

he put in the colophon and what he left out. There were no rules. It will be observed that my three examples all come from the first quarter of the sixteenth century and all come from Italian books. I have not yet found a parallel case in the incunable period; nor have I looked for examples of the use of 'facere' in the colophons of books printed outside Italy; but I have by chance seen the verb 'formavit' once used in the same position.<sup>5</sup>

# OBSERVATIONS ON THE 1562 EDITIONS OF CARDINAL REGINALD POLE'S *DE CONCILIO* AND *REFORMATIO ANGLIAE*

by

CURT F. BÜHLER

IN 1562, FOUR YEARS after the death of Reginald Pole, four editions<sup>1</sup> of the *De concilio* and of the *Reformatio Angliae* by the Cardinal were put in print by three presses. Although it should have been entirely self-evident which editions were the first printings of both tracts, contrary views have, from time to time, been set forth. The account given in the *Dictionary of National Biography*<sup>2</sup> states only that the *De concilio* "appeared in Venice in 1562," while Herzog-Hauck<sup>3</sup> claims that the Dillingen edition is the *editio princeps*. In accordance with the British Museum's cataloguing rules,<sup>4</sup> the Venice edition of this tract precedes the Roman one in its *Short-Title*

5. The *Pronosticon* of Jacobus Petramellarius was printed at Bologna in 1536 with the colophon 'Ioannes Baptista Phaellus Bononiae formavit'. In this case we know that Faelli owned his own press, so that 'formavit' is probably equivalent to 'impressit'.

1. The *De concilio* and the *Reformatio Angliae* are here treated as a unit, though the Roman editions were so printed that they could be sold either separately or together. In the other two editions, the two tracts form a single book with continuous pagination. The editions and their sigla are:

- Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1562  
— R1 (for both texts)
- Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1562  
— R2 (for both texts)
- Venice: Giordano Ziletti, 1562  
— V

Dillingen: Sebald Mayer, 1562

— D

See also Antoine Augustin Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde* (1834), pp. 185-186, and Otto Bucher, *Bibliographie der deutschen Drucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts: I, Dillingen* (1960), pp. 96-97, no. 158.

2. *DNB*, XLVI, 45.

3. Johann Jakob Herzog and Albert Hauck, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (1896-1913), XV, 504, lists the Dillingen edition first.

4. See the entries in the *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in Italy and of Italian Books Printed in other Countries from 1465 to 1600 now in the British Museum* (1958), pp. 529-530.

*Catalogue*.<sup>5</sup> But this arrangement is due solely to the fact that the Venetian edition is a collected one of *opuscula*<sup>6</sup> and thus is listed before the separate printings of these treatises.

It is unequivocally certain that the Roman edition of the *De concilio*, dated 1562 and with ten lines of *errata*, represents the first appearance in print of this tract.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, the Roman printing of the *Reformatio Angliae*, also dated 1562 and with a single line of *errata*, is certainly the first edition of that work.<sup>8</sup> This may be predicated on the fact that all four of the editions of the *De concilio* contain the preface by Paulus Manutius. It seems absolutely inconceivable that any printer in Venice or Dillingen could have obtained the text of this preface *before* Paolo had printed it himself. The first edition of the *De concilio* having been established through this and other evidence, as set forth in the study cited in note 7, a similar line of argument in determining priority can be applied to the *Reformatio Angliae*,<sup>9</sup> with the result noted above.

That the four editions are somehow related is also indicated by an omission common to all four. The *De concilio* consists of 86 questions and responses — but there is no Quaestio XXXIX in any of them. However, the first Roman edition and the two non-Roman ones restore the count by repeating the heading Quaestio XLI. The second Rome edition does not repeat no. XLI, so that thereafter there is always a numerical gap between it and the other three, this edition ending with Quaestio LXXXVII where the others have Quaestio LXXXVI. It can be argued, I think, that if either the V or D editions had used the second Roman printing as their copy, the numbering would have agreed with that edition. This suggests that V and D were either set up from R<sup>1</sup> or that one was set from R<sup>1</sup> and that the other copied this.<sup>10</sup>

That D was set from R<sup>1</sup> can further be shown by a number of misprints which these editions have in common.<sup>11</sup> In R<sup>1</sup> (25.b.7), one finds the phrase: "ut ad minutissimæ quæque legis obseruanda iidem promptos se

5. This has led to the remark: "the British Museum Catalogue lists it in the first place" (William Salloch, *Catalogue* 235 [1966], no. 1095).

6. It includes the *De concilio*, *De baptismo Constantini*, and *Reformatio Angliae*. In R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> the *De baptismo Constantini* is printed with the *De concilio*.

7. For further remarks on these Roman editions, see my "Paulus Manutius and his first Roman Printings," *PBSA*, 46 (1952), 209-214.

8. The *errata* of R<sup>1</sup> were incorporated in R<sup>2</sup>.

9. See Bühler, pp. 213-214.

10. In the *De baptismo Constantini*, the *errata* of R<sup>1</sup> suggests that (in 60.b.23) "semper professus" should be corrected to read "semper est professus." However, R<sup>2</sup> prints "semper professus est." Since both V and D follow the correction as in R<sup>1</sup>, it may be assumed that they did not use R<sup>2</sup> as their copy.

11. In 59.a.13, R<sup>1</sup> has been altered, by means of pen and ink, so that "conciliorum" reads "consiliorum." D follows uncorrected R<sup>1</sup>, while R<sup>2</sup> and V adopt the new reading of R<sup>1</sup>.

f  
S  
146

ostenderint." With this D agrees. However, the third word should read "minutissima" as modifying "obseruanda" and both R<sup>2</sup> and V have the correct form. This is further evidence to suggest that D was set from R<sup>1</sup>.<sup>12</sup> Again, in R<sup>1</sup> (32.a.19/21), the text reads "habuit in ea ciuitate" which V also prints (52.a.2), though the *errata* emends to the plural "habuerunt." R<sup>2</sup>, at the same place, offers "habuerunt in ciuitate" while D has the text of R<sup>1</sup> as corrected by the *errata* ("habuerunt in ea ciuitate"). Clearly, it is quite certain that V was set from R<sup>1</sup>, and it is highly probable that D was here following the corrected R<sup>1</sup> rather than R<sup>2</sup>, though in certain other instances (as will be shown) D follows uncorrected R<sup>1</sup>. The examples cited here demonstrate, of course, the independence of D and V from one another.

Similar arguments can be advanced in the case of the several editions of the *Reformatio Angliae*. In R<sup>1</sup> (6.b.13), the text reads: "in uniuersum orbem terræ primatum." Here the *errata* substitutes "tenere primatum" for "terræ primatum." R<sup>2</sup> prints the corrected text and V (100.b.7) concurs in this reading. But D (folio 184 verso) preserves the erroneous text of R<sup>1</sup>. Since D could hardly have arrived at this misreading by coincidence, it follows that D must have used R<sup>1</sup> as a *Vorlage*. Again, in 18.b.24, R<sup>1</sup> has an erasure after the ampersand in the sequence "purgati, & [ ] qua." The compositor of R<sup>2</sup> was apparently unaware of this correction and set the original, uncorrected text of R<sup>1</sup>: "purgati; & ea, qua." But both D and V print the corrected text of R<sup>1</sup>, not that of R<sup>2</sup>.

What, then, are the results of this investigation? That R<sup>1</sup> of both the *De concilio* and of the *Reformatio Angliae* represent the first printings of these texts can hardly be questioned. D and V, in turn, are independent of one another<sup>13</sup> — and both of them, together with R<sup>2</sup>, derive from R<sup>1</sup>. Which of these is the second edition cannot be determined from internal evidence, and no chronological details are available to us to aid in finding the answer. Probably the Dillingen edition is the last of these four — an opinion largely based, and perhaps too presumptively, on the remoteness of the German town from Venice and Rome. But whether Ziletti issued his Venetian "piracy" before or after Paulus Manutius got around to reprinting his *editio princeps* must remain a matter of speculation until further evidence comes to hand.

12. R<sup>1</sup> (60.b.11) corrects "acta" to read "actae" by an ink emendation. Again D follows the original reading of R<sup>1</sup>, while R<sup>2</sup> and V both make the correction. See Bühler, p. 212.

13. By following the erasure in R<sup>1</sup> of the "n" in "ante," R<sup>2</sup> and D read (59.b.15) "iam a te dictum est." V, however, preserves the uncorrected text of R<sup>1</sup>; see Bühler, p. 212, no. 11. Since V sometimes accepts the corrections and at other times prints the original text where D does the direct

opposite, it seems certain that D and V must be quite independent of one another. Sometimes V differs from the three other texts. Thus, in 13.b.1 in the *De concilio*, R<sup>1</sup> has "cum eum principium" in common with R<sup>2</sup> and D — but V omits "eum." In 2.a.15 of R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> (and so in D), we read: "legatis sunt communes" but V omits the "sunt." Similarly, in the *Reformatio Angliae*, R<sup>1</sup> (26.b.21) in common with R<sup>2</sup> and D has "an eorum bona" where V (127.a.14) alone prints "an uerò bona."