

## AN EIGHTEENMO GATHERED IN TWELVES

IN RECENT YEARS these pages have contained several articles on the eighteenmo,<sup>1</sup> and in particular on identifying volumes so imposed. Eighteenmos gathered in eighteens, in alternating twelves and sixes,<sup>2</sup> or in nines will instantly be recognized for what they are, and from previous accounts one might conclude that the only problem of identification - real though that problem is - is that presented by eighteenmos gathered in sixes, for volumes gathered in sixes might equally well be twelvemos or twentyfourmos. As far as I know, no one has observed that eighteenmos could also be imposed for gathering in twelves, thereby being much more likely to be mistaken for twelvemos or twentyfourmos.

Recorded in DMH<sup>3</sup> are two English Bibles which, collating A-2P<sup>12</sup> 2Q<sup>4</sup>, have understandably been entered there as twelvemos.<sup>4</sup> DMH586 (exemplar seen: British and Foreign Bible Society Library - deposited in the University Library, Cambridge - H586) has the imprint 'AMSTERDAM, | Printed by JOACHIM NOSCHE, dwelling upon the Sea-dijck. | 1645.' DMH587 (exemplar seen: British Library, C.64.cc.9) has the imprint 'Printed | by Roger Daniel Printer to the | Univerfitie of | CAMBRIDGE. | 1645.' What DMH do not record is that their 586 and 587 are in fact part of the same edition, the two differing only in the imprint on the general title page and that on the title page to the New Testament. Given that piratical printing in Holland of English Bibles destined for surreptitious introduction into Britain and its plantations was widespread after about 1633, one must assume that the Cambridge imprint is fictitious and that the edition was printed in Amsterdam by Nosche. And rather than being a twelvemo it is an eighteenmo.

Vertical chain lines in a volume gathered in twelves would normally suggest sheets of long twelves (see the imposition scheme in Gaskell, p. [96], fig. 54), but leaves from long twelves are comparatively tall and narrow, whereas those in DMH586-7 are squarish. If the volumes had been imposed as half sheets of twentyfourmos the watermark would appear in half the gatherings, but in DMH586-7 it appears in two out of three (in H586 in A B D E G H K L N O Q R T V Y Z 2B 2C 2E 2G 2H 2I 2L 2M 2O 2Q), suggesting that two sheets have produced three gatherings - or, put another way, that sequences of thirty-six leaves derive from two sheets. Confirmation that the volumes are indeed eighteenmos is afforded by the fact that in some gatherings \$1.2.3.10.11.12 are manifestly from a different sheet than \$4.5.6.7.8.9; in all these instances the gathering lacks a watermark. In other words, the volumes were imposed according to a scheme like that illustrated by Gaskell (p. [103], fig. 61) for gathering in alternating twelves and sixes; but instead of being imposed in such a way as to produce offcuts to be bound separately in gatherings of six the type pages were so imposed that the offcuts from two sheets could be quired to form every third gathering.

Why Nosche should have adopted such a scheme is puzzling. Certainly it involves less sewing than gathering in twelves and sixes, but why not impose as a twelvemo in the first instance?

B.J. McMullin,  
Monash University.

#### NOTES

1. Annemie Gilbert and Sylvia Ransom, 'The Imposition of eighteenmos in sixes, with special reference to tranchefiles', *BSANZ Bulletin* no. 17 (November, 1980), 269-75; B.J. McMullin, 'Press figures and format', *ibid.* v.7 (1983), 109-19; Brian Hubber, 'Eighteenmo in nines: an experimental technique', *ibid.* 183-6.
2. Philip Gaskell (*A New introduction to bibliography* Oxford 1972, p.107) observes that 'The commonest of the small formats were 18° in 12s and 6s (or in 6s)...', but observation suggests that the 18° in 6s was the more common and that the 18° in 12s and 6s was distinctly uncommon.
3. T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, rev. A. S. Herbert, *Historical catalogue of printed editions of the English Bible 1525-1961* London, 1968.
4. And in the British Library catalogue (DMH587) and Wing B2209 (DMH587). Wing has no entry for DMH586, but appears to have conflated it and 587, giving BL and BFBS as locations, whereas BL has only DMH587, BFBS only 586.

**Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)**