Vulteis habere parare altrascriptos libros magistri Peter Schoeffer. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München, Einbl. VIII 1m (Licence CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). Reduced from 295 × 205 mm.
A note on Peter Schoeffer’s book-list of ‘1470’

Among the earliest surviving printed lists of books for sale is one attributed to Peter Schoeffer (1425?–1502) of Mainz (Fig. 1). It is similar in format and language to a number of other book-lists of the 1470s and later, and rather different from the single-leaf advertisements for individual books which also appeared at this period. The only known copy, at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB), Munich, was discovered by the librarian and classicist Wilhelm Meyer (1845–1917) around 1885 in the binding of Clm 458 (a Sammelband of fifteenth-century manuscripts once in the library of Hartmann Schedel (1440–1515) of Nuremberg), and is in two parts with at least one line missing where some paper has been lost from the point where the two fragments were once joined. Adolf Growoll stated that ‘In removing it the print was cut in two, but only one line seems to have been lost in the cutting’. However, the list had clearly been bisected before it was used as waste; indeed staining from adhesives suggests that the two parts were used as the front and rear pastedowns of the binding in question. Growoll’s suggestion that Schedel may have collected the book-list himself is improbable, and it is rather more likely that it was simply among the sheets of waste-paper available in the bindery which bound the manuscripts, probably in Nuremberg, perhaps for Schedel.


2. These lists and advertisements are alike in having been printed on one side only of a half- or quarter-sheet of paper, to facilitate their use as hand-bills and posters. For a detailed analysis of single-sheet advertisements for individual books of the period see Winteroll (1987) and for a general catalogue of book-lists see Coppens (2020).

3. The chain-lines (only partly visible due to the fragments being pasted to a later sheet of paper) suggest that only a single line is missing, but it is possible that two or more have been lost. The discovery of a second copy might perhaps settle this question.


5. The manuscript, Clm 458, is available as a digital facsimile from the BSB, and bears a pencil note about the removal of the book-list in 1885.

6. The binding of Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 458, dates from the second half of the fifteenth century, and is decorated with tools which are likely to be susceptible of identification (although I have not matched them in any available source, including the BSB’s own Einband-datenbank, www.hist-einband.de). While the printed waste (Schoeffer’s book-list) has been removed from the binding, some manuscript waste remains and may help to date, and locate, it. I suspect the outcome of such identification would be to associate the binding with Nuremberg in the 1470s or early 1480s. But this is merely a guess, and a precise dating of the binding might be possible and might have a bearing on the likely date, and possible place of use, of the Schoeffer book-list.
Like the advertising ephemera of any age, many copies of such lists must have been lost, and those examples we have may well have been copied, in layout and wording, from earlier lists which have not survived. Thus we cannot know who originated the form. It may have been Schoeffer, or perhaps his rival Johann Mentelin (ca 1410–1478) who printed at least two similarly-worded lists at an early date. Book-lists in Latin appeared in the German-speaking lands, and soon in other countries (often from German emigré printers), throughout the incunable period. Johann Bämler (ca 1425–1507) of Augsburg issued a vernacular book-list following essentially the same format around 1473 (ISTC ib00007500), and Lucas Brandis (fl. 1465–1500) did the same at Lübeck around 1479 (ISTC ib01073600).

The Schoeffer list (Fig. 1), which is typical of the genre, begins with a short announcement addressed to anyone desirous of books, noting the quality of the goods and of the type used to print them (at this period the types of Mainz were famous for being the first and best of their kind, despite, by the 1470s, serious competition from other cities, notably Strasbourg), and directing the reader to look below for the name of the inn where they will be on display and available for purchase. The Munich copy has the manuscript addition at the foot ‘Venditor libro[rum] rep[er]ibilis est in ho[picio dicto Zum[m] willd[e]n mann’ (‘The vendor of books may be found at the hostelry called “Sign of the Wild Man”’). Most sources follow Meyer in suggesting that the establishment Zum Wilden Mann was the well-known inn of this name in Nuremberg and, given the likely location where the book-list was used as waste, this may well be so. However, I suspect the sign of

7. For Mentelin’s surviving advertisements of around 1469–1474 see ISTC im00497300, im00497330, im00497350 and im00497370; and Coppens (2020), 27–30.
8. See Coppens (2020). The following printers produced such book-lists in the 1470s: Günther Zainer (d. 1478), Augsburg, [ca 1471], [ca 1475] and 1476 (ISTC iz00001500, iz0001600 and iz00016100); Johann Zainer (d. 1493?), Ulm, 1474 (ISTC iz000316500); ‘C.W.’ (Claus Wencker or Conrad Wolfach?), Strasbourg, [1474] (ISTC ic01008500); Johannes de Colonia (d. 1494), Venice, [ca 1476] (ISTC ic00311300); Friedrich Creussner (ca 1440–1502?), Nuremberg, 1477 (ISTC ic00976000); and Anton Koberger (ca 1440–1513), Nuremberg, [ca 1480] (ISTC ik00028500). The Günther Zainer list of [ca 1471] is in two parts, in Latin offering Latin titles and in German offering vernacular titles; it may have been intended to be divided in two and the halves circulated separately. Several of these lists repeat phrases and sentences from Mentelin’s and Schoeffer’s book-lists, or perhaps derive from a common ancestor, now lost. Later book-lists can be found described in Burger (1907), Coppens (2020), istc, Meyer (1885), voge, and Velke (1908).
the Wild Man (an heraldic device included in many European coats-of-arms) was a common one in northern Europe in the fifteenth century, as it is today.\(^\text{11}\) The preliminary paragraph is followed by a list of available books, each described very briefly, with enough data only to identify the work and, in some cases, a little additional detail of notable content or fineness of appearance.

Who compiled the list? Coppens says that all Schoeffer’s advertisements were written by Adrianus de Brielis (ca 1420–1478),\(^\text{12}\) basing this on the latter’s editorship of Jerome’s *Epistolae*.\(^\text{13}\) While it may be true that Schoeffer’s more verbose advertisements for specific books, full of what is essentially learned advertiser’s copy, were written by a scholarly editor – de Brielis or Johann Borne, perhaps\(^\text{14}\) – book-lists like that described here were composed in a formulaic way, and could have been compiled by any literate hand, perhaps even by a master-printer himself.

We have little direct evidence for the way in which these lists were used, but can reasonably guess that agents were employed by printer-publishers to travel round Germany, and beyond, establishing themselves at inns for short periods and leaving copies of their stock-lists (completed with the name of the inn) in local hostelsries, and perhaps also in churches and religious houses, as well as posting them at crossroads and in market-places. Lehmann-Haupt suggests that these agents made special attempts to visit towns where ‘church festivals and fairs’ were scheduled, and that the more verbose advertisements might have been declaimed in public places and at religious gatherings (and perhaps the same is true of book-lists like that described here).\(^\text{15}\) Even if these agents had carried with them a single copy of each title they were selling – and they would surely have held multiple copies of each, to allow for quick sales when these could be accomplished (the Schoeffer inventory of 1479 certainly includes small numbers, between one and nine copies, of each title)\(^\text{16}\) – the

\(^{11}\) ‘Zum Wilden Mann’ was used as a sign for various businesses; in Wilhelm Raabe’s novel of this name (1874), the reference is to a chemist’s shop. In the medieval and early modern periods there was a Gasthofs zum Wilden Mann in Cologne, another in Stuttgart, another in Ulm, another in Ellwangen in Baden-Württemberg, another in Annaberg-Buchholz in Saxony and so on. At least four German hotels/pubs bear the name today, as well as others in Austria and Switzerland.

\(^{12}\) Coppens (2020), 14.


bulk of books would have been considerable, more than could be carried upon a man’s back, and thus it seems likely that each agent owned or hired a horse-drawn cart with which to take his stock from town to town. Or it may be that the publisher of the books arranged for their transit, quite possibly to more than one location at a time, sending his agents after his stock.\footnote{17} No prices are given in these early printed book-lists,\footnote{18} and we may infer that the purchase price was a matter for negotiation between agent and customer, no doubt influenced by the condition of the particular copies available (the degree and quality of their rubrication, illumination and binding). There is evidence that deals would be struck, including discounts, credit-arrangements and perhaps part-exchange or swapping for other printed books and manuscripts.\footnote{19}

As the century wore on, the breadth and depth of stock carried by these itinerant salesmen seems to have increased (as indeed more books were published). Later lists often included books produced by two or more different printer-publishers, one of whom was responsible for printing the list itself. We can imagine several possible business-models which allowed this to happen. Perhaps agents were employed by one printer-publisher who simply acquired stock from another to re-sell alongside his own; perhaps there was a more formal division of a list between two or more printers, who shared the costs of producing the book-list and the agent’s expenses (agents may well have worked at least partly on commission, receiving a cut of the income from any books they sold); or perhaps it was sometimes the agents who controlled the business, acquiring stock from more than one printer-publisher and commissioning a stock-list to allow them to hawk the books around, entirely at their own risk.\footnote{20} In some of the later lists, second-hand stock appears to have been included along with new books.\footnote{21}
Schoeffer’s book-list, although among the earliest known, is similar to later lists in including a number of books printed by other hands. Some hints of the manner in which Schoeffer operated when trading in this way may be gathered from the papers of a court-case of 1479–1480 which include an inventory of copies deposited by him and his partner in bookselling at this period, Conrad Henkis, at the Sign of the Sun in Basel. Here between one and nine copies of each of ten identifiable works, and a number of ‘Volumina parva’, are recorded, some bound, some unbound, some on parchment, some on paper, a couple noted as ‘illuminiert’, the majority printed by Schoeffer but at least two major works from other presses.

The works included in Schoeffer’s book-list were first identified (with Hain numbers) by Wilhelm Meyer in 1885, although he failed to match some editions, noting only that they were ‘unbekannt’. In 1907 Konrad Burger added Proctor numbers to the list, and made further progress in identifying the books listed, but still did not find them all. In the following year Wilhelm Velke provided a more complete list, corrected with additional bibliographical references and notes, along with tentative identifications of three works as publications of the ‘Catholicon press’ and three as books printed by Ulrich Zel at Cologne (a city, like Basel and Strasbourg, whose location on the Rhine facilitated business links with Mainz). Velke’s work forms the basis for all later discussions of Schoeffer’s book-list.

Schoeffer’s list is usually dated to after 13 June 1469 (the date of the colophon of item [3]) and before the autumn of the following year, since it does not include a major Schoeffer publication, the Epistolae of Jerome (ISTC ih00165000) which is dated 7 September 1470 in the colophon. However, I should like to look again at the titles which appear here and try to relate them to surviving incunabula and consider how, when and by whom, this list of stock was assembled. A transcription and attempted translation of the book-list follows.

In some senses, Henkis had replaced Johann Fust in Schoeffer’s business after the former’s death in 1466. Fust had apparently been in control of bookselling (while Schoeffer had been the printer and punch-cutter of the partnership), and Henkis assumed a similar role, albeit not as an equal partner. He also took Fust’s place in another sense, marrying his widow and so becoming Schoeffer’s step-father-in-law.
Those wishing to acquire for themselves the books noted below, revised with great care and printed in type of this sort at Mainz, and neatly bound, should come to the dwelling-place written below.

[1] First a beautiful Bible on parchment.
[3] Also the same man’s fourth work.
[4] Also a treatise by the same concerning church sacraments and the articles of faith.
[5] Also Augustine on Christian doctrine, with a most useful table listing the important subjects.
[6] Also a discourse between reason and conscience.
[8] Also the comforting of the devout conscience by that venerable monk Johann Nider, an outstanding professor of sacred theology.
[9] Also the same man’s tract on merchants’ contracts.
[10] Also the bull of Pope Pius II against the Turks.
[12] Also the canon of the mass with its prefaces and preliminaries.
[17] Also in civil law, the institutions.
[18] Also trees of consanguinity and affinity.
[19] Also the books of Tully’s de officiis, with his [Stoic] paradoxes.
[20] Also the history of Griselda, of that most constant of women.
[21] Also the history by Leonardus Aretinus from Boccaccio concerning the love of Tancred’s daughter Sigismunda for Guiscardus.
TRANSLATION OF, AND COMMENTARY ON, THE BOOK-LIST

In what follows the editions are identified (or suggested), with uniform titles, and imprints derived from the colophons of the books (when present). A note is also given of the bibliographical format and extent of each edition. \(^{28}\) Istitc references are followed by the number of substantially complete copies located by that source at the time of writing (2019). If the book was printed by Schoeffer, the type used for the bulk of the text is also noted, with reference to tw. The date of the book-list is interpreted broadly here, as of the 1470s (see below).

‘Those wishing to acquire for themselves the books noted below, revised with great care, and printed in type of this sort at Mainz…’. This last clause may be read slightly differently, depending on whether moguntiae is locative or genitive. If the former (and locative seems the natural reading), the clause may be read as ‘printed in this sort of type [literally ‘in this sort of writing’ or perhaps ‘letterform’] at Mainz’, if the latter then the meaning is the subtly different ‘printed in type of Mainz of this sort’ or ‘in Mainzian types like this’. I wonder if this was intended to be ambiguous, to imply that the books listed were all printed at Mainz while not explicitly saying more than that they might have been, to judge by the appearance of the types used.

‘... and neatly bound’ is, I suspect, the meaning here. ‘bene continuatosque’ can mean something like ‘and well held-together’ or ‘and well united’. Lehmann-Haupt translated this clause as ‘and which have been well seen through to the finish’ which is perfectly possible, if one takes continuo to mean continued or completed.\(^{29}\) The expression occurs in several other early advertisements, in a context suggesting that the presentation of the books is being alluded to.\(^{30}\) Thus another possible reading would be ‘and properly finished’, meaning that any necessary rubrication had been added. Perhaps this expression was meant to indicate that both aspects of ‘finishing’, binding and rubrication, had been undertaken. However, overall, my guess is that binding (literally meaning, of course, holding together) is here referred to, albeit the term is potentially ambiguous and perhaps intentionally so.\(^{31}\)

‘... should come to the dwelling-place written below’. It must be presumed that locum habitationis (literally ‘dwelling-place’ or more loosely ‘lodging-house’) would normally be understood to mean an inn or tavern. However, I suspect the form of words was intended to allow other loci habitationum (religious-houses, 28. I have noted the format of all books, including those known only from copies printed on parchment. In these editions, format is not of course dictated by the size of the sheet chosen (as it is with paper editions), but by the printer deciding to copy, more or less precisely, the standard dimensions of a sheet of paper when preparing or ordering sheets of parchment.
30. For example, Gunther Zainer has ‘beneq[ue] continuatos ac impressos’ and ‘cu[m] dilige[n]tia correctos ac bene [con]tinuatos’ in advertisements of 1471 and 1474.
31. The more common participle ‘ligatus’ for bound (of a book) has not been found in any of the printed catalogues or advertisements of the fifteenth century, though it does occur in some contemporary manuscript sources, including library catalogues, records of book-acquisition, and in the Schoeffer inventory of 1479, which is in Latin and German. We know that some at least of Schoeffer’s books were sold bound (and also sometimes illuminated) from the descriptions in this inventory (see note 23). On the binding and decoration of Schoeffer’s books see Hellinga (2018), pp. [89]–104, who accepts as close the links between printed waste, the printer who printed it and the binder who used it.
guildhalls, business premises or private houses perhaps) to be specified in a manuscript addition to the book-list.

[1] ‘First a beautiful Bible on parchment’. *Biblia Latina* (the 48-line Bible). In ciuitate Maguntij: Per Johanne[m] Fust cuiue[m], et Petrum Schoiƒher, 14 August 1462. Royal folio. [481] leaves (often bound as two volumes). *istc* ib00529000 (72 copies). *Type*: 5:118g. Velke notes the significance of this work being ‘Primo’ (not only the first item in the list but also the first, the foremost, Bible available) and that it is stated to be both beautiful and printed on parchment, this being, he suggests, puff to help the edition compete with other Bibles then on the market from printers in German-speaking cities (there are at least twelve such Latin Bibles datable to before the mid-1470s).32. Many copies of the 48-line Bible were printed on parchment, but the paper copies need not all have been sold out (as Velke suggests) at this date, and may not have been mentioned because of their secondary status within the edition (but see below). Schoeƒher’s next edition of the Bible appeared with a colophon date of 24 February 1472 (*istc* ib00536000), but cannot be that referred to here because no copies printed on parchment are known.


[4] ‘Also a treatise by the same concerning church sacraments and the articles of faith’. This is clearly Aquinas’s *Summa de articulis fidei et ecclesie sacramentis*, a short work which circulated in manuscript and was printed many times from around 1460, due in part to an ordinance of Nicolas de Cusa in the early 1450s that the
work should be read in every province and diocesan synod, and made known to every rector of a parish church.\textsuperscript{33} Schoeffer printed an edition around 1470 (chancery quarto, [14] leaves, \textsc{istc it00273200} (7 copies), \textit{Type: 3:91g}). However, Meyer and Velke both suggested that the edition referred to in the list was rather the first, printed in the Catholicon-type and published in at least two variant impressions (chancery quarto, [12] leaves, \textsc{istc it00272950} (7 copies) and [14] leaves, \textsc{it00273000} (40 copies)), Velke noting that Schoeffer’s edition has justified lines, which he believed proved it to belong to a later phase of his work than other titles in the list.\textsuperscript{34} On the connections between the titles in this list and the editions printed with the Catholicon-type see below. There may have been, by the mid-1470s, as many as eight editions of this text in print. In addition to Schoeffer’s own and that in the Catholicon-type, the following have been recorded:

\begin{itemize}
\item [III] \textit{[Cologne: Ulrich Zel, \textit{ca} 1467?]. Chancery quarto. [16] leaves. \textsc{istc it00274000} (47 copies).}
\item [IV] \textit{[Cologne: Ulrich Zel, \textit{ca} 1469?]. Chancery quarto. [16] leaves. \textsc{istc it00273300} (16 copies).}
\item [V] \textit{[Eltville: Nikolaus Bechtermünze, \textit{ca} 1469–1475]. Chancery quarto. [12] leaves. \textsc{istc it00272800} (4 copies).}
\item [VI] \textit{[Augsburg: Gunther Zainer, \textit{ca} 1472]. Chancery folio. [16] leaves. \textsc{istc ih00179000} (84 copies). Here, the \textit{Summa} is the second text in a pair printed together and issued by Zainer in a series of short tracts.}
\item [VII] \textit{[Basel: Martin Flach, \textit{ca} 1474]. Chancery folio. [18] leaves. \textsc{istc it00283000} (35 copies). A collection of short texts by Aquinas, beginning with the \textit{Summa}.}
\item [VIII] \textit{[Basel: Michael Wenssler, \textit{ca} 1474]. Chancery folio. [20] leaves. \textsc{istc it00283000} (41 copies). The same text as VII.}
\end{itemize}

There were also undated editions printed in Rome and Breslau at this period. Despite all these possibilities, I think it most likely that the edition of Aquinas offered here is Schoeffer’s own, which is now dated to around 1470, although this remains speculative, and is partly based on the dating of Schoeffer’s book-list and partly on the erroneous dating of the Catholicon-type edition to around 1469.\textsuperscript{35}


\textsuperscript{35} On the early editions of the \textit{Summa de articuli fidei et ecclesie sacramentis} see Needham (1992).
‘Also Augustine on Christian doctrine, with a most useful index proclaiming important subjects’. St Augustine, De arte praedicandi (book I V of De doctrina christiana). [Mainz]: Discreto vero Johanni fust incolre magu[n]tinensi impressorie artis m[a]g[iste]ro ..., [ca 1466]. Chancery folio. [22] leaves. IStC ia01227000 (45 copies). Type: 3916g. As with other early editions of this text, the printer is named in a clause of the introduction rather than in a colophon (though here the final leaf bears Fust and Schoeffer’s woodcut device). This title, intended as a handbook for preachers, was given a little extra puff in the list by special mention of the index, implying that the book was thereby more useful than the rival editions printed by Mentelin around 1465 (IStC ia01226000) and 1468 (IStC ia01228000), both of which also contain indices (but, the advertisement suggests, less complete and useful ones).

‘Also a discourse between reason and conscience’. This is clearly the dialogue between personifications of reason and conscience on the regular taking of communion, written by Matthaeus de Cracovia (ca 1335–1410) and often known as Dialogus rationis et conscientiae de frequenti usu communionis (but more usually entitled in print Tractatus rationis et conscientiae de sumptione pabuli salutiferi corporis Domini nostri Ihesu Chresti). Only two early editions are known, both printed without date, in chancery quarto format, and neither from Schoeffer’s press, the first edition set in the Catholicon-type, probably first printed around 1460 ([22] leaves, IStC im00367000 (59 copies of at least two impressions)), and Ulrich Zel’s edition of around 1469 ([58] leaves, IStC im00368000 (55 copies)), which includes a number of supplementary texts.

‘Also master Johann Gerson on the government of the tongue’. Jean Gerson (1363–1429), De custodia linguae et corde bene ruminanda. [Mainz: Peter Schoeffer, ca 1470]. Chancery quarto. [6] leaves. IStC ig00218600 (2 copies) and ig00218400 (6 copies). Type: 3916g. Schoeffer printed a single edition, without date but issued in two distinct states, with the outer bifolium (of three) reset for the second (though it remains unclear which setting was actually printed first). There is confusion in some catalogues about this; sometimes the two states are treated as one, and sometimes as separate editions, both of which are said to be earlier than the present book-list (although at least one state might have been produced later). At least four other locally-printed editions may have been available at this time, two printed by Ulrich Zel around 1468 and 1470 (IStC ig00218000 (40 copies)
and ig00219000 (25 copies), and two by the ‘Printer of the Dictys’
(now generally identified as Arnold Ther Hoernen of Cologne)
around 1470 (istc ig00219200 (17 copies) and ig00219300 (11 copies)).\(^{38}\) All these editions take roughly the same form, being
printed on six leaves in chancery quarto format.

[8] ‘Also the comforting of the devout conscience by that vener-
able monk Johann Nider, an outstanding professor of sacred
theology’. This title was not identified by Meyer or Burger, but
the text is clearly the Consolatorium timoratae conscientiae of Johann
Nider (ca 1380–1438), of which only two early editions are known.
One was printed by Ulrich Zel around 1469 (chancery quarto,
[108] leaves, istc in00164000 (45 copies)) and the other by
the unidentified ‘Printer of Augustinus, De fide’ in the same city
(Cologne), likewise without date (chancery quarto, [148] leaves,
istc in00165000 (38 copies)). The latter is dated around 1473 by
the istc\(^{39}\) and appears to be copied from the Zel edition with the
addition of a fairly extensive index (thus giving it the appearance
of an edition prepared to rival Zel’s).

[9] ‘Also the same man’s tract on merchants’ contracts.’ As with
the foregoing, Meyer and Burger failed to match this title among
Schoeffer’s publications, but Velke (1908, p. 226) noted an edition
of Nider’s De contractibus mercatorum from Zel’s press at Cologne
(chancery quarto, [30] leaves, istc in00170000 (38 copies)) and
another recorded by Meyer, which Velke rejected as a match
because it was printed at Cologne by the ‘Printer of Dares’, now
generally identified as Johann Schilling (chancery quarto, [32]
leaves, istc in00170500 (25 copies)).\(^{40}\) The two editions are both
dated to around 1472 by istc.

[10] ‘Also the bull of Pope Pius II against the Turks’. Pius II
(1405–1464), Bulla cruciata ... contra Turchos. [Mainz: Peter
ip00655750 (6 copies). Type: 3:91g. This occupies only twelve
pages, six leaves, plus (in some copies) an outer bifolium bearing
a title-page of sorts on the first recto. This is sometimes said to
be the first identifiable title-page.\(^{41}\) A parallel German-language
edition was printed, with a title-page reading Disf[s] ist die bul zu
dutsch die ... Pius herusz gesant bairt widder die snoden ungleubigen
turcken (istc ip00655800 (2 copies)), and may also have been
available from Schoeffer’s agent. In the Latin edition the bull is
dated ‘Anno incarnac[i]o[n]is d[omi]ni Anno
nouembris,pontificatus n[ost]ri Anno sexto’ and it must have

\(^{38}\) Both editions are dated around
1471 by istc (but see Rhodes (1984, note 36), p. 141). On Ther Hoernen

\(^{39}\) Of the dozen editions attrib-
uted to this printer by the istc
three are formally dated 1473 and
all but one of the remainder are
tentatively assigned to the same year.
Logic suggests that some were
actually printed in the year or two
prior, or posterior, or both, to
1473. On the ‘Printer of Augustinus,
De fide’ see Needham (1986), pp.
106, 127–128, who comments that
this printer ‘seems to have begun
printing in 1473 (i.e. later than
Caxton’s stay in Cologne)’ (p. 106).

\(^{40}\) On Schilling see Needham

\(^{41}\) See Margaret M. Smith, The
title-page: its early development 1460–
1510 (London: British Library;
New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2000),
pp. 38–40.
been printed in late 1463 or early 1464 for dissemination by the church. It seems a little incongruous that copies were still being offered for sale in the early 1470s, but the pamphlet evidently had a significance beyond its original purpose. It was issued in Pius II’s campaign to foment a crusade against the Turks, offering a plenary indulgence to crusaders and those funding them, a campaign which might have succeeded had not Pius fallen ill and died in August 1464. His successor as Pope, Paul II, did not pursue the Ottoman war with the same vigour, but the *Bulla* continued to be a symbol of both pious and nationalistic feelings against the Turkish empire. However, this may have been too limited an appeal to guarantee anything more than modest sales (given the survival of only a handful of copies).

[11] ‘Also the history of the presentation of the blessed virgin Mary’. Velke (1908, p. 228) notes that he found no Schoeffer publication to match this title, but agrees with Meyer that the list must refer to St Augustine (pseudo), *Sermo de festo praesentationis Mariae*. [Cologne: Ulrich Zel, ca 1470?]. Chancery quarto. [22] leaves. ISTC ia01300000 (22 copies). It seems, however, that neither author knew of a Schoeffer edition of another sermon with the same title, bearing Schoeffer’s woodcut device and printed between around 1470 and 1475 (chancery folio, [10] leaves, ISTC ia01301000 (24 copies)). Although Zel’s publication is dressed up with *exempla* of the Virgin, Schoeffer’s has its own additions, and both have implicits which emphasise the festival over the fact that these are Augustine sermons, neither is quite the *historia* referred to in the book-list. There are several other works which could match this title, perhaps slightly better than Augustine’s sermons do, as follows:


VI [Another edition of the same, expanded with Rolewinck’s sermon (see IX below)]. [Marienthal: Brothers of the Common Life, ca 1474]. Chancery folio. [12?] leaves. ISTC ia00053530 (1 copy). (Not seen).


IX Werner Rolewinck (1425–1502), Sermo in festo praesentationis beatissimae Mariae virginis. [Cologne: ‘Printer of Dictys’ (Arnold Ther Hoernen), ca 1469]. Chancery quarto. [1], 11 leaves. ISTC iro0304200 (4 copies).


XI [Another edition of the same with the title] Sermo ad populam predictabilis, in festo pr[ae]sentacionis, Beatissime Marie semper virginis ... Cologne: Arnold Ther Hoernen, 1470. Chancery quarto. [1], 11 leaves. ISTC iro0303000 (8 copies). (Final leaf not seen; imprint from ISTC). This edition is remarkable for having a primitive title-page and printed foliation in the outer margin.42

XII [Another edition of the same]. [Cologne: Arnold Ther Hoernen], 1470. Chancery quarto. [1], 11 leaves. ISTC iro0304000 (13 copies). This is a close resetting of item 42. See Smith (2000, note 38), pp. 41–42.
XI, including the title-page and foliation. Needham notes that the edition ‘probably followed rather close upon the first [of 1470], for the state of their types seems to be the same’ and convincingly places editions IX and X slightly earlier.43


XIV Historia de Festo praesentationis B.M.V. [Cologne: ‘Printer of Augustine, Manuale’, ca 1479?]. Chancery quarto. [26?] leaves. ISTC ih00283200 (1 copy). (Not seen). This may perhaps be an incomplete description, or a description of an incomplete copy, of edition VII above.

Thus, on title alone, the work by Adolph II is the best fit with the book-list description. However, since both Schoeffer and Zel printed editions which might be that listed, the identification remains uncertain (see below).

[12] ‘Also the canon of the mass with its prefaces and preliminaries’. Canon missae. [Mainz: Johann Fust and Peter Schoeffer, 1458]. Royal folio. [12] leaves. ISTC im00736000 (2 copies). Type: 1:286g, 2:234g. Meyer and Burger failed to match this title with certainty, but Velke (1908, p. 228) suggested the correct identification, although the book was little known at this date and today only eight copies have been located, all but two fragmentary. Its twelve leaves were intended to replace the Canon of the Mass in manuscript missals used in churches and for private devotion, since it is believed that this section of the missal was the most heavily used, and was therefore likely to need to be replaced in older manuscripts. All the surviving copies are on parchment, and the two complete examples were found as components of missals (one remains bound thus). The description in Schoeffer’s book-list appears to have been mistranscribed heretofore. What is usually rendered as cum praefacionibus et imparatorijs suis certainly looks like this, but I think the paper has been damaged here so that a ‘pp’ ligature with a suspension-mark above appears to be ‘ip’, meaning the true rendering should perhaps be cum praefacionibus et praeparatorijs suis. While this cannot be certain, the text seems to make a little more sense in this form, drawing the potential buyer’s attention to the Canon’s prefaces and preliminaries.

praeparatorii is an adjectival form, for which we can understand a simple noun, perhaps dictis or legendis (‘preparatory words’ or ‘preparatory readings’, possibly referring to the reading aloud of parts of the Canon in church). It would be very pleasing to understand instead litteris (‘preliminary letters’) as a reference not to the text but to the manner of printing, with large and impressive multi-colour initials at the opening of each division of the text, making this an advertisement for the fine appearance of the Canon as much as for its textual value. This interpretation, while possible, is perhaps a little fanciful. The Canon missae is certainly a beautiful book (or large pamphlet), with large decorated initials and red, blue and black elements fitted together in the manner of the contemporary Mainz psalters, and is among the oldest items in the book-list. It may be assumed that it had not sold well (being no doubt relatively expensive), and that a significant number of copies remained in stock at the time the book-list was compiled (see below).

[13] Here a line (possibly more) is missing, followed by ‘antiphons in great and large type’. The missing text here almost certainly refers to: Psalterium Benedictinum cum canticis et hymnis. [Mainz]: Per Joh[ann]em Fust ... et Petru[m] Schoeffer, 29 August 1459. Imperial folio. [136] leaves. ISTC ip01062000 (16 copies). Type: 1:286g, 2:234g. Velke (1908, p. 228) notes that the missing text must begin ‘Item psalterium ...’ and end ‘vigiliis et’, to judge by the traces of letters left at the perimiters of the cuts. He adds the guess that the line might originally have read ‘Item psalterium cum canticis, hymnis, vigiliis et’. This makes perfect sense, but does not quite fit with the fragments of typeforms still visible. I wonder if, instead, the text might have read something like ‘Ite[m] psalteriu[m] pulcrum eccl[es]ijs cu[m] ymnis vigiliis [et]’ (‘Also a beautiful psalter for churches with hymns, vigils and’; see Fig. 2); this is pure conjecture (especially the ecclesiis, for which the best argument is perhaps that it fits the available space); the
final character, apparently one of Schoefer’s abbreviations for et, seems a little too close to the previous type. Whatever the precise wording (and we can enjoy speculating about that until a second, complete copy of the book-list is discovered), it seems almost certain that the book referred to is Fust and Schoefer’s Mainz Psalter of 1459, with some mention of its nature and qualities. The only shadow of doubt is cast by the existence of a fragment of an edition of the canticles printed in the type of the 42-line Bible and usually said to be all that survives of an earlier Psalter, printed in the mid-1450s as a companion to the Bible (istc ip01035900). I suspect that this fragment is actually of later date, and was probably part of an edition of the canticles alone, intended as a cheap alternative to the larger Psalter, an edition which may never have been completed. However, it remains (remotely) possible that another edition of the Psalter with antiphons was printed and published by Schoefer in the 1450s or 1460s and may be that referred to in the book-list.

[14] ‘Also John of Genoa in the Catholicon’. This is, in some ways, the most troublesome entry in the book-list (see below). The book referred to is easy to identify as Johann Balbus’s immense Latin grammar and encyclopaedia known as the Catholicon, a work seen at this period as important for the study of the Vulgate. There were four possible editions available in the early 1470s, none directly associated with Schoefer, as follows:

I Mainz: [Johann Gutenberg?], ‘1460’. Royal folio. [373 leaves]. istc ib00020000 (81 copies, many from putative reprints of ca 1469 and ca 1472).

II Vindelica [Augsburg]: Impressit ... [Gunther] Zainer, 30 April 1469. Royal folio. [504] leaves. istc ib00021000 (37 copies). This edition was apparently produced without reference to edition I. The colophon is in verse.

III [Strasbourg: Adolf Rusch and Johann Mentelin?, ca 1474]. Royal folio. [398] leaves. istc ib00022000 (58 copies). With two prologues, copied respectively from editions I and II.


45. Ibid., p. 136.
[15] ‘Also the sixth [book] of decretales’. Boniface VIII (ca 1230–1303), Liber sextus decretalium. Alma in urbe Maguntina: Per Petrum de Schoiffer, 17 April 1470. Royal folio. [138] leaves. ISTC ib00978000 (19 copies). Type: 3:91G, 5:118G. This was Schoeffer’s second edition of this work, the first being dated 17 December 1465 (ISTC ib00976000 (27 copies)) and printed, it would seem, entirely upon parchment. A third Schoeffer edition is dated 5 April 1473 (ISTC ib00981000 (60 copies) and a fourth 9 January 1476 (ISTC ib00985000 (64 copies)). The 1470, 1473 and 1476 editions were all available on both paper and parchment (and indeed a few copies are made up with sheets of both). The second (1470) edition is usually assumed to be that referred to in the book-list, though clearly those who wish to place the list earlier or later may prefer the first or third editions. The only other edition of the period from a press in a German-speaking city was that of Heinrich Eggestein of Strasbourg, printed around 1473 (ISTC ib00977000 (76 copies)). This work appears in the book-list in conjunction with the following because they form a notional pair, being influential works of canon law, printed in very similar style, and the vendor no doubt hoped to sell copies together. Both works include the glosses of Johann Andreae (ca 1270–1348), whose name is mentioned in the book-list while the present author’s name is not; and, indeed, the apparatus in each volume is considerably more voluminous than the texts explained. Item [18] in the list was originally printed as a preliminary text to the 1465 edition of the present work.

[16] ‘And that of Clement with the apparatus of Johann Andreae’. Clement V (1264–1314), Constitutiones. Alma in urbe Maguntina: Per Petrus de Schoiffer, 8 October 1467. Royal folio. [65] leaves. ISTC ic00711000 (24 Copies). Type: 3:91G, 5:118G. The first edition of this work was printed by Fust and Schoeffer with the date 15 June 1460 (ISTC ic00710000 (22 copies)), a third Mainz edition appeared from Schoeffer’s press on 13 August 1471 (ISTC ic00713000 (42 copies)) and a fourth was dated 10 September 1476 (ISTC ic00721000 (53 copies)). As with item [15], to which this book was evidently a companion, there were rival editions printed by Heinrich Eggestein in Strasbourg in 1471 (ISTC ic00713000 (44 copies)) and at some date in the early 1470s (ISTC ic00712000 (26 copies)), perhaps as a companion to his edition of item [15] issued around 1473.

[17] ‘Also in civil law, the institutions’. Justinian I (482–565), Institutiones. Alma in urbe Maguntina: P[er] Petru[m] Schoyffer,
24 May 1468. Royal folio. [103] leaves. ISTC ij00506000 (33 copies). Type: 3:916, 5:1186. Schoeffer printed a second Mainz edition dated 29 October 1472 (ISTC ij00508000 (33 copies)), perhaps in reply to Heinrich Egggestein’s Strasbourg edition of around the same date (ISTC ij00507000 (38 copies)), and a third dated 23 May 1476 (ISTC ij00512000 (63 copies)). There were a number of other contemporary editions, mostly printed in Italy, with a few in Basel by Michael Wenssler. Schoeffer’s editions were uniform with items [15] and [16], using the same types and format, with the glosses (here by Franciscus Accursius (1185–1263)) similarly outweighing and encircling the main text. Many copies of the 1468 and 1472 editions were printed on parchment, but this seems not to have been the case with the 1476 edition, of which all surviving copies appear to be on paper. The two earlier Schoeffer editions conclude with allusive verses whose ‘neologisms and amazing metaphors’ Nicolas Barker attributes to Johann Borne.⁴⁶ Here the writer coins the word ‘p[ro]thocaragmaticos’ (rendered as ‘p[ro]pthocaragmaticos’ in 1472) for the early printers, and describes the relationship between two Johns of Mainz (Gutenberg and Fust), to which partnership ‘petrus’ (Schoeffer) came later, joining last but beginning first because he stood higher than the Johns in the art of engraving (‘Cursu posterior introe[n]do prior | Quippe quib[us] p[rae]stat sculpendi lege sagitus’).⁴⁷ Egggestein’s edition naturally omits the verses, and has no colophon, but is otherwise very like Schoeffer’s and was probably copied from it. He seems to have printed a small part of his edition on parchment.

⁴⁶ Barker (2017, note 14), p. 45. The same verses also appear, with others described by Barker (p. 46), after the colophon of Gregory IX, Decretales (In nobili urbe Magu[n]cia: Petrus Schoeffer, 1473; ISTC ig00447000).

⁴⁷ This is typical of this writer’s witty, allusive style. Here is word-play on ‘first’ and ‘last’ and allusion to the gospel of John (chapter 20, verses 4–6) in which Simon Peter is the third to arrive at Christ’s empty tomb, but the first to go in. It is difficult to render into English. Perhaps it might be read as ‘last in the business, first to business, with his mastery of the graver’ or, more facetiously, ‘joining the race last but coming in first, since he could cut along best of all’. A translation of these verses and other texts attributed to Borne may be found in Nicolas Barker, ‘A contemporary panegyrist of the invention of printing: the author of the Grammatica rhythmica’, Incunabula: studies in fifteenth-century printed books presented to Lotte Hellinga (edited by Martin Davies. London: British Library, 1999, pp. 187–214). Here (pp. 194–195, 201–203, 208) Barker discusses the text and translates the clause about Schoeffer as ‘last to start but first to enter in, since he surpasses them [the Johns] in the skill ... in engraving’.

⁴⁸ See, for example, Meyer (1885), p. 18, and Velke (1908), p. 229.
editions (all attributed to Andreæ as author) have been traced in the approximate period of Schoeffer’s book-list:

I  *Super arboribus consanguinitatis, affinitatis et cognationis spiritualis*. [Mainz: Peter Schoeffer, *ca* 1472]. Chancery quarto. [12] leaves. ISTC ia00597200 (3 copies). *Type*: 6:926. Originally placed around 1480 by *gw*, Paul Needham has suggested a provisional date between 1471 and 1475. I believe an earlier date is possible, although perhaps around 1472 (the period of the other competing editions) is most likely.


VIII  *Super arboribus consanguinitatis, affinitatis et cognationis spiritualis*. De Nurnberga: Impressum p[er] Fridericum


IX [German edition] Baum der Sippschaft. [Augsburg: Gunther Zainer, ca 1475]. Chancery folio. [6] leaves. ISTC ia00597000 (3 copies). This edition has probably been misdated ‘not after 1474’ by ISTC (the evidence for this date is not recorded there or in GW). The woodcut used here is the same as that appearing in edition VII, but here it is in a later state, so the present edition must actually be ‘not before 1474’. It seems likely that Bämler sold or lent the block to Zainer after completing his edition in that year.


The Nuremberg press of Friedrich Creussner (ca 1440–1502?) was almost embarrassingly fecund in the 1470s with editions of this work, and this continued for a while into the 1480s (ISTC lists four further Creussner editions printed after around 1480). We can infer that he was barely able to keep up with demand for copies at this time, perhaps partly because his edition contained first two, then three, attractive woodcuts of the family trees. The work is slight, and it is highly likely that further editions were printed but have not survived. The Schoeffer edition (number I above) is probably that offered in the book-list (although it is possible that the 1465 folio edition may have still been in print). That Schoeffer produced no (surviving) further editions may indicate that he decided not to compete with the illustrated editions coming onto the market after about 1472 (indeed he may have preferred to buy-in copies from other printers; see below).
not include the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Heinrich Eggstein’s edition of 1472, on the other hand, is very like Schoeffer’s and was no doubt copied from it, albeit in imperial octavo format (istc ic00579000 (17 copies)).

[20] ‘Also the history of Griselda, of that most constant of women.’ Meyer and Burger described the edition referred to here as ‘unbekannt’. Velke (1908, p. 230) was the first to suggest that it might be: Petrarch (1304–1374), *Historia Griseldis*. [Cologne: Ulrich Zel, ca 1469]. Chancery quarto. [12] leaves. istc ip00400000 (26 copies). Zel printed another edition at around the same time (istc ip00401000 (14 copies); the sequence of these two editions is uncertain. Both have the incipit ‘Epistola … De Historia Griseldis. mulieris maxime con[n]stantie et patien[n]tie …’ (the explicit repeats this title). German-language editions were also published by Gunther Zainer at Augsburg around 1470 and in 1471 (istc ip00402900 and ip00402850). A new Latin edition appeared at Ulm from Johann Zainer’s press in 1473 (chancery folio, [10] leaves, istc ip00402000 (43 copies)).

[21] ‘Also the history by Leonardus Aretinus from Boccaccio concerning the love of Tancred’s daughter Sigismunda for Guiscardus’. Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), *De duobus amantibus Guiscardo et Sigismunda* (translated by Leonardo Aretino (ca 1370–1444)). [Mainz: Peter Schoeffer, ca 1472]. Chancery quarto. [12] leaves. istc ib01235800 (12 copies). Type: 5:118. This edition has no colophon, but bears Schoeffer’s woodcut device in some copies. It is, in appearance and genre, a companion to the foregoing. The date given by istc, ‘not after Sept. 1470’, is derived from the dating of Schoeffer’s book-list. No other separate Latin edition from a German printer has been traced before 1480. Johann Zainer of Ulm produced at least two editions of a German-language edition, however, around 1476 (istc ib01239950 and ib01240000).

‘this is the type of the Psalter’. The type is actually the larger of two Psalter types (1:286 and 2:234) cut by Schoeffer and first used in 1457. Its use here, coupled with the reference to types in the opening paragraph of the book-list, have led some to describe the book-list as the first surviving type-specimen. Although displaying these types was clearly not the focus of the publication, they do play an important role in its mercantile purpose by exemplifying the quality and scale of the letters (if not necessarily the actual types) used to print the books on offer.
**Preliminary Analysis of the Book-list**

Before looking at the likely purpose and date of the book-list, and the attribution of those books not printed by Schoeffer to other printing-offices, it may be instructive to try grouping the books in other ways. When an edition is not certain, the more-likely alternatives are included in the following tables (with question-marks after the item numbers).

**By bibliographical format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial folio</th>
<th>Royal folio</th>
<th>Chancery folio</th>
<th>Chancery quarto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[18]?</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>[18]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>[20]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]?</td>
<td>[21]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only four formats are represented in the book-list (with one rogue octavo in an unlikely edition of item [19]). As will be seen, the majority of the books were either royal folios or chancery quartos, although I suspect this is no more than a reflection of the pattern across German printing of the period, in which folios tended to be printed on royal paper and quartos on chancery.

**By extent**

|------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
The foregoing table, which is divided into four groups (massive books, long books, middling-length books, and short books and pamphlets), indicates the preponderence of middling-length and shorter works in the book-list. Indeed, there are only four long books (although we may argue here about the definition of ‘long’), being the first three in the list – the Bible and works of Aquinas – and the *Catholicon*, all vital to the study of theology. There is a partial correspondence between this table and the foregoing, with all the long books being in royal folio format, and many of the short books being chancery quartos (only items [5], [10], [12] and possibly [18] are short books in larger formats). Although we have very little evidence for the prices paid for these books, it seems reasonable to infer that their relative size, extent and (in a few cases) typographical complexity dictated the price and that, broadly speaking, short and small books were cheap and long and big books expensive.

*By date*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to 1460</th>
<th>1461–1465</th>
<th>1466–1470</th>
<th>after 1470</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[13] 29 August 1459</td>
<td>[10] [1463 or 1464]</td>
<td>[5] [ca 1466]</td>
<td>[9] [ca 1472]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14] ‘1460’</td>
<td>[18] [1465]?</td>
<td>[2] 6 March 1467</td>
<td>[18] [ca 1472]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] [ca 1460]?</td>
<td>[16] 8 October 1467</td>
<td>[8] [ca 1473]?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[17] 24 May 1468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[14] 30 April 1469?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] 13 June 1469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[20] [ca 1469]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6] [ca 1469]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[8] [ca 1469]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11] [ca 1469]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[15] 17 April 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4] [ca 1470]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[7] [ca 1470]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[21] [ca 1470]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11] [ca 1470]?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These dates are, perhaps, a little conservative, being based on an early dating of the book-list (which obliges us to choose certain early editions as matches for the titles named therein). Those dates preceded by ‘ca’ are naturally uncertain, and may well need revision. A few of the dates, notably that for item [21], are themselves derived from this early dating of the list. However, it is
interesting to note that, even in this unimaginative table, the majority of books fall into the late 1460s, with a handful of older books and a few which appear to strain at the upper limit.

**By genre/subject-matter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre/Subject-Matter</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological study</td>
<td>[2], [3], [14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthood</td>
<td>[4], [5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/commerce</td>
<td>[6], [7], [8], [9], [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular theology</td>
<td>[10], [11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayers</td>
<td>[12], [13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>[14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (canon and civil)</td>
<td>[15], [16], [17], [18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romances/fiction</td>
<td>[20], [21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As anyone who has catalogued books to ‘modern’ standards will know, subject-headings and genre-terms can only be assigned to complex medieval texts in a simplistic way. The table above is arranged to follow the sequence of the titles in the book-list, while various other sequences, and other subject-headings, might have been possible. Nevertheless, the table serves to show how the book-list was arranged by subject/genre, with similar works grouped together and a simple hierarchy, with the Bible at the head and romances at the foot.

**By printing type**

1. Schoeffer, large Psalter 1:286G
2. Schoeffer, small Psalter 2:234G
3. Schoeffer, small ‘Durandus’ 3:916
4. Schoeffer, large ‘Durandus’ 5:118G
5. Schoeffer, small ‘Durandus’ variant 6:926
6. Ulrich Zel, 1b:116G
7. Ulrich Zel, 1a:996
8. Catholicon-type 1:82G
9. ‘Printer of Augustinus, De fide’, 1:1056
10. Johann Schilling, 1:100G
13. Gunther Zainer, 1:117G

WINTER 2019
The item numbers given above in italics refer to secondary typefaces, used for a large minority of the text in the edition in question. The designations and sizes quoted here are taken from $\tau w$, which reproduces some conspectuses taken from Haebler (these are incomplete, however, and the publication of thorough conspectuses of all these types, prepared using contemporary photographic techniques, is a desideratum). Type 4, the larger ‘Durandus’ type, is that used for the book-list itself and therefore that alluded to in the opening paragraph as the model for the typography of all the books in the list. As will be seen, only two or three of the books in the list were set chiefly in this type, the majority of the others being in the smaller Durandus type (which is similar in design). Type 1 is the large Psalter type of which a specimen appears at the foot of the book-list. Zel’s types 1a and 1b are essentially the same type, cast on different-size bodies; this type is not unlike Schoeffer’s type 5:1186, and Velke (1908, p. 228) suggests that the punches may have been cut by Schoeffer for Zel. This is possible, though it is perhaps more likely that Zel cut the punches himself, taking inspiration from Schoeffer’s letter-forms. The other types in the list (8–14) are significantly different from Schoeffer’s. Types 9–11 are essentially the same type, a utilitarian gothic attributed to Johann Veldener (fl. 1469–1486) and used, apparently in different castings, by a group of ‘minor’ Cologne printers (see below). Type 12 is a slightly later type used by Ther Hoernen, which includes some sorts from type 11; Needham describes this type as a development of the earlier fount ‘entirely different in appearance from the Veldener Cologne type, of which only an inconspicuous residue remained in ther Hoernen’s typecases’.

By survival rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in book-list</th>
<th>Printer and date</th>
<th>Number of recorded copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>Catholicon Press ‘1460’</td>
<td>81 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1462</td>
<td>72 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1467</td>
<td>71 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1469</td>
<td>71 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1476</td>
<td>64 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1473</td>
<td>60 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>Fust and Schoeffer 1466</td>
<td>57 copies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Konrad Haebler, Typenreper- torium der Wiegendrucke (5 volumes, Halle/Leipzig: Haupt etc., 1905–1924; Facsimile: Wiesbaden: Kraus, 1968). The long-established convention of assigning types a ‘size’ (measured over twenty lines in millimetres) with the addition of a letter (‘g’ for gothic, ‘r’ for roman, etc) is a useful shorthand and is used throughout $\tau w$; a preliminary number is often added to indicate the sequence of types used by a particular printer (thus ‘1:286g’ is the first known type used by Fust and Schoeffer working alone, a gothic measuring 286 mm over twenty lines). However, this system is rather crude and tends to identify castings of type rather than specific punches, and a more precise system of measuring printed characters is preferable for the detailed study and classification of fifteenth-century types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1476</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1467?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1469]</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1471</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1468]</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>‘Printer of Augustinus, De fide’ [ca 1473]</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1472]</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>G. Zainer 1469</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1472</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1468</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1465</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1469]</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1467</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1470?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>Schoeffer 1470</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1469?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>Fust and Schoeffer 1459</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>Zel [ca 1469]</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>Schoeffer [ca 1470?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>Ther Hoernen [ca 1472]</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Schoeffer (Latin edition) [1463 or 1464]</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>Schoeffer [ca 1472]</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Schoeffer (German edition) [1463 or 1464]</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>Fust and Schoeffer 1458</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foregoing table includes only the editions most likely to be those described in the book-list, published up to 1476 (see below). Statistics on surviving copies must be treated with caution, as there are numerous random and indeed systematic factors at play. Such figures naturally record levels of preservation in selected libraries (not quite the same as overall survival-rates) and of substantially complete copies (fragments represent other copies but, without a close examination of all surviving examples, it is very hard to detect whether they derive from the same or different copies). It is a truism of early-book studies that big and prestigious books survive better than small and modest ones. With these limitations understood, however, survival rates can give an indication of the commercial success or popularity of each edition, although not of the speed with which it sold (some books no doubt passed out of print quickly while others took decades to sell out, but were nevertheless successful in the sense that they did ultimately sell in relatively large numbers). We may draw cautious conclusions about overall sales in those cases where relatively large numbers of small books, and relatively small numbers of large books, are recorded. Among Schoeffer’s editions, one is struck by the apparent failure of such lavishly-produced works as the *Psalterium* ([13]) and *Canon missae* ([12]), and of the *Bulla* [10] and his *Super arboribus consanguinitatis, affinitatis et cognationis spiritualis* ([18]) – although the last two may be scarce partly because of their slightness – and generally by the apparent success of the first nine titles on the list, and of the *Catholicon* ([14]). This is not presumably an entirely random phenomenon, as we may guess that the compiler of the book-list decided to place first those books known to be the better-sellers (arranged broadly by subject). It may be worth noting that no edition in the list can be shown to have survived quite so well as Schoeffer’s *Epistolae* of Jerome of 1470 (see below).

**WHEN, WHY AND FOR WHOM WAS THE BOOK-LIST PRINTED?**

The books listed here seem to me to fall into two classes, recent books for which there was a ready market, and older stock which was in some sense selling slowly, either because though assured of a certain market the price was high (as with the parchment copies of the Bible) or because of simple lack of appeal to the book-buying community (as, perhaps, with the *Bulla* of Pius II). The first class might be further divided into those books available in Germany only from Schoeffer, and those published in competition, perhaps fierce competition, with rival printer-publishers.
Thus the purpose of the list appears to have been the obvious one of selling books, of making money, of shifting stock that was difficult to sell alongside good-sellers and popular works, some of which were challenged by editions from other presses, in order to return the best possible profit. For this reason (because the list includes some works which were ‘hard-sellers’), I think it most likely that Schoeffer was himself responsible for the list and for hiring an agent or agents to hawk it around the country. Had this been an example of a book-hawker compiling a list and commisioning its printing at his own risk (as we may imagine to have happened in some cases), it seems likely that he would have chosen only popular books which he knew he could sell easily. Such a list (that printed by Friedrich Creusssner at Nurember around 1477 may perhaps be an example) might have included books which sold more rarely, but at a high price (like the Bible and Catholicon), but would probably not have included ‘unpopular’ titles like the Bulla or expensive prayer-books like the Psalterium and Canon missae (as cheaper editions, at least of the psalter, were probably available). The particular, and perhaps disingenuous, emphasis in the list on the types used to print these books, and the eye-catching specimen of the Psalterium type at the foot, add further to the impression that the list was compiled by its printer as part of a campaign to sell his own publications.

This can only be an educated guess, however, and the question of who prepared and issued the list is related to the question of who it was aimed at, who were the men (and they were almost certainly all men) who came to the Sign of the Wild Man to see the books on offer and, perhaps, to buy them. Here again we can only guess, based on the list itself and on what little is known of this sort of book-dealing at this date. Although a German inn in the 1470s was partly a place of revelry, where the common man drank beer in convivial company and engaged in simple amusements with his fellows, very few of those common men would have bought books, although it is possible that items [20] and [21] (and possibly [10] and [11] too) would have been acquired occasionally by a literate drinker. The great majority of book-buyers would probably have been middle-class parents acquiring educational reading-matter for their children, schoolmasters, university students, mature scholars, monks, civil administrators, merchants, servants of wealthy institutions or of rich men acquiring books for their masters, and members of the clergy at all levels, who needed books for their own use and for use in church (some book-buyers were, of course, more than one of these things).56

55. istc ic00976000; Coppens (2020) 20. This is one of those book-lists which takes much the same form as Schoeffer’s, employing similar wording and offering seven (out of thirty-one) of the same titles, including the Bible and Catholicon. It differs, however, in being a hotch-potch of editions printed in at least four different German and Swiss cities.

56. Wagner (2009, note 1, p. 194) characterized Schoeffer’s customers as ‘mostly members of universities or monasteries, but also other citizens with some education’. On the fifteenth-century book-trade and Schoeffer’s place in it see Hellinga (2018), chapters 2 and 4. She comments (p. [20]) that ‘there is very little hard evidence of transactions’ of the sort associated with Schoeffer’s book-list.
If we assume that the book-list was masterminded by Peter Schoeffer, I wonder if the natural corollary – given the material included – is that the list was printed and circulated a little later than is usually suggested. I suspect it of being, essentially, a catalogue of back-stock. In this light it is very difficult to date the list precisely, but let us say ‘ca 1475’ as a working hypothesis. Such a date would allow the comfortable inclusion of both potential editions of item [9], of Schoeffer’s edition of item [11], and of his separate edition of item [18], as well as other potential editions of items [4], [8], [11], [14] and [18] (albeit some of these last are rather unlikely). It would also allow a more flexible dating of those undated editions ([8] and [21] for example) which have been placed before September 1470 because they appear in the book-list. Another consequence of a date around 1475 is that we can match later editions of items [15], [16] and [17], the last of which then appears to be a natural competitor to a Strasbourg rival. The same is true of item [19] which, although Schoeffer’s edition must still be that 1466, may owe its presence in the list to competition from the Strasbourg edition of 1472; likewise, the promotion of item [13] can be seen in the light of competition from other editions of the psalter which began to appear in the early 1470s. If we accept a date around 1475 for the list, then all the Schoeffer publications included could be said to be ‘back-stock’, not one of them a brand new publication, the majority from the period around 1469–1472. And if the list was used in the way I have suggested, to sell old and very old books, then it need not have been quite so ephemeral as a list of new books would have been, and could have been employed to hawk the same material round Germany for several years.

The ‘1470’ dating of the list is based chiefly on the absence of Schoeffer’s edition of the Epistolae of Jerome (istc ih00165000), which is dated in the colophon 7 September 1470 (copies may well have been issued later as they contain a good many manuscript corrections, and some are partly made up with sheets in a second, corrected edition). However, this work was promoted in at least three separate prospectuses that warned purchasers against another, inferior edition then on the market, a reference to Mentelin’s edition of around 1468 (istc ih00162000). Even if it was not selling well, Schoeffer may have felt that further advertising was redundant, given the three or more prospectuses already in circulation. However the work had probably proved popular enough that by around 1475 it did not merit inclusion in a list of back-stock (although it is unlikely to have been out of...
print, as two copies, one on paper, one on parchment, were included in the Basel inventory of 1479.\textsuperscript{60} To judge by survival rates, this was among Schoeffer’s most widely-bought (if not necessarily read) publications, with 99 substantially complete copies located by \textit{istc}. A few other books printed by Schoeffer before the end of 1470 are likewise omitted from the list. While such early publications as the \textit{Durandus}\textsuperscript{61} were no doubt out of print, and others (like Johann Borne’s \textit{Grammatica rhythmica} of 1466 and \textit{ca} 1472\textsuperscript{62} were probably private commissions, we might have expected Augustine’s \textit{De vita Christiana} of around 1465 (\textit{istc} ia01354000), for example, to appear.\textsuperscript{63} Overall, then, I would argue that the absence of the \textit{Epistolae} from the book-list is not certain evidence that the latter was printed and used before the former was available.

The omission of some books printed in the early 1470s can be explained by their either being out of print, or not being ‘old’ enough to be treated as back-stock, by the time the list was produced. It must be admitted that this explanation works better with some titles than with others. The 1471 edition of Aquinas’s \textit{Summa theologica} (part 2, book 1) (\textit{istc} it00203000), for example, seems the perfect companion to item [2], and if it was excluded from the book-list because it was out of print by around 1475 must have proved more popular than the edition of part 2, book 2 which was still in print from 1467. It is hard to judge this point, for while the title appears in the inventory of Schoeffer stock of 1479, this may be a reference to another edition, bought-in from Venice.\textsuperscript{64} The appearance of the 1462 Bible in the list, despite the publication of a new edition in 1472, can be explained a little more easily. We can identify the ‘pulcram bibliam in pergameno’ as the 1462 edition because it is ‘in pergameno’, while no copies of the 1472 edition printed on parchment are known. Thus we may imagine that the more expensive parchment copies of the 1462 Bible sold more slowly than those on paper and were still available around 1475, three or so years after a new edition had been printed on paper to meet the demand for cheaper copies.

\textbf{Where did Schoeffer acquire those books he did not print?}

If Schoeffer was behind the book-list, the next questions concern those books included therein which he did not himself print. Why did he include these titles at all? And where did he acquire them? The answer to the first question must relate to the commercial realities of the book-trade. It is a truism that printing was not

\textsuperscript{60} See note 23 above.

\textsuperscript{61} Guillaume Durand, \textit{Rationale divinorum officiorum}. [Mainz]: Per Johanne[m] Fust ... et Petru[m] Germssheym, 6 October 1459. Royal folio. [150] leaves. \textit{istc} id00403000 (57 copies).

\textsuperscript{62} \textit{istc} ib01222900 and ib01223000. See also Barker (2017, note 14), pp. 41–45.

\textsuperscript{63} This was a short, popular work, analogous perhaps to item [11], with new editions in the 1470s (\textit{istc} ia01356300 and ia01356000). Copies of one of Schoeffer’s editions appear to have been available at Basel in 1479 (Hellinga (2018), p. 32).

\textsuperscript{64} For this suggestion see Hellinga (2018), p. 35. See also note 23 above. Hellinga (2018, p. 35) also describes Zel’s edition of part 1 (only) of around 1469 (\textit{istc} it00166600) as ‘probably commissioned by Schoeffer’; whether or not this is so, this title is not obviously included in either the present book-list or the 1479 inventory.
practised for its own sake, any more than it was invented to solve a technical problem. With very few exceptions, early printers printed because they were also publishers, that is to say that they intended to sell their books in an open market and to generate income thereby. Schoeffer must have included some titles in his list simply because he knew there was a market for them and wished to meet it, and because he wished to compete with other publishers who were making a success of selling certain titles which he did not, at the time, print for himself. I think this last is an important point, and probably describes the main motivation for Schoeffer's acquisition of books from other presses, by purchase or trade – he wanted them to sell in direct competition with his rivals, and it made more economic sense to acquire copies from well-disposed printers in other cities than to print editions for himself. Schoeffer may perhaps have acquired relatively large stocks from other printers and held them for years, and so could have viewed these editions too as back-stock. It is known that he held multiple copies of such books from the inventory of 1479 which includes copies of at least two major works from other presses. Whatever the circumstances and terms of acquisition, Schoeffer would undoubtedly have viewed books acquired from other printers as investments to be realised.

The question of where they came from, and on what terms, is more complex and should be looked at in the light of our understanding of printers' enmities and alliances. The evidence for these is slight, but a common (and natural) assumption is that the partnership of Johann Gutenberg (1398?–1468) and Johann Fust (1400?–1466) ended in a court-case of 1455, after which date the two were rivals, each establishing (or continuing) a separate printing-office at Mainz, the latter with Schoeffer. After the sack of Mainz in 1462 (and in at least one case before) each business spawned a series of scions. From Gutenberg's press came Johann Mentelin and Heinrich Eggstein (Strasbourg), Nikolaus Bechtermünze (Eltville) and Albrecht Pfister (Bamberg), and from Fust and Schoeffer flowed Ulrich Zel (Cologne), Berthold Ruppel (Basel) and Nicolas Jenson (Venice) among others. From each

65. See Hellinga (2018, pp. 32–35), who notes the possible editions without suggesting which are most likely to have been those acquired by Schoeffer. Of both books there are Cologne editions, including at least three editions from Zel (istc ia00288000, in00196400, in00196600, in00198000), and of one a Basel edition printed by Ruppel (istc in00196000), all of which seem likely contenders. See also note 24.


67. On Jenson's connections with Fust and Schoeffer see Hellinga (2018), chapter 3.
of these, further offshoots sprang and, in each case, the old enmity between the branches is often assumed to have continued. This is a simplification, of course, but gives a rough indication of the manner in which the art seems to have spread across Europe with two rival clans, the Montagus and Capulets of printing. While the evidence is certainly limited, it seems that, during the 1460s and 1470s, Peter Schoefer on the one hand, and Johann Mentelin and Heinrich Eggestein on the other, were in active competition with one another. Indeed, Schoefer and Mentelin seem to have been very alike – both were skilled printers and businessmen, the creators of beautiful types, ruthless promoters of their own work, and publishers of similar book-lists and very similar, sometimes precisely the same, books, working on the same sort of scale in Mainz and Strasbourg respectively. Two examples of their competition are noted above, in their editions of Augustine’s *De arte praedicandi* (item [5] in the book-list) and of Jerome’s *Epistolae*. They were also, of course, rivals in the market for the Bible. We cannot know how real or bitter their rivalry was, and what Mentelin’s personal attitude to Schoefer may have been. I suspect that, for both men, indeed for all successful printer-publishers of the era, business came first and co-operation would have been, at times, more advantageous than competition. However, for the sake of trying to identify the non-Schoefer editions in the book-list, a good starting point will be to see the printers of Strasbourg (and Eltville) and their descendents as less likely to collaborate with Schoefer than those of Cologne and of some other cities along the Rhine.

The first book in the list which cannot have emanated from Schoefer’s press is item [6], Matthaeus de Cracovia’s *Tractatus rationis et conscientiae de summptione pabuli salutiferi corporis Domini nostri Ihesu Christi*. This is a relatively short work, and there is always the possibility here of a lost Schoefer edition. However, I think that rather unlikely, and the obvious assumption is that Schoefer acquired copies of Ulrich Zel’s undated edition of around 1469. It is possible that this, and other titles printed by Zel, may have been in some sense co-publications, Schoefer having part-funded Zel’s editions as elements in a planned programme in which the two would not produce rival editions but would share the risks and the profits; this edition, like many of Zel’s, names no printer or place of printing in the colophon, so could as easily be offered by Schoefer as a Mainz book as it could be by Zel as a Cologne book. There is no direct evidence for this, however, and Zel and Schoefer seem to have produced rival editions of

68. For notes on some of Schoefer’s known collaborations with other printers in Germany and Venice see Hellinga (2018), p. 122, who theorizes the purchase of unbound and un-rubricated sheets from six different printers, their rubrication and sale in Mainz alongside some of Schoefer’s own books, and later illumination and binding in another city.

69. When Schoefer and Mentelin competed in the market for particular titles they generally ‘pirated’ one another’s works. It might be possible to view this as being, in reality, a form of collaboration in which the two printers shared a text and produced parallel editions to reach their own natural, local markets, with the obvious rivalry no more than part of a shared marketing campaign (for a possible case of such collaboration in Rome see Davies (1997, note 18), p. 38). However, I suspect that this was not the case, and that the two competed in exactly the simple, commercial manner they appear to have done. An exception to the usual ‘pirating’ of texts was Schoefer’s edition of Jerome’s *Epistolae*, which was not a copy of Mentelin’s edition but a new text prepared by Adrianus de Brielis; here there was no likelihood of collaboration between the two printers, and the advertising of Schoefer’s Jerome made a point of the superiority of his text.

70. On their rivalry see also Lehmann-Haupt (1950), pp. 90–92. 71. But not Bamberg, since Pfister concentrated on books for a different market, specializing in popular vernacular texts, often illustrated with woodcuts.
other short works, so that it is at least equally likely that Schoeffer simply bought a stock of copies, no doubt on favourable terms, from the Cologne printer. The other edition on the market at the time, that printed at the ‘Catholicon-press’ (see below) from around 1460, I presume to be the rival edition, competition with which was the motive for Schoeffer to include the title in his book-list.

With item [8] in the list the picture is slightly different. There is a Zel edition of around 1469, but also another, by the unidentified ‘Printer of Augustinus, De fide’, probably datable to around 1473. This printer was one of a poorly-documented group which flourished in Cologne in the 1470s, often using the same type which they seem to have acquired from the printer and punch-cutter Johann Veldener (well-known from his collaboration at this same period with William Caxton).72 It is tempting to lump these printers together, and to assume that they were all rivals to Zel, attempting to compete with him in the local market for books. Indeed the publication of rival editions of the same or similar works suggests that this was the case, at least up to a point, albeit we cannot assume that all the ‘Cologne minors’ were anti-Zel (some may have been his scions), nor that they would be less likely than Zel to supply other printer-publishers with their books.73 Thus, Schoeffer may have bought editions from any of these Cologne printers. In the case of item [8], it is possible that Schoeffer began by stocking Zel’s edition and, when this was exhausted, bought copies from the ‘Printer of Augustinus, De fide’ to keep the title in print. It may thus be the latter edition which was on offer at the Sign of the Wild Man around 1475.

A similar pattern can be observed with item [9] in the list, which likewise exists in a Zel edition and another from a smaller Cologne press, in this case that of the ‘Printer of Dares’, most probably Johann Schilling (ca 1440–1490?). The editions are again undated but, as noted above, Zel’s edition is convincingly dated to around 1472 by paper evidence. Schilling’s edition may be earlier – being dated by ISTC ‘not after 1 Dec. 1472’, presumably based on a date of acquisition or rubrication – although it is unlikely to be much earlier given the dates of Schilling’s known activity as a printer. In this case it seems most likely that Schoeffer acquired Zel’s edition on or shortly after publication (made possible by the putative later date of the book-list) and offered it among his own books, although it is also possible that he acquired Schilling’s edition a little earlier and then turned to Zel, perhaps with an offer to co-publish a work which had already proved a good investment.

Item [11] is a still more uncertain case. Schoeffer’s edition of an Augustine *Sermo de festo praesentationis Mariae* does not fit perfectly the title given in the book-list, and the same is true of Zel’s pamphlet containing the text of another sermon. The dating of both is in doubt, and Schoeffer’s pamphlet may have been printed as late as 1475. Both may well have been preceded by two works printed by Arnold Ther Hoernen (ca 1430–1483?), another of the minor Cologne printers (albeit perhaps a major minor), Adolph II’s *Copiae indulgentiarum de institutione festi Praesentationis beatae Mariae virginis concessarum*, and Rolewinck’s *Sermo in festo praesentationis beatissimae Mariae virginis*, which probably appeared together, without date, around 1469. I wonder if the title given in the book-list may have been intended to be ambiguous. Perhaps Schoeffer bought a stock of pamphlets from Ther Hoernen around 1470, then more from Zel shortly afterwards, and then printed his own contribution to the genre. It is perhaps unlikely that he stocked them all at the same time. Those who turned up at the Sign of the Wild Man around 1475 would most probably have been offered whichever *historia* of the Presentation Schoeffer happened to have in stock at that time.

Balbus’s *Catholicon*, item [14], is perhaps the most puzzling entry in the book-list. Schoeffer never printed an edition himself, and neither did any of those he is known to have collaborated with after the division of the Fust/Gutenberg business in 1455. The chances of an edition of such an extensive text having been lost completely are small (although this remains a remote possibility). A great deal has been written about the first surviving edition, which has a colophon suggesting printing at Mainz in 1460, but which may have been printed over a long period, probably at least initially by Gutenberg, and appears to have been reprinted at least twice before around 1472 from the same setting of type. I have attempted to understand the, often conflicting, literature on this edition, and to draw my own conclusions, and hope to publish the results in these pages shortly. In the context of Schoeffer’s book-list, this first edition is usually assumed to be the one on offer, chiefly for its apparent date and associations with Mainz. Velke (1908, p. 229) notes the suggestion of Gottfried Zedler that Schoeffer bought the remaining stock of the edition after Gutenberg’s death in 1468.74 But this is predicated on the notion that there was only one impression, in or around 1460, which is not the case. I think it likely that the edition was first completed by Gutenberg after his dissenverance from Fust and Schoeffer, but that the later impressions were made by one

---

of his scion presses, probably in Strasbourg. It thus seems unlikely that Schoeffer would have obtained copies of this edition at any stage in its production. Unlike, but not impossible since, as I have mentioned, the Strasbourg printers may have been willing to co-operate with Schoeffer if there was sufficient financial motivation. Another possibility is that the first edition of the Catholicon was in preparation before the court case of 1455, and the judgement in that case (which we know only in part) included the provision that the edition should be divided between Fust and Gutenberg. The latter printed the sheets and then delivered part of the edition to his former partner, so that they both sold the book from around 1460. If this were so, one might reasonably expect that two other small works printed and reprinted in the same type would have been treated in the same way. These works are items [4] and [6] in the book-list, which may thus also have been in Fust and Schoeffer’s hands in their Catholicon-type editions in the early 1460s and these may be the editions represented in the book-list (although both of these small works were more likely to be out of print by the 1470s, when Schoeffer found, or printed, new editions).

All of this, while possible, seems a little unlikely to me, and I wonder if the more likely scenario is that Schoeffer wished to compete with the first edition of the Catholicon published first by Gutenberg and later by other ‘hostile’ presses, and with the two later Strasbourg editions, and so acquired copies of the only other edition then available, that printed by Gunther Zainer of Augsburg in 1469. Although Zainer had links with Mentelin, indeed probably learned the art of printing (and perhaps punch-cutting) from him at Strasbourg, he clearly operated independently, printing editions of some of the same books produced by his teacher, although whether this could said to be competition with Mentelin is uncertain, since he probably sold his books chiefly in the south-east of Germany and Swabia, while Mentelin’s market lay in the west and along the Rhine. In any case, Zainer may well have been willing to sell copies of his Catholicon to Schoeffer. It might be objected that Zainer’s edition has his name, and the name of his city, in the colophon so that anyone examining the book at the Sign of the Wild Man would perceive that this was not a Mainz book set in Mainz types. If this mattered at this stage of the sale – which it might or might not have done – the Augsburgian origins of the book would not have been immediately obvious. It is printed well, every bit as well as anything from Schoeffer’s press (and indeed rather better than the ‘1460’ edition), and the words

75. This edition is included in Zainer’s book-list of [ca 1471] (see note 8), using much the same form of words, ‘Johannem ianu-ensem in katholicon’ (see Coppens (2020) 6). It is not included in Zainer’s lists of [ca 1475] and 1476.
‘vindelica’ and ‘zainer’ are fairly well buried within the verse colophon. Even if a careful reader spotted the suggestion that the book had been completed in Augsburg by a master called Zainer, the types and overall quality could still be considered Mainzian. Another objection to this proposed solution might be the distance between Augsburg and Mainz, with no river-passage between the two (as there was, for example, between Cologne, Mainz and Strasbourg). Although what we would today call road-haulage was not especially easy in the fifteenth-century, it seems that books were transported in this way in significant numbers; if Schoeffer’s book-list was employed at Nuremberg, for example, then his stock had already travelled some 170 miles from Mainz by road, and was in fact nearer to Augsburg (which was around 90 miles distant). Thus it does not seem too fanciful to suggest that a number of copies of Zainer’s Catholicon were sent to Mainz, or perhaps directly to Nuremberg for sale there.

Item [20], the Historia Griseldis, is another short work which might once have existed in a Schoeffer edition, now lost. The more likely explanation is again that it was Zel’s editions, both undated but issued around 1469 or 1470, that were acquired by Schoeffer and included among his stock, as a companion volume to item [21], De duobus amantibus Guiscardo et Sigismunda, which he printed around the same date, or a little later. Indeed, these two (items [20] and [21]) have the appearance of a complementary pair, one printed by Zel, one by Schoeffer, and quite possibly sold by both.

CONCLUSIONS

While it is far from proven, I think it likely that the book-list shown in Fig. 1 was printed by Peter Schoeffer around 1475 and used to sell a selection of older stock for several years. It includes a number of editions which he did not print himself, and the most likely source for these was Cologne, the presses of Ulrich Zel and of a number of other, smaller operators.76 The only exception is the Catholicon, item [14], which probably derived from Gunther Zainer’s press at Augsburg. It seems likely that competition with Mentelin and Eggstein at Strasbourg was a major impulse for Schoeffer, both in selecting certain books to print and to buy-in from other printer-publishers, and in deciding what to include in the present list of available stock.

There are hints of ambiguity in the list. Not only can this be seen in the wording of the statement about the use of types of or at Mainz, but also in some of the book-titles, which could

76. In addition to those mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, items [11] VII, VIII and XIV represent editions from other ‘Cologne minors’, albeit not leading contenders as Schoeffer’s suppliers.
have been used to refer to more than one work or form of a work (in addition to item [11], the German-language edition of the *Bulla*, for example, might have been bundled in with the Latin under the title of item [10]). Indeed it is not impossible that, even in those cases where a Schoeffer edition of a work is known to have been printed before the putative date of the book-list, other editions may have been available from Schoeffer’s agent; items [4], [7] and [18] in the book-list are all known in contemporary or near-contemporary Cologne editions, which could—if we assume a flexible exchange of books between that city and Mainz, something that would have been facilitated by both cities lying along the Rhine—have been available alongside, or in place of, Schoeffer’s own.77
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