

SUMMARIES

THE ROYAL LIBRARY abbreviated: RL

ERIK FISCHER. *The Apocalypse as a Block-Book.*

In 1928 a Dutch block-book, *The Seven Planets*, was discovered in the library of Lerchenborg, a Danish manor-house, and was acquired for the Department of Prints and Drawings in the Royal Museum of Fine Arts in Copenhagen. It has been published in such a way that it must be presumed to be internationally well known (notes 2 and 3). But hardly anyone seems to be aware that for a very long time past a copy of the block-book edition of the Apocalypse has been in the possession of the RL although the book is mentioned in the printed catalogues of incunabula in the RL (n.4).

Already Bölling (n.4) described it correctly as a copy of Sotheby's edition III (n.10). It consists of 48 leaves, whereas a complete copy has 50. Using the numbering of Kristeller (n.8) the missing leaves are those containing pictures 1-2 and 17-18. In some places there are notes in a fifteenth-century hand; e.g. the erroneous indications of the colours of the horses in woodcuts 13-16 have been corrected. On the verso of the leaf containing cuts 9-10 is written a table of contents of the Apocalypse. The blocks are somewhat worn so that the copy must be described as a relatively late state of edition III.

During this century Paul Kristeller (n.8), Th.Musper (n.15), and Lamberto Donati (n.13) in particular have endeavoured to clear up the chronology of the various editions. Basing his views on an estimate of artistic quality Kristeller gives absolute priority to edition I/II, describing edition III as a mediocre copy of the former. Musper criticizes Kristeller's estimation and proposes another, according to which edition III is given priority and edition I/II is said to be the copy. After the present paper had been finished, Musper has published a work the inadequate evidence in which merely repeats what he has already adduced (H.Th.Musper, *Die Urausgaben der holländischen Apocalypse und Biblia Pauperum*. München, 1961). Moreover, he seems to be unacquainted with the important contributions of Donati and Gertrud Bing (n.12). Donati's article abounds in novel observations bearing the stamp of philological acumen. In a number of cases e.g. he is able to make probable the existence of lost states of the various editions. As regards chronology he is of opinion that edition III must be copied from a lost state of edition II. Even edition I must have existed in a state now lost. Without explicitly saying so he seems inclined to give priority to the latter. Two questions are to be considered here:

A. Can we identify the very first block-book edition of the Apocalypse? The following answers are possible: 1) Edition I/II represents the archetype. This is Kristeller's view. Donati clearly refutes this by calling attention to the mistakes of edition I/II that presuppose an earlier edition. – 2) Edition III is the archetype. This is Musper's view. As edition III shares all the mistakes of edition I/II even the former must rest on a previous edition. – 3) There must have been an edition preceding both editions I/II and III. Is this the archetype? This does not seem to admit of any proof.

B. What is the chronological sequence of the editions I/II and III? The following answers are possible: 1) Edition I/II has been copied from edition III, itself copied from an earlier edition now lost. Donati furnished conclusive evidence against this: in some places the cuts of edition III are narrower than those of edition I/II, *i.e.* it lacks details present in I/II which accordingly cannot be copied from III. – 2) Edition III has been copied from I/II, in its turn a copy of the postulated anterior edition. I/II and III have a number of errors in common. In addition to that III contains some errors not in I/II. Edition III contains all the errors of I/II plus some additional ones. This observation supports the view of Kristeller and Donati, *viz.* that III was copied from I/II. However, nobody knows anything about the appearance of the edition preceding I/II and III. Even that edition may have been copied from one still older, containing the errors common to I/II and III. – 3) Both editions, I/II and III, may derive independently from an older edition. To solve this problem we must find out whether there are things in III that cannot possibly be accounted for by I/II. As there are textual differences between I/II and III, explicable as revisions, such distinguishing features must be sought not in the wording of the text, but solely in the pictures themselves. Three wood-cutters with distinct styles were at work on edition I/II. A single cutter is responsible for edition III. The style of the latter is singularly close to that of the engraver of I/II called *Meister III* by Kristeller, whereas it does not very much resemble that of *Meister I* and *Meister II* of I/II. Actually we do not find the least trace in III of the rather more delicate and psychologizing manner of the *Meisters I* and *II*. This is the only trait of III that cannot derive from I/II. But is this observation a decisive piece of evidence? Probably not, as the engraver of III works in a characteristically heavy manner which is apt to blur the after all rather slight differences between the *Meisters I* and *II*.

By a sort of proof by elimination only possibility number 2 remains: edition III is based on edition I/II. And indeed this view is strongly supported by such perspicacious scholars as Kristeller and Donati, although they cannot be said to have adduced absolutely conclusive arguments. But after all, at the present stage of investigation it is the only view that cannot be refuted.

This argumentation, however, rests upon Donati's suggestion that neither the text nor the framing of the text but only the pictorial representations contain the clue to the relative chronology of the various editions. But if the discussion could be extended to include the framings of the text other conclusions might be arrived at. After all these framings could be considered the work of the draughtsman and not of the scribe. A close examination of the framings as shown in our figs. 2 to 5

(p. 28 to 35) might then suggest the possibility of editions I/II and III being relatively independent copies after an unknown but already corrupt earlier edition.

There remain a few further observations. In the first place the editions treated here show strong traces of deriving from the very same workshop. The close affinity between *Meister III* of edition I/II and the engraver of edition III suggests as much, even though they are not identical. For when the engraver of edition III is copying *Meister III* the result almost invariably is a certain coarsening. It seems more natural to suppose that the artist of edition III is a pupil of *Meister III*, who with hand and eye trained by the latter is sedulously imitating his teacher, freely adapting the manner of the more delicate *Meisters I* and *II* in the spirit of his master.

The second point concerns the dating of the block-books. Judging from its style the Apocalypse belongs to the earliest group of woodcuts. The stylization of the folds of the dresses points decidedly to the period about 1420-30, even allowing for the considerable uncertainty that mars our actual knowledge of the earliest history of this art. However, the copy of edition III in the RL shows a characteristic watermark (p. 25 left), that has been dated ab. 1469-78 (n. 17). Even the only known copy of edition I, in the John Rylands Library in Manchester, has watermarks representing two different types (p. 25, centre and right) (n. 18), between them indicating a date in the 1450's.

These dates are appreciably later than those generally accepted for the Apocalypse. It is conceivable that the copies available to us may be late impressions pulled from worn blocks, as is demonstrably the case with regard to the copy in the RL. But then the Manchester Apocalypse is a copy of the oldest known block-book Apocalypse, even in its early state. Between the date indicated by stylistic considerations and the oldest surviving copy there is thus a chronological gap of between twenty and forty years. The most likely explanation of this fact seems to be that there were not one but several editions now lost between the original edition and the Manchester copy of edition I. A good deal of the clumsiness, coarseness, and mistakes to be found in the extant editions may thus be the result of a corruption that, passing through several stages, has debased the presumably higher quality of a postulated original edition.

The editions and states of the Apocalypse were probably produced during most of the fifteenth century. The old iconographical type reaches from thirteenth-century manuscripts to fifteenth-century block-books. Not till the appearance of illustrated printed Bibles, such as the Cologne Bible of 1480, does an important iconographical revision take place and new pictorial types arise, culminating in 1498 when the young Albrecht Dürer issues his version of the Apocalypse. Dürer gives to his work the outward form of a sort of block-book. Only then were the old block-books superseded.

As a supplement to the article are given five illustrations showing the presentation of the same subject in MS lat. 19 in the John Rylands Library and in the block-book editions II, III, IV, and VI. The appended text calls attention to some questions of detail relevant to a discussion of the chronology and interdependence of the block-books.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Ronald Hall, Keeper of Printed Books, for his kind help during my studies in the John Rylands Library, Manchester.

HELGE TOLDBERG. *What is the Date of the First Print in Danish? Some Remarks on the Printing History of the Danish Metrical Chronicle.*

Among the incunabula printed in Denmark only the D.M.C. (Hain No. 5936), printed in 1495 by Gotfred van Ghemen, is in the vernacular; but the printer seems to have prepared a Danish "Floris and Blancheflur" and a slightly different version of the D.M.C. shortly after arriving from Holland in 1489. Probably neither was completed, as only their first and second sheets respectively are preserved, in both cases detached from the bindings of other works. The main evidence for an early date is a woodcut (v. p. 61) illustrating a section omitted in the Danish "Floris", but kept in the Dutch version. — Notes in Latin on the detached sheet of the D.M.C. (v. p. 67) may be compilations for a nominalist primer of logic, similar to some Latin grammars printed by Ghemen.

ERIK DAL. *New Incunabula in the Royal Library IV.*

In continuation of the supplements to the catalogue of incunabula in the RL (Fund og Forskning 1955, pp. 107–112, and 1956, pp. 79–90) the article gives a list of the accessions to the collection during the years 1956–61.

MOGENS BRONDSTED. *An Unknown Poem by Tycho Brahe.*

In the 1620's a Latin translation of Ptolemæus' *Almagest* was made by G.L. Frobenius, an astronomer and publisher in Hamburg and a great-nephew of Joh. Froben, the Basel printer; his correspondence relevant to this with the Dutch philologist Heinsius is preserved in the RL. At a later date he attempted to gain a subsidy for the publication of his work from the Danish king Christian IV by printing a sample sheet, the only known copy of which is in the Kungl. Bibliotek in Stockholm. The sheet is of particular interest because it contains a hitherto unknown Latin laudatory poem to Ptolemæus by the Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe, written in 1584 in Uraniborg where Frobenius had been a student in his youth.

ERIK IVERSEN. *Theodor Petraeus and the Oriental studies of the 17th century.*

In the history of the 17th century's oriental philology the name of Theodor Petraeus has generally been overlooked and forgotten. This is to a certain extent excusable and understandable as his published works are few and of no outstanding importance, but it is an injustice in so far as his importance for the development of the oriental studies cannot be judged solely from his publications. The extensive collection of oriental manuscripts which he brought home from his travels, still forms the nucleus of the oriental department of the Berlin State Library and has proved an inexhaustible source of working material. His learning, unusual even for his time, made him an acknowledged authority on Turkish, Persian, Ethiopian, Armenian, Coptic, and Modern

Greek, and he was able to make original contributions to the study of most of these languages, while pioneering Coptic and Greek. The acquisition of an oriental printing press made him a competent printer, and with his untiring energy and perseverance and his widespread connections amongst the period's influential patrons he was able to exert considerable influence on the career and the works of many young and obscure colleagues, whom he befriended and assisted, often with remarkable unselfishness. Owing to a deplorable lack of authentic material, the only available source for the biography of Petrus was for almost a century an article by Moller in his *Cimbria Literata* from 1744, some of the most blatant mistakes of which were corrected by Wilhelm Thomsen in the *Dictionary of Danish Biography* (1899), but Rahlfs' extensive study "*Nissel und Petrus, ihre äthiopischen Textausgaben und Typen*", was the first serious attempt at a modern biography, and it has remained the natural foundation upon which all subsequent studies must be based. However, renewed investigations have shown that a considerable amount of unknown and unnoticed material concerning Petrus is still to be found in various European archives and libraries, especially in the RL. Contrary to all expectations we find here not only oriental manuscripts from Petrus' collections, but a whole corpus of no less than 6 volumes of more than 2000 pages, with his personal papers, manuscripts, and notes, dating from about 1654 to 1671. One volume contains a Turkish manuscript with a history of Soliman, together with translations, notes and commentaries, and another notes on Coptic texts. A third volume contains P.'s original copy of the Ethiopian version of the minor prophets, on which all of Nisselius' and Petrus' Ethiopian publications are based, and the remaining volumes contain a profusion of notes, drafts, and letters providing useful information about his acquaintances and connections of all nationalities, and including for instance Cornelius Tromp, Nicolaus Tulp, the brothers Laurens and Gerhard de Geer, the "Great Elector" Frederick William of Brandenburg, who appointed P. professor at the University in Königsberg, and several others. From other sources we learn that he had similar offers from Ferdinand II, Grand Duke of Tuscany, but his scholarly independence and reluctance to accept any appointment which might interfere with his studies, made him decline all offers, and prefer an uncertain and miserable existence in Leiden, where he did odd jobs for the University, and was under consideration as a successor to Golius. In England his planned edition of the Coptic Psalter was recommended by the entire polyglot circle: Brian Walton, Thomas Barlow, Edward Pococke, and Theodore Haak, and the first Coptic text printed in England was his sample of the first psalm, printed by Thomas Roycroft in 1659, of which the only known copy is in the Sion Library in London. In Rome and Amsterdam are scattered remnants of his correspondence with Athanasius Kircher and Levin Warner, and in Germany he was closely, if not always amicably, associated with the circle of Hiob Ludolf, whose correspondence with Moller about Petrus is also in the RL, together with Petrus' annotated manuscript of the first psalm in Coptic, with phonetic transcription, and a calligraphic manuscript of the first Surah of the Koran in Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, as a sample of a planned edition of a polyglot Koran. Among the library's other manuscripts is also a copy of a Pilgrim's testimonium issued for

Petraeus during his stay in Jerusalem, and enumerating the various places he visited in Palestine, and in the unpublished diary of Ole Borch, the Danish physician, we find a report of Petraeus' personal account of his journey. In addition the Danish Record Office contains various references to him, so that we are faced with a considerable amount of new material. It is the aim of the article to establish its significance for our knowledge of Petraeus.

HERTHA KIRKETERP-MØLLER. *Nadir Shah, Christian VII, and William Jones.*

From an expedition to the Orient sent out by the Danish king, the celebrated geographer Carsten Niebuhr brought home in 1767 a number of oriental manuscripts, now kept in the RL. Among these is an account of the history of Nadir Shah, composed in Persian 1756-57 by Mohammed Mahdi, a Civil Servant of Nadir Shah (Cod. Pers. LXII). King Christian VII desired to have the manuscript translated into French, and in 1768 the Duke of Grafton put the Danish Ambassador in London into touch with a young Oxford undergraduate, William Jones, later on a famous orientalist, but at the time a private tutor with Earl Spencer at Althorp in Northamptonshire. Although reluctantly Jones undertook the difficult task, finishing it in about a year. The translation was published in London in 1770, being in its turn translated into English and German; both versions were printed in 1773. The history of the original MS and of the translations is illuminated by documents in the Danish Record Office and by the correspondence of Jones preserved *i.a.* in the archives at Althorp. The reward for Jones's work amounted to nothing more than a diploma as a member of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, and a Latin letter of recommendation for the young scholar from Christian VII to George III, published by the English press. This very simple way of settling a debt of gratitude gave occasion for censure in England, but Jones did not complain although he had every reason to consider himself meanly treated. In a letter to a friend he had stated in advance "that I neither wished for nor valued money, but was anxious only for some honorary mark of his (the King's) approbation", and on the preliminary pages of the English translation the King's letter was printed together with his own letter of thanks to the Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs for the honours received.

P. M. MITCHELL. *Utrykte Herderiana i København.*

Som en af ophavsmændene til den nye litterære strømning der udgår fra Tyskland efter 1770, har Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) med sit æstetiske og filosofiske forfatterskab haft stor betydning ogsaa for den danske litteratur. Til belysning af de personlige forbindelser han desuden har haft i Danmark, er der i nærværende afhandling fremdraget forskelligt utrykt fra Kgl. Bibl.s håndskriftsamling. Indledningsvis beskrives to skriftstykker der posthumt er kommet berømte danske digtere ihænde, H. C. Andersen og Oehlenschläger, der begge i 1840'erne har fået dem til deres auto-

grafsamling af tyske beundrerinder. Andersens blad er originalmanuskriptet til digtet „Vereinigung der Lebensalter“. Det er en gave fra Herders datter Luise Stichling under Andersens besøg i Weimar 1846, og gaven er et vidnesbyrd om hvor højt Andersen har været estimeret, da familien ellers omhyggeligt har holdt alle Herders manuskripter samlet. Her er derfor et af de undtagelsestilfælde hvor Suphan & Redlichs standardudgave (1887-1913) har savnet et originalmanuskript, hvad der i dette tilfælde ikke er uden betydning. Bladet var klæbet ind i Andersens stambog men er nu løsgjort så også digtets to sidste strofer på bagsiden er kommet for en dag; foruden andre, mindre rettelser ses her sidste strofe i en hidtil ukendt form hvor Herder har foretaget gennemgribende ændringer til den endelige redaktion. Denne frigjorte side har yderligere forneden en påskrift af Luise hvori hun overfor Andersen udtrykker sin taknemlighed både for hans „dybe, sarte digtninge“ og for hans „mundtlige foredrags elskværdige ejendommelighed“. Bladet er facsimileret ovf. s. 129 og 130.

Også Oehlenschlägers Herder-autograf er ledsaget af en taksigelse af samme art. På det omslag hvori brevet er overrakt ham, har den unavngivne beundrerinde takket den danske digter – i hvem hun ser en åndsfrænde af Herder – for „hans godhed“ der rimeligvis har bestået i en oplæsning af egne værker ved en privat soiré. Gennem våbnet i omslagets segl har giverinden kunnet identificeres som prinsesse Adelheid af Glücksburg (1821-99; gift 1841 med Christian IX.s bror, prins Friedrich) født prinsesse af Schaumburg-Lippe, det fyrstehus hvis hofpræst Herder blev 1771. Brevet der er skrevet samme år kort efter tiltrædelsen, indeholder nogle anmodninger til landsherren (giverindens farfar) og lader allerede ane den utilfredshed med forholdene, som få år efter fik Herder til at foretrække Weimar for Bückeburg.

Et mangeårigt hjerteligt venskab forbandt Herder og hans hustru Caroline med den teologiske professor Frederik Münter (senere Sjællands biskop) og hans søster Friederike Brun som begge gentagne gange besøgte familien i Weimar, den ene gang (1782) sammen med deres forældre. Om dette venskab vidner, foruden Friederikes stambog i Rigsarkivet, både breve og andre optegnelser i Kgl. Bibl. Herfra kan det tidligere ufuldstændige aftryk af Herderske breve til Münter (Euphorion 1908) suppleres med nogle partier som udgiveren, Louis Bobé, har oversprunget; de viser bl.a. Herders interesse for Münters virksomhed. Desuden gengives utrykte fællesbreve fra ægteparret til Friederike. I et brev fra 1782 udbeder Herder sig de danske melodier hun har spillet under sit første besøg, og afskrift med oversættelse af de viser som de to søskende har foredraget i Wielands nærværelse. I en kommentar til brevet har Friederike mange år efter genopfrisket sine erindringer om dette samvær og heri suppleret sine udførlige, ungdommeligt begejstrede dagbogsoptegnelser fra 1782, der ligeledes aftrykkes. I et brev fra 1795 ytrer Herder bl.a. i de stærkeste udtryk sin taknemlighed over at Friederikes mand storkøbmanden Constantin Brun har skaffet sønnen Wilhelm Herder en stilling i Hamburg, og fortæller desuden om den skræk på vennernes vegne som efterretningen om Københavns brand har hensat ham i. Af Friederikes kommentar får man den oplysning at Herders digt „Liebe und Freundschaft“, et af hans få lejlighedsdigte hvis anledning og årstal hidtil har været ukendt for Herder-forskningen, er skrevet til Friederike i dette år som tak for en spaserestok hun har sendt ham; i

denne anledning indeholder brevet ligeledes en „takke-ovation“ på prosa. Samme år, 1795, har Friederike for anden gang besøgt Herders, og mindet om denne oplevelse afføder nu i kommentaren både kloge og smukke ord til karakteristik af Herders personlighed. Dennes sidste brev (1796) angår både litterære og personlige emner (Friederikes digte i Wielands *Teutscher Merkur*, Herders i Schillers *Musen-Almanach*; fornyede taksigelser på Wilhelms vegne) og ender med en advarsel mod Kantianismen. Friederikes kommentar fortæller om Herders syn på Kant og om reaktionen hos de tyske kunstnere i Rom da kunsthistorikeren Fernow holdt forelæsninger for dem om Kants *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* og de deraf flydende kunstteorier. I anmærkningerne ovf. s. 146 er trykt et brev fra 1805 til Friederike fra Caroline der nu er enke og som takker for den hjælpsomhed hvormed Friederike og Münster har samlet københavnske abonnenter på den store udgave af Herders samlede skrifter (1805 ff.); resultatet var imponerende: 69 forudbestillinger mod 86 i Berlin og kun 29 i Leipzig.

I Kgl. Bibl. findes også et brev (1784) fra Herder til den teologiske professor, senere overbibliotekar ved Kgl. Bibl., D.G. Moldenhawer, hvem han beder om en oplysning til brug for en Afrika-rejse som hans ven grev August v. Einsiedel ville foretage.

Endelig omtales et løst blad af en ukendt stambog hvor Herder (1779?) har indført et Martial-citat, og afhandlingen slutter med nogle bemærkninger om forholdet mellem Herder og historikeren og bogsamlere P.F. Suhm. I en note anføres fra auktionskatalogen over Herders efterladte bogsamling (1804) en række værker som utvivlsomt er gaver fra Suhm, og hertil føjes en liste over de bøger i samme katalog som viser Herders interesse for og forbindelse med Danmark.

H. TOPSØE-JENSEN. *From a Poet's Workshop. H.C. Andersen's Notebooks.* A discussion of H.C. Andersen's notebooks in the Collin Collection of Manuscripts in the RL. To be concluded in the next issue of *Fund og Forskning* where a summary of both parts of the article will be printed.