

## *Introduction: the (im)material spectrum of manuscript and print interaction*<sup>☆</sup>

SARA NORJA  and MARI-LIISA VARILA 

The interactions between manuscript and print in Renaissance Europe were manifold and often complex, as both text producers and readers commonly utilized both media. Authors drafted texts by hand, and manuscripts were used as copy texts for producing printed editions.<sup>1</sup> Proofreaders and readers corrected and annotated printed books by hand. Printed books were also used as exemplars: both full works and extracts were copied into manuscript books, whether alchemical treatises, commonplace books or religious compendia. Printed books could be decorated by hand, while printed illustrations could be pasted into manuscripts. Print and manuscript gatherings could be bound into the same codex, and the bindings themselves could contain fragments produced by both media. There are also less material forms of interaction – which are for obvious reasons more difficult to study, but form an essential part of the history of the overall interaction between manuscript and print in the early modern period. As an example of more immaterial interaction, text producers may have read both print and manuscript books when preparing new texts. The linguistic practices in printed English may have had an influence on how individuals produced texts by hand, and personal linguistic choices also influenced printed English. Similarly, the aesthetics of manuscript and print influenced design choices across the media boundary.

This special issue focuses on various intersections of manuscript and print in Renaissance England. Despite recent contributions to the topic, described in more detail below, a lot of work remains to be done regarding the interplay between manuscript and print from the late medieval to the early modern period. A special issue focusing on the less straightforward aspects of this interplay will further advance this underexplored field. Our aim is to shed light on the different ways in which manuscript and print interact in this period, highlighting the various material and immaterial

<sup>☆</sup> We would like to thank our anonymous reviewer for their encouraging feedback on this introduction.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Lotte Hellinga, *Texts in Transit: Manuscript to Proof and Print in the Fifteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

practices related to such interactions. Following in the footsteps of recent book historical research, the contributions in this issue explore different interactions between manuscript and print and bring some previously under-examined aspects into focus. For instance, the values attached to both print and manuscript are examined in several of the essays in this special issue. Utilitarian texts and personal compilations are investigated alongside literary texts, to the extent that most texts discussed in this issue focus on non-literary material. Additionally, many of the essays discuss visual aspects in addition to textual transmission from manuscript to print or print to manuscript; this multimodality, in our view, is central to the interaction between print and manuscript.

Materiality is also a central focus: The evidence for the interplay between print and manuscript often shows in the margins, even the very bindings of books. Complex interactions also appear after printing, in the form of handwritten notes extant in the margins of printed books; they can consist of corrections and other reader interactions with the printed text as well as printed images, diagrams and tables. Examining these various aspects of manuscript and print provides us with a more complex view of the realities of text production and reader interaction in the early modern period, bringing us closer to the multifaceted and changing media landscape of the Renaissance. Although materiality is an important part of the essays in this issue, immaterial concerns are also raised; we discuss the theoretical underpinnings of our (im)material approach below.

The books and texts discussed in the issue were mostly produced in England and/or in English. The focus on English is due to both scholarly and practical reasons. The production context of English materials is well documented, and previous research has already provided insight into the question of manuscript and print in England. This provides a sturdy background for further in-depth, well-contextualized investigations into the topic. Both editors also come from the field of English studies, which influenced the choice of scope for the issue. However, some of the essays are also concerned with multilingual and international contexts.

The theme of this special issue has been inspired by the recent increased attention to the intricacies of manuscript and print as well as our own previous work on books and texts in which manuscript and print interact.<sup>2</sup> In our view, there is plenty of interesting work going on in this field at the moment, and

<sup>2</sup> For our previous work, see Mari-Liisa Varila, *In Search of Textual Boundaries: A Case Study on the Transmission of Scientific Writing in 16th-Century England*, Anglicana Turkuensia 31, PhD dissertation (University of Turku, Finland, 2016), which discusses a group of three sixteenth-century English manuscripts, including their connections to contemporary print; and Sara Norja, *Alchemy in the Vernacular: An Edition and Study of Early English Witnesses of The Mirror of Alchemy*, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B538, PhD dissertation (University of Turku, Finland, 2021), available online at <<https://www.utupub.fi/handle/10024/151694>> (accessed December 2024), in which Norja studied, inter alia, two cases of copying and translating an alchemical treatise from print to manuscript.

we wish to provide an avenue for furthering the study of the complexities involved in early modern text production, with a particular focus on less literary texts and books.

We consider ‘interplay’ and ‘interaction’ to be more fruitful avenues into conceiving the early modern relationship of manuscript and print, rather than the antagonizing ‘manuscript *versus* print’ relationship that was the cornerstone of some earlier research into this topic in book history.<sup>3</sup> We are far from the first to point this out; indeed, the genesis of this special issue was in noticing that the current has shifted when it comes to manuscript and print. What used to be considered a dichotomy has, in recent work, been seen more as a complementary relationship. This fluidity reflects the historical situation better than the old dichotomy. Manuscript and print are, of course, very different media when it comes to the practicalities and technologies of text production as well as the financial costs involved. However, examining them together, and finding intersections where their uses converge, provides a window into the realities of book production and use in the early modern period.

A few words are in order on the directions of transmission when it comes to interaction between the two media. In Renaissance England, texts and their parts, visual features, as well as more immaterial influences, could move in four basic directions: between manuscripts, from manuscript to print, from print to manuscript and from one printed edition to another. Manuscripts copied from other manuscripts have been the focus of much textual scholarship, especially by editors of medieval texts.<sup>4</sup> Since transmission of text from manuscript to print parallels the direction of the media shift from manuscript to print as the primary medium of commercial book production, it has often been treated as the default direction of textual transmission between the two media, although researchers have pointed out the problems of this implicit assumption. Studies concerned with the direction of print to manuscript have increased in the past two decades or so, as we note below. Early modern printed editions, of course, were often based on previous printed editions, and such print to print transmission has been of interest to scholarly editors, especially those editing works that

<sup>3</sup> Most influentially, the narrative involving the triumph of print over manuscript was put forth by Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962); and Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

<sup>4</sup> On medieval manuscript to manuscript transmission, see, for instance, the chapters in Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013); on early modern manuscripts, see H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), who explores early modern aspects of manuscript circulation with regard to poetry, as does A. S. G. Edwards in ‘The Circulation of English Verse in Manuscript after the Advent of Print in England’, *Studia Neophilologica* 83 (2011), 67–77; for the transmission of more utilitarian material, see, for example, Michelle DiMeo and Sara Pennell (eds.), *Reading & Writing Recipe Books 1550–1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).

first appeared in the printed medium.<sup>5</sup> Of these directions, the two involving manuscript and print are of course pertinent to this special issue. However, it should be noted that the four directions are themselves simplifications, and one of the present special issue's aims is to complicate such divisions: Texts and influences could and did move to and fro more fluidly between manuscript and print.

Indeed, already in 1989 N. F. Blake observed, in his chapter 'Manuscript to Print', that '[t]he continuity of the two media is often stressed in modern scholarship'.<sup>6</sup> Although the title of Blake's chapter highlights the transmission from manuscript to print, he also gives examples of print to manuscript copying, and concludes that print and manuscript were not in conflict, but rather 'complemented each other'.<sup>7</sup> It would thus be false to say that the scholarly consensus before the twenty-first century was unidirectional, with manuscript to print the only interaction studied; for instance, Curt F. Bühler made some remarks on manuscripts copied from printed books as early as 1960, in *The Fifteenth-Century Book*,<sup>8</sup> Cora E. Lutz examined manuscripts copied from print in 1975,<sup>9</sup> and in 1983, J. B. Trapp edited a volume of essays with varying viewpoints, *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing*.<sup>10</sup>

Of the papers in Trapp's edited volume, two are relevant for the question of manuscript and print interaction. Trapp frames the discussion as a dichotomy between 'the early printed book as an imitation manuscript and [...] the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century manuscript as an imitation printed book'.<sup>11</sup> We have since learnt that the situation was not quite so clear-cut, although Trapp's observations certainly apply to some printed books and manuscripts. Lotte Hellinga's 'Manuscripts in the Hands of Printers' discusses manuscripts used by printers as copy texts, with a focus on the potentially standardizing effects of print.<sup>12</sup> Hellinga notes that the separation in archives of manuscripts and printed volumes 'has conditioned our researches, and our

<sup>5</sup> A classic example is provided by William Shakespeare's plays; for a recent contribution, see Claire M. L. Bourne (ed.), *Shakespeare/Text. Contemporary Readings in Textual Studies, Editing and Performance* (London: The Arden Shakespeare/Bloomsbury, 2021).

<sup>6</sup> N. F. Blake, 'Manuscript to Print', in Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (eds.), *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 403–32 (403).

<sup>7</sup> Blake, 'Manuscript to Print', 419.

<sup>8</sup> Curt F. Bühler, *The Fifteenth-Century Book* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960); Bühler considers some manuscripts copied from print 'of high value for the study of scribal habits and practices' (37).

<sup>9</sup> Cora E. Lutz, 'Manuscripts Copied from Printed Books', *The Yale University Library Gazette* 49(3) (1975), 261–7.

<sup>10</sup> J. B. Trapp, *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years After the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at the Warburg Institute on 12–13 March 1982* (Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983). A recent contribution to the topic of early print's cultural impact are the essays in Cristina Dondi (ed.), *Printing R-Evolution and Society 1450–1500* (Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 2020).

<sup>11</sup> Trapp, 'Foreword', in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years After the Invention of Printing*, vii–viii (vii).

<sup>12</sup> Lotte Hellinga, 'Manuscripts in the Hands of Printers', in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years After the Invention of Printing* (1983), 3–11.

thinking'; her call for 'a close and connected observation of both' has increasingly taken place, as the essays in this special issue also show.<sup>13</sup> Her paper observes a unidirectional transmission, manuscript to print, but is an early step in the direction of noting the influence of manuscripts in the early days of print. Michael D. Reeve's 'Manuscripts Copied from Printed Books', following Curt F. Bühler's preliminary observations of fifteenth-century manuscripts copied from print, briefly discusses examples of print to manuscript transmission and some of the impulses behind these.<sup>14</sup> Reeve, approaching the issue from the point of view of scholarly editing, seems to regard such manuscript copies as inferior to their print exemplars.

In terms of cataloguing extant materials related to the interaction between manuscript and print, a pioneering publication was J. K. Moore's 1992 catalogue *Primary Materials Relating to Copy and Print in English Books of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. In the catalogue, Moore lists English manuscripts and printed books identified as printer's copy texts (including licensed copies) as well as manuscripts copied from printed books.<sup>15</sup> Although the catalogue only includes materials in London, Oxford and Cambridge repositories, it is an invaluable reference for further work in the field.

Most of these early studies on the interaction between the two media focus on the direction of transmission from manuscript to print, but some researchers also comment on the opposite direction of transmission or, in the case of Moore's catalogue, bring both directions together. These early observations laid the groundwork for twenty-first-century research.

The twenty-first century brought with it a blooming interest in further manuscript and print interactions, and a recognition of their complexity. This interest seems in part to have been prompted by the somewhat analogous shifts in medium in the printing and book culture of the early 2000s, brought about by digital technologies. Another potential influence may have been the 'material turn' in book studies and philology, which led to increasing attention towards individual witnesses and their material features as well as the production contexts of texts and books.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Hellinga, 'Manuscripts', 9.

<sup>14</sup> M. D. Reeve, 'Manuscripts Copied from Printed Books', in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years After the Invention of Printing* (1983), 12–20.

<sup>15</sup> J. K. Moore, *Primary Materials Relating to Copy and Print in English Books of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1992).

<sup>16</sup> The *Speculum* special issue on the 'New Philology' in 1990 helped paved the way for these developments, especially its introduction by Stephen G. Nichols: 'Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture', *Speculum*, 65(1) (1990), 1–10. As an example of the 'material turn' in textual scholarship and book studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Roger Lass, for instance, argued forcefully for the importance of material concerns in editing Middle English texts in 'Ut Custodiant Litteras: Editions, Corpora and Witnesshood', in Marina Dossena and Roger Lass (eds.), *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), 21–48. D. F. McKenzie's work on the meaning of materiality for bibliography has also been influential: see *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

The seminal work exploring the intersections of manuscript and print from the early twenty-first century is David McKitterick's *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450–1830*, in which he examines the gradual impact of print in western Europe, exploring a wide range of issues related to authority and materiality – and how pre-industrial print, sometimes considered more lasting and ‘fixed’ than manuscript, produced changeable, unfixed artefacts.<sup>17</sup> McKitterick's approach to manuscript and print interactions has been formative for the present issue: He treats the two as being ‘used, and often made, side by side’.<sup>18</sup> As he remarks, ‘It is misleading to speak of any transition from manuscript to print as if it were a finite process, let alone an orderly one or indeed that the process was all in one direction’; it is a ‘two-way process’.<sup>19</sup> Importantly, McKitterick also points out the long roots of the modern separation of the two media in archives and libraries as well as scholarly research.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, there is still something of a gap between manuscript studies and bibliography, although scholars have increasingly expressed the need to bring the two fields closer together.

The observation that manuscript and print transmission is not unidirectional has been influential, and similar observations about the fluidity of the two media were made by Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham in an edited volume involving a variety of issues relating to both print and manuscript in England in the late medieval and early modern periods.<sup>21</sup> The essays in their volume often examine the two media in tandem, in addition to exploring their relationship to speech; and Walsham and Crick, in their introduction, speak of ‘the artificiality of drawing hard and fast boundaries between script and print’.<sup>22</sup> This position is reiterated by Julia Boffey in her *Manuscript and Print in London c. 1475–1530*, in which she documents manuscript and print interactions in London during the crucial first decades of print in England, covering aspects of book production as well as reader reception.<sup>23</sup> As she notes: ‘Any attempt to construct a uni-directional model of script to print is quickly complicated by evidence of the many different kinds of scribal activity by which printed books were copied back into

<sup>17</sup> David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

<sup>18</sup> McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript*, 51.

<sup>19</sup> McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript*, 47, 52.

<sup>20</sup> McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript*, 13–17.

<sup>21</sup> Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds.), *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>22</sup> Alexandra Walsham and Julia Crick, ‘Introduction: Script, Print, and History’, in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham (eds.), *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–26 (12).

<sup>23</sup> Julia Boffey, *Manuscript and Print in London c. 1475–1530* (London: The British Library, 2012).

manuscript form'.<sup>24</sup> Boffey views manuscript and print interaction as a complex and fruitful area of study, treating both manuscript and printed book production on an equal footing. She also examines examples where manuscript and print are intertwined – whether bound into the same composite volume, or the copying of print into manuscript – laying essential groundwork for the essays in this special issue, some of which explore the challenges, even impossibility, of drawing clear boundaries between the two media.

In studies of transmission from manuscript to print, attention has been paid, for instance, to specific genres; Linne Mooney has examined the transmission of almanacks from manuscript to print, focusing on English material,<sup>25</sup> and Jonathan Culpeper and Jane Demmen have explored play texts.<sup>26</sup> The process of turning manuscripts into printed editions has also been investigated: For example, Lotte Hellinga has studied a manuscript that acted as Caxton's copy-text,<sup>27</sup> and Graham D. Caie has studied the textual relationship between a Chaucerian manuscript and a 1532 printed edition.<sup>28</sup>

The direction of print to manuscript has been explored, for instance, in an English alchemical text copied with scribal modifications, and a presentation copy of *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*.<sup>29</sup> Frans A. Janssen examined nine western European manuscript copies of printed books, six of them dating from the early modern period<sup>30</sup>; and Ann Blair surveyed some manuscripts copied from print in the John Rylands Library, made for different purposes such as providing deluxe items or for more practical reasons. Blair looked at 'the complex interactions between co-existing media' in the form of printed books and manuscripts copied from them.<sup>31</sup> As she remarks, 'the interplays

<sup>24</sup> Boffey, *Manuscript and Print in London*, 57.

<sup>25</sup> Linne Mooney, 'English Almanacks from Script to Print', in John Scattergood and Julia Boffey (eds.), *Texts and Their Contexts: Papers from the Early Book Society* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 11–25.

<sup>26</sup> Jonathan Culpeper and Jane Demmen, 'The Development of Play-Texts: From Manuscript to Print', in Päivi Pahta and Andreas H. Jucker (eds.), *Communicating Early English Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 162–77.

<sup>27</sup> Lotte Hellinga, 'Caxton's *Chronicles of England* and Its Printer's Copy', *The Library* 18(3) (2017), 316–24; see also Hellinga, 'Manuscripts'. Caxton's copy-texts have also been explored by Daniel Wakelin in 'Caxton's Exemplar for *The Chronicles of England*', *Journal of the Early Book Society* 14 (2011), 75–113.

<sup>28</sup> Graham D. Caie, 'The Relationship between MS Hunter 409 and the 1532 Edition of Chaucer's Works Edited by William Thynne', in Päivi Pahta and Andreas H. Jucker (eds.), *Communicating Early English Manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 149–61.

<sup>29</sup> Peter Grund, 'Sidrak and Bokkus: An Early Modern Reader Response', *Anglia* 125(2) (2007), 217–38; Dhira B. Mahoney, 'From Print to Script: The Luxury Metatext of Lambeth Palace Library, MS 265', in Joyce Coleman, Mark Cruise, and Kathryn A. Smith (eds.), *The Social Life of Illumination: Manuscripts, Images, and Communities in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 439–72.

<sup>30</sup> Frans A. Janssen, 'Manuscript Copies of Printed Works', *Quaerendo* 41 (2011), 295–310.

<sup>31</sup> Ann Blair, 'Reflections on Technological Continuities: Manuscripts Copied from Printed Books', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 91.1 (2015), 7–33. Accessed as a preprint online through <<https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/27715961>> (accessed December 2024), 1–19 (2).

between manuscript and print were thickly layered' in the early modern period.<sup>32</sup>

The work in this field in the past 20 years seems to share common attitudes towards manuscript and print interactions: The two media are viewed as complementary and interacting in various and complex ways. The essays in the present special issue give further nuance to the possibilities of research into manuscript and print interactions, and are in dialogue with the most recent research into this area.

The 2020s have so far seen a lively interest in the intersections of manuscript and print, a discussion in which this special issue takes part. For instance, Sonja Drimmer recently edited a special issue on manuscript and print with a different temporal and geographical scope, also discussing aspects of the print to digital continuum.<sup>33</sup> The essays in Drimmer's special issue, as well as Drimmer's introduction,<sup>34</sup> tend to promote pluralistic attitudes to the interactions of manuscript and print, disrupting the 'traditional' narrative with its unidirectional attitude, manuscript to print and keeping in mind the value of, for instance, deluxe manuscript productions in the age of print. The issue includes an essay on the 'print aesthetic' by Aditi Nafde, who has made major contributions to studying English manuscript and print interactions.<sup>35</sup> In the few years since Drimmer's special issue, more work has appeared on manuscript and print interactions, and it is our hope that this new special issue further stimulates the discussion in this active field.

One of the studies that has appeared since Drimmer's special issue is Martha Driver's essay on 'manuscripts after printing', in which she gives an overview of manuscripts' influence on print. Driver covers issues such as manuscripts' visual impact on early printed books; manuscripts used in print shops; manuscripts copied from printed books in continental Europe and England; printed books bound with manuscripts in *Sammelbände*, indicating their equal value and causing cataloguers difficulties; and the fact that manuscripts continued to be produced in various contexts, often for private or exclusive use, long after printing became common.<sup>36</sup> These studies mostly focus on one

<sup>32</sup> Blair, 'Reflections', 3 (preprint).

<sup>33</sup> The special issue is 'Manual Impressions: Visualizing Print in Manuscript, c. 1450–1850', *Digital Philology* 9:2 (2020).

<sup>34</sup> Sonja Drimmer, 'Introduction: The Manuscript Copy and the Printed Original in the Digital Present', *Digital Philology* 9:2 (2020), 93–119.

<sup>35</sup> Aditi Nafde, 'Replicating the Mechanical Print Aesthetic in Manuscripts before circa 1500', *Digital Philology* 9:2 (2020), 120–44. Nafde has recently also written on manuscript copies of Caxton in 'Gower from Print to Manuscript: Copying Caxton in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 51', in Martha Driver, Derek Pearsall, and R. F. Yeager (eds.), *John Gower: Manuscripts and Early Printed Books* (Boydell and Brewer, 2020), 189–200.

<sup>36</sup> Martha W. Driver, 'There and Back Again: Manuscripts after Printing', in Corinne Saunders, Richard Marshall, Alexander R. Lawrie, and Laurie Atkinson (eds.), *Middle English Manuscripts and their Legacies: A Volume in Honour of Ian Doyle* (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 155–88.

aspect of the manuscript/print spectrum, manuscripts influencing print, which is of course an important one: Devani Singh has also recently examined the transmission of Chaucer's works from manuscript to print.<sup>37</sup> However, as the print to manuscript aspect has been explored less in previous studies – even though certainly not neglected – the essays in this special issue tend to focus particularly on the latter. Importantly, some of the essays go even further and explore the complexities of the grey areas, in-between cases where the influence goes both ways.

The most recent collection of studies on manuscript and print interaction at the time of writing is Sylvia Brockstieger and Paul Schweitzer-Martin's 2023 edited volume, *Between Manuscript and Print: Transcultural Perspectives, ca. 1400–1800*, which covers a broad range of fifteenth to eighteenth-century manuscript and print interactions from central Europe to Iceland to Japan.<sup>38</sup> The editors note in their introduction that 'It is only in recent scholarship that the transition from a predominant "culture of handwriting" to a predominant "culture of print" in the early modern period has not been described in terms of a teleological process but rather as a complex event in cultural history which is characterized by various forms of transitions, simultaneities, and of shifting meanings.'<sup>39</sup> Their volume has a trans-cultural, broad range, although the individual chapters focus on case studies, and its attitude to the interactions of manuscript and print is, as ours, one of fluidity and interactivity. This certainly seems to be the present consensus when it comes to manuscript and print in the early modern period.

Research on manuscript and print interactions has focused on transmission and particularly the transmission of text: the texts and contents being copied and transmitted from one medium to another, whether from manuscript to print or print to manuscript. This special issue seeks to show that there are more layers to be explored in print and manuscript interactions, and that the complex and grey areas can be of especial interest, for example, for historians, textual scholars and literary scholars. Things other than text can also move between manuscript and print, as some of the essays in this special issue show: For instance, images can be transmitted, as Sonja Drimmer's essay discusses. This special issue continues the present decade's discussions on the complexities of manuscript and print interactions, but with a tighter focus on England and the Renaissance in order to shine a

<sup>37</sup> Devani Singh, *Chaucer's Early Modern Readers: Reception in Print and Manuscript* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023).

<sup>38</sup> Sylvia Brockstieger and Paul Schweitzer-Martin (eds.), in collaboration with Rebecca Hirt, Radu Leca, and Samuel Sugerman, *Between Manuscript and Print: Transcultural Perspectives, ca. 1400–1800*, Volume 40 in the series *Materiale Textkulturen* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 2023), available online at <<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783111242699-toc/html>> (accessed December 2024).

<sup>39</sup> Sylvia Brockstieger and Paul Schweitzer-Martin, 'Between Manuscript and Print – Introduction', in *Between Manuscript and Print: Transcultural Perspectives, ca. 1400–1800* (2023), 2.

spotlight on how manuscript and print interacted in one specific time and place. Although transmission is an important part of manuscript and print interactions, we do not wish to focus only on that, but also broaden the examination to other interactions. One way of broadening the horizons of manuscript and print interactions is to venture from the material interactions of the two media to a more abstract level of interaction and influence: from materiality to immateriality.

Some of the interactions between manuscript and print happen on the page itself, or within codices in which manuscript and print pages coexist. However, some interactions are less material than this: Scribes could incorporate design ideas from print, for instance, and conversely printers originally followed many conventions of the manuscript page – since that was the only concept of ‘book’ at the time. The latter, immaterial interactions have been dealt with less than the former, but we believe the immaterial is becoming ever more relevant as a concept. A lot of the interaction between manuscript and print can actually happen in the immaterial stage – and, thus, is more difficult to pinpoint. We have been inspired by the varied circumstances of materiality in the contributions to this issue, as well as Daniel Wakelin’s recent work on ‘immaterial texts’, in which he uses material evidence to explore ‘the immaterial ideas of scribes’. As Wakelin points out, ‘[s]ome elements of the material page exist only in the immaterial realm of intention’.<sup>40</sup> For instance, a manuscript page may include empty spaces where decorative initials were meant to be filled in, but this did not occur. The missing letters exist in the immaterial space even as they are absent from the material page. While the materiality of text has been highlighted following the ‘material turn’ in scholarship, the immaterial dimension of texts and textual transmission has received less attention.

We hope that paying explicit attention to the question of (im)materiality will help us further elucidate the interplay between manuscript and print in the early modern period. For example, pursuing the form of the printed page in a manuscript (for instance, by writing in a script modelled after a typeface) can stem from material influence from a printed exemplar, or then from immaterial notions of the aesthetics of print affecting the material manuscript product, or both. We do not wish to create a strict division between material and immaterial text, just as we do not wish to perpetuate a dichotomy of manuscript and print as strictly separate entities. Rather, we recognize that book/text production may involve complex back-and-forth movement between the material and the immaterial. It may also involve the simultaneous presence of both these aspects in a specific product such as a codex or work.

<sup>40</sup> Daniel Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts in Late Medieval England: Making English Literary Manuscripts, 1400–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 13–14; 3.

According to Wakelin, examining immaterial ideas about text is one way to approach material texts, contradictory though this may initially sound.<sup>41</sup> Focusing on materiality has been one of the major strands in book studies in recent history, and indeed, the present special issue also includes this focus: The materiality of the texts and books examined is important for exploring many questions about the forms and visuality of a work, for instance. However, the concept of immateriality gives us the opportunity to rethink the complex situations in which Renaissance manuscripts and printed books were created, and their interactions solidified.

Wakelin is not the first to explore the idea of immateriality in book history, although his perspective is, in our view, a fresh and much needed one. Editors and textual critics have implicitly considered immateriality when dealing with abstract concepts such as ‘work’ in critical editing, although the concept has not seemed to extend beyond textual immateriality<sup>42</sup>; and Sarah Wall-Randell, in 2013, focused on the immaterial book in a different sense, studying ‘representations of books and reading within those texts – books – that are “immaterial” because they are inscribed and portrayed within the pages of other books’.<sup>43</sup> Looking at early modern attitudes to reading through literary representations thereof, according to Wall-Randell, has ‘immaterial potential’ and is a good way of learning about the early modern imagination.<sup>44</sup> Although Wall-Randell’s focus on immateriality is in a different context from Wakelin’s (and our) use of the term, her point that book history should examine the immaterial in addition to the material is an important one. The intertwining of material and immaterial also appears in Adam Smyth’s work on English material texts. Smyth is concerned with the deeply material, such as printing waste, physically cut witnesses and material errors on the page; however, immaterial concerns, such as the ‘idea that a printed text exists after its material dissolution’, are also implicitly present throughout.<sup>45</sup> Even works focusing on the material are thus recognizing the need to think also in terms of the immaterial.

Smyth gives an intriguing example of immateriality when discussing a printed version of Philip Sidney’s lauded *Astrophel and Stella* (1591) which was used as endleaves to bind another contemporaneous book, *A true chronologie of the times of the Persian monarchie* (1597). As Smyth remarks, ‘Sidney’s text is being asked to forget itself as text, and to become instead a merely material

<sup>41</sup> Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 6.

<sup>42</sup> On editorial, immaterial concepts of ‘work’ and ‘text’ in the field of English scholarly editing, see, for example, Peter Shillingsburg, *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); and Ville Marttila, *Creating Digital Editions for Corpus Linguistics: The Case of Potage Dyvers, a Family of Six Middle English Recipe Collections*, doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki (2014), online at <<http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-0060-3>> (accessed December 2024), 16–33.

<sup>43</sup> Sarah Wall-Randell, *The Immaterial Book: Reading and Romance in Early Modern England* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013), 2.

<sup>44</sup> Wall-Randell, *The Immaterial Book*, 3.

<sup>45</sup> Adam Smyth, *Material Texts in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), 16.

prop'.<sup>46</sup> The immaterial becomes material indeed in a 'transformation from text to waste'; however, Smyth notes that the poems are still legible despite being used as binding. The immateriality of the text has been reduced, the poems being relegated to endleaves, but the text retains some of its immaterial weight, as it can still be read as a poem – and due to Sidney's fame in his time, a recognizable one at that. Binding waste is thus a good example of how the immaterial may become rudely material. Tamara Atkin's essay in this special issue focuses on this, using the binding waste in thirty-nine Bodleian Library manuscripts – fragments of manuscripts or printed books – to discuss their 'immaterial potential'.

As binding waste shows us, interaction between manuscript and print – as well as between the material and immaterial – is not only a matter of textual transmission, or even the transmission of information content. This becomes evident when studying handwritten annotations to printed books, as Aino Liira does in the present issue – or when examining *Sammelbände*, codices into which printed and manuscript booklets have been bound together.<sup>47</sup> Text is not the only thing to determine these interactions, since sometimes, in *Sammelbände*, booklets may have been bound together mainly for the convenience of being the same size.<sup>48</sup> In addition to Atkin and Liira, other essays in this special issue also explore issues beyond textual transmission.

Aesthetics, or visual design, are another immaterial influence on manuscript and print interaction. Aditi Nafde discusses this aspect in her recent article on 'Replicating the Mechanical Print Aesthetic in Manuscripts', which shows how sixteenth-century scribes who copied deluxe manuscript versions of printed books for wealthy patrons might add features from print aesthetics into their handwritten productions even when they were copying manuscript to manuscript.<sup>49</sup> These aesthetics go beyond script imitating typefaces, as they can include the aesthetics of image in their woodcut-like drawings and eschew red ink decorations in favour of 'the monochrome aesthetic of undecorated printed books'.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Smyth, *Material Texts*, 172.

<sup>47</sup> For a study of English *Sammelbände*, see Alexandra Gillespie, 'Poets, Printers, and Early English *Sammelbände*', *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2) (2004), 189–214; see also Paul Needham, *The Printer and the Pardoner* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1986) and the discussion of 'material intertextuality' in Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

<sup>48</sup> This is the case, for example, in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 846, which includes a printed sheet with genealogical information (Part XII, fols. 56–57) as well as a printed booklet with a poem dedicated to Charles I (Part XVII, fols. 71r–99v), bound in among handwritten works. The binding was done at the behest of Elias Ashmole (1617–92); the motive, in this case, appears to have been as simple as size: both of the printed inserts are large folios, as are the manuscript booklets bound together with them. Most of the material in this MS is genealogical.

<sup>49</sup> Nafde, 'Replicating the Print Aesthetic'.

<sup>50</sup> Nafde, 'Replicating the Print Aesthetic', 120.

When discussing aesthetics, we are in part talking about immateriality, since part of why an aesthetic has value is due to its immaterial qualities: For instance, values of newness attributed to print aesthetics. Aesthetics and their immateriality have always been a part of scribal work, however: Even though scribes worked with varying material conditions, especially before the advent of paper when even hole-ridden parchment might be valuable as a writing support, Wakelin argues that they were trying to realize abstract ideas about the concept of a rectangular page, or the work they were copying: In other words, they were engaged with the immaterial text.<sup>51</sup>

Copying can also involve immateriality; indeed, scribes sometimes copied more abstract immaterial ideas of textual organization and visualization. In the case of manuscript and print, for instance, a scribe script-switching in the manner of a printed book – for instance, switching to an italic script for quotations, while using secretary script otherwise – is copying the immaterial properties of a printed text in addition to the material.<sup>52</sup> This kind of script-switching is most obvious in cases where a scribe uses a printed text as their exemplar and indeed is one of the visual clues that a manuscript text may be copied from print. However, the immaterial influence – in this case, the idea that quotations should be visually marked in an italic style – can be seen even in texts which are not copied from print.<sup>53</sup> Of course, the practice of using different typefaces to distinguish between different elements of the text is itself indebted to medieval scribal practices.

The (immaterial) idea that a manuscript should look a certain way sometimes involves copying material aspects, but it does not need to. Scribes imitating the immaterial convention of marking quotations did not literally copy whichever italic typeface was used in their printed exemplar, but would use their own italic handwriting, transmitting the idea of a visual convention into material form. This is true for manuscript to manuscript copying, too: Scribes may employ the same immaterial function of textual or visual organization while not replicating their exemplar exactly.<sup>54</sup> However, as Aditi Nafde has shown, when copying from print to manuscript, a ‘mechanical aesthetic’ began to influence scribal fashions, and the

<sup>51</sup> Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 7–8.

<sup>52</sup> On script-switching and typeface-switching, and examples such as script-switching from secretary script to italic in a manuscript copied from a printed exemplar where the printed book has typeface-switching from blackletter to italic, see Samuli Kaislaniemi, ‘Code-Switching, Script-Switching and Typeface-Switching in Early Modern English Manuscript Letters and Printed Tracts’, in Matti Peikola, Aleksi Mäkilähde, Hanna Salmi, Mari-Liisa Varila and Janne Skaffari (eds.), *Verbal and Visual Communication in Early English Texts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 165–200.

<sup>53</sup> For instance, Richard Norwood (1590–1675), in his autograph fair manuscript copy of his *Confessions* (now at the Bermuda Archives, reference number 4105 – 003 PA 0307), uses an italic script for names (of places and people) and quotations, in a style immaterially imitating print conventions, even though this work exists only in manuscript form, and was his original work, not copied from print.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 208.

reproduction of print aesthetics ‘was becoming increasingly part of scribes’ skillsets’.<sup>55</sup>

Scribes did not always reproduce these aesthetics even when they were copying from print, however.<sup>56</sup> Nafde discusses ‘the value of making bespoke an aesthetic that is designed to be mass-produced’: Scribes laboured to reproduce the aesthetics of the printed page, but also added details that were easy for scribes to produce but difficult as part of the printing process, such as decorations.<sup>57</sup>

Thus, text takes an idea – immaterial by definition – and gives it a material, linguistic form. If that text, or images, for instance, are then copied into some form, the copies replicate a material manifestation of an abstract idea. Design transfers both material and immaterial features. Using a hypothetical book’s lifespan to exemplify the intertwining of (im)material as well as manuscript and print, we can imagine (im)materiality in practice.

The intertwining of manuscript and print happens at many stages in the production of a book. At the very beginning, the sources used for a specific material copy can be either printed or handwritten, or consist of a hybrid source with both print and manuscript elements. A Renaissance author preparing a new work would often work with both manuscript and print materials, drawing information and inspiration from other works, preparing their work in one or more manuscript versions, and potentially delivering the final draft to a printer. In the case of copying texts, the material features of the sources may guide the choice of materials for the new copy. For example, if the source is a folio-sized book, it may be easier to calculate the resources needed for a copy if the copy is also folio-sized and follows a similar layout. When a printed book is used as an exemplar for a manuscript copy, the scribe may replicate some of the aesthetic features of the exemplar, for example, the design of initials or the size and style of script used for various parts of the text.

Sources are also used by text producers on a more immaterial level, as exemplars for the text of a work. The text producer(s) may follow a single exemplar or combine elements from two or more (manuscript or print) sources. Sometimes they include references to sources or metatextual information about the copying process, for example noting that a recipe in a recipe book has been copied from a specific printed book, but such source references are often absent from medieval and Renaissance copies. This process can also lead to the birth of a new work: For example, a material book might contain thematically related but distinct texts, originally from different works. When a text producer reproduces the texts in a new context, they may combine these

<sup>55</sup> Nafde, ‘Replicating the Print Aesthetic’, 137.

<sup>56</sup> Nafde, ‘Replicating the Print Aesthetic’, 124.

<sup>57</sup> Nafde, ‘Replicating the Print Aesthetic’, 130.

separate texts under a shared title, thereby shaping them into a new, unified work.

Manuscript and print may also intertwine in the finished material product – the specific material copy resulting from the copying or printing process. For example, design features such as layout or initials may show traces of a source text produced in another medium. There are also ‘hybrid’ creations with material evidence of interaction between manuscript and print: A manuscript may contain woodcut illustrations cut from a printed copy and pasted into the manuscript, or a printed book may contain hand-painted illustrations or scribal rubrication.

The immaterial presence of the two media (or technologies) also appears in the finished immaterial product – that is, in the text of the work in the specific resulting copy. While the resulting text is affected by its exemplar(s) or copy-text, the reader accessing the work through a specific manuscript or printed book typically only encounters that version of the text. If the text producers have not included references or metatextual information about their sources, the influence of one or more specific sources often remains invisible to the reader unless they start comparing multiple material copies of the work.

Immaterial and material aspects of manuscript and print interaction are thus present in all the stages of production that lead from source to finished product – and even after the product has been discarded and potentially recycled, for example as binding waste. The immaterial and abstract ideas of a work are given a material, linguistic form in manuscript or print. Copying the text itself – whether this be a scribe copying from a printed exemplar, a printer using a manuscript as their copy text for an edition, or something more complex – involves transferring both material and immaterial text, as the process involves replicating a material manifestation of an abstract idea.

The interaction of immaterial and material in manuscript and print is also evident in copying design features and other visual presentations: sometimes the immaterial idea of a decorated initial is present in a manuscript even if the scribe has not, in the end, filled in the empty space left for such an initial. Immaterial ideas about visual design are also evident on a broader level, for instance in manuscripts emulating the visual features of a printed book. In general, Wakelin notes that it seems that scribes had ‘an immaterial idea of its [i.e. the page’s] rectangular shape and integrity that the scribes strove to realize’.<sup>58</sup> The physical realities of a manuscript page were variable (although less so once paper became more popular than parchment), but scribes sought to achieve a rectangular ideal. This can be seen, for instance, in the use of line fillers to end shorter lines of prose: The

<sup>58</sup> Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 57.

filler running until the end of the line preserves the rectangularity of the ideal page.<sup>59</sup> Manuscript and print interaction is a good example of this kind of immaterial text: When scribes pursued the form of the printed page in their manuscripts, they were pursuing the abstract visual ideal of a particular kind of page and evoking a certain type of visuality. For example, a scribe may have inserted catchwords on every page of their manuscript, following the practices of print production rather than the medieval scribal model of only including one catchword per quire.<sup>60</sup>

We suggest there is an (im)material spectrum: Materiality and immateriality cannot be strictly divided from one another, but interact throughout the process of producing a book. Copying from print to manuscript, for instance, can exist on both immaterial and material levels. Ideas can be copied or transmitted, such as when the immaterial, big idea of the work is transferred from one medium to another. They can also be transmitted on a more practical level, such as when the idea of emphasizing certain words or phrases, materially visible on a manuscript page, in italic script amongst the secretary script of the main text, is copied from a printed book with blackletter and roman typefaces. Of course, very material aspects can also be copied, such as scribes imitating the style of a roman typeface in their copies of printed books or a scribe replicating, through drawing, a woodcut image from a printed volume.

In our special issue, we wish to bring together various examples of transmission between manuscript and print – including but not limited to text. We hope that the contributions to this special issue help to broaden the scale of transmission from the textual to a holistic attitude where the immaterial and material aspects of transmission from manuscript to print, print to manuscript or a complex transmission in between these two poles are all considered. The complexities involved in the spectrum of manuscript/print, as well as the spectrum of (im)materiality, deserve to be laid out in all their messiness.

Nevertheless, copying is an important part of almost all the texts and works examined in the essays in this issue, since most printed texts first existed as manuscript drafts, and exploring the direction of ‘print to manuscript’ inevitably leads to printed texts being copied by hand. Immateriality is especially relevant to copying since, as Wakelin notes, ‘what is interesting about a copy is that it both is a material object in its own right and is defined by a link of an immaterial, ideational kind to another, materially separate object’; he even claims that ‘[c]opying is the ultimate pursuit of texts as things that transcend materiality’.<sup>61</sup> Copying, in Wakelin’s evocative words, is inherently related to ‘the pursuit of something immaterial – an absent textual idea, an aspiration in

<sup>59</sup> See Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 52.

<sup>60</sup> Nafde, ‘Replicating the Print Aesthetic’, 123.

<sup>61</sup> Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 195.

the craftsman's mind'.<sup>62</sup> As various examples of copying from print to manuscript suggest, sometimes the material form was seen as important (when a scribe attempted to copy a typeface, for instance), and sometimes, the text itself was copied without any adherence to the printed exemplar's materiality.<sup>63</sup> The immaterial *work* was often more important than the material, visual features of the exemplar.<sup>64</sup>

In other words, manuscript and print interact also in the immaterial stages of text production. Material becomes immaterial in the process of textual transfer and becomes material again in the next copy of the immaterial text of the work. There is no strict divide between material and immaterial; rather, as suggested above, we consider the notion of an (im)material spectrum to be useful. As a whole, this special issue contributes to the discussion of the spectrum of material and immaterial text, although the individual essays vary in their chosen focus.

The opening essay for this issue, by Tamara Atkin, has a sharp focus on materiality, yet also reveals the complex immateriality of the books she examines. Atkin delves into the reuse and mingling of manuscript and printed books as binding waste, with a case study showing how shifting religious attitudes in England might explain some material aspects of the sixteenth-century bindings she examines. The 'immaterial potential' of binding waste is a major consideration in Atkin's essay.

Sonja Drimmer provides a theoretical essay that challenges the common phrase 'from manuscript to print': She shows how much can be gained through the study of manuscripts copied from print by examining an English manuscript with images copied from printed Italian sources, using concepts from recent studies in queer book history to examine 'nonnormative temporalities' within a single manuscript. Drimmer's theoretical viewpoints are grounded in a case study embracing materiality.

Carrie Griffin explores the compilation of household books and how they reflect the curation efforts of the women who compiled them. Household books gather information from printed sources, but also from other manuscripts and oral transmission; Griffin reframes this process through transactions and exchanges, remaining on the material side of the spectrum. Turning to another kind of information transmission, Aylin Malcolm and

<sup>62</sup> Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 197.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Wakelin, *Immaterial Texts*, 204: 'the process of copying seems like a struggle to overcome the material problems of the exemplar in pursuit of a textual entity imagined to be elsewhere, almost immaterial'.

<sup>64</sup> Textual critics have frequently engaged, in-depth, with the immaterial concept of *work*; see, for instance, Douglas Moffat and Vincent P. McCarren, 'A Bibliographical Essay on Editing Methods and Authorial and Scribal Intention', in Vincent P. McCarren and Douglas Moffat (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998), 25–57; and Tjamke Snijders, 'Work, Version, Text and Scriptum: High Medieval Manuscript Terminology in the Aftermath of the New Philology', *Digital Philology: A Journal of Medieval Cultures* 2(2) (2013), 266–96. *Authorial intent* is another immaterial concept that has been highly influential in scholarly editing; see, for example, G. Thomas Tanselle, 'The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention', *Studies in Bibliography* 29(1) (1976), 167–211.

Margaret Maurer examine the uses of stylistic and visual conventions drawn from printed books in three seventeenth- and eighteenth-century recipe manuscripts. Their case studies reside in the murky in-between of (im)materiality, with very material evidence of immaterial conventions.

Continuing with manuscript/print interactions beyond that of textual transmission, Aino Liira discusses small-scale, but major, interactions of manuscript and print in the form of handwritten – or drawn – marginal notes in English printed books. Liira focuses on readers' annotations, specifically those related to printed 'graphic devices' such as diagrams, tables or images. Her essay is focused on the material, but also slides into immaterial concerns with the purposes of the readers; she also discusses drawings in addition to written annotations, reflecting the multimodality of handwritten early modern reader interactions with printed books.

Aditi Nafde highlights Caxton's printed editions and the deluxe manuscript copies made of them, showing how Caxton profited from the values associated with manuscripts. Nafde argues that such manuscripts problematize the notion that the transition from manuscript to print was linear, using her complex material to reveal plenty of immaterial concerns. Finally, Niamh Pattwell's case study of Edmund Horde's commonplace book continues with the theme of religious dissent: This manuscript includes material hand-copied from printed religious texts, providing evidence of both Catholic and Protestant concerns. Horde's use of printed works contradicts the common connection of print with reformed religion, and Pattwell's essay thus links to Atkin's, both suggesting new angles on book culture following the Dissolution.<sup>65</sup> Pattwell delves deep into the material side of the spectrum but also engages with immateriality by showing how Horde's religious convictions influence the texts he copies. This issue brings together scholars working on different aspects of the interaction between manuscript and print, thus providing an avenue for furthering the study of the complexities involved in early modern text production. In our view, there is plenty of interesting work going on in this field at the moment, including ongoing projects by our contributors. We hope that the present issue will inspire further research on the complex interactions between manuscript and print in the early modern period, especially on challenging situations where utilitarian needs have created complex artefacts that challenge the boundaries of material and immaterial text as well as those of manuscript and print.

University of Turku

<sup>65</sup> We are grateful to our anonymous reviewer for raising this point.

### Abstract

This introductory essay to the special issue on Early Modern English Textual Cultures Between Manuscript and Print first outlines previous research into different kinds of interaction between manuscript and print. Examples of this interplay include, for instance, the transmission of text and images from one medium into another, the use of manuscript and print sources in the creation of new texts, works and codices, and readers annotating and copying printed sources by hand. We suggest that it is fruitful to consider both material and immaterial aspects of book production when investigating manuscript–print interactions. For instance, scribes copying printed sources may have prioritized the immaterial work being copied or imitated the material features of their exemplar. In our view, the material and the immaterial are intertwined throughout the process of book production. We conclude the introduction by briefly outlining the seven essays in the collection, which address various types of interaction between manuscript and print.