

## A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

**T**HE above heading may seem presumptuous, as there are few traces of bibliography in the following lines. Yet my tour, of which I venture to give some account, was undertaken solely for the examination and collation of the copies, or fragments of copies, still existing of the several editions of the famous 'Speculum humanae salvationis,' presumably printed at Haarlem in the fifteenth century.

In May, 1906, the editor of the forthcoming new edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' asked me to bring up to date the historical part of the article 'Typography,' written by me for the last edition of that work in or about 1888, which mainly dealt with the controversy as to when, where, and by whom the art of printing with moveable metal types was invented.

I hardly liked to take this subject up again. But this opportunity for restating once more my views on it was, I thought, too favourable to let slip, especially as I was not aware of anything having occurred since 1888 to change my conviction that the honour of the invention must be ascribed to Haarlem and its citizen, Lourens Janszoon Coster,

and not to Johann Gutenberg of Mainz. Great celebrations in honour of the latter had, indeed, taken place in Germany in 1900, the supposed 500th anniversary of his birth. And on that occasion the foremost bibliographers and scholars of Germany published valuable books and pamphlets on Gutenberg's life, his relatives and parentage, and on some of the incunabula supposed to have been printed by him. A Gutenberg Museum was also established at Mainz on a large scale, as a repository for all obtainable books, documents, etc., bearing on Gutenberg's claims to the honour of the invention.

These new publications, however, though far superior to anything hitherto published on the subject, contain no evidence for Gutenberg's claims, unless we set aside those of Haarlem, which such thorough and fair-minded investigators as Dr. Schwenke and Dr. Zedler, the librarians of the Berlin and Wiesbaden Libraries, have begun to appreciate, if not to accept.

It had long seemed to me that reading and studying the four different texts (two Latin and two Dutch) found in as many separate editions of the 'Speculum,' and an examination of the woodcuts, which are the same in all the four, might give us a clue to the chronological order in which these editions should be placed, and, consequently, to the approximate period to be assigned to them and the other Costeriana. Hitherto the authors who have treated of this work have been far from unanimous as to this order. The systems of a few of the best known (Meerman, Heineken, Koning, Ottley,

## 284 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

Bernard, Sotheby, and Schreiber, the latest) placed side by side, show this:

MEERMAN (1765)	HEINECKEN (1771)	KONING (1815)	OTTLEY (1816), SOTHEBY (1858), SCHREIBER (1902)	BERNARD (1853)
I. D. <i>unmixed</i>	L. <i>mixed</i>	D. <i>unmixed</i>	L. <i>unmixed</i>	L. <i>mixed</i>
II. L. <i>mixed</i>	L. <i>unmixed</i>	L. <i>unmixed</i>	D. <i>mixed</i>	L. <i>unmixed</i>
III. D. <i>mixed</i>	D. <i>unmixed</i>	D. <i>mixed</i>	L. <i>mixed</i>	D. <i>mixed</i>
IV. L. <i>unmixed</i>	D. <i>mixed</i>	L. <i>mixed</i>	D. <i>unmixed</i>	D. <i>unmixed</i>

Want of space prevents me from explaining in detail the reasons for these different systems. Suffice it to say that Heineken placed the Dutch after the Latin editions, merely because he regarded the printed Dutch texts as translations from the printed Latin texts. Bernard was uncertain as to the order in which to place them. Ottley, Sotheby and Schreiber, who agree in their order, take as guides the absence or presence of breakages and other peculiarities in the woodcuts. These and other points, mentioned casually below, could only be verified by an examination of the texts and woodcuts of all the copies of the book, now scattered over nearly the half of Europe.

There being no copy of the book at Cambridge, I prepared myself for my visits to the European libraries by copying the text of the mixed Latin edition, with all its contractions and mistakes, from J. Ph. Berjeau's facsimile, published in 1861. Meantime, our librarian (Mr. Jenkinson) requested Lord Pembroke to send the two editions (mixed Latin and unmixed Dutch) in his possession to the Uni-

versity Library for my use, which his Lordship readily did, kindly adding his three Blockbooks ('Ars moriendi,' 'Apocalypse,' and 'Biblia Pauperum').

Autograph notes in the Pembroke (Dutch) copy show that it has been in the possession of the celebrated Antwerp geographer, Abraham Ortelius, and after his death in 1598 passed into the hands of his nephew Jacobus Colius Ortelianus, a Dutch (Flemish) merchant settled in London. At the latter's house, Emmanuel Demetrius, the historian, in his History published in 1612 states that he had seen it, and it may be supposed that the copy remained in Cole's possession till his death in 1628. Since then it has probably belonged to the Pembroke family, as their copy of the 'Apocalypse' also has Cole's autograph. Some of Cole's books, however, which he had received or inherited from his uncle, came into Bishop Moore's library, and from thence into the Cambridge University Library, and Ortelius' Album is in the Library of Pembroke College.

The Pembroke Dutch text, though slightly imperfect, I copied as far as it goes, but not with such facility as Berjeau's Latin text, as its printing is rather primitive, and has more numerous and puzzling contractions. With the Pembroke Latin text I collated the one copied from Berjeau's facsimile.

At the end of 1906 I went to Manchester to examine the copies of the mixed Latin and mixed Dutch editions preserved in the Spencer collection  
19. of the John Rylands Library. Here Mr. Henry

## 286 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

Guppy, the librarian, gave me every facility in his power for copying the text of the Dutch edition, which differs so much from that of the other (unmixed) Dutch edition, that merely taking notes of the variants would not have sufficed. This work, and other matters connected with it, took me four weeks, and as the Rylands Library contained many other treasures relating to the controversy of the invention, which were all placed at my disposal, I might have passed there another month or two, if Manchester's damp, smoky, black atmosphere, which necessitated my working every day by electric light, had not compelled me to defer the remainder of my task (the collation of the Latin copy and the examination of the Blockbooks) to a more favourable season.

But even the little I had hitherto done gave me already some idea of the order in which, at least, three of the 'Speculum' editions (the mixed Latin and the two Dutch) should be placed. I explained this to a meeting of the London Bibliographical Society, on the 20th of February, and showed at the same time photographs of two of the pages of Lord Pembroke's Dutch edition, taken with his consent, as well as the photograph, which Mr. Guppy had taken for me, of one of the two pages in the Spencer-Rylands Dutch edition printed in a different type from the rest of the book. But my explanation was still incomplete, as I had never yet seen a copy of the unmixed Latin edition, and was not likely to see one till I could go to the Continent.

Towards the end of April I collated the Douce copy of the mixed Latin edition in the Bodleian,

which is in fine condition, exhibited in one of the show-cases. Towards the end of June Lord Pembroke's books were returned, and the time for my tour had come. For various purposes I intended to visit the libraries, museums, or archives at Paris, Strassburg, Geneva, Florence, Munich, Vienna, Leipzig, Berlin, Hanover, Frankfurt-on-Main, Darmstadt, Mainz, Wiesbaden, Cologne, Utrecht, Haarlem, Leiden, the Hague, Antwerp, Brussels, and Lille. The well-known publication 'Minerva' gave me, in most instances, the desired information as regards the Directors or Librarians of all the Institutions to be visited, and anticipating no difficulties in obtaining admission anywhere, I provided myself with no introductions. But some ten or twelve days before I started, when I casually told a friend that, according to Bernard and Holtrop, there was a copy of the 'Speculum' in the Pitti Palace at Florence, he expressed a doubt as to whether this could be correct, as the Palace contained pictures, no books. But the 'Speculum,' being famous for its engravings, was it not possible that for this reason it had strayed into a collection of pictures? Still, I requested the Director of the Palace to let me know, and the reply-postcard which I had sent came back with the official answer that 'among the collection of prints of the Gallery Uffizi the work "Speculum humane Salvationis" did not exist.' As the book might have disappeared from Florence since Bernard and Holtrop's time, I requested the British Consul-General at Florence (Major W. P. Chapman) to make inquiries for me, and I record with much pleasure the promptitude

with which this gentleman ascertained that 'the "Speculum" was preserved in the Palatina Library once at the Pitti Palace and now in the Royal National Library.'

Meantime I had bought tickets for all the places mentioned above (and a few others to be visited for private purposes) from the 'Belgian State Railways' at their London office, 72 Regent Street. And I can recommend other intending travellers to do the same, if they will limit their luggage to so much as can be carried by hand, and dispense with the services of guides, interpreters, etc., supplied by other tourist-agencies. At least, my tickets have carried me, without any trouble, to all the places I wanted to go to, and were, I believe, 10 per cent. cheaper than those of other agencies.

On the 9th July I began my work on the Continent by the collation of the two copies of the *mixed* Latin 'Speculum' in the Paris National Library, which Campbell, and after him Conway, erroneously describe as copies of the Latin *unmixed* edition. In the copy that had formerly belonged to the Sorbonne Library is pasted a slip of paper, on which S. Leigh Sotheby wrote in 1858 that this edition was the *third* edition of the 'Speculum' or second Latin (see above), and referred to his 'Principia Typographica,' Vol. I., pp. 152-67, and Plates xxxv. and xxxvi., as 'showing that the texts in block-type in this edition are facsimiles of those in the first edition, thus satisfactorily proving the order of their issue.' I hope to show in another treatise that Sotheby's 'order' and 'proofs' are not so satisfactory as he thought them to be.

The various fragments of the Costerian 'Donatuses' and 'Doctrinales,' as well as the blockbooks in the Paris Library, were all readily placed at my disposal, and described by me for future use. Incidentally I may refer here to a curious omission in the heading of the celebrated passage in the 'Cologne Chronicle' of 1499 (on folio 311b) on the invention of printing. I had noticed that in the copy of the Cambridge University Library this heading reads: 'Wanne wae ind durch wen is vonden dye onvyssprechlich [end of line] kunst boicher tzo drucken.' This was wrong, as the word before 'kunst' being an adverb could not govern a substantive. Moreover, I remembered that some authors quote the word 'nutze' before 'kunst.' But the two copies in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, read like the University Library copy; so also the British Museum copy. When, therefore, M. Viennot, one of the librarians of the Paris Library, kindly showed me the inner library, and asked me whether I wished to see any particular book, I mentioned the 'Chronicle.' We found three copies of the book on one shelf, all reading like the four just mentioned, but a fourth copy had 'nutze' duly printed at the beginning of the line before 'kunst.' Afterwards I saw copies in the Munich University Library, the town library at Haarlem, and the private library of Messrs. Enschedé, all having 'nutze'; hence it is clear that the omission of this adjective was noticed and rectified in Koelhoff's office after a number of copies had been sold. Of course, its omission does not affect the testimony of the 'Chronicle' as



regards the invention of printing, but it is remarkable that the heading of such a celebrated passage has been quoted and translated, sometimes with, and sometimes without the adjective, for more than four hundred years without the discrepancy having been observed.

On the 18th July I went to Strassburg, where I arrived too late in the day to go to the library or to the archives, but early enough to ascertain that the old MS. Registers belonging to the St. Thomas Stift, which contain important entries relating to Gutenberg, are now deposited for public use in the 'Stadt-Archiv.' Here Dr. Jacob Bernays much facilitated my work by remaining at his post several hours after the official time for closing, and treated me, moreover, at his house with great hospitality. To my disappointment, Dr. K. Schorbach, the librarian of the Kais. Univers. Bibliothek, was on his holiday when I arrived. In his work on the documents relating to Gutenberg's life and work, published by the Gutenberg-Gesellschaft on the occasion of the Gutenberg festivities of 1900, he speaks of me as an obstinate opponent of Gutenberg, and of Dr. Van der Linde, and gives his readers to understand that, in my book on Gutenberg, I suppressed all evidence that seemed to be in favour of Gutenberg, or regarded it as forged. I had wished to explain to him verbally, what I have said two or three times in print, that it would not be worth any one's while to take this course, seeing that the Gutenberg documents, so far as we know them, show him to have been a printer, perhaps the first printer in Germany, but not the inventor

of printing; that this distinction is suggested not merely by Gutenberg's own silence as to any invention, but also by that of his contemporaries, who ought to have spoken of him as the inventor, and would and could have done so, if he had invented anything; and that, in its turn, this silence harmonises with Ulr. Zell's refutation or qualification of the rumours about a Gutenberg invention, and with Junius' advocacy in favour of a Haarlem invention, both corroborated by the circumstantial evidence found in the Costeriana, which point to a stage of printing anterior to that of Mainz.

As there are no Costeriana at Strassburg, and a cursory examination of the St. Thomas Registers showed me that Dr. Schorbach's treatise on the Gutenberg documents was sufficiently clear, I limited my work in this beautiful town to a description of the 'Biblia Pauperum,' to which Dr. Braunholtz, the assistant librarian, called my attention.

On the 21st July I arrived at Geneva for the collation of the copy of the mixed Dutch 'Speculum' preserved in the Public Library. It wants the leaves 1 to 7, 16, 17, and 62, and the binder has cut away the margins close to the letter-press and woodcuts, and in this condition the leaves have been pasted on large sheets of thick light brown paper, so that neither the water-marks nor any rubbings of the frotton can be seen. But as far as the printing of text and figures is concerned it is one of the best copies I have seen. In 1761 it was in the possession of Mr. Marcus at Amsterdam, and a note in the book informs us that in the

## 292 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

eighteenth century it was presented to the Geneva Library by Dr. Tronchin.

From Geneva I went on the 24th of July to Florence, where I had to collate the copy of the *unmixed* Latin 'Speculum,' preserved in the National Library. It only wants the first (blank) leaf, and bears the pressmark E. 6. 7. 15 (Old Palat. Libr. B. A. q. 630), not, as Schreiber says, D. 7. 5. 2 B., which is that of a copy of the 'Speculum humanæ vitæ.' I had never yet seen a copy of this unmixed edition, except the one at the Hague for a few minutes years ago.

Ottley, Sotheby, Holtrop, and Schreiber (1902), regard this edition as the *first* because, they say, (1) the twenty xylographic pages in the *mixed* are *fac-similes* of the same pages, type-printed, of the *unmixed* Latin edition; (2) a comparison of the composition of the remaining pages, all type-printed in both editions, points to the *unmixed* having served as model to the compositor of the *mixed* edition; (3) the absence of breakages in some of the woodcuts of the unmixed Latin, show that it was printed prior to the other three editions, in which the same woodcuts are defective; and (4) the fact that the scrolls in the last woodcut in some of the copies of the *unmixed* Latin edition have a black ground, but are blank in other copies and in all the other editions, proves that the unmixed Latin is the earliest of all.

As regards the first point, I found, indeed, such a close agreement between the text of the twenty xylographic pages of the mixed Latin edition and that of the corresponding type-printed pages of the

unmixed Latin edition, that, after having copied one or two pages of the Florence copy, I abandoned this work, and merely noted the differences between its text and that of the mixed edition. These differences, however, make it clear that the latter is not a facsimile of the unmixed Latin, but rather the reverse, as I hope to explain in another treatise, when dealing with the other three points referred to above. The Florence copy has blank scrolls in the last woodcut, not *black* as in some other copies of this edition, as noted above.

Saturday, the 3rd of August, I went to Munich, and on Monday, the 5th, began to collate the copy of the *unmixed* Latin edition (pressmark Xyl. 37) preserved in the Hof- und Staats-Bibliothek. It only wants the first (blank) leaf, but most of the rectos and versos of the other leaves left blank by the printer, are pasted together, so that the watermarks cannot be seen. The Munich University Library also possesses a copy (pressmark Xyl. 10) of this same edition, which is slightly imperfect, as it wants the leaves 54, 55 and 59. But it is most valuable, as having the scrolls on the final woodcut (116) *black*, as in the Vienna and John Inglis (now in New York) copies, and not blank as in the other copies. It bears, moreover, the date 1471, written in old Arabic numerals, in *minium* at the end of the Prohemium, as was first pointed out by Dr. W. L. Schreiber ('Centralblatt f. Bibliothekwesen,' 1895, p. 208). Underneath this contemporary date the same date is repeated, apparently for the sake of greater clearness, in numerals of the eighteenth century. As the librarian of the University Library kindly applied

for the loan of the copy of the Hof-Bibliothek for my use in his library, I was able to study and compare the two Munich copies minutely, the result of which I hope to give in another place.

On the 13th August I left Munich for Vienna, arriving there the following morning at 7.30. Prof. Engelbrecht, of the Vienna University, with whom I had had some correspondence three or four years ago, had, at my request, recommended me to the director of the Hof-Bibliothek, and as Dr. Kugel, the custos of the Library, considerably undertook to be in the Library from 2 to 4 p.m., when it was usually closed, I was enabled to work during these two hours, as well as from 9 to 12 in the morning. The Vienna copy belongs to the *unmixed* Latin edition, like the Florence and two Munich copies, and bears the pressmark 'Inc. 2 D 19.' The scrolls on its last engraving (116) are *black*, like those in the Munich University Library copy, and in the centre scroll, on the black ground, is *written* by a hand of the fifteenth century, 'Mane teter fares.' Unfortunately, the blank verso of this engraving is pasted on to a modern blank leaf, so that the impression of this scroll on the verso cannot be seen. The copy formerly belonged to the Celestins at Paris, and still bears their name (Celestinorum Parisiensium) on the first leaf. The Hof-Bibliothek bought it for 1,600 francs at the La Vallière sale. The same Library possesses also two editions of the 'Biblia Pauperum,' one with, the other without signatures.

From Vienna I went to Leipzig, where no 'Costeriana,' but Klemm's two vellum volumes of

the 42 line Bible are preserved. Herr Heinrich Klemm is known to have been a tailor at Dresden, and to have published books on tailoring. His 'Museum' of Incunabula, of which this Bible forms part, was bought by the Saxon Government in 1886 and presented to the 'Deutsches Buchgewerbemuseum' at Leipzig. He also possessed Gutenberg's 'Printing-Press' bearing the date 1441 (!), discovered (!) at Mainz in 1856, and other rarities of a similar nature. The two volumes of the Bible are ornamented (?) in several places with miniatures of a much later date than the Bible itself. Klemm described it three times, in 1883 and 1884, and calls it a 'real unicum' on account of these miniatures, which he says were probably executed for some prince. But he nowhere speaks of the date '1453,' written in small Arabic numerals of fifteenth century form, at the bottom of the last leaf of the second volume. Yet Klemm must have been aware that the earliest date known up to that time for this Bible was 1456, so that his earlier date, if it were genuine, was of the utmost importance, and would have considerably enhanced the value of his copy. It could, moreover, have assisted him in his Descriptive Catalogue of his Museum in his argument against those who ascribe the Bible to Peter Schoeffer. His silence, therefore, is suspicious, and the doubt is increased by the date being written quite at the bottom of the last leaf. Otherwise, in the date itself I saw nothing suspicious; it is perfectly clear; but it is surrounded by traces of writing now scratched out, and no doubt these traces have caused the

black and indistinct photograph of the date which Dziatzko published a few years ago ('Sammlung,' VII., 104).

It will, perhaps, not seem out of place if I add a few words on Dr. Dziatzko's bibliographical researches and discoveries regarding this Bible, which he published at Berlin in 1890 under the title, 'Gutenberg's früheste Druckerpraxis' (Gutenberg's earliest work as printer). In 1889 he and several of his pupils had elaborately examined and compared the 42 and 36 line Bibles, and found that these resembled each other in every respect; their quires and divisions into volumes were alike (pp. 19-31); paper and watermarks were alike (pp. 32-50); the types (letters, marks of punctuation, etc.) were alike, only those of B 36 were larger than those of B 42 (pp. 50-74). Ergo, he says, the two Bibles were undoubtedly printed in one and the same office, by one and the same printer, who was, of course, John Gutenberg. Therefore, he concluded: (1) Gutenberg printed B 42 during his partnership (1450-5) with Fust; (2) he superintended the manufacture of its type, instructed the compositor and the printer, and hence was its printer; (3) Fust supplied the money and material, and took part in the printing and the revision of the text, and had an important share in its publication; (4) the types came afterwards into the possession of Schoeffer; (5) B 36 is a reprint ('Nachdruck') of B 42, but Fust had nothing to do with it, in spite of its type and workmanship being similar to that of B 42; therefore it was Gutenberg's work; (6) B 36 being a mere

reprint of B 42, with the exception of its commencement, which was, perhaps, set up from a MS., the printing of it cannot be placed before 1450; (7) but, as the types of B 36 existed already in 1454, Gutenberg seems to have been preparing this new type since 1453, when his quarrels with Fust were beginning, and to have printed with it some Donatuses, the Indulgence of 1454, and other small books, and finally B 36, often with the technical and financial assistance of Alb. Pfister, who must have acquired B 36 and its printing-material in or shortly before 1458; (8) Gutenberg *may* have prepared the types for B 36 before 1450, therefore a little time before those of B 42 existed, but finding the former not solid enough or too large, he began preparing the types of B 42, and then, anticipating the quarrels with Fust, commenced the printing of B 36 in partnership with some one else, using his experience gained in printing B 42, but with less care, and merely reprinting B 42, chiefly on paper, and therefore with less cost. And, strange to say, (9) the Donatuses of Dutch origin cannot be ascribed to an earlier date than those attributed to Mainz and Gutenberg, because he (Dr. Dziatzko) has observed a peculiar *x* in the former, which, unless those who defend the Dutch claims prove it to be national Hollandish, must be regarded as an imitation of the same *x* in the Gutenberg prints.

It is difficult to reconcile this Gutenberg activity, this wholly speculative activity, with the Helmasperger Instrument of 6th November, 1455, which rather shows that Gutenberg had as yet done little.

<sup>20</sup> But Dziatzko says nothing on this point. To him



## 298 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

the only remaining question was: Which of the two Bibles was the earliest? To decide it he examined most minutely both texts, counted their lines, noted their agreements, contractions, differences, errors, etc., and found unmistakeable evidence of B 36 being a reprint of B 42 (pp. 87 to 112).

It seems never to have occurred to Dr. Dziatzko that the two Bibles could have been printed from two different MSS., and that the difference between their respective types conclusively shows that these at any rate were cut after different MS. models. Occasionally he speaks of MSS., but if I understand him correctly, he thinks that only B 42 was printed from a MS.; that the commencement of B 36 might have been printed from some MS.; but that no MS. was used in the printing of B 36 except where the latter has a more correct reading than B 42. Differences such as *Moyses* and *Moises*, *ismahel* and *ysmahel*, he regards as whims of the compositor.

We should not forget that to the correctness of Bible-manuscripts somewhat more attention was paid than to that of other books. Hence their texts are not likely to differ from each other so much as that of other books, especially not those written in such large letters as the models of B 36 and B 42 must have been. It follows that the great similarity between the texts of these two Bibles does not necessarily mean that the one must have been printed from the other, and hence it is no clue to the priority of either of them; the similarity may have existed in the MSS.; likewise the differences of spelling between the two texts. Even

the singular cancel in the Stuttgart copy (Dziatzko, p. 95) may be owing to the condition of the MS., but, not having seen this copy, I cannot speak with certainty on this point. A further examination of the two Bibles is not yet superfluous.

Dr. Dziatzko's ninth point, respecting the  $\times$  in the Dutch Donatuses, we may pass by. If he had examined Dutch incunabula or Dutch manuscripts he would have seen that, in the fifteenth century, the Northern Netherlands had their own national or rather provincial handwritings (including the peculiar  $\times$  mentioned by him), like the Flemish or Southern Netherlands and Germany. So that the printer of the 'Speculum' and 'Donatuses,' whose types all betray the bookhand indigenous to his province (Holland proper), could not have felt under the necessity of borrowing an isolated  $\times$  or any other letter of the alphabet. It is to be regretted that Dr. Schwenke has, to some extent, countenanced this  $\times$  theory.

In the Royal Library at Berlin I was fortunate enough to find the librarian, Dr. Schwenke, at his post. His treatises on early Mainz printing are models of clearness and preciseness, and should be studied by all who wish to know what books are now attributed to Gutenberg. The Berlin copy of the mixed Latin 'Speculum' belonged formerly to Frid. Jac. Roloff; it is imperfect, and its leaves do not all follow in due order. In spite of this, it was to me as important as the Pembroke copy, on account of a bibliographical peculiarity which will be explained elsewhere.

At Hanover, where I arrived on the 22nd of

### 300 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

August, are two copies of the 'Speculum,' one (Bodemann, 2 B) belonging to the *mixed* Latin, the other (Bodemann, 2 A.) to the *unmixed* Latin edition. They are both imperfect; the *mixed* Latin edition wants leaf 25, instead of which it has a duplicate of leaf 21, and it wants leaf 30, for which it has a duplicate of leaf 34. The copy of the *unmixed* Latin edition wants leaves 1 to 4 of the prefatory matter, while leaves 5 and 6 come at the end of the book; it further wants the whole quire *d* (leaves 35 to 48), and the pictures Nos. 93 to 100 come after No. 108. It has *blank* scrolls in the last engraving, but in the central scroll is written VERBUM DOMINI.

The Hanover Library has also a copy of the 'Biblia Pauperum,' of which a note in the book says: 'S. Ansgarius est autor huius libri.' Another note in the book says: 'N.B. Hic liber est de iis qui post inventam artem impressoriam, primo est typis divulgatus a Laurentio Costero Harlemensi anno 1428 usque ad annum 1440. Vide Monathl. Unterred. de anno 1698 mens. Jul. p. m. log. ex die oude Chron. ende Hist. van Zeeland, p. m. 159 in 4to.'

I stopped a night at Frankfurt on the Maine, where, on my arrival in an hotel, I was asked whether I was a Christian, as they took in no Jews.

At Darmstadt I had the pleasure of seeing again the archivist, Dr. Freih. Schenk zu Schweinsberg, who had been so kind and hospitable to me on a former visit, and whose 'Genealogy of Gutenberg,' published in 1900 in the 'Festschrift,' is in every

way clear, elaborate, and accurate. Dr. Ad. Schmidt, the librarian, not only gave me a copy of all that he had written on the Gutenberg question, but showed me, in the few hours at my disposal, many of the interesting rarities under his charge.

At Mainz, the librarians, A. Börckel, H. Heidenheimer, and A. Tronnier, did again their utmost to make my short visit pleasant, and to enlighten me on all the treasures in their keeping; their copy of the Laurentius Valla, ascribed to Coster, is bound up with four or five MS. treatises of the fifteenth century, ranging from 1443 to 1472. The handsome Gutenberg Museum at Mainz deserves to be visited, and should be imitated or excelled by a Coster Museum at Haarlem.

At Wiesbaden, the librarian, Prof. Dr. Zedler, who has contributed so much to the Gutenberg literature, showed me all that he had done to initiate himself in the art of cutting and casting types; he presented me with several photographs of incunabula taken by him, and kindly sent me after my return from my tour, two leaves of a Costerian Doctrinale, discovered by him, for my examination.

At Cologne (30th August) I learnt to my disappointment that, owing to careless custody, the fragments of the 'Donatuses' and 'Doctrinales,' formerly preserved in the library of the Catholic Gymnasium, had already been missing before this library was incorporated with that of the town. Some other fragments, described in Ennen's catalogue as being in the town library, had also disappeared. Consequently I only found (1) two

leaves of a 27-line Donatus (=Ennen's No. 1, p. 7 =No. 33 of my list of Costeriana), but not printed in any Speculum, or any other Costerian type; (2) two leaves of a 24-line Donatus, in the Saliceto type (=Ennen's No. 3, p. 7=my No. 24); (3) two leaves of a 24-line Donatus (=Ennen's No. 4, p. 7=my No. 24?); (4) two leaves of a 29-line Doctrinale, in the Saliceto type (=Ennen's No. 5, and my No. 36); and (5) two leaves of a 32-line Doctrinale (=Ennen's No. 6, [and my No. 15] in the small Speculum type. The town library also possesses an edition of the 'Biblia Pauperum,' and the 'Apocalypse.'

From Cologne I went (30th August) to the University Library at Utrecht, to examine again the fragments of the *French* Donatus printed in the Speculum type, and the fragments of Lud. Pontani de Roma, 'Singularia Juris' (my No. 25), and the other work of Pontanus, which latter are printed on one side of the leaf only (see my No. 26). I also examined half a dozen MSS., written at Utrecht about the middle of the fifteenth century (one actually dated 1458), which the librarian, Dr. Van Someren, kindly looked up for me, to see whether their handwritings bore any resemblance to the Costerian types, or could support the theory that the Costeriana might have been printed at Utrecht; but I found in none of them any such similarity. I also perused the letters written by and to Hadrianus Junius, preserved in the same university library, but in none of them was there any allusion to his account of the invention of printing.

At Utrecht I had already noticed a good deal of bunting in honour of Queen Wilhelmina's birthday (31st August), and on my arrival at Haarlem in the evening the whole town was celebrating the event most enthusiastically. A large crowd of people thronged the brilliantly illuminated market-place, where the statue of Lourens Janszoon Coster stood, for that evening, in darkness behind a marquee in which a military band were playing.

The Haarlem Town Library possesses a copy of the *unmixed* Latin 'Speculum,' with the scrolls of the last woodcut left blank by the printer, but the blank has been filled up with some yellow fluid. The same library has also two copies of the so-called *unmixed* Dutch edition; in one of them two sheets (leaves 24-27) are replaced by the corresponding sheets of the later (or *mixed*) Dutch edition; the other copy is all in loose leaves, mounted on other (modern) paper. But in spite of these imperfections, or rather on account of them, the two copies have a great bibliographical importance, which I also hope to explain elsewhere.

I also examined here the 'Genealogy of Coster,' which, after its very faulty publication by Dr. Van der Linde in 1870, has been the cause of a good deal of controversy. It is clear, from its different writings, that it must have been written up at various times. The present piece of parchment was evidently prepared before 1559, the year which occurs in its fifth division. But the first three divisions have all been written by one hand, in Roman, or Karoline minuscules, which shows that these divisions were copied straightway from some earlier genealogy or

other document. The handwriting changes at the fourth division, containing only the names of Gerrit Thomass (who died about 1563-4) and his wife, Ermingaert Jansdochter, for whom the 'Genealogy' is presumed to have been made. It then continues till the fifth entry in the fifth division, at the end of which is added, 'Na 1559 den Junii' (after 1559 the of June), after which other hands continue. It is obvious that, the first three parts of this 'Genealogy' being a copy of some earlier document or documents, we cannot argue, as some authors do, that the 'Genealogy' did not originate earlier than 1520-60. This approximate date may be assumed with respect to a portion or portions that follow after the first three divisions, but to the latter it is not unreasonable to assign a much earlier date.

At the Hague the Museum Meerman-Westreenianum possesses a perfect copy of the *mixed* Dutch Spiegel; an imperfect copy of the mixed Latin edition; the single leaf 46 of the unmixed Dutch edition, which is wanting in the copy of this edition preserved at Lille; and a copy of the unmixed Latin edition which only wants the Prohemium; the scrolls in the last woodcut have been left blank by the printer, but a contemporary hand has filled them up with the words 'mane thekel phares,' and the interpretations *nus appēsio dīfio*. After having made descriptions of several fragments of Costerian Donatuses and Doctrinales belonging to the Royal Library, I was unable to finish all my collations, as, by some accident, the key of one of the presses in which fragments were locked up, was

not accessible. I need not say that Dr. Knuttel, the curator of the museum, did what he could to further my work, and to make everything agreeable to me. Of the leaf of the 'Penitential Psalms,' printed in the Speculum type on one side of the vellum, the librarian allowed me to have a photograph taken for future use. I found another copy of the very same leaf in the Royal Library at Brussels, not mentioned by Campbell.

Passing rapidly from the Hague through Delft, Rotterdam, and Antwerp, I was collating, on the 15th September, the copy of the unmixed Latin 'Speculum' preserved in the Royal Library at Brussels. It is imperfect, wanting leaves 8, 9, 18, 19, and 31, while most of the other leaves are bound in an irregular order; its scrolls in the last engraving are blank. I naturally examined here again the Maria engraving of 1418, for which every facility was given me by the keeper of the Print Department, M. van Bastelaer. I could find no trace whatever of the alleged scratching or any other tampering with the date, and there is no room for an L, to have made 1468. The date 1418 is genuine enough. So is that of 1440, which occurs twice in the 'Pomerium Spirituale,' which the conservateur of the library allowed me to examine at my leisure. We know already from Sir Martin Conway's description that the text of this work was written for the purpose of explaining the wood-engravings now pasted on to the leaves of text, that, therefore, these engravings could not be later than 1440, and after having examined the book,



## 306 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

I doubt whether any one could come to any other conclusion. As has been said above, I found here another copy of the same leaf of the 'Penitential Psalms,' which I had already examined at the Hague.

From Brussels I went to Lille to examine and collate the important copy of the *unmixed* Dutch edition, preserved in the Town Library. Most of the peculiarities have already been described by Bernard ('Origine de l'imprimerie,' p. 20 *sqq.*), Holtrop ('Monum.') and others.

But these isolated descriptions cannot bring out the real importance of this copy for the bibliography of the 'Speculum.' Its peculiarities should be examined and placed side by side with those in the other editions of the work—it, however, cannot be done in this short article.

From Lille I returned, via Calais and Dover, to Cambridge, on the 21st September, not altogether sorry that this eleven weeks' life in steamers, trains, tunnels, hotels, motor 'buses, trams, restaurants, cafés, etc., coupled with hard work (sometimes from eight o'clock in the morning till six or seven in the evening) in libraries, museums, etc., had come to an end for the present.

The December following, I requested the Earl of Crawford to send his copy of the mixed Dutch 'Spiegel,' which formerly belonged to the Enschedé family at Haarlem, to the British Museum, where I wished to examine it side by side with the Grenville copy of the mixed Latin edition. With the director's consent and ready support of my application, Lord Balcarres, in the absence of his father,

kindly forwarded the book to the Museum. Some of its margins are tender and bear traces of much wear and tear. For this reason, no doubt, it was interleaved by M. Enschedé. Otherwise the copy is in fine condition, and the text, as well as the woodcuts, are intact.

As far as I know, there are now only two copies of the unmixed Latin 'Speculum' which I have not yet seen: one which formerly belonged to Mr. John Inglis, and is now in the Lennox Library; another is in the Library at Stuttgart; a third (mixed Latin) belongs to Capt. Holford. The latter two I hope to collate shortly.

I need not point out to those who have had the patience to read the above lines that studies of this kind are interesting, but laborious and expensive, as the books to be examined are scattered over nearly the half of Europe. I gladly record, however, the universal readiness of librarians and directors of libraries and museums wherever I came to assist me in every way, and even to give me special facilities where practicable. I started on my tour convinced that the claims of Haarlem rested on firm grounds, but, with the desire to notice and work out anything that might tell against them. I have returned more convinced than ever of the justness of these claims, and with considerable confidence as to the chronological order in which the various editions and issues of the 'Speculum' must be placed. My reasons for this confidence, and the outcome of my researches, I hope to submit to those who take an interest in these studies more at length in a separate work on

308 A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TOUR.

the invention of printing to be published before long, and in my article for the new edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.'

J. H. HESSELS.

Cambridge,  
April, 1908.