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I

MOST of our information about Caxton and the history of the first English press comes from the various prologues and epilogues that he wrote for some of the books that he printed. But scholars have tended to extract from these sources merely what they were looking for; a comprehensive investigation has never been made.¹ I believe consequently that not only have we misinterpreted some of the details, but also that the prologues and epilogues could yield far more information from such an investigation. As Caxton is the most important, if still a somewhat enigmatical, figure in the history of the early English book trade, we ought naturally to find out as much about him as possible. An investigation of this sort will not always be able to answer all the questions it raises, but there is much to be said for knowing what the problems are so that scholars can be in a position to offer possible solutions. I realize also that some of the solutions I shall offer in the course of this paper will be somewhat speculative, but they are for me the most convincing in the light of the available evidence.

Before a start is made it should be made clear that there is as yet no authoritative edition of Caxton’s prologues and epilogues. The edition by W. J. B. Crotch for the Early English Text Society is the most recent and the one which I shall use for reference where possible. Yet not only does it include many pieces which are now recognized as not being original pieces by Caxton, but, more importantly, it also omits some prologues which

add to our general picture of him.\(^1\) The investigator still has to rely on the original printed books.

The first question I should like to deal with is the relationship that existed between Caxton and Margaret of Burgundy. Here I think we have misinterpreted what Caxton has to say about Margaret because we have read his prologue and epilogues to the *History of Troy* in isolation without comparing them with his other prologues and epilogues. Because of what he says in this book biographers have understood that Caxton was in the service of Margaret of Burgundy and one of them has gone so far as to suggest that he was Margaret’s librarian.\(^2\)

The theory that Caxton was in Margaret’s service is based on three details found in the prologue and epilogues of the *History of Troy*. Firstly, he uses such expressions as “my ... redoubtid lady” (p. 6) when referring to Margaret. Secondly, he received a yearly fee from her (p. 5). Thirdly, he says of himself that “y am a seruant vnto her sayde grace” (p. 5).\(^3\) The first of these arguments is clearly of no significance, for expressions of that nature merely imply a general subservience to someone of higher status. Such a remark is “eine blosse Etikette-form”.\(^4\) Caxton frequently uses such expressions with reference to others. Earl Rivers is “my lord” (p. 28) or even “my special lorde” (p. 32), and the young Prince of Wales is “my moost redoubted yong lorde” (p. 34). That Caxton received a yearly fee from Margaret is also inconclusive. We do not know how much this “fee” was, though it should probably be understood as being similar to Chaucer’s pension from Richard II rather than in the sense of a modern salary. An illuminating parallel can be found from Caxton’s later life. He started translating the *Golden Legend*, but because of its length was inclined to give it up. He was encouraged to continue it by the

---

\(^1\) For example, the prologues to the *Siege and Conquest of Jerusalem* and the *Chronicles* are omitted; Crotch also includes too much from *Reynard the Fox* (both editions). Page references in brackets after quotations from Caxton’s works are to Crotch’s edition.

\(^2\) Hittmair, op. cit. p. 32.

\(^3\) The most recent book on English printing repeats the generally accepted view; see C. Clair, *A History of Printing in Britain* (London, 1965), p. 10.

\(^4\) Hittmair, op. cit. p. 18.
Earl of Arundel through one of his servants. As an inducement the earl offered him "a yerely fee" (p. 70), which in this case consisted of a buck in summer and a doe in winter. Margaret's fee was possibly of the same type and granted for the same reason. It was a mark of favour given to encourage Caxton to complete his translation and to encourage him to hope for further favours (p. 5). It does not prove that he was in the service of Margaret of Burgundy any more than his later fee proves he was in the service of the Earl of Arundel. The last detail, and doubtless the one considered most conclusive by a majority of scholars, is his statement that he was a "servant" of Margaret of Burgundy. This detail I find equally inconclusive, for I would suggest that the meaning of "servant" has been misunderstood. "Servant" is, in fact, a polite formula which a gentleman might apply to himself when addressing a lady, or a member of a lower class to himself when addressing a member of the nobility.\(^1\) It need not at this date mean that the person was serving in the household of another. It is merely the reverse of Caxton's addressing Margaret as "my redoubtèd lady". Caxton in his prologues and epilogues calls himself a "servant" of many people—and it is surprising that this has not been noticed before. The *Game and Play of the Chess* is dedicated to the Duke of Clarence "by hym that is your most humble seruant" (p. 16), and the *Golden Legend* to the Earl of Arundel by "Wyllyam caxton hys poure seruaunte" (p. 70). Caxton is a "humble seruaunt" (p. 105) of Margaret, Duchess of Somerset. In some prologues and epilogues "servant" is linked in a doublet with "subject" and this confirms for us what Caxton understood by the word. The Prince of Wales is asked to accept *Jason* from "his humble subgiett & seruaunte" (p. 34). Caxton also describes himself as being the "moost humble subget & litil seruant" (p. 44) of Edward IV and the "most Indigne humble subgette and lytel seruaunt" (p. 104) of Henry VII. Caxton's use of "servant" in the *History of Troy* is certainly no different from his use of it in these examples. It cannot be proved from the occurrence of the word "servant" in the *History of Troy* that Caxton was a servant in the household of Margaret. It is

---

1 Cf. The Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. Servant, sb. 4.
a polite expression of respect that he used when addressing many of his patrons; and this is how we should understand it in the *History of Troy*. Margaret of Burgundy was Caxton's patron.

II

If it is accepted that Caxton was not in the service of Margaret of Burgundy, it is possible that the current theories about how and why he started to print will have to be reconsidered. As such an investigation would take us far beyond his actual prologues and epilogues, I should like to postpone it for the moment. I want to consider now the early fortunes and patrons of the first English press as revealed to us through his prologues and epilogues.

After finishing the *History of Troy* under the patronage of Margaret of Burgundy Caxton did not continue with English works, but either alone or with Colard Mansion he produced several printed books in French. This fact is not without interest. Caxton tells us in the *History of Troy* that he had been asked for so many copies by various people that he was forced to turn to printing to provide them all. If this statement were true, we may well wonder why Caxton turned to printing French books afterwards. The English *History of Troy* must have been printed mainly for English people either in the entourage of Margaret of Burgundy or at home in England. The change to French might indicate that it had proved more difficult to distribute the *History of Troy* in England than Caxton had anticipated. That he was aiming at an English market can hardly be in doubt, for the next book in English he produced, the *Game and Play of the Chess*, was dedicated to George, Duke of Clarence. The Duke of Clarence had little connection with Burgundy except that he was a favourite brother of Margaret of Burgundy and one may assume that Caxton was recommended to Clarence's patronage by Margaret. The choice of this patron can be interpreted as an attempt to win an English patron in England who might be willing to support the press in England. As it happens the choice of patron was unfortunate, for Clarence was not particularly popular in England and was to be imprisoned for
high treason in 1478. So the period following the printing of the History of Troy can be seen as one in which Caxton marked time; he printed books in French while waiting for a suitable opportunity and patron to come to England.

The next two books published in English with prefaces by Caxton show a complete change in direction. So far he had relied on more orthodox Yorkist support. Margaret of Burgundy, Edward IV's sister, was a useful patron while Caxton was in Burgundy and no doubt she rewarded him well. But if Caxton's intention was to produce and sell books in English on the English market, her usefulness was limited. George, Duke of Clarence, Edward IV's brother, may well have been pleased by the dedication of the Game and the Play of the Chess, but politically he was too much of a lightweight and his character was too volatile for him to be of much service to a publisher trying to break into the English aristocratic market. The dominant faction at court was the Woodville family and Caxton's next books show that he had thrown in his lot with them. His next two books (excluding any smaller pieces which were published without a preface) were Jason and the Dicts of the Philosophers. They were dedicated to the Prince of Wales and Earl Rivers respectively.

Let us consider Jason first. As a literary and historical narrative this work might be considered an extension of the History of Troy and it is therefore noteworthy that the dedication is not to the same person. Caxton does not dedicate it to Edward IV, as one might have expected after dedicating books to his brother and sister, because he assumes that Edward already has it in French. This can only be an excuse, for we know that the Burgundian library contained several copies of the History of Troy in French, though this did not prevent Caxton from dedicating his English version to the Duchess of Burgundy. He


2 J. Barrois, Bibliothèque prototypographique, ou Librairies des fils du roi Jean, Charles V, Jean de Berri, Philippe de Bourgogne et les siens (Paris, 1830) contains the inventories of the Burgundian library.
may not have known what reception Edward IV would give the press. But it is more likely that he had been assured that the Woodvilles would give him all the support they could. So he offered the book to the prince through the agency of the queen, Elizabeth Woodville. We cannot tell when Caxton first met Elizabeth Woodville though it seems probable that he had done so before this book was printed. We may remember that Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers, had been governor of the Prince of Wales since 1473 and he must certainly have been known to Caxton as Rivers's translation of the *Dicts of the Philosophers* was printed in 1477. Possibly the impetus for the dedication came from Earl Rivers and it certainly seems likely that Caxton was introduced into the Woodville circle by Earl Rivers. It is difficult to imagine that either Margaret of Burgundy or the Duke of Clarence would have supported such a move. Relations between Edward's brothers and sister and his wife's family were strained.

This leads us on naturally to a consideration of the *Dicts of the Philosophers*.1 We may note straightaway that this is the first book Caxton printed which had been translated by someone else. Indeed, we may go further and say that Earl Rivers is the only living translator who had his works published by Caxton. He was the only man who translated works in order that they might be printed at Caxton's press. Other patrons asked Caxton to make translations for them. This consideration by itself suggests that there may well have been a fairly close relationship between Caxton and Earl Rivers; there are other indications in the prologue which confirm it. When he had finished his translation Earl Rivers sent a part of it to Caxton to look over. Caxton found the book was well translated. However, there were two major omissions: firstly, letters sent between Aristotle and Darius; and secondly, the sayings of Socrates about women. Caxton agreed to leave out the first piece, but decided to include the second in his prologue. He introduces the sayings of Socrates with some playful comments on why Earl Rivers might have left

---

1 The arrangement of the editions of the *Dicts of the Philosophers* and their dates are disputed, but this does not affect the conclusions reached here as they all have the same prologue.
them out. Nowhere else does Caxton joke publicly with one of his patrons. His tone is usually that of the utmost deference. One can only assume that even at this date there was a rather special relationship between Caxton and Earl Rivers which allowed the former to take these liberties with his patron. He would hardly have included the sayings if he had thought they would not have been well received. There was no reason to include the sayings; he could have left them out, as he did the letters of Aristotle and Darius. Even if he felt he ought to include the sayings, there was no need for him to draw attention so ostentatiously to them. Our conclusion will be that Caxton must have known Earl Rivers for some time before 1477 and that probably it was Earl Rivers’s patronage which enabled him to transfer his press from Bruges to Westminster.¹

The relationship between Caxton and Earl Rivers progressed well. The following year Caxton printed the *Moral Proverbs* of Christine de Pisan in the translation by Earl Rivers. In 1479 he printed Earl Rivers’s translation of the *Cordial*. This contains a very interesting prologue, for in it Caxton mentions the various shrines which Earl Rivers had visited abroad on different pilgrimages. He also refers to the indulgence the Earl had brought back from the pope. Only otherwise in the case of the Earl of Worcester (cf. infra) does Caxton enlarge upon the exploits or journeys of a patron. These details suggest that Caxton took a special interest in the earl’s career. The earl certainly supported him financially (p. 39), but other patrons did this as well without Caxton taking a particular interest in them. During the first few years after his return to England, Caxton printed three books by Earl Rivers, received financial support from him and was apparently on terms of some intimacy with him.

In the meantime Caxton was also printing smaller pieces. Individual poems by Chaucer and Lydgate were issued as well as a few works in Latin. Few of these works have either a printer’s name or date of publication and so it is not possible to decide why or for whom they were printed. However, his text of Chaucer’s translation of Boethius does contain a prologue. This

¹ On Earl Rivers see R. Hittmair, "Earl Rivers' Einleitung zu seiner Übertragung der Weisheitssprüche der Philosophen", *Anglia*, lix (1935), 328-44.
is of interest because it was printed at the request of "a singuler frende & gossib of myne" (p. 37), though Caxton does not say who this particular friend was. The expression he uses is echoed in later works. Thus he printed the *Royal Book* for "a synguler frende of myn a mercer of london" (p. 101) and he uses a similar formula in the prologue to the *Book of Good Manners* (p. 99). I think it likely that Caxton's friend of the Boethius was also a mercer. It is unlikely to have been Earl Rivers or another member of the aristocracy, for Caxton does not address them in this way. If Earl Rivers were the patron of the Boethius volume there would seem to be no reason why Caxton should have referred to him so obliquely. Why, then, is this patron not referred to by name? An answer to this question must be tentative, but two possibilities do suggest themselves. The mercer who made the request might since then have committed some misdemeanour which could have made it impolitic for Caxton to refer to him. I find this somewhat unlikely, though my reasons for rejecting this solution will become clearer later. Alternatively, it could be that Caxton would have regarded including a mercer's name here as detrimental to the potential sale of the book. It is only we today who can realize that this friend might have been a mercer; it might not have been so evident to a contemporary purchaser. After Caxton had left Bruges he settled in Westminster where he was trying to build up a noble clientele for his books.¹ Through the Woodvilles, and Earl Rivers in particular, he apparently managed to become accepted almost as the court printer. The Boethius is a book which could have had a good sale among the noble clients and Caxton might not have wished to discourage any of these clients by indicating it was printed at the request of a mercer. This view is possibly too subtle; we shall have to consider it again when we discuss the *Royal Book* and the *Book of Good Manners*.

The next book with a preface, the *Chronicles*, shows a new departure in patronage. Caxton states that he has printed it at the request of various gentlemen. Perhaps this is merely a euphemism, Caxton meaning that he published it on his own

initiative and that he hoped it would be acceptable to his gentlemen clients. It might also indicate that the press was achieving a certain amount of independence. Even books of this size could now be issued without recourse to a particular patron.

The next group of works also indicates a new publishing venture for the press. This group consists of Cicero's *Of Age* and *Of Friendship* and the *Declaration of Noblesse*. It is not known who translated the first of these, though the translation was made for Sir John Fastolf, about whom Caxton gives us some information. This information may well have come from a preface to the original work, for there is no other evidence that Caxton had had any connection with Fastolf or his family. Caxton had made special efforts to acquire this volume, though he does not tell us why he made these efforts or how he knew of the existence of the translation. It does suggest that his connections with the general book-trade and with members of the aristocracy were good enough for him both to know of works and to acquire them. The other two works in this group were translated by John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester. Tiptoft, who had been executed in the temporary Lancastrian revival of 1470-1, is remembered now mainly for his part in the growth of humanism in England. It is natural, therefore, that many should see in this publication of two of his translations a recognition and acceptance by Caxton of humanism. But it is necessary first to consider why Caxton printed these works and how he regarded the Earl of Worcester. Caxton makes the following points about him: (i) he was recently killed; (ii) he excelled in "vertue & cunning" and among his lords temporal none was his peer "in science & moral vertue" (p. 45); (iii) he made other "vertuous werkys, whiche I haue herd of" (p. 47); (iv) he visited the holy places of Jerusalem; (v) he visited the pope who received him with honour; (vi) "I am enformed he ryght aduysedly ordeyned alle his thynges as well for his last will of worldly goodes as for his sowle helthe. & pacyently and holyly without grudchyng in charyte" (p. 47). Although Caxton thought highly (or rather expressed a high opinion) of Worcester, there is nothing in all this

---

which specifically links Worcester with humanism. He values his learning, but this need not be the New Learning. Indeed the way in which "science" is coupled with "moral vertue" suggests it is not. Furthermore, Worcester is praised for such medieval virtues as going on pilgrimage and visiting the pope; and we may recall that Caxton had praised Earl Rivers in exactly the same way. Nothing is said of his studies in Italy, his collection of manuscripts or his bequest of books to Oxford (though perhaps point (vi) could be interpreted to mean this). Even more important than the question of Worcester and humanism is the clear indication from these prefaces that Caxton had an informant who was quite well acquainted with Worcester and presumably favourably disposed to him. One cannot be certain how Caxton learned this information, but I would like to suggest that it might have been through the Woodvilles. The Woodvilles were firm patrons of Caxton and they had been friendly with Worcester. Though the exact relationship between the queen and Worcester is not clear, it was largely through the queen's influence that he was made Constable and then Treasurer of England in 1470.¹ Unpopular with many, Worcester was a friend of the Woodvilles; and so, even if the informant were not a Woodville, we may be certain that the publication of these translations would have been well received by the Woodvilles. They have much in common with the treatises translated by Earl Rivers.

Caxton followed these books with his version of the crusade of Godfrey of Bouillon. Doubtless the book reflects an attempt to capitalize on the interest shown in crusading at this particular time. It follows on also from the praise Caxton had bestowed on Rivers and Worcester for their crusading ventures and pilgrimages. But an English crusade could be organized only by the monarch and so the book is dedicated to Edward IV, the first book Caxton had dedicated to him. Even so, he includes the two young princes in the dedication, for he hopes they might also go crusading one day. It needs stressing that this is the first dedication to Edward IV, for it confirms our impression gained from the earlier prefaces that Caxton's position at court came through the Woodvilles rather than through Edward IV personally.

¹ MacGibbon, op. cit. pp. 87-88.
The *Mirror of the World* was translated and printed by Caxton at the order of Hugh Bryce, an alderman of the city of London, who paid for the edition to be set up—at least that seems the best interpretation of "at the request, desire, coste and dispense of . . . Hugh Bryce" (p. 52). What the financial arrangements were we cannot say, though possibly Bryce paid for the edition and Caxton distributed it. Perhaps Bryce took a major share in the profits, though his principal reason for asking for the edition was to be able to present it to Lord Hastings. The public for whom the book is intended is not any different from that for Caxton's other books, though it does show that other merchants were becoming interested in the press, perhaps for both prestige and profit. Furthermore, the prologue does raise the question of whether Caxton had had financial backing from other merchants at any earlier stage in the history of the press. Did the mercer who asked for Boethius contribute financially? Or, indeed, was the whole venture of the press supported financially by other merchants? We cannot tell, but we may accept the possibility. Although the edition was paid for by Bryce, Caxton does not fail to abrogate a good deal of the credit for the edition to himself. Caxton figures more prominently in the prologue than poor Bryce.

The final work I shall deal with in this section is the *Polychronicon*. The book was apparently issued on Caxton's own initiative. Possibly he had found that the *Chronicles* had done well and he wished to foster this type of demand. To Trevisa's translation he added the eighth book, which is drawn in great part from the *Chronicles*. Like the *Chronicles* and the *Description of Britain*, it is not dedicated to a particular patron. Whether this fact is significant or not is doubtful; it might indicate that Caxton felt historical works would sell quite well without patronage.

During the course of this brief survey it has not been possible to mention all the works published by Caxton in the period prior to 1483, a significant date in the history of the press for it saw the death of Edward IV and the temporary eclipse of the Woodville faction. The story we have pieced together is as follows. The two earliest English books were issued under the patronage

---

of the old-established Yorkist aristocracy. For various reasons this patronage was not very effective. Caxton consequently had also to issue books in French and later to turn to a different source of patronage. On his return to England he attached himself to the Woodvilles, particularly Earl Rivers. Yet as the period progresses we find Caxton issuing books on his own initiative and also for people other than the Woodvilles, although the primary market for which he is producing his books remains the court and the aristocratic public. Although he becomes more independent, there is much to suggest that Caxton still maintained close connections with the Woodvilles.

III

Relying upon the evidence provided by the early history of the press considered in the last section, we shall be in a better position to interpret the few scattered facts we know about the printing of the first English book. Most of the evidence comes from the prologue and epilogues to the *History of Troy* and we may start by rehearsing what details we can gather from that work. The translation was commenced in Bruges on 1 March 1469 (p. 2). After he had completed five or six quires Caxton fell into despair at ever finishing the task and put it aside, intending to give it up completely. Two years later he showed the part he had translated to Margaret of Burgundy. She ordered him to complete the translation (pp. 4-5). He continued it in Ghent (p. 6) and finished it in Cologne on 19 September 1471 (p. 2). From various other pieces of evidence we know that he was in Cologne to learn how to print. After his return to Bruges he set the translation up in type, for he had promised copies "to dyuerce gentilmen and to my frendes" (p. 7). Only by using the printing press can he carry out his promise. We may also note that Caxton makes the claim that he learned the art of printing at his own expense (p. 7). Finally, Caxton gives us some details about the book he was translating. The French version had been translated from Latin into French by Raoul

Lefèvre in 1464 at the command of Philippe, Duke of Burgundy (p. 2). Caxton does not explain how he managed to acquire a copy of a book in the ducal library.

A problem which is in my opinion central to the origins of the English press is the connection between the translation of the *History of Troy* and the printed book. Was this translation the first one that Caxton made and was it carried out in order that it should be printed? Some scholars have suggested in the past that Caxton tried his hand at translation from an early age and that both *Reynard the Fox* and the *Vocabulary in French and English* are examples of this early interest in translation.¹ This view is not supported by such evidence as is available. *Reynard the Fox* is a translation of a Dutch version printed at Gouda in 1479 and so the translation must have been made immediately before the book was printed in 1481.² The *Vocabulary* was almost certainly translated in 1465-6, as Grierson in a study of the coinage mentioned in the *Vocabulary* suggested.³ But both the method of translation and the linguistic details characteristic of the *Vocabulary* are very different from those in Caxton's accepted translations. It is unlikely that the *Vocabulary* was translated by Caxton. Probably it was made by another mercer and it may have come into Caxton's hands only shortly before he printed it.⁴ From the information at our disposal we may conclude that the *History of Troy* was Caxton's first translation. This is certainly the impression one gets from the prologue and epilogues of the *History of Troy*. Caxton would hardly have compared this attempt of his at translation to the running of "blynde bayard" (p. 4) if he was already experienced in the art of translation. Nor should we expect him to give up in despair after a few quires because of his ignorance of English and French. If, as Plomer suggested, he had translated for many

years, he ought to have had both experience and confidence. The tone of the prologue and epilogues of the History of Troy is very much that of a first attempt. If the History of Troy was Caxton’s first translation, the question naturally arises as to why he started to translate at all. It would be difficult, I think, to believe that the translation was merely the relaxation of a busy man. The conjunction of a first attempt at translation and a first attempt at printing is best interpreted to mean that the translation was undertaken in order to be printed. In other words Caxton’s decision to learn how to print may be dated to 1 March 1469 or earlier. The translation was probably only incidental to the grand design of learning to print. Caxton’s decision to translate is unusual, for there is no reason why he should translate a book in order to begin printing. He could have chosen an English book or he could even have employed someone else to do the translation. The reasons which led Caxton to choose such books as the History of Troy I have investigated elsewhere.\(^1\) The choice was governed by the aristocratic public he had in mind. An English book would not have had the advantages of being both a novelty and fashionable. Whether Caxton in Bruges could have found someone else competent to make an English translation is not clear, but it seems most likely. When he returned to England he continued to make his own translations, which suggests that he took an interest in translating and that in 1469 he made a conscious decision to undertake the translation himself.

Although the History of Troy is Caxton’s first translation, the very fact that he made the translation himself intimates that he may already have had an interest in books and literary matters. This raises the question of why Caxton is England’s first printer. Too many people think of the mercers as being exclusively wool merchants. Wool was one of the major commodities they dealt in, but they also handled luxury goods of various kinds. One of these luxury goods was manuscripts.\(^2\) We do not know enough

---

1 See p. 24, n 1.
about Caxton's early business life to be certain whether he handled manuscripts or not, but much would favour the idea. The transition from a seller of manuscripts to a printer and seller of books is an easy one and would not necessitate that sharp break in Caxton's life which most biographers see. When he became a printer he distributed his own books and acquired European books very quickly. This evidence suggests that he knew the workings of the book trade and became familiar with it while on the Continent. Finally, we now possess a manuscript which might have belonged to Caxton, MS. 1519 in Boston Public Library. Yet it appears that Caxton gave this book away in 1471 at a time when he was embarking on his printing career. It seems strange that if Caxton had had little to do with books till then, he should suddenly give away a manuscript when he started printing, particularly as the manuscript contained useful material which could be printed. If, however, he handled manuscripts by way of business and if they were passing through his hands continuously, one can appreciate why a gift of his should be a manuscript and why he should not be concerned at parting with it at the start of his printing venture. I would suggest it is very likely that part of Caxton's business at Bruges consisted in the purchase and sale of manuscripts.

In 1469, Caxton, the governor of the English nation, who probably already dealt in manuscripts, decided either on his own initiative or at someone else's insistence to begin a translation of the History of Troy in order to set it up in type. It seems likely that some arrangements must already have been made for him to learn how to print. Firstly, there would not be much point in beginning the translation until he was certain that he could print it. Secondly, when he took up his translation again after a lapse of two years, he went to Cologne shortly afterwards and learned to print. The speed with which the scheme was carried

1 For example, Reynard the Fox had been translated and printed by 1481 from the Dutch edition of 1479, Charles the Great by 1485 from the French edition of 1483.

2 H. McCusker, "A Book from Caxton's Library", More Books, 6th Series, vol. xv (1940), pp. 275-84. I am indebted to the Librarian of Boston Public Library for providing me with a microfilm of this manuscript.
out after its resumption suggests that plans had been carefully laid in the past. Yet having embarked on a translation and having completed a few quires, Caxton suddenly stopped the project and it remained in abeyance for two years. Why did this happen? He says it was lack of ability in translating on his part, but this is scarcely credible. He could have found another translator to take over. Furthermore, as when he resumed his translation he finished it without further misgivings, the reason for the stoppage should be looked for elsewhere.

In my opinion the reason lies in the political conditions in England. The finished product was intended for sale in England, for a translation would not otherwise have been necessary. When Caxton started on 1 March 1469 it seemed as though conditions in England were ideal for the introduction of printing. The Yorkist monarchy was apparently firmly established and it seemed destined for a brilliant future. Although he had as yet no male heir, Edward IV had been on the throne for some time and had brought relative stability to English political life. His sister had recently married the most illustrious and richest ruler in Europe. Much of the old aristocracy still remained and a new aristocracy had been created; and all were potential clients for the luxury book-trade. So on 1 March Caxton started his translation. Then suddenly in May 1469 rebellion broke out in England and it soon became apparent that it was a serious one. Not long afterwards the king was captured by Warwick. Although the king was released from captivity later in 1469, there was clearly too much political uncertainty for Caxton to contemplate continuing with the plan. His caution was justified, for in 1470 Edward's fortunes again took a turn for the worse. This time he was forced to flee from England and in October 1470 he took refuge in Burgundy. In March 1471 Edward IV with the help of Charles of Burgundy landed in England again and began the task of regaining his kingdom. He managed to do this by winning two important battles: Barnet (14 April) saw the defeat and death of Warwick, and Tewkesbury (4 May) resulted in the rout of the Lancastrians and the death of Henry VI's son, Prince Edward of Lancaster. Fauconberg's attack on London in support of Henry VI was a
failure and on 21 May Henry VI was murdered. Edward's position was now secure and his enemies had been dispersed. Men could once again turn their attention to more peaceful pursuits. Caxton, who had been waiting to see what the outcome of the struggle would be, could resume his translation. Nevertheless, it is clear from the foregoing that he is not likely to have resumed it until about June 1471. The two years of despair must have been from about June 1469 till June 1471.

We come now to a consideration of two difficult, inter-related problems: firstly, Caxton's relationship with Margaret of Burgundy; and secondly, did Caxton make the decision to learn printing by himself? It is doubtful whether we shall ever know the answer to the second question; the first is a little easier to answer. In the past it has been accepted that Caxton was in the service of Margaret and consequently many have felt that she should have the major credit for the first English printed book. I have shown above that there is no proof for this assumption and in my opinion it is unlikely that Margaret had anything to do with the initiation of the project. If Caxton ceased translating because of the political conditions in England, as I have just suggested, this would make Margaret's involvement at an early stage improbable. Although Edward IV was Margaret's brother and doubtless she was grieved by his misfortune, her own position was in no way threatened by his flight from England. If Caxton had been making the translation for Margaret at her command, there would be no very good reason why he should break it off on account of the turmoil in the English political scene. Furthermore, there is nothing in the *History of Troy* to suggest that Margaret was involved at an early stage. She seems only to have taken part after Caxton showed her the part he had translated. If she had ordered the translation in the beginning, Caxton would probably have told us so. Her role was the same as that of Caxton's later patrons. She gave her moral and financial support and she lent her name; but it is doubtful whether she did any more than this.

If Margaret took no part in promoting the press originally, can we discover whether Caxton initiated the project himself or whether someone else prompted him? All the early English
translations from the press were issued under patronage and this might indicate that Caxton felt a patron was necessary in order to break into the English market. If there were a patron at an early stage, who could it have been? Of the early patrons of the press the Duke of Clarence can almost certainly be eliminated as a possibility; he appears merely as a distant patron of one book and apparently took no real interest in the press. As we have seen, Earl Rivers had a close relationship with Caxton from a fairly early date in the press's history. Much could be said in favour of the theory that Earl Rivers was involved at an early date: he was often in Bruges and he was interested in literary matters. But it is open to two objections. Firstly, Caxton does not mention either in the *History of Troy* or later that Earl Rivers was involved, and a reason for this omission would have to be found. Secondly, the way in which Caxton tried Margaret and then Clarence and then Earl Rivers suggests that he was looking for a suitable patron by a process of trial and error. He would not have needed to go looking for another patron if Earl Rivers was already patronizing him. We can probably dismiss Earl Rivers. It is possible, finally, that someone other than a known patron might have helped Caxton in 1459, but that he was unable because of death or some other reason to go on assisting him later. This might account for the absence of any reference to such a patron and for Caxton's search for another one. But since this idea involves so much speculation, it is better to disregard it. It would seem easiest and therefore most satisfying to assume that Caxton himself initiated the project. In the first place, he does not mention that anyone else was involved. Secondly, he was a man of business and would have realized the possibilities of the press. Finally, if he was already in the manuscript trade, it would be a natural step for him to extend his operations to printing.

---

1 A person who would fit this arrangement is John Tiptoft. He was interested in literary matters and Caxton later printed some of his works. Furthermore, he was killed in 1470. But there is no known personal connection between Worcester and Caxton, and one might have expected some mention of it in the prologues to Caxton's editions of Worcester's translations. This suggestion may therefore be discounted.
From the foregoing discussion we may suggest, then, that Caxton decided to embark on a publishing venture and started translating the *History of Troy* as part of this venture. His intention was to set up his books in type and to capture the English market. His plans were disrupted by the revolt in England and Edward IV’s flight. After the restoration of the Yorkist monarchy he resumed his plans, but this time with the additional safeguard of the patronage of Margaret of Burgundy. With her financial support he finished his translation, learned how to print, and printed it.

IV

I want to take up here the story of the press where I left off at the end of section II, that is the year 1483. I want to consider now the years 1483 to 1485, for in those years many troubled events took place. The death of Edward led to the struggle for power between the Woodvilles and Richard of Gloucester. This was followed by Richard’s accession, the death of the princes in the Tower, Buckingham’s rebellion and, finally, Henry Tudor’s invasion leading to Bosworth. As we saw in the last section, the history of the press was influenced by the political upheaval in England in 1469-71 so that we should expect the same to happen in 1483-5. After all, Caxton had thrown in his lot with the Woodvilles and their influence waned considerably at this time, quite apart from the fact that Earl Rivers, Caxton’s principal patron, was executed in 1483.

By way of introduction I should like to consider the second edition of the *Game and Play of the Chess* (c. 1483). The first edition was dedicated to the Duke of Clarence as part of Caxton’s attempt to gain a patron in England. But Clarence was executed for high treason in 1478. So when the second edition was issued from the press Caxton wrote a new prologue which omits all reference to Clarence, though the new edition is not dedicated to any other patron. It does show that Caxton was quite willing to drop a patron who had become a liability, although he was not willing to replace him by another. It is instructive to compare this second edition with the other editions of the *Dicts of the Philosophers* and with the *Curial*. The latter was published in
1484 and in a short prologue Caxton says that it was delivered to him by "a noble and vertuous Erle, At whos Instance & requeste I haue reduced it in to Englyssh" (p. 89). Blades has, quite rightly I think, interpreted this earl to be Earl Rivers. Although it seems transparent to us that this must be Earl Rivers, the way in which Caxton phrases it can only be understood as an attempt to conceal the identity of the patron. It could be that many would recognize who the patron was, but in this way Caxton could avoid giving open offence to Richard III and his party. He could still sell his books without too deeply offending either side: the Woodvilles would realize it was Earl Rivers and their opponents could pretend that it was not. In the light of this it is important to note that in the third edition of the *Dicts of the Philosophers* (c. 1489) Caxton does not omit Earl Rivers's name. The reasons which had persuaded Caxton to suppress the earl's name in 1484 were no longer valid in 1489, for we know from the *Game and Play of the Chess* that Caxton would alter a later edition if necessary. The reason is clear enough. In the meantime Henry VII had married Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Elizabeth Woodville, and thus the Woodvilles were able to regain some of their former influence. The Woodville name became an asset again: it was no longer a liability. In the period 1483-5 we ought therefore to expect two things: books published with the names of the patrons suppressed for political reasons and an attempt on Caxton's part to find new patrons to replace the Woodvilles, particularly Earl Rivers. These expectations are fulfilled.

The first intimation of the new conditions comes from the *Golden Legend*. This was published in November 1483. The events which we can trace for the preparation of this volume are parallel to those of the *History of Troy* and thus the one volume illuminates the other. Caxton says that after he had started to translate it he became desperate and was on the point of giving it up ("was in purpose to haue lefte it ", p. 70) because the translation was such a long one and because of the expense involved. We can hardly doubt that the real reason was that the patrons

---

upon whom he had been relying had been removed by the new political conditions and Caxton was thus deprived of financial and moral help. But just as a patron had stepped forward to help in 1471 with the History of Troy, so now a new patron, one who, as far as we can tell, had had no previous dealings with the press, offered his name and financial assistance. This new patron was William, Earl of Arundel, who asked Caxton to continue his translation and promised to take "a resonable quantyte" (p. 70) of the printed books off Caxton's hands. He also promised to deliver to Caxton an annual fee of a buck in summer and a doe in winter. This fee may be a reflection of Arundel's new appointment as Master of the Game of all the king's forests, chaces and parks south of the Trent. Caxton consequently describes Arundel as the "chyef causer" (p. 70) of the book's completion and as "my special good lord" (p. 76), and refers to himself as Arundel's "poure seruaunte" (p. 70). It is difficult to accept that Caxton was held up by the actual translation, for he was now an experienced translator. Furthermore, the fact that he issued a second edition of the Golden Legend and printed other books of a large format suggests that finance was not an insuperable problem. As earlier, Caxton was worried that political conditions might affect his sales; and he took steps to counteract those conditions by enlisting a new patron. One suspects that Caxton sought the patronage, for the earl took very little personal interest in the press. The negotiations were carried out by John Stanney on the earl's behalf.

Once again the new patron saved one book, but did not prove of much help on a permanent basis. Arundel did not patronize any other books. Caxton had to begin looking for another patron and his next book with a prologue, Cato, shows a completely different approach to the whole question of patronage and security in those troubled times. Cato is dedicated to the city of London. Such a dedication is completely unexpected, from the previous history of the press. Until then works were issued without dedication or under the patronage of some nobleman. Boethius had been produced for a friend, but this was glossed over. Not only does Caxton dedicate the book to London, he also states very clearly that he is a member of the mercers' company and
that he wishes to help London to the best of his ability. No­theme else does Caxton underline his affiliation to the merchant body of London. It is conceivable that the book itself may have suggested this to Caxton, for he tries to draw a parallel between Rome and London. The Londoners are not now so well-versed in conduct as they ought to be; the children do not follow in their father’s footsteps. The book may have been one more suitable for merchants than noblemen. But as previous books of this type were issued without comment and as Caxton is so anxious to point out his connection with London (though he lived and was to continue living in Westminster), it could be that the political conditions prompted this prologue. In this way he could withdraw from the Woodville faction without seeming to do so. He was merely stressing that side of his support which he normally chose to ignore.

The Knight of the Tower was commissioned by a “noble lady” (p. 86) whose name Caxton does not reveal. I have elsewhere advanced reasons for identifying this noble lady as Elizabeth Woodville. The present investigation reinforces those reasons. We should expect Caxton to be supported by the Woodvilles and we should expect him at this time not to draw attention to the help he had received from that quarter. The history of the book also underlines Caxton’s caution. The translation was finished on 1 June 1483, but the book was printed only on 31 January 1484. This is somewhat longer than he took to print some of his books and it might indicate a slight hesitation in setting it up. Of equal interest is the Order of Chivalry, published about the same time. This book had been translated at the request of “a gentyl and noble esquyer” (p. 82), though once again the squire is not identified. Presumably the squire was of the Woodville faction, though it is doubtful whether we should ever be able to identify him as there is no one in the list of Caxton’s known patrons who answers the description. Possibly he had been killed, because, although the book

1 The Vocabulary in French and English is a good example. It was no doubt designed for merchants and schools, but it was published without preamble.

2 “The ‘Noble Lady’ in Caxton’s The Book of the Knyght of the Towre”, Notes and Queries, ccx (1965), 92-93.
had been commissioned by him, Caxton dedicated it to Richard III. This brushing aside of one patron for another is unique in Caxton's works and might indicate the squire was not too important and was not in a position to object. Caxton attempted to win the favour of the new king by dedicating the volume to him. This was a move which was bound to happen, for Caxton would naturally want to safeguard his position. One may say, however, that this was the only book that Caxton did dedicate to Richard III; generally he remained loyal to his former patrons, even if somewhat surreptitiously. For his own part Richard must have been too busy to take much interest in the press; and normally it was not the monarchs but members of their circle who were the most dependable patrons of the printer.

Two other works from this period reveal the same story, the second edition of the *Canterbury Tales* and *King Arthur*. It will be remembered that Caxton was informed by "one gentylman" (p. 91) that his first edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was textually unsatisfactory and that if he would reprint it this gentleman would try to get his father's manuscript which had a better text. This was done. Once again the reason for the suppression of this gentleman's name must be the same; he must have fallen into disfavour in the new regime and Caxton deemed it expedient not to name him. It cannot have been Earl Rivers, for his father had been killed in 1470. Once more, I think, we have to accept that we cannot identify the patron. *King Arthur* is a little different in that Caxton does not say specifically that one man asked for the work, but that would seem to be the inference of the prologue. According to the prologue "many noble and dyuers gentylmen" (p. 92) asked him why he had not printed anything about King Arthur. Caxton objected that many believed that Arthur was a fiction, "wher to they answerd and one in specyal sayd" (p. 93) that there were many proofs of his existence. This *one* would seem to be the main person with whom Caxton had discussed the matter and probably for whom he printed the book. Certainly the manuscript he used had been sent to him for this purpose, or, as he writes, the story was set up "after a copye vnto me delyuerd" (p. 94). The whole prologue seems to indicate that he is once more concealing
the identity of a patron; again, we can only surmise that it was the political conditions which caused this suppression; and once more we cannot identify the patron. Possibly it was Earl Rivers, but the books he translated are of a very different type from *King Arthur*.

Although *Charles the Great* was translated in Richard III’s reign, it was not printed until after Henry VII’s accession and so it will be convenient to deal with it in the next section, which will be devoted to the last years of Caxton’s life. During the period 1483-5 discussed in this section we see that Caxton had had to suppress the names of five patrons, of whom two can be identified with considerable certainty as Earl Rivers and Elizabeth Woodville. That the other patrons were members of this circle is likely, for this would provide the most convincing reason for their names being withheld. It is, however, surprising that none of them had patronized volumes earlier and it could be that it took Caxton and Earl Rivers some time to interest the earl’s friends in the press. If so, it would be ironic that their efforts should be thwarted just as it seemed they were going to succeed.

The details of patronage in this period have considerable importance for our knowledge of the general working of the press. Firstly, Caxton evidently had a considerable backlog of work to get through, since we can assume that most of the volumes were given to him before the Woodville faction was worsted by Richard. The press was not working on such a hand-to-mouth basis as some have suspected. Secondly, it appears that Caxton remained basically loyal to the Woodvilles. Apart from one book dedicated to Richard III and another financed by William, Earl of Arundel, he published the books for anonymous patrons; he did not dedicate all his books to Richard III or his followers. Caxton may have been able to maintain a certain independence by relying upon the support of his mercer friends. Thirdly, we may conclude that the press was strong enough to survive the political upheavals of 1483-5. As we saw earlier, the disturbances of 1469-71 postponed the whole inception of the press. Now the press went on working at the same rate as before. To a certain extent the impetus which it had built up over the last five years was sufficient to carry it forward for the moment,
though, as we shall see, output was influenced by the troubles of the time. Patronage was still necessary for the sort of book that Caxton wanted to print.

Before concluding this section there is one small point I should like to consider. In the epilogue to the Order of Chivalry Caxton makes a reference to Froissart and he encourages all nobles to read his work. Clearly he had himself read it, for he mentions many of the English knights who appear in it. At the same time he refers to the stories which together form the tale of King Arthur. His readers are also advised to read these stories. The names of Arthur's knights are taken from Malory, for Caxton refers to a "perse forest" (p. 83). This must be Sir Perys de Foreste Sauvage, which is a name found only in Malory and which Malory apparently coined from his source.\(^1\) Caxton may well have been preparing the ground here for his later edition of Malory. We have seen that he might have been asked for this by a member of the Woodville circle prior to the summer of 1483 and so he would have had plenty of time to read it. In view of this it is equally likely that he intended to translate and print Froissart; indeed, he might have been asked for it by the same patron who asked for Malory, for the noble deeds of many English knights are included in it. This is speculation, but Caxton in his prologues and epilogues usually only deals at length with texts he has printed or will print. Froissart is an exception which is perhaps best explained as an intention to print which never came to fruition. The political conditions could offer an explanation of why it was not printed.

V

The translation of Charles the Great was concluded on 18 June 1485, and it was printed on 1 December; Richard III had been killed in the meantime, on 22 August. It was asked for by "a good and synguler frende" of Caxton's called "Maister wylliam daubeney" (pp. 98-99). Caxton does not refer to any offices that this William Daubeney held under Richard III,

but calls him a treasurer of the jewels to Edward IV. Unfortunately we know very little about William Daubeney except that he was a treasurer of the jewels and a searcher of the port of London under Edward IV and Richard III. Since Caxton was a large importer of books and since his name appears frequently in the customs accounts of the port of London,¹ he probably got to know Daubeney well in his office of a searcher of the port. Caxton must have known that Daubeney, his "synguler frende", had been confirmed in his positions by Richard III and no doubt he omitted this on account of the new political situation which prevailed when the book was printed. What Daubeney's position was under Henry VII we cannot tell, but there are one or two intimations that he might not have been in sympathy with the new regime.² Caxton has resorted to patronage once again, but this time of a different sort. William Daubeney and Charles the Great do not sort well together; this type of book might have been more fittingly sponsored by a nobleman. Possibly Caxton was unable at the moment to recruit more aristocratic support, for not until 1489 is another of his books dedicated to a nobleman. The next few were requested by mercers. Perhaps Charles the Great should be regarded as continuing the trend set by Cato which was to be continued later by the Book of Good Manners and the Royal Book.

It is paradoxical that in 1483-5, when the country was disturbed, the press should flourish at least in respect of the quality of the books published. The years following 1485 are relatively poor years for the press. This may indicate that in 1483-5 the press was working through its backlog of orders, but that it received few or no orders during that period. No text is credited to the press for 1486, though some undated ones may well belong here. The year 1487 witnessed only the Book of Good Manners, the Speculum Vitae Christi and the Directorium Sacerdotum. The following year was a little better with the third edition of the Horae, the Royal Book, the Image of Pity, the Doctrinal of Sapience and another edition of the Speculum. Apart from the Book of

Good Manners and the Royal Book, which were commissioned by mercers, these are all technical religious works which were suitable for a rather different public than the one Caxton usually supplied. This selection reveals that Caxton was finding it difficult to recruit new patrons among the members of the new court. Possibly we should attribute his life of Robert of Oxford, which he brought out for John, Earl of Oxford, to these years, for it was completed before 1490 and almost certainly dates from after 1485. Oxford was in no position to order it before then. But even including this volume, these years are very thin for literary and aristocratic works when compared with the previous few years.

The Book of Good Manners was delivered to Caxton by "An honest man & a specyal fren[d]e of myn a Mercer of london named wylliam praat which late departed out of this lyf" (p. 99). The copy was in French, which Caxton translated and then printed. This is the only time that Caxton mentions a mercer by name, except in the case of the Mirror of the World where the book was asked for by Bryce in order to be presented to Lord Hastings. Several reasons might account for this. Firstly, the aristocratic book market was at a somewhat low ebb at the moment. Secondly, Caxton may have thought the book more suitable for merchants and people of a lower status than for noblemen. He opens his prologue with the words "Whan I consydere the condycions & maners of the comyn people" (p. 99). Under these conditions the patronage of a mercer would be an asset. Finally, Caxton may have wished to honour the name of his dead friend. On the other hand, the Royal Book was given to him to be translated and printed by "a synguler frende of myn a mercer of london" (p. 101), whose name he does not give us. This book is somewhat different from the Book of Good Manners for it was "made in frensshe atte requeste of Phelip le bele kyng of fraunce" (p. 101) and was therefore suitable reading for all members of society, but particularly for noblemen. Caxton may have been trying with this book to regain the aristocratic market. We have seen earlier that he omitted the name of his friend who requested Boethius. The same reason may account for the omission of the name
in both cases and that reason may be that he did not want to alienate his noble customers by introducing a merchant's name. On the other hand, loyalty to the person who made the request and tact would demand that some oblique reference should be made to the mercer who commissioned the work, particularly if he was also making some financial contribution. It might seem odd to us that Caxton should act in this way, for in the latter case he does not conceal the fact that his friend is a mercer. But there is a parallel to this behaviour in many of the books published in 1483-5. Caxton refers to his patrons in such a way that some of them can confidently be identified; but he does not include their names.

In 1489 Caxton regained his position as a printer patronized by members of the court and once more the titles he prints show a decided swing to romances and books of chivalry. It is this year which witnesses his breakthrough with the new monarchy. Among his new patrons the Earl of Oxford was to be the most faithful, but Henry VII himself and his wife and mother all began to take an interest in the press. The *Fayts of Arms* appeared in July. It was sponsored by both Henry VII and the Earl of Oxford. The book was delivered to Caxton by the king at the palace of Westminster on 23 January, but the actual handing over was performed by the Earl of Oxford, who was attending on the king. This might imply that the Earl of Oxford sponsored Caxton at court and helped him with orders. Certainly Oxford patronized volumes on his own account. Oxford, who is now Caxton's "good synguler and especial lorde" (p. 106), sent the latter his copy of the French *Four Sons of Aymon* in order that it might be translated and printed. Caxton performed this to his "great coste and charges" (p. 106) and in the hope the earl would reward him. Oxford was perhaps not so munificent as Rivers and Margaret of Burgundy, who were thanked for what they had already given. It may be for this reason that Caxton mentions the previous volume he had printed for the earl. Also dated to 1489 is *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*. This Caxton translated at the request of Margaret, Duchess of Somerset, the mother of Henry VII. How long Margaret had taken an interest in Caxton is not clear, but he had sold her the manuscript of the French text
"longe to fore" (p. 105). She was also to commission another work. It is interesting to note that just as before 1483 it is not Edward IV but Earl Rivers and Elizabeth Woodville who take most interest in the press, so after 1485 it is not so much Henry VII as the Earl of Oxford and Margaret of Somerset who patronize the printer. For Caxton 1489 must have been a satisfying year. He had at last regained the position which he had built up before 1483 and which he had apparently lost in the political upheaval following Edward's death. For a man of his years to fight back in this way is in itself a considerable achievement.

The last year of his life shows Caxton still thinking of the future. At least this is how I would interpret his dedication of Eneydós to the Prince of Wales. He had dedicated Jason to the eldest son of Edward IV; he dedicated Eneydós to Henry VII's heir. The reason is probably the same in both cases: to work for protection from the future monarch while flattering his parents. It is probably only because Skelton was tutor to the Prince of Wales that Caxton wrote of him with such enthusiasm and asked him for his advice about the translation. It might not be out of place to recall that Earl Rivers had been governor to the future Edward V. A good way to influence a child is through its tutor and even Skelton must have been pleased with the eulogy. At about the same time Caxton printed the Fifteen Oes for Margaret of Somerset and Queen Elizabeth. Consequently, when he died in 1491 he could justifiably have felt that he was handing over a well-established business to Wynkyn de Worde. Wynkyn did not, however, carry on in the same way as Caxton. In 1500 he moved from Westminster and went in for more popular publishing.

In conclusion I should like to stress what I said at the beginning of this paper. I have tried to make a thorough investigation of Caxton's prologues and epilogues in an attempt to build up a history of the early press. I am aware that because of the nature of the available evidence I have had to speculate in certain places. I also realize that I have not exhausted the information which could be obtained from the prologues and epilogues. I hope, however, I have shown that they have been unjustly neglected, for they remain our most valuable source in trying to unravel
the development of England's first press. The limitations of space have prevented me from exploring all the hints contained in them but I hope that it may be possible for me to do this in a book in the not-too-distant future.¹

¹ I should like to thank Dr. D. J. A. Matthew for his help with this article.