

Recycling and Compilation Techniques in Francis Kirkman's *Psittacorum Regio* (1669) and Richard Steere's *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo* (1684): Two Rewritings of Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem* (1605)

Csaba MACZELKA

Author:

Csaba Maczelka
University of Pécs, Hungary
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1344-1266>
maczelka.csaba@pte.hu

Date of reception: 08/11/2025

Date of acceptance: 27/05/2026

How to cite:

Maczelka, Csaba. 2026. "Recycling and Compilation Techniques in Francis Kirkman's *Psittacorum Regio* (1669) and Richard Steere's *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo* (1684): Two Rewritings of Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem* (1605)". *Alicante Journal of English Studies / Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, no. 45 (July): 99-121. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.31093>

Funding: The research for this paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and was carried out at the re:Text – Textual Tradition and Explication Research Group at the University of Pécs.

Conflict of interest: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest concerning the publication of this article.



Licence: This work is shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0): <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

© 2026 Csaba Maczelka

Abstract:

This paper offers a detailed comparative investigation of two recycled versions of Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem* (1605) with the purpose of demonstrating the widespread use of compilation as a textual strategy in late seventeenth-century prose fiction. Hall's satirical travelogue is first reissued by Francis Kirkman in 1669 with no reference to its original author, combining the original with new sources and introducing numerous structural changes as well. Altogether, Kirkman's compilation seems to focus more on the selective recycling and rearrangement of already existing sources, with no significant individual additions. The second recycled version was published in 1684, and it is proposed here that its previously unidentified author might be the lesser-known American poet Richard Steere. Steere's compilation technique shows significant differences from Kirkman's. He adds new paratextual materials and inserts a poem in his version. The new paratexts present the text as a translation of Francisco de Quevedo's Spanish original, a completely fictional attribution, which, however, reflects the immense popularity of the Spaniard's works in England. Based on an in-depth comparative analysis of the two later versions, and a thorough exploration of their intertextual backgrounds and literary contexts, the article situates the recycled editions within the changing requirements of the Restoration book market.

Keywords: prose fiction; recycling; compilation; Restoration literature; attribution; Pseudo-Quevedo; Francis Kirkman; Richard Steere

1. Introduction

In the late seventeenth century, English prose was thriving, many enduring classics were frequently reprinted,¹ and a host of new works were produced at a rapidly increasing rate. New did not necessarily mean original, however, as the example of John Milton's *The History of Muscovia* (1682) shows, in which the author candidly admits to the use of compilation as the primary textual strategy: "What was scattered in many volumes [...] with no cursory pains I laid together, to save the Reader a far longer travail of wandering through so many desert authors" (Milton 1682, A3r–A3v). Given that Milton is a 'honest' compiler providing all the sources of his work, and that travel writing has a long-standing association with compilation from John Mandeville's *Itinerarium* (c. 1370) through Richard Hakluyt's collections (late 16th century), Milton's natural attitude to compilation reminds us that the publishing environment of the late seventeenth century was vastly different from the modern context more familiar to us, which emerged only during the nineteenth century.² Nonetheless, literary history's preference for the original author and the singular and exceptional work, bolstered by heroic narratives like Ian Watt's influential but outmoded 'rise' of the novel,³ renders works by minor or unknown authors, and/or derivative in nature almost invisible in critical accounts. Although continuations building on the success of an earlier work received some critical attention, and efforts have been made to get a better understanding of the transmission of prose fiction in the seventeenth century,⁴ hundreds of works are still only known from bibliographies, and their analysis has been largely neglected. The present paper sets out to demonstrate that such pieces have a lot to tell us about how publishers appropriated earlier texts, and compiled purportedly new, but, in fact, highly derivative works for the expanding book market.

The present case study focuses on two prose fiction works: Francis Kirkman's *Psittacorum Regio* from 1669 and the yet unattributed 1684 publication entitled *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo*, in which case, an attempt at identifying

1 Cf. Hume (2017, 29) and Orr (2017, 104, 264).

2 Hume (2017, 26).

3 Watt (1957). For a concise summary of criticism against Watt, see Hammond and Regan (2006, 4–15), while for a cultural historiographical critique of the overly narrativized form of Watt's work see Reeves (2000). For a more recent meta-analysis, see Faktorovich's strongly worded review article, which aims to "make a case for seizing all discussions on Watt, and instead developing objective taxonomies of international genres based on statistical and historic research" (2020, 48).

4 On sequels in the seventeenth century, see Simonova (2015), while for transmission with an international focus, see Glomski and Moreau (2016).

the author (or rather the compiler) will also be made. Both works are included not only in prose fiction bibliographies but more specifically in Lyman Tower Sargent's standard bibliography of utopian literature, where they are associated with their primary source, Joseph Hall's *Mundus alter et idem*, originally published in 1605.⁵ Although to some extent the extant bibliography registers the intertextual connection, and there are brief references to it in more recent critical accounts,⁶ no detailed study of the intertextual relationship between these three texts has yet been conducted. Therefore, the present article provides a thorough exploration of the textual strategies and the intertextual connections used in the two later versions, primarily relying on a comparative method to suggest that forgotten works can provide valuable insight into the actual textual practices of this dynamic period, and showcase the liberal handling of earlier works. Particular attention will be paid to the identification of the potential sources of the two volumes, and the compiler's attitude to their sources. In order to see the true significance of any possible findings, however, recent critical studies on early prose fiction in English must be briefly considered.

Newer critical accounts of late seventeenth-century fiction significantly expand the range of works to consider and discuss. First, they argue for the inclusion of anonymous texts, and challenge the idea that works without clearly identifiable authors are of lesser value.⁷ The expansion of the canon with works by women writers, significantly absent in earlier critical accounts,⁸ has also been a pressing issue actively addressed from the 1970s, initially with a strong critical-political charge, later increasingly with "more bibliographical and historical rigor" (Orr 2023, vi). Furthermore, reflecting a wider interest in the material aspects of literary culture, late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century book historians address the economic conditions of the emerging and increasingly professional book market. Thus, Robert D. Hume suggests that "price" was an important factor in the period, "to which book historians are usually sensitive, but which literary critics have not tended to consider important" (2017, 26). In a similar vein, Leah Orr explores the "economic and social contexts of the fiction market," because "popular or noncanonical fiction has been incorporated into literary histories of the novel, but only so far as it helps explain the 'rise' of prose fiction" (2017, 14, 15). As Orr's remark suggests, while prose fiction is

5 Sargent (2016b).

6 Turner (2017, 78) gives a brief summary of Kirkman's work under the heading "Recycling, Translation, and New Fiction." The 1684 edition is not mentioned.

7 Hume (2017, 30) criticises bibliographers for giving the false impression that most fiction was readily claimed by the authors, while in Orr's view bibliographies "imply that the bulk of [unattributed] prose fiction is less worthwhile" (2017, 9).

8 On the absence of female writers in Watt's account, see Reeves (2000, 41).

now more widely recognised and appreciated, its history is often still determined by the perspective of ‘rise’ or ‘evolution’ towards the novel, even though the increased accessibility of texts both enables and calls for an approach “without predetermined conclusions” (Orr 2017, 3). The bibliographic and economic realities of the period reveal a thriving market for fiction of all kinds, where the novel was just one out of a wide number of trending generic labels (Orr 2011), while genres that might seem incompatible for a modern reader could “coexist quite comfortably” (Salzman 2017, 25).

A more inclusive look at the early modern prose fiction corpus also helps to recognise the importance of the translations and adaptations of works from non-English cultures. Admittedly, in this respect, the study of the novel itself has changed: while previously the genre was, through “[a] certain chauvinism,” perceived as “somehow essentially English” (Doody 1996, 1–2), it is now more typically viewed as a global, geographically and chronologically universal “world form” (Bulson 2018b, 12–13). In the case of prose fiction, the importance of translations is beyond question, confirmed by the sheer numbers: in Hume’s reckoning, around 33% of the 852 works of fiction published between 1660 and 1749 were, or at least purported to be, translations (Hume 2017, 32), whereas in the narrower time span between 1690 to 1730, a quarter of the fiction produced was translated (Orr 2017, 143). The impact of continental literature obviously cannot be overstated, and it is clear that among others, “the very visible Spanish novels of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries” (Doody 1996, 1–2) had a huge bearing on the development of English prose fiction, especially, but as we will see later, not exclusively, through the picaresque genre.⁹

The late seventeenth-century panorama of fiction is further complicated by the prevalence of reprinted versions of earlier books, so much so that the truly popular works of the time comprised only a relatively small group of texts that constantly reappeared. According to Hume, this was a mixed bag in terms of critical recognition – some of them staples of secondary literature, but others more or less invisible.¹⁰ Neither was this selection characterised by a linear progression towards a more realistic prose – it included allegorical and didactic/moralising works alongside texts that were closer to the modern concepts of fiction. Significantly, for a late seventeenth-century reader, available fiction was not restricted to novelties and

9 On the general significance of the picaresque, see Garrido-Ardila (2015a). Also in Garrido-Ardila (2015b), the critic offers a particularly useful treatment of the ‘rise of the novel’ thesis, while also explores the connection between the picaresque and *Robinson Crusoe* (cf. Hammond 2015). For more details on this connection, see Hurtado (2024) and especially Maciulewicz (2024). On the impact of earlier examples of Spanish picaresque works, see Samson (2016).

10 Cf. Hume (2017, 29) and Orr (2017, 104, 264).

publishers happily republished anything ranging from prose versions of medieval romances to Elizabethan and seventeenth-century works of diverse types.¹¹ All these aspects have a bearing on the present case study, which shows that the popularity of fashionable genres and frequently reprinted authors and works was so appealing that some publishers even tried to capitalise on it using dubious tactics including textual appropriation, silent recycling, and false attribution of earlier texts, or misleadingly positing a vernacular text as translation.

It is clear, then, that the world of fiction around the seventeenth and turn of the eighteenth century is more complex than previously thought but also that it is an area that merits exploration in its own right.¹² In this thriving 'culture of fiction,' modern conceptions of a hierarchy of genres or the sharp distinction between factual and fictional texts simply fail to work. To bring up one example, the original title page of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) did not feature Defoe's name, the missing author powerfully reminding us that our present-day concerns about the agents and processes of the print market are not necessarily applicable to the period of study.¹³ Furthermore, originality, a key aspect in more traditional literary histories was not yet a fundamental requirement in the period, and the market of printed works was dominated by derivative works, as the high number of – often unauthorized – translated and reprinted works already suggests. It must be noted, however, that the first bibliographical projects questioning the illicit appropriation of earlier texts started to emerge around the same time. The most famous example among such works is *Momus Triumphans* (1687) by George Langbaine (1656–1692), revealing all the "plagiaries of the English Stage," which shows that by the end of the century the silent appropriation of earlier works is criticised as an illegitimate practice. According to Kevin Pask's thought-provoking account of the context and significance of *Momus*, this change revealed how "[p]rint capitalism established the original and thus individual author as the principle of its authority" (2002, 727) – but this did not happen before the eighteenth century. The end of print licensing (1695) and the milestone Statute of Anne (1710) fostered originality and the professionalisation of authorship (Keymer 2017b, xxv), and such changes certainly distinguish eighteenth-century prose fiction from the previous period.¹⁴

11 For a detailed overview, see Orr (2017, 106–40).

12 This shift has begun much earlier, and Paul Salzman's role in it cannot be overstated, cf. his history of the early novel in English for the period 1558-1700 (1985) and his anthology of seventeenth-century fiction (1991).

13 Some of Defoe's other works (especially *Moll Flanders*) are even more problematic. See Hume (2017, 31) or, for a summary of earlier debates from a present-day perspective, Powell (2023).

14 Orr acknowledges the importance of the Statute of Anne but chooses to begin her research a few years earlier (2017, 4). She also argues that real change as far as copyright is concerned

In the late seventeenth century, however, such questions were far from being settled, and the instability of the concept of authorship, the absence of originality as a fundamental requirement, as well as the lack of a clear-cut distinction between factual and fictional genres gave rise to interesting textual experiments that feel strikingly different from the ‘modern’ novel, if its modernity, that is, is defined by the importance of the author, the use of realism, and a focus on the individual (Watt 1957, 9–20). This was a period when “instabilities of prose fiction” led to an “astonishing variety of fictional experiments” (Moreau 2016, 1; McKeon 1987, 25–64) that resulted in a dynamic environment characterised by unique textual techniques often at odds with philological accountability. Many translations were so far-fetched versions of their originals that they should be accounted as adaptations, but in certain cases, the combined use of adaptation and compilation produced in fact a new, hybrid work. Whereas the importance of anonymous works, reprints and translations have by now been duly recognised, the actual textual strategies employed in this dynamically changing period of English prose fiction have received only limited attention. To remedy this situation, this article explores two interconnected episodes of a particular case of recycling older texts in the late seventeenth century, arguing that they reflect unique compositional techniques and authorial and editorial attitudes that merit further study.

The departure point for the present inquiry is Joseph Hall’s (1574–1656) *Mundus alter et idem*, originally published in Latin in 1605, and first translated, or rather adapted, into English by John Healey (d. 1610) in 1609 (Hall 1609).¹⁵ The Latin original met with some success on the Continent: it was mentioned in Gabriel Naudé’s *Bibliographica Politica*, together with Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) and Tommaso Campanella’s *Civitas solis* (1602), and it was even published together with the acclaimed utopias of Campanella and Francis Bacon in 1643, associating the work with other stories about the ideal commonwealth; some records of its German and – perhaps more surprising – Central European reception show its far-reaching international impact.¹⁶ On English soil, the early

is only visible around the 1740s (269). According to Hume, “[o]nly in the 1740s do we start to find a publishing environment that is clearly a precursor of the nineteenth-century circumstances more familiar to us” (2017, 26).

15 Critics seem to agree that Healey’s version is more an adaptation than a translation. John Millar Wands wrote a modern translation of the Latin original (1981).

16 On Naudé’s reference, see Hölscher (1996, 33). The 1643 compound edition was published in Utrecht by Dutch printer Janssonius van Waesberge (1616–1681). Online facsimile: <https://lib.ugent.be/europeana/900000012569?pg=PP1>. The German translation was published in 1613; see [Hall] 1613. On the Latin poems of the Hungarian poet Johannes Filiczki (1580–1622), inspired by Hall’s text, see Molnár (2024). For bibliographical information on Hall in Hungary, see Maczelka (2019, 191–93).

reception was less successful: the work and its author were scornfully attacked in one of John Milton's polemical works, and the text was briefly but approvingly mentioned in a volume on cosmography.¹⁷

This silence is abruptly broken by the two episodes under scrutiny here. In 1669, well-known "bookseller and author"¹⁸ Francis Kirkman (1632–1680) reissued the work under a new title: *Psittacorum Regio. The Land of Parrots: Or, The She-Lands. With A Description of other strange adjacent Countries, in the Dominions of Prince Del'Amour, not hitherto found in any Geographical Map*, its author being designated as "one of the late most reputed Wits" (*Psittacorum Regio* 1669, title page). Interestingly, this version combines the text with Sir Benjamin Rudyard's *The Prince d'Amour* (1660), and as such showcases a unique use of compilation to produce—from the market perspective—a new piece of prose fiction both from an older and a more recent source. This new version is followed in 1684 by a vastly different reworking, whose title page reveals even more complexity: it features the name of Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645) as the author and adds the (false) note "Originally in Spanish," the full title running as follows: *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo through Terra Australis incognita discovering the laws, customs, manners and fashions of the south Indians: a novel, originally in Spanish* (*Travels* 1684). Both versions reflect many of the above-mentioned trends of late seventeenth-century prose fiction and deserve more than the limited treatment they have so far received. It is argued here that the recycled versions offer powerful snapshots of their respective contexts, and that they might serve as examples of compositional techniques and attitudes characteristic of the late-seventeenth-century culture of prose fiction.

The context of these recycled publications reveals a universal fascination with travel writing. Kirkman's version was licensed in the year when Henry Neville's (1620–1694) *The Isle of Pines* (1668), one of the greatest literary 'hoaxes,' or rather media events of the time, appeared. The second, standalone edition of Margaret Cavendish's (1623–1673) *The Blazing World*, the generic hybridity of which is now a critical commonplace, was published in the same year, just like the translation of an anti-Jansenist travel allegory by Louis Fontaines (1596–1661), and the triumph of Quevedo's translations (associated in the 1684 preface, to be discussed later, with travels) also begins here, with four editions

17 Hall's work is heavily criticised in Milton's *An apology against a pamphlet called A modest confutation of the animadversions upon the remonstrant against Smectymnuus* (1642), referred to as "that wretched pilgrimage over Minshew's dictionary called 'Mundus alter et idem,' the idlest and paltriest mime that ever mounted upon bank" (Milton 1641, 880–81). Peter Heylyn's *Cosmographie* (1652, Bk. IV/195) offers a sharp contrast to Milton's mockery.

18 Bald (1943) describes Kirkman in these terms. See also Newcomb (2004).

in two years.¹⁹ The circumstances of the 1684 edition show similarities: in the same year, the new translation of More's *Utopia* by Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715) comes out, along with a new edition of Mandeville's *Voyages*. However, this essay argues that travel writing appears in a unique combination with some other genres in these later versions; in fact, especially the later version tries to sell the earlier travelogue as something else: a “novel” that is definitely not. As this reorientation suggests, both versions reflect many of the above-mentioned trends in prose fiction research,

2. Kirkman's *Psittacorum Regio* (1669)

Kirkman's 1669 edition was licensed on 9 November 1668, and its title page contains no reference to the original author, or any other indication suggesting that it is not an original work. The layout largely follows the conventions of contemporary (imaginary or real) travel literature: the most emphatic part is the name of the land, followed by the stock phrase “with a description of.” When compared with other travelogues, Kirkman's *Psittacorum Regio* shows some variance, and instead of pointing out to a verifiable geographical location, it claims that it will explore “the Dominions of Prince De L'Amour,” which establishes an explicit link with the other source in the compilation, Sir Benjamin Rudyard's *Le Prince De L'Amour* (1660), as does the vague attribution of the 1669 text to “one of the late most reputed Wits.”²⁰ Significantly, the title page talks about the Land of Parrots as a place that is not featured in “any geographical map,” which might be a subtle hint at the fictionality of the description, since “*Psittacorum Regio*” was, in fact, a standard part of contemporary maps standing for a prominent southern landmass called ‘*Terra Australis Incognita*,’ the fictional catalyst for the imaginary voyage in Hall's original work.²¹

As for the general structure of the text, while both Hall's Latin original and Healey's English rendering made clever use of paratextual materials, this is only partially preserved in Kirkman's fiction. The rudimentary maps of the original were replaced by a set of woodcuts: a panorama of the region, along with two vivid scenes from the neighbouring lands ‘*Gluttonia*’ and ‘*Quaffonia*.’ There is a “Preadmonition To the READER,” a radically abridged version of the “To the

19 1670 sees a new edition of Bacon's *New Atlantis*, and Mandeville's *Voyages and Travels* as well. All the information here derives from the respective parts of Mish's bibliography (1967, 42–44; 65–66).

20 Rudyard's title page features “the Wits of the Age” (1660).

21 On the unique subgenre of Australian utopias, see Fausett (1993). For example, Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570, with many later editions) also contains the landmass and the region.

Readers, Instructions for their voyage into this new world” section in Hall’s text. A comparison of a key passage in the two versions in Table 1 reveals important aspects of Kirkman’s compilation technique:

TABLE 1. Hall (in Healey’s translation) and Kirkman with additions highlighted

Hall (1609)	Kirkman (1669)
Secondly you must neuer trauell single, but two, or three in a company, for one you know may apprehend more then another can, and those before, that haue miscaried in this voyage, as you haue heard, incurred their misfortunes onely by neglecting this direction, and by too much conuersing with those of the Foolianders nation. (Hall 1609, ¶4)	Secondly, you must <u>not follow my example to</u> travel <u>at the first</u> single, but two or three in a company; for one you know may apprehend more then another can; and <u>I my self that thus</u> miscarried, <u>give you this warning. having</u> incurred <u>my own</u> misfortune onely <u>by this my desperate</u> neglect, <u>which you may also occasion</u> by <u>your</u> too much conversing with the <u>She-landers</u> . (<i>Psittacorum Regio</i> , 1669, A1v)

As the examples above show, while the content is largely preserved (apart from minor spelling variations), the most significant change is the strengthening of the narrator’s voice through the consistent conversion to first-person singular form. These changes reinforce Turner’s observation about Kirkman’s “quirky and self-conscious authorial voice, aware of his own foibles yet alert to the interactive process of reading” (2017, 78). This self-consciousness, however, is reduced by the conservative nature of the compilation and the restricted narratorial presence. Turner’s observation is further challenged by the fact that the remarks which suggest familiarity with “the interactive process of reading” clearly derive from the translator Healey’s preface in the 1609 edition.

The overall impression of the textual transformation of the original is certainly less exciting than Turner’s remark suggests. In fact, a computational comparison between the 1609 and the 1669 texts confirms that Hall was Kirkman’s primary source, comprising at least 55%-60% of the text, but a close textual comparison reveals that any significant diversions from the main source can be traced only towards the end.²² Whereas the text itself is not heavily altered, Kirkman shows

22 The comparison was conducted with the software wCopyFind, which compares phrase matches across different texts with an adjustable level of tolerance for variations. For more details on the software, see McCarthy (2022). Using *RapidFuzzy* library’s fuzzy

significantly more initiative in the arrangement and combination of his sources, as represented in Table 2:

TABLE 2. The sources of the different parts of Kirman's text

Kirkman 1669	Source (H = Hall 1609, R = Rudyerd 1660)
1. Title page	H. + R.
2. Opening, p. 1-5. A heavily reduced and slightly altered version of the original framework story with contemplations on travel and discovery.	H. – The Occasion of this Travel
3. Arrival, general description, pp. 6-8. The voyage aspect is strengthened, crew members are named (Captain Young, Merry man, Good-fellow) and there is at least a minimalistic account of the initial discovery.	H. – opening sections of Book 2 + Book 1.
4. Description of Gluttonia + Quafonia, pp. 8-54. Apart from minor changes in spelling and some condensation, there is an almost <i>verbatim</i> transcription of the source.	H. – Book 1.
5. Pastoral/erotic poem, pp. 55-57.	Antoine Girard de Saint-Amant (1594–1661): <i>La Jouissance</i> (1617–1621)
6. Description of She-land, pp. 54-88. Largely following the source, with smaller additions referring to Prince de l'Amour or reinforcing the narrative of exploration.	H. – Book 2.

function, the result was 50.19%, see <https://github.com/rapidfuzz/RapidFuzz>. A cosine search conducted between 20 smaller chunks of Kirkman's text and the totality of Hall's English translated by Healey shows between 82% and 92% of similarity between the texts (using scikit-learn's machine learning library's TfidfVectorizer function, <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>), indicating that Kirkman relies heavily on the original even when he is not directly borrowing from him. AI tools were used to design and code the latter comparison procedures.

7. Prince de l'Amour, pp. 88-155. A clearly marked transition: "In this following relation I shall pursue the same course as I have all this while done, onely to take notice of the most remarkable passages and places."	R. – imitation? Interspersed with passages from H., Book 1-2.
8. Closing, pp. 155-156.	H., Book 3, chapter 3. (Fooliana the fickle)

This overview reveals Kirkman's surprisingly complex use of his sources. Hall's original comprises four books describing different parts of the unknown southern land: Book 1 is about Tenter-belly, a land of plenty full of gluttons, Book 2 is about Shee-landt or Women-decoia, where gender roles are reserved, Book 3 is about Fooliana covering follies of the mind, while Book 4 is about Thee-uingen, a land of thieves. Although Kirkman's title page suggests that the volume is based on the second book of Hall describing the Land of Women, a third of the publication is in fact a retelling of the more famous first book,²³ and it also borrows the original's 'Occasion' (the opening framework story), a large portion of Book 1, and the opening passages of Book 2. Thus, while the compilation remains consistently conservative in its textual relationship with the original, Kirkman is particularly creative and experimental in his rearrangement of the different parts of the main source. The same applies to the handling of other sources: even those parts which are not directly borrowed from Hall are constantly interspersed with passages from different sections of the original, making the work more than a servile repetition of its different sources.

Those sections which do not rely on Hall contain the description of the land of Prince d'Amour. In Turner's view (2017, 78), this only "resembles" Rudyerd's *Le Prince d'Amour*, and indeed, a close textual connection cannot be observed. Nonetheless, in its portrayal of the upside-down world of the Prince d'Amour, Kirkman is clearly inspired by the cavalier nature of Rudyerd's book, as well as the famous description of the abbey of Thélème in Francois Rabelais' carnivalesque *Gargantua* (1534), as suggested by Turner (2017). Kirkman uses here a peculiar technique of imitation to deliver a satiric discourse on the follies of courtly life, with detailed description of allegorical figures like Lady Mode [ie. Fashion], Lady Intrigue, etc. At one point, the text relies on allegorical language to the extent that

23 Hall, counted as a member of the Cokaygne tradition (which only applies to the first of the four books), was completely ignored in Davis' 1981 classic study.

brings it close to the popular religious allegories of the time, although a textual link has not yet been identified. The section in question discusses how those who fail to reach preferment at court, under the guidance of Captain Repentance, can escape the Abyss of Despair and reach the Miraculous Chapel, only to realise the falsity of pleasures and the mutability of Fortune (*Psittacorum Regio* 1669, 114–17). The episode is so inconsistent with the surrounding satiric passages that the narrator feels the need to close it with an apology: “I am resolved no longer to tyre out my Reader with this tedious preachment, but to go on jovially with my following description” (117). This is an exception to the indeed ‘jovial’ nature of the latter part of the book, inspired by Rudyard’s description of the revels of the Middle Temple, which “seem to be one of the oldest formalized rituals of misrule to survive into the modern era” (Combe 2000, 17). Similarly to Hall, Kirkman’s publication ends rather abruptly, but instead of recycling the closing passage of the original, it uses the words from the third book of Hall, once again exhibiting a creative rearrangement and recycling of the original, but also reinforcing the impression that the backbone of Kirkman’s 1669 publication is no doubt Hall’s text.

Kirkman’s compilatory technique is also characterised by smaller additions which either explain something—like a reference to Hakluyt’s “Voyages” (1669, 49)—or break the rather static narrative with shorter rhymes (13), reinforcing the gaiety of the text. This gaiety is more visible in the second half of the work, but it occasionally reaches a masque-like quality in the first sections as well: in the middle of the Hall section, the book contains a whole poem written in the pastoral mode but bordering on sheer eroticism. Its source has not been previously identified but it is no doubt based on Saint Amant’s *La Jouissance*, whose English translation was circulating from around the 1650s.²⁴ The use of the poem here serves a double purpose, since it provides an entertaining interlude and also signals the arrival to the geographical region of Shee-land. Once more, it is not so much the narratorial voice but the author’s compilation technique that is remarkable.

Kirkman’s work is, then, a unique combination of several sources of vastly different genres ranging from imaginary travel, carnivalesque descriptions and poems, and religious allegories. While such a wide range of text types threatens with a loss of coherence, the careful compilation technique and the consistent reliance on the main source provides the text with a unified narrative structure. All in all, a close look at these techniques reinforces our image of Francis

24 Both the original and one of the English translations of the poem are included in Cameron (2008, 232–36), with chapter 3.2.2. (pp. 93–95) providing helpful background information.

Kirkman as an adventurous and resourceful publisher who is capable not only of recognising prevailing trends but also of fusing them into marketable “new” publications.²⁵ Yet it also strengthens our more general impression about the hybrid nature of prose fiction around this time, where divergent genres could happily coexist, even within the same work (cf. Salzman 2017, 25). The second case study will showcase an even more creative use of compilation techniques in a different context.

3. Questions of Authorship in *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo* (1684)

The second recycled version of Hall appeared in 1684 in a different guise, characterised by a distinctive textual strategy. This edition offers an almost *verbatim* repetition of Hall's original, which, however, was sold under the name of one of the most popular authors of late seventeenth-century prose fiction in translation, Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645). Although scholars only start to realise the impact of Quevedo's works in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English literature, the sheer numbers leave no doubt that he was among the bestselling authors of the era. His most successful book was *The Visions of Don Francisco de Quevedo*, appearing in no less than seventeen editions between 1667 and 1759, an exceptional popularity largely neglected by scholarship (Hume 2017, 29; Keymer 2017b, xxv). Yet, contemporary readers were well aware of the popularity of the author, as Samuel Pepys' praise of Roger L'Estrange's translation shows (Turner 2017, 79). The success led to a “burlesqued” (versified) edition appearing in 1702, whose preface openly speaks about its somewhat belated English reception with important reflections on form:

But now we Present you our Grave Spaniard [...] in a Burlesque Fashion; insomuch, as we were the Last that took notice of this Stranger in Prose, yet have we made him amends, as being the First of all European (or other) Nations, that ever attempted turning him into Verse; it having been the Admiration of Men endued with extraordinary Parts and Learning, that this incomparable Wit was not sooner Paraphras'd. (Quevedo 1702, A2v)

The quote does not only give us an insight into Quevedo's wider reception in England, but also puts it in a comparative European perspective, further problematising the limited critical attention given to what was clearly an international hit at the time. Accordingly, the connection of the 1684 edition

25 On Kirkman's editorial activity, see Bald (1943), Newcomb (2004) and the numerous references in Keymer (2017a).

with this vogue, as well as the literary finesse of the whole volume, might contribute to the identification of a potential author/compiler, as suggested by the paratextual materials.

The paratextual address to the reader of this late verse rendering has its own peculiar significance from the perspective of the 1684 edition as well, as it justifies the success of Quevedo's "biting piece of Satyr" with the argument that "it taxes the Corruption of Manners, in all sorts and degrees of People" (Quevedo 1667, A3v-A4r). The "biting piece of Satyr," which includes the adjective only in the 1702 edition, points directly to Joseph Hall's *Virgidemiarum: Six Books of Satyrs* (1597-1602), containing the exact same phrase, which is hardly surprising, "biting" being the conventional epithet of satire. Such a description of Quevedo's work fits equally well with the original *Mundus*, defined by one of the finest readers of Hall's text as "a Menippean satire upon the vices of Europe written in the guise of an allegorical travelogue" (McCabe 1982, 76); more recent readings also approach the text as a "geopolitical satire" (Mills 2016). An interest in satire exposing the "corruption of manners" seems to be an important motivation for the recycled late-seventeenth century versions of Hall's text, which will become important when it comes to the attribution of the 1684 edition.

Turning now to the textual strategies of the 1684 version, the later rendition shows fundamental differences with respect to the 1669 edition. Although Kirkman's compilation was previously characterised as conservative on the level of words and phrases, it was still a true compilation fusing several different sources. By contrast, the Pseudo-Quevedo version builds on the original to the extent that it hardly qualifies as a compilation and appears more like an appropriation of Hall's text, cleverly adjusted to the expectations of a late-seventeenth century reader of prose fiction. Thus, two versions produced within a fifteen years' span reveal a radically different approach to the production of purportedly new works, which certainly tells us something about the development of prose fiction in this crucial period, confirming Orr's observation that around the 1680s, prose fiction experiences a fundamental transition (2017, 125). As for the general structure of the 1684 edition, the most striking difference with Kirkman's version is that it contains all the four books included in the original, making it a somewhat bulkier volume. In fact, the only additions are a radically refashioned title page, a completely new preface, and an introductory poem sustaining the false attribution to Quevedo.

The preface is a satiric tour-de-force, far more inventive than anything found in *Psittacorum Regio*, written from the pseudo-translator's perspective and utilising the "old manuscript" topos.²⁶ It provides a background for the

26 The topos is a well-known staple of Gothic fiction, although its early uses can be traced much earlier, for example, in *Gulliver's Travels*, which also begins with a version of it.

fictional Spanish original, while featuring a whole range of generic labels: “Preambles and Allegories, have been used in Sacred Writ; yet not censured as Romantick, and though this Peregrination is represented in the Nature of a Romance [...] it is only with an intent [...] To Please and Convince at the same time” (*Travels* 1684, A3v). Romance is associated with suspicious entertaining value, and the Horatian maxim together with the reference to the Scripture serve as arguments for the usefulness of entertaining literature – this in a text whose title page prominently features the word ‘novel,’ mirroring the fallacy of the concept of a romance-novel dichotomy around this time, as highlighted in Turner’s influential study (2012). Yet, the adjective “Romantick” is heavily critical, and the noun “Romance” also calls for an apologetic tone. The work is also referred to as a “brisk ingenious fancy” that is “satirical enough,” raising the number of genre-related terms used in a couple of lines to five: allegory, fancy, preamble, romance/romantick, and satire.

The excusatory reflections on genre are followed by a brief account of the story which relies heavily on the original. The beginning of this part uses a language mixing travel writing and allegory, making it hauntingly similar to the translator’s preface in the original. The narrator discovers the manuscript in Bilboa, where it “was taking post [...] to the Land of Oblivian,” and only the translator saved it “from the Teeth of time, and very Paw of Destruction” (*Travels* 1684, A3v). In a satirical twist, the discussion moves on to the corrupted state of the manuscript, particularly of the “characters,” which were so “defaced” that even the author’s name was only partially preserved: “Don Q.” The text suggests the potential resolution of this as either Quixote or Quevedo, therefore, the next part of the address gathers arguments for Quevedo’s attribution, referring especially to his *Visions* and the subterranean ‘travel’ described in that book. The text addresses the reader’s potential objection that the popular work was but a ‘Dream’ by a kind of inverse logic claiming that it “seems as unlikely to be reall as that (A4v)”. This argument creates an explicit link with dream narratives, bringing two important subgenres of prose fiction closer to each other.²⁷ The rest of the preface offers an ingenious explanation for the “Black, Knotty, Rough and Uneven” writing, in the course of which Quevedo had been allegedly attended by a devil, since, it is claimed, the text “seem’d to be Written with a Cloven hoof” (A5r). The association of travelling and reading, present since the translator’s 1609 preface

Further uses of a similar device could be cited from utopian literature, especially in French utopias by Tyssot de Patot (1655–1727), Denis Vairasse (1630–1692), and Gabriel de Foigny (c. 1630–1692). See Balázs (2010).

27 On the importance of dream narratives in English literature, see Weidhorn (1970), although he makes no reference to Quevedo and prose is significantly underrated in his work.

is repeated here, and it is signed by “R. S.,” which might be significant for its potential attribution.

The preface is followed by “A Prologue,” a poem in rhyming couplets replacing the “Occasion of the Travel” in the original, which speaks about ‘Quevedo’s’ motivation: travel is “so tick’ling to my Fancies, / As I have read in Old Romances / As Gyants, and Inchanted Castles” (1684, A8r). Such passages are perfect examples of the emerging distinction between old and new romance around this time, which is seen by Turner as more important than the romance-novel conundrum, with giants and enchanted castles becoming the set phrases to describe the outdated text type (Turner 2012, esp. 65-66). Thus, although the 1684 text adds limited material to the original, both its title page, its preface and its versified prologue firmly situate it in the debates characterising the culture of fiction around this time; in fact, the appeal of the original text might very well have been its “enchanted” or “romantick” nature, which tickled the fancies of two different authors/compilers in the late seventeenth century. The literary features of the 1684 version, fuelled by an interest in satire, responding to ongoing theoretical debates, and transmitting a clear sense of formal confidence point towards a potential author with firmly established literary credentials.

The initials used in the preface, together with a further poetic addition to the text, offer a promising candidate for authorship. In a passage in the original where a ship voyage between two regions is briefly described, *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo* introduces the description of a tempest and its aftermath. The episode is so important for the attribution of the text that it is worth quoting at length:

I was cold and faint, and the motion of the Ship had so jumbled my brains together, that my head seem’d to turn round upon my shoulders, as if it had been set on with a Swivel: I wished heartily for a Dram of Dr. Stephens, and entering the first door I found open, got such refreshment as the Country afforded, and whilst I was thus recruiting my Spirits, my fellow Traveller seeing a sheet or Writing Paper lye on the Counter, exercised his skill in Poetry, expressing the Terror of the late Storm; at which I was very well pleased and therefore took a Copy, which take you as freely. (*Travels* 1684, 75)

These lines are followed by a poem, beginning “All Round the Horizon Black Clouds appear, / A Storm is near.” This is not only interesting because of the similar poetic interpolation in Kirkman’s version. More importantly, the poem and the description provide a key to the attribution of the 1684 edition, which point to the American poet Richard Steere (1643–1721), whose interest in maritime matters is recorded in his most famous poem “A Monumental Memorial

of Marine Mercy,” published in Boston in 1684 (Steere 1684). Previously fled to New England from religious persecution, in 1683 he was on a secret visit to London, a journey that almost brought about his premature death (Russell 2000). In the 1684 edition, the episode serves as a cameo of the author/compiler, reinforced by the insertion of the meditative poem “On a Sea-Storm nigh the Coast,” described in one of the rare references to Steere in literary histories as an exception to the general rule of neglect of aesthetics in sea poems (Wharton 1992, 45).²⁸

Not much is known about Steere’s secret London visit. However, it can hardly be a coincidence that the next year saw the publication of the Pseudo-Quevedo volume discussed here. The publication dates match, and the initials in the volume (R. S.) correspond to the author’s name. Moreover, the embedded poem and the authorial cameo in the 1684 edition fit well into Steere’s biography. If that evidence is not convincing enough, Steere’s investment in satiric literature further strengthens the case. Before leaving England, he got involved in the vitriolic debates of the time, responding to John Dryden’s *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681) with his scriptural allegory *The History of the Babylonish Cabal*, and the “satiric doggerel” (Wharton 1979, 17) *A Message from Tory-Land to the Whig-Makers in Albion*, both published in 1682. Certain features of the 1684 volume might also help clarify the question of attribution. First, the preface refers to the ensuing work as an “allegory,” and argues for the use of “preambles and allegories” in Scripture without them being “Censured as Romantick,” very much in line with Steere’s use of scriptural allegory. The preface is also fuelled by a passion for satire, reflecting the tone of the ongoing polemic. Furthermore, Steere’s general interest in sea voyages is well documented in the poems already mentioned, while Hall’s numerous anti-Catholic episodes align well with Steere’s fervently anti-Catholic stance. With all these points considered, there can be little doubt that the 1684 edition is a largely compilatory work by Richard Steere, with a few important additions.

4. Conclusion

To conclude, the previous case study has attempted to demonstrate that the specific techniques of textual composition and compilation employed in

28 No surprise here, as Donald P. Wharton is the author of what is probably the only monograph dedicated to Steere, enthusiastically claiming that he “ranks behind only Edward Taylor and Anne Bradstreet, and alongside Michael Wigglesworth,” and describing the interpolated poem as “one of the few fully rendered aesthetic contemplations of the era” (Wharton 1979, 3). I found no reference to the 1684 edition in the book.

anonymous, translated, reprinted or otherwise recycled or appropriated texts can be subjected to in-depth analysis with unexpected results. As the two cases investigated here show, examining sources and how they were used in works appearing on the market as new publications provide a rich insight into the culture of prose fiction in the period, and might occasionally even shed light on questions of authorship. The two later renderings of Hall's original showcase that compilation without any kind of reference to the original was a technique widely and freely used in the period, and only towards the end of the century do we start to see the slow emergence of a requirement of originality, when debates about repackaged earlier writings appear.²⁹ Furthermore, it has also become clear that compilation worked across seemingly incompatible text types, operating as a melting pot: an imaginary voyage could seamlessly combine with the description of carnivalesque entertainment, pastoral/erotic poetry, and religious allegory, reinforcing our notion of the hybrid nature of late-seventeenth fiction from yet another perspective. This complicates the initial observation about the heightened interest in (not necessarily authentic) travel literature in the times. As it has been shown, travel writing is not only used here for the appeal of exotic places but both Kirkman's and Steere's version exploit the satiric tone of Hall's original to expose vices or political inadequacies of their own times. It must also be added that especially in the 1684 version, the aspect of travel writing is significantly toned down by the false attribution to Quevedo and the emphatic display of the generic term 'novel' on the title page. Steere seems to reorientate the original and bring it closer to ongoing trends. After all, 1684 also sees publications by Aphra Behn and John Bunyan, representatives of a new phase in the history of prose fiction. Their works clearly bring something vastly different compared to the hybrid, pastiche-like, heavily experimental prose fiction represented by the two versions of Hall's original discussed here. Nonetheless, the texts analysed in this article, still belonging to that hybrid phase, should remind us that if something indeed changed in the 1680s, it was not acknowledged immediately. More importantly, the close textual reading of these two works also tells us something about the unexplored alternative (re)uses of literary texts in the late seventeenth century, and highlights the proximity of genres like travel writing, satire, allegory, and dream narratives. With easy (digital) access to texts of the period, such issues could and should be fruitfully studied on a much larger scale as well, an inquiry that would probably reveal a denser intertextual web behind the vast body of prose fiction texts in the period. Taken together, these findings suggest that compilation, adaptation, and anonymous reuse were a more organic

²⁹ *Momus Triumphans* was partly motivated by the dubious practices of "crafty Booksellers, whose custom it is as frequently to vent old Plays with new Title" (qtd. in Pask 2002, 736).

part of the production and circulation of fiction in the late seventeenth century than previously considered.

References

- Anon. 1684. *The Travels of Don Francisco de Quevedo through Terra Australis Incognita Discovering the Laws, Customs, Manners and Fashions of the South Indians: A Novel, Originally in Spanish*. London: Printed for William Grantham.
- Balázs, Péter. 2010. "»ISMERJÜK EL, HOGY NEM ÉRTJÜK...« A teológiai diskurzus bírálata három 17. század végi „spinozista” regényben.” *Korunk* 21 (12): 86–98.
- Bald, R. C. 1943. "Francis Kirkman, Bookseller and Author." *Modern Philology* 41 (1): 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1086/388599>
- Bulson, Eric, ed. 2018a. *The Cambridge Companion to the Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316659694>
- Bulson, Eric. 2018b. "Introduction." In Bulson 2018a, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316659694.002>
- Cameron, Anne Louise. 2008. "The English Translation of Seventeenth-Century French Lyric Poetry and Epigrams During the Caroline Period." PhD diss., Durham University. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2531/>
- Combe, Kirk. 2000. "Shadwell as Lord of Misrule: Dryden, Varronian Satire, and Carnival." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 24 (3): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00982601-24-3-1>
- Davis, J. C. 1981. *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing 1516-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle and H. T. Meserole, eds. 1992. *Early American Literature and Culture: Essays Honoring Harrison T. Meserole*. Newark: U of Delaware P.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP.
- Faktorovich, Anna. 2020. "A Review of Critical Failures in the Watt Canon." *Pennsylvania Literary Journal* 12 (1): 47–68.
- Fausett, David. 1993. *Writing the New World. Imaginary Voyages and Utopias of the Great Southern Lands*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP.
- García-Hurtado, Manuel, ed. 2024. *The United Kingdom and Spain in the Eighteenth Century: Beloved Enemy*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003504306>
- Garrido-Ardila, J. A., ed. 2015a. *The Picaresque Novel in Western Literature: From the Sixteenth Century to the Neopicaresque*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382687>

- Garrido-Ardila, J. A. 2015b. "The Picaresque Novel and the Rise of the English Novel: From Baldwin and Deloney to Defoe and Smollett." In Garrido-Ardila 2015a, 113–139. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382687.007>
- Glomski, Jacqueline and Isabelle Moreau, eds. 2016. *Seventeenth-Century Fiction: Text & Transmission*. Oxford: Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198737261.001.0001>
- Godwin, Francis. 2009. *The Man in the Moone*. Edited by William Poole. Peterborough: Broadview.
- Hadfield, Andrew, ed. 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose 1500-1640*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [Hall, Joseph.] 1609. *The discovery of a new world or A description of the South Indies Hetherto vnknowne by an English Mercury*. [Translated by John Healey.] [London]: Imprinted for Ed: Blount. and W. Barrett.
- [Hall, Joseph.] 1613. *Utopiae Pars II. Mundus alter et idem. Die heutige neue alte Welt*. Leipzig: Gross. Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum. <https://mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11109903-0>
- Hammond, Brean. 2015. "Defoe and the Picaresque." In Garrido-Ardila 2015a, 140–156. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139382687.008>
- Hammond, Brean and Shaun Regan. 2006. *Making the Novel: Fiction and Society in Britain, 1660-1789*. London: Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-80223-0>
- Heylyn, Peter. 1652. *Cosmographie in Four Bookes : Containing the Chorographie and Historie of the Whole Vvorld, and All the Principall Kingdomes, Provinces, Seas and Isles Thereof / by Peter Heylyn*. London: Printed for Henry Seile.
- Hölscher, Lucian. 1996. "Utopie." *Utopian Studies* 7 (2): 1–65. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719510>
- Hume, Robert D. 2017. "Authorship, Publication, Reception (2) 1660-1750." In Keymer 2017a, 26-45. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199580033.003.0002>
- Keymer, Thomas, ed. 2017a. *Prose Fiction in English from the Origins of Print to 1750*. The Oxford History of the Novel in English 1. Oxford: Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199580033.001.0001>
- Keymer, Thomas. 2017b. "Introduction." In Keymer 2017a, xvii–xxxii.
- Maciulewicz, Joanna. 2024. "The Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in the Eighteenth-Century Literary Space. English Translations of Spanish Picaresque fiction and the Rise of the Novel." In García-Hurtado, 163-179. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003504306-10>
- Maczelka, Csaba. 2019. *A kora újkori angol utópiák magyar története*. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület. <https://eda.eme.ro/handle/10598/33293>
- McCabe, Richard A. 1982. *Joseph Hall. A Study in Satire and Meditation*. Oxford: Clarendon P.

- McCarthy, Dennis. 2022. "Bloomfield, Lou, Project Creator. WCopyfind. Software." *Renaissance and Reformation* 44 (4): 196–200. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v44i4.38646>
- McKeon, Michael. (1987) 2002. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600–1740*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins UP <https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801869952>
- Mills, Dan. 2016. "Joseph Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* and the Geosatirical Indictment of the English Crown." In Tally and Battista 2016, 155–169. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137542625_9
- Milton, John. 1641. "An Apology against a Pamphlet Called A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus." In Wolfe 1953, 880–881.
- Milton, John. 1682. *A Brief History of Moscovia: And Other Less-Known Countries Lying Eastward of Russia as Far as Cathay. Gathered from the Writings of Several Eye-Witnesses*. London: Printed by M. Flesher, for Brabazon Aylmer. <https://digital.tcl.sc.edu/digital/collection/bhm/id/118/rec/1>
- Mish, Charles Carroll. 1967. *English Prose Fiction, 1600–1700: A Chronological Checklist*. Charlottesville, Virginia: Bibliographical Society of the U of Virginia.
- Molnár, Dávid. 2024. "Johannes Filiczki's 1614 Book of Poetry Published in Basel." *Hungarian Studies* 38 (S): 55–86. <https://doi.org/10.1556/044.2024.00279>
- Moreau, Isabelle. 2016. "Seventeenth-Century Fiction in the Making." In Glomski and Moreau 2016, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198737261.003.0001>
- Newcomb, L. H. 2004. "Kirkman, Francis (b. 1632, d. in or after 1680), Bookseller and Writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/15672>
- Orr, Leah. 2011. "Genre Labels on the Title Pages of English Fiction, 1660–1800." *Philological Quarterly* 90 (1): 67–96.
- Orr, Leah. 2017. *Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690–1730*. Charlottesville and London: U of Virginia P.
- Orr, Leah. 2023. *Publishing the Woman Writer in England, 1670–1750*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Pask, Kevin. 2002. "Plagiarism and the Originality of National Literature: Gerard Langbaine." *ELH* 69 (3): 727–747. <https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.2002.0028>
- Powell, Manushag N. 2023. "More Wars of Attribution?", *Digital Defoe. Studies in Defoe and His Contemporaries* 15 (1): 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.70213/1948-1802.1030>
- Psittacorum Regio, the Land of Parrots, or, The She-Lands with a Description of Other Strange Adjacent Countries in the Dominions of Prince de l'Amour, Not Hitherto Found in Any Geographical Map / by One of the Late Most Reputed Wits*. 1709. London, Printed for F. Kirkman and are to be sold at his shop [...].

- Quevedo, Francisco de. 1667. *The Visions of Dom Francisco de Quevedo Villegas, Knight of the Order of St. James Made English* by R.L. London: Printed for H.
- Quevedo, Francisco de. 1702. *The Visions of Dom Francisco de Quevedo. Villegas. Knight of the Order of St. James. Made English by Sir R. Lestrangle, and Burlesqu'd by a Person of Quality*. London, Printed and sold by B. Harris, at the Golden Boar's-Head in Grace-Church-Street.
- Reeves, Margaret. 2000. "Telling the Tale of The Rise of the Novel." *CLIO* 30 (1): 25–49.
- Rudyard, Sir Benjamin. 1660. *Le Prince d'amour; or the Prince of Love. With a Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs by the wits of the Age*. London: Printed for William Lake.
- Russell, Henry. 2000. "Steere, Richard (1643-1721), Colonial Merchant and Religious Poet." *American National Bibliography*. New York: Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/anb/9780198606697.article.1602731>
- Salzman, Paul, ed. 1991. *An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Salzman, Paul. 2017. "I. Authorship, Publication, Reception (I). 1470-1660." In Keymer 2017a, 3-25.
- Salzman, Paul. 1985. *English Prose Fiction, 1558-1700: A Critical History*. Oxford: Clarendon P.
- Samson, Alexander. 2016. "Lazarillo de Tormes and the Picaresque." In Hadfield 2016, 121-36.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower, ed. 2016a. *Utopian Literature in English: An Annotated Bibliography from 1516 to the Present*. University Park, PA: Penn State Libraries Open Publishing. <https://openpublishing.psu.edu/utopia/>
- Sargent, Lyman Tower. 2016b. "Hall, Joseph. *Mundus Alter et Idem*." In Sargent 2016a. <https://openpublishing.psu.edu/utopia/bibcite/reference/18425> [Accessed online on April 27, 2026]
- Simonova, Natasha. 2015. *Early Modern Authorship and Prose Continuations: Adaptation and Ownership from Sidney to Richardson*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137474131>
- Steere, Richard. 1684. *A Monumental Memorial of Marine Mercy Being an Acknowledgement of an High Hand of Divine Deliverance on the Deep in the Time of Distress, in a Late Voyage from Boston in New-England to London, Anno 1683: In a Poem. / By Richard Steere; To Which Is Added Another Occasioned by Several Remarkable Passages Happening at the Birth of a Male Child on Board the Same Ship in Her Voyage Returning 1684. By the Same Author Then a Passenger*. Massachusetts: Richard Pierce.
- Tally, Robert T. and Christine M. Battista, eds. 2016. *Ecocriticism and Geocriticism: Overlapping Territories in Environmental and Spatial Literary Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137542625>

- Turner, James Grantham. 2017. "Cross-Sections (3). 1666-1670." In Keymer 2017a, 73-88.
- Turner, James Grantham. 2012. "'Romance' and the Novel in Restoration England." *The Review of English Studies* 63 (258): 58-85.
- Wands, John Millar, ed. and transl. 1981. *Another World and yet the Same. Bishop Joseph Hall's Mundus Alter et Idem*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Watt, Ian. 1957. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Weidhorn, Manfred. 1970. *Dreams in Seventeenth-century English Literature*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wharton, Donald P. 1992. "Hudson's Mermaid: Symbol and Myth in Early American Sea Literature." In Derounian-Stodola and Meserole 1992, 38-56.
- Wharton, Donald P. 1979. *Richard Steere: Colonial Merchant Poet*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.
- Wolfe, Don M., ed. 1953. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton. Volume 1 1624-1642*. New Haven: Yale UP.