The Oxford University Press, a publishing and printing office which has served the university since the second half of the 17th century, set up its own museum in 1955. Unfortunately we now have to use the past tense, for this Typographical Museum at the Oxford University Press, which Harry Carter reported on in the 1958 Gutenberg-Jahrbuch, no longer exists.

The nucleus of the museum consisted of a large collection of punches and matrices which the OUP acquired in the second half of the 17th century. They included the famous Fell types, which were purchased by Bishop John Fell, mostly in the Netherlands, and which he donated to the University Press. On special occasions there were demonstrations of casting from these matrices, both manually (in an old hand mould) and mechanically (in an early 20th-century caster). The subsequent operations on the cast letter were also demonstrated, such as rubbing, dressing and reducing the type. Three old compositor’s frames still survive: one is at the Press in Oxford, and the other two are in London (Science Museum and St. Bride Printing Library). They date from 1668–9, and are the oldest in the world. The associated type cases are probably of a slightly later date, but even so they must be among the oldest which survived. The OUP also preserves one of Stanhope’s more obscure inventions: a type case in which the boxes are set on a slant for easier access to the type (in practice the type tended to tumble out). There is a Stanhope press, but a wooden printing press, which was not actually built for the OUP but was acquired at the end of the 19th century, is at the moment set up in the Bodleian Library. It is of the Blaeu type, and dates from the late 18th or early 19th century. Many readers will have seen it in 1963 at the major exhibition, Printing and the mind of man.

That is the position of the Typographical Museum at the time of writing, but there are hopes that it will be reopened at some future date.

It is my opinion, incidentally, that government and industry should do all they can to see to it that before long a Dutch printing museum opens its doors.

(to be continued)

Frans A. Janssen

THE JOHANNES VAN PADDENBURGH EDITION (UTRECHT 1684) OF BUNYAN’S EENS CHRISTENS REYSE REDISCOVERED

In the present writer’s article on the textual history of the three earliest editions in Dutch of The Pilgrim’s Progress reference was made to a slightly later edition of which no copy was known to have survived at the time.1 Recently the Free University Library in Amsterdam acquired a copy of this edition, which was published in 1684 by the Utrecht bookseller Johannes van Paddenburgh.2

Establishing the relations between this edition, another Utrecht edition published in the same year by Juriaen van Poolsum,3 and the three editions referred to above, which were issued by the Amsterdam bookseller Johannes Boekholt between 1682 and 1684, might

2 So the period of his activity, given as 1653–82 by J.A. Gruys and C. de Wolf in Thesaurus Nederlandse Boekdrukkers en Boekverkopers tot 1700 (Nieuwkoop 1980), should at any rate be extended by two years.
3 See my 1975 article, p. 325.
shed some additional light on the early reception of Bunyan's work in the Netherlands. That the edition appearing under the Van Paddenburgh imprint is a faithful reprint of Boekholt's second edition (which I called edition B), even retaining most of its errors, may easily be seen by a comparison of the collations:

**Edition B**

12°: A–O, [S7 (A, E, K, N6, G6, — A1, A2, M6, O5, with A4 wrongly signed as •4, A6 as •6, D3 as C3, and D4 as B4) signed]; 168 leaves, pp. [20] 21–336.


**Johannes van Paddenburgh's edition**


Note: pages 84, 120, 191, 202, 210, 213, 215, 261, and 293 wrongly numbered as pages 8, 102, 193, 102, 110, 113, 115, 265, and 295.

**Juriaen van Poolsum's edition is collated thus:**


Note: pages 85 and 103 wrongly numbered as 83 and 113.

The fact that two Utrecht editions appeared in the same year is probably indicative of its being in rather great demand there at the time. The two editions vary considerably in length. From p. 261 onwards much smaller type is used in Van Poolsum's edition with the obvious intent of squeezing the rest of the text into the remainder of gathering L and into gathering M. In view of this it turned out to be necessary to reduce the size of type once more (p. 287 from the second line onwards) and to print the concluding verse in double columns and without any space between its thirteen stanzas.

That D is much shorter and consequently cheaper possibly indicates that it appeared later in 1684 than did Van Paddenburgh's edition. Potentially, then, the latter could be the source text of D. Actually, this is not so; E, for instance, has not got the marginal note (p. 70) that is there in D (p. 62: Hy leyd hem in een Cierlyck Paleys).

The eleven woodcuts in E can be traced back to the eleven copper engravings in Boekholt's edition B. It stands to reason that the cheaper edition (D) could not afford to be less attractive by leaving out the illustrations, which are nearly identical in the two Utrecht editions. There are slight differences, which together with the initials in two woodcuts in E (p. 101: MV; p. 194: V) show that the illustrations in D and E were produced independently of each other. But there is more to it. Surprisingly, D contains a twelfth woodcut (p. 49). This is only paralleled by an engraving on p. 36 of Boekholt's third edition (which I called edition C). It cannot be inferred from this that D was entirely printed from that edition, for on p. 23 D features an illustration which is not found in C, but which does occur in Boekholt's first (which I called edition A) and second editions.

This means that as to the ancestry of D the following options are still open: Boekholt's editions A, B, and C or one or more unknown editions. Like E, Boekholt A must be discarded. Again one example must suffice. Edition A has got 'voetsporen' (sig. *6r.), whereas in D, as in B and C, we read 'voorsporen' (sig. A5r.). The occurrence of the illustrations on p. 23 and on p. 49 in D points to a possible composite source text consisting of B and C.

The provenance of one or more hypothesized unknown editions can hardly be more than guesswork. Van Poolsum himself may have been involved, for he displayed definite com-