

THE PRINTING OF SHEET B IN THE
W. A. CLARK LIBRARY COPY OF
MONSIEUR D'OLIVE (1606)

Akihiro YAMADA

I have now collated all the extant copies (thirty-two in number) known to me of the 1606 quarto of *Monsieur D'Olive*,⁽¹⁾ and have found press-variants appearing on sheets A, B, C, D, E and H. The uncorrected state of sheets A, D, E and H has been found at least in several copies, and that of sheets B and C only in the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library copy and the University of Illinois Library copy respectively. The correction of the reading of sheet C in the University of Illinois Library copy is self-evident and needs no explanation. But the uncorrected reading of sheet B in the Clark Library copy is of great interest and importance, not only because it retains several original authorial readings which were to be wrongly corrected in the rest of the copies, but also because it provides us with an example of wrong imposition in the printing work of the early Jacobean period.

The uncorrected readings as well as the wrong imposition, as far as I am aware, have never been reported. Walter Greg in his *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, vol. 1 (No. 236), writes about the running-titles of *Monsieur D'Olive* "(normally) *MONSIEVR D'OLIVE*. [*MONSEVER* in B(o) E-H] (CD) *MONSIEVR D'OLIVE*.", and gives no reference to the variant running-titles of B outer in the Clark Library copy, which read "*MONSIEVR D'OLIVE*." throughout. And quite naturally he does not record in his *Bibliography* any variations in catch-words in sheet B: the Clark Library copy's "*Enter*" for others' "*Rho*." on B_{1v}. As is

(1) Copies collated:— Bodleian Library (3 copies: Douce C 286; Malone 240, item 3, and 4°T 39 (2) Art), Boston Public Library (2 copies: G. 3967.44 and G. 3967.45), British Museum (4 copies: Ashley 372, Ashley 373, C. 12. g. 4/6, and C. 34. c. 15), William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Library of Congress, Eton College Library (2 copies: STC 4983 and 4984), Folger Shakespeare Library (2 copies: STC 4983 and 4984), Harvard University Library, H.E. Huntington Library (4 copies: 60513, 98555, 98556 and 98557), University of Illinois Library, University of Michigan Library, Pierpont Morgan Library, Newberry Library (Chicago), New York Public Library, Carl H. Pforzheimer Library, University of Texas Library, Trinity College Library (Cambridge), Victoria and Albert Museum (2 copies: Dyce 2033 and Dyce 2033. 18. K. 2), Worcester College Library (Oxford), and Yale University Library.

I should like to thank the trustees and the librarians of these British and American libraries for their kind co-operation and permission to utilize material obtained from their libraries.

suspected from the interchange of the catchwords between pages B_1^v and B_3^v (and it has been proved true), wrong imposition took place of these pages which belong to the same forme. As the text of both of these pages happens to begin with the same speech-prefix "Mug.", the interchange of them does not affect the catchwords on B_1 and B_3 , which read "Mug." correctly.⁽²⁾

R. B. Mckerrow in his *Introduction to Bibliography*, 259-60, records only two instances of wrong imposition: Heywood's translation of *Hercules Furens* printed by Sutton in 1561 and Hooper's *Declaration of the Ten Commandments* printed by R. Juggé in 1550. In both cases, the pages interchanged belong to the same forme. He writes that "A few other examples can, I think, be found, but they are very rare...." And here we have another example which occurs in *Monsieur D'Olive*. But since the correct imposition is, as Mckerrow *loc. cit.* remarks, "so elementary a part of a printer's training that such an error could hardly occur...and if it did, it would almost certainly be corrected in proof." Indeed, what we have in *Monsieur D'Olive* is presumably the one and only example of the sheet of that kind in the book which has been erroneously perfected and, as in the case of a few proof-sheets which have been discovered in some gatherings of old books, quite inadvertently come to be gathered. I am pretty certain that the wrong imposition could not be corrected in proof until the time when the printer had already perfected all the papers which were to become sheet B of the book.

Thanks to the existence of this instance of wrong imposition, we can with certainty infer the press work of sheet B. As the running-titles will indicate, both formes of sheet B seem to have been set up originally by one compositor. Let us call him compositor C.⁽³⁾ As I shall discuss later, this probability has been proved by spelling tests of the text in these formes. The printer seems to have printed the outer forme first. Having finished printing the outer forme, he started printing

(2) The question of the catchword must probably receive a consideration here. R. B. Mckerrow discussed this question as early as in 1921 (cf. *The Library*, IV ser., ii. 97-108), and several years later he wrote: "The catchword must therefore have been taken from the MS., not, as would be the case if the matter had been first standing in galley, from the opening line of the next page" (*An Introduction to Bibliography*, 65). So far as sheet B of the W.A. Clark Library copy of *Monsieur D'Olive* is concerned, the case seems to be *vice versa*. In spite of the wrong imposition, the catchword "Enter" on B_1^v which should be "Rho." in correct imposition corresponds correctly to the opening word of the next page, and so does the catchword "Rho." on B_3^v which should be "Enter". This would be possible only when we assume that the matter must have been "first standing in galley" and the catchword taken "from the opening line of the next page".

(3) In my article on "Bibliographical Studies of George Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive* (1606) Printed by Thomas Creede", *Studies in English Literature* (English Number 1963), published by the English Literary Society of Japan, I have suggested that six compositors seem to have worked on the text of the 1606 quarto; compositor A being responsible for A_{2-4}^v , compositor B for B outer and G_1-H_4 (but in the Clark Library copy, G_1-H_4 only), compositor C for B inner (but in the Clark Library copy, the whole of sheet B), compositor D for C_{1-4}^v , compositor E for D_{1-4}^v , and compositor F for $E_1-F_4^v$.

the inner forme with wrong imposition, which could only be noticed by the proof-reader after (or, with much less probability, at the last moment of) the printer's work on the forme. Therefore, all the sheets thus perfected ought to have been cancelled. The printer had to print sheet B from the start. However, what was worse, when the wrong imposition was found and corrected, distribution of the types in the outer forme had already been over. Compositor C, therefore, had to ask his fellow compositor B⁽⁴⁾ to set up anew the four pages in the outer forme with a new running-title "*MONSEVER D'OLIVE.*" on each page, while he himself, after correcting the wrong imposition, was printing the inner forme once more. It seems highly probable from the variant readings on B₃^v which was corrected to be B₁^v that the page had also been distributed when its wrong imposition was noticed, and therefore compositor C had got to reset the page line by line following his own printed composition. No essential difference in spelling habits between B₃^v of the Clark Library copy and B₁^v of other copies can be against this inference. The very slight variations on B₁^v which was corrected to be B₃^v may have been due to the compositor's own meddling with the last several lines of the page which must have been loosened when correcting the imposition. Anyway, the printing of the corrected sheet B was certainly started with the inner forme by compositor C, who was followed by compositor B printing the outer forme. And this is the state in which stands sheet B of all the extant copies except the Clark Library copy of *Monsieur D'Olive*.⁽⁵⁾

In order to make the compositorial identification of sheet B in the Clark Library copy more convincing to the reader of this article, it would be advisable to give here the statistics of words the spellings of which can so easily differentiate the compositors one from the other.

	(1) W. A. Clark Copy: Sheet B							(2) Other Copies: Sheet B						Comparison: Total of:-					
	Compositor C							Compositor B			Compositor C			Sheet					
	1	2 ^v	3	4 ^v	1 ^v	2	3 ^v	4	1	2 ^v	3	4 ^v	1 ^v	2	3 ^v	4	(1)	(2)	A
admire	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	0	
admyre	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	0	
A/art	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	3	0	
A/arte	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	0	
be	-	2	3	-	1	1	4	1	-	4	7	1	4	1	1	1	12	19	14
bee	-	3	4	1	3	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	2	14	7	0
choice	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	0	
choise	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	0	

(4) *Vide* the last note.

(5) Thus compositor C seems normally to have first printed the outer forme of a sheet, which is contrary to the tradition of French printing-houses at one time—cf. Mckerrow, *op. cit.*, 18-19, note 2 and 31-2, note 2.

Deuill	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	1	0
Diuell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	0
flesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	0	3	0
fleshe	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	0
he	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	4
hee	-	1	-	-	6	-	3	8	-	-	-	-	3	-	6	8	18	17	0
indeed	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	4	0
indeede	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	0
me	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	7	7
mee	-	1	5	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	8	2	1
she	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	10	1	-	-	-	-	2	13	13
shee	2	-	11	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	2	-	9	-	-	-	22	11	0
sir	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	1 (S-)
Syr(s)	2	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	6	4	1
we	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	1	2	-	-	2	-	3	10	2
wee	2	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	0	0
wit	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	0
witte	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0	0
wits	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	6	0
witt(e)s	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	0	0
Final <i>t</i>																			
in <i>cut,</i>																			
<i>let,</i>																			
<i>wit,</i>																			
<i>forget.</i>																			
-t(s)	-	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	14	1	-	-	-	1	-	8	18	0
-tt(es)	2	7	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	11	1	0
Initial } en-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0	2
} in-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	0
Uses of VV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	0

No one would fail to notice that there is practically no difference at all on pages B₁^v, B₂, B₃^v and B₄ (*i. e.* B inner) between the two columns in the table given above, whereas some influence on compositor B of compositor C's habits in spelling might be observable on other pages (*i. e.* B outer). Anyhow, the clearest differences between the work of compositors B and C are in the following spellings:

<i>Compositor B.</i>	<i>Compositor C.</i>
admire	admyre
A/art	A/arte
choise	choice
Diuell	Deuill
flesh	fleshe
indeed	indeede
me	mee
she	shee
sir	Syr
we	wee
wits	witt(e)s

As compositor C's general habits in his style of composing a page is very much the same as those of the compositor A who is responsible for sheet A, I have given the table of statistics a column in which a total number of occurrences of one spelling in each compositor's stints up to B₄^v is listed in order to indicate their different spelling habits. Spellings of such words as *hee / he*, *mee / me*, *shee / she* and presumably *wee / we* would be enough to distinguish compositors C from A.

Thus, it is now clear, I hope, that in the history of the printing of *Monsieur D'Olive* there was an interesting complication with regard to sheet B (particularly the outer forme). It is not at all surprising that all the past editors of the play, such as Dilke, Shepherd and even Parrott, have failed to record this fact, because the study of old printed books has only recently made appreciable advances. Indeed, the outer forme of sheet B has been, and would probably be, a stumbling block to the editors of the play because the forme in the Clark Library copy alone shows, in the strict sense of the word, the first original composition from the manuscript, and the forme in other copies merely its resetting—one step removed from the manuscript.