

able dreams about — some day — assisting an earth-shaking piece of bibliographic Sherlockery. But this library is a library for the people. It exists to help the great majority of ordinary men, women and children. But it exists also to aid and defend the bibliographic rights of minorities. To balance these extreme needs in terms of finance, space, organization and service, to help you — and Edna Everage's mob — that is the job we are trying to do.

### SOME BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE NUYTS *ALBUM AMICORUM*

The *Album Amicorum* of Pieter Nuyts in the State Library of Victoria has been the subject of a detailed study by John Fletcher which is to be published shortly as part of the Society's first Occasional Paper. The purpose of the present note is to describe certain physical features of the volume which were outside Mr. Fletcher's terms of reference.

Nuyts solicited the first entry in his *stamboek* in 1613 as a student of Thomas Erpenius at the University of Leiden. It travelled with him during his epic exploration of the Great Australian Bight and his disastrous term as Governor of Formosa, eventually passing into the hands of Pieter Nuyts the younger, the poet and dramatist, by whom it was given a handsome new binding bearing the initials "P.N." and the date "1663". By 1705, the date of the last entry, it had acquired twenty-six inscriptions, the other pages remaining blank. In its original (i.e. pre-1663) form it is likely to have consisted throughout of gatherings of 8 leaves. Its present more complicated format may be expressed in the following *ad hoc* formula:

Three detached leaves glued to endpaper 1<sup>6</sup> 2<sup>8</sup>  
 (lacks 2<sub>1</sub>) 3 - 7<sup>8</sup> 8<sup>8</sup> (lacks 8<sub>5</sub>) 9<sup>8</sup> (lacks 9<sub>4</sub>)  
 10 - 13<sup>8</sup> 14<sup>6</sup> 15<sup>8</sup> 16<sup>1</sup> 17 - 19<sup>8</sup> 20<sup>6</sup> 21<sup>8</sup> 22<sup>4</sup>  
 (lacks 22<sub>4</sub>)

The paper, bearing the familiar Strasburg lily watermark surmounted by a crown, comes from two moulds, one having a monogram "WR" at the foot of the design and the "4"

reversed (as in Briquet 7212) and the other the "4" in its normal form and a simple "W" monogram. In gatherings 10 and 11 ("W" pattern), part of the watermark is visible at the top of each of the eight leaves while in gatherings 1, 7, 8 and 14 no mark at all is visible. These gatherings were presumably produced by cutting two sheets in half and folding the resulting half sheets together in quires. The most common pattern, however, is for the two outer (2, 3, 9, 12, 21) or the two inner folds (4, 6, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19) to have the mark and the other two to lack it. These collocations are consistent with single sheets having been subjected to a variety of irregular octavo foldings, though the resulting leaf size (oblong 91 x 151 mm with some loss of text during the second binding) is a little on the small side. The leaves with the upper or crown half of the design precede those with the lower or monogram half in 2, 4, 12, 13, 18 and 20 only. Gathering 5 is anomalous having the left side of the watermark visible on the fold formed by the third and sixth leaves and the remaining folds without any mark.

In the course of the 1663 rebinding, at least two gatherings seem to have been removed and leaves from them inserted as cancels. In addition, three further gatherings - 1, 14 and 20 - are found to contain only three folds (though it is not impossible that this was their condition in the original binding) and three leaves from the surviving gatherings have been torn out. The most vulnerable point was the beginning. The front endpaper bears a stamped inscription from the donor of the book, Frederik Muller, however the watermark, showing the lower or monogram end of the Strasburg lily, indicates that it was probably part of the original paper stock. The conjugate leaf pasted to the front board can be presumed to have the upper part of the mark though this is now concealed by the State Library's bookplate. The existence of this conjugate fold implies that three additional folds, one showing the other side of the mark and two without the mark, may also have originally formed part of the book.

The following leaf bearing the arms of Nuyts has been pasted to the endpaper. Its watermark is a rampant lion resembling Briquet 10542. This was probably the front endpaper of the original binding. The succeeding two leaves bearing inscriptions by Erpenius and Merula respectively are also cancels secured by pasting. Each exhibits the lower part of the lily design, the Erpenius leaf having it

in the form without the "R" in the monogram and the Merula leaf in the form with the "R". If we are again to invoke the hypothesis of regularity (and in a book composed of blank pages it is hard to see what reason there could be to depart from it) the presence of these two leaves would seem to imply the existence of fourteen others now relocated or lost, i.e. two with the left hand side of the lower part of the mark, four showing parts of the crown, and a further eight with no mark at all. Other possibilities are that one or other of the two cancels originally belonged to the missing fold from gathering 20, or occupied the place of the anomalous central fold in gathering 5, or was part of the same sheet as the two markless folds which now form gathering 22 (with the last leaf cut to a stub).\*

A fourth possibility is that the cancels correspond to the torn out leaves, however the patterns of watermarks within the gatherings would seem to be against this. The missing 2<sub>1</sub> will have shown the left hand side of the crown, while the missing 8<sub>5</sub> and 9<sub>4</sub> will have had no part of the watermark at all. The single leaf bearing the inscription of the elder Junius inserted after 15<sub>8</sub> has no watermark and is of a smaller size than the other leaves. The fact that it has once been folded at the same point as certain leaves in gathering 2 would appear to be a co-incidence; if the leaf comes from elsewhere in the book it can only be the original 8<sub>5</sub> or 9<sub>4</sub> or part of one of the folds missing from 1, 14 and 20; however it seems more likely that it is a survivor from a lost preliminary gathering. As it happens, two of the torn out pages, 2<sub>1</sub> and 8<sub>5</sub>, immediately precede leaves containing quite elaborate entries. It would be in keeping with the known habits of contributors to autograph books if these had contained false starts at an inscription which were personally removed by the inscribers.

It would seem, therefore, that the book as reconstituted by the younger Nuyts' binder in 1663 differs in a number of respects from the book Nuyts senior acquired fifty years earlier as a student in Leiden. At least three leaves (four if we count 22<sub>4</sub> which is only visible as a stub pasted onto the board) and possibly as many as thirty have disappeared, while three leaves present, all with inscriptions, are cancels and can not therefore be assumed to be in their original order.

Harold Love

\*Neither cancel can be conjugate with the front endpaper as more than half the watermark is visible in all three cases.

**Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)**