<div align="center">**Error and Print Culture, 1500-1800: Abstracts**</div>

Giles Bergel (Oxford), "'The ordinary correctors being not skill'd in the Pedegrees": genealogical errors, corrections and emendations in Sir William Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656)'

Sir William Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656) is a substantial achievement of historical scholarship and the printer's art, embodying decades of learning in 800 folio pages. Like all complex early-modern books, it contains numerous errors, which are only partially enumerated in the author's Errata statement at the back of the book. Many of the undisclosed errors relate to the almost 200 letterpress genealogical diagrams of the Warwickshire gentry contained in the book, one of its most appealing features to its intended readership. It is known from Dugdale's own words that the diagrams gave Dugdale and his printer Thomas Warren considerable trouble: errors that result in genealogical nonsense are readily apparent. The problems inherent in setting complex hierarchical figures in letterpress are further exposed by a comparison of the book as printed with its manuscript. Between the book and the manuscript we can see the author and printer engaged in a dialogue about how best to fit content to page. The outcome of that dialogue resulted in deletions and alterations, through which the most disposable (and hence by implication the more important) parts of the book, as far as its author was concerned, may arguably be glimpsed. This paper will examine the printing of the *Antiquities* in relation to our general understanding of the processes of printing and correcting of the time - in particular the role of the author in the printing-house – and ask how far the *Antiquities* are a special case. It will address the book's reception through looking at some manuscript annotations, later editions and through the book's usage as a handbook of genealogical information that was cited in legal proceedings. Comparing the book's monumental reputation with its troubled birth, the paper will conclude with some thoughts on its digital remediation.

Claire Bolton, 'In Praise of Errors'

Errors are valuable. They provide clues that give the game away - in life, and in bibliography. Errors contribute diagnostic evidence of printing practice. Our knowledge of printing practice at its beginnings is fragmentary - there are no manuals that explain printing methods until the 17th century. To discover how the early printers worked it is necessary to look at their products, the books they printed, and find the errors. In contrast perfection tells us nothing. This paper will look at a variety of printers' errors in typesetting, inking, copyfitting, make ready, press work and paper handling, and consider how they came about, and what they can tell us about printing practice. Some of the errors are so noticeable it is surprising (from today's point of view) that the pages containing these imperfections were not removed but instead were allowed to be bound up into expensive books – one wonders why the printer and/or the purchaser did not notice or mind. Many of the errors of the early printers have continued to be made in the sixteenth and succeeding centuries. Indeed many of them are easily recognisable by hand press printers today. A better knowledge of the processes that go into the production of a book can help us understand what was required of hand press printers, and the equipment that was available to them, throughout the last 560years. This is essential knowledge for the bibliographer or book historian to appreciate how the book was made, now that letterpress printing has almost become a thing of the past.

Piers Brown (Kenyon College), 'Preliminary problems in Thomas Coryat's *Crudities*'

Modern books still bear the marks of methods intended to avoid errors in the process of print publication, most prominently in the convention of separate pagination for the preliminaries and the rest of the text. This arrangement developed out of the practical problem of how to sign the quires of a book (and later to foliate or paginate the leaves) when the preliminaries would be produced after the rest of the work, allowing them to be expanded, supplemented or fixed during the printing process. Yet even this precaution could prove insufficient. My paper will examine what might go wrong using the example of Thomas Coryat's *Crudities* (1611), a publication whose preliminaries became so long that they were later published in a pirated edition as a separate text, *The Odcombian Banquet*. I will examine the evidence of the sorts of insertions and revisions that this practice was intended to prevent

and discuss Coryat's own attempts to explain and excuse the problems posed by the profusion of commendatory texts.

Alexandra da Costa (Newnham, Cambridge), 'Negligence and Virtue: Error in Early Evangelical Printing'
   Tyndale ended his edition of *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon* (*STC* 24454) by apologising to his reader that 'divers thinges are oversene thorow negligence in thys lytle treatise', while simultaneously marvelling 'that it is so well as it is' and arguing that 'it becometh the boke even so to come as a morner and in vile apparell.' There then follows just two rather minor errata:

   ¶In the .x. leafe .ii. syde .v. line / for fewe and fadeth reade fewe and sealden.
   ¶In the .xxxix. leafe / fyrst syde / xv. line / for Roma. ii. reade Roma.ix.

In this rhetorically constructed notice, Tyndale used the presence of error to allude to the difficulties of printing under persecution and so to equate poor printing with greater textual virtue, unlike the handsome, easily printed texts of the traditional Church. By drawing attention to just two mistakes, he also paradoxically emphasised the quality of the printing achieved and bolstered the reader's sense that this was a careful text, accurately grounded in scripture by 'compare[ing] the textes together' (A2r). In this paper, I will look at how Tyndale and other English evangelicals used discussions of printing error, both its presence and attempts to avoid it, to construct an image of themselves as authors, to give greater authority to their texts, and as a metaphor for spiritual qualities. The paper will focus closely on the earliest evangelical tracts, printed between 1528 and 1539 for an English readership and how the writers made use of paratextual features, such as errata notices, tables and prefaces, to foreground these ideas.

Karina de la Garza-Gil (University of Cologne), 'Ulrich Zell's Workshop, The House of Errors?'
        This paper will discuss two instances in which productions from Ulrich Zell's workshop "went wrong" and intends to position these mishaps within the perspective of a printing workshop approaching the 16th century. It is a House of Errors, each one to be analysed in isolation but at the same time contextualised within the broader frame of social and political factors surrounding the printing house. Since the evidence collected is better understood when presented visually, the paper will illustrate data collection techniques and their potential for historical interpretation. The two examples intended for use in this paper provide evidence for two different errors in one specific printing house. The first one is Ulrich Zell's edition of the *Formicarius* (GW M26847), it seems that compositors ran out of space and an emergency measure was taken to "fit in" the forecasted text; this error is very probably related to the kind of printing technology and printing practice Ulrich Zell was using. The second example is made of the three editions of Ulrich Zell's *Epistola ad Turcorum imperatorem Mahumetem* (GW M33645, M33648, M33649). This error had little to do with the technology used to print the editions, but provides evidence for a "continuity of errors", i.e. a compositor omitted words from the Epistle and the mishap was then reproduced in further editions (also by printers other than Zell). This "continuity", might have an explanation in the socio-political context of its reception.
This paper is part of a research in progress, which originated from previous bibliographical research into the early production of quarto editions from Ulrich Zell's printing house. The research is conducted by the author at the University of Cologne in the form of a PhD, and it falls in the context of printing technology history and its interrelation with geographical and socio-economical contexts.

Katherine Hunt (University of East Anglia), 'Listening out for error in print'
        This paper considers some relationships between printed notation and (mostly non-musical) sound in early modern England and asks how this notation was read and mis-read: encoding, or creating, noisy kinds of error. I take as a starting point Tim Ingold's assertion in *Lines: A Brief History* (2007) that 'Reading a script is an instance of cognition, of taking in the meanings inscribed in the text; reading music is an instance of performance, of acting out the instructions inscribed in the score' (p. 11). If scores have such an outward- facing relationship to

the world, where might error fit in to the success or failure of the 'acting out' of a score for non-musical sound? From representations of poetic syllables in diagram form, to hunting noises, to the directed ringing of bells, I investigate how some specific sounds were made visible on the printed page: as printed type, woodcut diagrams, or engraved illustrations that combined image and text.

Hearing error I suggest, required a particular kind of attention. In early eighteenth-century Oxford, the deputy keeper of the Bodleian Thomas Hearne listened out for mistakes as he heard the local bell-ringers ring according to the strict notation of change-ringing: counting the 'faults' in what was otherwise 'true ringing'. Such an activity required extreme close listening; he confessed that, in listening out for these errors, 'I do not know that I ever gave greater attention to anything in my life' (Hearne, *Remarks and Collections* XI, 1914, p. 328). Hearne's ultrasensitive aural awareness seems to assume that the printed score should be precisely 'acted out', and takes any deviation to be a fault. Other scores, however, and other ways of hearing proposed a fuzzier relationship between sound and notation in which noise was not always so strictly tied to the printed page and error was, therefore, less easy to recognise. In this paper I pay attention to printed notation and the ways in which it could be acted out, and to the relationships between cultures of print and practices of noise-making in order to ask: what might error sound like?

Eilidh Kane (Glasgow), 'Corruption or Collaboration?: Compositorial 'Error' and the Creation of Meaning'

Printerly interventions are most often treated by textual scholars and editors as 'corruptions' which must be removed if readers are to access texts as their authors meant them to be. It is as though any digression from an authorial manuscript (real or imagined) is an error which must be corrected. However, such a straightforwardly negative characterisation does not take into account the fact that often writers expected printers to intervene and make changes to their texts in the move from manuscript to print. Taking Thomas Middleton's *The Nice Valour* (1622) as a starting point, my paper reconsiders the idea of 'corruption' by examining early modern perceptions of what printers were supposed to do. I focus on the attempts made by the play's author character, Lepet, to have his book printed and Middleton's depiction of the relationship between writer and printer: although Lepet believes the compositor has made many mistakes while setting his text, he never questions the printer's right to read and interpret his writing. I move on from this depiction of an author who accepts a printer's role in shaping meaning in the text to examine some instances of 'compositorial error' as identified by the Oxford *Middleton.* I propose that these 'errors' are, in fact, examples of printers making valid readings of the texts entrusted to them. In light of the evidence which suggests that shaping meaning was understood to be part of a printer's job and that their changes could arise from reasonable interpretations of the text, my paper builds on Jeffrey Masten's suggestion that 'corruption' is just 'collaboration' given a negative spin. I argue that before we dismiss printerly interventions as 'errors' or 'corruptions', it is worth considering what was gained when an early modern printer departed from his copy text.

Huub van der Linden (University College Roosevelt), 'Errors and corrections in Italian music prints: The Silvani firm in Bologna (1696-1726)'

For financial and technical reasons, one of the most challenging areas in the realm of early modern printing was printing music. The firm run by Marino Silvani in Bologna from 1696 to his death in 1710, and afterwards by his heirs until the death of his sun Giuseppe Antonio in 1726, was one of the more important music printer-publishers in Italy at the time. It used moveable type, which allowed for flexibility and an efficient use of the hardware, but also could lead to a range of errors of the sort that also occur in text editions. Based on the first-hand inspection and detailed comparison of multiple copies of many editions printed by the Silvani firm, this paper presents – for the first time for late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Italian music printing – a broad overview of the types of errors and their correction methods that are found in music editions of this period. This shows errors ranging from relatively innocuous ones, such as displaced or upside-down clefs, to more serious ones, like missing notes, wrong notes, missing or superfluous measures, or worse. A close inspection of the firm's editions shows

an equally large range of correciton methods: stop-press corrections, post-printing in-house corrections by pen, errata lists, smaller and larger cancel slips, and even the occasional cancel sheet. This material raises questions about who, when, and why the choices about corrections were made. Some errors, however, went (deliberately or not) uncorrected within the print shop. Of these, some were corrected in later editions, and others were corrected by early users. In fact, these instances form a good indication that the music in question was actually performed by that particular owner. As opposed to texts, the more serious errors in a music print would result in a piece sounding evidently wrong. Thus, beyond providing insight into how an early eighteenth-century music printer dealt with errors and corrections, a detailed study of corrections in printed music also provides key clues about the use or lack thereof of individual copies.

Peter McCullough (Lincoln, Oxford), 'Badly printed? Donne's *XXVI Sermons* and good bad text'

This paper explores material from the third folio of John Donne's sermons (*XXVI Sermons*, 1661): notoriously 'badly printed', according to some critics. Editing, however, reveals a more complicated story that tells us a lot about the (messy) manuscript texts used for copy, the learning (or lack of it) among compositors confronted with learned texts, patterns (such as they are) of stop-press correction, the legacy of those errors *and* corrections in modern editions, and the eye-popping concern over error as shown in manuscript corrections by anonymous seventeenth-century owners of two copies of the folio now in the Bodleian.

Harry Newman (Kent), '"[W]hat have we heere? … sure some Scape": Reading for Scapes, Faults and Slips in Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*'

Although not available in print until more than twelve years after it was first performed, *The Winter's Tale* is a play that concerns itself with the printed book trade. As well as presenting an encounter in which printed commodities – Autolycus' broadside ballads – are expertly flogged, Shakespeare uses print as a recurring metaphor, especially in analogies between biological and typographical reproduction. Paulina, for example, exhibits the face and body of the new-born Perdita in order to prove to Leontes that, 'Although the print be little,' she is 'the whole matter / And copy of the father' (II.iii.97-8). The characters' language of print is intertwined with the rhetoric of truth, accuracy and error, perhaps most crucially through the Shepherd's identification of the abandoned Perdita as a 'scape'. The play engages with the discourses of textual illegitimacy and deformity which pervaded the prefatory materials to books printed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, including the volume in which *The Winter's Tale* was first published, Shakespeare's First Folio (1623).

Building on the work of scholars such as Aaron Kitch, this paper explores the significance of literal and figurative references to print in *The Winter's Tale*, but it also considers the impact of experiencing the play in print as a reader, especially as it was published in the Folio. This approach enables insights into the relationship between authorial, scribal and compositorial errors and the sexual, interpretive and psychological errors made and perceived by characters within the play. How do textual cruxes or errors inflect our understanding of the jealous Leontes' hermeneutic inflexibility (surely Hermione is a 'hobby-horse', not a 'Holy-Horse')? Can the editorial imperative to identify and correct errors be related to the processes by which Time 'makes and unfolds error' (IV.i.2) in the play? In addressing such questions, this paper seeks more broadly to investigate how dramatic metaphors are nuanced by their material forms, and to consider the role of error in the relationship between stage and page in early modern England.

Emma Smith (Hertford, Oxford), '"Vouchsafe with your pen the amendment of these few faults": errors and correction in the Shakespeare First Folio'

Errors must have been much in the mind of William Jaggard's printshop as the First Folio went slowly through the press: at the same time as the Shakespeare volume, the business was producing Augustine Vincent's folio *Discovery of Errors*, in which Jaggard was given space to defend himself against the charges of carelessness. My paper uses this context to reexamine the errors and corrections in the Folio, and uses examples from early annotations to understand where readers exercised their own corrective agency.

Simon Smith (Birkbeck, London), 'Notation errors and musical skill in printed music book paratexts'

In 1601, Philip Rosseter published a handsome *Book of Ayres*, containing twenty-one pieces by his friend and contemporary Thomas Campion, and twenty-one of his own compositions. Whilst the book's folio format and ornate title page might suggest permanence and precision, the prefatory address to the reader undermines these suggestions by speaking of errors in the volume, announcing that 'if anie light error hath escaped vs, the skilfull may easily correct it, the vnskilfull will hardly perceiue it'. A familiar trope in both early modern and contemporary publication is to offer an apology for any overlooked mistakes, but Rosseter and Campion's address to the reader is idiosyncratic in eschewing such admission of responsibility. Instead, they seek to pre-empt criticism of 'anie light error [that] hath escaped vs' by suggesting that such errors do not actually matter. Readers with the skill to spot such a mistake should also have the skill to 'easily correct it', whilst 'the vnskilfull' will be oblivious – and there is really no need to apologize to those who can 'hardly perceive' that they are performing wrong notes. This paper will ask what such paratextual comments might tell us about composers' attitudes to errors in printed notation, and about how different consumers might respond to such errors (if at all). In particular it will examine how early modern understandings of musical skill are imagined to impact upon engagements with printed musical notation. Does a mistake in the notation matter if a singer can correct it automatically in performance? Is an error still an error if no one notices it?

**

The Printer.

The Auther being a farre off, some faults may haue passed mee: I pray you impute them to meere ignoraunce.