its first abrupt transition when the reader questions: “But art thou at rest from thy labours?” (154). The phrase “rest from thy labours” has dual meaning: either retirement from literary activity or a more permanent rest from all earthly work (i.e., physical death). The latter option begins to look like the obvious interpretation as the reflective reader seems to have inside information after all:

> This (among others) thy Work follows thee, and hath here erected thy lasting Monument. Where ever thou wert buried, Obscurity shall not swallow thee. Every good Heart that knew thee is thy Tomb, and every

---

\(^ {105}\) The reader has been an attentive reader indeed because the reference to the author of *Divine Breathings* as a “Scribe” recalls the claim made in the text that “God … made [him] his Secretary” (21).
Tongue writes thee an Epitaph; good men speak well of thee, but above all God delights in thee. [...] Thou livedst in deed, while most live only in shew, and hast changed thy place, but not thy company. (154-155)

Clearly, the writer of this postscript is among those who “knew” the author of *Divine Breathings*, and this published reflection acts an “an Epitaph” which supplements the “lasting Monument” which *Divine Breathings* will prove to be over the course of the ensuing three centuries. It seems quite likely that Perin, who wrote the laudatory preface, is also the author of the postscript.106 As Dobranski reminds us, early modern “readers imagined, to borrow Milton’s metaphor from *Areopagitica*, that books preserved an author’s ‘pretious life-blood’ and allowed even deceased writers to communicate with them personally” (*Readers* 48-49).

After praising and memorializing the author, the Devout Reader makes yet another sudden transition, shifting the address introspectively: “Blush and be ashamed, my drousie Soul, at sight or thoughts of such active Christians” (155). Here this Devout Reader is encouraging engagement; by admonishing himself he is simultaneously chastising other readers, reminding them to be “active Christians” like the author of *Divine Breathings* and follow his example by practicing meditation, imitating the pious author, and acting on the printed resolves in their efforts toward godly living.107 As

---

106 However, if Perin is the author of the postscript then it is puzzling that he would pretend not to know the location of the author’s grave: “Where ever thou wert buried....” (154). If Perin is not the “Devout Reader” then perhaps it is one of his progeny.

107 And while Dobranski and many of us wish to interpret these as invitations to active reading, we must not forget that these authors ultimately desired to stir the hearts of their readers to be more pious, active Christians, to live their religions, to be obedient and faithful believers; not hearers or readers only. As Bunyan in his apology to *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678) reveals his intentions: “This Book will make a
Dobranski has argued, “both authors and readers gained considerable authority during the early modern period—and … the two phenomena were reciprocal. Early modern authors who developed individual identities did so by envisioning and, in some cases, trying to train active readers” (12). But, in the case of *Divine Breathings*, it is not the author but either the presenter/editor, Perin, and/or perhaps the editorial/publication team who through the preface and postscript attempt to engage readers by the use of rhetorical strategies to meditate and imitate the example of the anonymous author.

As part of the aforementioned self-examination in the postscript, the Devout Reader compares himself with active Christians like the author of *Divine Breathings* and reprimands himself for his relative degree of slothfulness, especially for not “ruminat[ing] on the Word”: “David meditated day and night, but thou scarce day or night” (155-156). The Devout Reader invokes David’s authority in order to liven his (and thus the reader’s) sense of duty and motivate himself to act. This is further illustrated when the Devout Reader makes the following resolution: “O see thou be not onely alive, but a lively Christian” (157). The remainder of the postscript serves as the reader’s meditation; this reader, inspired by the exemplary pious soul who wrote *Divine Breathings*, is now modeling what other readers should do—as Perin disclosed in the preface that he hoped they would: resolve to improve in piety. In sum, this “Devout Traveller of thee, / If by its Counsel thou wilt ruled be; / It will direct thee to the Holy Land, / If thou wilt its Directions understand: / Yea, it will make the sloathful, active be” (6).

---

108 In Anthony Stafford's *Meditations and Resolutions* (1612), following the wonderful preface "To the Understander" (wherein Stafford concludes with the admonition to "use me well") there are four blank pages inserted (at least from what I see on EEBO). This seems like an obvious invitation for the reader involvement. And perhaps the answer is that the meditations are only numbered and there is no table of contents provided: readers are invited to create their own notes and topical labels for the entries.
Reader” encourages the engagement of the reader; he serves as a model reader of the text; by admonishing himself to improve his piety, he is simultaneously chastising other readers, reminding them to be “active Christians” like the author of Divine Breathings and to follow his example by practicing meditation, making resolutions to strive for greater holiness.

At the beginning of the postscript this adoring Devout Reader declared, “Thou hast begun well, who, what should hinder thee?” This invitation was not ignored but was accepted by T. S., who in 1680 offered a sequel of his own titled: Divine Breathings or a Manual of Practical Contemplations, in One Century, Tending to Promote Gospel Principles and a Good Conversation in Christ. Comprizing in Brief Many of those Great Truths that are to be Known and Practiced by a Christian. The Second Part.\textsuperscript{109} It includes a preface signed by the “Well-wisher, T. S.” Unfortunately, unlike the apology written by T. S. affixed as an introduction to his Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress published two years later, this preface reveals very little about his intentions and motivation for offering this sequel. This preface does, however, emphasize the importance of having truth written in the heart—that disciples of Christ are symbolic epistles “written not with Ink, but the Spirit of the Living God; not in Tables of stone, but in the fleshly Tables of the heart” (A2).

Similar to the author of Divine Breathings, T. S. presents his Second Part as a century of entries, but these are labeled as contemplations, whereas the first was a compilation of meditations. Furthermore, while the anonymous author of Divine

\textsuperscript{109} For the printing history of Divine Breathings…the Second Part see Appendix D.
Breathings wrote in an introspective, resolve style, T. S.’s Second Part lacks that “eloquent I” and instead preaches to his reader. Although most of the contemplations conclude with statements marked with emphatically capitalized “THEREFORE”s, the entries are much more sermonic and deliberately directed to an audience. Early in his sequel, T. S. warns the reader against “deceitful Resolutions”—which both the original Divine Breathings and this Second Part are full of—specifically when “they see their sins, and a necessity of changing their lives, labour to quiet their Conscience with Resolutions to set upon the work hereafter…. THEREFORE speedily set upon the work, for if hereafter thou resolvest to repent, why not now?” (9). Although T. S. is attempting to imitate the resolve-style so successfully employed in Divine Breathings, T. S. makes resolutions for the reader that are less engaging, lacking the “eloquent I,” and seem too formulaic and rigid in their format. Furthermore, this “manual” is full of documented scriptural citations but lacks the breadth of references to moral philosophers and historical figures that the original included. It should be noted also that nowhere in the text does T. S. explicitly avow authorship of the original Divine Breathings.

Consequently, this sequel was not well-received in the seventeenth century, and it was not reprinted until the nineteenth century, when it finally was embraced by some as an interdenominational devotional manual, heralded as a “rich treasure of Evangelical sentiment…calculated to inform and warm the heart” but also recommended for use as “a parlour book, furnishing the most important topics for conversation” (Manual of Practical Contemplations 3). This may be explained in part because of what is omitted; absent from Divine Breathings... the Second Part are those paratextual features that
functioned as bibliographic codes that enhanced the success of the original version: no frontispiece; no preface provided by Perin. Also, there is also no postscript modeling the active reading and participation of a “Devout Reader.”

As proposed at the conclusion of Chapter II of this study, my research regarding the author, T. S., who has been identified by bibliographers as Thomas Sherman, has discovered the following: 1) there is no Thomas Sherman listed in indexes or directories of nonconformist ministers; 2) there is no established biographical information for a nonconformist named Thomas Sherman. I argue that instead of labeling this author as Thomas Sherman we should opt instead to refer to this particular writer as T. S. It is also likely that this T. S. did not author the original *Divine Breathings* for reasons listed above. I propose that we consider that T. S. establishes an authorial identity as an imitative, sequel writer. It is this last point that I wish to emphasize.

The success of *Divine Breathings*, as mentioned earlier in this chapter (see also the printing history included in Appendix A), would have been difficult to ignore in the 1670s. By producing a Second Part, T. S. shows himself to be an opportunistic author who capitalizes on the popularity of *Divine Breathings*. It is also possible that Nathaniel Ponder, the printer, may have selected the title for T. S.’s collection of practical contemplations and opted to imitate the title of the steady seller, *Divine Breathings*. It must also be noted that two years later in 1682 T. S. offers another sequel (*The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*) published by a pseudonymous printer (T. H.) imitating
another work (*Pilgrim’s Progress*) which had been printed exclusively in London during this period by Ponder.\textsuperscript{110}

As noted in Chapter II, the attribution most likely occurred because T. S. authors a sequel to the anonymous *Divine Breathings*, and bibliographers evidently assumed that T. S.’s avowal of the *Second Part* justified identifying this writer as the originator of the initial work. However, from evidence I have already presented, it appears unlikely that T. S. is the author of the original *Divine Breathings*. As detailed earlier in this chapter, the postscript by the “Devout Reader” reveals that by 1671 the anonymous author was deceased. With that in mind, it makes sense that Perin may have decided to wait to publish the meditations of his “eminent Divine” posthumously. The *Second Part* is presented to readers by an author who identifies himself as T. S. and we assume is alive at the time of its publication in 1680. As emphasized at the end of Chapter II, I favor J. L. Chester’s proposal that Michael Renniger is the author of *Divine Breathings*. Furthermore, those who identify T. S. as Thomas Sherman and a “dissenter” (see Ian Green 287) and a General Baptist may be incorrect.\textsuperscript{111} No biographical information has been located for an English nonconformist named Thomas Sherman. Instead, it seems likely that T. S. is a clergyman in the Church of England; we will explore evidence that suggests that possibility in our examination of the *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*

\textsuperscript{110} For more on Ponder see Frank Mott Harrison, “Nathaniel Ponder: The Publisher of *Pilgrim’s Progress*,” *The Library* IV.15 (1934): 257-294.

\textsuperscript{111} Like the anonymous author of part one, this writer portrays himself as erudite, particularly as a scholar of foreign languages. T. S. shows familiarity with Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. But to what extent do we know confidently that he is not copying this from another source? There is some attention to the importance of ordinances in *Divine Breathings…the Second Part* which is not found in the original.
in Chapter IV. However, as shown in Chapter II the whole premise to begin with that
this T. S. should be named as Thomas Sherman is shaky, based on, at least at this point,
an unstable foundation, lacking the proof which Bindley may or may not have possessed.
Until compelling evidence is provided which explains Bindley’s decision to label the T.
S., author of *Youth’s Tragedy*, as “Sherman,” I propose that this T. S. remain
anonymous.

The invitation to participate in meditative practice and emulate the pious,
anonymous author of *Divine Breathings* was, during the course of its history spanning
three centuries, interpreted in various ways. Readers frequently became writers.
Dobranski supports my argument that active reading spurred imitation and sequels:

> Early modern readers did not just read attentively; many…went beyond
> an author’s apparent intentions and re-wrote parts of another writer’s
> works. Although not all Renaissance readers were able to write, those
> who could were then able to use that skill to personalize and/or
> appropriate some of the books they read. During the seventeenth century
> “peruse” … meant “to read thoroughly.” That it also could mean to
> “reconsider” or “revise” suggests the overlap between carefully reading
> and partly re-writing a text.” (*Readers* 54)

Whereas early modern authors like the Earl of Manchester, David Tuvill, Arthur
Warwick, and Henry Vaughan “tacitly borrow[ed] phrases” from Felthams’s *Resolves*
and incorporated them into their own works (Jean Roberson 108-109), spurious attempts
were made to claim the anonymously authored *Divine Breathings* as their own. In 1702,
for example, the name of James Taylor, B. D., appears on the title page of *The Pious Soul’s Divine Breathings, Pantings and Thirstings After Christ, In Holy and Heart-Searching Meditations*, with only a slight variation from the original title. Taylor appropriates the work, for example, by opening with his own (we may suppose) entry, a meditation on the importance of undelayed repentance. The style in this entry is imitative of the original *Divine Breathings*, using similes in expounding the necessity for spiritual nourishment. But Taylor does not acknowledge that what follows are twenty-six meditations that he has selected and copied from the work of another author; instead, he states that “it is requisite I lay down such necessary Helps and proper Rules, as may wing the Soul with a Desire of mounting towards the happy Regions of Glory and Happiness” (8-9). Taylor adds some poetry to the meditative prose, omits credit to Saint Bernard for one citation (which was included in the original meditation), and slightly alters the language of the original, adding a few extra phrases. Although such appropriation was not viewed as pernicious thievery as it is today, certainly Taylor’s reliance on another’s work while placing his own name upon it was excessive. It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that because of its anonymity *Divine Breathings* was easy prey for those like Taylor; however, such an impulse is erased by the fact that what appears next in this same edition is James Taylor’s appropriation of Jeremy Taylor’s

---

112 For an extensive discussion on the history of this practice see Harold Ogden White’s *Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance*. As White concludes, those in the English Renaissance “did not damn imitation outright, even though its abuse was evil. They did not damn independence alone, even though its right use was good.” White argues that “English writers from Sidney to Jonson completed the circuit, and restored, in its true form, the classical doctrine that originality of real worth is to be achieved only through creative imitation” (202).
Holy Living. In defense of James Taylor, he was following the invitation to imitate signified in the bibliographic codes of Divine Breathings. As Dobranski reminds us, “Readers [in this era] were conditioned to participate in their books—whether through conventions of decoding, studying, lecturing, or socializing—so that interpretation required, above all, readers’ active engagement in determining an unfixed meaning” (Readers 48).

The next imitator, though not as brave as Taylor was in divulging a name, places only the initials “E. H.” in the by-line along with the claim that he is the “Author of Divine Breathings.” While this claim was intended to remind the reader of the popularity of another work, the contents of this book printed in 1705, titled Suspiria Divinia: or True Christian Divinity. Teaching us to Think, Speak, and Do as we Ought, is Divine Breathings in a different dress, the Latin title translated into English as divine breaths or sighs. E. H., like Taylor before him, has cause to hide his identity and be ashamed of his plagiarism: rather than accept the invitation to meditate, he simply adds ornate language and lengthier phrases to the original work of another. For example, when opening the first entry of Suspiria Divina, E. H. opts to insert the phrase “Elegantly and Excellently, as well as Aptly and agreeably” before providing a copy of the original text from Divine Breathings (1). Another brief illustration will reveal how E. H.’s version exchanges brevity for redundancy. Consider first the following meditation from the original Divine Breathings:

113 As Harold Love states in his essay, “Originality and the Puritan Sermon,” during this early modern period “the humanist close imitation of admired [texts] continued to be enjoined as a method of creating new works” (151).
O my Soul! what makest thou groveling on the Earth? every thing here below is too base for thine excellency, too short for thine eternity: thou art capable of God, and must have a Being; when these poor creatures are reduced to nothing, the creature is too base a metal to make thee a Crown of Glory, too rotten a bottom to carry thee through eternity. Oh fill thy self with God, so shalt thou raise thy dignity to perpetuity. (42)

Now compare it with E. H.’s version (the bold text identifies E. H.’s meager editorial contribution):

**Regard, yea, Respect and Reverence thy self**  O my Soul! **my Soul!**

**Mind! Spirit!** What makest thou groveling on the Earth? Every thing here below is too base for thine excellency, too short for thine eternity. Thou art capable of God, and must have a Being; when these poor creatures are reduced to nothing. The creature is too base a Metal to make Thee a Crown of Glory, too rotten a bottom to carry thee through Eternity. Oh fill thy self with God, so shalt thou raise thy dignity to perpetuity, **perennity, Eternity.** (28)

Comparing these passages shows E. H.’s plagiaristic strategies. According to Ben Jonson’s interpretation of the ambiguous honor code of classical imitation theory, E. H.’s act represents a violation of that code, crossing from imitation across the gray border into the realm of plagiary. Consider Jonson’s description of ideal type of imitation:
To make choise of one excellent man above the rest, and so to follow him, till he grow very Hee; or so like him, as the Copie may be mistaken for the Principall. Not, as a Creature, that swallowes, what it takes in, crude, raw, or undigested; but, that feeds with an Appetite, and hath a Stomacke to concoct, devide, and turne all into nourishment. Not, to imitate servilely, as Horace saith, and catch at vices, for virtue, but to draw forth out of the best, and choisest flowers, with the Bee, and turne all into Honey, worke it into one relish, and savour: make our Imitation sweet: observe, how the best writers have imitated, and follow them.

(qtd. in White 200)

In his imitative endeavor, E. H. fails to take the original and improve upon it; the evidence of his utter failure is that, like Taylor’s version, no further editions were merited. As shall be discussed in Chapter IV, the terms *spurious* and *plagiaristic* belong to works such as this one by E. H. because of the author’s intention to deceive others. First of all, he falsely claims to be the author of the original *Divine Breathings* and provides this work with a new Latin title in order to deceive unlearned readers into believing it was something original. Secondly, his strategy of sandwiching original entries of *Divine Breathings* between his own words shows a lack of critical engagement and creative effort on his part. E. H. does not understand the classical theory “that originality of real worth is to be achieved only through creative imitation” (Harold White 202).
As we begin now to examine a few of the other eighteenth and nineteenth century editions of *Divine Breathings*, I will consider the editors of these texts as practicing a type of sequel writing; these are responses—some to the original text and some directed to other respondents. Furthermore, even as a collaborative ethos existed between writer and reader in the early modern era, that interaction seems to extend into the nineteenth century due, perhaps in part, to the nature of the genre of religious writing and also the invitations found in bibliographic codes to participate as active readers. The invitation in *Divine Breathings*’ postscript by the “Devout Reader” proves historically to elicit active participation among readers.

Notwithstanding the successful reception of *Divine Breathings*, at least three other editions besides Taylor’s in the eighteenth century include the insertion of poetry to the text. Perhaps it was perceived by editors as necessary to supplement the prose with poetry to justify printing a new edition. For example, the 1722 edition of *Divine Breathings* printed in Edinburgh by J. M. for John Paton (labeled as the ninth edition with additions) offers 28 poems, a total of 96 lines of verse (averaging just over 3 lines per poem); 21 of the 28 poems appear in the first half of the book, but none are added after the 71st meditation. The majority of them function as a summarized reflection of the preceding meditation; a few anticipate the entry that follows. After Meditation 29 which addresses “The Vanity of the World,” the following couplet is inserted: “This world is Nothing, nothing ‘tis at all, / Or when ‘tis most, ‘tis as a Tennis Ball” (34). The same poems inserted in the 1722 edition are found in editions printed by G. Keith later in the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, these verses were deemed unacceptable and
irrelevant by W. Nicholson, an editor who issues in 1836 a “corrected and improved” version in Halifax, West Yorkshire, England. Nicholson, who also decides to omit Perin’s preface and the “Pious Reflections” from the text, replaces the poetry with new “verses, by the best of our Poets” (iv). These poems have proven difficult to attribute; however, several of the passages are identifiable as hymns, including “The Pilgrim’s Song” and “The Power of Faith.”

One of the most extraordinary editions illustrates the exuberant participation of Reverend W. Kirkpatrick, a minister of the Church of Scotland in Liverpool; his edition published in 1813 contains 141 meditations. Unlike most of the previous editors, Kirkpatrick openly acknowledges that, in his judgment, “many of the numbers” found in Divine Breathings were “not so lively and instructive as to merit republication” and so he has “omitted such numbers entirely” (iii). He also explains in his preface that he altered “obsolete and sometimes inaccurate language” and has included some of his own writings and selections from other sources (iii). Because he values simplicity, “those…who expect studied, elegant language will be disappointed” (vi). He discloses that he has utilized the Psalmody of the Church of Scotland as well as writings “from late and from living eminent divines” including Dr. Watts.

By 1842 an American edition boasting 108 meditations appears, published by R. Fellows, who values Divine Breathings for its potential utility in nourishing youth, the future “generations [who] may be fed with these crumbs of God’s treasure” (6). But these “crumbs,” he declares, are “more than meat to the needy soul” (6). Although not announced to the reader that additions have been made to the original text, this edition
contains seven new entries (the postscript, “Pious Reflections of Devout Reader” is numbered as the 108th meditation).

The 101st meditation lays out the theological basis of its editor: emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in the believer, rather than the works of an individual. The next entry then petitions the reader to carefully study those “sins which ruin multitudes” (107). Continuing the theme in *Divine Breathings* of the importance of not delaying repentance, the editor admonishes readers not to wait until the final moments on their death beds but rather to reflect now frequently on how they have spent their time. Whereas the original *Divine Breathings* was introspective (“O my soul”), these new entries address the reader: “My dear friend, let me deal plainly with you” (107). The intended audience begins to narrow in the 104th entry, focused on disobedience to parents. Although the 105th meditation also seems more directed toward younger readers, there were others surely guilty of the vice it warns against. An excerpt from this entry titled “Waste of Precious Time” shows the hortatory tone of these added writings:

One of the most common ways in which time is worse than wasted, is devoting your hours to romances, plays, and novels. Novels are the poison of the age. If you are a novel reader, think the next time you take a novel into your hands: “How shall I answer to my tremendous Judge for the time occupied by this? When he shall say to me, “I gave you so many years in yonder world, to fit you for eternity: did you converse with your God in devotion? did you study his word? did you attend to the duties of life? and strive to improve to some good end even your leisure hours?”
then—then shall I be willing to reply, “Lord, my time was otherwise employed. Novels and romances occupied the leisure of my days; when, alas! my bible, my God, and my soul were neglected!” (115)

The concluding, additional entries likewise reveal a strict code of living, advocating restraint from worldly pleasures and obedience to the laws of the Sabbath-day.

Unlike versions by Kirkpatrick and Fellows, another American edition, issued the following year (1843) in Philadelphia, contains fewer than the original century of meditations: only 96 entries (even though the title promises 97). Those meditations omitted include entries such as: “The difference between good and bad men, with respect to this life”; “Evil Age”; “Blessings from God must be used for God”; and “Deceitful riches leave us at our death, but our good works follow us.” We may speculate that the reason why the entry called “The difference between good and bad men, with respect to this life” may have been deleted is that perhaps it was not attractive theology to the American publisher; the original entry opens with this statement: “I see the wicked have their Heaven here, and their Hell hereafter; and on the contrary, good men have their Hell here, and their Heaven hereafter.” In other words, the righteous must suffer here or at least not prosper in temporal matters. Such a teaching does not seem to match with the American dream of enjoying prosperity and abundance.

But such omissions pale in comparison with those imposed on one peculiar edition printed in the mid-nineteenth century. Titled *Gift of Piety, or Divine Breathings in One Hundred Meditations*, this unique printing produced in New York contains only 61 of the original 100 meditations. No explanation is given for the reduction; it is a
miniature book but others with the identical title, *Gift of Piety*, which were published in Boston include all 100 meditations.

In our continued quest to ascertain possible explanations for the successful reception history of *Divine Breathings*, it is useful to consider the reasons publishers provide for reprinting the text. In the early nineteenth century a new preface began to appear in some editions signed by “The Publisher.” It first appears in the Philadelphia edition printed by Abel Dickinson in 1809. Therein the publisher expresses the wish “that the great family of the human race but felt half the concern for themselves which the author of these pathetical Meditations hath breathed forth to their view, then might it be hoped the great day of promised PEACE would soon gladden the very borders of our streets, and cheer the disconsolate, the tempted, and the weary travelers of Sion” (Dickinson i). In 1836 Nicholson explains his admiration for the anonymous author who “must have felt an ardent desire for the conversion of the ungodly, and the increase of vital religion. His observations,” Nicholson continues, “are both scriptural and energetic, admirably adapted to alarm the careless sinner, as well as to animate the fainting Christian. By a frequent perusal of the [book] the Christian will, no doubt, be induced to pour contempt upon this vain world, and to direct his thoughts to an eternal inheritance in heaven” (iii).

In addition to theories of active participation of its readers and the invitation to imitate already presented, we must also consider other factors that may explain the successful printing history of *Divine Breathings* as a steady-seller. One possibility is that most printings continued to include the preface and postscript which helped to
market the book for its intrigue about the anonymous, pious author. Nineteenth-century editions often included an additional preface from the editor or publisher repeating again that the identity of the author was still unknown, that is, until late in the century when Chester’s theory was presented about Renniger; thereafter only one additional printing appeared. Perhaps part of its success, as I have suggested before, was due to its persistent and intriguing cloak of anonymity.

Another factor is that *Divine Breathings* was often marketed as an ideal gift. In the late eighteenth century, printings included the promise of “good allowance to those who give it away” at the bottom of its title pages. Some of these editions were reprinted in the late nineteenth century and that same invitation was repeated and extended on title pages. Copies of *Divine Breathings* were liberally shared, presented as gifts by friends and relatives, passed down from generation to generation. Evidence of this is recorded in the copy of *Divine Breathings* (9th ed., 1722) held by the National Library of Scotland which contains the following handwritten inscription: “This Interesting Volume was given to Chas. Taylor, Glasgow, by the late Mrs. Bremmer of Mains St. O. S. Church, who received it from the mother of the late Thomas Manson D. D. O. S. Church Perth + it is now presented to his granddaughter Davina S. Morton July 10 1901” (Vincent).

Another reason for its popularity is that *Divine Breathings* transcends sectarian boundaries, reaching a variety of Christian readers in England, Scotland, the United States, and Canada. The original *Divine Breathings* seems purposefully directed at a large, interdenominational audience; its relatively palatable theology makes it accessible to many readers. In this aspect, the author of *Divine Breathings* exemplifies what
Dobranski declares to be those tendencies among early modern authors toward emphasizing “readers’ diversity” (35). Its honest, resolute style resonated with readers of various denominations in Christendom. As W. J. Loftie declares in 1879, *Divine Breathings* “has worked ... noiselessly, humbly, ...not heedful of the sectarian strife, the so-called theologies, the warfare of books and tongues, the jangle of creeds and the tyranny of forms, but nestling…close to the heart of one pilgrim after another” (ix).

Unlike other devotional steady sellers which, according to Matthew P. Brown, are “informational and aesthetic” and “generate meaning through their thickness” (69), *Divine Breathings* provided readers with an alternative, slimmer text, offering brief but meaty meditations for the pious to ponder. Brevity, highly valued by Puritans along with plainness in style, may be a major selling point, and not only in the early modern period because it certainly is a feature that the Victorian editors of *Divine Breathings* focused on when promoting their various editions of the text. Historically, its brevity was appreciated, functioning as bite-sized religious food for the busy nineteenth-century lifestyle. The meditations in *Divine Breathings* are more than just aphorisms but not sermon-length either; they were the ideal length and depth—just enough to feed the soul and mind.

Because of the fast paced lifestyle in the nineteenth century, editors frequently appealed to readers and prospective readers by persuading them that reading an entry or two from *Divine Breathings* could provide daily morsels to ponder on the go. As Kirkpatrick explains in 1813, *Divine Breathings* is ideal for “those persons who are inclined to read divine truths, but who cannot spare time from business for reading long,
elaborate discourses…one of these Meditations may be easily read…in the space of five or six minutes, without neglecting their necessary labour or business.” The benefit of doing so is that it “may bring to their recollection some of the truths that belong to their present and everlasting peace” (iv).

As detailed above, the impressive printing history of *Divine Breathings* and its status as a devotional steady-seller should prompt further attention to this text and hopefully a renewed interest in the resolve genre. Even though my work argues for de-attributing *Divine Breathings* away from T. S. and crediting Michael Renniger for its authorship, by recognizing this and understanding *Divine Breathings* both for its content and style and its successful reception history we can, in the process, begin to appreciate T. S.’s career as an imitative sequel writer. His foray into the resolve style of meditative writing with *Divine Breathings…the Second Part* in 1680 is immediately followed with his project of critiquing and revising Bunyan’s incredibly popular *Pilgrim’s Progress*. In 1682, when T. S. publishes his imitative, corrective sequel, *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, he validates the success of Bunyan’s allegory just as he did by imitating the resolves of *Divine Breathings*. As Terry Castle points out, it is “only charismatic texts, those with an unusually powerful effect on a large reading public, [that] typically generate sequels” (133-134). As shall be shown in Chapter IV, T. S. employs his *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* as a way of responding to Bunyan’s literary methodology and, in a conservative manner, of promoting and stressing the practice of meditation among readers.
CHAPTER IV
FIRST AMONG BUNYAN’S CRITICS:
T. S., AUTHOR OF SECOND PART OF THE PILGRIM’S PROGRESS

Of the five works traditionally attributed to T. S., Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress has received the most recognition among scholars since the tricentennial of John Bunyan’s birth celebrated in 1928. Most of those references that appear in contemporary Bunyan scholarship which recognize this work and its author identify T. S. as Thomas Sherman, typically add that he was a General Baptist, and occasionally include a brief excerpt from the preface to The Second Part. However, scanty critical attention has been given to this imitative allegory. As Michael Davies states in his book, Graceful Reading: Theology and Narrative in the Works of John Bunyan (2002), this text “has been generally ignored in Bunyan scholarship (analysis rarely ever gets beyond the first page)” (297).

There are two notable exceptions: Susan Deborah Cook and Davies. Cook devotes half of a dissertation chapter in 1997 to analyzing T. S.’s style in The Second Part and argues that it is “structurally linked to the Book of Common Prayer and the prescribed homilies of the Church of England” (205). While she raises questions about identifying “Sherman” as a General Baptist, Cook remains ambiguous in her final assessment of the author’s religious affiliation. In contrast, Davies allots the first eight pages of his chapter “First Among Sequels: John Bunyan’s Other Allegories” toward musing on what he perceives as a common, “profound concern over seventeenth-reading
habits” shared by the General Baptist T. S. and the Particular Baptist John Bunyan (292). Davies asserts that T. S. is “the first in a long line of Bunyan critics...intent as F. R. Leavis upon illustrating and resolving the fundamental tensions evident in Bunyan’s book between theology and narrative, story and doctrine, allegory and imagination” (298).

There are several major objectives for this chapter. First, we will consider U. Milo Kaufman’s argument that Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress functions not only as an allegorical work but also as a book of heavenly meditations.114 As part of that exploration, it is essential to examine how (if at all) Bunyan invites (entices) readers like T. S. to participate in the meditative process. When T. S. offers a “Supplyment” to Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, early in his sequel he explicitly refers to his project as meditations. After examining the contents of those meditations and briefly reviewing the printing history of T. S.’s Second Part, we will consider how T. S. has been utilized among Bunyan scholars—namely his significance as an early critic of Bunyan’s famous allegory. I will challenge the often published and repeated assumption that T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress is a “spurious” work by continuing to argue in this chapter that T. S. establishes his authorial identity as an imitative author who, in the process, offers criticism of and enters into an intertextual dialogue with Bunyan. T. S.’s criticism prompts Bunyan to respond with a sequel that he hopes will (unlike Mr.

114 For further study of responses to Kaufmann’s scholarship and the impact of his work, see: John Preston’s review of Kaufmann’s Pilgrim’s Progress and Traditions in Puritan Tradition in The Review of English Studies (May 1968); Nick Shrimpton’s essay, “Bunyan’s Military Metaphor;” pp. 205-224; Kathleen Swaim’s Pilgrim’s Progress, Puritan Progress, passim; Davies, pp. 214-215, 227-228.
Badman) satisfy the expectations of the general readership in Restoration England and one that more overtly emphasizes the meditative aspects of the original allegory.

While Pilgrim’s Progress has been read as an allegorical work, few have detected the meditative characteristics it contains. The most notable exception is U. Milo Kaufmann, who asserts in The Pilgrim’s Progress and Traditions in Puritan Meditation (1966) that “Bunyan the allegorist was also Bunyan the heavenly-minded [meditative writer], and the emphases and methods of heavenly meditation are conspicuously relevant to the narrative he develops” (150). Kaufmann identifies two practices employed by Bunyan that illustrate the influence of “the tradition of heavenly meditation” on his work: “his undidactic handling of the imagery of scriptural metaphor and his realistic use of the imagery of private experience” (155). With regards to the first, Bunyan uses scripture to describe the scenes the Dreamer sees, and they are presented in a way that invites interpretation of experience rather than providing doctrinal explanation to the reader. The influence of Puritan meditation on Bunyan is apparent in his emphasis on private experience. In order to get a better glimpse of celestial things, the Puritan must compare them with earthly things (171).

Puritans like Bunyan were constantly asking the question: “What does this signify?” Every situation, no matter how trivial, offered potential stimulus for meditation on this question. Such events were opportunities for “occasional meditation, a method for redeeming the manifold occasions of immediate experience and as often

115 Kathleen Swaim builds upon Kaufmann’s work in her Pilgrim’s Progress, Puritan Progress (1993), but her focus is on placing Bunyan squarely among the Puritans. For example, Swaim asserts that “Bunyan’s Christian is a hero of the universal sort as well as a specifically Puritan hero inhabiting a specifically Puritan myth” (48). Swaim does address some of the meditational aspects of Bunyan’s writings, specifically those found in the Pilgrim’s Progress...the Second Part (see pp. 245-253).
concerned with the ‘creatures’ of the natural order as they offered themselves to observation” (Kaufmann 175). Granted, there are occasions in Pilgrim’s Progress that invite both Christian and the reader to meditate; however, the practice is more explicitly promoted and encouraged in the Second Part. For example, the practice of occasional meditation is promoted in Bunyan’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress when Prudence at the House Beautiful encourages the children to “Observe also and that with carefulness, what the Heavens and the Earth do teach you” (213). As commonly perceived among Puritans, Bunyan espouses the belief that God speaks through His creation; by meditating on God’s creations man could give voice to the ways in which those creatures praised the Creator (Kaufmann 184).

As Kaufmann declares, “the bulk of the specific appearances of occasional meditation in Pilgrim’s Progress are to be found in Part Two” (188). It is important to ask why Bunyan emphasizes occasional meditation in his sequel. Later in this chapter we will consider how T. S. may have been a significant influence in Bunyan’s decision to stress meditative practice in the Second Part. For example, in Bunyan’s sequel, the following occasion is presented: after Interpreter shows Christiana and her entourage the Muckraker, he takes them into “the very best Room in the house.” In the following

scene, Interpreter trains Christiana, her children, and Mercie in the practice of occasional meditation:

…he bid them look round about, and see if they could find any thing profitable there. Then they looked around and round: For there was nothing there to be seen but a very great Spider on the Wall: and that they overlook’t.

Mer. Then said Mercie, Sir, I see nothing; but Christiana held her peace.

Inter. But said the Interpreter, look again: she therefore lookt again and said, Here is not any thing, but an ugly Spider, who hangs by her Hands upon the Wall. Then said he, Is there but one Spider in all this spacious Room? Then the water stood in Christiana’s Eyes, for she was a Woman quick of apprehension: and she said, Yes Lord, there is more here then one. Yea, and Spiders whose Venom is far more destructive then that which is in her. The Interpreter then looked pleasantly upon her, and said, Thou hast said the Truth. This made Mercie blush, and the Boys to cover their Faces. For they all began now to understand the Riddle.

(Bunyan, Second Part 189)

Unlike Christian’s pilgrimage, which is rushed with minimal time spent meditating on the Book of Creatures (Kaufmann 195), the narrative in Part Two is replete with examples of occasional meditations such as the one above. Bunyan shared Calamy’s opinion that occasional meditation was the easiest type of meditation (Second Part, 190; Huntley 36).
Kaufmann also considers those examples in the first part of *Pilgrim’s Progress* regarding meditations on experience. Although he does not label it as such, personal experience is included in the last of the three books Puritans typically meditated on, referred to as the Book of the Soul. After carefully studying Hall’s meditational writing and handbook, *The Art of Divine Meditation*, Huntley identifies these three books as the Book of Scriptures, the Book of Creatures, and the Book of the Soul. The Book of the Soul includes the self, the conscience, and one’s personal experiences (Huntley 31-43).

In *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Christian arrives at the House Beautiful and is invited to enter into discourse with its inhabitants about the past events of his pilgrimage. As Kaufman summarizes, “formal meditation upon the individual’s past” is “one of the most common of Puritan devotional practices” (197). By 1678, when *Pilgrim’s Progress* first appears, the discipline of meditation had evolved to the point that Bunyan could write about such scenes and the practice within his allegory and readers would appreciate the methodology employed, a methodology which “had become formalized and which from all indications was coextensive with Puritanism” (197). The publication of Calamy’s handbook, *The Art of Divine Meditation* (1680), borrowing its title from Hall’s previous work, indicates the continued interest in practicing meditation in a time when Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* was just beginning to be devoured and savored by the English reading public.

Most important for Puritans in the meditation of experience, Kaufman claims, “was the concern to find in the events of one’s life the assurance of election” (197). This echoes the assertion in *Divine Breathings*, as noted previously in Chapter III, that in
order to ascertain whether or not one’s name was written in the Book of Life one only needed to look into one’s heart where the Book of Conscience is kept to see what is written there. To aid in the quest to discern their individual salvation, Puritans recorded personal meditations and could then exercise self-reflection in order to better discern the signs of election (Kaufmann 198). Furthermore, Puritans were also interested in meditating on experience because “Life was a second scripture by which to understand the written Word” (201). Another purpose was to detect Providences (or moments of God’s intervention) in their lives.

One example of meditation on personal experiences in *Pilgrim’s Progress* is when Prudence interviews Christian, and she presses him to remember “by what means” he had enjoyed those particular moments which he had said were “Golden hours,” those moments when he was not “annoyed” with “inward and carnal cogitations” (50). Christian answers:

Yes, when I think what I saw at the Cross, that will do it; and when I look upon my Broidered Coat, that will do it; also when I look into the Roll that I carry in my bosom, that will do it; and when my thoughts wax warm about whither I am going, that will do it. (50)

Later, Christian, after meeting with Faithful, in a similar fashion encourages his new traveling companion to candidly share his past experiences. Although modern readers may resist those sections in *Pilgrim’s Progress* which pause to reflect on particular actions or events such as these, they reminded early modern readers of the importance of
meditation on past experiences. By doing so, Providences could be identified, God’s voice heard, and signs of election discerned.

There are at least two challenges to Kaufmann’s scholarship that I wish to offer. First of all, Kaufmann places Bunyan among those such as Richard Baxter whom he identifies as being divergent from Bishop Joseph Hall. Like Frank Livingstone Huntley, I disagree with Kaufmann’s contention that there are clear distinctions to be made between the type of meditation practiced by those such as Hall (who supposedly does not allow space for the senses) and Puritan meditators, including Baxter and Bunyan (who emphasized personal experience). Even though Kaufmann admits that Hall influenced Puritans such as Bunyan, he (as well as Louis Martz) failed to point out just how foundational Hall’s *The Art of Divine Meditation* was for Bunyan. Neither Kaufmann nor Martz shows an awareness of an important passage in Bunyan’s spiritual autobiography, *Grace Abounding* (1666), which illuminates Hall’s impact on Bunyan. After hearing “three or four poor women sitting at a door…talking about the things of God,” Bunyan reports how he continued to reflect on their words and then reveals those internal changes that had occurred within himself that he has discerned: “presently I found two things within me…the one was, a very great softness and tenderness of heart, which caused me to fall under the conviction of what by Scripture they asserted; and the other was, a great bending in my mind to a continual meditating on them, and on all other good things which at any time I heard or read of” (*Grace Abounding*, Ed. Owens

---

117 In response to Kaufmann’s assertion that the “central tradition in formal Puritan meditation may be said to begin with Joseph Hall” (120), Huntley points out that Kaufmann provides “only two who followed Hall’s ‘steps’: Isaac Ambrose…and Edmund Calamy” (52). Huntley argues against Kaufmann’s claim that there are two divergent traditions in Puritan meditation (52-58).
Hall’s influence can be readily detected by comparing Bunyan’s statement above with the definition of meditation provided in *The Art of Divine Meditation* first published sixty years prior to *Grace Abounding*; according to Hall, “divine meditation is nothing else but a bending of the mind upon some spiritual object, through divers forms of discourse, until our thoughts come to an issue” (72). Both Bunyan and Hall utilize the word “bending” as they describe the mental exertion essential to meditation.

As a second matter, I believe that Kaufmann, who, inspired by Martz’s work, identifies the influence of Puritan meditation in Bunyan’s writing, does not go quite far enough. Kaufmann rightly observes how *Pilgrim’s Progress* begins—with the pilgrim in “anguished meditation,” standing and reading a book (118). This image is reminiscent of the biblical passage often cited by Puritans regarding Isaac’s evening meditation in a field (Genesis 24:63). Later, in his *Second Part*, Bunyan reminds readers of this opening scene and stresses the importance of the pilgrim’s meditation on the Book of Scripture. Prudence counsels Christiana’s boys, “Observe also and that with carefulness, what the Heavens and the Earth do teach you; but especially be much in the Meditation of that Book which was the cause of your Fathers becoming a Pilgrim” (213). Bunyan interprets for us here what the Pilgrim in Part One was doing in the opening scene: he was meditating. But what Kaufmann fails to emphasize is how *Pilgrim’s Progress* functions as a text that illustrates and promotes the practice of meditation. In the opening scene of *Pilgrim’s Progress*, as mentioned above, Bunyan presents an active reader (the Pilgrim) who is depicted meditating, and the narrative that follows not only traces his journey but also details his meditations. Even more importantly, Bunyan’s
allegory shows the positive outcome of his meditative practices. *Pilgrim's Progress* serves as a veritable case study of one who meditates and experiences the benefits of practicing meditation: Christian successfully arrives at and is accepted into the Celestial City. Thus, *Pilgrim’s Progress* promotes the practice of meditation by showing a pilgrim whom the reader should emulate in his individual journey to heaven.

Furthermore, to borrow Joan Webber’s terminology, Bunyan’s use of the “eloquent ‘I’” in *Pilgrim’s Progress* invites participation. When Christian speaks in first person the reader is drawn into the pilgrim’s position. In a brief reference to the allegory, Webber asserts that Bunyan’s narrative “transmutes all particular men into General Man” (36). The reader is expected to be like Christian, who functions as an Everyman-type of character. Bunyan divulges in his Apology his intention of transforming his reader into an “active” Christian:

This Book will make a Travallier of thee,

If by its Counsel thou wilt ruled be;

It will direct thee to the Holy Land,

If thou wilt its Directions understand:

Yea, it will make the sloathful, active be… (8)

Therefore, similar to the way that *Divine Breathing* encourages active reading and the emulation of meditative practice (as argued in Chapter III), Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* likewise promotes the active participation of its readers.

Another way that *Pilgrim’s Progress* entices readers to participate in meditative practice is that this text, like early editions of *Divine Breathing* (as detailed in the
previous chapter), included emblem-like frontispieces. Similar to the emblems presented to readers in Divine Breathings, the frontispiece of Pilgrim’s Progress acts as a bibliographic code, signaling to readers the type of careful, meditative reading the work will require. Although Bunyan will linguistically create in the opening pages of the text the image of the pilgrim, the frontispiece assists the reader by presenting a visual depiction of the pilgrim making his way to the Wicket Gate, with a burden on his back and a book in his hand; once again, the image of Christian as an active reader who meditates (in this scene, specifically on the Book of Scripture) is presented. Hence, the Pilgrim is the epitome of an active reader, one which the Christian Reader should emulate.

Although the emblematic frontispieces of Divine Breathings essentially legitimize the practice of imitation since they are themselves slightly altered copies of prior emblems, the frontispiece and even the title itself of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress may have functioned in a similar though more subtle manner. Before explaining that point further, it must first be stated that the influence of the emblem tradition on Bunyan’s imaginative writing has been previously examined. As James Montgomery observed nearly two centuries ago, one of Bunyan’s sources of inspiration for creating the Pilgrim’s Progress may have been an emblem entitled “The Pilgrim” found in George Whitney’s book, Emblemes and Other Devises, published in Holland in 1585.
The emblem represents a Pilgrim leaving the world (symbolized by a large globe with “Europe” and “Africa” inscribed upon it) behind him, walking with staff in hand, adorned in hat and cloak, his gaze fixed upon heaven where the Hebrew name for God is written. Ahead of him in his path is a large mountain and a forbidding sky filled with dark clouds. The accompanying text of poetry begins with the line “Adewe deceiptful worlde, thy pleasure I detest.” “Peregrinus Christianus loquitur” (Christian, the Pilgrim, speaks) is placed in the margin (Whitney 225). It is quite likely that readers such as Bunyan and T. S. were familiar with Whitney’s popular book (Wharey 119-121; Moseley 21-23).120 Both James Blanton Wharey and Roger Sharrock have provided significant scholarship that convincingly shows that there are numerous texts that Bunyan either imitated or was influenced by. In addition to those emblem books by Whitney, Quarles, and Wither, there is evidence found in Bunyan’s imaginative writings that resemble aspects in works such as John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs (1563), Arthur Dent’s Plaine Man’s Pathway to Heaven (1601), Guillaume de Deguileville’s Pilgrimage of Man (1483),121 and Richard Bernard’s Isle of Man (1627).

Although Montgomery, for example, credits Whitney as the author of the aforementioned emblem book, what he does not reveal is that, according to the 1586 edition of Whitney’s work which I examined on Early English Books Online, the complete title illuminates the extent to which imitation occurred in the emblematic tradition: A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Devises, for the most parte gathered out of sundrie writers, Englished and Moralized. And Divers Newly Devised. Notice how the title acknowledges that this work draws liberally upon the previous writings (and likely the artwork as well) produced by other individuals.

120 Roger Sharrock declares that even “as [Bunyan’s] diction owes much to the racy, figurative type of sermon, so, much of his imagery is borrowed from the world of the emblem books. The years of his boyhood were those of the popularity of Quarles and Wither” (“English Emblem Writers” 106). As Sharrock also points out, Bunyan produced an emblem book, A Book for Boys and Girls (1686), later in his life.

121 According to Wharey, Deguileville wrote three Pilgrimages in French, the manuscripts reportedly were composed between 1330 and 1358 (Sources 10). By 1430 English translations were produced. However,
In a fashion similar to the “Pious Reflections of a Devout Reader” postscript to *Divine Breathings*, Bunyan’s “Conclusion” to *Pilgrim’s Progress* opens the door for future sequels. First, Bunyan invites engagement with the “Reader” whom he addresses directly with this challenge: “See if thou canst Interpret it to me; / Or to thy self, or Neighbor” (155). He warns the Reader to “be not extream” in interpreting his dream; “Nor let my figure, or similitude, / Put thee into a laughter or feud” (155). In the above statements, Bunyan encourages the active participation of his reader. Perhaps equally important is Bunyan’s admission that if his readers were not satisfied with his attempt then he would consider writing a sequel: “But if thou shalt cast all away as vain, / I know not but ’twill make me Dream again” (155).

Bunyan’s notoriety and the immediate, sensational success of his allegory enticed authors and would-be writers to attempt to imitate the method and style of *Pilgrim’s Progress*. One of the first to do so is T. S., author of the imitative sequel, *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, published in 1682 by T. H. Although the author’s initials are not found on the title page, T. S. does sign both the prefatory “Dedication” and

---

Wharey states, “Of Deguileville’s three Pilgrimages the second only was printed in English before Bunyan’s time. This prose translation of the second Pilgrimage [was] published by Caxton in 1483” (15). Because of this information, I list 1483 rather than 1330 as the pertinent date for this book.

122 Gerard Genette would likely label T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* a “hypertext,” which by Genette’s definition “is any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation” (*Palimpsests* 7).

123 In his definitive biography on Bunyan, Richard Greaves declares that T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* represents “the first attempt to continue the allegory” (*Glimpses* 615). Elsewhere in *Glimpses of Glory*, Greaves claims that John Dunton issued Sherman’s work (498-499). My extensive research on the printing history of *The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* by T. S. has not discovered any editions of this work printed by Dunton. Unfortunately, Greaves does not document a source for this claim. Another error that needs to be corrected in future editions of Greaves’ work is the date of publication (mistakenly listed as 1681) for T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* provided in the text; however, he correctly documents the date (1682) of the first edition in the footnote (498).
“Author’s Apology.” While T. S.’s significance in the field of Bunyan studies is typically that of a literary critic, minimal scholarly attention has been given to the creative way that he presents his sequel as “Meditations” (xii). This is remarkable because the overwhelming majority of references to T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress target the opening pages of his “Apology” where he explicitly refers to his sequel as “Meditations” (xii). Instead of focusing on his work as meditative, scholars tend to harshly criticize T. S. for his “audacity” to offer a “corrective sequel,” label his work “a piece of piracy,” or implicitly refer to his venture as “spurious” (Lynch 83; Harris, “Higher Criticism” 350; Wharey, “Introduction” cv; Johnson 247; Greaves 620). I will attempt in this chapter to counter those arguments by showing that T. S.’s significance is not only as the earliest critic of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress but also as an author who establishes an identity as an imitative sequel writer who emphasizes and promotes the practice of meditation.

As cited earlier in this chapter, Davies has parenthetically commented that “analysis [of T. S.’s Second Part] rarely gets beyond the first page” (297). By that Davies is referring to the opening paragraph of the text.124 In order to more accurately

---

124 It appears that few scholars have actually studied the entire text of T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. Some have simply repeated prior references to T. S.’s “Apology” and perhaps the opening paragraph on page one of the text. In Brean S. Hammond’s essay, “The Pilgrim’s Progress: Satire and Social Comment,” for example, the footnote for his preliminary reference to T. S.’s motivation to publish a sequel reveals that he is quoting the text second hand; his source is Roger Sharrock’s John Bunyan, p. 139. In the defense of scholars who have had to study either indirectly or casually T. S.’s Second Part, access to this work has been difficult. Recent advances in internet technology (e.g., digital archives such as Early English Books Online) have made access to rare books (including Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress) more convenient and feasible. Prior to these digital archives, in order to personally examine a copy of T. S.’s Second Part a scholar would have had to travel to one of the few libraries in the world that hold extant copies of this work (for a list of those locations, please see Appendix E). Even though there is now electronic access to this text, it is still cumbersome to properly study and analyze the entire work. For
understand T. S. we will commence a more comprehensive examination of the textual and paratextual evidence found in T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress. I will also provide extensive references to previous scholarship in Bunyan studies that incorporate T. S.

Before proceeding, however, we should remember that “seventeenth-century readers … often appropriated another writer’s work with their own goals in mind.” Dobranski suggests:

Here we may detect the influence of not only Protestant hermeneutics but also the polemical approach to learning that shaped early modern pedagogy. Disputation remained the primary means of learning in seventeenth-century universities… Reading, like learning, need not be limited to a single person’s ideas or arguments; instead, it required discussion, or as Milton summarizes, ‘much arguing, much writing, many opinions’” (Readers 42).

Thus, the venture that T. S. undertakes in rewriting Bunyan’s allegory is an example of the active reading Dobranski detects as common in the early modern period, when “readers did not just read attentively; many … went beyond an author’s apparent intentions and re-wrote parts of another writer’s works.” Those that could write “were … able to use that skill to personalize and/or appropriate some of the books they read.” As Dobranski reminds us, “During the seventeenth century ‘peruse’ … meant ‘to read

that reason, I intend in the future to produce a critical edition of T. S.’s sequel that will allow readers a more desirable medium by which to study this text.
thoroughly.’ That it also could mean to ‘reconsider’ or ‘revise’ suggests the overlap between carefully reading and partly re-writing a text” (*Readers* 54).

Upon picking up a copy of the first edition of *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, as seventeenth-century readers did, we notice the similarity of the title—

*The Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress, From This present World of Wickeness and Misery, to An Eternity of Holines and Felicity; Exactly Described under the Similitude of a Dream; Relating the Manner and Occasion of his setting out from, and difficult and dangerous Journey through the World, and safe Arrival at last to Eternal Happiness.*

--compared to Bunyan’s best-seller¹²⁵

*The Pilgrim’s Progress From This World to That which is to come: Delivered under the Similitude of a Dream Wherein is Discovered, The manner of his setting out, His Dangerous Journey; And safe Arrival at the Desired Countrey.*

By what the modern reader sees on the title page, it might be tempting to abruptly stop and rashly judge the work as “piracy” or “spurious.” But it is unfair to do so, considering the liberal attitude toward imitation that prevailed in early modern England.¹²⁶ Furthermore, although T. S. is typically identified as the first of the imitators of *Pilgrim’s Progress*, his work is not spurious in that he does not attempt to deceive readers into thinking he is Bunyan: he attaches his initials to both the Dedication

---

¹²⁵ By the end of 1682, Nathaniel Ponder had printed over the course of five years at least eight editions of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* (Wharey, “Introduction” lixi-lixiii; Greaves 637-639).

¹²⁶ See Harold White’s *Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance*. 
and the Apology. Moreover, as shall be shown below, he makes it clear that his intention is not to copy but rather to correct Bunyan’s allegory.

Turning the title page we glimpse the first prefatory section, the Dedication. Few scholars have analyzed this Dedication, but it is significant because it contains clues regarding T. S.’s strategies to engage readers. Unlike some Restoration authors who dedicated works to patrons or paid homage to King Charles II, this writer addresses his Dedication to the Heavenly King—“To Him that is Higher than the Highest: The Almighty and everlasting Jehovah” (i). What follows is a prayer signed by T. S. which reveals the piety of the author. Therein, T. S. refers to the literary work which he offers to God as “Meditations” (i) and hopes that “by this or any other means [he can] be an instrument of doing good to [his] fellow pilgrims” (iv-v). Also important in the Dedication is his admission and gratitude to God for persuading him to begin his own pilgrimage:

Thou wast pleased out of thy infinite goodness and tender Compassions, which have been ever of Old, to pluck me out of the Horrible pit, as a brand out of the Fire, and by an Effectual changing of my nature, turn my Feet into the ways of thy Testimonies, and persuaded me to go on Pilgrimage to the Celestial Canaan, and hast enabled me to make a Considerable progress towards it through the midst of many amazing difficulties…. (iii–iv)

127 The most notable exceptions are George Offor and Susan Cook. In 1860, Offor registered his interest in the unique nature of T. S. addressing the Dedication of the book to God (Notes and Queries, Vol. 10, 2nd S. [Sept. 15, 1860], pp. 216-217). In her dissertation, Cook detects “Sherman’s intended purpose of prompting a meditative reading of his book” as “expressed in [the] prayer” found in the Dedication (207).
In this sentence (which continues on in his typical verbose style) T. S. provides not only a meditation on his past experience and detects the Divine Providences in his life but also publicly testifies of God’s grace in helping him in his journey. To a certain extent, the content of this dedicatory prayer functions as a spiritual autobiography, a miniature version of Bunyan’s *Grace Abounding*. Furthermore, by utilizing the language of pilgrimage to describe his religious experience he reminds the reader how deeply invested he is in striving for holiness and shows how he has internalized Bunyan’s allegory as a result of active reading. By doing so he is able to connect with his reader, using terms that they understand, hopefully drawing them further into his book.

Although packaged as a prayer, as shown above, the Dedication serves as a rhetorical device by which T. S. establishes his credibility as a godly author with his reader.¹²⁸

Unlike the early editions of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, T. S.’s *Second Part* includes not only a Dedication but also a prefatory endorsement saluting “the Ingenious Author of the Second Part of the Pilgrims Progress” (A5). This poetic preface fills three-and-a-half pages, and after a brief passage marked as “Swain” the remainder is credited to “Pilgrim.”¹²⁹ The endorsement signed by R. B. previews for the reader what lies ahead in the text for “those who intend to go / On Pilgrimage thou letst them know / What they’ll meat with on the Road” (ix). R. B. prophetically warns the would-be

¹²⁸ See Beth Lynch’s *John Bunyan and the Language of Conviction* for an excellent study of how Bunyan establishes his identity as a godly author.

¹²⁹ As documented in Chapter II, at least one scholar, J. Rendel Harris, jumped to the conclusion that “Swain” must be the last name of T. S. (“Bunyan Books” 126-127). However, “Swain” is not a name but refers to a possible role that an author or religious leader assumes, that of a servant, or more specifically in this case, a shepherd or a farm labourer. The opening line of the stanza under “Swain” includes reference to “labouring” and thereby seems to be more likely how this word was used in the latter part of the seventeenth century (see “swain,” *OED*).
pilgrim-readers about the challenges that they may face in both their spiritual journeys and reading experiences with this book: “And through the tedious way they pass / They’ve a sure Guide, and cordial Glass…Short-sighted ones may sometimes faint, / When they the Glorious Prospect want” (ix-x).130

The third and final prefatory section, “the Authors Apology,” is the most frequently cited part of T. S.’s Second Part because here he explains why he opts to augment Bunyan’s work. T. S. begins by lamenting the mental and moral laxity he detects among readers during the Restoration period. He observes that their “minds are so vititiated [sic] and debauched, that no books will please them to read, but Novels, Romances and Plays” (xi). While devotional literature is neglected, readers are attracted more to those books that “contain something that’s New and unusual, either for Matter, Method or Stile” (xi).131 T. S. makes reference to Bunyan’s attempt to incorporate new methods in order to entice a general readership of both the uneducated and the learned.

One scholar, William York Tindall, credits T. S. as being the first critic to detect in

130 What is particularly interesting about the first edition of T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress is the degree of caution exercised by all involved in the project. Not only does the author opt for anonymity, but so does the mysterious printer (T. H.) and the one who signs the laudatory endorsement of the author (R. B.). It is difficult to resist the impulse of speculating on the identity of R. B. Could it be Richard Baxter? If it was such a celebrity, however, it would seem logical that he would have revealed his identity. Considering Baxter’s interest in promoting “heavenly meditations” and T. S.’s intention of emphasizing the meditative aspects of the pilgrimage allegory, it seems a possibility. Being so far removed as we are as 21st-Century readers from the Restoration reading culture in England, it is difficult to fully understand the decision of not signing. Furthermore, we may speculate that it may have been possible that discerning English readers were able to recognize some if not many of those who signed only with initials. It is probable that rumors quickly spread about authorial identities of particular books.

131 T. S.’s lament here seems incongruous with the statistics provided at the beginning of Chapter III that assert the dominance of devotional texts in the seventeenth-century literary marketplace. Perhaps due to T. S.’s puritan perspective, any attention at all given by readers to “Novels, Romances, and Plays” would be excessive.
Bunyan’s writing the influence of Bernard’s allegory, *The Isle of Man*. T. S. discloses that his “Motive” for producing his sequel is similar to Bunyan’s objective in the First Part: he wishes to utilize the allegorical method and pilgrimage motif in order to engage and stimulate both the illiterate and the intellectual reader toward improving their piety. Furthermore, even though Bunyan deserves “Universal esteem and commendation” for “composing that necessary and useful Tract” (i.e., *Pilgrim’s Progress*), T. S. offers “the following Meditations in such a method as might serve as a Supplyment, or a Second Part” (xii). Because of the “brevity” of Part One, T. S. perceives in Bunyan’s allegory “a fourfold Defect” which he wishes to remedy:

First there is nothing said of the State of Man in his first Creation: Nor

Secondly, of the Misery of Man in his Lapsed Estate before Conversion,

Thirdly, a too brief passing over the Methods of Divine Goodness, in the Convincing, and Reconciling of Sinners to himself. And fourthly, I have endeavored to deliver the whole in such serious and spiritual phrases, that may prevent that lightness and laughter, which the reading some passages therein, occasion in some vain and frothy minds. (xii-xiii)

---

132 William York Tindall admits, “As Thomas Sherman suggested in 1682, as Dr. James Blanton Wharey discovered in 1904, and as our ignorance of their work enabled us to find independently in 1932, Bunyan owed much to Richard Bernard’s allegory, *The Isle of Man*” (145). But what is curious is that Tindall and Wharey both credit *The Isle of Man* as a source of inspiration not for *Pilgrim’s Progress* but rather for Bunyan’s *Holy War*, published in 1682 (Wharey 136; Tindall 144-145). In contrast, T. S. does not explicitly identify the work of Bunyan’s in which he sees Bernard’s influence. In his Apology, T. S. states that because of the “decay of Piety and Religion: The observation whereof put some eminent and ingenious persons upon writing some Religious Discourses, which they designed for a General Use in such kind of methods as might incline many to read them, for the methods sake, which otherwise would never have been persuaded to have perused them, as Bernard’s *Isle of Man*, *Gentile Sinner*, &c. Hoping that the Power of those plain Truths which they thereby delivered in so much plainness and familiarity, that made them the more easy to be understood by most illiterate persons, and meanest capacities; and yet afford pleasure, delight and satisfaction to the most Judicious, Learned and Knowing Reader” (xi-xii).
Thus, the first three items on T. S.’s agenda outline the theological deficiencies in Bunyan’s “Tract” which he intends to remedy, and in the fourth item T. S. announces that his style will differ from Bunyan’s First Part; he plans to dampen the entertaining aspects of the original allegory: salvation is serious business and should not be trivialized. Regarding this announcement, Davies comments that T. S. intends his Second Part “to be a revised version in which the imaginative indulgence and surface froth apparent in Bunyan’s book is to be septically treated and skeptically scraped away” (294).

However, T. S.’s motives do not appear altogether holy. Before concluding the Apology with a reminder about his desire to “promote thy present piety” (xv), T. S. devotes several pages to what appears to be a marketing ploy. He encourages readers to purchase and give away books which “would mightily tend to the making people serious” such his Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress as funeral gifts “instead of Rings, Gloves, Wine or Brisket” (xiii). The suggestion of giving books as funeral gifts was not altogether unusual (Roberson 109; Offor, Works 57; Harris 126). While it may be interpreted that such a suggestion was intended to sell more of his books, it is also possible that T. S. abhorred the thought of Bunyan’s comical allegory being given as a funeral gift and offers his as an alternative.

Having examined carefully the prefatory materials, it is time to study the text of T. S.’s “Supplyment.” In his opening sentence, T. S. describes the following scene:

The Spring being far advanced, the Meadows being Covered with a Curious Carpet of delightful Green, and the Earth Cloathed in Rich and
Glorious Attire, to Rejoyce and Triumph for the Return of her Shining Bridegroom: The Healthful Air rendered more Pleasing and Delightful by the gentle Winds then breathed from the South, impregnated with the Exhilerating Fragrancy of the Variety of Flowers and odoriferous Plants over which they had passed; and every Blooming Bush, and Flourishing Grove plentifully stored with Winged Inhabitants, who with a delightful Harmony sweetly Sing forth their Makers Praise and Warble out their joyful Welcomes to the Gaudy Spring, I one Day took a walk in the Fields, to Feast my Eyes with the variety of Delightful Objects which that Season of the Year, wherein the Universe bears the nearest resemblance to the happy state wherein the Immortal God at first created it, liberally offers to the view of the Admiring Beholders and thereby lays an irresistible Obligation upon Heavenly Minds, to Spiritualize the several Objects they behold, and satiate their happy Souls with Heavenly Meditations, by affording them such innumerable occasions of Contemplating the Divine Goodness. (1-2)

This opening sentence illustrates T. S.’s verbosity that tends to drive away many scholar-readers. But rather than focus solely on his prolix style, readers should understand that his intention is not to entertain but rather to describe his preparation for meditation.

Embedded at the end of the passage cited above is one of T. S.’s theses: nature provides “innumerable occasions” for “Heavenly Meditations” (2). Thereafter, he continues to emphasize the importance of occasional meditation and that the Book of Nature, which
he has presented in the lengthy description of a spring landscape, provides a wealth of
subjects for meditative opportunities. One sympathetic scholar, James Turner,
appreciates Sherman’s style in the text’s opening pages by perceiving
it as “typical of seventeenth-century landscape description” (92).

As promised, T. S. remedies the four-fold defects identified in Bunyan’s
version—and does so in the first nine pages of his sequel. In a methodical manner, he
offers his meditations on the creation, fall, redemption of mankind, the pain and
suffering of morality, and the difficulty of saving souls. After contemplating God’s plan
of salvation, his soul “soaring above the Clouds” as a result of these heavenly
meditations, the narrator suddenly becomes “so overwhelmed with Grief and
Melancholy” that he sits down, falls asleep, and dreams (9-10). He dreams of a
protagonist, who is mentioned infrequently by name, called Reprobate.

Before leaving on pilgrimage, Reprobate converses with Mr. Conscience and Mr.
Judgment and must get consent from Mr. Will. Two paths are discovered, one toward
the Kingdom of Darkness and the other to Celestial Paradise (11). Seven reasons are
given as to why people choose to take the Path to Hell. He sees people dancing
dangerously close to the pit of Hell, “playing with Flames that never go out” (22). These
people are cautioned and warned to “flee from the wrath to come,” and several fall into
the Pit. Reprobate hears a voice like thunder (Boanerges), telling him to repent and
become a pilgrim (25).

Similar to Bunyan’s allegory, throughout the narrative the question arises, “What
must I do to be saved?” T. S.’s pilgrim encounters a “grim and terrible,” “deformed and
ugly” malicious Devil. The Fiend commands the poor man to give up the pilgrimage, reasoning: why give your “Pleasant [E]njoyments…for something which you have never seen, felt, or enjoyed and cannot possibly be assured that they certainly are true” (52-3). Armed with a sword he continues his journey, but his Adversary sends Mr. Phansie to entice him with “something he had formerlie been verie much in Love with” (60) and the pilgrim becomes ensnared by it. He is told to flee to the City of Refuge, and on the way he climbs the hill of Self Denial, but finding it too steep and difficult, he turns to the easier and closer mountains of Confession, Prayer, Amendment of Life, Holy Duties, and Ordinances (79). He prays and hears a voice within which says “flee for thy life” (84). The pilgrim despairs and fears, but a cheerful voice tells him to go to the City of Refuge for Jesus is there ready to greet him. This news profoundly affects him, his eyes are anointed, he walks and then runs to the Gate that goes directly to the City of Refuge. Before entering, however, he must shed the things he is carrying that impede his entrance. He receives new garments and a new heart (90) and makes a covenant with Christ, who gives him promises of a new name, a stone, and eternal life (100). Then Jesus takes him to the Sacred Armory and gives him armor, a sword, and the “Engine of Prayer” (103).

During the narrative several references are made to the Inexpressible Nature of what the Dreamer is seeing. Furthermore, there is emphasis on the idea of the pilgrim going forward in his journey. At the Royal Feast—which includes many dishes that represent the death of Jesus, the Gospel Mysteries, and multiplied pardons—the King appears, and the pilgrim reviews his Covenants, promises stricter obedience, and thus
renews his Covenant (159). Finally, the pilgrim, now called Believer, draws near to Paradise; first, however, he must pass through the River Dissolution. Faith and Hope assist him in crossing the river whereupon he is welcomed by the Redeemer with outstretched arms and is presented to the Father. At this stage, T. S. reveals his hesitancy in describing Heaven, where those admitted are transformed into the likeness of God (177). The allegory concludes with the Dreamer admitting that his “eyes were too weak to behold” the Splendor of Heaven, nor “could my mortality [any] longer endure” its glory. He awakes to find himself back in the wicked, profane, and carnal World (178).

Throughout his Second Part, T. S. frequently pauses to review with the reader what he has already presented in his narrative. Such interruptions emphasize the meditative qualities of his sequel. Furthermore, these acts of reflection represent the common Puritan practice of meditation on past experiences. In his Apology T. S. had disclosed that these were, after all, “Meditations” (xii). Rather than engaging readers with exciting details about the pilgrim’s adventures, T. S. discourages such fantasies with regular halts along the way with didactic interludes. Nearly every stage in the narrative is drawn out. As mentioned earlier, for example, after nine pages the narrator finally falls asleep and dreams about the pilgrimage. At least twelve pages are devoted to describing the pilgrim’s encounter with the Fiend. Finally, nearly ninety pages are exhausted before the pilgrim makes it to the Gate and officially begins on the Way to heaven.
In considering the style of this sequel, we should review Susan’s Cook extensive analysis of T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. In the third chapter of her 1997 dissertation, “*The Pilgrim’s Progress*: Its Influence on and Relationship to Religious Fiction, 1678-1710,” Cook pays particular attention to the literary and theological structure of *The Second Part*. Besides signaling attention to how this sequel functions, a major contribution Cook offers is her suggestion that it is “structurally linked to the Book of Common Prayer and the prescribed homilies of the Church of England” (205). Cook finds linkage between T. S.’s concern with repentance and preparation for communion and the “call to reformation and renewed communion [found] in the Book of Common Prayer” (212). Additionally, she explains how the sequel is similar to

the standard homilies of the Church of England, appointed to be read in order on successive Sundays. These cover an exposition of the Christian life that is outlined in Sherman’s criticism of the content of Bunyan’s work, the first three being “A Fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture,” “Of the Misery of all Mankind” and “Of the Salvation of all Mankind.” Their brevity and intensity is found in the sermons within *The Second Part*, and is typical of the appeals Sherman makes to Anglican liturgical traditions and those of private devotion. (Cook 210)

Cook also sees similarities between T. S.’s *Second Part* and Henry Wilson’s *Spiritual Pilgrim* (1710), “another text that relies closely upon Anglican liturgy” (210).
According to Cook, the religious loyalties of T. S.’s Believer are not easily discernible. Although Cook detects, as I do, elements of Anglicanism in T. S.’s *Second Part*, she remains ambivalent about proposing that the sequel’s author is a conformist. Instead, she cites past scholars who have labeled T. S. as a General Baptist\(^{133}\) but whose sequel she interprets as “remarkably Anglican in style” (207).\(^{134}\) Cook believes that in his sequel T. S. seeks to attract Anglican readers but attempts to do so in an ecumenical manner (205-206). In the *Second Part* it is obvious that its author is opposed to High Church practice yet appeals to a church tradition and weaves a liturgical pattern in the sequel (206, 213). Cook documents the theological contradictions she finds in *Divine Breathings* and *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, two texts traditionally attributed to the same author. What I propose is that, rather than compare T. S.’s *Second Part* with *Divine Breathings*, a text he never claimed, scholars should instead utilize for comparison *Divine Breathings…the Second Part*, which T. S. did claim; by doing so, one may be able to more fully understand T. S.’s meditative, contemplative, and theological approach to writing *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. For example, in addition to insights such as the one cited previously (regarding T. S.’s concern with “deceitful Resolutions”), a study of *Divine Breathings…the Second Part* reveals (as outlined in Chapter III of this dissertation) T. S.’s imitation of the resolve genre. Traces

\(^{133}\) Cook acknowledges Whitley’s *Baptist Bibliography* as her source for the supposed affiliation of T. S. (aka Thomas Sherman) as a General Baptist. As documented in my first chapter, in November 2006 I checked the extant index of Baptist ministers compiled by Whitley currently housed at the Regent’s Park College Library, in Oxford, England, and there is no record of a seventeenth-century Baptist minister named Thomas Sherman.

\(^{134}\) One work of scholarship that Cook does not acknowledge but would have enhanced her work is Tindall’s *John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher*. In his book, Tindall frequently refers to T. S. as Thomas Sherman and discusses the theological differences between Bunyan, the Particular Baptist, and Sherman, the General Baptist.
of the resolve surface in T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*, the following excerpt serving as one illustration: “I will now therefore resolve to enter into Covenant anew as if I had never done it before” (153).

Considering the high style and Anglican elements found in T. S.’s *Second Part*, it is possible that its author is an Anglican Puritan. Although he is critical of university-trained clergy, T. S. stresses the importance of communion. The eucharistic feasting highlights the latter part of the journey when Believer attends the King’s Table for “a Royal and Plentiful Feast” of various dishes representing the body of Christ, Gospel Mysteries, and Multiplied Pardons (127, 130, 134). But T. S. is also sympathetic to Puritanism. When the pilgrim is accosted by the Fiend (later explicitly identified as Satan, the Power of Darkness), Believer is accused of being “a Traitor, a Rebel, Schismatick, a Puritan, a Precisian; that he was Headstrong, Stubborn, Disobedient, to the Church, and what not” (52). Considering the source of these accusations (the voice of Satan), the reader is led to believe that in this context all of these are desirable labels and traits. However, this author tends not to stray far from conformity. As Cook declares, “Sherman uses the liturgical patterns of self-analysis that are repeated within the life of the Christian, in the cycle of regular communion and the teachings of the church year” (213).

Even though modern critics have severely judged T. S.’s works—one scholar simply called T. S.’s writing in *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* “bad” (Wharey cvii)—this work cannot be dismissed for lack of interest among seventeenth-century
readers. In fact, the text merited four printings from 1682 through 1684.\footnote{Offor incorrectly speculated that the book “never reached a second edition, being totally eclipsed by the real Second Part, in 1684” (Works 57). T. S.’s Second Part merited three printings in London in successive years: 1682, 1683, and 1684. T. S.’s sequel was also published in Scotland with two editions printed in Edinburgh (by the King’s printer in 1684 and 1696) and in Glasgow (1736). The 1736 Glasgow edition deserves recognition for its peculiar placement. The Frank Mott Harrison Collection in the Bedford (England) Public Library holds a unique copy described in an entry in the printed Catalogue of the John Bunyan Library (Bedford, 1938). T. S.’s “spurious” Second Part is sandwiched between Bunyan’s First Part and J. B.’s Third Part. All three parts collected in this remarkable copy were printed by Carmichael and Miller between 1735 and 1737. Librarian Barry Stephenson confirms that (as of December 2006) the Bedford Library still holds this rare book (E-mail to Author).} While some readers bemoan the lack of humor in T. S.’s writing, this was precisely one of his stated objectives.\footnote{Sharrock, for example, calls T. S. “a humourless prig” (John Bunyan 139). T. R. Glover states: “There is no laughing in the book; the author promised us that, and he fulfills his promise” (252).} It is apparent from studying his Apology to the Second Part that T. S. was conscious about the intended readers he wished to engage in his sequel.\footnote{Although focused on nonconformity in early modern England, N. H. Keeble’s musings on the implied reader seem relevant to our discussion of T. S.: “Nonconformist writing presupposed a reader. Its composition was not a private pursuit for personal ends (however personal its immediate occasion and inspiration may have been), but a public service, and furthermore, a service whose full performance demanded not only diligence in writing but an equal diligence in transmitting the text to potential readers and in persuading them to acquire it, read it and act upon it. Nonconformist texts were rarely thought of as having intrinsic merit; their virtue resided in their potential to transform lives” (Literary Culture 135). As Keeble observes, “Nonconformist authors generally make it clear, on their title-pages and in their prefaces, to whom their books are primarily addressed. They characterized their intended readers in one of two ways: by their religious state or their secular calling. The former descriptions classify readers as unregenerate; as believers who have reached a particular stage of spiritual maturity; as members of particular congregations; and as adherents of a denomination” (139).} Included among those actual early modern readers was “avid bookcollector Sir William Boothby, a justice of the peace since 1660 and a devout Anglican” (Greaves, Glimpses 620). As shall be argued later in this chapter, Bunyan was not only among T. S.’s intended readers but must also be included among those who actually studied the imitative sequel.

In order to more adequately comprehend T. S.’s significance as the first critic of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, we must turn our attention back to Kaufmann’s scholarship. Besides emphasizing the influence of the Puritan meditative tradition in...
Bunyan’s writing, Kaufmann wishes to pursue a much larger argument in which he employs two key terms: *mythos* (action; also homologous with image, imagination) and *logos* (thought; synonymous with idea, reason, and the Word). Kaufmann states that the “spiritual progenitor of Puritanism, John Calvin, was oriented toward *logos* rather than *mythos* as the fit vessel of truth” (9). Kaufmann argues that the popular works of seventeenth-century authors like Baxter, Sibbes, and Bunyan begin to diffuse the Puritan mistrust of allegory and imagination, and there is a movement among Puritan authors toward *mythos*. For example, spiritual metaphors were liberally utilized and promoted by Sibbes and Baxter. This was part of “a massive program,” Kaufmann asserts, to legitimize “the imagination [i.e., *mythos*] as a faculty for glimpsing spiritual realities” (156). Hence, by choosing his method of allegory for *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Bunyan endorses the imagination as a vehicle for edification.

However, T. S.’s *Second Part* represents his public statement against that “massive program.” T. S. resists the trend that he sees in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, namely the movement away from *logos* toward *mythos*, and he wishes to correct that imaginative emphasis in Bunyan’s allegory and bring readers back to the Word. In order to do that he focuses on presenting a pilgrimage in a style more meditational and homiletic than imaginary and romantic. This explains why episodes in Bunyan’s allegory that allowed for chivalric imagination—such as the battle with Apollyon—are “effectively reduced and defused (if not simply refused) in T. S.’s version” (Davies 296). Evidence of T. S.’s stance against mythos can be detected during his description of Believer’s encounter with the Fiend. The devil enlists the assistance of Mr. Phansie,
who admits that he is “naturally inclined to Froth & Vanity and am in my Element when Actually impoy’d in your Service” (57). The Fiend instructs Mr. Phansie to employ “the strength of [his] imagination” against the pilgrim (58). Phansie successfully distracts Believer from his resolutions and promises by using “artificial glosses and smooth appearances of delight and advantage” (63). These methods practiced by Mr. Phansie resemble those which T. S. in his Apology employs in his criticism of Bunyan’s style. As Davies points out, the allegorical figure of Mr. Phansie “enables [T. S.] to embody his criticism of The Pilgrim’s Progress within the very texture of his own narrative and not just from the distant pages of [his] prefatory apology” (297).138

Although T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress is more sermonic, emphasizing logos or the Word, it lacks the marginal documentation of scripture references (unlike Bunyan’s version which includes extensive documentation of biblical references in the gloss).139 The hortatory style of The Second Part is reminiscent of T. S.’s revision of Divine Breathings published just two years prior to his pilgrimage sequel. Similar to Divine Breathings...The Second Part, which lacks the depth of personal candor and the intimacy of the “eloquent I” found in the meditations of Divine Breathings, the persistent homiletic style of T. S.’s Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress directs the reader’s attention away from the characters and the action toward

138 Both Cook and Davies acknowledge T. S.’s criticism of Bunyan’s style, but they do not utilize Kaufmann’s argument as I have done. While Davies shows some familiarity with Kaufmann’s work, he does not employ Kaufmann in his discussion of T. S.’s sequel. Unfortunately, Cook does not document any awareness of Kaufmann’s prior scholarship in her writing on T. S.

139 Stephen Dobranski states: “The common practice of printing marginal notes also allowed a text to engage in conversation with other writings. By indicating Biblical citations and source materials, marginalia expanded textual authority to include works by other writers while paradoxically bolstering credibility of the author who cited them—much like footnotes in modern scholarly editions” (Milton 28). See also Evelyn B. Tribble’s Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England.
the subject being taught. Unlike the allegorical imagination and narrative genius of Bunyan found in *Pilgrim’s Progress*, T. S.’s mission is pedagogical: as Cook notes, “To teach is the overriding passion of Sherman” (204).

In addition to criticizing Bunyan’s method of using imaginative narrative to convey spiritual truths, T. S. challenges the doctrinal content of the original allegory. Among the theological deficiencies T. S. identified in *Pilgrim’s Progress*, which he then emphasizes in his corrective sequel, are church organization, communion, and “the general rather than the particular call” (Tindall 64). Thus, T. S.’s relevance in the history of criticism of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* must also be reckoned by his careful, attentive reading of the allegory’s theology. Modern critics can learn from T. S.’s approach to analyzing Bunyan’s work. As Davies succinctly explains:

But whereas most modern criticism emphasizes how the story of Bunyan’s text can and should be read in spite of its abhorrent theological content, Sherman’s response evinces an exact inversion of the approach. For him, the problem with *The Pilgrim’s Progress* is not that theology gets in the way of the fable but that the fable obfuscates the theology.

(298)

As emphasized in this chapter, T. S.’s critical response in his *Second Part* focuses on the importance of meditation in religious life. As suggested in Chapter III, emblem books were extremely popular in the seventeenth century and encouraged meditative interpretation. Attempting to further imitate Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* and also to promote meditative reading of T. S.’s sequel, the 1683 edition published by
Thomas Malthus in London includes two emblems. One emblem appears as the frontispiece opposite the title page, mimicking the famous frontispiece portrait of Bunyan “the Dreamer, better known as ‘the sleeping portrait, engraved by Robert White” found in early editions of Pilgrim’s Progress (Wharey & Sharrock xxxviii). The frontispiece emblem of the Second Part features a male figure dressed in clerical garb with a skull cap sitting with his eyes closed, leaning his head on his hand in the posture of dreaming. To the right of the dreamer is another male figure dressed in clerical garb wearing a brimmed hat; standing with outstretched hands he is depicted in the act of preaching, these words proceeding out of his mouth: “Except yee repent yee shall all Likewise perish.” Both figures are placed outdoors in a natural landscape. Descending down from heaven is a revelatory, scriptural promise—“He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the Second death but I will give him a Crowne of Life”—a melding of two verses, Revelations 2:10-11, in the King James Version.

The second emblem is placed in the book as page 26. It presents a circle of finely dressed men and women dancing outdoors around a huge pit. Three of the fourteen individuals dancing have either jumped or fallen into the pit. There is one additional male figure in the background, much taller than the others, who is running off the right, fleeing the scene with his mouth gaping open and his head turned back at the revelers. This emblem provides a visual aid for readers representing the following passage found in the narrative:

---

140 The artist of these emblems, neither of which contains a signature, remains anonymous.
I went towards the plain, and as I drew nearer, I perceived there was a large hollow Circle or Cavern in the midst of them…and going to the brink thereof looked in, and lo to my Amazement and Wonder, I then plainly perceived that they were all of them Dancing about a Pit that was bottomless, and playing with Flames that never go out; and as I stood there, methoughts I could hear the horrible out-cries and dismal screeches of the Damned, and the Ratling of the chains, and the Fiery Shackles of the prisoners of Hell…I suddenly started back, and fled for my life. (21-22)

To further attract the attention of the reader, R. B. (who, as discussed earlier, provided an endorsement of T. S.’s work in the first edition) authors a poetic, prefatory section, “Explanation of the two Emblems,” included in this second printing, and placed between the Dedication and R. B.’s endorsement (“To the Ingenious Author”). R. B. leads the reader in a meditative interpretation of the emblems. He explains that Jezebel, the figure with the tambourine, “leads the dance,” while the person fleeing the scene is “[t]he ‘frighted Pilgrim’ who seeks “a safer Way.” Regarding the frontispiece, R. B. explains:

In the next page, the friendly Preacher stands
Telling their Danger, with up lifted hands:
Indulgent Heaven offers them a Crown;
But thoughts of Heav’n in sensual Frolicks drown.
According to this explanation, it seems that initial plans envisioned these two emblems to be placed side-by-side in the published text. The two emblems were designed to fit into the same visual panorama: the Preacher faces to the right in the direction of the intended audience—the dancers parading around the pit of Tophet—and addresses the call of repentance to them. “But,” as R. B. reports, “thoughts of Heav’n in sensual Frolicks drown.” Instead, as placed in extant copies of this edition, the emblems are separated, and the frontispiece’s evangelist preaches his message of repentance to the adjacent title page—his desired congregation is hidden deeper inside the text (located, as noted above, on page 26). In sum, the inclusion of these emblems marks the attempts of the author, editors, and printer not only to imitate Bunyan’s successful allegory but also to emphasize to readers the meditative nature of T. S.’s sequel.

To reiterate my argument, by offering this sequel T. S. is following the invitation to imitate Pilgrim’s Progress. As an opportunistic, imitative sequel writer, T. S. writes the type of sequel that Bunyan was not yet ready, at that point in 1682, to produce. Consider the following observation by theorists of sequel writing, Paul Budra and Betty A. Schellenberg:

Poststructuralism and cultural materialism have taught us that the public sphere in which the original text takes place must be considered both as a marketplace and as a discursive space, which can, in both of these forms, be constructed not only by writers, publishers, texts, and readers, but also

---

141 Of the earliest printings of T. S.’s Second Part, the 1683 edition by published by Tho. Malthus in London is the only version to include these two emblems described above. In contrast, the famous frontispiece portrait of Bunyan the Dreamer is included in most of the seventeenth-century editions of Pilgrim’s Progress (commencing with the third edition of 1679). Also, beginning with the fifth edition in 1680, Nathaniel Ponder includes copper cut illustrations depicting various scenes from Bunyan’s allegory.
by other actors such as agents, pirates, advertisers, imitators, and reviewers. (4)

Granted, T. S.’s motivation for imitating may have been partially fueled by monetary ambitions; however, by providing his Second Part, T. S. enters into public discourse with Bunyan, offering to the renowned Baptist author a creative but formal statement of his position regarding issues of literary style and theological doctrine. In the process of doing so, T. S. engages Bunyan in an intertextual dialogue.

When composing his critique, T. S. had Bunyan in mind as one of his intended readers. His carefully constructed Apology reveals T. S.’s rhetorical strategies: although he commends Bunyan for producing “that necessary and useful Tract” (i.e., Pilgrim’s Progress), T. S. also documents the inherent dangers which he perceives in Bunyan’s imaginative, entertaining style of writing (xii). He is concerned about the lightmindedness and “laughter” which some parts of Bunyan’s allegory promote in the “vain and frothy minds” of certain readers (xiii).

Unlike Bunyan’s heated public debates with the Quakers (most notably Edward Burrough) which occurred approximately twenty-five years prior to 1682, T. S.’s rebuttal regarding those defects he sees in Bunyan’s style and theology is much less combative. If he had intended to humiliate or attack Bunyan, T. S.’s choices would have reflected that purpose. For example, by choosing to add “Second Part” to the title, he softens the blow. Unlike the spurious attempt of another author who would eventually

---

142 According to Tindall’s research, T. S. is not the only author to refer to The Pilgrim’s Progress as a tract (see p. 274, n. 51).

143 For details on the Bunyan-Burrough debates, see Greaves’ Glimpses of Glory, pp. 75-86.
publish a *Third Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* in 1696 and places the initials “J. B.” on its title page, T. S. does not try to deceive the public into thinking he is Bunyan. Instead, in his *Second Part* T. S. provides a methodical, logical, and civil critical response to those areas of concern he detected in his active, meditative reading of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*.

Rather than conceive of them only as opponents, it is possible to consider that T. S. and Bunyan were associates. Furthermore, we may even speculate that they were among a circle of authors who, in a coterie-like fashion, shared pre-published manuscripts and discussed ideas for future literary projects. I found inspiration for developing this theory in several phrases Susan Cook proffers in a published essay summarizing her dissertation research on those writers who produced derivative versions of *Pilgrim’s Progress*. Cook declares her desire “to make the case for …reassess[ing] … their worth as partners with, and not merely followers of, Bunyan within a religious culture that valued the sharing of narratives and looked to the solidarity of repeated patterns in conversion and the Christian life” (“Derivative Texts” 186). Furthermore, Cook intimates that this group of imitators “may legitimately be said to constitute a loose writing group” (189). I wish to theorize on that possibility by considering the following pieces of evidence.

By examining and comparing Bunyan’s post-*Pilgrim’s Progress* writings with T. S.’s work, I detected similarities that merit closer attention. First of all, Bunyan’s *Mr. Badman* (1680), his initial attempt to provide a sequel to his blockbuster allegory, addresses a problem in a fashion that resembles T. S.’s *Youth’s Tragedy* (1671).
Although *Badman* is prose and *Youth’s Tragedy* is poetry, these works provide similar tales of individuals who resist conversion; Tindall recognizes and suggests a correspondence between these works (234).

Additionally, Davies observes similarities between Bunyan’s *Holy War* and T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress* (299). Both emphasize feasting and meditation and include identical allegorical characters (such as Boanerges and Conscience). Such evidence evokes questions as to how close Bunyan and T. S. may have been. Was T. S. among Bunyan’s circle of preliminary screeners or readers and perhaps even a confidant or advisor? Perhaps while T. S. was working on publishing his sequel as a formal response to Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, he was already orally discussing with Bunyan his concerns and ideas which would be included in his imitative sequel. Simultaneously, Bunyan may have adopted some of T. S.’s suggestions and ideas and incorporated them into *Mr. Badman* and *Holy War*, the latter work published, coincidentally, in 1682, the same year as T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. Regardless of whether or not they were close associates, it is evident that Bunyan thoughtfully studied T. S.’s corrective sequel and T. S.’s criticism of his allegory, as shall be shown later in this chapter.

During the year 1680, *Pilgrim’s Progress* continued to captivate readers and increased the author’s notoriety as a godly author—Ponder, for example, issuing fifth and sixth editions of the popular allegory; meanwhile, the release of Bunyan’s *Mr. Badman* generated little appeal among readers. Intended and packaged as a sequel to *Pilgrim’s Progress*, *Mr. Badman* performed dismally in the marketplace—only two
editions were published in England between 1680 and 1687—and it “failed to satisfy the public demand for more of the original allegory” (Wharey, “Introduction” cv). By publishing his criticism in the form of his 1682 “Supplyment”, T. S. plays a significant role by prompting questions about the appropriate subject for a sequel to the pilgrimage allegory. What should a sequel to Pilgrim’s Progress look like? Badman and his downward spiral to hell obviously did not fulfill readers’ expectations. T. S. proffers a meditative version, imitating the pilgrimage experience of Christian, which, unlike Badman, resulted in three printings in three years.

Witnessing that success prompted Bunyan to write an authentic sequel. As T. R. Glover declared, T. S.’s Second Part is important because “it spurred Bunyan on to write his own Second Part” (252). If Greaves is correct in his speculation that Bunyan wrote Part Two sometime between February and October of 1684 (Glimpses 499) then two or three printings of T. S.’s Second Part had already been published. Bunyan took notice of the cordial reception that T. S.’s Second Part experienced; inspired by T. S.’s version, Bunyan decided to stick with the motif of a pilgrimage to the Celestial City and wrote a sequel that features Christian’s wife, Christiana, and their children, who collectively follow the footsteps of his journey. Along the way, they reflect and meditate on the pilgrimage of Christian. Bunyan had learned an important lesson from T. S., Lynch notes: “Sherman’s sequel demonstrated that public appetite for a sequel to The Pilgrim’s Progress lay not in a soteriological counterpart, with its unsettling spiritual and ethical implications, but in more of the same” (155).
T. S.’s impact has been recognized by Bunyan scholars who identify those overt changes in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress... the Second Part* (1684) and credit T. S. for inspiring those alterations. According to Tindall, in response to the defects (e.g., emphasis on the individual, neglect of church ordinances and conversion) detected by T. S.,

Bunyan described in his own second part the conduct of a church under Greateheart, which distinguished it as Baptist. The feast at the Porter’s lodge, at which communicants piously consumed ‘Lamb with the accustomed Sauce belonging thereto,’ was a concession to T. S., as were the allegorical communions suggested by the pills compounded ‘ex Carne et Sanguine Christi’ and the meal at the house of Gaius. Before having been admitted to the eucharist, some of the original group had benefited by an initiating bath of sanctification at the Interpreter’s House, and had been sealed into the fellowship of the traveling conventicler. And apparently in answer to T. S.’s advocacy of the general call, Christiana received an individual letter from God, ‘smelling after the manner of the best Perfume,’ and asking her particularly to set out. (64-65)

Additionally, there is greater emphasis on the benefits of spiritual community in Bunyan’s *Second Part*. Baptist historian Whitley admits that Bunyan “profited by the hint of T. S. and proceeded to sketch a more social type of religion in the pilgrimage of Christiana Mercy and the four boys” (*History of British Baptists* 139).
Bunyan had previously acknowledged his hesitancy when deciding whether or not to publish the original *Pilgrim’s Progress*; in his Apology to part one he exhibits a self-consciousness and concern about his method and style. Upon completing *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Bunyan discloses that he

shew’d them [to] others, that [he] might see whether

They would condemn them, or them justifie:

And some said, let them live; some, let them die:

Some said, John, print it; others said, Not so:

Some said, It might do good; other said, No. (4)

Despite these divided opinions, Bunyan decides to go forward with its publication even though some of his friends and associates (perhaps T. S. was among that coterie) attempted to dissuade him from doing so. Consequently, in his Apology to part one Bunyan goes to great lengths to defend his method and style of using “dark and cloudy words,” “Metaphors,” “Dark Figures, Allegories” (6). James Rendel Harris explains “that Bunyan was obliged to invoke the argument from style to protect himself” (350). To aid in defending himself, Bunyan employs scriptural documentation in the margins of the text to aid readers in interpreting his metaphors, and he also places a scripture—“I have used Similitudes” from Hosea 12:10—on the title pages of both his first and second parts to justify his method.

When prefacing his authorized sequel, *Pilgrim’s Progress...the Second Part*, first published by Ponder in 1684, Bunyan selects an alternate heading for his *de facto* apology: “The Author’s Way of Sending Forth His Second Part of the Pilgrim” (159). In
a manner perhaps mimicking T. S.’s outline of the perceived four-fold defects in Bunyan’s allegory, Bunyan methodically answers four problems or objects. First, he addresses the question of authenticity and authorship, acknowledging that others have attempted to imitate his writing:

‘Tis true, some have of late, to Counterfeit
My Pilgrim, to their own, my Title set;
Yea others, half my Name and Title too;
Have stitched to their Book, to make them do…. (160).

In this passage above, he alludes to T. S.’s project but also reveals that other imitative works had appeared, more spurious in appearance and motives, which attempted to deceive readers into thinking their books were produced by Bunyan. Secondly, Bunyan wishes to calm an angry mob of critics who rage against him. To pacify those raucous naysayers, Bunyan proudly reports how his “Pilgrims Book has travel’d Sea and Land,” achieving international recognition, esteemed by readers in France, Holland, Ireland, and New England (161). Thirdly, he must again (as he did in his Apology to Part One) defend his literary style because

some there be that say he laughs too loud;
And some do say his Head is in a Cloud.

Some say, his Words and Storys are so dark,

---

144 Albert B. Cook III’s concise study—“John Bunyan and John Dunton: a Case of Plagiarism,” Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 71.1 (1977): 11-28—considers possible candidates that Bunyan may be referring to “That Counterfeit [his] Pilgrim.” As stated earlier in this chapter, those who label T. S.’s Second Part as spurious are uninformed regarding this critic’s agenda. For examples of spurious works, examine Suspiria Divina (1705) by E. H.—see my description of this text in chapter two—and The Third Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress (1693) by J. B.—see Susan Cook’s dissertation research on this text (pp. 170-202).
In his rebuttal of T. S., who desired to “prevent that lightness and laughter, which the reading some passages [in Pilgrim’s Progress], occasion in some vain and frothy minds” (T. S., Second Part of Pilgrim’s Progress xiii), Bunyan argues for the spiritually didactic benefits of using similitudes, which “on the Fancie more it self intrude, / And will stick faster in the Heart and Head, / Then things from Similies not borrowed” (163).

Nevertheless, Bunyan announces that his Second Part will enlighten readers regarding those previously challenging passages found in Part One. What was “conceal’d” in the first allegory will be “reveal’d” by Christiana in the sequel. Although Bunyan does not admit to it, this will be accomplished in his Second Part by modeling his sequel in a format more like T. S.’s sequel—meditative and contemplative as Christian’s journey is reviewed and revisited. Fourthly, addressing those who object to his “method” and call it rubbish because it is “romance,” Bunyan concludes that he cannot entice everyone since each individual has personal reading preferences equivalent to the diversity of palates. By the end of this prefatory section, Bunyan pretends to convey an attitude of indifference toward his audience of critics. He surmises that since not everyone can be pleased, he will dedicate his Second Part to receptive, charitable readers: “To Friends, not foes: to Friends that will give place / To, thee, thy Pilgrims, and thy words imbrace” (163).

Bunyan’s problem—his hypersensitivity to the methods utilized by respondents such as T. S.—and T. S.’s actions may be partially explained by reviewing and applying Roland Barthes’ proposals found in his essay “From Work to Text.” Assuming Roland
Barthes’ theory that, unlike a work, the Text “is read without the father’s signature” (78), then T. S. has license to tackle the Text of Pilgrim’s Progress and do what he wishes with it or to it. Barthes declares that “no vital respect is owed to the Text: it can be broken” (78) and, we can add (as learned from the case of T. S.’s interaction with the pilgrimage text): amended. “The Text can be read without its father’s guarantee,” and, Barthes suggests, “the restitution of the intertext paradoxically abolishes the concept of filiation. It is not that the author cannot ‘come back’ into the Text, into his text; however, he can only do so as a ‘guest,’ so to speak” (78).

At a time when Bunyan’s authorial reputation was solidifying and burgeoning, it is important to recognize and sympathize with Bunyan’s natural impulse to possess and claim ownership of his literary works, especially his celebrated pilgrim. Bunyan does not wish to let go of his work; he wants to own it, protect it, and control how his readers interpret it. Like an artist who must risk the misinterpretation of her painting when releasing it to the public, so also Bunyan the writer, when publishing his Pilgrim’s Progress, releases his text into a space that may be potentially hostile to it. That space, as Barthes asserts, is a “social space that leaves no language safe or untouched” (81). Even though Bunyan desires that his allegory make his reader an active pilgrim, he has little control over how the reader enacts his agency in participating (or not). T. S.’s impulse to respond, to imitate, to add a “Supplyment” is justifiable within Barthes’ view of the Text, since the Text “requires an attempt to abolish (or at least lessen) the distance between writing and reading…by linking the two together in a single signifying process” (79). T. S. was, in a sense, an early modern pre-Barthesian critic because he viewed
Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* as a Text that “asks the reader for an active collaboration” (80). This is evident by T. S. offering a corrective sequel, one that emphasizes meditation rather than imagination.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

As evident in Chapter II, identifying T. S. as Thomas Sherman has been called into question. From the results of my research, we must conclude at this point that the entire identification rests on the shoulders of Victorian bibliophile James Bindley, and that the primary piece of evidence that is crucial to labeling T. S. as Thomas Sherman is undiscovered, namely Bindley’s copy of *Youth’s Tragedy*. Until that copy is located, I suggest that caution be taken in identifying this T. S. as Thomas Sherman.

Furthermore, the common practice of referring to this author as a General Baptist must also be questioned. I was unsuccessful in locating any biographical details of a nonconformist by this name. He is not listed in the directory of Baptist ministers found at the Regents Park College Library in Oxford, England, an index compiled by noted Baptist historian W. T. Whitley—who exhibited an awareness of Sherman but never documented his sources for labeling this author as a Baptist. Instead, there are several Anglican clergymen named Thomas Sherman that may serve as candidates. As discussed in Chapter IV, there are hints of Anglicanism in T. S.’s *Second Part of the Pilgrim’s Progress*. It is possible that this T. S. was a member of the Church of England who was sympathetic toward Puritanism.

As for definitively solving the case of T. S., that may never be possible. However, the work that I have performed may open the door for others to conduct further research on this attribution. It would be particularly interesting to perform a
computer-assisted, stylistics analysis of writings attributed to T. S. and Michael Renniger and also include writings by Joseph Hall and John Bunyan as control groups. This information may be useful when coupled with my research on the internal and external evidence provided in this dissertation.

My analysis in Chapter III of *Divine Breathings* represents the first scholarly attempt to provide a critical examination of this meditative work. However, I echo Matthew Brown’s suggestion that much more scholarship needs to be engaged in studying early modern devotional steady sellers; these texts have been neglected for too long, and it is time to remedy that problem.

More generally, it has become apparent that there is a need for further developing a theory of imitation in early modern literature. Although my analysis has introduced and emphasized several suggestions regarding imitation, more work needs to be done in constructing a theory that may explain the common practice of imitation among early modern writers. Harold Ogden White’s study, *Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance* (1935), invites augmentation, and Paulina Kewes’s collection of essays focuses primarily on plagiarism rather than imitation. As Bertrand A. Goldgar suggests, “Somebody needs to write White’s book all over again” (219).145

Sequel writing as a genre is another field of scholarship that beckons attention. Although sequels are ubiquitous in English literature, as Paul Budra and Betty

---

145 One work referenced in Chapter IV, Gerard Genette’s *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, is an important text not only for its survey of imitative texts but also for its attention to distinguishing and categorizing terms such as imitation, parody, satire, pastiche, and travesty. In his essay, “Forgery, Plagiarism, Imitation, Pegleggery,” Nick Groom considers the term *imitation* but does not present an extensive theory of imitation.
Schellenberg declare, “virtually nothing has been written about the phenomenon” (3). Although this study has considered sequels, particularly works that may appear to be sequels but may actually function more appropriately as critical responses to the original, this dissertation has only scratched the surface of a much larger theoretical project available to be undertaken or assumed by future scholars. As evident by the sequels examined in this dissertation, the field of early modern literature seems particularly fertile; numerous opportunities await scholars willing to explore the phenomena of sequels in seventeenth-century British literature.

146 Budra and Schellenberg’s collection of essays titled Part Two: Reflections on the Sequel makes an important and historic contribution and establishes a foundation for future work on the genre of sequel writing; however, what it lacks is attention to sequels in religious writing. In its rudimentary and professed “broad overview of a chronological shift in sequel forms,” it fails to acknowledge allegory, meditations, and devotional writing among those forms. This neglect denies the impact steady sellers like Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress had and the profusion of imitative texts and sequels it spawned.

147 A simple search performed on Early English Books Online, for example, yielded hundreds of early modern works that include “Second Part” in their titles.
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APPENDIX A

PRINTING HISTORY OF *D*IVINE *B*REATHTHINGS

Notes: 1) Those titles listed in **bold** are a variation of the original title.
   2) An asterisk (*) denotes that that particular edition was anthologized or included with other works.
   3) The † sign indicates that I have personally examined a copy of the material book, a photocopy, or an electronic copy of that particular edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: R. Pawlett</td>
<td>4th ed.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: R. Pawlett</td>
<td>5th ed.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: R. Pawlett</td>
<td>6th ed.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: E. Pawlett</td>
<td>7th ed.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: E. Pawlett</td>
<td>8th ed.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td><em>Pious Soul’s D.B.</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Blare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td><em>Suspiria Divina</em> †</td>
<td>London: Browne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>Boston: B. Green</td>
<td>10th ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em></td>
<td>London: W. Innin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em></td>
<td>London: G. Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: G. Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: Scratcherd</td>
<td>16th ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td><em>Devout Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>Glasgow: Bryce</td>
<td>16th ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>Philadelphia: Gibbons</td>
<td>1st American ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148 Only one extant copy has been located and it is held at the Clark Memorial Library.

149 No extant copies have been located. This edition was advertised in the *Term Catalogues* (see Arber I, p. 123).

150 Only one extant copy has been located and it is held at the British Library.

151 Extant copies of this edition are held at the Cambridge and University of Iowa libraries.

152 Only one extant copy has been located and it is held at the Clark Memorial Library.

153 Extant copies of this edition are held at the British and Dr. Williams’s libraries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Bennington: Haswell</td>
<td>1st Vermont ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Leeds: Geo. Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Leeds: Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804?</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Portsmouth, NH: Treadwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Philadelphia: J. Kay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Philadelphia: Dickinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Philadelphia: Fordyce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td><em>Pious Meditations</em>†</td>
<td>Poughkeepsie, NY: Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>New York: J. C. Totten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Brookfield: E. Merriam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Nottingham: Sutton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Bennington: D. Clark</td>
<td>19th American ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Gazette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>London: J. Nisbet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td><strong>Devout Breathings</strong>†</td>
<td>Glasgow: Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Philadelphia: G. Latimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Book Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>5th ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Lowell: Holmes and Piper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Lowell: R. Fellows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td><strong>Ardent Aspirations</strong>†</td>
<td>Philadelphia Tract Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Otley, Wm. Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850?</td>
<td><strong>Gift of Piety</strong>†</td>
<td>NY: J. Q. Preble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850?</td>
<td><strong>Gift of Piety</strong>†</td>
<td>Boston: G. W. Cottrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850?</td>
<td><strong>Gift of Piety</strong>†</td>
<td>Boston: J. Buffum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

154 This edition is a remarkable one: it is titled, *The Minor Works of John Bunyan*, and promises to contain: *The Water of Life, Solomon’s Temple, Christ a Complete Saviour, Divine Breathings, and Grace Abounding*. According to bibliographical records, Bunyan never wrote a work titled *Divine Breathings*. Is it possible that this is the anonymously written meditative work, *Divine Breathings*? Unfortunately, extant copies of this edition identified in my research contain only the first three works—both *Divine Breathings* and *Grace Abounding* are missing. Either these two works were never included in printed editions or perhaps, because of their popularity, they were removed by readers from the book and studied separately.

155 An extant copy of this edition has yet to be located; it was referred to by J. O. in *Notes & Queries* (April 26, 1879), p. 336.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td><em>Devout Breathings</em>†</td>
<td>Edinburgh: Religious Tract and Book Society of Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: Pickering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em></td>
<td>New York: Dodd, Mead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: Pickering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: Suttaby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PRINTING HISTORY OF YOUTH’S COMEDY

Note: The † sign indicates that I have personally examined a copy of the material book, a photocopy, or an electronic copy of that particular edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Youth’s Comedy †</td>
<td>London: N. Ponder</td>
<td>1st ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694?</td>
<td>Youth’s Comedy</td>
<td>London: J. Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Youth’s Comedy</td>
<td>London: W. Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

156 Extant copies are held at the Huntington, Folger, British, and Canterbury Cathedral libraries.

157 No extant copies have been located. This edition was advertised in the Term Catalogues (see Arber II, pp. 530-531).

158 No extant copies have been located. This edition was advertised in the Term Catalogues (see Arber III, p. 297).
APPENDIX C

PRINTING HISTORY OF *YOUTH’S TRAGEDY*

Note: The † sign indicates that I have personally examined a copy of the material book, a photocopy, or an electronic copy of that particular edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td><em>Youth’s Tragedy</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Starkey and F. Smith</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td><em>Youth’s Tragedy</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Starkey and F. Smith</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td><em>Youth’s Tragedy</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Starkey and F. Smith</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td><em>Youth’s Tragedy</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Starkey and F. Smith</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td><em>Youth’s Tragedy</em> †</td>
<td>London: N. Hillier&lt;sup&gt;163&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td><em>Youth Undone</em> †</td>
<td>London: T. Ilive&lt;sup&gt;164&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>159</sup> I have personally examined extant copies held at the Huntington, Bodleian, and Newberry libraries. According to WorldCat and individual library catalogues, other copies can be found at Yale and Miami (Ohio) University libraries.

<sup>160</sup> The Folger Library holds an extant copy of this edition.

<sup>161</sup> I have personally examined extant copies of this edition held at the Huntington and Bodleian libraries.

<sup>162</sup> I have personally examined extant copies of this edition held at the Ransom, Bodleian, and British libraries. I have also examined digital images of the copy held at the University of Illinois Library.

<sup>163</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the Bodleian Library.

<sup>164</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the Bodleian Library.
APPENDIX D

PRINTING HISTORY OF *DIVINE BREATHINGS...THE SECOND PART*

Note: The † sign indicates that I have personally examined a copy of the material book, a photocopy, or an electronic copy of that particular edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings II</em> †</td>
<td>London: N. Ponder</td>
<td>1st&lt;sup&gt;165&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803?</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em>&lt;sup&gt;166&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Bristol: Harris and Bryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td><em>Divine Breathings</em> †</td>
<td>London: J. Dennett&lt;sup&gt;167&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td><em>Manual of Practical Contemplations</em> †</td>
<td>Schenectady: Magoffin&lt;sup&gt;168&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td><em>Christian Counsel</em> †</td>
<td>London: Simpkin and Marshall&lt;sup&gt;169&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td><em>Christian Counsel</em> †</td>
<td>Kingston: J. Attfield&lt;sup&gt;170&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td><em>Aids to the Divine Life</em> †</td>
<td>Liverpool: E. Howell&lt;sup&gt;171&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td><em>Aids to the Divine Life</em> †</td>
<td>London: Griffith, Farran, &amp; Co.&lt;sup&gt;172&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>165</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

<sup>166</sup> No extant copies of this edition have been located; W. C. B. refers to this edition in *Notes & Queries* (Dec. 25, 1879), p. 575.

<sup>167</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

<sup>168</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

<sup>169</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

<sup>170</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

<sup>171</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library. Other copies can be found at California Baptist University Library, Bodleian Library, and the National Library of Scotland.

<sup>172</sup> I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the Bodleian Library.
APPENDIX E

PRINTING HISTORY OF SECOND PART OF THE PILGRIM’S PROGRESS

Note: The † sign indicates that I have personally examined a copy of the material book, a photocopy, or an electronic copy of that particular edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Place/Publisher</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Second Part of PP †</td>
<td>London: G. Larkin</td>
<td>[3rd] 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Second Part of PP †</td>
<td>Edinburgh: A. Anderson</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Second Part of PP</td>
<td>Edinburgh: heirs of A. Anderson</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Second Part of PP</td>
<td>Glasgow: R. Sanders</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Second Part of PP †</td>
<td>Glasgow: Carmichael and Millar</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Second Part of PP †</td>
<td>Glasgow: J. Hall</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

173 I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.

174 I have personally examined extant copies of this edition held at the British, New York Public, Huntington, and Clark Memorial libraries.

175 I have personally examined extant copies of this edition held at the Bodleian and Huntington libraries.

176 I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the Huntington Library.

177 An extant copy of this edition is held by the National Library of Scotland.

178 An extant copy of this edition is held by the National Library of Scotland.

179 I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the New York Public Library. An extant copy of this edition is also held by the Bedford (England) Central Library.

180 I have personally examined an extant copy of this edition held at the British Library.
APPENDIX F

ALEXANDER GARDYNE

According to other published submissions to Notes and Queries, J. O. experienced “a long residence in India” (“Boyle’s Works” 275) and shared his observations about the bookselling practices in Calcutta (“Bookselling in Calcutta”199-200). Likewise, Alexander Gardyne, according to his obituary, had resided not only in Hackney, London, but also earlier in Calcutta and Mauritius (Shipwreck 65). Gardyne kept a journal dated 1827-1828 recording his journey aboard the Reliance from Deal, Kent, England to Calcutta (Gardyne, “Journal”). He would have been about 26 or 27 years old during that expedition and may have stayed in India for nearly 20 years before returning to England. Gardyne also kept a journal that tells of his unfortunate journey that originated in Calcutta. On his way back to England in 1846 Gardyne and others traveling aboard the Trio were shipwrecked on the island of Rodrigues (Shipwreck 7).181

Relatively few additional biographical details are known about Alexander Gardyne; for example, he is not included in the Dictionary of National Biography. Given his reputation as a book collector, it is also surprising that he is not mentioned in Seymour De Ricci’s work on English Collectors of Books & Manuscripts (1530-1930). He was born around 1801 to Scottish aristocrats David Gardyne and Anne Ritchie, descendants of the ancient Barony of Gardyne. This Victorian gentleman (who

---

181 Gardyne was shipwrecked on the reefs of Rodrigues on board the bark TRIO in 1846 and kept an epistolary diary addressed to his mother. These letters, written on the reverse side of bank checks, were published in a book, The Shipwreck of the bark Trio at Rodrigues 6th March 1846: A Diary of Alexander Gardyne, compiled by Jean Brouard.
frequently attached “Esq.” to his signature) evidently enjoyed sufficient wealth that allowed for ample leisure time to travel and pursue other interests. A footnote found in the preface to the aforementioned published diary detailing his shipwreck experience simply states that Gardyne “was a learned intellectual and bibliophile” (Shipwreck 3). If Gardyne is J. O., his active and frequent participation in Notes and Queries discussions from 1851 till at least 1879 reveals his bibliomania and dedication to independent scholarly pursuits.  

Several of J. O.’s published submissions in Notes and Queries attest to his interest in Scottish studies (“George Chalmers” 58; “Scottish Union” 252). Gardyne amassed what was described as a “very extensive and remarkable collection of works illustrating the history, topography, biography, and poetry of Scotland” (“Gardyne Library” 12). According to another source, Gardyne was “a gentleman who may well be classed among the foremost collectors of his day” (“Gardyne Collection” 141). Most notable is Gardyne’s interest in collecting works of Scottish poetry, from which he made the year before his death “a most handsome donation…to the Mitchell Library in Glasgow (Shipwreck 62). In fact, the advertisement for the sale of his library boasted that his collection of various editions Robert Burns’s works was likely the most complete and valuable of its kind (Shipwreck 62). Gardyne’s love for Burns’s poetry may help answer the question: Why would Gardyne choose the use the initials “J. O.”? First of all, the manuscript note found in Gardyne’s copy of Youth’s Tragedy eventually published in the June 16, 1855 edition of Notes and Queries is signed “Jo.” Unlike the

---

182 J. O.’s first published submission in Notes and Queries was a query about George Chalmers on July 26, 1851 (58).
other initials handwritten in this note, such as “T. S.” and “Y.T.” (Youth’s Tragedy), which are much more deliberate and printed with a period and space separating the capital letters, the concluding signature lacks these characteristics. The capital “J” is connected in a continuous fashion to a lower case “o”. There is a period placed after the “o” and there is a small mark under the “o” but if it was intended it almost seems an afterthought. As it reads, “Jo.” seems to indicate an abbreviation for a first name such as “John” or “Joseph.” Unfortunately, it is currently unknown if Gardyne possessed a middle name. However, given his affinity for Robert Burns (1759-1796) he may have chosen pseudonymous initials or, in this case, an abbreviated name to use when submitting to Notes and Queries; recall how earlier in this narrative Gardyne and others were admonished by editor Thoms to submit contributions anonymously. Burns wrote a poem titled, “John Anderson, my Jo” which may have been Gardyne’s source for selecting the pseudonym “Jo.” The opening stanza reads:

> John Anderson, my jo, John,

> When we were first acquent,

> Your locks were like the raven,

> Your bonnie brow was brent;

> But now your brow is beld, John,

> Your locks are like the snow;

> But blessings on your frosty pow,

183 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, ‘jo’ is an old Scottish word used from the 16th through the 19th Centuries as a term of endearment towards a beloved one; it also was used in the 16th Century to denote joy or pleasure.
John Anderson, my jo! (Burns 569-570)

The editor may not have understood that the signature “Jo.” was meant to be an abbreviation and instead interpreted it to be an initialism and inserted a period between the letters.184

Although it is possible that Gardyne could have used the initials of “A. G.” in some of his submissions to Notes and Queries, it seems unlikely. There is an “A. G.” who contributes to Notes and Queries beginning with its initial issue in 1850, and there continues to be other submissions similarly signed through at least 1875 (“Chinese Pirates” 337; “Hymnes and Spiritual Songs” 261; “Remarkable Edition of Bunyan” 264; “Index” 548; “Remarkable Edition of Bunyan” 64). In the earliest submissions, A. G. signs with Ecclesfield designated as his residence (“Burning the Dead” 308; “Miniature Gibbet &c.” 248). However, there is no evidence showing that Gardyne ever resided in Ecclesfield, a village in Sheffield, England.

---

184 There is a signature of a “Jo. Gorges” found in a copy of a book that also bears Gardyne’s stamp, a book currently advertised online for sale by Krown and Spellman, California booksellers: The Psalms of King David, translated by King James I, King of England. ca. 1637—was this where Gardyne may have adopted the pen name “Jo.” from?
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