



Ilha do Desterro

ISSN: 2175-8026

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Egan, Grace; Johnston, Colin
“Serving the turn”: Collaboration and Proof in Illegal Hand-press Period Books
Ilha do Desterro, vol. 71, no. 2, 2018, May-August, pp. 129-152
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

DOI: 10.5007/2175-8026.2018v71n2p129

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=478359431008>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

UABM
redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and
Portugal

Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

“SERVING THE TURN”: COLLABORATION AND PROOF IN ILLEGAL HAND-PRESS PERIOD BOOKS

Grace Egan*

Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford, United Kingdom

Colin Johnston**

Independent researcher currently not affiliated, Aberystwyth, United Kingdom

Abstract

This article considers the proofing of illegally-printed texts, primarily during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We argue that proofing – the practice of correcting a text during the printing process – is key to understanding the social dynamics of authorship, and the strains on production resulting from political suppression of the press during this period. We look at the evidence of proofing left in books (usually religious pamphlets), as well as the testimony of authors and printers. These sources reveal that illegal printing necessitated a remarkable degree of team work.

Keywords: Proofing; Ideal Copy; Reformation; Marprelate Controversy; Tyndale.

* Grace Egan completed a doctorate at the University of Oxford in 2015. She works for the Oxford English Dictionary. Her e-mail address is egan.grace@gmail.com.

** Colin Johnston is a librarian whose research interests include bibliography and illegal printing. His e-mail address is colinsj@aberwales.eclipse.co.uk.



Introduction

Turning out an illegal book in the hand-press period (c.1455—c.1830) was a difficult process, both politically and practically. With the Reformation, the printed word in Britain became a tool for disseminating controversial as well as orthodox ideas, and as such, printing was subject to various degrees of censorship. This remained the case throughout the political tumult of the seventeenth century. During the hand-press period, the proofing stage of printing – when errors in the text were corrected – was of special concern for producers and censors. By ensuring a certain level of accuracy and legibility, proofing upheld the message of a printed text. Being implicated in the correction of an illegal book was also held as proof of another kind, and could result in execution. Yet, despite the high stakes for those involved, and the insights it offers into the press's social machinery, proofing practice in the early hand-press period is not fully understood.

The logistics of correction and their impact on the quality of the final text have long exercised the minds of textual editors and historical bibliographers. The extent to which printers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries cared for the accuracy of the text is a particular "known unknown". Traditionally, "ideal copy" – a concept first floated in 1949 by Fredson Bowers – is the measure by which bibliographers have assessed all printed representations of an author's texts. Bowers defined it as "a book which is complete in all its leaves as it ultimately left the printer's shop in perfect condition and in the complete state that he considered to represent the final and most perfect state of the book" (113). One of the shortcomings of this approach is that usually we do not know what the perfect condition of a work might be and Bowers concedes the point for he states "if the only known copy seems normal, we must infer it is perfect" (113). In general, the earlier a work was printed, the fewer copies remain today. For illegal works, which had to be distributed carefully, even fewer might remain. Clearly, assessing "ideal copy" in the context of the hand-press period presents a challenge. Changing trends in editorial practices in the last few decades suggest that editors equate "perfection" with authorial intention (conscious or otherwise). This is despite widespread misgivings about relying on it as the sole measure of the accuracy of critical interpretation. Another limitation of this approach is its assumption of singular authorship, and that those proofing and printing have no impact on a book's state and meaning. Again, the model of textual production implied by "ideal copy" as it is traditionally understood does not fit. What we know of the workings of illegal presses in the early hand-press period suggests a highly collaborative approach borne of necessity and in some cases idealism.

The copy text preferred by scholarly editors used to be the last edition that an author amended. Now the first edition tends to be used as copy text, on the basis that authors "edit out" the radical linguistic innovations or social frissons of

their début. In the hand-press period, authors routinely attended the printing of their work, to catch errors early. Authorial involvement could be even greater for illegal material, where the author often belonged to the same network or faction as the printer, corrector and compositor. At the least, those responsible for the printing process would have to be complacent about putting illegal texts through their press. The accuracy of texts was heavily impacted by the legal and material conditions – often restrictive – to which they were subject. Considering these material and social circumstances can, therefore, be useful in our interpretations of what constitutes “ideal copy”. The shape given to printed texts by ideological and practical contexts means that we might only realistically expect copy that represents a line of best fit between authorial intention and reader reception. That is, a work that presents to the reader that which the author(s) intended in as clear and unambiguous a manner as is appropriate to the sense (Jackson 257).

While the relationship between “ideal copy” and authorial intention may have changed drastically, authors have been held responsible – to varying degrees – for the accuracy of their copy since the spread of the printing press. From the earliest years of the hand-press period, those involved with the press could face legal consequences for poor proofing. Around the year 1500, a case in Chancery was brought against three lawyers, based on their failure to “gyue attendaunce in Correctyng examenyng euery lefe after the prynting of the seid bokes [*Abbreviamentum statutorum*, 1499]” (Blayney i.80-1). That action was levelled against all three lawyers shows us that proofing was seen as a collective responsibility. We also know the general practice of making stop-press corrections was carried out whilst the sheets passed through the press, for variant states have been found in Caxton’s early works (Bühler). Also, according to Simpson, the practice of authors attending the press or expecting the printer to send out proofs seems to have become customary in the sixteenth century (255). Apologies, excuses and recriminations for errors remaining in published texts are often found in prefatory material. By 1625 it seems that the procedure was common enough for it to be the subject of a series of jokes in Middleton and Fletcher’s *The Nice Valour* and thus understood by the audience (Act iv, scene 1).

Delineating the normal stages of proofreading during the hand-press period requires that we consider evidence in practical and circumstantial terms. The varying degrees of evidence attributable to the successive stages of proofing may be significant in themselves. The abundant evidence of the third stage of proofing (stop-press correction) afforded by press variants and the lack of examples of stages one and two (first proof and revises) might at first be misleading, for by their very nature, “presspulls” tend not to survive. There are also some contemporary accounts of printing that claim multiple proofing stages were common practice. Moxon’s *Mechanick exercises*, which was first published in 1683-4, is the most comprehensive contemporary printing manual in the early hand-press period. The process involved several distinct roles, and multiple cycles of revision:

...the *Compositor* gives the *Corrector* the *Proof* and his *Copy* to *Correct* it by: which being *Corrected*, the *Corrector* gives it again to the *Compositor* to *Correct* the *Form* by (233).

[Then the compositor]...carries the *Form* to the *Press*, and lays it on the *Stone* for a *Second Proof*, and sometimes for a *Third Proof*... (238).

After all this *Correcting* a *Revise* is made (239).

[If necessary], After the *Second* or *Third Proof* he has a *Revise*, which is also a *Proof-sheet*: He examines in this *Revise*, *Fault* by *Fault*, if all the *Faults* he markt in the last *Proof* were carefully mended by the *Compositor*; if not, he marks them in the *Revise*.

Thus you see it behoves him to be very careful as well as skilful; and indeed it is his own interest to be both: For if by his neglect an *Heap* be spoiled, he is obliged to make *Reparation* (250).

As the text bounces back and forth between compositor and corrector, Moxon's explanation begins to read like a Biblical litany. Best practice is outlined here in the manner of a conduct manual, which points to the social and commercial obligations involved. Despite Moxon's detailed account of the press's procedures, Bowers doubts that the *Mechanick exercises* represents what happened during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Multiple revises, he contends, would have been seen as needless interruptions. But the "Reparation" mentioned by Moxon could be reason enough for stopping copy from being "spoiled" (a descriptor suggestive of moral as well as pecuniary reasoning). Whatever the reason, a significant number of changes were made to texts at the press during these periods, despite the resulting inconveniences.

Against this background of scepticism about Moxon's accuracy, it may be relevant to note another of his involvements pertaining to the presentation of printed language. Moxon also printed John Wilkins' *An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (1668). The *Essay* contained Wilkins' attempt at a "real character": a set of symbols associated with his attempt to create "philosophical language", from the need perceived by the Royal Society for a means of communicating unambiguously. Thomas Sprat, in *The History of the Royal Society*, explained the society's intention to reform English as a "return back to the primitive purity, and shortness, when men deliver'd so many things, almost in an equal number of words." Members aspired to speak "as near the Mathematical plainness, as they can" (113). The attempt was doomed to failure because language naturalises figurative senses all the time (Lakoff 3). But, Moxon's involvement in the project, and his mathematical expertise, suggest that his account of printing would have been as directly representative of his view of real practice as he could make it. And we know the language used by Moxon was not unique to his press; it was also current in Jaggard's workshop in London in the 1620s (McKerrow 207). So why not the practices, at least to a lesser degree? Certainly, Greg

believed that “there is plenty of evidence to show that the printer was not indifferent to the accuracy of his text and that he took what were thought in his day to be reasonable precautions, and went to some trouble, to reach a moderate standard” (*Shakespeare* 464).

Greg’s concession that a “moderate” proofing standard was the aim of Jacobean printers is not unique. McKenzie questioned the extrapolated conclusions of our imperfect knowledge of printing-house practices during the hand-press period. In his essay, “Printers of the Mind”, he set aside a purely “scientific” investigative approach; instead, he mixed the intellectual process with not a little common sense when examining bibliographical considerations. McKenzie argued that, by nature, each successive stage of the correcting process superseded the previous one: there never can be equal amounts of evidence of stages one and two to compare with stage three (44). If the last stage was carried out, why should we assume the other two were not? This is especially relevant with illegal material that, if discovered and confiscated, would have been destroyed by the authorities.

Conditions between different printing houses were changing constantly, as were the conditions within each house, maybe even on a daily basis. Further, we cannot compare the working practices of commercial presses in London with the partially-subsidised university presses of Oxford and Cambridge and expect to find identical approaches to printing procedures between them (see Hammersmith). Also, variations between works from the same printing house are not unknown; and this extends to the type, quality and frequency of corrections within an individual work. With so many participants and moving parts, the printing and proofing of text was bound to be complex and inconsistent.

The penalties for producing seditious and treasonous works were well known, for punishments were carried out publicly, arguably for the benefit of the collected gathering. However, we cannot know the impact of the law, and the extent to which it influenced the accuracy of unlicensed material. It is true, though, that proofing procedures – especially stop-press corrections – would have a significant impact on the length of time needed to complete the printing of illegal or seditious texts. Consequently, any evidence of material that was seditious or politically sensitive being proofed, should call our attention to the increased risk that the authors and printers were taking in the name of good copy. As we shall see, proofing was regarded as a necessary intermediate step in the production of printed works, and was also broadly understood to be part of the enterprise, or system of the press. The author(s) were often expected to be present, although the proofing itself was also the responsibility of printers and compositors. This practice means that illegally-printed material which shows evidence of having been proofed, was the work of collaborative networks of actors, not solitary authors.

The following discussion will focus on seditious material – from Tyndale’s *New Testament* to the dissenting presses of the seventeenth century – where the collaborative nature of the press is demonstrated by records of proofing practice.

Historical background

A degree of state control of the press had been an aim of the authorities since early Tudor times. In the 1530s, some authors manipulated the current disagreement between Henry VIII and the Pope, presenting it as a backdrop to their heretical pronouncements. Given this context, the authorities in England turned a blind eye to those who criticised the church even to a heretical level if their arguments appeared to support the king, but this "strategically vague" approach did not last (Costa). The mechanism for controlling the press remained relatively undeveloped under Edward VI and Mary Tudor. It continued to be ineffectual for the most part until the mid-sixteenth century, until organised resistance by a growing number of printers, led by John Wolfe, prompted reform. Members of the trade agreed to share some responsibility for administering and enforcing regulations governing the press (Hoppe; Woodfield). In 1557, the Stationers' Company received its charter from Philip and Mary. The collective responsibility exercised by the Company demonstrates that collaboration was a familiar tactic to those in the printing trade.

Methods of control were gradually reformed piecemeal by Elizabeth I, who was plagued by both Puritans and Catholics. In the early years the authorities seem to have difficulty dealing with those involved with printing and distributing illicit material, and this is reflected in the lack of consistency in the punishments meted out. In some cases the Stationers' Company petitioned on behalf of imprisoned booksellers. Printers could be arrested and escape prosecution, only to be prosecuted and executed for similar offenses several years later (Greg *Arber* 19-20). The plethora of proclamations that were issued does seem to support the belief that the authorities were unable to formulate a coherent policy on how to proceed against illegal printing (Loades).

However, Elizabeth I persevered and with the Act of Uniformity (1558) was determined to stabilise and secure the religious question that seriously threatened her crown. She also strengthened her position through the bishops, to whom she gave extraordinary powers to compel obedience via the ecclesiastical courts. To ridicule the bishops was tantamount to ridiculing the queen. With her excommunication by the Pope in 1570, the authorities increased their efforts to suppress printed Catholic propaganda. This was a policy carried over into the seventeenth century, when Milton advocated for toleration of nonconformist texts but not of Catholic ones, in his *Areopagitica* (1644). By 1576, the Stationers' Company instructed that all London printing houses be inspected once a week by two searchers, who would report on the work being carried out, numbers employed and the number of presses in operation. The Star Chamber decree of 1586 confirmed the Company's authority to search for and seize all unlawful printing as well as establishing ecclesiastical censorship.

Circumstantial Evidence

State control of printing developed in response to commercial and ecclesiastical changes in England and on the continent. In the 1530s, ecclesiastical courts moved against Lollards, Lutherans and heretics. For nonconformists seeking to print Biblical texts in the vernacular, there was no specific personal threat as there would be following the Reformation for Catholic recusant printers. Nonetheless, William Tyndale's intention to produce an English *New Testament* led to his permanent departure from England in April 1524. His safety in Germany was relative for he was aware of the ever-present threat from church spies, other English expatriates, and three commissioned agents from England sent to find him. Just as Tyndale found it necessary to remain ever vigilant, so too did the printers who produced heretical works, as punishments on the continent were equal to those in England. It was therefore common to use false or fictitious colophons.

The first edition of Tyndale's *New Testament* was printed in Worms in 1526, which marked the beginning of a nine-year career of producing heretical works during which he was actively sought by Sir Thomas More and his agents, whose aim was to bring about his rendition to England for trial and execution. More, the humanist and champion of the orthodox Christian church, had one obsession: heresy, and his *bête noire* was Tyndale. It is highly likely it was More's agent, Henry Phillips, who finally sprung the trap that ended in Tyndale's seizure, even as More languished in the Tower in 1535. Tyndale's *New Testament*, like the great majority of heretical publications, was published in octavo and was some 700 pages in length.¹ A cautious estimate of the print run is in the order of 3,000 and this quite possibly gives an indication of the impact such material might have, for it was common for those who could read to do so to small, like-minded gatherings. Hence the size of the audience for Tyndale's work must have been a concern to the ecclesiastical authorities.²

In his *Confutacyon of Tyndales answere*, More grouped Tyndale with Luther and Huskyn as "hell houndes that the deuyll hath in his kenell" (176). Tyndale's exactitude was a problem for More: Tyndale identified and managed to correct 70 "errours committed in the prentyng", with a further 70 given in a three-page list of errata, although he admits many others went unnoticed (Moynahan 85-6). As the demand for his work grew, so (as with Luther's work) did pirated copies. In the second edition Tyndale added marginal notes, or "set lyght in the mergent" (title page verso). These were a textual tradition in religious works in manuscript and print, and they played a significant part in the developing relationship between marks of annotation and marks of quotation (Parkes 57-60). However, marginal notes are time-consuming to set, and Tyndale often only added explanatory notes or personal comments in his marginal text. Though these notes were superfluous to the Biblical translation, Tyndale used marginal notes because he was concerned with the meaning, accuracy, and his readers' understanding, of the text. According to George Joye, Tyndale's one-time friend, John Frith, helped Tyndale work on his printed answers to More's *Confutacyon*

"and corrected them in the prynte": a phrase that suggests Tyndale's attendance at the press (Joye sig. E1^v). The second edition of the *New Testament* (1534) saw more than 5,000 changes, so bear witness to the title page statement "dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke..." stating in the epistle that he "wedde oute...many fautes...therein" (title page verso). We have no reason to doubt these statements when we remember that Tyndale was motivated to propagate the scriptures in English and so was acutely concerned with the coherence of his translated text.

The lengthy dialogues which More published in refutation of Tyndale warned readers that the *New Testament* translation was dangerous because it "semed very lyke" good and wholesome doctrine. This was more dangerous than a less convincing counterfeit would have been, because "folke vnlearnyd" would be unable to discern that it was heretical (*A dyaloge* fol. 79^v; sig. Diii^v). Because Tyndale's "mistranslation" is so convincing, More is forced to discuss at length Tyndale's word choices and why they signified the wrong things ("elder men", "presbitari" or "prestis"?). Printed analysis that criticised the *New Testament* this closely was bound to encourage textual vigilance in Tyndale and his collaborators. Typographical errors would hinder the cause by fuelling More's argument that Tyndale's translation was untrustworthy, and a theological aberrance. This would appear to be the purpose behind the sermon preached by Cuthbert Tunstall, the Bishop of London, at St Paul's Cross on Sunday 28 October 1526, when Tunstall claimed to have found "errours three thousand and more" in Tyndale's *New Testament* (Moynahan 101). In these texts, then, a reputable alignment of type was either a sign of a judicious translation of Biblical meaning, or a dangerous imitation of both scripture and state-approved print: a pertinent reminder of the varieties of "ideal copy" that can arise in the printing of text. All the more reason to lean on others to make sure the copy accurately "set lyght" (Tyndale) to the text.

The Elizabethan Puritans had always been active in promoting their cause through the medium of the press and this in turn led to its continuing and systematic control by the state. In 1572, the authorities seized the authors of *An admonition to the parliament...*, John Field and Thomas Wilcox, but were unable to locate the press, for Archbishop Parker informed Lord Burghley, in a letter dated 25 August 1572

[The admonition] hath been twice printed, and now with additions... We wrote letters to the major [*sic*] and some of the aldermen of London to lie in wait for the charects [type] printer and corrector but I fear they deceive us. (*Arber* 13)

Towards the end of the year Thomas Cartwright printed *A second admonition...*, which was rebuffed by John Whitgift in *An answer to a certain libel intituled An admonition...* This was answered by Cartwright with *A reply to an Answer...* and printed in 1573 by John Stroud, who states that he had been

for wante of healpe giuen bothe to worke at the presse to sette and to correcte: but also that I wanted the commoditie that other printers commonly haue of being neare eyther the auther or to some that is made priuie unto hys booke [for the purpose of correcting] (Simpson 122)

The slight disjunction in Stroud's description between the implied pair in "bothe to", and the *three* infinitive verb forms (work, sette, correcte) tells us that correcting was a distinct activity. The naming of "corrector" as a distinct role by the authorities, along with Stroud's categorisation "to correcte" as a separate labour, confirms that proofing was a well-recognised stage of the printing process by the 1570s. Bühler also demonstrated that even in incunabula, the set up of lines was changed to correct errors "after a number of copies of a quire had come off the press" (62). Another feature of the process as described by Bühler that seems to have carried over into the hand-press period is the probable involvement of the author in proofing. Bühler suggests that because the corrections made in Caxton's press were mostly confined to "introductory passages and colophons (Caxton's own compositions)", it is reasonable to suppose the alterations were "due" to Caxton himself, even if composition was not (63). Stroud's complaint that he had none of the usual assistance shows that finished copy in good condition was conventionally the work of many hands.

As Albright and McKerrow have shown, it was fairly common for authors to remain near at hand for the purposes of correcting or amending their text (Jackson 255). Authorial absence in the case of Cartwright's *A replye to an Answer* caused the printer, John Stroud, to append a short errata list of "faultes escaped in thys booke, besydes those whych are amended wyth the pen." Stroud was conscious of his shortcomings, not only as a corrector but also regarding the lack of variety of typefaces he could work with. Given a larger selection, he would have used different sets of "letters" for the Greek and Latin quotations, as was customary in Biblical printed texts. As it was, Stroud lamented that he was

compelled (as a poore man doth one instrument to diuers purposes) so to vse one letter for three or foure tongues and being for wante of long training vp in thys mysterie not so skilfull to spie a faulte... (Simpson 122)

In this set of events, further evidence of proofing procedures beyond the circumstantial exists in the fact that B1 and B2 have been inserted before the original B2, with the original B1 cancelled, indicating the incompleteness of the original B1, which had to be reset (Simpson 122).

While Stroud resorted to proofing by himself out of necessity, another illegal press from the same period enjoyed a better division of labour. Even before he left Rome in June 1580, the Jesuit Father Robert Persons had a mind to set up a local printing press in England. Within months of his arrival he selected a secluded property near a place called Greenstreet some seven miles from London. Persons was helped by the printer Stephen Brinkley, who was no stranger to the production of illegal material, for he had previously been involved in printing a

number of recusant works. This set Persons at ease on two accounts: Brinkley was a safe pair of hands because of his fidelity to the cause, and in his experience as a press overseer. Brinkley duly hired workmen, whom Persons expected would be "*fidelissimae operarum Catholicarum manus*", that is, faithful to both their creed and copy. Although the location was secluded, security was tight, for Brinkley and his workmen came and went disguised as "gentlemen". After printing one book, the press was re-located to the house of Frances Browne, where it remained in use until March 1581, when it was moved again, this time to the home of Dame Cecilia Stonor near Henley. Yet, despite all the delays such upheavals must have caused, Persons notes in *Domesticall difficulties* that "Mr Stephen Brinkley ... was the corrector and overseer" (Southern 355).

The press was seized on the 8 August and Brinkley was imprisoned, where he remained until 24 June 1583. On his release he immediately crossed the Channel and settled in Rouen where he continued to produce recusant books, again under the direction of Father Persons. The repeated movement of the press and the general uncertainty that surrounded the whole enterprise must have made the work difficult. Certainly the logistics could not have been easy: the dismantling of the press and its removal, together with the type and any stores of paper, would have generated a certain interest from the curious unless it was done in the utmost secrecy. Yet, we do have some evidence of the high quality of Brinkley's work. Richard Bristow, in his *A Reply to Fulke* (1588) addresses the reader

...although I haue had great care and bene very diligent in the correcting thereof, yet because my Compositor was a straunger and ignorant of our English tongue and Orthographie, some faultes are passed vnamended of me (Sig. Eee4^v).

Apologies for mistakes caused by printing in unfamiliar languages are fairly common, but some are erroneous and help to lay false trails as to the origins of printing. This is a good example for, although the imprint reads "Imprinted at Louaine by John Lion. Anno Dom. 1580" it was printed at the Greenstreet House press by Brinkley. However, in his sympathetic study of Elizabethan recusant prose, Southern believes that Brinkley "produced one of the most correctly printed of all the Catholic recusant works" (358). A century later, the accuracy of printed text was still playing a part in religious debate. Between 1690-1710, Quaker and anti-Quaker pamphleteers in Philadelphia and New York were using the correcting of errors to deride one another's Christianity in print. Daniel Leeds, an ex-Quaker, published numerous rebukes and counter-rebukes to Caleb Pusey, William Penn and George Fox. In particular, Leeds attacked Fox for being scarcely able to write "Two lines of good Sence" (*Fox-craft* 6). This was an attempt to strike at a "signal part of the Quakers' faith – literacy" (Bonomi 122, 236). The Quakers' development of "plain speech" was more than using language in an extremely literal manner, it was borne of their emphasis on God's word, and speaking truthfully. Speaking plainly therefore

underpinned how they spoke to others, and how they expressed themselves in print (Bauman 44). Since their inception, the Society of Friends had been aware of how important the press would be in disseminating their beliefs and from an early period potential Quaker publications passed through a series of meetings before acceptance for publication was agreed. Once accepted, it was at the Meeting for Sufferings that the finer details of production and distribution were discussed. These included the selection of a printer (not always a Friend), the length of the print run as well as matters relating to circulation and distribution. It was also at this Meeting that printers would be reprimanded, if it was thought justified (Bronner 57; Mortimer). Some may find such extensive control of the press exercised by the Quakers ironic, given the circumstances under which they produced and distributed their works; however, the importance they attached to language and how they used it must not be underestimated. As in the case of the More—Tyndale pamphlet war of the 1530s, it is reasonable to assume that Leeds and his opponents would not have been satisfied with issuing uncorrected copy to their readership. Because Leeds' criticism of the Quakers hinged on false plainness in word and deed, he would have needed to take care at the press. Faulty printing would undermine the integrity of his message, because of the emphasis Leeds had placed on the falsehood of his opponents' words.

Leeds was absent when his *News of a trumpet sounding in the wilderness* (1697) was first printed, and he was not satisfied with the results. He added a prefatory epistle to the "Friendly Reader" in which he partially excuses himself for errata in the main text, citing his absence and the press being "thronged with other work". This account of what went wrong suggests that usual proofing practice involved collaboration between authors and compositors. Leeds may have anticipated that many of his readers would be "Friendly" in the sense of belonging to the Society of Friends, making it all the more important that the text was free from distracting typographical mistakes. But perhaps because of the disruption to the usual order of things (or "throng" of work), the apology itself was marred by an unusual error. The first edition's first gathering has signatures on the verso.³ Because signatures on the verso are so rare, this example corroborates Moxon's assertion that printers' marks were routinely checked during proofing. That this error crept in after Leeds had thought it necessary to apologise for mistakes in the main text suggests that despite it being customary for the author to attend the press, authors were not solely responsible for the accuracy of text. Leeds' other explanation for the errors – the "throng" of work at the press – might suggest that despite the hardships of illegal printing, there would have been an editorial advantage in cases like that of Persons' tracts, where the press was dedicated solely to the work at hand.

It would be fair to say that the circumstantial evidence indicates proofing procedures were commonly carried out during the earlier hand-press period, not only in unlicensed material but also in other documents. Religious pamphlet wars reveal much about the organisation of proofing practices, because of the conflict between the need for hasty printing, and the desire to communicate theological ideals using "ideal copy".

Some Harder Facts

Not all evidence is so circumstantial or superficial. Robert Waldegrave was the printer of the first four of the Marprelate tracts. These were a small collection of illegal works produced by a group of dissenting Puritans, who used the press to lampoon the authority of bishops using satirical ridicule and theological arguments. The dissenters went under the collective *nom de plume* "Martin Marprelate". The main authors were Job Throckmorton and John Penry. The press was initially set up at Mosely, near Kingston, where the first tract, *An epistle to the terrible priests of the Confocation house* was printed in October 1588. John Penry, the Welsh radical Puritan, took the proofs to Northampton, where Henry Sharpe, a highly inquisitive bookbinder, saw them. These sheets were probably not a first proof, as this would have been pulled and corrected immediately. If Penry was going to "revise" the work then he must have been aware of the risk of taking the sheets away from the relatively safety of the undiscovered press (Pierce 157). Such delays could only shorten the odds against discovery.

On completion of *An epistle*, the press was dismantled and moved to the north of England – to Sir Richard Knightly's Fawsley House, for it had been used to produce a number of other illegal Puritan works that were also printed by Waldegrave. Here the second tract, *The epitome*, was produced in November 1588. Searchers had already traced the press to Kingston, so it was decided to move once again, this time to Coventry. The next two tracts, *The Minerall Conclusions* (February 1589) and *Hay any worke for Cooper* (March 1589) were produced by Waldegrave and were his last for "Martin Marprelate". (By spring 1589 Waldegrave had become concerned with his association with the more extreme elements of Puritanism and decided to sever his association with the venture.) Work was not seriously affected, for another printer, John Hodgkins had been found and he provided two assistants, Tomlyn and Simmes.

Valentine Simmes is also known for his involvement with the printing of dramatic quartos at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. These reflect a number of the inconsistencies found in other material of the same period, and go some way to underline Bowers' argument regarding the quality of work. This is seen when notionally different works are examined, but also different formes within the same work. Quality is variable, with corrections not necessarily improving the accuracy of the text, rather removing obvious errors, with no guarantee there has been reference to printer's copy. Simmes' tolerance of error, and the inconsistency we find in his dramatic quartos, is a notable backdrop against which the recusant authors' efforts stand in sharp relief.

Following Waldegrave's abandonment of the Marprelate project, the printers Hodgkins, Tomlyn and Simmes proceeded to Walston Manor, where a press had been set up. It was here the fifth (authored by "Martin Junior") and sixth ("Martin Senior") Marprelate tracts were printed in July 1589. Waldegrave had timed his departure well, for at the end of August 1589, Hodgkins, his two assistants and the press were seized at Warrington. The commitment shown by the authorities

in seeking out the press was maintained (as others were involved⁴), for a note, purporting to come from Elizabeth I, is found in the state papers “Item: the examynacion of marten marp’late toe be thoroughlye persevered in”. All three were tortured on the rack and it is from their confessions that details of the printing procedures come to light. Hodgkins’ examination (regarding the printing of Martin Junior) revealed the exacting standards that Throckmorton had when overseeing the tracts’ printing:

...before the fin[i]shinge of y^e work m^r Throck: came to them usinge there [their] print and expoundinge certaine obscure interlines unto the printers, demaunding further of the said hodgk: whether the said Symes and Tomlynes were fitt men for the purpose...wherein Hodgk: then satisfied him... (Pierce 333)

It seems then that Throckmorton wanted to insert additional material. That these were considered “obscure interlines” is further evidence of the exactitude which dissenting Puritan authors brought to their work. This testimony is confirmed by the independent confessions of the two assistants:

Immediately after his [Throckmorton] cominge he read that w^{ch} was in printinge, and found fault in some place wth the orthography. Then he looked upon the written copy and bicause it was in diverse places interlined he asked Sim[m]es yf he could read the sayd place so interlyned, poynting him unto them. Among the w^{ch} places ther were two, wherein Sim[m]es doubted. And Mr Throckmorton did p[re]sently read them distinctly and readily unto him. Ffurthermore at the sayd time he asked Hodgkins softly in his eare, whether these examinants were good workmen and able to serve the turn: and Hodgkins answered yea (336).

Throckmorton’s query, whether the “workmen” were able to “serve the turn”, brings to mind the press as a mechanism, the workings of which included the people attending it (and departing it). To “turn” a text might mean correcting it into an “ideal” state; it might also be related to a “turn” as a single cycle of printing.⁵ In any case, Throckmorton’s involvement in the “interlinings” was evidence of his complicity in the tract’s message. The care taken over the printing extended to the next tract, for Hodgkins’ confession continues:

When “martin Senior” was in printinge Sim[m]es, thy examine, p[er] using the copy found falt wth somethings in it towards the end as being written wthout sense whereupon Hodgkins *cariinge ye copy to Harrison* [Penry] *he strooke owt certayne lines and interlined that w^{ch} should be supplied* (339).

The phrase “cariinge ye copy to Harrison” was added in the margin, significantly altering the meaning of the sentence. When neither Penry nor Throckmorton were present at the press, Simmes’ confession records that “Simes him selfe was the onely corrector” and it is a reasonable assumption that in these

instances the major concern would have been to amend the obvious printing errors rather than meddle with the text.

Frequent referrals to interlines and interlining in these testimonies reveals a connection between the material and metaphysical processes involved. The Marprelates were anxious to put across their theological message with the greatest accuracy, just as Tyndale had striven to correct his Biblical translation. Printing interpretations of scripture – especially recusant ones – required diligent attention, then, to parse the finer points of translation and doctrine. During periods of greater tolerance, readers took on some of the interpretative work equated with interlining. In *Areopagitica* (1644), John Milton advocates tolerance of nonconformist Christian texts on the basis that together they add to the “dissever’d peeces yet wanting to the body of Truth” (30). Applying this principle to proofing, one might say that the tradition of Biblical exegesis was seen as analogous to that of continual copy-editing, with the readership being trusted to ensure that what was printed was correct, both materially and theologically. Tyndale’s “corrected and compared with the Greek” (quoted above) also equates proofing with “substantive” theological, editorial decision-making.

Following the failure of Cromwell’s Protectorate, and the relative freedom of religious publication advocated by Milton, “*Religious Sects*” and “our late *Civil Wars*” were blamed for “many fantastical terms” and “outlandish phrases” with which English had been enlarged during the period of political and religious flux (Sprat 42). The glut of nonconformist pamphlets led to suspicion or cynicism about those who would “interline” a text. After the Restoration, Hamon L’Estrange (brother of Sir Roger, who was Surveyor of the Imprimery from 1662) criticised works where “the series of the story is ... enterlined [or] disturbed with matters independent” (208). For L’Estrange and his fellow Royalists, revisions and interlineations could have reminded them of the political “disturbance” of the “Interregnum”: “independent” actors inserting themselves into the line of Royal succession. And during the Restoration, reinterpretation of Christian texts became the subject of similar suspicion, leading Andrew Marvell to warn against interlineation in the Biblical context: “No man ought to cheat another though to the true belief: Not by Interlining the Scripture” (sig. F4^v).

Interlining in the service of theological accuracy as a routine practice might change our understanding of the author’s role in the production of “ideal copy”. In the case of the Marprelate tracts, discovering an individual behind the Marprelate persona matters less than the editorial principles, or even “house style”, that “Martin” stood for. Jesse Lander suggests that critical focus on the uncertain identity of the Marprelate author(s) distorts our understanding of the tracts’ significance. Instead of the aberrant printings of a lone eccentric, it is more accurate to think of the pamphlets as the work of a “remarkably extensive” print-production network (81). Despite the difficult conditions under which the pamphlets themselves were printed, the tracts’ arguments rest on critique of errors in the print of their adversaries. Marprelate’s targets, such as the *Book of Common Prayer*, used the uniformity of print to regulate belief and extend

orthodoxy (Lander 85). Objections to certain translations of scripture, then, could be framed as criticism of lazy proofing. Whitgift's leaving uncorrected the "grose and vngodly faultes in the print" (F4^r) in the *Book of Common Prayer* was presented by Marprelate as evidence of theological negligence. Print itself contributed to the deleterious effect of such errors; faults repeated in "many thousand of books" and through succeeding editions would have a vast, malign effect (Lander 87). Without carefully attending to errors in the text, and being willing to stop press if necessary to prevent the replication of faults, the Marprelate group's arguments would be defunct. Letting misprints stand in the copy could only undermine the cause.

It was "Martin Marprelate", who first drew attention to "knaue Thackwell the printer, which printed popishe and trayterous welche bookes in wales". Marprelate complained that "Thackwell is at libertie to walke where he will, and permitted to make the most he could of his presse and letters".⁶ John Penry adds further information by referring to a publication "written in weltch, printed in an obscure caue in Northwales" (101).⁷ He identified the work in a marginal note as *Y drych Cristianogawl*, [The Christian Mirror] a devotional text written by the Welsh seminary priest Robert Gwyn, who is believed to have travelled from Rome to England in 1580 with Robert Persons and Edmund Campion (January-McCann "Gwyn"). *Y drych* was printed in 1585 or early 1586 in a cave thought to have been on the Great Orme, north Wales and is now widely believed to be the first book to be printed in Wales.⁸

The format of *Y drych* is octavo and the text runs to just under a total of 190 pages, the font used is Gothic for the most part, with biblical quotations and marginal references in Roman. However, the quality of the printing is suspect for it displays some evidence of hasty and at times careless work (Jones 16-26). It appears when his Gothic font was exhausted, the printer resorted to the use of Roman. Overall, the quality of printing leaves something to be desired and perhaps indicates a printer with little experience.⁹ The general standard of work may be considered better than Throckmorton's and Penry's attempt at producing the first sheet of the *Protestatyon*, but certain errors would not normally have survived a first revise, for example the inverted running title on C2^r. The inking is variable with some pages over-inked¹⁰ whilst others are under-inked.¹¹ Spacing is poor and on occasion the text is out of alignment. With regard to the Welsh language, the division of monosyllables at the end of a line might be considered bizarre (Gruffydd).¹² In all, the evidence points to no author attending the press and a printer who was not familiar with the Welsh language, for on D4^v we note that "the printer was ignorant of the same language and of bad spirits or moods". This seems surprising, for the cave had been in continuous use by Welsh recusants for nine months before it was raided by William Griffith, the local Justice of the Peace. Also, it is hard to believe that none of the occupants spoke Welsh, in fact it would be harder to believe that anyone in the cave spoke English. We know for certain that the Welsh-speaking Father William Davies, who oversaw the chapel that existed in the cave, was in constant attendance (January-McCann, *Na all fod*, vii).

This contrast in quality of the printed text with the Greenstreet House recusant press does seem surprising, considering the relation between those involved. Robert Gwyn, the author of *Y drych*, was born and brought up on the Llŷn peninsula, some 55 miles from the cave at Rhiwledyn, and was also a Welsh speaker. He was acquainted with Robert Persons in Rome and they travelled to England together, so he could be in no doubt regarding the importance Persons placed on the use of the press in their ministries. It is surprising, therefore, that Gwyn did not pay more attention to the printing of his own work. Also, Thackwell, if he had been one of Brinkley's workmen, would have been aware of the quality of his work, but this does not seem to have influenced Thackwell to emulate "one of the most correctly printed of all the Catholic recusant works", as Southern claims of Brinkley's handiwork. Marprelate's comment on Thackwell's liberty to "make the most he could of his presse and letters" may have been driven by the anxiety of discovery. For authors who would rather correct errors in the print (thereby increasing their risk of arrest), Thackwell's "libertie" must have grated. Perhaps, too, Marprelate was derisive of the results: to "make the most" of one's printing apparatus, and still produce a text riddled with inconsistencies, might suggest carelessness that bordered on linguistic and religious negligence.

The printing of the seventh, and final Marprelate tract, *The protestatyon* (September 1589), was an act of defiance on the part of Penry and Throckmorton. There was a press at Wolston Priory but no printer and since both had attended the press in the past, they set to the task of printing the tract themselves. This was not as simple as it had appeared to them, as the quality of the first half-sheet shows. However, a competent printer was found to complete the 32-page tract. The difference between the first half-sheet – which contains such basic weaknesses as crooked lines and uncorrected literals – and the rest of the work is dramatic. The poorly printed half-sheets were used to complete the print run, which makes the comparison a relatively easy task. Nowhere is a typical selection of errors more easily found than on the title page; most of those would have been corrected with the first press-pull. For example

not wih standing	for	not withstanding
t:rannous	for	tyrannous
a ssayling	for	assayling
Pnblished	for	Published

Other basic mistakes occur, such as lack of reasonable spacing throughout the title page, and normally these would have been corrected or amended in the usual course of proofing. Also, at the bottom of the title page in the copy held at Lambeth Palace Library the type has been over-inked, on one copy at least, to such an extent that the print is difficult to read (Pierce 193). Such badly inked sheets normally would not have been used, but replaced before the work was collated. Usually, those blemishes that did not affect the understanding of the text, such as raised quads, and corrections that had a mainly visual impact, we

would expect to have been dealt with immediately. (This hierarchy of error might have been the basis of the distinction between the interventions that a printer like Simmes would have been authorised to make, and those for which he had to defer to Penry.)

On a general level, all the Marprelate tracts exhibit a reasonable quality of workmanship, especially so for those tracts for which Waldegrave was responsible. The exception is *The protestatyon*, and even here the poor quality of workmanship is limited to the first half-sheet. This is made all the more remarkable when the circumstances of their printing are taken into consideration. The great majority of the textual errors are single-word misprints and therefore do not seriously inhibit the understanding of the texts. Excluding *The protestatyon*, only *Hay any worke for Cooper* exhibits a serious title page fault, and this is in the form of an omission (though there are the accidentals “hublication” and “becytfull”, too). A brief list of “Falts escaped” was printed on the final leaf of *An Epistle*, directly below the closing salutations of “Martin the Metropolitane”. On line ten of the title page the reader is asked to insert after “...Chaplainne”) the phrase “hath shown himselfe in his late Admonition to the People of England” (48). This is quite an extensive “interline” for any reader to attempt, especially on the shaped lineation of a title page. Martin asks his readers to “Beare with” his other errors, a request with which they have been conditioned to comply, as throughout the epistle “Martin” has interwoven religious debate with comments on the circumstances of its printing. On the title page, the pseudonymous author claims to have both “Penned and compiled” the work, which adds to the picture given in the testimonies of Hodgkins and his helpers of continual authorial “interlining” throughout the printing process, because it suggests a multi-stage, multi-media writing effort. Further to the attention he draws to successive rounds of editing involved in producing the tract, “Martin” argues with his opponents on the basis of *their* textual emendations. He mocks them for having “pasted the word *can* vpon the word *dare*” (38); “patching” aggressive statements into more moderate ones opens the bishops to accusations of *being* “patches” themselves. Inconsistencies in their “consciences” are exposed by their disordered proofing methods.

Press restrictions continued after the death of Elizabeth I, through the reign of James I and into the reign of Charles I. As the Court of Star Chamber and the bishops tightened their control over the press it was often safer to alter the text after receiving the licenser’s imprimatur. The correctors of the press made such a complaint to the king in 1635. Still, some printers continued to operate outside the licensing system. In 1662, John Twyn printed the unlicensed (and seditious) *A treatise of the execution of justice* and felt the full weight of the king’s justice for his actions. At his trial, the prosecution states in its opening address to the court:

We shall prove that this Prisoner ... did ... Print the sheets, Correct the Proofs and Revise them all in his own house, which were corrected and brought back into the Workhouse by himself, in so short a time that they could not be carried abroad to Correct, so that he must needs Correct them himself (*Exact Narrative* 12).

The prosecution labours the point, and for good reason, for one half of the jury were booksellers and printers and the implication of proof correction would be fully realised by them. Having proofread a document, a printer could not claim to have been ignorant of its seditious contents. Twyn must have understood that the contents were seditious "mettlesome stuff", but nevertheless he refused to reveal the author. Lord Chief Justice Hide questions Twyn's apprentice, Walker, thus:

- L. Hide: After you had stamp't the sheet, who did peruse, and over-read it, to see if it were right?
- Walker: I carried them into the Kitchen and laid them down upon the Dresser by my Master.
- L. Hide: Who compared them?
- Walker: I know not.
- L. Hide: Who brought them back to you?
- Walker: My Master brought them into the Workhouse and laid them down.
- [...]
- L. Hide: When you had carried a sheet down, how long was it ere it was brought back again?
- Walker: About an hour, or an hour and a half.

Hide seeks clarification on the point of proofing and the prosecution pursues Walker, who ducks and weaves, until the point is made

- L. Hide: When you had printed one sheet, were there not some mistakes of the Letters to be mended?
- Walker: Yes, there were *Literals*.
- [...]
- Mr Record: Did anybody correct books in your house but your Master.
- Walker: No Sir.
- Serj. Morton: Did not you see your Master with Copie?
- Walker: Yes he had Copy before him. (14-6)

Twyn's prospects, which looked bleak, were about to take a turn for the worse, for Sir Roger L'Estrange, who arrested and initially interrogated Twyn, stated

I asked him (Mr. Twyn said I) who corrected this sheet? *Alas*, said he, *I have no skill in such things*; who revised it then? who fitted it for the Press? *Truely I had no body but my self; I read it over*; What thought you upon reading it? *Methoughts it was mettlesome stuffe, the man was a hot fiery man that wrote it*, but he knew no hurt in it.

[...]

I did ask him in the house of the Constable: Who corrected this? the Corrector must certainly know what it was. Said he, *I have no skill in correcting*. But when I speak of *correcting*, I mean who *revised* it, *overlooked* it for the Press; *I read it over*, sayes he (20-1).

The inconsistency of Twyn's statements regarding the proofing is repeated by others testifying for the prosecution. The trial continues much in the same vein with various witnesses swearing much the same, that is, Twyn had initially confessed to the proofing only to change his mind and denying all knowledge of the author. It was this intransigence on Twyn's part that prompted Lord Chief Justice Hide to comment after the prisoner's call for intercession on his behalf, on hearing the sentence: "I would not intercede for my own father in this case, if he were alive".

It may be that L'Estrange influenced not only the verdict but also the sentence. In his *Considerations and proposals for the regulation of the press* (1663) he recommends that

If any unlawful Book shall be found in the Possession of any of the Agents, or Instruments aforesaid, let the Person in whose possession it is found, be Reputed, and Punish'd as the Author of the said Book, unless he Produce the Person, or Persons, from whom he Receiv'd it. (2)

The typographical distinction given to keywords in L'Estrange's proposed "Expedient" emphasises the legal conflation of different categories of involvement in seditious printing. For L'Estrange's deterrent ends, being an "Agent" or "Instrument" was tantamount to being "Author". Even though in theory authors fared worse than printers and sellers of seditious material, Twyn, like Penry in the previous century, was publicly hanged, drawn and quartered. The question of proofing procedures was clearly his undoing, yet Twyn continued his denial even as he stood upon the ladder for his execution. Just as the severe sentences of the previous century, also publicly executed, served as a reminder to the populace, Twyn's death served as a fitting example not just to authors but anyone who might consider "serving the turn" at the press in any capacity.

Two days after the trial and sentencing of Twyn, Thomas Brewster was tried for publishing a seditious pamphlet. Although the prosecution did not place the same importance on proofing procedures in Brewster's trial as it did in Twyn's, it is nevertheless informative. The printer, Thomas Creek, was questioned by Judge Keeling, among others:

J. Keeling: Who did you send the Proofs to?

Creek: They were sent for to my House.

J. Keeling: Sometimes by Calvert [Brewster's partner] sometimes his Man, sometimes his Maid, sometimes by Brewster. (State-trials 535)

Again, the proofs were sent away from the press for correction, suggesting more than just a first proof. We would expect those blemishes that had a mainly visual impact, such as raised quads, to have been dealt with immediately. Sending the proofs to a different location increased the likelihood of discovery. Yet despite the danger of arrest, Brewster and Calvert obviously felt that further corrections

were necessary. Multi-stage correction, as is apparent from Creek's interrogation, meant involving lots of people. When asked who ordered him to print the books in question, Creek answered "[t]hey all gave me order together". Asked to clarify, he names three men: Brewster, Calvert and Chapman. Creek's testimony reveals that collaboration through the successive stages of printing was vital to the completion of Brewster's book.

These examples show that printers were prepared to carry out some or all of the three traditionally accepted stages of correction – press-pulls and revises; stop-press corrections and cancellation – to varying degrees. Also, the number of times the sheets were sent from the press for correction is surprising and surely reflects more than just a passing interest in achieving the minimum acceptable standard in the text. This is further indicated by the rare example of John Stroud, who went to the trouble of cancelling a leaf, resetting B1 and B2 and inserting the corrected cancellans (see Simpson).¹³ No simple conclusions can be drawn from these tentative excursions, and the varying quality of the Marprelate tracts can testify to this. We see the calculated risk taken by Penry when he took the early sheets of *An Epistle* away from the press for revision on the one hand, and the rather frenzied approach to the production of the first half-sheet of *The protestatyon*, on the other.

The printing of Tyndale's *New Testament* was to such a high standard that after some 85 years the panel of 54 divines appointed by James I to revise the New Testament incorporated nine tenths of it verbatim. Returning to the notion of "ideal copy" and editorial interpretations of it, the religious motives of Tyndale, "Marprelate" and the Quakers constitute a profound dedication to the idea of "perfect" copy. At the same time, the varying efforts of nonconformist printers of all stripes demonstrate one profound obstacle to the attainment of "perfect" copy. The Christian God could not be in attendance at the press to correct errors in the print. "Perfect" copy of His word was no more feasible than uniformity of doctrine between the "dissever'd" factions of the Church. Given that proofing practices were shaped by theological perfectionism, printers such as Brinkley and Waldegrave were also motivated by ideals other than financial gain and therefore would not shirk from such necessary steps as revision in the course of printing. In the end Waldegrave was not only imprisoned, but had also to see his tormentors "spoyle his presse and letters", just as Andrew Sowle had to endure the destruction of his press and stock in the following century (*Cooper* 39; Andrews). Certainly, loyalty "to both creed and copy" was not to the printers' benefit.¹⁴ Throckmorton's doubts about Simmes' abilities to refer to copy suggest that recusants and dissenters were less willing to "bear with" faults introduced by printers than with their own. The beliefs they were defending in their recusant literature were bound up with the collaborative (im)practicalities of printing and dissemination of the texts themselves. Without extensive networks of fellow believers, neither Tyndale's *New Testament*, nor the Marprelate tracts could have been printed well enough to take their place in the system of religious debate, refutation, and reply. "Ideal copy" was integral to the practice of religious and

political resistance throughout the hand-press period. Dissenters, Quakers and recusant authors all wanted to convey corrective ideas, and their arguments could stand or fall on the quality of their copy. But as Penry and Throckmorton found, without the help of compositors and correctors to proof and revise, printing a text whose quality did justice to the authors' particular beliefs was impossible. Despite the heightened risk of discovery, the beliefs laid out in illegally-printed works justified the effort of proofing. These works are evidence of a process which embodied the ideal of collaboration, both on a mechanical level (the setting and amending of type) and a semantic one (the conveyance of meaning through reading, writing and speaking, and the resulting shift in beliefs). Little wonder, then, that all involved were asked to serve their turn.

Notes

1. The octavo format had some advantages. Measuring approximately six inches by four inches it could fit neatly in the palm of a hand and so was easily concealed.
2. Daniell believed that by 1534 there were reckoned to have been over 30,000 copies of Tyndale's *NT* that was printed in Worms (including pirated editions) circulating in England. See Moynahan 107.
3. ESTC R11241. Copies checked in University of Oxford, Christ Church College WH.8.25; St. Paul's Cathedral; Huntington library 9792, Wing L914. Haverford College has a manuscript entitled *Corrections of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness*, but there is not enough information to say whether or not this was Leeds' own manuscript copy, or proofing 'boke'.
4. Carlson (21-2) suggests that 'at least 23 persons were involved' in the production and distribution of the Martin Marprelate tracts.
5. 'turn', *n.*, 2. a; 9. *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edition.
6. *An Epistle*, 23, sig. D1^r. The complaint is repeated in *Cooper* 39 sig. G1^r.
7. See also *A viewe* 68.
8. Its precise location remains unknown. However, a raid on a cave in the area of Rhiwledyn is reported in a letter (dated 19 April 1587) from the local Justice of the Peace to the Archbishop of Canterbury. A force of some 20 entered the cave only to find it deserted except for food, weapons and 'Printtes of leade & spaces' (Rogers).
9. Thackwell is otherwise untraceable. Gruffydd suggests a number of rather tenuous links between *Y drych* and two of Robert Person's books, both printed by Brinkley. He contends that there is a significant resemblance between the general layout and the deployment of Gothic and Roman fonts in *Y drych*, and Brinkley's printings of Person's works. He also notes that only four workmen were apprehended with Brinkley in August 1581, even though in June Brinkley employed seven workmen.
10. For example E1^r, L1^v, P2^v.
11. For example B3^r, R4^r, T2^v.
12. A large debt of gratitude is owed to Mr Ffrangcon Lewis who provided a translation from the Welsh.
13. 'But more important, as showing the make-up of the book is the fact that B.i and B.ij - this last unsigned - are an insertion before the original B.ij ... The stub of the original B.i is left before B.ij, ...' (Simpson 122).
14. '*fidelissimae operarum Catholicarum manus*' (Southern 355) in Person's account of Brinkley's printing practises.

References

Primary

- An exact narrative of the tryal and condemnation of John Twyn, for printing and dispersing of a treasonable book...* London: Brome, 1664.
- A Complete Collection of State-trials, and Proceedings for High-treason...* 2nd edition. Vol. 2. 1730.
- "Corrections of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness". MC.975.11.034. Quaker & Special Collections, Haverford College, PA. Manuscript.
- Bristow, R. *A Reply to Fulke*. 1588.
- Gwyn, Robert. *Y drych Cristianogawl*. [1585/6].
- Joye, George. *An Apologie Made by George Joye to Satisfye ... w. Tindale*. 1535.
- L'Estrange, Hamon. *The Reign of King Charles*. 1655.
- L'Estrange, Roger. *Considerations and Proposals in Order to the Regulation of the Press*. London: A. C., 1663.
- Leeds, Daniel. *News of a Trumpet Sounding in the Wilderness*. 1697.
- _____. *The Great Mistery of Fox-craft Discovered...* New York, 1705.
- 'Martin Marprelate'. *An epistle to the terrible priests of the Confocation house*. [October, 1588].
- _____. *The Minerall Conclusions*. [February, 1589].
- _____. *Hay any worke for Cooper*. [March, 1589].
- Marvell, Andrew. *Mr. Smirke; or, The divine in mode*. 1676.
- Middleton, T. and J. Fletcher. *The Nice Valour, or the Passionate Madman*. 1625.
- Milton, John. *Areopagitica*. London: [n. p.], 1644.
- More, Thomas. *The co[n]futacyon of Tyndales answere made by syr Thomas More knyght lorde chau[n]cellour of Englonde*. London: Rastell, 1532.
- _____. *A dyaloge of syr Thomas More knyghte: one of the counsayll of oure souerayne lorde the kyng [and] chauncellour of hys duchy of Lancaster... Wyth many othere thyngys touching the pestylent sect of Luther and Tyndale...* London: Rastell, 1529.
- Penry, John. *An exhortation vnto the gouernours and people of her Maiesties countrie of wales*. 1588.
- _____. *A viewe of some part of such publike wants & disorders as are in the seruice of God, within her Maiesties countrie of Wales...* 1589.
- Sprat, Thomas. *The History of the Royal Society*. London: Martyn, 1667.
- Tyndale, William. *The Newe Testament*. Anwerp [sic]: Emperowr, 1534.

Secondary

- Andrews, Charles M. "The Quakers in London and Their Printers There." Brinton, Howard H. (ed.). *Byways in Quaker history*. Wallingford (Pa.), 1944.
- Bauman, Richard. *Let Your Words be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Secenteenth-Century Quakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Blayney, Peter W. M. *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London 1501-1557*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013.

- Bonomi, Patricia U. *The Lord Cornbury Scandal: The Politics of Reputation in British America*. Chapel Hill: N. Carolina UP, 1998.
- Bowers, Fredson. *Principles of Bibliographical Description*. Russell, 1949.
- _____. *Bibliography and Textual Criticism*. Delaware: Clarendon, 1964.
- Bühler, Curt. 'Caxton Variants.' *Library* 4th series, vol. 17, no. 1 (1936): 62-69.
- Bronner, Edwin B. and Fraser, David. *The Papers of William Penn*. Vol. 5, *William Penn's Published Writings 1660-1726: An Interpretive Bibliography*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1986.
- Carlson, Leland H. *Martin Marprelate, Gentleman: Master Job Throkmorton Laid Open in His Colors*. San Marino: Huntington, 1981.
- Costa, Alexandra da. "'Functional ambiguity': negotiating censorship in the 1530s." *Library*, vol. 15, no. 4 (2014): 410-423.
- Craven, Alan E. "Proofreading in the shop of Valentine Simmes." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 68, no. 4 (1974): 361-372.
- _____. "Simmes' compositor A and five Shakespeare quartos." *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 26 (1973): 37-60.
- Daniell, David. *William Tyndale: a biography*. New Heaven: Yale, 1994.
- _____. *The New Testament: a Facsimile of the 1526 Edition*. Translated by William Tyndale with an introduction by David Daniell. British Library, 2008.
- Evenenden, Elizabeth. *Patents, Pictures and Patronage: John Day and the Tudor Book Trade*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2008.
- _____. "The Michael Wood Mystery: William Cecil and the Lincolnshire Printing of John Day." *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2004, 383-394.
- Fairfield, Leslie P. "The mysterious press of 'Michael Wood' (1553-1554)." *Library* 5th series, vol. 27, no. 3 (1972): 220-232.
- Greg, W. W. *A companion to Arber: being a calendar of documents in Edward Arber's "Transcript of the registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640" with text and calendar of supplementary documents*. Clarendon: Clarendon, 1967.
- _____. *Shakespeare's First Folio*. Clarendon: Clarendon, 1955.
- Gruffydd, Geraint. 'Gwasg ddirlgel yr ogof yn Rhiwledyn.' *Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society*, vol. 9, no. 1 (July 1958): 1-23.
- Hammersmith, James P. "Frivolous Trifles and Weighty Tomes: Early Proof-reading at London, Oxford and Cambridge." *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 38 (1985): 236-251.
- Hoppe, H. R. "John Wolfe, printer and publisher, 1579-1601." *Library* 4th series, vol. 14 (1933): 241-288.
- Jackson, William A. "Proof-reading in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." *Colophon*, Autumn (1935): 254-260.
- January-McCann, James. *Na all fod un Ffydd onyd yr hen Ffydd*, Robert Gwyn. Unpublished PhD thesis, Aberystwyth University, 2016.
- _____. "Robert Gwyn and Robert Persons: Welsh and English perspectives on attendance at Anglican service." *Recusant History*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2014, 159-171.
- Jones, Ifano. *The History of Printing and Printers in Wales*. Caerdydd [Cardiff], 1925.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago UP, 1980.

- Lander, Jesse M. *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Loades, David M. "The Press under the early Tudors." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, vol. 4, no. 1 (1964): 29-50.
- McKerrow, R. B. *An introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Clarendon, Clarendon, 1927.
- McKenzie, D. F. *Making Meaning: "Printers of the mind" and Other Essays*. Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 2002.
- Mortimer, Russell S. "The first century of Quaker printers II." *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, vol. 41 (1948): 74-84.
- Moxon, Joseph. *Mechanick exercises on the whole art of printing...* ed. by Herbert Davis and Harry Carter. 2nd ed. Dover, 1962.
- Moynahan, B. *Book of fire: William Tyndale, Thomas More and the Bloody Birth of the English Bible*. Sydney: Abacus, 2010.
- Myers, Robin. *The Stationers' Company Archive: an Account of the Records, 1554-1984*. Winchester: St.Paul's Bibliographies, 1990.
- Nichols, John Gough (ed.). *The chronicle of Queen Jane, and of two years of Queen Mary, and especially of the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. Camden Society, 1850.
- Parkes, M.B. *Pause and Effect: an Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Leicester: Scholar, 1992.
- Pierce, W. *Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts*. London: Constable, 1909.
- Rogers, D. M. "'Popishe Thackwell' and early Catholic Printing in Wales." *Biographical Studies*, vol. 11 (1953-4): 37-54.
- Simpson, P. *Proofreading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1935.
- Southern, A.C. *Elizabethan Recusant Prose 1558-1582*. London: Sands, 1950.
- Woodfield, J. *Surreptitious Printing in England 1550-1640*. New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1972.

Recebido em: 05/11/2017

Aceito em: 27/04/2018