

7147 Sir William Osler ④
Respectfully

Desiderata in the Cataloguing
of Incunabula

With a Guide for Catalogue Entries

W.O.N.

ARNOLD C. KLEBS

Reprinted from
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA—PAPERS, Vol. X, No. 3, July 1916

st.
o.

ists
idge

.Mfr.

ner.
rt

.I.

cat
on

a.

#

1956

(9)

DESIDERATA IN THE CATALOGUING OF INCUNABULA

WITH A GUIDE FOR CATALOGUE ENTRIES

BY ARNOLD C. KLEBS, M.D.
Washington, D.C.

SPECIALISTS, as a rule, are self-sufficient beings who do not bother about other people's specialties and who do not care to have others intrude upon theirs. I suppose that bibliographers and medical men are no exception to the rule. As a member of this latter guild, circumstances have forced me to peep out of my pigeon-hole. Historical research and the collection of material for a catalogue of fifteenth-century books on medicine owned in this country have brought me in contact with incunabula and through them with your profession, whose labors have smoothed the path toward a proper comprehension of them. One fact has been strongly impressed upon me during my researches: it is the apparent lack of co-operation between those interested in these books mainly from the typographical point of view and those more attracted by their contents.

A priori it may seem paradoxical to emphasize the desideratum of paying attention to the contents of a book. And still it may well be done, as we have the fact before us that until very recently incunabula have been considered mainly as objects precious to the collector and

of scientific value only so far as they could serve in throwing light upon the early technical, and possibly artistic, development of the art of printing. The students of the literature contained in them gave preference to the earlier manuscripts or consulted later editions. To a certain extent this finds its explanation in the fact that many incunabula are inferior to the productions of earlier penmanship or to those of the later presses, both in regard to contents and typography. And yet we find among them many unique and rare specimens which are not extant in any other form, so that they can properly be ranged as historical sources of major importance. There is for this reason a legitimate demand for cataloguing them in such a way as to make them readily available to all interested.

The first scientific bibliographer of incunabula, Hain, in his monumental *Repertorium* realized the importance of subject entries and placed a synoptic title behind the author's name, a practice which most of his successors adopted, although very often the title was shortened or conventionalized so as to hide the subject altogether. The custom of arranging the entries according to their printers, favored particularly by English bibliographers, Proctor, Pollard, and others, although perfectly legitimate for the purposes they had in view, nevertheless has further helped to obliterate the subject. Mr. Pollard's recent catalogue of the Dyson Perrins collection (1914), with its subject index, forms a notable exception, pointing in the right direction, which has been so admirably outlined

6756

by the editors of the *Gesamt-Katalog*. The British Museum Catalogue when once completed will undoubtedly be provided with a subject index, but it will be very difficult to bring this up to the highest scholarly standards, because of the lack of uniformity in the subject entries and the generally one-sided aim of a typographical catalogue.

A great deal of trouble is caused us of the other guild by erroneous or ill-considered entries of authors' names. A bibliographer who will bestow infinite pains and much time upon accurate type measurements and other subtleties of typographical analysis will cheerfully enter as one and the same person a savant of the twelfth and one of the fifteenth century, simply because they have the same personal name. A translator will figure as an author, a commentator or glossator will become a translator, and a prince, to whom a work was dedicated, will parade as its creator. Almost all such works sailing under false colors are lost to the scholar who is interested in a certain subject and cannot afford the time for a detailed search among all the entries. It will probably never be possible to bring about an absolute uniformity of name entries, but surely much can be done, by co-operation, toward establishing certain standards which will make impossible such obvious errors.

When one sets out to compile a catalogue or a bibliography for the press one can, to a certain extent, deviate from precedent by correcting customary name entries, and by calling attention to such corrections in appropriate

cross-references. But for ordinary library entries innovations of this kind hardly pay, and it is much safer to adhere to the names by which the authors are most frequently quoted. It is a pity, for instance, to bury the work of Petrus Hispanus because of the few months of his popedom as Johannes XXI. The best modern practice is to give, whenever possible, the family name, and not to substitute town names or epithets for them, as Hain did so frequently. If there is no distinct family name, the personal name must serve as leader, and there is no good reason to shy at this, as it corresponds to mediaeval practice. Epithets, titles, and the like can always serve to distinguish two identical surnames or personal names entered as leaders. The British Museum Catalogue attempts to distinguish the various name entries by several combinations of majuscule and minuscule types, a practice which complicates matters without any corresponding gain.

The excellent example given in Collijn's Stockholm catalogue and adopted by the *Gesamt-Katalog*, that of giving for each work brief biographical notes about the author, might be followed more generally, and a few more lines might characterize also the different works, and their versions and translations. The author's name, in mediaeval literature especially, was not used in the same sense as we use it today, or at least as we pretend to use it, viz., in its literal sense. Very often it simply headed another man's work, which circulated anonymously in manuscript form and was not rarely of great antiquity. Or the name of a

6756

famous ancient authority was used by some enterprising publisher to enliven the interest of the reading public in the work or compilation of some contemporary author. Generally speaking, in those times when erudition counted for more than original research, plagiarism did not have the bad odor it has now, and therefore was frequently indulged in. It is most desirable that in a catalogue such surreptitious authorship should be properly characterized. So far as I know it has not been done.

Cataloguers in general seem to be anxious to find authors for anonymous works. The aim is undoubtedly in the right direction and distinctly to be encouraged in general. But in the older works, and in incunabula in particular, there are serious obstacles to its fulfilment which can be overcome only by a complex search of the manuscripts or by other scientific investigation. Some anonymous works of this class have acquired as such a definite individuality, by a popularity extending through centuries. This individuality is sometimes destroyed by the addition of an author's name. So, for instance, the famous *Regimen Sanitatis* of the School of Salerno is in no way improved by Mlle Pellechet's assigning it to Arnoldus de Villanova, who happened to have written a commentary on it but did not compose the *Regimen* itself. Similarly, the *Hortus Sanitatis*, that most troublesome of bibliographic puzzles, is sometimes artificially squeezed under the aegis of one Dr. Johannes of Kaub, Cube, or Cuba, on the basis of his very slender editorial claims to a work the roots of which reach into the remotest

antiquity of civilization, and which we can hope to untangle only by keeping the various editions together and not by separating them under various author names which at best are conjectural.

The standardization of author's-name entries ought not to present unsurmountable difficulties. Those in the way of adequate entries of the titles, however, are greater. The practice of giving in the main heading after the author's name a textual rendering of the "Incipit" and the usually loquacious introductory sentence is a monstrosity. It is poor cataloguing because it promotes obscurity and can impress no one but the tyro. If a work has not already been described, it ought to be described, but in its proper place, and not here where one expects to find a clear indication of the contents of the book. Since such a clear indication in a title was not the fashion in the fifteenth century it is obviously the cataloguer's duty to supply it, and to do it in a brief, succinct form is perhaps the highest part of his task. One has only to run over modern catalogues to find manifold evidences of neglect of this important feature. An unimaginative entry like "Geber: Liber Geber," to be found in the list of a noted bibliographer, is hardly justifiable on grounds of necessary brevity, or of precedent, or of the special importance of the book. There are some titles consecrated by long popularity, such as "Legenda aurea," "Rosa anglica," "Canon," "Speculum vitae," and others, which immediately convey to the adept an idea as to the contents, while they are meaningless in themselves.

6756

The erudite bibliographer may consider it entirely superfluous to add explanatory words to such titles; and still it seems good practice to do so, if for no other reason than to facilitate the mechanical compilation of a subject catalogue by less experienced library assistants. If we keep in mind that the contents of incunabula (by classical, mediaeval, and contemporary writers) can suitably be classed as grammar, literature, jurisprudence, theology, art, and science, it ought not to be difficult to choose such a title as will allow of the proper assignment.

Another desideratum, self-evident to many, though most frequently overlooked, is that the same works should always be entered under the same headings, no matter whether inside the book they are designated in the same way or differently. This main heading should remain immutable, even if the work in its course through many presses and publishers' hands, and with the help of commentators, expositors, translators, and others, has been modified in appearance. It is most desirable that, while the main title remains the same, the facts of such literary contributions, as well as those of new additions, should be properly stated, viz., with the full name of the contributor or translator. Such contributions and additions are sometimes more valuable from the literary and historical point of view than the first work, which, by the accident of its position in the book, overshadows the others unless they are brought out in some such way as suggested. While it seems perfectly proper that the synoptic title in the main heading should be given in the

st.
o.

ists
ldge

Kft

ner.
rt

ra
on

1,1

language of the text, there is no earthly reason why we should use the Latin jargon introduced by earlier bibliographers, instead of the much clearer "Edited by . . . ,", or "Commentary by . . . ,", when indicating the nature of these contributions. It is a curious fact that some cataloguers should still insist on employing a dubious Latinity, when the best bibliographers have found out long ago that a clear description of an incunabulum simply cannot, for obvious reasons, be made in Latin.

The main heading is usually completed by the entry of the place, the printer, the publisher, the day and year of publication, and the format of the book. This, followed by carefully determined bibliographic references, ought to be ample for all purposes of cataloguing and bibliography. In regard to this part of the heading we have reached a fairly satisfactory stage of uniformity, although some will spell the names of place and printer in various ways, and some will give the day and year only in the way in which they appear in the colophon or elsewhere in the book, while others will give them only in the terms of our calendar. Here also we encounter the mysterious Latin symbolism, especially when date, place, or printer are lacking. But these are questions of form only and not of substance, such as those I have tried to bring out in regard to the other part of the main heading.

Since the greater part of the 30,000 incunabula have found adequate descriptions in works which must be within easy reach of anybody who wishes to occupy himself profitably with incunabula, it seems lost labor and

6756

energy to repeat these descriptions again and again in library catalogues. I know some librarians who insist on doing it because, they say, they can more readily identify their copies. Personally I think that if we put the energies spent in this laborious task to a more careful construction of the main heading we render a better service. A sheet bearing such a main heading, inserted into every incunabulum, will permit of immediate identification without requiring a profound search for names, titles, or dates, for which the ordinary library attendant is little qualified and which also puts the fifteenth-century paper to a severe test, although fortunately it is more solid than the modern product. I am inserting such sheets into the copies of incunabula in the Surgeon General's Library.

In conclusion I should like to make a further plea for a more attentive study of those features which are peculiar to a given copy. In the latest home-made catalogue, that of the John Boyd Thacher collection, Mr. Ashley has successfully adopted this practice and so set a good example. The measurements of the cut-page are given—important, since the size of the halo is in proportion to the sanctity of the copy; imperfections are noted, and the work of the illuminator, rubricator, and binder is described. Collijn in his catalogues of Swedish libraries has gone still further and made a special study of the various manuscript entries, giving in index form the information obtained. Often historic data of considerable importance are thus furnished. It ought to be the pride

st.
o.

ists
ldge

Kft

ner.
rt

ra
on

1,1

of every owner of incunabula to extract this information out of his books, information which distinguishes his copy from all others and establishes its individual history in the libraries of former owners. I quite agree with the English reviewer (Literary Supplement, *London Times*, No. 750) of the latest volume (IV, Subiaco and Rome) of the British Museum Catalogue, when he characterizes as "irritating" the unqualified entry of "Bought in April, 1866" for the Durandus of 1474. He sarcastically adds that quite another annotation would be equally applicable, "if, as is highly probable, some of the early printed books in the Museum once formed part of the notorious Libri accumulations."

While fifteenth-century books interest me mostly because of their contents, I am not insensitive to their artistic and technical charms, and I fully realize the importance of a study of them in this aspect. But I also believe that best results will be obtainable by closer co-operation such as obtained in the times when these books left their presses. Artists and artisans, then, were members of the same major guilds in some towns, together with the physicians, and some of the latter are known to have been printers themselves or acted as patrons or publishers. Considerations of this kind have led me to intrude upon your proper field and to learn something about the best methods for systematically describing incunabula. Strange to say, there are nowhere definite rules about it. Everyone seems to evolve them out of his inner consciousness, following laboriously whatever prece-

6756

dent may be handy. True, Mr. Pollard, in his introduction to the British Museum Catalogue, outlines the principles which guided him; the editors of the *Gesamt-Katalog* add some more information, giving excellent examples of descriptions; other details are brought out in various technical journals; but there is, so far as I know, no one place that may bring solace to the cataloguer who wishes to enter his one precious incunabulum according to the approved rules of the art. For our own convenience I have therefore drawn up, with the help of Mr. Cary R. Sage of the Surgeon General's Library, a brief guide for such entries, and I append it here, hoping that with the help of your suggestions and additions we may evolve something that may seem generally acceptable and useful.¹

GUIDE FOR CATALOGUE ENTRIES OF INCUNABULA

NOTE.—Before making any entries at all, examine the quire arrangement of the book, verify signature and foliation marks. If there are none printed, supply them on the recto of each leaf (faint black pencil). It saves trouble later.

I. Incunabula not Needing a Detailed Description

This is the case in the majority of incunabula which are adequately described in one or the other of available bibliographies. When slight variations are found, such as missing or misplaced

¹ The literature of the subject has been reviewed lately by the librarian of the Surgeon General's Office, so that I did not think it necessary to refer to it here again. This review, together with Peddie's little book, ought to fulfil all practical requirements in this direction. See Lieutenant Colonel C. C. McCulloch, "On incunabula," *Bulletin Medical Library Association*, 1915, V, 1-15. R. A. Peddie, *Fifteenth Century Books*. London: Grafton & Co., 1913.

letters, evidently accidents which occurred during the printing of an edition, it is better to state these variations than to attempt a new description. Separate and distinct entries, on cards, for a list by authors and by printers, are much to be recommended.

A. List of Books by Authors (or Titles).

Aa. MAIN HEADING

Entries for this are made in the following sequence: (1) Author's name. (2) Title (supplied) of work. (3) Additions. (4) Place. (5) Printer and publisher. (6) Day and year of publication. (7) Illustration. (8) Number of parts or volumes. (9) Format. (10) Bibliographic references and notes about the individual copy.

1. *Author's name.*—In general, follow good precedent. Whenever possible, and when it will not conflict too much with current practice, give preference to family name:

Falcutius (or Falcucci), Nicolaus (or Niccolò), *not* Nicolaus Falcutius.

Avoid epithets, titles, and town names in the leading name:

Jacobus Forliviensis, *not* Forliviensis, Jacobus; Petrus Hispanus, *not* Hispanus, Petrus, or Johannes XXI. Arnoldus de Villanova, *not* Villanova, Arnoldus de.

When the author is unknown and cannot be supplied (in brackets) the first word of the title serves as leader.

2. *Title of work.*—A brief synoptic title in the language of the text has to be supplied. It must clearly characterize the contents of the book. Titles of identical works must have the same wording, even if they differ in the original. In a work which is a commentary on some other author's work, do not omit the latter's name, as, for instance, "Aristoteles" and "Rhazes" in: Paulus Venetus: *Summa naturalium Aristotelis*; and Arculanus, Joannes: *Expositio in IX librum Rhazis ad Almansorem*.

6756

Translations:

Italian by ; German by ; or simply: Italian, German, etc. (unknown translator).

Editor, Interpreter, Corrector, Emendator, Glossator: note their names and function.

3. *Additions*.—Commentaries, expositions, etc., should be characterized as such, with the names of commentator, etc., and as distinct contributions to the main work, the same as true additions of independent tracts or the like by the same or other authors.

If the entry of such additions is likely to overburden the main heading, enter here the word "Additions" and give the details at the end. Such an entry can serve for several editions with the same contents (see also below under iii, "Literary Collation").

4. *Place of publication*.—Give in the language of the country:

Venezia, *not* Venetiis, Vinegia, or Venice; Lyon, *not* Lugdunum or Lyons; Leiden, *not* Lugdunum Batavorum; Regensburg, *not* Ratisbon, etc.

Be sure to enter the town of publication and not that of editor's letter or author's studio, which may be different.

5. *Printer's and publisher's names*.—Give, with the names of their associates, in the spelling adopted by Haebler, Burger, and Proctor:

Bonetus Locatellus for Octavianus Scotus.

Do not add: first or second press, etc. If place, printer, or publisher is not named in the copy and cannot be supplied (in brackets) on good authority, leave a blank between the brackets for future insertion, or state: Place or press unknown. (Do not forget that Proctor's list does not distinguish between signed and unsigned books.)

6. *Day and year of publication*.—Give in English, with Arabic figures and in terms of our calendar. When modern terms have to be calculated it is better to indicate both terms:

xvii Kal. April [16 March]

Mittwoch vor Urbani [23 May]

Enter not only the date at the end, but also those of different parts. Contemporary manuscript entries (rubricator) may be entered:

[Before 17 March 1476]

7. *Illustration*.—Note as: Woodcut or woodcuts (by — [artist's name or initials]), Title woodcut, Diagrams, Printer's or Publisher's device, etc. If there is color printing in the book, note: Black and red title, or simply: Color. Here also may be entered a word or symbol denoting prevalent type: Roman, Gothic, etc.

8. *Number of parts*.—Only if there is more than one part or volume: 2 vols., 5 pts., etc.

9. *Format*.—Use conventional terms: Folio, Quarto, Octavo, Duodecimo, etc. (number of folds of sheet), or abbreviated: 2°, 4°, 8°, 12°, etc.

10. *Bibliographic references*.—Do not give Hain first unless he gives a complete description (*Hain). Search for identification of present copy at least: Hain, Copinger-Burger, Pellechet, Reichling, Haebler (Spain), and Campbell (Netherlands). Enter the most complete description as first reference, others only if they complete the first one. Cite Proctor and Burger only if they supply information about an unknown printer.

Here may also be added notes about the particular copy (see below, vi).

Ab. CROSS-REFERENCES (*Main Heading*)

1. *Different versions of author or title entry:*

Nicolaus Falcutius. *See* Falcutius, Nicolaus.

Abano, Petrus de. *See* Petrus de Abano.

Albucasis. *See* Abulcasis.

Bulchase. *See* Abulcasis.

Cube, Johannes of. *See* Hortus sanitatis.

Capua, Joannes of (translator): *See* Directorium humane vite (Bidpai) etc.

6756

2. *Names in title of main heading:*

Aristoteles. See Paulus Venetus.

Rhazes. See Arculanus, Joannes (Exposit.)

3. *Names of contributors, authors of additions, or parts of collections.*—Here give name, with title of contribution, if it has any, i.e., treating it exactly like a main heading (outside of serial numbering, if such is used):

Hippocrates: Aphorismi. With commentary of Galen. Translated by Constantinus Africanus.

In: Articella. Venezia, 1487, 1493, 1500.

B. *List of Books by Printers*

Duplicates of entries made under Aa ("Main Heading") can be used for this list, but separate headings are preferable and best made in tabular form in the following sequence (*Gesamt-Katalog*):

1. Name of printer (publisher) and place.
2. Author and title (clear but very brief).
3. Place given in book, and
4. Press given in book; if so, *, if not, —.
5. Year.
6. Day (modern calendar).
7. Format: 2, 4, 8, etc.
8. Leaves: total number.
9. Foliation, Signature, Catchwords; if printed only, F., S., or C.
10. Columns: their number.
11. Lines: number per page or "varying."
12. Type: Haebler's or Proctor's number for particular press, or measurement in mm. of 20 lines.
13. Initials: Haebler's minuscule Roman annotation.
14. Rubrication, i.e., printed paragraph marks: Greek minuscules.
15. Woodcuts: their number up to 10, then "numerous." Printer's device: PrD., with Haebler's Roman numerals.
16. Color printing: indicate colors. (b: Black; r: Red; etc.).

For unknown place or printer, 1 is left blank. The cards are filed separately until the missing information can be supplied.

Sample entry for Printer's List (3×5 card):

Printer													
Günther Zainer											Augsburg		
Title													
Rodericus: Spiegel des menschlichen Lebens.													
—	—	[1477]	—	2	174	F	I	32-36	2 118-9	c, f p	β	num	b, r
PLACE	PRESS	YEAR	DAY	FORMAT	LEAVES	FOL. SIG. CATCH	COLS	LINES	TYPE	INIT.	RUBR.	WOOD C.	COLOR

II. Incunabula Needing a Detailed Description

Order: (i) Main heading. (ii) Collation. (iii) Literary collation or contents. (iv) Description. (v) Owners. (vi) Individual copy.

(NOTE: (i) and (vi) ought to be given for every book, (iii) for composite works; of the others, only those not provided already in bibliographic reference books; (v) only if inter-library annotations seem desirable.)

- (i) **Main heading:** Duplicate of the entries under Aa above.
- (ii) **Collation** (of book as product of the press [see below, iii]):—
Give in the following order, underscored (italics):
 1. Number of *leaves*: 300 leaves. Not: 300 ll. or l. If (iv) is not given, state which leaves are blank.
 2. Count of quires, gatherings, signatures, etc.

Without numbering in print: [In square brackets.]

Supply both signatures with indices and continuous leaf-numbers. (Note under head title of this guide.) For signatures use the Roman alphabet (without j, u, and w, 23 letters), one letter in succession for each

6756

quire. Number of leaves in each quire is denoted by Arabic index numbers:

736 leaves. [a-z⁸ A-Z⁸ aa-zz⁴ AA-ZZ⁸] describes the quire arrangement of a book in which every gathering contains 8 leaves.

Brit. Mus. Cat. would give this: [a-ZZ⁸], simpler indeed, but recommendable only if alphabetical arrangement is generally understood.

94 leaves. [a-b¹⁰ c⁶ d⁴ e-m⁸] shows an irregular alteration of gatherings.

15 leaves. [a⁸⁺¹ b⁶]: inserted leaf.

42 leaves. a-f^{8.6} (abbreviation for a⁸b⁶c⁸d⁶e⁸f⁶) shows a regular alteration of gatherings. It sometimes happens that groups of sixes, tens, sixes, eights, i.e., 6.10.6.8 or other arrangements alternate regularly several times. (B.M.C.)

With printed numbering:

When signatures are printed, with or without indices, note *Sign*: giving from beginning to end the signatures as printed with indices supplied for the leaves.

Unsigned quires, corrected errors, preliminary and additional matter are given in brackets. Preliminary matter: *or ** with indices.

When foliation or pagination is printed, note *Numb*: giving foliation numbering as printed (in addition to above), making corrections in same manner as before:

110 leaves. *Sign*: [*4] a-d⁸ e-p⁶ q⁸. *Numb*: [27] Das ander Blat—Das lxxxiiij Blat.

Indicate doubtful count:

84+? leaves. *Sign*: a-o⁶; *Numb*: [20]-LXIII[?].

*3. Stated page. Select one page which as regards type and number of lines to the page represents a good average. State its leaf number, recto or verso, as a or b.

*4. Lines. Their number on this page:

3a: 46 lines

Or, if page is not stated: 46-50 lines, or: lines varying, or: 20 lines with interlinear glosses, as case may be.

- *5. Columns. Their number, unless there is, throughout the book, only one column:

2a: 34 lines, 2 cols., or
43-46 lines, 1-2 cols., or
lines varying, 2 cols., text surrounded by commentary.

- *6. Measurement of stated page. Printed part only, inclusive of columns, height first (in mm.):

3a: 30 lines, 138×90-1 mm.

When there are headlines, marginalia, or catchwords they are not included in the measurement. B.M.C. gives them in addition to above in parentheses.

7. Type or types used:

Type: 4, 5, Indication by Haebler's or Proctor's numbers for different fonts of each printer.

When press is unknown or instead of above form, state:

Type: 20 lines=80 mm., or simply Type: 80

Measure from top of first to top of twenty-first line, projecting upper and lower parts of letters not counted. Type may also be described in accordance with Haebler's M- and Qu-classes:

Type: M⁹ 93 mm.

8. Special features. State only presence, not absence of: Headlines. Catchwords. Marginalia. Borders. Initials:

Minuscules or guide letters for initials. Three-line initials. Spaces left for initials or 8-10 line spaces left for initials, Lombardic, Calligraphic, Contour Initials (or other descriptive terms), or better simply Initials: *a, l, k*, after Haebler's grouping, which also embraces various types of borders.

Rubrication marks (i.e., printed paragraph marks): State presence simply by some clear symbol, or indicate character of these marks according to Haebler's classification by Greek minuscule.

6756

Pinholes: Look out for them in early unsigned books. If present give number per leaf.

9. Illustration and color printing. Use such terms as.

Title woodcut. 5 woodcuts. Numerous woodcuts (if more than 10). Printer's and Publisher's devices or marks. (Title woodcuts and Printer's marks may be specified following Haebler: Title woodcut A or B or C; PrD. or PrM: I or II. See his Repertorium.) The fact that color printing occurs is simply noted or colors are indicated:

10 woodcuts, of which 1 black, red, yellow, sepia; or 6 diagrams 2 of which black, red, yellow; or PrD: IV black and red.

*NOTE.—It is very doubtful if there is anything to be gained in stating a definite page (*3) and referring counts and measurements (*4, 5, 6) to it. The scheme has distinct disadvantages, but is here mentioned because it corresponds to the practice of the B.M.C.

- (iii) **Literary Collation** (of book as product of the author or editor. See above: ii). Give main divisions of work and additions, and their location in the book (foliation), or simply contents, as in the following example:

AESOPUS: *Vita et fabulae*. [With additions.] [Strassburg: H. Knobloch, about 1481.] Folio.

BMC. I, 88. *Ges.-Kat.* 289. HC. 325.

114 leaves. Sign: a-o^{8.6} p-q⁸. 3^a: 42 lines, 200×116 mm. Types: 3, 4. (20 lines=120 mm. for verse, 96 mm. for prose). Init: a, e; borders: o, p. Rubr: β. Numerous woodcuts.

Contents: (1) *Vita Aesopi*, Latin by Rinucius. (2) *Aesopus: Fabulae*. Lib. I-IV in the version of Romulus with the verses of the Anonymus Neveleti. (3) *Fabulae extravagantes*. (4) *Rinucius et Avianus: Fabulae*. (5) *Fabulae collectae*.

Here notes may be added about the book and illustrations (artists), its relation to other editions, etc.

(iv) Description (typographical)

This must avoid duplicating information given under iii. It attempts only the reproduction of selected sentences, exactly as printed with the indication of their position on stated pages and lines. This is therefore not the place to show the literary contents of the book. Printed passages are merely selected with a view toward the identification of different issues even when copies are in a state of partial mutilation. Sentences at the beginning and end must always be selected for reproduction, and if desirable such parts in the inside which are easily located by their signatures, new paragraphs, etc.

Exact reproduction of the spelling and typography of selected sentences. Follow original as closely as possible. Do not spell out abbreviations (draw "peculiar sorts" by hand). Use only one form of *r* and *s*. Do not write *j, u, J, U* when original has *i, v, I, V*, or vice versa. Distinguish between majuscules and minuscules. Note all blank pages and leaves. Underscore (Italics) everything except the reproduced text. Mark the end of lines ||, when larger space follows |||. Emphasize misprints [!]. Left out matter . . .

EXAMPLES

Blank pages, printed signature, line ending: 1 blank. 2a with sign. a:
Ends 10a line 15: . . . 10b blank.

Printed and supplied signatures, verses: 1 blank ? 2a with sign. a2:
2b. line 27: 3a with sign. a3: Sign. b: Ends 28a line
20: 28b blank. 29a with sign. ei: Ends 51b line 14:
Below: 3 distichs, etc.

Title and printer's device: 1a Title: Below printer's mark.

Different Columns: 1a with sign. a: Ends 4aβ line 46 Quire
register ends 25bδ line 15: or: Below quire register in 3 cols. Ends
γ line 39:

6756

Example of complete description (cont. from p. 161, iii):

Ia blank. Ib: Woodcut. 2a: Title border in which: Vita Esopi fabulatoris clarissimi e greco latini per Rimicium [!] || facta ad reuerndissimum patrem dominū Anthoniū tituli sancti || Chrysogoni presbiterum Cardinalem. || (Q)Vi per omnē vitā vite studiosissimus fuit is || fortuna seruus/ Nazione phrygius ex am- || monio phrygie pago fuit esopus . . . *Sign. b:* xāt⁹ beniuoleuti [!]mee Inquit esopus [!]. beniuolenti tue traditum ē || . . . *Ends 114b, line 24:* . . . dubito inq̄t vulpecula. an canes isti || decretum pacis audierint Et sic dolus dolo est illusus. || Finis diuersarum fabularum. ||

(v) **Owners.** If desirable to enter at all, give various owners by towns; for former owners see (vi).

(vi) **Individual copy.**

Measures in mm. of cut or uncut page. Date and price of purchase. "On vellum" if so.

Imperfections, mutilations, leaves misplaced in binding (C3 C4 are misbound before sheet C1).

Rubrication and illumination. (Describe technique, design, color. If coat-of-arms try to determine the owner, also artist.)

Ex Libris. Owners plate (Describe).

Manuscript notes. Transcribe if important.

Binding. ("Modern, Old stamped pigskin, Embossed inscriptions and pictures, Old shelf-marks, Pigskin painted white, Old parti-colored lined leather, Old vellum with MSS musical annotations, Palimpsest," etc.).

#

1956

st.
).

ists
ldge

Kft

ner.
rt

.I

ra
on

a.

#

1956