

Priscian, Sallust, Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. From Brescia came *Lucretius*, from Vicenza, *Claudian*; Ferrara and Naples gave birth to *Martial* and *Seneca*. In Germany, France, and the Low Countries, on the other hand, the progress at first was slow. Few classics were printed out of Italy before 1480, or, indeed, until the last ten years of that century. The *De Officiis* of Cicero, it is true, had appeared at Mentz in 1465,—the first portion of any classical work committed to the press, unless precedence is given to the *De Oratore* of Sweynheim and Pannartz at Subiaco. But with that exception the first impressions of *Terence* and *Valerius Maximus* at Strasburg, and of *Sallust*, and, perhaps, *Florus* at Paris, are all that Cisalpine presses contributed of that kind within the period under review. The first appearance of *Velleius Paterculus* at Basel and of *Anacreon* and *Menander* at Paris was not until the next century was well advanced. In Spain the first classical book was a *Sallust* of 1475. In England, the earliest was a *Terence*, printed by Pynson in 1497; but, besides that, *Virgil, Sallust*, and Cicero's *Offices*, together with two Greek books, were the only classics published down to 1540. A complete edition of *Cicero*, printed in 1585 at London, was the chief Latin work up to that date. A neat edition of Homer's *Iliad* appeared in 1591, and the first impression of *Herodotus* in this country came out in the same year at Cambridge. Our early printers were content with French translations for their versions and abridgments; and Gavin Douglas, in the preface to his translation of *Virgil*, records his indignation at the injustice done to the "divine poet" by the second-hand translation of Caxton.

Most of the Latin classics had appeared in print before the art was employed on any Greek author. This was due rather to the want of adequate editorship than to any indifference to Greek in Italy; for the taste for that language had steadily increased since the arrival of the learned Greeks from Constantinople, and the want of printed editions became general before the close of the 15th century. To Aldus belongs the glory of ministering to that desire, by publishing, in quick succession and with singular beauty and correctness, almost all the principal authors in that tongue. Beginning in 1494 with Musæus's *Hero and Leander*, he printed before 1516, the year of his death, upwards of sixty considerable works in Greek literature. The list includes the first impressions of *Aristophanes, Herodotus, Theocritus, Sophocles, Thucydides, Euripides, Demosthenes, Pindar, and Plato*. The *editio princeps* of Aristotle is the finest of his productions. Himself, in several cases, editor as well as printer, he had the assistance of the most learned scholars of the day; and the handy size of his octavos, which he substituted for the more cumbersome quartos after his removal from Venice, added to the popularity of his editions. Within two years after Aldus commenced his labours, Greek printing began at Florence with the works of Callimachus,¹ Apollonius Rhodius, and Lucian; at Rome, however, the earliest work was the *Pindar* of Calliergus in 1515.² At Paris the first Greek press of importance was established in 1507 by Gourmont, but the days of its chief celebrity date from his successors Colines and Stephens. Aldus, though the most prolific, was not the earliest Greek printer. The first entire work in that language was the *Grammar* of Constantine Lascaris, printed by Zarot at Milan in 1476. Homer's *Batrachomyomachia* was the earliest printed Greek classic; his complete works first appeared in the

¹ This *editio princeps* is among the scarcest of Greek capital letter productions.

² Roscoe's *Leo X.*, ii. 257-8. Greek types, according to Panzer, had first been used in a treatise of Jerome, printed at Rome in 1468; and detached passages are found in some of the first copies of Latin authors.

Florence *Homer* of 1488, a volume which, Gibbon observes, "displays all the luxury of the typographical art." Besides these works, the *Orations* of Isocrates had appeared in 1493. Aldus has been unduly eulogized by his biographer, M. Renouard,³ who has represented him as having given an entirely new direction to the art of printing, and indeed to the literary taste of Europe. His taste for Greek he had imbibed from the age: he saw that there was a great and growing want of Greek books, and his peculiar praise lies in this, that he applied himself to supply it with much more constancy and skill and with much more learning than any other printer of that period. His preface to Aristotle's *Organon*, published in 1595, amply recognizes the demand for Greek books. "Those," he says, "who cultivate letters must be supplied with books necessary for that purpose; and till this supply is obtained I shall not be at rest."⁴

The absolute rarity of the first editions of the classics it is difficult to determine with precision. They have been much prized by collectors, especially during last century, though their price has fluctuated considerably at different times. The date of some, as for instance, of *Juvenal, Q. Curtius*, and *Horace*, is conjectural; and the last-named is one of four classics,—*Lucan, Plutarch*, and *Florus* being the other three,—of which the printer is unknown. The Naples edition of *Horace* of 1474 is called by Dibdin⁵ the "rarest classical volume in the world," and it was chiefly to possess this book that Earl Spencer bought the famous library of the duke of Cassano. Of the first edition of *Lucretius* only two copies are believed to exist; and not one in its integrity of Azzoguidi's *editio princeps* of Ovid. On the other hand, there are several classical authors, of whom the second and even later impressions are far the most valuable and scarce. The intrinsic merit of the *editiones principes* of the classics is too unequal to admit of any general description. Their chief value, in a literary sense, consists in the security afforded by printing against the further progress of transcriptional error; but it would be a great mistake to imagine that the text was then finally established. Maittaire gives precedence to their authority as equivalent to that of the MSS. from which they were taken, but the question obviously turns on the character of those MSS. themselves. Later discoveries and the progress of critical research confirm the testimony of many of the first editors, in their prefaces,⁶ regarding the insufficiency and mutilated character of their materials. Thus Grævius observes of the celebrated *editio princeps* of Cicero's *De Officiis* by Fust, that it was printed from a very inaccurate manuscript. Schelhorn, in his *Amenitatis Literaria*, insists, with good reason, on the want of collation among the first editors. Frequently the first manuscript that offered itself was hastily committed to the press, in order to take advantage of the recent discovery; and fragments of different manuscripts were patched together to form *Opera Omnia* editions, without regard to the relative authority of their contents. On the other hand there are first editions which represent a single lost archetype, and whose value, therefore, cannot be exaggerated, while others

³ *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Aldes*, Paris, 1825, and third edition in 1834. Renouard afterwards published a similar work on the family of the learned printers, Robert and Henry Stephens, *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Estiennes*, Paris, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo.

⁴ The preface is translated in Roscoe's *Leo X.*, i. 110.

⁵ The bibliography of first editions of the classics is treated copiously by this writer in his *Introduction to the Classics*, his *Bibl. Spenceriana*, and his *Catalogue of the Cassano Collection*. The prices of many valuable first editions at a sale in London in 1821 are given at the end of the last-mentioned work. See also a curious chapter on "First Editions" in Marchand's *Histoire de l'Imprimerie*.

⁶ These prefaces have been edited by Botfield, with an introduction of some merit.

represent copies of undoubted merit. La Grange assurés us, in the preface to his French translation of *Seneca*, that he never, in any case of difficulty, consulted the first edition of 1475, without finding a solution of his doubts. The fact is that each *editio princeps* must be judged by itself. It is to such scholars as Turnebus, Muretus, and Lipsius that we owe a juster estimate of their relative value, than prevailed in the early days of printing. Victorius has been called the "Sospitator Ciceronis;" and the real restorers of Greek learning are to be found in Scaliger, Casaubon, Budæus, Camerarius, and Stephens. The text of the classics has been slowly and laboriously constructed, and in some cases, as with Aristophanes, Dion Cassius, and Pliny, among others, a manuscript, discovered in modern times, has superseded entirely the authority of early editions. This branch of the subject is fully treated in an article in the *Edinburgh Review* on "Classical Manuscripts and First Editors" (Jan. 1873).

Sets of the classics, more or less complete, have been published at different times, and for different purposes. Among the earliest and most important are the *Delphin* editions, prepared, by order of Louis XIV., at the instance of the duke de Montausier, for the use of the Dauphin. The duke had been in the habit of studying the classics on his campaigns, and the want of books of reference appears to have suggested to him the idea of a uniform series of the principal classics, with explanatory notes and illustrative comments. On his becoming governor to the Dauphin, the scheme was carried into execution; and Huet, bishop of Avranches, a preceptor of the prince, was entrusted with the choice of authors and editors, and with the general supervision of the series. A list of the editors is given by Baillet in his *Critiques Grammaticiennes*. The collection, which, including Danet's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, extends to sixty-four volumes quarto, is of very unequal merit; but the copious verbal indices, which were added by the direction of Huet, afford a useful means of reference to particular passages.⁷ Only Latin classics, however, are included in the series; and "it is remarkable," as Dr Aikin observes, "that *Lucan* is not among the number. He was too much the poet of liberty to suit the age of Louis XIV." The entire collection, enlarged with the notes of the *Variorum* editions, was republished in 1819-1830, by A. J. Valpy, forming in all 185 vols., 8vo. These *Variorum* classics number upwards of 400 volumes, and were edited in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries. A complete collection is very rare; Peignot mentions one belonging to M. Mel de Saint-Ceran, which was sold for 3000 livres. For the names of the authors and commentators see De Bure's *Bibliographie*, vol. vii. p. 680, and Osmont's *Dictionnaire*, vol. ii. p. 411. The editions most prized by collectors are the Elzevirs and the Foulises. The *Elzevirs*, or properly Elseviers, were a family of famous printers and booksellers at Amsterdam, no fewer than fifteen of whom carried on the business in succession from 1580 to 1712. Their *Pliny* (1635), *Virgil* (1636), and *Cicero* (1642), are the masterpieces of their press: the last of the family brought out editions in 12mo and 16mo.¹ A full list of their publications is given in Brunet's *Manuel*, vol. v., *ad fin.* The *Annales de l'Imprimerie Elsevrienne*, by Pieter, 1851 and 1858, supersedes the authority of previous works on that subject, and contains much curious research. The project of reprinting the Elzevir editions, which originated in 1743 with the Abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy, led to the famous *Barbou* collection, commenced by Coustelier and continued by Joseph Gaspard Barbou, one of the family of Paris printers and booksellers of that name,

¹ Without disparaging the Elzevirs, it must be remembered that their texts were mere re-impressions, and did not rest, like those of Aldus and the Stephens, on ancient MSS.

and extending finally to 76 volumes in 12mo. Lemaire's *Bibliotheca Classica Latina*, 1819-26, which was dedicated to Louis XVIII, is one of the best collections of Latin classics which exists in France, although the list of authors is incomplete, and the notes far too voluminous. The whole series extends to 154 volumes in 8vo. The editions of Robert and Andrew Foulis, printers at Glasgow, were the finest which Britain produced during the 18th century. Their *chef d'œuvre* was the *Horace* of 1744, each printed sheet of which, probably after the example of Robert Stephens at Paris, was hung up in the college of Glasgow, and a reward offered for the discovery of any error.

Among the most useful bibliographical accounts of the classics may be mentioned the following:—*A View of the Various Editions of the Greek and Roman Classics, with Remarks*, by Dr Harwood,—this work, first published in 1775, is still a convenient manual of reference; *Degli Autori Classici, sacri e profani, Greci et Latini, Biblioteca portatile*, 2 vols., Venice, 1793, a compilation of the Abbé Boni and Bartholomew Gamba, and containing a translation of the preceding; Dibdin's *Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the Classics*, first published in 1802, and greatly enlarged in subsequent editions, containing a full account of Polyglot Bibles, of the Greek and Latin editions of the Septuagint and New Testament, and of lexicons and grammars; *A Manual of Classical Bibliography*, by J. W. Moss, 2 vols., 1825, noticing at length the different translations of the classics, the prices obtained for the rarer editions at public sales being also specified; *A View of the English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Authors*, by Brugemann, London, 1797; Engelmann's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*, Leipsic, 1847-53, containing an account of German editions between 1700 and 1852, while Greek and Latin classics printed in Germany and France are noticed in the *Répertoire de la littérature ancienne*, by F. Schöll, Paris, 1808; *Handbuch der Classischen Literatur*, by G. D. Fuhrmann, Halle, 1807-10, 5 vols. 8vo.; Hebenstreit's *Dictionarium*, Vienna, 1828; and the *Handbuch der Classischen Bibliographie*, Leipsic, 1830-34,—all of them works of considerable merit. The improved editions, by Harless and Ernesti, of the *Bibliotheca Græca* and *Bibliotheca Latina* of Fabricius are well known as immense magazines of classical lore, but they extend over a much wider field of inquiry than is embraced by bibliography.

V. Anonymous and Pseudonymous Books.

Books of this class originate, generally speaking, either from the necessities or the caprice of authorship.² Their number, however, has been such as to occupy, at an early time, the attention of bibliographers. In 1669 Frederick Geisler, professor of public law at Leipsic, published a dissertation, *De Nominum Mutatione*, which he reprinted in 1671, with a short catalogue of anonymous and pseudonymous authors. About the same time, a similar but more extensive work had been undertaken by Vincent Placcius, professor of morals and eloquence at Hamburg, which was published in 1674 with the title *De Scriptis et Scriptoribus anonymis atque pseudonymis Syntagma*, in which the writer invited information from learned men in Europe. Four years later, John Decker, a German lawyer, published his *Conjectura de Scriptis adespotis, pseudepigraphis, et supposititiis*, which was republished in 1686, with the addition of two letters on the same subject, one by Paul Vindingius, a professor at Copenhagen, and the other by the celebrated Peter Bayle. In 1689 appeared the *Centuria plagiariorum et pseudonymorum* of John Albert Fabricius, as well as a letter to Placcius from John Mayer, a clergyman of Hamburg, under the title—*Dissertatio Epistolica ad Placcium, qua anonymorum et pseudonymorum farrago exhibitur*. The complete fruits of Placcius's researches were published after his death in a folio volume at Hamburg in 1708, by Matthew Dreyer, a lawyer of that city. The work was now entitled *Theatrum Anonymorum et Pseudonymorum*; and, besides an Introduction by Dreyer and a Life of Placcius by Fabricius, it contains, in an

² Baillet, in his *Jugemens des Savans*, i. 1690, notices several motives for concealed authorship.

Appendix, the before-noticed treatises of Geisler and Decker with the relative letters of Vindingius and Bayle, and the Dissertation of Mayer. This elaborate work contains notices of six thousand books or authors; but it is ill-arranged and frequently inaccurate, besides being cumbered with citations and extracts, equally useless and fatiguing.

The subject of false and fanciful names attached to books had been undertaken in France by Adrien Baillet, nearly about the same period that Placcius commenced his inquiries. In 1690 this author published his *Auteurs Déguisés*; but this is little more than an introduction to an intended catalogue which Baillet never completed, being deterred, as Nicéron says, by the fear lest the exposure of concealed authors should in some way or other involve him in trouble. In this piece, which was reprinted in the sixth volume of De La Monnoye's edition of Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans*, there are some curious literary anecdotes, especially with reference to the passion which prevailed after the revival of letters for assuming classical names. In Italy these names were so generally introduced into families, that the names of the saints, hitherto the common appellatives, almost disappeared from that country. A similar rage for assuming the names of celebrated authors was common among French writers in the 18th century.

The taste for this kind of research, which the work of Placcius had diffused in Germany, produced several supplements to it in that country. In the *De Libris anonymis et pseudonymis Schediasma*, published by Christopher Augustus Neumann in 1711, there is a dissertation on the question, Whether it is lawful for an author either to withhold or disguise his name? which question he decides in the affirmative. But the most considerable of these supplements was that published in 1740 by John Christopher Mylius, librarian at Hamburg. It contains a reprint of the *Schediasma* of Neumann, with remarks, and a list of 3200 authors, in addition to those noticed by Placcius. The notices of Mylius, however, are limited to books in Latin, French, and German. The younger De Bure occupied himself partially with these researches: his omissions were supplied by M. Née de la Rochelle in his *Table destinée à la Recherche des Livres anonymes qui ont été annoncés dans la Bibliographie Instructive*, Paris, 1782. The names of several anonymous writers were discovered by Rollin in his *Traité des Etudes*, by Jordan in his *Histoire d'un voyage littéraire fait en 1783*; and by Bayle in his *Réponse aux Questions d'un provincial*. In 1758 the Abbé de la Porte published his *France littéraire*,¹ which was republished with large additions in 1769 by the Abbe de Hebraül. Both editions contain numerous errors, many of which, unfortunately, were reproduced by Ersch, librarian of the university at Jena, in his enlarged publication of 1797-1806, a work in other respects of solid merit and utility. The *Dictionnaire des Anonymes* of the Abbé Duclos is serviceable but incomplete; it has been abridged by Fournier in his *Dictionnaire portatif de Bibliographie*, Paris, 1805.

Among later authorities may be mentioned Weller's *Maskirte Literatur der älteren und neueren Sprachen*, Leipsic, 1858, and *Die falschen und fingirten Druckorte*, 1858, and the *Dictionnaire des Pseudonymes*, by G. Heilly, 1869. Conspicuous in merit is the *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes et Pseudonymes*, by M. Barbier, librarian to Napoleon I., the last edition of which is as recent as 1872. It comprises a vast number of articles, but the plan does not extend to foreign productions, except those

¹ Quérard's *France Littéraire*, Paris, 1846, contains a copious list of such works from 1700 to 1845.

which have been translated into French. His labours have been supplemented and improved upon by De Manne, in his *Nouveau Dictionnaire* of 1868, and by Quérard in his *Supercheries littéraires dévoilées* 1847-53. The list of anonymous writers in France includes Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, and Cardinal Richelieu. The authorship of Montesquieu's *Esprit des Lois* was disguised, on its appearance in 1748, as was the *Anti-Machiavel*, written by Frederick II. of Prussia, and published by Voltaire, who himself wrote several works anonymously. For Italian literature there are Vinc. Lancetti's *Pseudonima*, published at Milan in 1836; and Melzi's *Dizionario di Opere Anonime e Pseudonime di Scrittori Italiani*, Milan, 1848-59.² In England the practice of anonymous writing, in spite of the example of journalism, has never largely prevailed; but the *Letters of Junius* are a conspicuous example of authorship successfully concealed. The *Ecce Homo* is a recent instance among the works of current celebrity. The *Handbook of Fictitious Names*, by Olphar Hamst, London, 1868, is a useful and amusing guide, especially to English authors of the lighter literature of this century. Works of this class, however, are most applicable to countries in which the liberty of the press has been most restricted.

VI. Condemned and Prohibited Books.

Books supposed hurtful to the interests of government, religion, or morality have been sometimes condemned to the flames, sometimes censured by particular tribunals, and sometimes suppressed. Such methods of destruction have been followed in various countries, with regard both to their own and to foreign productions; and lists have been published from time to time of the works so interdicted.

Heathen antiquity supplies some instances of the burning of obnoxious books, such as the reported destruction of the works of Protagoras at Athens, and of astrological works, as well as the writings of Labienus, by Augustus at Rome. Some Greek works, alleged to have been found in the tomb of Numa in 181 B.C., and ascribed to him, were burnt by order of the Senate; the story of their discovery, however, is a mere fabrication. Tacitus mentions a *History* by Cremutius Cordus, which the Senate, to flatter Tiberius, condemned, because it designated C. Cassius the last of the Romans.³ Diocletian, according to Eusebius, caused the Scriptures to be burnt, but the early Christian Church was not slow in following the example of intolerance, and the charge of heresy was a ready instrument for putting down works alleged to be injurious to the faith. The first recorded instance is that of Arius, whose writings were condemned to the flames at the Council of Nicæa, Constantine himself threatening with death those who should harbour any copies. The same fate befell the works of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus, and those of Eutyches at Chalcedon. Pagan works were prohibited at the Council of Carthage in 400. Aristotle was forbidden by the church in the 13th century, but the restriction was relaxed in favour of the universities by Pope Nicholas V. A list of prohibited books is found in a decree of a council at Rome as early as 494.⁴ But the chief rigours of persecution began with the Inquisition, and the crusade against literature increased in severity with the multiplication of books through the press. In 1515 the Council of Lateran at Rome appointed clerical censors to examine all works before publication, as if, to use Milton's indignant remonstrance, "St Peter had bequeathed to them the keys of the

² See Petzhold's chapter on "Maskirte Literatur," in his *Bibliotheca Bibliographica*.

³ See the chapter on "Book-Censors" in Beckmann's *History of Inventions*.

⁴ Labbe's *Conc.* ii., col. 938-94.

press as well as of Paradise."¹ In 1543 Caraffa issued an order that no book should be printed without leave from the Inquisition, and booksellers were, accordingly, required to send in catalogues. Brunet mentions, however, a list of prohibited authors, prepared by order of Charles V., which was printed at Brussels in 1540, and is the earliest of its kind. An *Index generalis scriptorum interdictorum* was published by the Inquisition at Venice in 1543, and similar catalogues followed from the universities of Paris and Louvain. The first Index of the Court of Rome appeared in 1558, and was reprinted in 1559. The subject was discussed at the Council of Trent, who delegated the right of supervision to the Pope, and the result was the *Index Tridentinus* of Pius IV.,—the first strictly Papal Index,—which was printed by Aldus at Rome in 1564. Thence began a long series of literary proscriptions, which was continued by the Congregation of the Index,² and of which one of the immediate effects was to drive printing to Switzerland and Germany. The right of dictating what books should or should not be read was a consequence of the claims of the Papacy over the conscience and morals of mankind; and the vitality of persecution has been preserved within the Romish Church by the consistent exercise of such pretensions. The bibliography of these Expurgatory Indexes has been copiously treated.³ Among the earlier victims were Galileo and Copernicus; and English literature is represented by such names as Gibbon, Robertson, Bacon, Hallam, Milton, Locke, Whately, and J. Stuart Mill. In Spain the power of the Inquisition, provoked by the invasion of Lutheranism, was wielded by Fernando de Valdes, whose catalogue of 1559 formed the model of that issued by Pius IV. in the same year. An edict of Philip II. was published at Antwerp in 1570, and a general Index of all books suppressed by royal authority appeared at Madrid in 1790. It is noticeable that Smith's *Wealth of Nations* has been proscribed in that country, "on account of the lowness of its style and the looseness of its morals." A list of books suppressed in France between 1814 and 1850 has been edited by Pillel. For the more general notices of prohibited literature, we refer our readers to Klotz's *De Libris auctoribus suis fatalibus*, 1761; to Struvius's *Bibliotheca Hist. Litter.* vol. iii. c. 9; to the Dissertations in the seventh volume of Schelhorn's *Amenitates Literariæ*, which contain much curious information; to Brunet's *Livres Supprimés et Condamnés*; and to Peignot's *Dictionnaire Critique et Bibliographique des principaux Livres condamnés au feu, supprimés, ou censurés*, 2 vols., Paris, 1806. This last work is agreeably written, and gives a copious list of authorities on the subject; but its enumeration of principal works is far from complete, and comparatively few English books are mentioned.

A comprehensive account of works condemned or suppressed in England has yet to be written, but an article in the *Edinburgh Review*⁴ supplies some interesting materials on this subject. Peacock's *Precursor*, which the author burnt with his own hand, is an early instance, before the invention of printing. The "war against books,"⁵ however, began under Henry VIII., the sudden-

¹ *Liberty of Unlicensed Printing*.

² A complete list of their catalogues is given in Petzhold's *Bibl. Bibliogr.*, "Verbotene Literatur."

³ See the *Index Librorum prohibitorum a Pontificis auctoritate, in usum Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ*, by Tho. James, 1627; Francus, *De Papiatarum Indicibus*, Leipsic, 1684; *Thesaurus Bibliographicus ex Indicibus Librorum prohibitorum congestus*, Dresden, 1743. Carnot, in 1826, published a complete list of all books condemned by the court of Rome from the date of printing to 1825, with the dates and decrees of their condemnation. The best known, though not the latest, edition of the *Index* was issued by Pius VII. in 1819.

⁴ "Suppressed and Censored Books" vol. cxxxiv., July 1871.

⁵ See the final chapter in Disraeli's *Amenities of Literature*. A

ness of whose breach with Rome is shown by the circumstance that, whereas in 1526 anti-papery books were condemned as heretical, in 1535 all books favouring popery were decreed to be seditious. Several of the early translations of the Bible were suppressed,—Tyndal's version among others. As many copies of that work as the superior clergy could buy up, were publicly burnt at St Paul's on Shrove Tuesday, 1527, Fisher, bishop of Rochester, preaching a sermon on the occasion. An edition of the Bible was suppressed for a misprint, the printer having omitted the word "not" in the seventh commandment, but a copy survives in the Bodleian. A general burning of unlicensed books was ordered by the king in 1530, the *Supplication of Beggars*, a well-known invective against Wolsey, being included in the list. Another catalogue was issued in 1546 by proclamation, and the Act 3 and 4 Edward VI. made a raid against missals and books of devotion. The regulations of the Star Chamber in 1585 claimed the power of licensing and seizing books, and their scrutiny was as rigorous as that of the Inquisition. Nevertheless the reign of Elizabeth was fruitful in "schismatic and libellous tracts."⁶ A notable offender was Cardinal Allen's *Admonition*, containing a furious attack on the queen, of which a copy remains in the British Museum; and the famous Martin-Marprelate tracts raised a storm of opposition. In 1607 Dr Cowell's *Law Dictionary* was burnt by order of the House of Commons, for its assertions of divine right in favour of James I.; and the *King's Book of Sports* incurred the same fate at the hands of the Puritans in 1644. The persecutions of the Star Chamber include the punishment of Prynne for his *Histriomastix*, and the still more barbarous mutilation of Dr Alexander Leighton for his two works, *The Looking Glass of the Holy War*, 1624, and *Zion's Plea against the Prelacy*, 1628. Milton's *Eikonoklastes* and the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* were suppressed after the Restoration. Defoe's *Shortest Way with the Dissenters* was burnt by Parliament in 1703; and sixty years later Wilkes's *North Briton* incurred the same fate. The last instance of authorized book-burning in Great Britain was in 1779, when the *Commercial Restraints of Ireland considered*, by the Hon. Hely Hutchinson, was given to the flames.

This branch of bibliography has a peculiar interest to the literary historian. It serves to indicate, for the most part, periods of political excitement or religious intolerance. Fortunately, however, the efficacy of persecution has been frustrated by the disseminating power of the press. *Punitis ingenis, gliscit auctoritas*, is the reflection of Tacitus; and experience has abundantly proved that it is easier to destroy an author than his book. Melancholy as are the records of literary martyrdom, there remains this satisfaction that, in the main, the policy of oppression has defeated its own ends.

VII. Catalogues and Bibliographical Dictionaries.

The first catalogues, after the invention of printing, were those of the early printers, who, as booksellers, published sale-lists of their works, to attract the attention of the learned. The most ancient of these *catalogi officinales*—the humble predecessors of Bohn's gigantic catalogue—is a simple leaf, entitled *Libri Græci impressi*, printed by Aldus in 1498. The list consists of fourteen articles, distributed into five classes,—grammar, poetry, logic,

curious list of Lutheran works prohibited in England is given in Strype's *Ecl. Memorials*, i. 165.

⁶ The registers of the Stationers' Company contain entries of books ordered for "immediate conflagration" in 1599. See *Notes and Queries*, 3d series, xii. 436. Volume ii. of Wood's *Athen. Oxon.* was burnt at Oxford in 1693 by the apparitor of the university, for some alleged reflections on the memory of Lord Clarendon.