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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines VienNB 11883, a manuscript of sacred Renaissance polyphony from the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Its makeup is unusual: it is a fascicle manuscript, composed of an assortment of individual fascicles likely meant for circulation that were then bound together later. Preserving a large body of unica and anonymous masses, VienNB 11883 contains a repertoire that might have otherwise been lost and has not often been addressed in musicological literature. This project questions prior approaches to the manuscript, catalogs the watermarks, and analyzes an anonymous mass as a representative case study.

Chapter One takes stock of the manuscript as a whole, evaluating the features that make it function as a collection. It addresses certain consensus views about the manuscript, testing assumptions about how the fascicles were used before they were bound, and how they were brought together. I conclude that several current assessments of this manuscript are based on questionable assumptions, including the current belief that someone, possibly Petrus Alamire, collected the fascicles for use in a scriptorium.

Chapter Two is an in-depth investigation of all the watermarks in VienNB 11883. The findings suggest a sizable increase of the number of paper types known to make up the manuscript—at least forty-one, rather than the previous view of eighteen. I conclude that the prevailing understanding of VienNB 11883, in which almost every fascicle shares a watermark with another fascicle in the manuscript, is incorrect; instead, I show that only a few of the fascicles definitely share watermarks. As a result, I suggest that this manuscript is better envisioned as a collection of assorted documents, unrelated until shown otherwise.

Chapter Three is a stylistic analysis of the anonymous Missa Ma bouche rit, preserved in fascicle XXVII. It tests the hypothesis that the mass shares enough features in common with certain works by Josquin—Missa Malheur me bat and Missa Fortuna desperata in particular—to suggest his possible authorship. I conclude that although the mass is most likely not by Josquin, it displays a remarkable fusion of compositional techniques also used by the most prominent composers of the era.
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INTRODUCTION

In the Austrian National Library's Collection of Incunabula, Old, and Valuable Books sits an unassuming manuscript with a white paper cover. Known by its library siglum VienNB 11883, it is a humble volume, neither ornately decorated nor carefully penned like many of the flashier presentation manuscripts housed nearby. The fifteenth- and sixteenth-century repertoire it preserves is in part obscure, with anonymous composers and *unica*, the only known copies of a particular work, bound alongside better-known works and composers. Perhaps oddest is the manuscript's makeup: most of its twenty-nine fascicles seem to hail from varying times and places, stretching from the late-fifteenth century to the mid-sixteenth century, with an assortment of scribal hands on paper types matched to various places in Europe. Nearly all the fascicles consist of a single mass, and with few exceptions the fascicles are independent of each other despite being bound as one volume.

The unusual makeup of VienNB 11883 aligns with what Charles Hamm, in a study of manuscripts of the Dufay era, termed a “fascicle manuscript”—it is composed of separate fascicles that were not originally planned as part of a larger structure. Instead, each fascicle was self-contained, formed from a few folded leaves of paper and meant to circulate separately.¹ Likely only later in their lives were these individual texts brought together and sewn as a single manuscript. Relatively few examples of this type of manuscript survive, and VienNB 11883 is singled out as an example of fascicle-

manuscript structure in a recent monograph devoted to Renaissance sources. Yet even as a textbook example of a particular type of manuscript, VienNB 11883 remains in many ways elusive to musicologists—enigmatic in origin and resistant to some of the common ways we engage with texts.

The unusual fascicle structure poses difficulties for typical codicological methods that musicologists employ to narrow down the manuscript’s origins or creators, such as watermark dating and analysis of scribal hands. Without a common origin among the fascicles, discoveries or information gleaned from one cannot inform the others, making each piece a mini-text that stands alone, to be questioned in isolation. Moreover, little is known for certain about the manuscript’s original purpose or how its fascicles arrived at their current bound state, presenting a musicological mystery story to unravel.

The repertoire, too, resists typical methods based on discerning a composer's distinct style or tracing concordances among sources. Alongside masses by well-known composers such as Josquin des Prez, Heinrich Isaac, and Jacob Obrecht, eleven of the thirty-two works preserved in the manuscript are anonymous, ensuring that they are frequently overlooked in a field that often assumes authorship as a starting point. Furthermore, fourteen of the works are unica and are not preserved in any other source, precluding comparison of variant readings between sources. As a result, musicological studies that examine VienNB 11883 as an exemplar for other sources do not investigate

3 The entry for this MS in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire lists only thirty-one works, classifying them as “29 masses (7 incomplete), 1 Agnus, 1 motet.” (p. 150). There are two voices of a stray Agnus III on f. 252 they did not include in their listing of works, however, which if counted brings the total count to thirty-two. The Census-Catalog entry likewise does not include this Agnus on f. 252, giving a total number of works as thirty-one as well. (Census-Catalog of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music 1400-1550, Renaissance Manuscript Studies 1 (Neuhausen/Stuttgart 1979-1988), Vol. 4, 92)
these isolated works. For these reasons, scholarship on the music preserved in VienNB 11883 has thus far tended to focus on individual works rather than the repertoire as a collection. Scholars have chosen to give particular attention to certain masses, such as Josquin’s Missa Malheur me bat, Obrecht’s Missa L’homme arme, or the several masses by Matthaeus Pipelare not preserved elsewhere. Other works bound alongside these masses have received relatively little attention, such as the Missa Se Javoye porpoin de veleur of Jo. Sticheler, or the anonymous Missa L’amour de moy—perhaps an indication of how the slippery nature of VienNB 11883 affects which works musicologists choose to study, even from within a single source.

Yet when VienNB 11883 is mentioned in musicological studies of Renaissance sources, it is often highlighted as a manuscript that we are lucky today to have: with so many unica making up its contents, had the manuscript not survived we would have lost a considerable repertory. For example, Barton Hudson concludes his study of the watermarks of this manuscript by saying that “we are indebted to VienNB 11883 for a substantial Mass repertory of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, much of it

---


5 See for example, M. Jennifer Bloxam, “In Praise of Spurious Saints: The ‘Missae Floruit Egregiis’ by Pipelare and La Rue,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 44, no. 2 (July 1, 1991): 163–220; Ronald Cross, Matthaeus Pipelare: A Historical and Stylistic Study of His Works (PhD diss., New York University, 1961); Giovanni Zanovello, “Heinrich Isaac, the Mass Misericordias Domini, and Music in Late-Fifteenth-Century Florence” (PhD diss., Princeton, 2005), 270–326; Murray Steib, “Loyset Compère and His Recently Rediscovered Missa De tous biens plaine,” The Journal of Musicology, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Autumn, 1993), 437–54, especially 442–43. Editions that draw on isolated works from VienNB 11883 include several composers’ opera omnia in the Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae (CMM), such as Barbireau’s (CMM vii/1), Ghiselin’s (CMM xxiii/3), Isaac’s (CMM lxv/7), and Pipelare’s (CMM xxxiv/2-3).
unique to this source. For this alone it is a great treasure.” And the entry for VienNB 11883 in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire says “One significant aspect of the manuscript, then, is that it preserves a repertory that could easily have been lost completely, and it thereby helps to give perspective to the musical landscape of the period.” The online Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (DIAMM) entry for the manuscript concurs in its description, concluding that “Although the Codex has not been produced as a presentation manuscript, it is very valuable from a musical point of view, since fourteen masses are unique, including the four Masses of Mattheus Pipelare, the Mass of Johannes Ghiselin and the Missa De tous bien plaine by Jacob Obrecht.” In this sense, the manuscript is similar to certain essential manuscripts from the era that preserve a large quantity of unica works that might have otherwise been lost, such as the Chigi Codex. Yet unlike the Chigi Codex, a well-known source among musicologists that preserves many unica works of Ockeghem, VienNB 11883 is discussed relatively rarely, perhaps because of the proportion of anonymous works it preserves. Our investigations into its pieces are often limited to those connected to already well-known composers, almost entirely overlooking the other anonymous masses or works by lesser-known composers, even as we tout how lucky we are that they were preserved.

The physical makeup of the manuscript is one reason that it is so easy for scholars to pick and choose among the works in VienNB 11883, privileging some pieces for

---

7 M.F. [Michael Friebel], The Treasury..., 150.
attention while neglecting others. As a physical text, the manuscript is both many and one: the composite structure is made of primarily independent fascicles that could themselves stand alone as artifacts of various times and places, while the manuscript as a single object represents the moment at which those fascicles came together and were bound into one unit. It is likely that the binding of these separate fascicles helped ensure that they survived to today by protecting the individual sheets from wear and tear, as well as by perhaps elevating their perceived status: a bound volume of music imparts more seriousness and significance to its contents than loose sheets do. Yet in previous approaches to the music in this manuscript, musicologists usually attempt to dissolve these bindings, metaphorically snipping away those threads to separate out individual works. Doing so allows us to take an unwieldy amount of music and work with it in more manageable ways: to compare various works by a single composer, to trace modeling and borrowing between works, to analyze the cantus firmus usage, or to scrutinize the scribal hand that copied the text—all standard musicological tools for analyzing works of this period. But what of the aspects of VienNB 11883 that are not

---

9 Speaking of early prints, Kate van Orden explains that “The rare copies of many early prints that survive today often do because collectors such as Castell had them bound. Not only did the bindings preserve the contents, they greatly enhanced the value of the prints, which helped guarantee their future.” (Kate Van Orden, Materialities: Books, Readers, and the Chanson in Sixteenth-Century Europe [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015], 19.) She suggests the same was true of chansonniers when their music fell out of style and less durable copies of the music were likely recycled as scrap paper: “Binding played a decisive role in securing futures for the chansonniers that did survive, adding considerable value to the printed sheets and protecting them from harm. (Ibid., 39.)

10 Metaphorically, but thankfully not literally, as other less fortunate manuscripts have experienced. According to Van Orden, “Huge numbers of tract volumes were removed from their bindings in the nineteenth century. In some cases, well-intentioned librarians sought to modernize their collections, but in doing so destroyed a considerable wealth of physical evidence relevant to the history of private libraries and habits of early modern collectors. Thomas Oliphant initiated such a project at the British Library in 1842, apparently splitting up volumes with multiple titles, either because the bindings were deteriorating or, more likely, because separating them made cataloguing and shelving easier.” (Materialities, p. 22–3.)
suited to these frameworks? By examining VienNB 11883 with an eye on the ways in which we typically approach manuscripts of this period, I suggest we learn something not only about the manuscript itself, but also about our own priorities and values as musicologists. The works we choose to study, the methods we choose to employ, and the composers we hoist aloft above others—each decision we make when examining Renaissance music consequently shapes the directions of future inquiries into the music of the period.

In Chapter One, I address how VienNB 11883 as a manuscript falls outside of the usual networks of our traditional musicological approaches. I show that, rather than viewing the manuscript as problematic for this reason, we can see it instead as valuable for the light it sheds on the holes in our methods and how it complicates the usual assumptions we bring to works of this period.

Chapter Two is codicological and questions the physical aspects of VienNB 11883 with particular focus on the watermarks, with the dual purpose of reexamining the origins of the manuscript, and questioning the methods we have applied to it.

Chapter Three examines an anonymous mass preserved only in VienNB 11883 with focus on the stylistic traits that might define its authorship; this part also functions as a case study of the stylistic discoveries offered by anonymous works.
CHAPTER ONE: AN OVERVIEW

There’s an old joke told in various forms, such as this version recounted in Mark Haddon’s *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*. As the very literal and mathematically minded young protagonist of the novel tells it:

There are three men on a train. One of them is an economist and one of them is a logician and one of them is a mathematician. And they have just crossed the border into Scotland (I don't know why they are going to Scotland) and they see a brown cow standing in a field from the window of the train (and the cow is standing parallel to the train).

And the economist says, ‘Look, the cows in Scotland are brown.’

And the logician says, ‘No. There are cows in Scotland of which at least one is brown.’

And the mathematician says, ‘No. There is at least one cow in Scotland, of which one side appears to be brown.’

And this is funny because economists are not real scientists and because logicians think more clearly, but mathematicians are best.¹

I recount this not just for the entertainment of imagining how a musicologist would fit into this setup, but also to make a more serious point. Many scholarly approaches to VienNB 11883 thus far have been based on thinking about the manuscript like an economist in this joke might, making conclusions about the whole from fairly localized data. Instead, we might find it more fruitful—even if exasperatingly literalist—to try on the role of the mathematician instead: taking the data for what it tells us about parts, and not extrapolating or generalizing regarding the rest of the manuscript. For much of this dissertation I will attempt to wear the metaphorical mathematician’s hat: to approach the differing fascicles of VienNB 11883 with no preconceptions or expectations of them.

In its current form, VienNB 11883 functions as a collection, if merely by the fact that its fascicles were bound together as a manuscript. But what beyond this singular trait organizes its collective nature? In this chapter I provide an overview of the traits of the manuscript, test the current scholarly claims about how the fascicles may have come together, and examine the role of authorship in guiding how we approach the music contained within its pages.

A COLLECTION: MUSICAL, PHYSICAL, AND CONCEPTUAL

MUSICAL TRAITS

The collection of these fascicles—the act of assembling the separate gatherings into a single volume—likely played an important role in the preservation of this music, raising the question of what traits render the manuscript a collective entity beyond just the fact of its binding. At first glance, one of these collective traits of VienNB 11883 is straightforward: the manuscript brings together twenty-two complete settings of the mass ordinary, nine incomplete masses or mass movements, and one motet (copied in a fascicle otherwise devoted to a mass on what was presumably an unused sheet of paper). Thus, at the most basic level the manuscript is a collection defined by genre. Of these thirty-two works, fourteen are preserved without attribution, though scholars have linked three with a composer, leaving eleven still anonymous. Among the composers of the attributed masses are some commanding names—the star Josquin and the major planets who orbit him, Obrecht, Pipelare, Isaac—as well as composers such as Severdonck, Carlit, and Sticheler, about whom we know relatively little or even nothing.

Other general musical traits do not seem to define this collection as cohesively,
however. The number of voices in the masses vary, from only three in Obrecht’s *Missa De tous biens plaine*, to a five-voice Credo in the anonymous *Missa Ma bouche rit* (a mass otherwise for four voices), to six voices in Sticheler’s *Missa Se j’avoye porpoin de veleur*, to eight for the anonymous Marian motet “[Regina celi letare] Quia quem meruist.” The majority of masses, though, are written for four voices, as was the standard during this period. So the number of voices called for in this collection does not imply a specific performing group required to execute this music, and the rather unremarkable variety of voice parts suggests that the voicing was likely not the guiding factor here.

Likewise, the languages of the various cantus firmus texts vary, with possible implications about usage or geographical origins implied in the titles. At least one cantus firmus title indicates the likely location in which the work was composed. According to Hudson, “Pipelare’s *Missa Floruit egregius* was so specialized in its liturgical use that it could hardly have been used outside Ghent without major revision.”

Drawing further on M. Jennifer Bloxam’s work on the mass, he explains that “the numerous chants quoted are particular to the liturgy of that city, so that the Mass could hardly be used elsewhere; and the chant texts are preserved in such complete form that this copy must be very close to the archetype.” Among the other masses in VienNB 11883, there are the usual Latin models based on sacred sources, such as Pipelare’s *Missa Dicit dominus* (with text from Luke 9:3), Prioris’s *Missa De angelis* (on a chant), or the anonymous *Missa Crux fidelis* (on a sacred hymn/antiphon) and anonymous *Missa Auditorium meunm intende* (on Psalm 70). Predictably, French chanson models are also prevalent: Josquin’s *Missa

---


Malheur me bat, Obrecht’s L’homme arme, Isaac’s Missa Quant j’ay au cuer, Winters’s Missa La plus gorgiase, or the anonymous Missa Pourquoi alles vous seullette. Other less mainstream languages make an appearance as well, though. Also represented are Netherlandish models, such as Giselin-Verbonnet’s Missa Ghy syt die wertste on a Flemish secular song, Severdonck’s Missa Waer is die alder liefste? on a German/Netherlandish popular song, or the anonymous Missa Noch weth ic ein so scoen joncfraw on a Flemish secular song, all less common sources for mainstream mass models than French-language chansons and Latin-texted sacred works.

The musical models underpinning these masses also vary in nature: they are a mix of sacred and secular, from songs and chansons to chants and antiphons. And there are three anonymous Sine nomine masses, each without a known cantus firmus. It is possible that these are truly masses that were freely composed without a model, though it is also possible that they have some sort of model contained within them that is now unknown. Despite the prevalent tendency to assume a lost model for Sine nomine masses dating from this time—reasonable given the widespread popularity of musical borrowing—the former possibility is also worth considering. As pointed out by Honey Meconi, it seems that Masses that were not based on pre-existing material rarely achieved widespread popularity, since Sine nomine masses (including the three in VienNB 11883) are preserved today mostly as unica. The three masses could be artifacts of this comparatively “failed” tradition.

---


5 Hudson’s explanation as to how not more copies exist of many of these fascicles is that they were late witnesses of repertoire that was already becoming passé. (Hudson, “A Glimpse…,” 198.)
PHYSICAL TRAITS

Physically, VienNB11883 is not only a collection in the obvious sense that its disparate gatherings were collected and bound together, but also in the collective effort that was required for its construction. Even manuscripts that were planned from the start as single volumes require many hands that necessarily touch and sometimes alter the works in creating them: papermakers, scribes (perhaps multiples, with differing scribes for notes and text), illustrators who add decorative initials, binders who sew together manuscripts and add covers—all build on the role of the composer in transmitting works across space and time. VienNB 11883 in particular is an acute example because of its unusual fascicle structure, since each step of the process is multiplied by each individual fascicle.

Even the most straightforward phases of manuscript construction such as binding have had an outsized impact on the music as a result of its unusual structure. A typical manuscript planned as a complete unit from the beginning would have generally uniformly sized paper across its fascicles, as well as composer attributions and work titles in consistent positions, placed well enough in from the edge of the paper to not be affected by any trimming of the papers that accompanies the binding process. But for VienNB 11883, the simple act of binding (and perhaps rebinding) the separate fascicles—while probably helping ensure that they survived the centuries, since loose sheets and gatherings are overwhelmingly lost to the sands of time—in some cases severed works from their composers. Of the anonymous works represented in this manuscript, it is not entirely clear how many were simply never attributed and had been circulating anonymously before they were bound, versus how many lost their ascription
when the manuscript was trimmed.⁶

At least some fascicles clearly experienced the latter: several folia bear evidence that an attribution was left partially on the cutting-room floor after trimming, and more attributions could have been completely sheared away without leaving any evidence. For example, the incomplete *Missa Johannes christi care* (295v–303r) bears a partially cropped inscription of Matthaeus Pipelare, a lucky save since the mass is not preserved elsewhere (Fig. 1.1B).

![Fig. 1.1A: Partially trimmed ascription of Matthaeus Pipelare on the Missa Johannes christi care, f. 295v](image)

In another case, Ockeghem’s *Missa Prolationum* (208r–221r) retains no evidence of a title or ascription, but we can know the composer since it is also preserved (with attribution) in the Chigi Codex (VatC 234). Other works were not so fortunate, such as

---

⁶ The distinction between intentional anonymity and accidental or incidental anonymity highlights a challenge posed by VienNB 11883: in some cases, there is no way of knowing at what point the anonymous works it contains became anonymous. That is, they might have had attributions at some point that were lost incidentally when a scribe chose not to recopy them, or were lost accidentally due to trimming after binding, or they might never have been attributed at all and were circulating anonymously at the time of their copying. While “anonymity” refers to the state of lacking an attribution, it may or may not imply an inherent characteristic of the work itself depending on genre. For example, communally created music such as folk songs or chant may lack a single author and exist anonymously as a characteristic of the piece. In other situations, the anonymity may be limited to the material existence of the work in a certain time or place, but not be an inherent trait of the work itself. (Marcy L. North, *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003], 10.) With no way of knowing whether the now-unattributed works in VienNB 11883 were anonymous at the time of their circulation, I will treat all of the unattributed works in VienNB 11883 as “equally” anonymous unless evidence exists suggesting otherwise.
the anonymous *Missa Sine nomine* (20v–29r), which retains only the very bottom fragments of what is presumably a title or attribution on the first folio, and which survives as an *unicum* (Fig. 1.1B). By rendering certain of these works anonymous in their only surviving source, the impact of these trimmed edges were lasting.

Fig. 1.1B: Nearly entirely obliterated ascription or title on the first page of a fascicle preserving an anonymous *Sine nomine* mass (f. 20r).

But before these fascicles were bound, the music had to be copied. We know that a wide variety of scribal hands penned these fascicles: they range from professional quality to sloppy and corrupt. Previous investigations of the scribes represented in VienNB 11883 have singled out the fascicles with links to well-known scribes, particularly the two fascicles (V and XIV) that were partially copied by Petrus Alamire.⁷ Leopold Nowak identifies f. 198 as being in his hand as well.⁸ Furthermore, the first page of Winter’s *Missa La plus gorgiase* (f. 64), bears the inscription “p. alamyre” along the bottom, leading Hudson to hypothesize that perhaps this fascicle was either signed by Alamire or had been addressed for delivery to him.⁹ (See Fig. 1.2)

---

Fig. 1.2: Folio 64, first page of *Missa La plus gorgiase*. The title and attribution along the top edge have been cut off by trimming, but the Index page records the piece as “Missa per Alamýr. Hieronimus Winters 4 Vocum.” Along the bottom is the inscription “p. alamyre,” discussed further below.
Other fascicles clearly have humbler origins, though, such as fascicles XXIII–XXIV, which together contain an anonymous mass on the Flemish secular song *Missa Noch weth ic ein so scoen joncraw* (and an anonymous partial *Agnus dei*) replete with hash marks crossing out lines and redrawn staves. (See Figure 1.3A–1.3B) Some of the works include instructions for the realization of musical canons, including Obrecht’s *Missa L’homme armé*.\(^\text{10}\) Presumably the actors behind these individual fascicles were as varied as their scribal styles, with highly trained scribes from famous scriptoria contributing some of these fascicles, and lower level copyists, singers, or even the composers themselves supplying others.\(^\text{11}\)

Prior to copying, editing, trimming, and binding, however, the paper itself needed to be made. The papers that make up VienNB 11883 vary in quality, color, and size, even after trimming. A preliminary survey of watermarks demonstrate an assortment of designs, indicating many different papermakers.\(^\text{12}\) These little makers’ marks tucked into the texture of the paper reveal a complexity of concordances and differences among the fascicles, to be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

\(^{10}\) In this mass an inscription in the tenor line instructs the singers “Don’t singe the note D. Take the note A below,” which Emily Zazulia describes as “a doubly confusing set of notational instructions,” since the cantus firmus until that point had begun on the Phrygian starting note of E, not D. (p. 731) In her analysis of this instruction, Zazulia establishes that Obrecht’s careful manipulation of the cantus firm in relation to the mass model by Busnoys necessitated that he move the phrase to a different staff position to maintain consistency in notation, reminding us that “in the fifteenth century notation was not just a tool for recording sound but also an outlet for conceptual work.” (p. 740) (Emily Zazulia, “Whatever You Do, Don’t Sing D: On the Notation of Obrecht’s *Missa L’homme armé*,” in *Qui musicam in se habet: Studies in honor of Alejandro Enrique Planchart*, ed. Anna Zayaruznaya, Bonnie Blackburn, and Stanley Boorman (Middleton, WI: American Institute of Musicology, 2015), 731–42.

\(^{11}\) Barton Hudson, building on an observation of M. Jennifer Bloxam’s, suggests that Scribe O, who made corrections to works by Pipelare, might have been that of Pipelare himself (Hudson, p. 194n).

Fig. 1.3A: Folio 42v displays meticulous planning, steady note shapes, and room left for decorative initials.
Fig. 1.3B: Folio 253r is a far messier affair.
CONCEPTUAL TRAITS

Traits beyond the musical and physical that typically define collections of music are more conceptual: how did the people who brought this manuscript together envision its use; what was its purpose? In the century prior to the rise of printing, manuscripts had commonly been anthologies of works by different composers (such as the Trent Codices), organized around a particular genre (such as chansonniers), or reflecting the intended use (such as the Cambrai Cathedral Choirbooks). Little physical details acquired during these uses tend to be apparent in such manuscripts. For example, some fascicles in VienNB 11883 have *signa congruentiae* that appear to be page turn indicators copyists. VienNB 11883 appears to fall into the category of being organized around a single genre, but it is an unusual example, since individually the fascicles likely had one purpose, and then as a bound unit the manuscript would serve a different purpose. We may presume that the people who created the individual fascicles had certain intended uses in mind—involving circulation or copying—whereas whoever bound the fascicles together into a single manuscript probably had other purposes in mind, related to the usages demanded by a collector.

Turning first to the fascicles as single units, we see there are little clues that suggest active circulation. There are, for example, “handling instructions” like those on f. 305, which bears an inscription commanding that the masses in the fascicle be given to a “Meester Heynrijc van Loouen,” about whom almost nothing concrete is known, but whose identity has garnered much speculation, since it might give an indication of the source of at least one of these fascicles. (See Fig. 1.4)

13 M.F. [Michael Friebel], *The Treasury…*, 151.
Fig. 1.4: Folio 305, with two inscriptions: “Duas missas Pipelare” [Two masses of Pipelare] and, in a different hand, “Dese Coopie salmen gheuen Meester heynrijc van loouen Ende Niement anders” [This copy shall be given to Master Heynrijc Heynrijc van Leuven and to no one else”].\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} Translated in Hudson, “A Glimpse…,” 192.
M. Jennifer Bloxam explores two possible identities of the “Meester Heynrijc van Loouen,” suggesting he might have been a Burgundian clerk and court *sommelier* named Gauthier Henrici, who died in 1494, or Balduinus Henrici, a church dean of the city of Louvain who retired in 1463.15 Hudson, however, proposes that van Loouen was associated with the Vienna court and that he lived later than Bloxam’s suggestions, based on the watermark data for that fascicle.16 (As will be shown in the following chapter, the watermark is actually a very long-lived design, so Bloxam’s suggestions need not be discounted on this basis.) Regardless of van Loouen’s identity, indications of circulation such as this one led Hudson to conjecture that the fascicles making up VienNB 11883 were meant for dissemination, and perhaps were collected by a single scriptorium, like that of Petrus Alamire, to be used as file copies.17

This explanation aligns with Michael Friebel’s assertion that at least one of VienNB 11883’s fascicles contains notations that suggest it was used as an exemplar for other manuscripts. Friebel found that fascicle VII’s *Missa La plus gorgiase du monde* was the exemplar for the same work preserved in MontsM 771.18 This particular fascicle in VienNB 11883 also contains the inscription “p. alamyre” on the first page, a reference to the master scribe Petrus Alamire and thus another connection to a scriptorium

---

17 Hudson, 195–97. For an alternate explanation of the meaning of this inscription, see Rob C. Wegman, “Musical Offerings in the Renaissance,” *Early Music* 33/3 (2005): 432, where he proposes that these masses were marked as bequests to a colleague, to be distributed with other belongings after Pipelare’s death.
tradition. But the name is not necessarily in Alamire’s own hand (a point which will be explored in the next chapter), and rather than a signature might instead be an indication that the fascicle was to be delivered to him, for copying purposes. Yet small details like these have fueled the speculation that the fascicles that make up VienNB 11883 are connected to Petrus Alamire’s workshop—a claim that will be tested in greater depth in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.19

QUESTIONING CURRENT APPROACHES TO VIENNB 11883

In order to assess the current scholarly assumptions about VienNB 11883, I begin with the entry on the manuscript from The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, an attractive catalog devoted to the manuscripts linked with the famous scribe Petrus van den Hove, known best by his professional name derived from the musical notes within the hexachord system on the note A: A-la-mi-re.20 It is worth quoting the entry at length to establish the story that currently surrounds this manuscript.

According to the standard narrative about VienNB 11883, the manuscript likely stems from a scriptorium tradition, a claim that is based primarily on the foundational work laid by Barton Hudson in the 1990s,21 which was later summarized in places such as The Treasury encyclopedia entry for this manuscript. As The Treasury entry begins:

VienNB 11883 is unique among the Burgundian-Habsburg music manuscripts. The manuscript contains 27 gatherings, each comprising from two to eleven bifolia. With minor exceptions, these gatherings each contain one composition in a single scribal hand, thus constituting an independent unit. Together, the gatherings constitute fourteen Masses by major composers, seven by less well-known composer, and ten anonymous works. Fourteen masses are unica, including four by Pipelare and one each by Ghiselin and Obrecht. One significant

20 Kellman, ed., The Treasury….
aspect of the manuscript, then, is that it preserves a repertory that could easily have been lost completely, and it thereby helps to give perspective to the musical landscape of the period. The gatherings exhibit a variety of both scribal hands and papers (Hudson 1994 distinguishes 27 scribes and 18 watermarks). Seventeen gatherings have cover pages, seven of them with some identifying inscription either on the front or on the back. From this it can probably be concluded that these gatherings were intended for temporary use in the dissemination of their repertory. It may furthermore be conjectured that such a large group of gatherings, intended to serve in the dissemination of the works they contained, might have been at some time the property of a scriptorium, in which they were used as models for the preparation of more formal manuscripts. Several details support this conjecture. While the inscriptions are usually written horizontally across the top of the cover page, in two gatherings they are written vertically along one side, while in one gathering the inscription appears along the bottom edge. It seems as if these identifications were written where they could most easily be seen when the gatherings were collected together in one place, such as on a shelf or in some kind of file drawer—the sort of storage arrangement one might expect in a scriptorium.

That at least some of the fascicles were indeed used in the process of copying more formal choirbooks seems to be demonstrated by the Missa La plus gorgiase du monde, which is transmitted both in VienNB 11883 and MontsM 771. There can be little doubt that the Montserrat copy was modeled on VienNB 11883. The readings of the two manuscripts are almost identical. Furthermore, wherever MontsM 771 has a page turn where there is none in VienNB 11883, someone, probably not the main scribe, has drawn a stroke across the staff in each voice of the latter, or, in one case, has written a signum congruentiae in each voice. It is difficult to imagine what purpose these marks could have had other than to indicate to the copyist where to make page breaks, just as they appear in the later manuscript.  

To summarize: the support for the commonly held conjecture that these fascicles were collected by a scriptorium is 1) that in three of the twenty-seven gatherings, the
composer labels appear in unexpected places; and 2) that one mass in VienNB 11883 served as an exemplar for another manuscript’s rendering of that mass.24

The first point unravels a bit under scrutiny. First is an obvious question: even if these unusually placed ascriptions were the remnants of some sort of filing system, why does this system appear in only three of the fascicles? Furthermore, the actual placement of these attributions is arguable and inconsistent. The three fascicles with unusually placed attributions are XV and XXIX (both vertically along one side), and VI (horizontally along the bottom). But fascicle VI, with the ascription “A maistre Jacquet Obrecht” along the bottom, also bears a partially trimmed ascription and title along the top using the Flemish spelling “Hobrecht.” (The Flemish name, this time spelled as “Hobrect,” appears again at the top of the verso side of the same folio, in red ink.) Rather than evidence of a scriptorium’s filing system, the bottom ascription could be a clarification added because of the trimmed top attribution, or simply indication of a provenance for this fascicle where both the French and Flemish spellings of the composer’s name were used interchangeably. (See Fig. 1.5)

24 According to Michael Friebel, VienNB 1783’s copy of Barbireau’s Missa Faulx perversa might also have been copied from VienNB 11883 based on matching pagination markings. (Friebel, “Die Handschriften…,” 69. But other concordances among signa congruentiae seem to be related to a more general common tradition, and not evidence of direct copying. According to The Treasury…, “Indeed, there are a number of manuscripts, dating from about 1500 (VienNB 1783) to 1540 (MontsM 771) with page breaks corresponding to these signa. Although they need not all be direct copies of VienNB 11883—some of the readings are too different—they seem to come out of the same tradition of using signa congruentiae in fascicle-manuscripts at the court’s scribal workshop.” (M.F. [Michael Friebel], The Treasury…, 151.)
Fig. 1.5: VienNB 11883, folio 52 (fascicle VI)
Fig. 1.6: VienNB 11883, folio 175v (fascicle XV)
Moreover, even a brief investigation of the two vertical ascriptions undermines the assumption that they were intended as filing system titles. On fascicle XV, the ascription supposedly written vertically along one side is actually toward the middle of the page on the last verso of the gathering, where it would face the opposite way as the other ascriptions and not be particularly visible when viewed by someone riffling through the edge of a stack of papers or through a file drawer. (See Fig. 1.6)

The other vertical inscription, in fascicle XXIX, is indeed written along one edge, but as mentioned previously, this is the inscription that reads “Duas missas Pipelare / Dese Coopie salmen gheuen Meester heynrijc van loouen Ende Niement anders.” The meaning—“Two masses of Pipelare / This copy shall be given to Master Heynrijc van Leuven and to no one else.”—makes it clear that this is an instruction for a courier of some sort, not an ascription placed along that edge to make it more easily found in a file drawer.25 (See Fig. 1.4 above.)

The second point the Treasury makes to support the scriptorium hypothesis—that the mass in fascicle VII was an exemplar for another manuscript, thereby suggesting that “at least some of the fascicles were indeed used in the process of copying more formal choirbooks”—is less convincing overall in the absence of the “filing system” ascriptions from the first point.26 What are the odds that any random selection of twenty-seven gatherings from this period would have one fascicle among them that served as an exemplar to another manuscript? What of the other twenty-six, and why would such a high proportion of the masses in this manuscript be preserved as unica if they were being actively used as exemplars for copying and circulation? Or to refer back to the opening

25 I have drawn this translation from Hudson, p. 192.
26 E.J. [Eugeen Schreurs], *The Treasury...*, 150.
joke: we might stop ourselves at saying that there exists at least one fascicle in VienNB 11883 with indications that it was used as an exemplar for another extant manuscript, but from this evidence we cannot draw any conclusions about the other cows in Scotland—or the other fascicles in VienNB 11883.

The Treasury entry next addresses the scriptorium conjecture, still drawing primarily from Hudson’s work:

If these fascicles were indeed the property of a scriptorium, the question arises which workshop used them. There are several indications that this must have been the Burgundian-Habsburg court scriptorium. First, Alamire’s own hand appears in the manuscript (in its most familiar guise on fols. 42v-45, 145v-148; see Hudson 1994, p. 186). Furthermore, several fascicles have inscriptions in Flemish. And, as stated, at least one Mass in MontsM 771—a choirbook probably prepared at Mary of Hungary’s court—was directly copied from VienNB 11883. This does not necessarily mean, however, that all the gatherings were actually prepared in the court scriptorium. On the contrary, most probably originated elsewhere. At what point within the broad chronology suggested by Hudson they might have found their way to the scriptorium, at what point in the century they were bound together, and when precisely the manuscript was acquired by the Fugger family—all this remains uncertain. It is clear only that the Fugger library was purchased by Emperor Ferdinand III and brought to Vienna in 1656 (see Nowak 1946).27

This all seems reasonable at first glance, and the Treasury writers here acknowledge that not all the fascicles were necessarily prepared in a scriptorium, but were rather copied elsewhere and then brought there. But here is where I find the logic circular: the original supposition is that the fascicles were property of a scriptorium, and evidence is laid out to support this hypothesis based on just a few fascicles. No evidence is suggested for the remaining fascicles, though—and yet the discussion proceeds as though the other fascicles must also have been property of a scriptorium.

27 E.J. [Eugeen Schreurs], The Treasury…, 150-51.
Following its discussion of the possible connections between VienNB 11883’s fascicles and a scriptorium tradition, *The Treasury* continues with a brief discussion of scribal hands:

Generally, each gathering of VienNB 11883 has its own scribe. At least three gatherings are written by members of the Alamire workshop: fols. 42-51 (Isaac, *Missa quant j’ay au cueur*), and fols. 145-163 (Isaac, *Missa Misericordias domini*), are the teamwork of the music scribe who copied the first part of VienNB 4809 and the music scribe who copied the second part (Warmington’s scribes H and F respectively); fols. 20-29 (anonymous Mass) are written by the first of those two scribes. The inscription *p alamyre* on fol. 64 (first page of Winter’s, or Vinder’s, *Missa La plus gorgiase*) is difficult to interpret: is it the signature of the scribe or simply a name written by the owner?28

In his article from which much of *The Treasury* entry draws, Hudson ventures further on this point by comparing the handwriting with two examples in other manuscripts that contain Alamire’s signature. He points out many differences between the signatures, and yet still comes to the conclusion at the end that it is in Alamire’s hand:

However, the handwriting of the signature in VienNB 11883 differs in some respects […]. Furthermore, the music was copied, apparently by the same person, with less discipline than other known examples of Alamire’s work. Especially noticeable is that ascending note stems consistently lean to the right, while

---

28 M.F. [Michael Friebel], *The Treasury*…, 151. In a discussion of whether the work *T’Andernaken* was composed by Alamire, David Fallows points out that Alamire signed at least some of the works he copied, and lists some examples. He does not include VienNB 11883 among them, however: “Two are in VienNB Mus. 18825, but on the outside paper covers of the part books, well away from any music. Two appear at the ends of sections in the secular song part books VienNB Mus. 18746, but placed so that there was no possibility of thinking that they were ascriptions; these are reproduced in the exhibition catalog; and it is hard to see how even the most ignorant copyist would thing that these were ascriptions, though I cannot imagine why Alamire signed them. One appears at the bottom of the unbound part-sheets in VienNB 9814, for a work firmly and clearly headed with the name of Verbonnet. And the last is at the bottom of the single part-sheet now inserted in VienNB 11778, containing the texted Patrem and Agnus 3 of Josquin’s *Missa Fortuna desperata*. This last could conceivably be read as an ascription; and it is perfectly possible that there were many similar cases among Alamire sources that have not survived.” David Fallows, “Alamire as a Composer,” in Bruno Bouckaert and Eugeen Schreurs, eds., *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500–1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire: Colloquium Proceedings, Leuven, 25–28 November 1999* (Leuven: Alamire Foundation, 2003), 249, 252.
descending ones tilt even more markedly toward the left. Noteheads are a rounded teardrop shape. The writing of the text is an undistinguished gothic style.\(^{29}\)

Hudson compares it with an example written in Alamire’s informal and quick hand, and yet points out the following about the latter:

Noticeable, however, is the highly disciplined style of both music and text characteristic of an accomplished professional. One notes in particular that the stems are always perfectly vertical and that the tops of ascending stems are thickened […]. Semibreves, minims, and semiminims with ascending stems have somewhat triangular teardrop-shaped noteheads with stems connected at the top point, while notes with descending stems are consistently written as lozenge-shaped notes. The signature has a different style of ‘p’, and Alamire is spelled with an ‘i’ instead of a ‘y’. Elsewhere in the text these shapes differ as well. Yet there are basic similarities. How are the differences to be accounted for? One can only speculate. One possibility is that the fascicle was copied for, rather than by, Alamire, or that it was to be given to him. More likely, it represents a late example of his work written during a time of physical decline.\(^{30}\)

Despite all these differences, and an additional footnote stating that the other examples of Alamire’s signature are consistent as a group, each including a “flamboyant dot over the ‘i’ and the flourish after the final ‘e’—neither of which appear in the VienNB 11883 example—Hudson proposes that it is more likely that these differences can be accounted for by “physical decline” late in life rather than the simpler explanation that it is simply someone else’s hand. Scribal hands certainly changed over time, but the regression to the more amateurish tilting of stems and differently shaped noteheads that do not vary when ascending versus descending seems unlikely for one of the master scribes of his time, even in old age or infirmity.\(^{31}\)

\(^{29}\) Hudson, “A Glimpse…,” 185.
\(^{31}\) On changing scribal hands see, for example, Warmington, “A Survey of Scribal Hands in the Manuscripts” and Kiel and Warmington, “Overview of the Scribes” (both in The Treasury…, 41–46 and 47–52 respectively). They address how certain scribal hands changed over time, with examples of “early” and “later” forms of the same musical signs by the same hand.
The Treasury entry on VienNB 11883 concludes with a discussion of watermarks, stating that, “As a rule watermarks change with gatherings, but some of them reappear frequently, and several layers bear more than one watermark (or bear the same motif in slightly different versions). Almost all of the gatherings are thus interconnected by sharing at least one of their watermarks with other gatherings; they are obviously all of a similar origin.” But is it so obvious? Given the other questions raised about traits thus far taken as a matter of fact about this manuscript, further study of the watermarks in this manuscript are warranted. Building on Hudson’s preliminary survey, a deeper study of these watermarks can reveal further nuances about the fascicles’ origins, the uses of the manuscript, and the music contained within it.

COMPOSERS, PRESENT AND ABSENT
The preceding discussion of physical, musical, and conceptual traits that define VienNB 11883 reveals a persistent urge to link those traits to concrete people—to scribes or papermakers, to collectors or scriptoria, and of course to composers, despite the profusion of anonymous works in the manuscript. The last is often a foundation of certain branches of musicological inquiry: those that place authorship above other traits, usually filing works in a taxonomy that sorts first by composer (i.e., the New Josquin Edition) and only then by other categories (i.e., “Masses on Polyphonic Songs”). Anecdotes suggest that contemporaries of these composers put similar importance on whomever they believed composed a work. There is the famous story from Italian nobleman Baldassare Castiglione’s Book of the Courtier, in which the author chides those who value others’

32 M.F. [Michael Friebel], The Treasury..., 151. Emphasis mine.
judgment over their own by recounting an instance in which a motet sung for a Duchess was considered worthless by all who heard it until it was revealed to be by Josquin. And there are indications that not only were works valued differently based on authorship, but the composers themselves were as well. In a letter to Ercole d’Este, the Duke of Ferrara, Gian de Artiganova compares the musical (and temperamental) merits of Isaac versus Josquin and weighs the respective benefits they might offer against the salaries they each demand—a literal monetary valuing of the two composers.

Yet, there are also indications that our current hierarchy, which places a work’s composer before the work’s intended use, could have been reversed at the time this music circulated. Through an investigation of the Alamire manuscripts, Zoë Saunders finds that identifying a mass by function or model took precedence over identifying it by composer. Scribes showed little consistency in how they wrote a composer’s name, using various shortenings or spellings based on personal habit or preference, and omitting the composer’s name far more often than a title. She argues that the omission of an ascription was usually because the scribes lacked the information about who composed the work, suggesting “the composer’s name was not always an integral part of his composition.” and concluding that “there is no reason to regard the anonymous works transmitted in these manuscripts alongside works by renowned composers as having any less status and importance in their time.” This is one indication that those personally involved with circulating music did not consider anonymous works lesser than ascribed works.

34 Rob C. Wegman, “And Josquin Laughed…” Josquin and the Composer’s Anecdote in the Sixteenth Century,” The Journal of Musicology 17, no. 3 (July 1, 1999): 334–35.
These conflicting views—that Renaissance listeners and patrons were aware of perceived differences in quality between composers, and yet that anonymous works were not considered inferior—get at the heart of a question that surrounds the music in VienNB 11883. If we as musicologists are so lucky to have this manuscript, which preserves so many anonymous and unica works, why are these works almost entirely absent from our scholarship?

Within our composer-based hierarchy, even the attributed works in VienNB 11883 that are ascribed to a lesser-known composer are sometimes approached with the purpose of reattributing them to more well-known composers. One example is an investigation by Murray Steib, who has attempted to assign certain works in the manuscript to Compère.\textsuperscript{36} Steib argues that the \textit{Missa De tous biens plaine} in VienNB 11883 attributed to Johannes Notens is actually by Loyset Compère, to whom it is credited in another manuscript, Berlin 40634. (The mass is also preserved anonymously in three other sources.) Steib bases his findings primarily on comparison with other works by Compère, particularly the early motet \textit{Omnium bonorum plena}, which uses the same model as \textit{Missa De tous biens plaine}. He finds similarities between the two works, primarily in the incorporation of borrowed material and distribution of the cantus firmus material in the Credo of the mass, which is very similar to the treatment in the motet. But he also discusses dissimilarities with Compère’s known masses, pointing out the simplicity of cantus firmus treatment and lack of polyphonic quotation compared to this other masses. From this, he concludes that \textit{Missa De tous biens plaine} represents an early work of Compère’s, suggesting that it was written in the 1470s, and drawing conclusions

about Compère’s biography based on that. And since the fascicle that preserves Missa De tous biens plaine in VienNB 11883 also contains three other works, Steib questions the authorship of them as well.

The hitch here is that, as I will show in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, similar or even nearly identical treatment of a cantus firmus is not necessarily proof that works share a composer; such similar treatments of borrowed material can stem from the musical lingua franca gaining greater currency in early music studies. By taking the similar use of cantus firmus as proof that both works are by Compère, Steib neglects the possibility that Missa De tous beins plaine was modeled on Compère’s motet, as just one example of the complex intertextuality among works of this period. In the rush to reattribute the work to Compère, it is easy to overlook the stylistic red flags indicating that the work might not be his, and explain them away by saying the mass is an early work. Furthermore, the general rule when working with conflicting attributions is that the less famous of the two composers is usually the correct one, since it was more common

37 Ibid., 446–52.
38 Ibid., 443.
39 The current move in early musicology toward defining a lingua franca (a term brought to the forefront by Jesse Rodin’s Josquin’s Rome: Hearing and Composing in the Sistine Chapel [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012]) seems to parallel a rise in “stylistic deattribution.” For example, Obrecht’s use of segmented cantus firmi in several masses was reason enough to previously assign him the anonymous Missa Naray je jamais based on its segmented cantus firmus. The eventual deattribution of the mass meant not only that the technique was no longer a fingerprint linked uniquely to Obrecht, but also that the technique was in wider use, perhaps utilized by composers whom Obrecht copied. (Theodor Dumitrescu, “De-attributing the Missa Naray je jamais”, Journal of the Alamire Foundation 2 [2010]: 168.)
that a well-known name would be added spuriously to a work. That would favor the attribution to Johannes Notens, who has no other known attributed works extant today.40

All this is to say that we are easily led astray by the temptation to distribute works into neat categories based on composer attributions: Johannes Notens is a category of only one work, and thus it is easier to fold him and his mass into the category of Loyset Compère instead. But as this manuscript repeatedly shows, a certain body of musical literature is resistant to such approaches based on categorizing works. The anonymous works, the works without models, and indeed, the doubly disenfranchised works with neither model nor attribution can all easily fall through the cracks.

So how do we deal with this? How can we confront the gravitational pull toward the more “tethered” works among those available to us? For one, we might remain aware that, though of course in theory anonymous works need not necessarily be assumed inferior in quality simply because of their anonymous nature, in practice when unattributed works are discussed they are often damned by the faint praise of special pleading. As an example, Edward F. Houghton concluded his study of anonymous motets in the Chigi Codex by separating the anonymous works in the manuscript into those that deserved their inclusion, and those that did not. Speaking of three of the works (Asperges me, Regina celi, and Vidi aquam), Houghton determined that “their character seems more

40 This desire to assign and reassign works to well-established categories is a common impulse in the field. As just one example, when the motet “Absalom fili mi,”—whose attribution to Josquin was the subject of prolonged debate—was “granted” to Pierre de la Rue's oeuvre, it was considered quite a boon to the less celebrated composer. Nigel Davison, an editor of the Pierre de la Rue: opera omnia explained, "It would give me the greatest pleasure to accept La Rue as the composer of this masterpiece. Once generally accepted, La Rue's prestige would be much enhanced, particularly as a composer of motets," before going on to admit that he was not yet convinced of even La Rue's authorship. (Nigel Davison, "Absalom fili mi Reconsidered," Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis 42 no. 1 (1996): 42).
utilitarian than distinguished in comparison to the extraordinary works in the codex” and “These additions do not approach the musical achievement contained in the codex’s collection of Ockeghem masses, the more recent masses by Barbireau, Agricola, and La Rue, the collection of L’homme armé masses, the tenor motets of Regis, or the more recent motets of Josquin, Gaspar, Isaac, Févin, Mouton, and Compère.”\(^{41}\) The other two anonymous works in the manuscript he deemed more suitable, concluding that “Despite the anonymity of their composers, Ave rosa speciosa and the textless motet merit their inclusion among the motets of the Chigi Codex.”\(^{42}\) Yet only the anonymous works were scrutinized for indications of their worthiness of inclusion in the collection—the other works presumably pass muster by virtue of being attributed to the well-known composers listed above.

With so many works in VienNB 11883 rendered anonymous—whether originally circulating as such or because they lost their attributions over time—this sort of view holds powerful sway over how this manuscript has been approached. The implication is that we should choose among the works in the manuscript to establish their worthiness. A comment from Daniel Leech-Wilkinson sums up the view that we should choose which pieces are deserving of study based on modern aesthetics, saying that isolating the "really bad pieces" sheds light on the "ordinary musicians" and allows us at least to "narrow the field of music worth hearing and studying."\(^{43}\) Yet the assumption that only ordinary musicians could produce really bad pieces is itself suspect. Going further still, James


\(^{42}\) Ibid.

Haar lamented a profusion of less-inspired works in the sixteenth century, saying that "examples of Renaissance music that follow the rules but amount to little more than spinning of contrapuntal wheels are not hard to find, though much of the mass of second-rate sacred and secular polyphony printed in the sixteenth century has mercifully remained unedited in modern times."\(^{44}\)

By this logic we are guided by our own taste to decide what is to be studied and what is to be ("mercifully!") left to languish in the archives. But things are not so simple: taste is notoriously hard to pin down. For example, from our vantage point one of the greatest hits of the fifteenth century was Hayne van Ghizeghem's chanson *De tous biens plaine*, surviving in thirty sources and acting as the model for fifty-four later works, more than any other in the fifteenth century.\(^{45}\) Yet despite this apparently popularity, Fallows calls it "one of the least obviously interesting songs of the century," explaining that "the discantus line has no magical moment; the tenor, used for the majority of the later settings, is relatively staid; the text is one of the blandest possible poems of praise for a lady." To explain this disconnect, Fallows suggests, "it was the very restraint of the musical expression that appealed to the refined tastes of the time rather more than it does today."\(^{46}\)

Certainly our priorities as musicologists need not hinge on what musicians in past centuries valued. Yet, if a piece so boring to us can be such a seminal work for the time, then following our own tastes and ideas of what is interesting will necessarily skew the view of what music was heard at a particular time. By cherry picking music to study—

---


\(^{46}\) Ibid.
taking, for example, a few more "valuable" works from VienNB 11883 to examine closely yet ignoring others because they are anonymous, corrupt, or not "interesting"—we are self-selecting a non-representative sample of the music that circulated. If we choose instead to be less guided by current tastes, we widen the lens through which we view a richer Renaissance musical tradition.
CHAPTER TWO: QUESTIONING THE WATERMARKS

In this chapter, I survey the watermarks of VienNB 11883 as a way of demonstrating the need to revisit the contemporary consensus regarding the manuscript. I turn to watermarks in this chapter in part because they are among the more quantitative types of data available to musicologists. Paper studies can be valuable to scholars working with books and manuscripts because of the relatively objective information they offer in helping to narrow down the range of places or times from which a document likely hailed. This is particularly important for VienNB 11883, in which the fascicles are not necessarily connected to each other; rather than dating one manuscript, we are dating twenty-seven mini-manuscripts. Indeed, in this chapter I use watermark data to show that, rather than nearly all the fascicles sharing at least one watermark with another, as previously believed, most of the fascicles do not share a watermark with another fascicle in the manuscript. This assertion casts doubts on the understanding that VienNB 11883 is composed of fascicles that share a similar origin, and opens a new range of possibilities to explain this intriguing manuscript’s origin story.

WATERMARKS AS EVIDENCE?

To explore the makeup of this manuscript, I turn to the watermarks of VienNB 11883—physical evidence of the papermaking process preserved within the pages of the manuscript. The easily overlooked miniature artworks are artifacts specific to the particular type of paper found in this manuscript: VienNB 11883 is constructed of laid (or
on which the paper was formed.1 These molds consisted of a wooden frame crisscrossed by thicker chain lines, which ran vertically, and thinner laid lines, which were more closely set and stretched horizontally across the mold, with the addition—important for our purposes—of a wire emblem sewn to the mold to leave an imprint that served as a trademark.2 Descriptions of the papermaking process in Renaissance Europe usually describe the process as involving several workmen who created paper from vats of fibrous slurry. According to the general description of forming laid-and-chain paper—which may not be entirely accurate for all the papers in VienNB 11883, but gives a good overview of the general process—a vatmen dipped the molds into the vat and shook them to spread the pulp evenly across the mold, and then passed the mold to the coucher, who flipped the newly formed paper onto felt to dry.3 To speed this process, these two workers used two molds, alternating between them so that no time was lost when the mold was transferred onto felt to dry: one dipped his mold into the vat while the other turned his

1 Papers came in various sizes, and individual sheets were generally wider than tall with the expectation that they would be folded into folios. According to Census-Catalog of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music, 1400–1550, VienNB 11883 measures 287 mm tall and 210 mm wide (Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music, 1400–1550, vol. 2., ed. Herbert Kellman [American Institute of Musicology; Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänsler-Verlag, 1988], 93). Based on these measurements, the paper size is mostly likely Chancery, which measured approximately 300 mm tall by 420 mm wide before being folded in half to form a folio approximately 300 mm tall by 210 mm wide. The Needham Calculator (http://www.needhamcalculator.net/) confirms that Chancery folio would be the smallest available size of paper that would suit the current dimensions. Since Chancery was one of the most common sizes of paper, this seems the most likely case. (It is possible that larger paper was trimmed down to these dimensions, but it most unlikely given how widespread Chancery was; the high cost of paper would likely make such waste prohibitive.) While identifying sheet size is important in matching watermarks and paper types, it is less useful for VienNB 11883, given the multiple trimmings that obfuscate the original size of the papers that constitute it.  

2 Dard Hunter, Papermaking: The History and Technique of an Ancient Craft, (New York: Dover, 1978) [replication of 1947 2nd ed. published by Alfred A. Knopf, New York], 114–23, 264). Laid paper is distinct from wove paper, developed in the eighteenth century, which used thin chains so closely woven together that the resulting paper displays a more even texture rather than distinctive lines.  

3 Hunter, Papermaking, 177–78.
pulp sheet onto felt to dry, each sheet in the growing stack separated by a new piece of felt. The third craftsman, the layer, brought this accumulated stack to a press where the paper was squeezed, separated, and hung to dry.

Each of these steps has implications for studying the paper in VienNB 11883. One result of this process is paper that differed slightly on each side, with one side imprinted with the dents from the mold wires and the other side smoother and imprinted by felt fibers. This allows the observer today to differentiate which side of the paper they are viewing, ensuring consistency when comparing watermarks from different sources. The watermarks in particular are an enticing bit of data, though the wire shapes that produced them were more subject to wear than the rest of the mold, and were likely to shift, become bent out of shape, or even reattached during a mold’s lifespan. Since the vatmen alternated between two molds, the resulting stack of paper would vary slightly from sheet to sheet, with similar impressions from the chain lines and watermarks, but differing slightly as would be expected with any pair of handmade tools. The result is what bibliographers today call “twin watermarks”—markings that are very similar in design and that imply an interconnected provenance, but that are not exactly the same as sheets

---

4 Ibid.
6 Stevenson points out that the centrifugal force of the vatman’s and coucheur’s swinging motions would over time cause the watermark to shift leftward on the mold (and therefore to the right on the sheet of paper when viewed with the mold side up), at a rate of perhaps five or six millimeters in a few months’ time. When these marks butted up against a chain line they might be sewn there or re-centered again, restarting the process. (Allan Stevenson, “Introduction,” in Charles-Moise Briquet, Les filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier, Jubilee edition, ed. Allan Stevenson [Amsterdam: Paper Publications Society, 1968], vol. 1, 17.)
from the same mold would be. Moreover, since the paper was pressed and hung to dry (usually multiple times), even sheets from the same mold could vary slightly from the pressure and stretching during the finishing process. Other factors such as varying thickness or composition of the batch of pulp, or even humidity or the weather (which can cause contraction or expansion of the cellulose fibers) could introduce irregularities between different sheets as well.

In combination, all these details can paint a useful picture of a particular type of paper. Researchers might consider factors such as the distance between the chain lines, the shape and position of the watermarks, the position of visible sewing dots, and other traits such as the size or color of the paper. By comparing these traits across various papers, we are able to search for identical sheets between sources in the hopes of finding a matching example with a secure date or provenance.

Of course, there is the question of what constitutes a match between papers, and whether simple similarity is actually useful. One view is summarized by Joseph A. Dane, scholar of book history and printing, who contends that:

Two watermarks similar in appearance are not necessarily closer in time or culture than two watermarks that are dissimilar. As with fingerprints, the only claim of value is the claim of absolute identity. A forensic scientist does not say

---

7 VienNB 11883 does not contain paper with countermarks, an additional mark (often consisting of letters) that was added to the other side of the mold so that each half of the folded sheet of paper would have a mark.
“Suspect’s prints are ‘similar’ to those of the perpetrator”; the only judgment the expert is asked to make is whether the suspect’s prints are those of the perpetrator. It may not really mean much to say “this mark is similar to Mark #3216 in Briquet,” as some scholars suppose, any more than it means anything to say my thumbprint is similar to the thumbprint of George Washington or Jack the Ripper.\(^\text{11}\)

I would suggest in response that we consider a more apt simile than fingerprints: DNA. Forensic DNA specialists can and are called upon to discuss similarity and likelihood rather than a claim of absolute identity, or to narrow down the categories of possible suspects, for example to someone of a particular race or gender, or even a specific family.

With watermarks, similarity may likewise in some cases be helpful for narrowing down the “suspects” as far as locations or time periods (by allowing, at the very least, to tentatively rule out certain areas where the design has never been seen). As shown above, there are multiple reasons why (unlike fingerprints) paper from the same mold could vary slightly from year to year, batch to batch, or even sheet to sheet. I also heed the suggestion from Jan LaRue that “[i]t is prudent to assume that no two sheets from the same mould will be absolutely identical. We are dealing with possibilities and probabilities more than identity and proof.”\(^\text{12}\)

The likelihood of these probabilities and possibilities are also a matter of debate, as are the comparative utility of the various techniques for working with watermarks.

There are several reasons to be cautious. Curt F. Bühler, for example, addresses five axioms on which watermark studies rest: that a mold had a limited life, was in constant use, that the paper it produced was used within a few years, that the paper was used by


\(^{12}\) LaRue, “Watermarks are Singles, Too,” 5.
the buyer in the order it was bought from the printer, and that stocks of paper were not accumulated by buyers.\textsuperscript{13} Finding several of these suppositions wanting, particularly the assumption that great quantities of paper were not bought and stored by buyers, Bühler concluded that watermarks should be treated cautiously for dating purposes.\textsuperscript{14} Likewise, papermaking expert Dard Hunter warns of the possible lag between when a paper was made and when it was sold, as well as the possibility of counterfeit marks.\textsuperscript{15} There is also the question of how long a particular mold might have been in use; Hunter suggests they were hardy instruments and might have had a long lifespan, even being sold to other mills (though he acknowledges that the thin wire affixing the watermarks might break more frequently, necessitating reattachment and therefore different placement on the mold).\textsuperscript{16} More recently, though, the accepted average range of use for a particular mold has narrowed. In \textit{The Problem of the Missale Speciale}, Allan Stevenson suggests that for printed books, the range of dates for matching watermarks might be only a few years in either direction of a matching watermark.\textsuperscript{17} Though Stevenson’s findings applied only to print runs, and not manuscripts, and though there is always the possibility that stray sheets of paper might have been left unused for many years, Mark Bland points out that “a study of flag watermarks over a 40-year period has indicated that whilst material can be misdated, rogue sheets are rare enough that one has yet to be found.”\textsuperscript{18} Supporting Stevenson, Bland estimates that statistical probability suggests 99.7\% of paper from a

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{14} Bühler, “Last Words on Watermarks,” 16.
\bibitem{15} Hunter, \textit{Papermaking}, 264–65.
\bibitem{16} Hunter, \textit{Papermaking}, 264–65.
\bibitem{17} Stevenson, \textit{The Problem of the Missale Speciale} (London: Bibliographical Society, 1967), 94.
\bibitem{18} Bland, \textit{A Guide...}, 35.
\end{thebibliography}
particular mold would be used within a two-to-three year period, and defines a “stray” sheet as one that was used more than five years after the first sheets from a mold were produced.\(^{19}\)

Furthermore, simply finding two matching sheets of paper is difficult. Acting as codicological detectives, bibliographers armed with tracing paper have copied many watermarks from manuscripts, looking for matches between them. Though the most exacting approach is to compare reproductions of a watermark from one manuscript directly to a watermark in another manuscript, there are also standard catalogs of watermarks from papers with known dates or origins. The major early catalog was compiled by Charles-Moïse Briquet, and comprises four volumes with reproduced tracings and descriptions of the designs, and dates and locations based on dated documents found in European archives. Though long a standard, this catalog is not without flaws, however; in particular, Briquet regularly consolidates similar designs under a single tracing, and does not identify between twin marks and very similar marks.\(^{20}\) Stevenson suggests that Briquet’s catalog be viewed instead as a valuable index or finding aid, pointing researchers toward manuscripts in various archives to consult in person, rather than a resource for dating paper without further consideration.\(^{21}\)

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 36.


\(^{21}\) Ibid., 16–17.
The standard catalog produced by Gerhard Piccard in 1961 consists of seventeen volumes organized by design. Like Briquet’s catalog, Piccard draws upon evidence from dated documents in European archives. More rigorous in identifying distinct markings, Piccard’s catalog nevertheless still relies on tracings, which are an inexact method of reproduction. Newer methods of reproducing watermarks, such as using beta-radiography, are touted as the higher standard, and in the 1970s G. Thomas Tanselle suggested that “many pairs [of molds], unrelated to each other, contain quite similar designs; but analysis of the sewing dots can distinguish between individual molds in every instance. Tracings are not detailed enough for this kind of research, whereas photographs—or, preferably, beta-radiographs which reproduce watermarks without reproducing the inked type-impressions over them—can be better for study than the paper itself. Indeed, the future of watermark study lies in radiography, and the student of paper will need to carry with him a Carbon 14 source.”

Despite the decades that have passed, I have not had the opportunity to carry a Carbon 14 source while studying the watermarks in VienNB 11883. Instead I relied on tracings using a light source in a darkened room, cautiously heeding the warnings discussed above in establishing my methods. I have chosen to trace marks from the mold side of the paper whenever possible (that is, the side of the paper indented from pressing against the wires of the mold, as opposed to the smoother side that faced the felt while drying).

---

Viewing and reproducing a watermark from a consistent side allows for a universal method of comparison, so there is no question whether a reproduced mark is reversed. For example, a P design might appear in a manuscript both upside down and facing the opposite direction because the paper was rotated around the central point, since a sheet of paper is easily spun so that the top becomes the bottom without affecting side of the sheet faces up. (See Fig. 2.1) A sheet of paper flipped horizontally produces a mark that is reversed but upright, and turns the previously upright mold side to face down. And a paper that is flipped vertically produces a mark that is upside down but not reversed with, again, the mold side facing down. With a P-shaped watermark it is easy to see when the design has been reversed or is upside down, since we know a typical P faces to the right; with other marks such as hands and pots, though, it is not as clear whether a thumb should be on the left or right side of the hand, or which direction a pot’s handle should face. Being consistent about tracing from the mold side allows for comparison on marks from the same direction, allowing for rotation, but not flipping, in determining whether two marks match.

Determining the mold side of the paper was not always possible with VienNB 11883, though I take solace in the similar troubles experienced by watermark specialist Jan LaRue, who said, “Speaking only from general experience, I do not find it easy to locate the mould side in many inferior papers, especially those that have been hammered.” Certain fascicles in VienNB 11883 are more easily distinguishable, but for other fascicles it was not always clear which was the mold side of the paper; these instances are indicated with a question mark in the sixth column of Table 1. In the

23 LaRue, “Watermarks are Singles, Too,” 8.
examples in this chapter I have rotated marks without comment, since it does not affect which side of the paper the mark was viewed from. I have noted any manipulations involving flipping the mark (and therefore reversing the design).

![Diagram of watermark directions when the paper has been rotated or flipped](image_url)

Fig. 2.1: Diagram of watermark directions when the paper has been rotated or flipped
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Learning from Theo Gerardy, I have followed guidelines concerning the
measurements of mold parameters, particularly for establishing the width of chain lines.\textsuperscript{24} Gerardy’s mold parameters include the size of the paper and the distance of the
watermark from the edge of the paper. Since the leaves of VienNB 11883 have been
trimmed, however, this is not possible to determine—a rather limiting factor, since two
matching watermark designs might not necessarily indicate the same type of paper if they
are not in the same position on a page. Given this limitation, I relied upon measuring the
distance between the chain lines bracketing the mark, and the watermark’s position
relative to those chain lines.\textsuperscript{25}

Though a sheet of paper with a watermark offers a multitude of measurable
parameters—height of the mark, width of the mark, width between the chain lines, the
number of laid lines per inch, and so on—I have prioritized the height of the mark and the
distance between the chain lines in this study. The height of the mark is more reliable
than the width of the mark since, as discussed above, watermarks experienced
considerable horizontal force that could shift and warp them from left to right over the

\textsuperscript{24}Theodor Gerardy, \textit{Datieren mit Hilfe von Wasserzeichen} (Bückeburg: Verlag Grimme, 1964).
\textsuperscript{25}I have learned as well from the many previous studies of watermarks in musicology, which
have given us such contributions as the dating of the Trent Codices, and the conceptual
reunification of Beethoven’s scattered sketchbook pages. In particular, Jan LaRue added
contributions on the utility of watermarks for musicologists, how to classify watermarks, and—of
particular interest to this study—the variability of watermark designs even when formed from the
same mold, as a result of environmental factors such as humidity, flaws in the pulp, and uneven
drying. See, for instance, Suparmi Elizabeth Saunders, \textit{The Dating of the Trent Codices}...; Peter
Sketchbooks: History, Reconstruction, Inventory} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985);
Jan LaRe, “Watermarks and Musicology,” \textit{The Journal of Musicology} 18, no. 2 (Spring 2001):
313-343; LaRue, “Classification of Watermarks for Musico logical Purposes,” \textit{Fontes Artis
Musicae} 13, no. 1 (January–April 1966): 59-63; and LaRue, “Watermarks are Singles, Too,” 1–
12. For a useful summary of watermarks as used in bibliographic studies and musicology, see
Saunders, \textit{The Dating of the Trent Codices}... 29–36.
course of a mold’s lifespan. Chain line width is usually clearly visible when viewing paper through a light box, even when the thinner laid lines are not easily seen; as such, chain line distance is a nearly universal standard in watermark catalogs.

For purposes of identification I have relied on several standard catalogs, with limited comparison to other manuscripts. Even with their limitations, tracings that include other details in addition to size and shape, such as the occasional sewing dots (distinctive patterns of holes from when the mark was sewn to the mold) and distances between chain lines, can be valuable in helping to confirm or rule out matches. For this manuscript in particular, tracings can help provide further data even within their limitations. For example, Fig. 2.2 shows two watermarks previously deemed identical. Superimposed tracings show, however, that they are different watermarks, twins, or a watermark at two different stages of its life.

I have primarily relied upon the following catalogs: Gerhard Piccard, Die Wasserzeichenkartei Piccard im Hauptstaatsarchiv (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1966–87); Charles-Moise Briquet, Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1907); George Eineder, The Ancient Paper-Mills of the Former Austro-Hungarian Empire and their Watermarks (Hilversum: Paper Publications Society, 1960); Briquet Online (http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/BR.php); Piccard Online (https://www.piccard-online.de/); Printed Piccard Online (http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/PPO.php). I have crosschecked other manuscript sources with similar watermarks in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Musiksammlung and Handschriftensammlung, but no identical marks were found in these manuscripts (listed by Census-Catalogue sigla): VienNB 4809, VienNB 4810, VienNB 11778, VienNB Mus. 11832, VienNB Mus. 15941, and VienNB 18746.

The example shows two Pots watermarks from different fascicles of VienNB 11883 that were deemed identical by Barton Hudson. (“A Glimpse into a Scribe Workshop,” in From Ciconia to Sweelinck: Donum natalicum Willem Elders, ed. Albert Clement and Eric Jas [Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1994], 206, 211.)
Fig. 2.2: Comparison of watermarks from folios 155 and 319

Knowing the limitations of tracings, I do not suggest any hard dates based on apparent matches in catalog entries. Instead I offer the comparisons to narrow down likelihood rather than pinpoint exact identity. In the same vein as Stevenson’s suggestion that Briquet’s catalog is best used as an index, pointing researchers toward manuscripts with likely watermark matches, I present occasional instances of similar marks in published catalogs as a guide for future lines of inquiry into VienNB 11883 and its relationships to other manuscripts. The suggestions are cautiously given, though, since the usual limitations of dating or locating a piece of paper based on its watermark (i.e., the ubiquity of certain long-lived designs, and the tendency of papers to travel) are compounded by the problems of the VienNB 11883 manuscript in particular (i.e., so many different papers in a single volume, the trimmed sheets hindering size comparison). As such, I concluded during my research that it would be unwise to try to make any statements about whence or from when these papers hailed based on watermarks. Instead,
I can utilize the same watermarks to do the reverse: to dismantle a current story about the manuscript by showing dissimilarities between the watermarks like the ones above, rather than construct a new story from proposed similarities.

WATERMARKS OF VIENNB 11883

The watermarks of VienNB 11883 fall into several general design types; the majority of folios bear watermarks that are some sort of Pot, Letter P, Hand, or Shield, with the remaining four watermarks categorized under a fifth heading as Other (these include a Block Letters design (ADICM), Reaping Hook, Sun, and Paddle Wheel). The general divisions of watermark are from commonly used classifications, recently standardized by the International Paper Historians (IPH), under which the Ps would fall under W-Individual Letters, the Hands under A-Human Figures, Men, Parts of the Body, and so on. The more specific names, such as Quatrefoil Pot, are my own, added to facilitate the compressibility of this text, so that the reader can have a general image of the mark that is not provided by simply numbering the watermarks as WM 1, WM 2, and so on. The flowchart in Fig. 2.13 shows my further divisions in each of the categories. Based on the tracings, I categorize the watermarks of VienNB 11883 according to Table 2.1.
Fig. 2.3: Watermarks of VienNB 11883 categorized according to design. (QF = Quatrefoil, TF = Trefoil)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gathering (folios)</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>NEW WM ID</th>
<th>Width b/t chain-lines (mm)</th>
<th>Height (mm)</th>
<th>Recto Side</th>
<th>BH’s WM#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyleaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letters ADICM</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reaping Hook</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (2-11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (12-19)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hand w/ 4-PF 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (20-29)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59?</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1A</td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (30-41)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Shield w/ Letter R 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (42-51)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>QF Pot 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>QF Pot 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>QF Pot 2A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>QF Pot 2A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI (52-63)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>QF Pot 2A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>QF Gothic P w/ Slash</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>QF Gothic P w/ Slash</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>QF Gothic P w/ Slash</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>QF Hand 2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Hand 2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 71 Felt?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 74 Mold?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Hand 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 69 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 70 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Hand 3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 69 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 69 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-22 68 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 70 Felt?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Hand 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 71 Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Gothic P 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 71 Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF Hand 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 72 Mold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 72 ?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF Hand 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 71 ?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF Hand 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 72 Felt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 72 Felt?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QF Gothic P 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 55 Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 56 Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 57 Felt?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-25 56 Mold?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paddle Wheel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 62 ?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shield w/Letter R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 74 Mold</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 74 Mold</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shield w/Letter R2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 75 Felt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shield w/Letter R2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 75 Felt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shield w/Letter R2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 75 ?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple QF Pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 49 Mold</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 49 Mold</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple QF Pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 49 Mold</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-24 49 Felt?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple QF Pot A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 48 Mold</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 52 Mold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 52 Mold</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-26 50 ?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 48 Felt?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td><strong>Hand A</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td><strong>Hand A</strong></td>
<td>26?</td>
<td>49?</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII (133-144)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4</strong></td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4</strong></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4A</strong></td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4A</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 4A</strong></td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV (145-163)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3A</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3A</strong></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3A</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3A</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 3</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV (164-175)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td><strong>Shield 1</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td><strong>QF Gothic P 5</strong></td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td><strong>Shield 1A</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td><strong>Shield 1</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td><strong>Shield 1</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td><strong>Shield 1</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI (176-189)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td><strong>Shield 2</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td><strong>Shield 2</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td><strong>Shield 3</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td><strong>Shield 2</strong></td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td><strong>Shield 2</strong></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td><strong>Shield 3</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td><strong>Shield 3</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII (190-195)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4A</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII (196-203)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4A</strong></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4A</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td><strong>QF Pot 4</strong></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX (204-207)</td>
<td>QF Pot 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX (208-221)</td>
<td>QF Pot 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic P 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield A</td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield A</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Shield A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot w/2 Handles 1</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot w/2 Handles 1A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot w/2 Handles 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot w/2 Handles 1A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2A</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Hand 2A</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic P with Shield</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot, 1 Handle</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot, 1 Handle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot, 1 Handle A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Pot 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Pot 6A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Pot 6A</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Pot 6A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot w/2 Handles 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield w/Filigree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI (277-284)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>QF Pot 7</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII (285-294)</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>QF Pot 7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>QF Pot 7A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>QF Pot 7A</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII (295-304)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Gothic P 2</td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Gothic P 2A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Gothic P 2A</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Gothic P 2A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Gothic P 2A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX (305-325)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>QF Pot 8</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>QF Pot 8A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>QF Pot 8A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>QF Pot 8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>QF Pot 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>QF Pot 9A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mold</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Small P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Small P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Felt?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 6</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mold?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endleaf</td>
<td>Letters ADICM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Positions, descriptions, and sizes of watermarks in VienNB 11883. “QF” = “Quatrefoil” and “TF” = “Trefoil.”
LETTER P WATERMARKS

The Gothic P design is among the most common of watermark motifs: according to Stevenson, it represents one of the giant classes of watermark designs, and a quick glance at standard watermark catalogs backs this, with pages and pages of disconcertingly similar examples. Barton Hudson identified four different P watermarks in VienNB 11883 (his WMs 5, 12, 16, and 19); I expand his count to five main design types, with eleven different watermarks (not counting twins).

Small P (x1):

The Small P, which appears in fascicle XXIX, is an unusual design, differing from the other Ps in VienNB 11883 in height: folio 314 stands only 18 mm high and measures 20 mm between chain lines (Fig. 2.4). There do not seem to be many representations of Gothic Ps this small in the catalogs and databases I have consulted.

Fig. 2.4: Watermark from f. 314 (flipped)

28 Stevenson, “Introduction,” 34. He continues: “The Anchors, the Bull’s Heads, the Fleurs-de-lis, and the Gothic P’s are among the most difficult for the new student of paper, the most bewildering.”
Gothic P (x2):

The basic Gothic P—of a more standard size than the previous example, and with no adornment as in the following examples—is one of the most common watermark designs and appears in two forms in VienNB 11883.

**Gothic P 1** appears in fascicle XX, on only one folio, 215. It measures 29 mm between chain lines and 48 mm tall (Fig. 2.5).

![Fig. 2.5: Watermark from f. 215](image)

**Gothic P 2** appears in fascicle XXVII, in twin forms. Folio 285 represents one version, and measures 26–27 mm between chain lines and 49 mm tall. The twin version appears in the remaining folios, and is represented here by f. 293, which measures 25 mm between chain lines and 47 mm tall (Fig. 2.6).
Hudson classified both of the two Gothic P designs in VienNB 11883 as a single watermark design, his WM 12—“Simple Gothic letter P, Similar to BriquetF 8534, 8535, 8536, 8538 (Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1502-1516)”\(^{30}\)—thereby linking fascicles XX and XXVII as having a shared watermark. While the two Gothic P design are similar in size and shape, comparison of overlapped tracings shows that they are not the same watermark, especially when you take into account the multitude of strikingly similar Gothic P designs that circulated during this time. The different distance between the chain lines confirms that these are not the same watermark, so these two fascicles are not necessarily linked as Hudson suggested (Fig. 2.7).

Gothic P with Shield (x1)

The Gothic P with Shield design appears on only one sheet of paper in VienNB 11883, f. 251, the outside sheet around gathering XXII, which otherwise is composed of paper with Trefoil Hand 2 watermarks. Hudson describes this watermark as “=BriquetF 8796 (Vienna; 1557). So few examples are known that the paper must have been rare.” And indeed, in Briquet’s catalog this mark is an unusual design, and at first glance the VienNB 11883 mark and Briquet 8796 look very similar (Fig. 2.8A). However, a closer look reveals that the arrows in the shield tilt in different directions (possibly from wear). Overlapping the tracings reveals more vexing differences: the VienNB 11883 marking is taller in the body of the P than the Briquet mark (Fig. 2.8B).

---

Fig. 2.8A: Watermark from f. 251 and Briquet 8796

32 Briquet Online, watermark 8796,
[accessed February 5, 2018].
Fig. 2.8B: Comparison of Briquet 8796 and VienNB 11883 f. 251

Searching other catalogs reveals that this design is less rare than Briquet’s catalog and Hudson suggested, but it is geographically and chronologically constrained. A search of the Bernstein watermark database (keywords: “Gothic P” and “Shield,” with limits of 70 mm +/- 2 between chain lines and 65 mm, +/- 2 mm for height) returns 104 marks, with most of them following this general design. The closest designs generally range from the 1550s to 1560s, but span a further geographical field than just Vienna, turning up in such places as Prague, Linz, Innsbruck, and Graz.

One of these marks presents a closer match than the Briquet example that Hudson offered. WZIS AT3800-PO-114950, which similarly dates from Vienna in 1554, is very close in size and shape to the VienNB 11883 mark, though with slight variance in chain
Fig. 2.9A: Watermark from f. 251 and AT3800-PO-114950

Fig. 2.9B: WZIS AT3800-PO-114950 and VienNB 11883 f. 251, superimposed

lines (which might be a result of the tracing process). Fig. 2.9A and Fig. 2.9B show these two marks in comparison and superimposed; they appear to be exceedingly similar marks.

**Quatrefoil Gothic P with Slash (x1)**

The remaining seven Gothic P designs were all classified by Hudson as his WM 5, which he described as “Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = BriquetF 8652 (Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1494–1510).” Each of the VienNB 11883 marks has their own distinctions, though. Most obviously is the Quatrefoil Gothic P with Slash, which

---

34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
appears in fascicle VI, and has a slash across the bottom part of the P that the other marks do not. It is represented here by fascicle 56 and 58; they might be twin forms, or are possibly the same mark at different points in the mold’s life, since the two are extremely similar, and it is possible that the top quatrefoil was bent at some point making it slightly shorter (Fig. 2.10). (The differences could possibly be a result of the tracing process, so further examination of this mark would be welcome.) Folio 58’s watermark is 23 mm between chain lines and 61 mm tall; the possible twin in folio 56 is 22 mm between chain lines and 59 mm tall.

Fig. 2.10: Briquet 8652, and watermarks from ff. 56 and 58

A very similar mark is Piccard’s P XII 80: the overlapped designs align quite well, with the caveat that the VienNb 11883 mark is flipped horizontally from the

---

direction a P should face, suggesting that my tracing was possibly taken from the felt rather than mold side of the paper (Fig. 2.11). Piccard’s P XII 80 dates from 1485/1488 in Aachen, Culemborg, Köln.\textsuperscript{38}

![Fig. 2.11: Comparison of Piccard P XII 80 and watermark from f. 58 (flipped)\textsuperscript{39}](image)

**Quatrefoil Gothic P (x6)**

The Quatrefoil Gothic P motif is very common: Piccard’s catalog alone has several thousand tracings of Gothic Ps with Quatrefoils on top.\textsuperscript{40} This design is central to Hudson’s argument that most of the fascicles in VienNB 11883 share at least one watermark with another fascicle. Hudson deemed this general design his WM 5 and

\textsuperscript{38} Printed Piccard Online, Band 4, Abteilung 12, 80: http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/loadRepWmarkImgPDF.php?rep=PPO&refnr=4-12-80 [accessed August 2, 2017].

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{40} See Piccard, Die Wasserzeichenkartei..., vol. IV, nos. 1–3 (Buchstabe P). The Gothic Ps in VienNB 11883 are most similar to those in Piccard’s section VII (vol. IV, no. 2).
suggested it appears in seven fascicles: the six discussed below and the mis-categorized Quatrefoil Gothic P with Slash in fascicle VI (discussed directly above). Beyond just calling all seven of these watermarks the same, he declared this design to be a match to Briquet 8652, which measures 29 mm between chain lines, 24 mm wide, and 69 mm in height. As shown below, this match is suspect.

**Quatrefoil Gothic P 1**

The first Quatrefoil Gothic P appears in Fascicle III and is represented here by f. 20 and f. 27 (Fig. 2.12). Folio 20 measures 22 mm between chain lines and 59 mm in height; f. 27 measures 22 mm between chain lines and 58 mm in height—both shorter and with narrower chain lines than Briquet 8652.

---

Fig. 2.12: Briquet 8652 and watermarks from ff. 20 and 27\textsuperscript{42}

\footnotesize
\bibitem{Briquet8652}
*Quatrefoil Gothic P 2*

Quatrefoil Gothic P 2 appears in fascicle VIII and is represented here by f. 78, which measures 23 mm between chain lines and 71 mm tall (Fig. 2.13). This makes it taller than the other marks in VienNB 11883 that Hudson had suggested it matched, as well as slightly taller than Briquet 8652. The Quatrefoil Gothic P 2 is very similar, however, to a mark in Piccard’s catalog: his Gothic P VII/1546, which dates from 1520/1521 in Braunschweig and Ghent (Fig. 2.14).\(^4^3\)

![Image: Quatrefoil Gothic P 2 and Briquet 8652](image)

Fig. 2.13: Briquet 9652 and watermark from f. 78

---

Fig. 2.14: Comparison of Piccard P VII 1546 and watermark from f. 78\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
Quatrefoil Gothic P 3

Quatrefoil Gothic P 3 appears in fascicle IX and is represented here in twin forms by f. 90 and f. 93 (Fig. 2.15). Folio 90 measures 24 mm between chain lines and only 55 mm tall, making it shorter than Briquet 8652 and most of the other Quatrefoil Gothic Ps in this manuscript. It also sports distinctive sewing dots not seen on the other marks.

![Fig. 2.15: Briquet 8652, and watermarks from ff. 90 and 93 (both flipped)](image)

Quatrefoil Gothic P 4

Quatrefoil Gothic P 4 appears in fascicle XIII, and is represented here by f. 134 and f. 139 (Fig. 2.16). Folio 134 measures 22 mm between chain lines and stands 58 mm tall, clearly shorter than Briquet 8652.

Fig. 2.16: Briquet 8652, and watermarks from ff. 134 (flipped) and 139

Quatrefoil Gothic P 5

The Quatrefoil Gothic P 5 appears in fascicle XV, in only one folio: f. 165, measuring 24 mm between chain lines and 58 mm tall (Fig. 2.17). Quatrefoil Gothic P 4 (in fascicle XIII) and Quatrefoil Gothic P 5 are generally similar in design, though the same can be

---

said for many of the P watermarks. The two fascicles also share the same scribe, perhaps indicating that they were copied together, but the fascicles do not form a unit and are separated by one fascicle between them.

Fig. 2.17: Briquet 8652 and watermark from f. 165

**Quatrefoil Gothic P 6**

Quatrefoil Gothic P 6 appears in fascicle XXIX, in only one folio: f. 325 (Fig. 2.18). The watermark measures 22 mm between chain lines and 60 mm tall, again smaller than Briquet 8652.

---

As seen from the above examples, there are differences—often significant—between each of these marks, so Hudson’s claim that they are all the same watermark cannot be correct. More importantly, Hudson argues that his WM 5 is an exact match to Briquet 8652—that is, Hudson listed each of the six watermarks above (and his seventh, the Quatrefoil Gothic P with Slash) as exactly matching Briquet 8652—an assertion that limits all these fascicles chronologically to a narrow timeframe of approximately sixteen years and geographically to the Low Countries and Germany. Given the various sizes and other distinguishing features, however, these marks cannot all match Briquet 8652; indeed, I would suggest that none of them do.

---

A broader examination of catalog marks similar to this Gothic P show this design to be far more widespread than Hudson’s proposed identification suggests. A map search of the Bernstein database (using search terms Gothic P, quatrefoil, 23 mm between chain lines, 59 mm in height, +/- 1, which encompasses most of the marks, but not IX or VII) returns more than 600 examples, clustered around the Low Countries, but spread as far as Estonia, Sweden, and the Alps. Chronologically the returns range from 1401–1596. Narrowing these matches down further will require time and resources outside the bounds of this study, but the conclusion here is simply that these fascicles are likely not related.

**POT WATERMARKS**

The next classification of watermarks, Pots, is the most common design found in VienNB 11883. Indeed, the Pot watermark was a widespread design in general: though produced primarily in northern France, it is found in manuscripts far afield, spread by Dutch traders throughout northern Europe and, according to Stevenson, “even unto Muscovy.”

Paper bearing Pot watermarks similar to those in VienNB 11883 was so common in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (when most paper in use in England was imported from other parts of western Europe) that, according to Mark Bland, it can be considered the standard paper—so much so that it represented a standard size of c.305 x 400 mm before trimming, and was so frequently used that it can now be considered a matter of interest when one comes across a printed English book from this period that is not on pot

49 Stevenson, *Les filigranes…*, Jubilee edition, 34. Stevenson distinguishes what he calls Norman Pots from other Pots that bear *bande composée*, bands across the waist of the pot that contain short vertical lines. Normal pots, and the pots in VienNB 11883, lack these lines. (p. 55)
Though Bland addresses English books in particular, the underlying implication is applicable to the watermarks in VienNB 11883: at the least, this design is not an unusual one.

Briquet divides the category of Pots into two big subclasses, Pots with One Handle and Pots with Two Handles, stating that the oldest Pot markings are those with One Handle, dating back to the mid-fourteenth century in Italy. Hudson contended there were four types of Pot watermarks in VienNB 11883: two of the Pots One Handle, and two of the Pot Two Handles. I expand the number of these subcategories further, particularly in the category of One Handle.

**Pots with Two Handles**

Watermarks of the Pot with Two Handles design appear in two fascicles of VienNB 11883, each with a set of twin designs. Hudson seems to have switched the tracings for these two marks. His WM 14 (folios 223-229, my Pot with Two Handles 1) is bisected by a chain line, whereas his WM 17 (folios 273-276, my Pot with Two Handles 2) is not. In my tracings, the reverse is true.

---

51 According to Bland, “when a printed book is not on pot this may be of interest: it could be a matter of scale (a large folio might be printed on crown), or the difference might represent a social or political statement, and a financial investment. (Bland, *A Guide…*, 27.) When folded and trimmed, this standard size sheet of pot would be c.290 x 190 mm in folio format. (Bland, 54). VienNB 11883 is 287 x 210, according to the Census Catalog entry, p. 93, though the sizes of various fascicles vary.

Pot with Two Handles 1

The watermark represented in Fig. 2.19 by folios 227 and 229 was classed by Hudson as his WM 14: “Pot, 2 handles, Similar to BriquetF 12862, 12863, 12866 (Netherlands, northern France, eastern Germany; 1521–1547).” Each of these Briquet marks boasts a second quatrefoil on a stalk above the first quatrefoil, and each Briquet mark stands significantly taller than the VienNB design, from 49 to 50 mm tall, while the VienNB design is only 37 or 38 mm tall (with 25 or 26 mm between chain lines).

Fig. 2.19: Watermarks from ff. 227 and 229

It is possible that the quatrefoil and stalk fell off of the VienNB design, causing it to stand so much shorter; or it is possible that this is a different design, outside the category of the traditional Pot with Two Handles and Quatrefoil as represented by the Briquet designs. For example, this mark, dating from 1524/1525 in Geldern, stands 37 mm tall with 26 mm between chain lines—closer in dimensions to the VienNB 11883 mark than the Briquet designs (Fig. 2.20).

The point here is not that this mark is a perfect match for the VienNB 11883 mark—it is not—but simply that there are likely closer corresponding marks for this watermark than suggested by Hudson.

**Pot with Two Handles 2**

The watermark represented in Fig. 2.21 by folios 268 and 276 were categorized by Hudson as his WM 17: “Pot, 2 handles, Similar to BriquetF 12861, 12862, 12864 (Netherlands, western Germany, northern France; 1517–1537; similar to WM 14).”

---

Of these three suggestions, 12864 is not bisected by a chain line as the VienNB 11883 mark is, so only the first two are somewhat similar. For the same reason, I would be hesitant in describing this mark as “similar to WM 14,” which might imply a relationship between the two fascicles: the other watermark is centered between two chain lines rather than neatly bisected between them, and there is a second quatrefoil atop the stem in this watermark that the other lacks.

### Pots with One Handle

The Pot with One Handle variety is found more frequently in VienNB 11883 (and in general) than those with two handles. I have separated these into three categories, not all of which are apparent in Hudson’s study: Simple Pot with One Handle; Pot with One Handle (No Quatrefoil); and Quatrefoil Pot (of which there are multiples examples in VienNB 11883).
**Simple Pot with One Handle**

The Simple Pot appears in fascicle XI, and is represented here in its twin forms by folios 113 and 120 (Fig. 2.22).

![Diagram of Simple Pot with One Handle](image)

Fig. 2.22: Watermarks from ff. 113 and 120

Hudson calls this his WM 17 and describes it as “belong[ing] to the type represented by BriquetF 12564–12579, widely used in northern France from the late 15\textsuperscript{th} through the 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries.” Measurements play a role here, in addition to the general design: the watermark in VienNB 11883 are 49 mm tall and have 23–24 mm between chain lines, while the ones in Briquet that Hudson mentions vary from 33 mm to 59 mm in height, and from 20 mm to 26 mm between chain lines, a sizeable range for each (Fig. 2.23).

When taking measurements into account, the only design that seems similar is Briquet 12567 (47 mm in height, 24 mm between chain lines), which is dated to 1504 in Bewegen-Rheine, not northern France. Again, this is not an exact match; this similar mark simply leads us to consider a wider geographical area than was suggested by Hudson’s study.
Fig. 2.23: Watermarks in Briquet, 12564–12579\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{56} Briquet Online,  
**Pot with One Handle (No Quatrefoil)**

An overlooked design not accounted for in Hudson’s study is the One-Handled Pot, without a quatrefoil. It appears in fascicle XXIII, here represented by folios 254 and 256, and was classified in Hudson’s study as being among his many examples of WM 2, the Pot that is topped with a Four-Petalled Flower (Fig. 2.24).

![Diagram of Pot with One Handle (No Quatrefoil)](image)

Fig. 2.24: Watermarks from ff. 254 and 256

One explanation is that this mark is simply a pot without any quatrefoil adorning it above, a design that is certainly common in the catalogs. It is also possible that this mark could have started its life with a quatrefoil (like all the other Pots with One Handle in this manuscript), which was later lost to wear on the mold. There are several points to consider. On the one hand, the total height of the watermark is approximately 52 mm to 55 mm, whereas the other Pots with a Quatrefoil in this manuscript tend to stand around that height with their quatrefoil, and would be shorter had the quatrefoil been lost. Additionally, there are twin versions of this mark, implying two molds used as a pair, so it is less likely that they both would have lost their quatrefoil at the same time. On the other hand, the watermark design in this fascicle is somewhat similar to the watermark in the following fascicle, XXIV, which does have the quatrefoil atop the pot (Quatrefoil Pot
6). (The marks in the two adjacent fascicles are not from the same molds in different stages of their lives, though; the Pot in fascicle XXIV is more slender in the body than the Pot in XXIII.) The repertoire and scribal hand continue from fascicle XXIII to XXIV, verifying that the two fascicles share a common origin. In this case, it is possible that the creator of these fascicles had a source of paper from supplier who used watermarks that were similar but not exactly the same. Such a situation might suggest an active copyist who worked with a steady source of paper.

**Quatrefoil Pot**

The next Pot design is most prevalent watermark type in VienNB 11883, and an important one upon which a major claim about this manuscript rests. Deemed WM 2 by Barton Hudson, the Quatrefoil Pot design shows up in numerous fascicles in this manuscript (see Table 2.2). With the exception of the design I called Simple Pot (discussed above, and which is distinctively less complex in design), Hudson identified every One-Handled Pot with a Quatrefoil (and even one without a quatrefoil; see previous paragraph) as the same watermark. In this view, eleven fascicles—I, V, XIV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVIII, XXIX—all bear the watermark he deemed WM 2 (“Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, 12635 (Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515-1551”).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicle</th>
<th>QF Pot Family</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
<th>Example Folios</th>
<th>Chain line Distance (mm)</th>
<th>Height (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>f. 11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>QF Pot 2</td>
<td>f. 42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>QF Pot 2A</td>
<td>f. 48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>QF Pot 3</td>
<td>f. 145</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>QF Pot 3A</td>
<td>f. 155</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>QF Pot 4</td>
<td>f. 193</td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>QF Pot 4A</td>
<td>f. 194</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>QF Pot 4</td>
<td>f. 200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>QF Pot 4A</td>
<td>f. 201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>QF Pot 5</td>
<td>f. 204</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td>Pot, 1 Handle (no quatrefoil)</td>
<td>f. 254</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C?</td>
<td>Pot, 1 Handle (no quatrefoil) A</td>
<td>f. 256</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>QF Pot 6</td>
<td>f. 258</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>QF Pot 6A</td>
<td>f. 264</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Stand-alone</td>
<td>QF Pot 7</td>
<td>f. 281</td>
<td>20–21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stand-alone</td>
<td>QF Pot 7A</td>
<td>f. 282</td>
<td>20–21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>QF Pot 8</td>
<td>f. 304</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>QF Pot 8A</td>
<td>f. 298</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>Stand-alone</td>
<td>QF Pot 9</td>
<td>f. 319</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stand-alone</td>
<td>QF Pot 9A</td>
<td>f. 308</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Traits of Hudson’s Watermark 2 Pots
From Table 2.2 we can see that many of the designs have significant differences. Were this a group of a particularly rare design showing up in so many fascicles, its frequent appearance would be more striking. But since the Quatrefoil Pot design is one of the most widespread of this period, it is important to consider equally that they might well be different watermarks that simply resemble one another.

Comparing the size of the watermarks is an effective starting point as its an easily observed and quantified factor; an evaluation of just the distance between chain lines and the height of the watermarks allows us to group the designs into a few families.

**Family A:**

I categorize the watermarks in several fascicles as Family A, which measure in the range of 23–25 mm between chain lines and 55–57 mm in height. At least three of these fascicles seem to be as close to exact matches as is possible to determine from tracings: fascicles I, V, and XIV. (A fourth fascicle, XXVIII, might also belong to this family.) Figures 2.25A–B show these watermarks in comparison.
Fig. 2.25A: “Family A” Pot watermarks, ff. 11, 42, and 48
These fascicles share several other features as well, lending weight to the hypothesis that they share a common origin: fascicles V and XIV both contain masses by Heinrich Isaac, and each are penned by scribes known to be connected to the Alamire scriptorium, including Alamire himself. Fascicle I contains does not share this scribe, but also contains a well-known mass by a famous composer: Josquin’s *Missa Mahleur me bat*, suggesting a connection to a scriptorium tradition that circulated masses widely known and available. Each of these three fascicles contains paper with only this watermark (and twins), perhaps suggesting a reliable/steady source of paper from a supplier, as a professional scriptorium would be expected to have.

58 Warmington, “A Survey of the Scribal Hands…””, 44, 46. According to Warmington, the beginning of these two masses were copied by Alamire, and the rest of the masses were finished by Scribe K.
The watermark and twin in fascicle XXVIII are also similar in size to the other “Family A” Pot watermarks, standing 54–56 mm tall and measuring 23–24 mm between chain lines (Fig. 2.26).

Fig. 2.26: Watermarks from ff. 298 and 304

Like the other fascicles in which “Family A” watermarks appear, this fascicle contains only one watermark throughout the gathering, and records a mass by a well-known composer, the Missa Johannes Christe care by Matthaeus Pipelare. Other traits would tentatively support this inclusion with this more “professional” family of gatherings. For one, a piece of the first folio has been clipped out, suggesting that a decorative initial at the start of the Superius of the Kyrie was of high enough quality for someone to snip it away to save it. Second, the cut-off attribution on the verso of the first folio is likely the trimmed remains of “Pipelare” using a particular abbreviation that spells out the last two syllables of Pipelare’s name using the musical notation of a ligature for the notes La and Re. Zoe Saunders has shown that this abbreviation was
favored by certain Alamire scribes, particularly Scribe X.\textsuperscript{59} Flynn Warmington describes Scribe X as “perhaps the most eloquent scribe in Alamire’s workshop, producing finely chiseled notes, graceful and varied letters, and undoubtedly many of the finest calligraphic initials.”\textsuperscript{60} Given the similarity between the watermark in this fascicle and fascicles associated with the Alamire scriptorium, the missing corner suggesting a skilled calligraphic initial, and the abbreviated spelling of Pipelare’s name, this fascicle deserves deeper study of the paleographic traits to ascertain whether it was copied by Scribe X.

\textbf{Family B:}

The Family B fascicles consist of XVII and XVIII, which share the same watermark and twin, with each version identical in height, chain-line width, and position between the chain lines in both fascicles. These marks measure 22–23 mm between chain lines and 52–53 mm in height. Furthermore, there is a loose wire on the top of one of the marks (though not its twin) that can be seen moving around on subsequent sheets, in both fascicles (Figs. 2.27 and 2.28).

\textsuperscript{60} Warmington, “A Survey of Scribal Hands,” 43.
Based on the loose wire, there is little doubt that these two adjacent fascicles share the same paper. This is confirmed by the contents of the fascicles: fascicle XVII contains Notens’ Missa De tous bien plaine, an Anonymous motet “Regina celi letare Quia quem meruisti,” and a few movements of Josquin’s Missa La sol fa re mi, as well as
the beginning of the anonymous *Missa Pourquoy alles vous seullette*, which then continue seamlessly into fascicle XVIII.

According to Nowak, these fascicles are in Alamire’s hand, though a hurried version of it. Though this might suggest inclusion with the Family A fascicles and their links to the Alamire scriptorium, the yellowed paper and worn edges of these fascicles are incongruous with the crisper and whiter paper of fascicles V and XIV. If this is Alamire’s hand, then perhaps it is stems from a different time or place compared to the Family A fascicles, either earlier or more weathered by travels before finding its way into VienNB 11883.

**Family C:**

The third family of Quatrefoil Pots includes watermarks that vary slightly in shape but are very similar in size, ranging approximately 20–21 mm between chain lines and 49–51 mm in height. Another feature they have in common is that they all appear in fascicles that preserve anonymous pieces. These marks are represented here in Fig. 2.29 by folio 204 (in fascicle XIX, measuring 21 mm between chain lines and 49 mm tall), and in Fig. 2.30 by folios 258 and 264 (twins in fascicle XXVI, measuring 22 mm between chain

---

lines and 49 mm in height, and 22 mm between chain lines and 51 mm in height respectively).

Fig. 2.29: Watermark from f. 204

Fig. 2.30: Watermarks from ff. 258 and 264

Another mark loosely associated with this family is the mark found in fascicle XXIII, the One-Handled Pot (No Quatrefoil) discussed above. It shares general
similarities with the design of the Quatrefoil Pot 6, found in the adjacent fascicle XXIV, and the same scribe and continued repertoire link the two fascicles. One final mark, the QF Pot 7, is of similar size and appears in a third fascicle that preserves an anonymous work (XXVI); this mark has similar width between chain lines, but differs enough in shape that it will be considered in the next section as a stand-alone mark, not as a part of this family of watermarks.

**Stand-Alone Quatrefoil Pots:**

The Quatrefoil Pot 7 mark, appearing in fascicle XXVI, is similar to the Family C watermarks at 21–22 mm between chain lines, but at only 75 mm tall, it is shorter and differs enough in shape to be considered a stand-alone mark (Fig. 2.31).

![Fig. 2.31: Watermarks from ff. 281 and 282](image)

Finally, the last Quatrefoil Pot mark appears in the final fascicle of VienNB 11883, fascicle XXIX. Quatrefoil Pot 9, represented by f. 319, is bigger than all the previously discussed Quatrefoil Pot designs, standing 58 mm tall with 23 mm between...
chain lines (Fig. 2.32). (Its twin, however, represented by f. 308, measures 53 mm tall with 24 mm between chain lines, a range that puts it closer to several of the previously discussed families of Quatrefoil Pot markings.)

Fig. 2.32: Watermarks from ff. 308 and 319

When the tracing of f. 308’s Quatrefoil Pot 9A watermark is overlapped with the previous Quatrefoil Pot watermarks, it is somewhat close to Quatrefoil Pot 4, as can be seen here in overlapping f. 308 with f. 201 for comparison (Fig. 2.33).
Fascicle XXIX contains works by Pipelare and immediately follows another fascicle (XXVIII), which also contains a mass by Pipelare.\textsuperscript{62} The adjacent ordering and common composer between them might imply that fascicles XXVIII and XXIX are related. But fascicle XXIX differs from the Family A fascicles in a few ways. It contains other watermarks in addition to the Quatrefoil Pot watermark (which might imply a less steady source of paper than was available to the creators of the other fascicles, since every other fascicle with a Quatrefoil Pot contained only that one design, with no other watermarks of another design). The scribal writing, though neat, differs from that of the Family A scribe in its smaller, more diamond shaped noteheads, and uses red ink for some text. The paper is more yellowed than the other Quatrefoil Pot fascicles,

\textsuperscript{62} See above for the discussion in the “Family A” section of the Pots watermarks overview, and a further discussion below in the Conclusions.
particularly Family A’s V and XIV. It is likely that this final fascicle, with Quatrefoil Pot 9, is distinct from the other fascicles with Quatrefoil Pot watermarks in VienNB 11883.

Despite Hudson’s assertion that the final two fascicles, both preserving masses by Pipelare, are related by the same watermark, it is possible here that the fascicles ended up next to each other simply because of their common composer, and not because they shared a common origin. Yet the Isaac masses in fascicles V and XIV almost certainly do share an origin, but have been separated in VienNB 11883 by nine intervening fascicles. From this we might draw the conclusion that the ordering of fascicles in VienNB 11883 is not necessarily something to read into deeply.

HAND WATERMARKS

Another prevalent watermark design in VienNB 11883 is the Hand, again a very common watermark design. According to Hunter, “Watermarks of hands were used extensively by the old papermakers in Germany and the Netherlands, and at times this mark resembled an iron gauntlet or glove, the initials or name of the maker often appearing on the wrist.” Like Pots, Hands over time came to represent a certain size and quality of paper in England, where, as mentioned above, paper was imported from the continent for the book printing industry. The design is found in great quantity in watermark catalogs, often topped with a variety of quatrefoils or trefoils, stars, crosses, but also appearing unadorned. The Hands in VienNB 11883 fall into three main design types: Hand (Unadorned), Trefoil Hand, and Quatrefoil Hand.

63 Hunter, 262.
Unadorned Hand

The unadorned Hand design appears in only one fascicle of VienNB 11883, fascicle XII, measuring 26 mm between chain lines and standing 48–52 mm tall. It is represented in Fig. 2.34 by folios 123 and 129:

![Diagram of unadorned Hand](image)

Fig 2.34: Watermarks from ff. 123 and 129

This mark was Hudson’s WM 10, which he says, “Belongs to the type represented by BriquetF 11399-11410 and many variants recorded in the Netherlands, Belgium, northeastern France, and Germany, 1475-1576.”⁶⁴ There is something wrong with Hudson’s tracing, though: while his reproduction shows chain lines that match my own tracings in width, the hand itself is about half the size of my own tracings (Fig. 2.35). (If Hudson’s reproduction were expanded in size to match my own, the chain lines would no longer align.) The thumbs also face different directions, but given the relatively paper

quality it was difficult to distinguish mold from felt for several folios in this fascicle. Based just on the sizing issues, however, it seems Hudson’s tracing of the design was accidentally reduced but only within the chain lines, or that his tracing was actually a freehand drawing of the general design.

Fig. 2.35: Comparison of watermark from f. 123 (flipped) and Hudson’s watermark 10⁶⁵

Trefoil Hand

The Hand Topped By a Trefoil (which I will refer to as Trefoil Hand) design is a relatively common design that is classified in Piccard’s catalog along with the Hands topped by crosses (Fig. 2.36). (In contrast, the Hands topped by a quatrefoil are classified separately in Piccard’s catalog along with Hands that are topped by more realistic flower designs—perhaps indicating a sacred-versus-secular divide between these two types of designs.)

Fig. 2.36: Piccard’s division between Hand Type II (top, with crosses and other tripartite adornments) and Hand Type III (bottom, with quatrefoils and flowers)⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Piccard, *Die Wasserzeichenkartei...,* vol. XVII (Hand und Hanschuh), 10–11.
**Trefoil Hand 1**

The Trefoil Hand design appears in two fascicles in VienNB 11883. The first, Trefoil Hand 1, is in fascicle VIII, represented here in twin forms by folios 86 and 82, and measures 22 mm between chain lines and stands 72 mm tall (Fig. 2.37).

![Diagram of Trefoil Hand 1](image)

Fig. 2.37: Watermarks from ff. 82 and 86

This was classified by Hudson as his WM 6, which he describes as matching “BriquetF 11465 (Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, Germany; 1516-1540).” Hudson’s match cannot be right, however, since the Briquet mark measures 24 mm between chain lines, and the mark in VienNB 11883 measures only 22 mm between chain lines (Fig. 2.38).

---

68 Ibid.
Fig. 2.38: Comparison of Briquet 11465 and watermark from f. 86 (flipped)\textsuperscript{69}

The trefoil is slightly different in shape as well. (The difficulty in identifying the mold side of this fascicle accounts for the thumbs facing different directions.) A further bit of confusion is that Hudson says that this watermark (his WM 6), also appears in the previous gathering in VienNB 11883, fascicle VII. But the watermark in fascicle VII (discussed below as Quatrefoil Hand 3) is a different mark with four petals, not three.

The visible sewing dots on the twin version of this watermark help narrow down possible matches among the plethora of hand designs in various catalogs. In particular,

the twin tracing bears very strong resemblance to Piccard Hand II/447, which dates from 1522 in Culemborg, Ermland, Fellin (Livl), Schwerin (Mecklenb) (Fig. 2.39).\textsuperscript{70}

Fig. 2.39: Comparison of Piccard Hand 447 and watermark from f. 82\textsuperscript{71}

\textit{Trefoil Hand 2}

The second Trefoil Hand design appears in fascicle XXII, represented here by f. 235 and f. 250. It measures 23–24 mm between chain lines and 53–55 mm in height (Fig. 2.40).

Hudson classified this mark as his WM 15; he said that it “Has some features in common with the type represented by BriquetF 11416-11423 (1480-1530), others with BriquetF

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{70} Piccard, \textit{Die Wasserzeichenkartei…}, vol. XVII (\textit{Hand und Handschuh}), 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 87.
\end{itemize}
11461-11466 (1516-1577), both known in the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France.”

Fig. 2.40: Watermarks from ff. 235 and 250

The problem here is that Hudson is again comparing the three-petalled VienNB mark with Briquet marks that primarily have four petals (only Briquet 11464, 11465, and 11466 among these have three petals). Since Piccard classes the Trefoil Hands separately from the Quatrefoil Hands, Hudson’s suggested dates and locations do not apply to this design.

**Quatrefoil Hand:**

Similar to the Trefoil Hand is the hand topped with a quatrefoil. This design was even more widespread than its three-petalled counterpart; it appears in three different versions in VienNB 11883.

---

**Quatrefoil Hand 1**

The first Quatrefoil Hand appears in fascicle II, in only one folio, f. 12. It measures 24 mm between chain lines and 60 mm tall (Fig. 2.41). Hudson deems it his WM 3, calling it “Similar to BriquetF 11419 (Netherlands, northern France; 1522-1523; generally similar to numerous papers common in the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France in the first quarter of the 16th century).”

Fig. 2.41: Briquet 11419 and watermark from f. 12

Briquet 11419 is ten mm taller and noticeably wider than the VienNB 11883 mark, however, so while the two are similar in general design, they are not *that* similar when the widespread nature of this mark is taken into account. To illustrate, using a database of

---

European watermarks to search Quatrefoil Hands of this size shows that the design is even more common and widespread, with dates spanning from the early fifteenth century to the late sixteenth century; this design is found quite frequently in Germany (and similar hands with the same dimensions are found as far away as Russia). This is a more widespread design than even the general description by Hudson suggests; the possibility of a German origin for this fascicle can also be added to Hudson’s more Franco-Flemish centered list.

**Quatrefoil Hand 2**

The second Quatrefoil Hand design appears in fascicle VI. There are either twin marks in this fascicle, or a single mark that shows some movement due to wear. While it was difficult to establish the mold side of all of the sheets of this particular paper, the marks are represented in Fig. 2.42 by folio 62 (A, 27 mm between chain lines, 71 mm tall) and folio 63 (26–27 mm between chain lines, 74 mm tall).

75 http://www.memoryofpaper.eu/BernsteinPortal/appl_start.disp#, using motif search terms “hand” and “quatrefoil,” specifying 24 mm between chain lines and 60 mm in height, each with a +/- tolerance of 1 mm [accessed January 31, 2018].
Hudson did not record this mark; he lists only the accompanying Gothic P mark for this fascicle. Furthermore, Quatrefoil Hands of this height with these measurements between chain lines are relatively rare in catalogs of watermarks, despite the profusion of this general design. Searching the Bernstein Database for Quatrefoil Hands with 27 mm between chain lines with a tolerance of +/- 1 mm and 73 mm in height returns only nine results, with a geographical spread that is more limited than, for example, Quatrefoil Hand 1, which had similar designs turning up as far away as Riga and Moscow. The Quatrefoil Hand 2 design is clustered around the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany. The chronological range is from 1482 to 1529, but the 1529 watermark is a bit of an outlier that does not resemble the VienNB 11883 mark; it is thinner, has a stem leading to the quatrefoil, and has a thumb that is nearly the length of the other fingers. If you
exclude that result, the remaining eight designs all strongly resemble the VienNB 11883 marking, and are all dated between 1482 and 1488.

Of these, the Quatrefoil Hand 2 marking shares several characteristics with Piccard Hand III/1096, which is dated to 1485 in Frankfurt Main. Comparison of the two designs shows that the index finger of the VienNB mark is too long, and other subtle differences exist between the sleeves, yet the general design aspects, such as the slanting of the sleeve and tall, thin quatrefoil shape, are apparent (Fig. 2.43).

![Fig. 2.43: Comparison of Piccard Hand 1096 and watermark from f. 63 (flipped in superimposition)](image)

---

77 Ibid.
These marks are not a perfect match, but their close similarity along with the other eight very similar designs from the Bernstein Database, all dating from the 1480s in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany, suggests that this is a likely decade for this paper.

**Quatrefoil Hand 3**

The final Quatrefoil Hand design, Quatrefoil Hand 3, appears in fascicle VII, and is represented in Fig. 2.44 by folios 68 and 73. It measures 21–22 mm between chain lines and 69–70 mm in height. Hudson classified this as his WM 6, saying it matched “Briquet 11465 (Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, Germany; 1516-1540).” He also classified the Trefoil Hand 1 watermark in the following fascicle, VII, as this same WM 6, discussed above. These two watermarks cannot be the same, since one is topped by a trefoil, and one by a quatrefoil.

The Quatrefoil Hand 3 mark and Briquet 11465 do look somewhat similar at quick glance: each features a relatively slender hand, with a long thin thumb. But this cannot be Briquet 11465. The VienNB mark measures 21-24 mm between chain lines (depending on which folio is measured) and only 69-70 mm tall; Briquet 11465 measures 24 mm between chain lines and 73 mm tall. Most importantly, however, the Briquet mark has only three petals (a trefoil), not four (a quatrefoil). As discussed above, Piccard considers hands topped by quatrefoils to be classed with flowers; the trefoils are classified with the crosses. Given this disparity, Hudson’s dates and geographical identification for this fascicle (and for fascicle VIII) must be disregarded.

---

This mark is also very similar to a design in the Piccard Online catalog that dates for 1529 in Arnhem, but the two are centered differently between the chain lines—perhaps related to movement from centrifugal force as Stevenson suggested was common—and the VienNB 11883 mark from f. 68 is flipped when compared to the Piccard mark (Fig. 2.45). Most likely these are generally similar but not the same mark.

---

Fig. 2.45: Comparison of Piccard Online Nr. 155107 and watermark from f. 68 (flipped)\textsuperscript{81}

A search of the Bernstein Database for this watermark’s dimensions returns only twenty-two marks, clustered around Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands, but also in Estonia and Latvia, with a chronological range of 1487 to 1540.\textsuperscript{82}

**Shield Watermarks**

Though not as massive a category of watermarks as Pots or Hands, Shields are also a common design. Hudson identified three main shield designs in VienNB 11883; I offer several more designs, broken down into four main types.

---

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{82} www.memoryofpaper.au, using search terms “Hand” + “Quatrefoil” + 22 mm b/t chain lines + 69 mm height, with a tolerance of +/-1 on each.
Simple Shield (x1)

The Simple Shield appears in fascicle XX, and is a particularly hard watermark to view and trace. It is represented here by a tracing from the only folio from which I could get a complete tracing, f. 219, and measures 27–28 mm between chain lines and 43 mm tall; a lower-quality tracing from folio 221 measures 26–27 mm between chain lines and 45 mm in height (Fig. 2.46). Hudson called this mark his WM 13 and said it was similar to BriquetF 1562 (north-central France; 1482-1511). This design represents the arms of Orleans with a horizontal lambel with three points, and nails symbolizing the passion of the cross on top.\textsuperscript{83} Similar designs dating from the 1460s and 1470s appear in another French catalog of watermarks, and the difficulty in tracing this particular paper suggest that a relatively older date is not out of the question for this fascicle.\textsuperscript{84}

![Fig. 2.46: Watermarks from ff. 219 and 221](image)


\textsuperscript{84} Midoux and Matton, \textit{Etudes sur les filigranes...}, entries #278 and #279, unpaginated.
Shield (x3)

Hudson identified three Shields in two fascicles as his WM 11, suggesting it “Belongs to a type of French provenance used over a period of some two centuries; most similar to BriquetF 1743, 1744, and 1746 (1480-1526), but larger.” These three shield marks appear in two neighboring fascicles (XV and XVI), and according to Hudson’s view that they are the same mark, the fascicles would be linked. Yet closer examination shows that the marks have subtle (and not so subtle) differences.

Shield 1

The first Shield design appears in fascicle XV. Shown in Fig. 2.47, folio 164’s watermark measures 41 mm between chain lines, and 75 mm tall; its twin, represented by folio 166, measures 39 mm between chain lines and is 76 mm tall (and is quite worn). These marks are bisected by a chain line, have three fleur-de-lis inside, and are topped with a row of quatrefoils that are themselves topped by another quatrefoil on a stalk. Below the shield is a letter, likely T.

Shield 2

The second Shield appears in fascicle XVI, and is represented here by f. 179, which measures 24 mm between chain lines and is 75 mm tall (Fig. 2.48). Two chain lines overlap Shield 2, rather than a single line bisecting it, as is the case with Shield 1. It is otherwise similar to Shield 1 in the previous fascicle: they both have three fleur-de-lis inside, quatrefoil on top with a quatrefoil on a stalk above them, and a letter, likely T, below the shield body. Yet the stalk leading to the quatrefoil shorter than the stalk above Shield 1, and the body shape of the shield itself is fatter. These are different marks, and not an instance of Shield 1 falling off the mold and being subsequently reattached to a different point on the chain lines.
Fig. 2.48: Watermark from f. 179

*Shield 3*

The third Shield appears in fascicle XVI, alongside Shield 2. It is unlikely to be a twin version of Shield 2, however. Represented in Fig. 2.49 by folio 188, it measures 43 mm between the outer chain lines and 77 mm tall; unlike Shield 2, it is bisected by a chain line, rather than overlapped by two chain lines. Like both Shield 1 and Shield 2, its design features three fleur-de-lis, topped by a row of quatrefoils and another quatrefoil on a stalk above them, and has a letter, probably T, below the shield. It is thinner in shape than Shield 2, so it is not the same mark that simply fell off and was reattached with different positioning between the chain lines; they are manifestly different watermarks.
Shield 3 is very similar to Shield 1—so much so that it is hard to distinguish between the two by eye, but when the tracings are overlapped little differences reveal themselves: the differing height of the top stalk, for example, and the shape of the letter beneath (Fig. 2.50). This close similarity might suggest a relationship between the two fascicles, but it is not as ironclad as Hudson suggested.
Fig. 2.50: Comparison of watermarks from ff. 164 and 188
Shield with Letter R (x2)

The Shield with Letter R was deemed WM 8 by Hudson, which he described as “Shield, letter R; Similar to BriquetF 8992–8994; papers of the same general type were common in the Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, and Germany from c. 1495 to the mid-16th century.” The design appears in two fascicles in VienNB 11883, and features a shield with two fleur-de-lis inside flanking a majuscule letter R, topped by a crown. Below the shield is a letter C.

Shield with Letter R 1

The first Shield w/Letter R appears in fascicle IV and is represented in Fig. 2.51 by folio 41, which measures 22–24 mm between chain lines and 74 mm in height. Folio 33 appears to be a twin marking, as the two shields are centered slightly differently between the chain lines when superimposed. It might also be the same mark that fell off and was later reattached, which would be supported by the obvious wear on f. 33’s watermark. A similar shield is found in the WZMA database, dating from approximately 1496–1503 (Fig. 2.52A–B). Given the rarity of this design, the similarity to the WZMA watermark dating from around 1500 is a relatively strong suggestion that the VienNB 11883 fascicles date from around that time as well.

87 Briquet, Les filigranes..., Vol. 3, 476. In Midoux and Matton’s catalog, a very similar mark is described as containing a K rather than an R inside the shield: “Écu au K couronné, accosté de deux fleurs de lis, sommé d’une couronne portant un quatrefeuille, avec la lettre C à la pointe.” (Midoux and Matton, Études sur les filigranes..., entry #282, unpaginated.)
88 My thanks to Paul Needham, who discussed this watermark with me and confirmed that he believes it to be a rare mark.
Fig. 2.51: Comparison of watermarks from f. 33 and f. 41
Figure 2.52A: Comparison of WZMA AT8100-RKM46_60 and f. 41 (flipped)\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{89} WZMA AT8100-RKM46_60, http://www.wzma.at/19531 [accessed February 5, 2018].
Shield with Letter R 2

The second Shield with Letter R design appears in fascicle X, represented by f. 103 and 109 (Fig. 2.53). The twins are easily distinguished by the crooked C in one version. In comparing the Shield with Letter R watermarks from the two fascicles, f. 103 (fascicle X), is extremely similar to f. 41 (fascicle IV). When overlapped, however, they are ever so slightly different (Fig. 2.54).

---

Fig. 2.53: Comparison of watermarks from f. 103 (flipped) and f. 109
Fig. 2.54: Comparison of watermarks from f. 41 (flipped) and f. 103 (flipped)
It is hard to determine whether the slight differences are just consequences of the natural variations that occur when tracing watermarks, or whether these are actually different watermarks. If the two fascicles had twin markings that matched very closely, then it would be reasonable to conclude that they are likely the same paper.

Unfortunately, fascicle IV has only one folio with a twin marking, f. 33, which was difficult to view and trace. Though there are parts of the tracing missing, it is clear that f. 33 does not have the tilted R that would match with f. 109 in fascicle X. One possibility is that f. 33 represents a mark that was re-sewn to the mold after some wear; further study with beta-radiography or other more precise methods would need to be applied to these two fascicles to come to stronger conclusions about any relationship between these two fascicles. The close similarities between f. 41 and 103 are, I believe, enough to imply a connection to at least the same manufacturer, and to warrant a closer examination of these marks in conjunction with one another.

**Shield with Filigree (x1):**

This design was classified by Hudson as his WM 8, which was the Shield with a letter R below it; the design below the shield is not a letter, but rather a looping filigree shape. It appears in only one fascicle, XXV, in only folio 270. It measures 67 mm tall with 22-23 mm between chain lines, and is bisected by chain line (Fig. 2.5). It is similar to the Shield with Letter R watermark discussed above, except for the filigree at the bottom rather than the letter C. The top design features quatrefoils with one more quatrefoil stacked directly atop the center one. The interior of the shield contains several degraded
fleur-de-lis, topped by a crown. The patterns inside and atop the shield are not unusual, but the curling pattern is uncommon.  

Fig. 2.55: Watermark from folio 270

Having found few other similar curls at the bottom of shields in other catalogs I have consulted, my conclusion here will be simply that this mark is not WM 8 as Hudson suggested. Thus, the connection between this fascicle and the other fascicles containing the shields he called WM 8 is dissolved.

91 There is only one mark with a similar bottom design that I have come across in catalogs: Briquet 1730, which measures 44 mm across the three chain lines it spans, 36 mm in width, and 59 mm in height, and dates from 1526 in Rotterdam. The heights between the VienNB mark and Briquet 1730 are significantly different, as are the ornaments on the top of the shield; I mention this mark only because of the curling filigree at the bottom, since it seems a particularly uncommon motif below shields.
OTHER WATERMARKS

Reaping Hook

One of the first watermark designs in VienNB 11883 is a Reaping Hook (or Sickle), belonging to the “Other” category, which consists of five watermarks that are limited to one fascicle each. The Reaping Hook appears only once, on the unnumbered folio containing the manuscript’s index. It is a relatively unusual design that Hudson identified as Briquet 6152 (Vienna, Salzburg, 1553). Though the ViennNB 11883 mark and Briquet 6152 are quite similar, they cannot be exactly the same: Briquet 6152 measures 33 mm between chain lines, while the VienNB mark is only 29 mm between chain lines. Just by eye it is apparent that the ViennaNB 11883 mark touches both chain lines, and the Briquet mark does not:

![Fig. 2.56: Comparison of Briquet 6152 and Reaping Hook watermark from VienNB 11883’s index sheet](image)

Another very close match can be found in Eineder’s *The Ancient Paper-Mills of the Former Austro-Hungarian Empire and Their Watermarks*. Eineder’s WM 1644 is 32 mm

---

tall, with 30 mm between the chain lines (Fig. 2.57).\(^{93}\) (My tracing of the VienNB mark faces the opposite direction from the Briquet and Eineder marks it is compared to above. Some catalogs “standardize” the marks they publish so that all the designs face the same way; there is also the possibility that I or the other watermark tracers did not correctly identify the mold side of the paper when tracing.) As it happens, the Eineder mark is also from Salzburg in 1553, and the catalog shows several other similar designs that all hail from the same paper mill (Lengfelden) in the 1550s.\(^{94}\) The level of design similarity plus the geographical and temporal limiting of this design to a single area across a few decades supports the possibility that this index page dates to Austria, likely in the 1550s.

Fig. 2.57: Eineder 1644 and watermark from VienNB 11883’s index sheet (flipped horizontally)\(^{95}\)

Furthermore, the link between the Eineder watermark and Salzburg—rather than Vienna—is significant. Based on this Reaping Hook watermark and another sheet elsewhere in the manuscript, Hudson concluded that “the unbound fascicles were taken to

---


\(^{94}\) For example, Eineder WM 1639 which is dated ca. 1552, and Eineder WM 1643, which is dated to 1559.

Austria at some point where, during the 1550s or later, they were provided with a table of contents and several other leaves with WM 1 [the Reaping Hook] and 16 [P with Shield, discussed above]. Since WM 1 [Reaping Hook] is known only from examples in Vienna and Salzburg, WM 16 [P with Shield] only in Vienna, the latter city is the more likely place for the final leave to have been added, especially since the manuscript remains there to this day.”

That is, the aforementioned P with Shield watermark, which dates from later than the rest of the paper in the fascicle it surrounds, and this Reaping Hook sheet, also from the mid-sixteenth century, were likely added later to the fascicles that already existed. Hudson narrows down the location of this addition to Vienna, since it is the only overlap between the two suggested matches he identified. But Hudson’s conclusions do not take into account the equally close match to the Eineder Reaping Hook watermark, which does not appear in Vienna but does appear in other parts of Austria. This opens up a wider geographic area for this particular sheet of paper, and for Hudson’s hypothesis about where the fascicles were collected and bound together.

Block Letters ADICM

The watermark shared by the flyleaves, the block letters ADICM, is distinct from those throughout the rest of the manuscript: sharper, more geometrical, and pressed into more finely made paper (Fig. 2.58). (Because of this refinement, I was unable to ascertain the mold side of the paper, and instead traced from the side from which it was easier to

97 Interestingly, there are several watermark designs that combine the Reaping Hook and P design, classified right nearby the P with Shield—most of which hail from Salzburg in the 1550s and later, e.g., Briquet 8801, 8802, 8803 (Briquet, Les Filigranes..., vol. 3, unpaginated).
view the mark.) While this watermark does not appear in either Briquet’s or Piccard’s catalogues, a countermark listed in *The Ancient Paper-Mills of the Former Austro-Hungarian Empire and their Watermarks* is similar in content, size, and shape.98

![Diagram of ADICM watermark and Eineder 1538 watermark]

Fig. 2.58: ADICM watermark from VienNB 11883 flyleaf (flipped vertically) vs. Eineder 153899

The watermark from Eineder’s catalog dates from the 1750s. Though these general traits are not definitive enough to determine a specific date or location, the likeness suggests that the flyleaves were added to the manuscript in the eighteenth century.

---

99 Ibid.
Sun

Gathering II contains three folios with a Sun watermark. Hudson identifies this design (his WM 4) as Briquet 13930, dating from 1492–1506 in the Netherlands, northern France, and Germany.\(^{100}\) A closer look, though, shows that Briquet 13930 has only seven rays extending from the sun, while the mark in VienNB 11883 has eight rays. The two marks vary as well in the distance between chain lines (Fig. 2.59).

![Briquet 13930 and F. 14 watermark](image)

Fig. 2.59: Briquet 13930 and watermark from f. 14 (flipped horizontally)\(^{101}\)

Something more similar to VienNB 11883’s mark can be found in Piccard’s catalog. Piccard’s watermark measures 28 mm in height with chain lines separated by 27 mm; the VienNB 11883 watermark is 28 mm in height with 27–28 mm between chain lines (Fig. 2.60). The VienNB mark from f. 14 shown above has been flipped horizontally from my original tracing (suggesting either I misidentified the mold side or these are not the same marking) so I cannot declare these two marks an exact match, but the tracings align reasonably when overlapped (especially considering the fragile nature of the

---

\(^{100}\) Hudson, “A Glimpse…,” 181.

design’s thin rays, which would be vulnerable to the forces that act upon the molds and deform watermarks). The Piccard Online catalog dates their example from Heiersberg in 1515—later than Hudson’s Briquet suggestion above, and bolstering the possibility of a German origin for the fascicle.

![Fig. 2.60: Comparison of Piccard 41230 and f. 14 (flipped)](image)

**Paddle Wheel**

Fascicle IX contains one sheet of paper with a lone Paddle Wheel watermark, folio 98. Barton Hudson matches this design (his WM 7) with Briquet 13564, found in central France. While I agree that this is likely a match, Hudson’s chart incorrectly lists the dates associated with this watermark as 1484-1514, while Briquet’s catalog shows the earliest as 1481. The VienNB 11883 mark shows obvious wear, however, with noticeable

---


movement of the initials EB to the right between chain lines—evidence of centrifugal force from the papermakers’ swinging movements (Fig. 2.61). Likely, the VienNB 11883 folio dates from the latter end of the mold’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{104}

![Fig. 2.61: Briquet 13564 and watermark from f. 98 (flipped horizontally)\textsuperscript{105}]

CONCLUSIONS

So where does this leave with regard to the claim that VienNB 11883 brings together fascicles that are almost all related by a shared watermark with another fascicle? As it turns out, there are only a few fascicles that have definite links to each other. (See Figs. 2.62 and 2.63 below.) In two instances we knew that two fascicles functioned together as a single gathering: XXIII–XXIV and XVII–XVIII both have works that span

\textsuperscript{104} According to Stevenson, “Briquet attempted to discover and reproduce the earliest examples of each mark and species or mark; and naturally, a clear early state was better for tracing than a state from worn wires” (Stevenson, Les filigranes..., Jubilee edition, 22).

\textsuperscript{105} Briquet, Les filigranes..., vol. 4, unpaginated.
across the fascicle break, without a change in scribe. In the case of XXIII–XXIV, the Quatrefoil Pot watermarks in the two fascicles are similar, but not the same, perhaps indicating a regular supplier of paper in the possession of the copyist. In the case of XVII–XVIII, the fascicles share the same Quatrefoil Pot watermark, which is confirmed by a loose wire that can be seen moving around between folios.

Folios XIII and XV share the same scribe according to Hudson, and they have very similar watermarks, though they not an exact match (Quatrefoil Gothic Ps 4 and 5). Again, this might suggest the copyist had a steady supply of paper from a single manufacturer. These two fascicles are not adjacent, however, and do not function together as a unit as in the previous examples.

Folios V and XIV are likewise linked by very similar Quatrefoil Pot watermarks and the same scribes, both connected to the Alamire’s scriptorium. Folios I and XXVIII also share very similar watermarks to this duo, but they do not have the same scribes.

There is a likely—but not definite—link between fascicles IV and X, based on extremely similar Shield w/R watermarks. And finally, there is a possible link between fascicles XV and XVI, which have similar watermarks and are adjacent fascicles.

This is not to say that the other fascicles are not related. It may well be that these fascicles were originally from a similar geographic area and were collected by someone, perhaps Petrus Alamire, for use in a scriptorium. The proof for this will have to come from elsewhere, though: the watermarks alone do not firmly support this hypothesis.

---

Fig. 2.62: Related fascicles based on Barton Hudson’s watermarks
Fig 2.63: Related fascicles based on new watermark data presented in this study
Index and Flyleaves

Judging from the ADICM watermarks that are similar in design to those from the eighteenth century, the two flyleaves were likely added well after the fascicles were created. Most likely, they were added when the manuscript was most recently bound in the eighteenth century—though the manuscript was brought to Vienna in 1656,\textsuperscript{108} the cover is stamped with the date 1752 and bears the imperial symbol of the eagle.\textsuperscript{109} The index, however, is on paper bearing the Reaping Hook watermark, likely dating from Austria in the 1550s. There is the possibility that this page was originally a flyleaf from a previous binding that had been left blank and was later utilized by someone to write an Index, or the Index itself could date to when this page was added. What is clear is that the Index was written after the manuscript was trimmed at least once: we can see this in the ascription at the top of folio 295v, in which there is a partially lost attribution to Mathius P followed by a symbol that appears to be a natural sign (Fig. 2.64).

Fig. 2.64: Partially trimmed attribution to Mathius Pipelare (indicated by a P followed by a La and Re in musical notation), f. 295v.

\textsuperscript{109} Hudson, “A Glimpse…,” 180.
This is how the name is recorded in the index, and someone glancing through the manuscript quickly to compile the list, or who was not familiar with the repertory, would understandably see it as Mathias P♮ (Fig. 2.65). However, the composer’s name is Pipelare, so what likely follows the P is not a natural sign, but rather the remains of trimmed depiction of the notes La and Re, spelling his name out musically. In fact, the upper left line of the ‘natural’ is longer than the lower right and extends off the trimmed page. What remains is probably the Re half of a two-note ligature, the upper half of which was lost. There is also a horizontal line just above the sign, presumably a staff line. The mutilated attribution in the Index indicates that at least one trimming likely occurred early in the life of the manuscript, if we assume that the Index was added at the same time the page was added. If the page had been left blank, however, there is no way to tell when the Index was added—but regardless, the trimming happened before.

Fig. 2.65: Index listing of Missa *Johannes Christe care* attributed to Mathius P♮

Such musical depictions of names was not uncommon, such as substituting a La in Pierre de la Rue, or the entirety of Alamire’s name (an alias chosen to depict the gamut syllabules La Mi and Re that could represent the note A). In a study of anonymity and attribution in the Alamire complex manuscripts, Zoë Saunders found that one scribe associated with the Netherlands Court Complex particularly favored the abbreviation La-Re for Pipelare’s name (Saunders, “Anonymity and Ascription in the Alamire Manuscripts…”). Dubbed “Scribe X” by Flynn Warmington, he is described as “perhaps the most eloquent scribe in Alamire’s workshop, producing finely chiseled notes, graceful and varied letters, and undoubtedly many of the finest calligraphic initials,” and who did most of his copying between about 1515 and 1518 (Warmington, “A Survey…,” 43.). If this is the work of Scribe X, it would date the fascicle with some security to those years as well as provide another link to the Alamire workshop. It is a tempting connection: the first folio of the fascicle has been mutilated at the top corner, giving the impression that an impressive calligraphic initial has been cut out. But the handwriting was not identified as Scribe X’s by Warmington’s survey of the various Alamire hands in this manuscript, and the messiness of the fascicle makes it difficult to compare with examples known to be linked to the scribe, mostly in formal presentation manuscripts.
Overall, we are left with a manuscript with fascicles from a variety of places and dates stretching from the end of the fifteenth century into the mid-sixteenth century, with an Index page (and an added page, as Hudson pointed out, discussed above) dating from the mid-sixteenth century in Austria, and flyleaves and a binding from the eighteenth century. There is little way to tell, however, how and why these fascicles came together. Hudson based his claim that the fascicles shared similar origins and were likely related in some way to a scriptorium on the idea that there were a multitude of shared watermarks across the fascicles, but he was mistaken. In part, this could be a result of the pitfalls of watermark methods that would be more appropriate to a traditional manuscript being applied to VienNB 11883, a thoroughly non-traditional manuscript. There is also the sense that perhaps there was some eyeballing of the watermarks, rather than more precise measuring. The Quatrefoil Gothic is a good example, in which seven clearly different P designs were classed as a single mark. But there is something deeper going on here as well: Hudson matched all these Quatrefoil Gothic Ps to Briquet 8652, which in truth does not much resemble any of the designs very well. One might wonder why Hudson gravitated toward this particular P out of the numerous volumes of Gothic P tracings in various catalogs. To me, it only makes sense when you consult the Census Catalog listings that describe other Alamire manuscripts—many of which are described as resembling Briquet 8652. One gets the sense that Hudson went into this manuscript with Alamire and Briquet 8652 on the mind, and thus was (consciously or not) looking for this particular match. I see no other explanation for why all these disparate P designs would be described as matching—not just resembling, but matching—this particular watermark, despite obvious physical data to the contrary.
This readiness to overlook contrary indications is representative of the constant negotiation musicologists face between sustaining enthusiasm for a subject and maintaining objectivity. Whether in stylistic inquiries or when approaching evidence built into the paper, we maintain a veneer of impartiality, but here we confront a situation in which even watermarks, offering arguably among the hardest of hard data, have been shaped by our biases and the story we hope they will tell. As this chapter shows, watermark data is both potent and delicate—seemingly impartial but very much in the eye of the beholder. If seemingly immutable evidence like images pressed into paper can be shaped by our own predispositions, then what of the softer traits—what of our subjective evaluations of style, taste, and quality? In the following chapter I will approach a representative work preserved in VienNB 11883 to serve as a case study of how our stylistic understanding of works can be shaped by the framework through which we view them.
CHAPTER THREE: CASE STUDY,
THE ANONYMOUS MISSA MA BOUCHE RIT

Of the anonymous masses in VienNB 11883, one of the more curious is the Missa Ma bouche rit, preserved in fascicle XXVII. On the surface, it is a standard mass cycle, written for the five sections of the mass Ordinary. Like many masses of the period, it is based on a pre-existing model, in this case the chanson “Ma bouche rit.” The use of a chanson as a model is in itself unremarkable, but this mass employs an unusual blend of techniques in adopting the chanson model. The work is neither a parody mass that quotes all the voices of the model together at the start of each movement, nor a standard cantus-firmus mass that draws from a single voice of the model, but is rather a mix of the two: it draws from each voice of the chanson, but uses them successively as cantus firmi. Additionally, the cantus firmus in some movements uses an uncommon technique—segmentation—in an especially unusual way. A close analysis of the manipulation of the chanson model reveals that these techniques are almost unknown in the mass repertoire, except for in a few works by the leading composer of the period, Josquin des Prez.

This anonymous Missa Ma bouche rit, preserved in fascicle XXII of VienNB 11883, retains no evidence of attribution, and exists in no other source that might provide a hint about the composer. Could this work be by Josquin, perhaps a bit of juvenilia that did not circulate widely? Or could it be the work of an imitator—someone hoping to
pay homage to Josquin, train to write in his style, or meet a challenge? If it were indeed an example of another composer imitating Josquin, this mass would give insight into how other musicians viewed Josquin during his lifetime, and speak to decades-old debates regarding whether certain aspects of historiography have inflated our understanding of Josquin’s reputation. There is no attribution for the work, and only vague watermark data for fascicle XXVII suggesting a copying date in the first decades of the sixteenth century. As such, there is little from which to draw an answer except from the musical material itself—that is, we must analyze the music for stylistic evidence that might indicate the hand of a particular composer.

This curious mass also speaks to a larger question about using stylistic qualities to prove authorship in a genre of music that engaged in frequent and intentional imitation. What is necessary to prove or disprove authorship through stylistic traits inherent to the work itself? This question is particularly thorny for Renaissance musicologists because a complex network of musical borrowing and imitation permeated nearly all aspects of


polyphonic music at the time. Given the pervasiveness of these techniques, it is difficult to draw the line between what might be personal stylistic traits of a particular composer, and what might be another composer borrowing from him.3

Further complicating the situation is the extent to which certain musical gestures are now understood to be part of a collective grammar, the common musical language composers shared and built upon—what Jesse Rodin has termed the musical lingua franca.4 What makes a work by a particular composer stylistically his, when so many elements—whether the cantus firmus, structural planning, contrapuntal lines, texture, or melodic gestures—were shared among many? How can we define the boundaries between the traits that define a composer’s distinctive voice, those that represent conscious acts of borrowing, and the more commonly shared gestures making up the weft and weave of the musical language?

Another reason these questions are difficult to approach is that Renaissance counterpoint can at times strike the modern listener—even specialists—as a wash of dense sound, leaving us stretching our modern ears to distinguish differentiating traits. As

mentioned in previous chapters, Fabrice Fitch has recently examined the possibility that some sources of Renaissance music were left unattributed because contemporary musicians could easily distinguish between different composers’ styles, and thus would not need attributions—a prospect Fitch acknowledges is “oddly unnerving” to musicians today.⁵

In taking on this topic, Fitch points out the tendency of musicologists to favor attributions as “hard” evidence over the “softer” evidence conveyed by musical style, despite indication from a sixteenth-century music theorist expressing the opposite preference. Fitch offers the policies of the New Josquin Edition as one example of this tendency, in which the editors have chosen to list every work ascribed to Josquin in the catalog, but have excluded other works that might be arguable for inclusion based on factors like stylistic evidence and transmission history.⁶ The anonymous mass Ma bouche rit in VienNB 11883 is just such a work: it is unattributed, yet displays enough structural parallels to works by Josquin—in particular, the Missa Malheur me bat and Missa Fortuna desperata—that it invites side-by-side comparison to tease out further links between them.

In this chapter I examine the anonymous Missa Ma bouche rit preserved in VienNB 11883, investigating the musical features that stand out in comparison to common compositional approaches from the period, as well as the traits that link it to

---

other specific works of the time. Through my analysis I show that the piece is a remarkable example of multivalent musical borrowing: it combines structural traits from several composers, and in particular has stylistic similarities and quotations that link directly to Josquin, all overlaid with a polished musical language and an inventive synthesis of its borrowed features. Narrowing in on specific musical traits and moments of borrowed material, I address the question of whether musical style can inform authorship in unattributed works. I argue that this mass is an example in which the musical material does indeed provide information about the composer, and show that—despite the similarities to several works by Josquin—this mass is almost certainly not by him.

THE MASS AS PRESERVED IN VIENNB 11883

As is the case with most of the works in VienNB 11883, Missa Ma bouche rit is copied in a single hand that does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript. The paper in the gathering is watermarked with a Gothic P, which is similar to several others that date from 1502–1516 in the Netherlands, northern France, and Germany. The fascicle contains no other works and is ten folios in total, numbered 285r through 294v in a modern hand. The mass takes up the nine manuscript openings; the two single pages at the beginning and end are blank and presumably acted as covers when the gathering was an individual fascicle. All voice parts are labeled fully on the first opening, and the voice layout is standard (superius and tenor on the left, contra and bassus on the right, top and bottom

---

6 Ibid., 70, fn. 55.
respectively). The hand is informal and without embellishment, but the musical text and underlay are both clearly readable and the movement allocation among pages is not haphazard (see Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gathering opening/pages</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 / 285v – 286r</td>
<td>Kyrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 / 286v – 287r</td>
<td>Gloria: Et in terra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / 287v – 288r</td>
<td>Gloria: Qui tollis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 / 288v – 289r</td>
<td>Credo: Patrem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 / 289v – 290r</td>
<td>Credo: Crucifixus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 290v – 291r</td>
<td>Credo: Et in Spiritum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 / 291v – 292r</td>
<td>Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 / 292v – 293r</td>
<td>Osanna, Benedictus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 / 293v – 294v</td>
<td>Agnus dei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Allocation of mass movements in gathering XXVII, VienNB 11883

Though the gathering contains no composer attribution or title, the mass model is identified under the superius of the Kyrie, where it first appears as borrowed material: *Ma bouche rit*.

**THE CHANSON AS A MODEL**

The mass takes as its model all three voices of a bergerette by Ockeghem, *Ma bouche rit et ma pensée pleure*. This chanson was perhaps one of Ockeghem’s most famous, and survives in seventeen sources, a relatively large number. 8 It was the source of material for several other works, some of them by very prominent composers: Josquin
des Prez, Jacob Obrecht, Pierre de la Rue, and Johannes Martini all based songs or masses on the chanson superius or tenor (or both, in the case of Martini’s three-voice mass).\textsuperscript{9} Typically, when composers drew material from three-voice songs, they only borrowed from the superius or tenor; the contra tenor was all but ignored. This particular chanson, however, is a notable exception. Not only is the contra tenor used as a model in \textit{M. Ma bouche rit}, but the first eight notes are also adopted in one of Josquin’s most famous masses, his \textit{L’homme armé super voces musicales}, as the opening of a mensuration canon in all three voices of the second Agnus dei.\textsuperscript{10}

Bergerettes were popular in the second half of the fifteenth century. They consist of a refrain, a number of statements of the stanza on a different rhyme scheme, a repeat of the refrain with new text, and close with a final repeat of the original refrain. \textit{Ma bouche rit et ma pensée pleure} is seemingly Phrygian, with the internal stanza cadence on A, and particular emphasis on the resting tone C; Reinhard Strohm argues that it might more accurately be described as a combination of Phrygian and Dorian with the result of a composite “minor mode.”\textsuperscript{11}

Tonally, the mass movements are structured around the tonal organization of the song’s Bergerette form, which consists of a refrain (bars 1–46) cadencing on E, and


stanza (bars 47–72) cadencing on A. The mass movement sections that quote these two chanson parts invariably end on the same cadences. For example, the Gloria is divided into the two sections Et in terra and Qui tollis: the first quotes the tenor of the refrain section and ends on E, and the second completes the chanson quote with the stanza section and cadences on A. The result of this pattern is that the mass, though distinctly Phrygian in flavor, cadences on A at the end of most mass movements, since the model is quoted once through without the repeat of the refrain. That is to say, the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, and Sanctus each end on A, but the Agnus dei closes the entire work on E since the first Agnus (quoting the refrain) is repeated for the final Agnus dei.

This plan may explain why the Pleni sunt section of the Sanctus is left without model quotation. As it is, the refrain of the chanson is quoted in the opening of the Sanctus, the Pleni is without model, and the Osanna completes the quotation with the stanza section. Since the Osanna is repeated at the end of the entire movement ("ut supra") it must be that section that quotes the material cadencing on A if the tonal scheme is to be continued, so the Pleni is skipped so that the appropriate material can be carried at the end of the movement. Typically, reduced-voice sections such as the Christe, Benedictus, or in this case the Pleni and second Agnus are free of the model. But this mass is atypical in that certain reduced-voice sections do quote the chanson. So while it is not remarkable in itself that the Pleni is freely composed, it is worth noting that if it had carried borrowed material as had other reduced-voice sections in this mass, the tonal progression of the movement would have been disrupted by ending on the incorrect final. Or to put it simply: the tonal scheme governing the mass did not arise through chance, but through a predetermined plan that mirrors the structure of the chanson on the largest
Many other masses of this period incorporate the chanson model by either using all voices of the opening as a head motif or borrowing just one voice throughout as a cantus firmus. *Missa Ma bouche rit* combines these approaches by incorporating each of the three voices of the song, used successively in different sections and voice parts of the mass. In addition, borrowed material is used in one or more voices at the beginning of some sections. Table 3.2 shows the deployment of the borrowed material throughout the voices and mass movements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kyrie:</th>
<th>Kyrie I:</th>
<th>chanson S, mm. 1–26, in S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christe:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 27–46, in S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrie II:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 47–72, in S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria:</td>
<td>Et in terra:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 1–46, in T; divided into six segments, each of the first three repeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qui tollis:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 47–72, in T; divided into six segments, each repeated: first segment in C-mensuration, second through fifth segments in cut-C, final segment first time in C-mensuration, second time in cut-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo:</td>
<td>Patrem:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1–46, in S; in C-mensuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crucifixus:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1–6 (downbeat), in B; beginning on d, repeated five times with a varying number of rests between each statement, forming an ostinato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Et in Spiritum:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 47–72, in S; divided into four segments, each repeated, then entire section stated again without repeats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus:</td>
<td>Sanctus:</td>
<td>chanson C, mm. 1–46, in T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleni sunt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osanna:</td>
<td>chanson C, mm. 47-72, in T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benedictus:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qui venit:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in C; beginning on d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In nomine:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus dei:</td>
<td>Agnus I/III:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 1-46, in T; with canon indicating removal of rests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnus II:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Superius, C=Contratenor, T=Tenor, B=Bassus

Table. 3.2: Deployment of quoted chanson material in *Missa Ma bouche rit*
In several places the first six bars of the superius (“Ma bouche rit et ma pensée pleure”) are used as a head-motive: the Crucifixus of the Credo, and the Benedictus, Qui venis, and In nomine of the Benedictus. Otherwise, the cantus firmus deployment is as follows: first, the entire superius line of the song is stated in the superius line of the Kyrie, separated into three sections that align with the three sections of the Kyrie. The Gloria takes up the tenor of the song in the tenor voice of the mass, using the first half in the Et in terra and the second half in the Qui tollis. The Credo returns to the superius of the mass, placing it again in the superius voice of the mass, but this time in a two-part division with first half of the song in the Patrem and the second half of the song in the Et in Spiritum. Skipping the Sanctus for a moment, the Agnus dei again uses the chanson tenor, placing the first half of the song in the tenor of the mass and utilizing a canon to remove the rests.

According to this pattern in which voice parts in the mass correspond to those in the song, the contratenor of the song should be carried by the contratenor of the mass. Yet the Sanctus proves to be a conspicuous exception, since the material from the chanson contratenor is instead placed in the tenor voice (the first half of the chanson in the Sanctus, and the second half in the Osanna). It is possible that this is an error in transmission; the tenor and contratenor voices of the Sanctus begin with very similar material and are in exactly the same range, and could have been inadvertently switched while being copied. Similarly, a well-meaning scribe not realizing the large-scale plan for the mass may have traded the two voices in an erroneous attempt to correct what he viewed as an error, since the contratenor had not carried borrowed material previously.
and it was very unusual for cantus firmus material to be placed in that voice. Or perhaps the pattern hinted at by the other sections of the mass is not actually a pattern after all.

Regardless of whether these voices were exchanged in error or whether the structural plan simply did not extend to the contratenor voice, this method of total adoption of the cantus firmus—in which the complete line of each of the three voices of the song is stated in full across different sections of the mass—was not standard practice. Only two other masses are composed similarly. As it happens, both are by Josquin: Missa Fortuna desperata and Missa Malheur me bat. Together with Missa Ma bouche rit, these three works stand apart from the rest of the fifteenth-century mass repertory as the only works to incorporate each voice of the model as cantus firmus material in the corresponding mass voice. Missa Fortuna desperata is a parody mass; each mass movement opens with material drawn from all voices of the chanson, forming a head-motive. Borrowed material pervades the setting, creating a closer link between mass and model than in the other two masses in question. The masses on Malheur me bat and Ma bouche rit adopt chanson models that are very similar;¹² rather than using the borrowed chanson as a head-motive as the Missa Fortuna desperata does, these two masses present the cantus firmus using the technique of segmentation.¹³

¹² For example, both chansons employ a poetic lift after the fourth syllable (Ma bouche rit; Malheur me bat). The text of Malheur me bat does not survive beyond those four words, but the structure of the music of the song suggests it might have been a rondeau quatrain (Wexler and Plamenac, Johannes Ockeghem: Collected Works, vol. III, CVI).

¹³ For a deeper discussion of how masses are shaped by the songs they use as models, see Clare Bokulich, “Generic Interconnectivity in Fifteenth-Century Music,” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2016). She particularly addresses Josquin’s Missa Malheur me bat, suggesting that it is an extreme case in which “the song seems almost to overtake the mass (put differently, the mass becomes a song).” (Bokulich, 167.) Given the similarities between how the anonymous Missa Ma bouche rit and Josquin’s Missa Malheur me bat each adopt their song models, the same could be said of Missa Ma bouche rit.
SEGMENTATION

The adoption of all voices of the chanson model as the cantus firmus is in itself an
unusual approach to creating the scaffold for a mass, but there is yet another layer to
the uncommon method in which the cantus firmus is deployed: it undergoes
segmentation in the Gloria and Credo. A survey of fifteenth-century masses reveals
that segmentation is an atypical technique that survives in just a handful of examples
that can be classified into three distinct types.

The traditional idea of segmentation is usually associated with Obrecht and the
technique used in his masses Maria zart, Malheur me bat, Je ne demande, Rosa
playsante, and Si dedero. This technique involves the (usually arbitrary) fragmentation
of the cantus firmus into segments that are then apportioned between the mass
movements and manipulated through any number of techniques. The entire model is then
brought back in complete form in the Agnus dei. A common trait that occurs in parts of
all the above masses is the introduction of the cantus firmus in expanded—sometimes
hugely augmented—note lengths, with each successive statement of the segment in
progressive diminution approaching integer valor.

Though no extant masses predating Obrecht’s employ this particular method of
segmentation, his technique did not spring from a complete void. One possible precedent

---

14 Edgar Sparks, Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet: 1420–1520 (Berkeley: University of
California Press, 1963), 260. The anonymous Missa N’aray-je jamais was previously grouped
with these five masses in its use of segmentation procedure, and Rob C. Wegman tentatively
accepts Obrecht’s authorship of this mass in his discussions of that composer’s oeuvre in Born for
recently, Theodor Dumitrescu has questioned Obrecht’s authorship of the work based on a
statistical analysis of dissonance usage compared to more securely attributed masses. Based on
his findings, Dumitrescu suggests that the type of segmentation usually associated solely with
Obrecht might have had wider usage among other composers. (Theodor Dumitrescu, “De-
attributing the Missa Naray je jamais,” Journal of the Alamire Foundation 2 [2010], 167–92.)
for Obrecht’s procedure may be found in the six anonymous *L’homme armé* masses in Naples, *Biblioteca Nazionale*, MS VI E 40, which date to around the 1470s.\(^{15}\) Considered together, these masses form the only examples of what may be considered a second type of segmentation procedure, related to but distinct from Obrecht’s variety. In this cycle, the *L’homme armé* melody is split into five segments, each of which serves as the cantus firmus for the entirety of one of the first five masses. The sixth mass incorporates the entire melody; this is analogous to Obrecht’s technique of presenting the song model in full for the first time in his Agnus dei settings.\(^{16}\)

What occurs in *Missa Ma bouche rit* can be classified as a third type of segmentation. In contrast to the techniques discussed above, which are fully pervasive procedures governing the structural foundation of the majority of the work, only the Gloria and Credo of this mass use the cantus firmus in its segmented form. The cantus firmus treatment in the other sections—Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus dei—is straightforward and follows the structure of the chanson by using the primary division between refrain and stanza at the end of bar 46 as the division between sections. For example, the tripartite structure of the Kyrie is reasonably accommodated by using both that division and another in bar 26, a logical choice that involves a cadence and rest in the

---


\(^{16}\) The relationship between the two should not be overstated, however. Obrecht’s presentation of the unsegmented model in the Agnus dei may not have been influenced by this mass cycle at all. It was not uncommon to reveal in that movement the ‘answer’ to what might have been, throughout the rest of the mass, cleverly disguised references to the mass’s model. Rob C. Wegman does not support the connection between Obrecht’s use of segmentation and this cycle on the grounds that “Obrecht’s handling of the technique appears to be motivated by different artistic concerns.” (*Born for the Muses: The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994], 235, fn.)
superius; the three sections are divided with equivalent awareness of both the naturally occurring divisions and the need for sections of roughly equal size.

The partitioning involved in the fragmentation of the cantus firmus in the Gloria and Credo, however, adopts the more illogical disjunctive divisions discussed above. The first use of segmentation in the Et in terra demonstrates this: the six segments encompass the refrain of the chanson and are divided with little regard to phrasing or relative length; only the first five are repeated (Fig. 3.1).

Fig. 3.1: Segmented tenor line of Et in terra, Missa Ma bouche rit, VienNB 11883, f. 286v

The Qui tollis completes the chanson statement with the stanza section divided into six repeated segments, the first segment in C-mensuration, the middle four in cut-C, and the final segment stated first in cut-C and then in C when repeated (Fig. 3.2).
There is a brief respite in the Patrem, which simply quotes the chanson refrain once through without any modification, but the Crucifixus and Et in spiritum continue the segmentation. The Crucifixus is the most straightforward in segmented construction. It is merely the first six bars of the chanson superius—a fragment also used in several of the reduced-voice sections of the Sanctus—transposed to begin on D in the bassus and repeated five times with varying rests between statements to form an ostinato. The Et in spiritum is the occasion for the final use of segmentation: the superius of the chanson stanza (bars 47–72) is divided into four segments, each repeated once, followed by a recapitulation of the entire quoted section straight through without repeats—perhaps a musical nod in the direction of the conventions of the Agnus dei recapitulation discussed above.

This method, while clearly a type of segmentation, shares only the barest outlines with Obrecht’s technique and finds a far closer relative in Josquin’s only mass using segmentation, Missa Malheur me bat. The cantus firmus treatment of this mass has been discussed at length elsewhere, but the reiteration of some of the main points is warranted, since in both cantus firmus treatment and use of segmentation the two masses could
hardly be more similar. Like the composer of Missa Ma bouche rit, Josquin uses segmentation only in the Gloria and Credo, reserving the Kyrie to first state the cantus firmus in its entirety, divided among the threefold structure. The Gloria presents the first half of the chanson tenor in seven repeated segments in the Et in terra, and the second half of the tenor in six repeated segments in the Qui tollis. Again, like in Missa Ma bouche rit, the model is fragmented with little regard to equal lengths or naturally occurring phrase divisions. The similarities between the two masses are further apparent in the Credo: Josquin’s setting uses repeated segments with the first statement in doubled note lengths in the Patrem, repeated segments of non-altered note lengths (with the final segment not repeated) in the Et incarnatus, and non-segmented treatment in the Et in spiritum. (These sections compare respectively with the Qui tollis, Et in terra, and Patrem of Missa Ma bouche rit.)

The other non-segmented sections of the two masses show further similarities in cantus firmus deployment. Both masses revert to unelaborated cantus firmus quotation in the Sanctus. The Benedictus of Josquin’s mass states the first eleven bars of the chanson alto in three successive duets, beginning on different pitches each time. The Benedictus of Ma bouche rit states the first six bars of the superius in three successive short sections (the first two of which are duets), with the starting pitch moving up by a fourth in the second statement and from there again by a fifth in the last. In the first Agnus dei, both masses place the chanson tenor as the mass tenor cantus firmus, each with a written canon prescribing the removal of something from the original line: notes with values less than a semibreve in Missa Malheur me bat, and all rests in Missa Ma bouche rit. Finally, the second Agnus dei of Missa Malheur me bat is a duet in strict canon; the same section

---

17 See Sparks, Cantus Firmus . . ., 346–51.
of *Missa Ma bouche rit* is a duet that begins imitatively and becomes canonic as the movement progresses. The similarities between these two masses are striking enough to confirm that they belong together as an altogether different kind of segmentation construction distinct from the techniques of Obrecht or his predecessors.

**THE MUSICAL LANGUAGE**

Segmentation as a technique creates a framework of short repeated phrases, laying the foundation for imitative musical language that blurs the line between borrowed and newly composed material.

Ex. 3.1: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, Qui tollis, mm. 124–130
An example of this is the tenor line in bars 124–130 of the Qui tollis (Ex. 3.1): it is repeated as a result of the structural framework of segmentation, and yet it blends so naturally with the related composed voices delicately hung above that it ceases to act as formalized building material and simply flows as another textural line.

Indeed, this particularly pervasive type of imitation twines itself through much of the mass, with the freely composed voices often drawing basic motivic material from the model. As a result, references to borrowed material remain present even when the cantus firmus is not, so that the model chanson remains a pervasive allusion. The second Agnus dei is ostensibly a freely composed duet, without a cantus firmus, but much of the material is actually drawn from the chanson model.

Both voices of the duet begin with a reference to the opening phrase of the chanson superius (Ex. 3.2A):

Ockeghem’s *Ma bouche rit*, superius opening, mm. 1–5

*Missa Ma bouche rit*, Agnus II, beginning of duet, mm. 43–48

Ex. 3.2A: Comparison of *Missa Ma bouche rit* and chanson model

---

18 *Johannes Ockeghem: Collected Works*, vol. III, 73–74. Note values are reduced in the edition, but have been reverted to original lengths in this example.
Then the second phrase recalls the opening of the chanson contratenor (Ex. 3.2B).

![Musical notation image]

Ockeghem’s *Ma bouche rit*, contratenor opening, mm. 1–6

---

Finally, the canonic strings of minims that make up much of the rest of the movement hint at several moments in the chanson of stepwise ascent followed by a fall of a third, such as in bars 40–42 of the chanson tenor (Ex. 3.2C).

![Musical notation image]

Ockeghem’s *Ma bouche rit*, tenor part, mm. 40–42

---
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*Missa Ma bouche rit*, Agnus II, second phrase, mm. 53–56

Ex. 3.2B: Comparison of *Missa Ma bouche rit* and chanson model

---
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*Missa Ma bouche rit*, Agnus II, mm. 64–68

Ex. 3.2C: Comparison of *Missa Ma bouche rit* and chanson model
To put these sections into the context of the preceding mass movements, the freely composed second Agnus refers to both the Benedictus and the endings of the Et in terra and first Agnus dei. These echoes of earlier music, along with the frequent imitation of model material as discussed above, create the illusion that the mass borrows far more from the chanson than is simply apparent from the cantus firmus quotations. The setting is not precisely a parody mass like Josquin’s Missa Fortuna desperata, complete with head-motives linking the beginnings of each mass movement, yet it approaches something similar in the way that it is infused throughout with musical material from the chanson.

As another example, in the Et in terra (Ex. 3.3), the staggered entries in the superius, contra, and bassus outline imitative lines, the foundational building block of the late fifteenth-century musical idiom. But these lines are also part of something more: when the tenor enters in bar 47, it becomes clear that the imitative line is related to the model and has been drawn from the cantus firmus. The freely composed voices that open the section foreshadow the strictly borrowed material, presaging the cantus firmus line so that when it finally enters it fits seamlessly into the web of imitation, following rather than presenting a new idea to be followed.

Another point of interest in this example is the overlapping phrases. In both bars 38–39 and 48–49 of the example, as two or three voices (respectively) reach a minor cadential point, another voice simultaneously begins a new phrase. This blunting of cadences is another prevalent feature throughout the mass, and the dovetailing of consecutive musical thoughts helps to smooth the transitions and create horizontal
cohesion. Furthermore, it suggests another link to Ockeghem’s chanson, which also elides cadences (Ex. 3.4A–C).\(^{19}\)

Ex. 3.3: Missa Ma bouche rit, Et in Terra, mm. 37–52

\(^{19}\) This is described in the commentary to the chanson “Ma bouche rit” in the Ockeghem Collected Works edition: “As in many of his works, Ockeghem avoids strong cadences and maintains the forward momentum by eliding the end of one phrase with the beginning of the next.” (Johannes Ockeghem: Collected Works, vol. III, LXXXII.)
As such, this excerpt of the mass shows the anonymous composer drawing on the chanson not just for the cantus firmus, but also for musical gestures in the freely composed voices, infusing the mass with a deep sense of the source material.

---

20 Ibid., 73–74. Note values are reduced in the edition, but have been reverted to original lengths in this example.
THE CREDO

The crowning glory of the setting is surely the Credo. First, it is massive—far larger than any of the other movements. In the fifteenth century, the convention was to compress the much lengthier Credo text into an amount of music not much longer than the Gloria; indeed, because of this practice there are some masses in which the Gloria and the Credo are nearly equal in length and others, such as Obrecht’s Maria Zart, in which the Credo is actually shorter than the Gloria. Yet in this mass, the Credo is uncompressed, with the relationship between text and length being comparable to that of the Gloria. A straightforward method through which to compare text compression among the movements of a particular mass is to calculate the number of breves set against the number of syllables of Latin text in each section. Whereas a typical mass setting would have disproportionate breves-per-syllable ratios for the Gloria and Credo, the ratios for Ma bouche rit are almost equal between these sections.\(^{21}\) As such, the Credo is much longer than would normally be expected, dwarfing the Gloria that comes before it and in turn underscoring its own significance.

The length is not the only defining factor in this Credo. The addition of a fifth part above the superius and thick textural voicings contribute to a new density in the music. This is especially apparent in the outer of the three divisions of the Credo, the Patrem and Et in spiritum, but the middle Crucifixus section is less thickly scored. In this part, the simultaneous use of the five voices is reserved for the buildup to the final cadence. Until

\(^{21}\) This is calculated by dividing the number of breves in the Gloria (219) by the number of syllables of Latin text (187) to find a breve/syllable ratio of 1.171. The ratio in the Credo is 1.165 (454 breves divided by 364 syllables). A mass such as Obrecht’s Maria Zart, however, has a ratio of 4.2 breves per syllable in the Gloria and 2.2 breves per syllable in the Credo, demonstrating the markedly more disproportionate ratios expected in between a Gloria and Credo of relatively equal length.
then, the voicing alternates between groupings of the two upper voices and the lower three; interior cadences are smoothed by the overlapping entrances of one or more voices so that each section seems to build out of the preceding. The construction is comparable to a reduced voice section, similar to what follows later in the Benedictus. In effect, it further highlights the broadened texture that precedes and follows the section.

The addition of the fifth voice is another example in which a conventional construct is adapted and used in an unexpected manner, much like the method of segmentation discussed above. One of the precedents in this situation is the practice of setting extra voices in the Agnus dei, a technique particularly prevalent in the works of Josquin. Often this is a byproduct of canonic writing, with the new voice being extracted from an existing line, and in several of Josquin’s masses (Hercules Dux Ferrariae, L’homme armé sexti toni, Malheur me bat) the final Agnus is increased to six voices in this manner. This familiar technique acts to generate a finale at the end of a mass cycle.

Another feature with precedents is the method of using voices to sculpt an overall textural shape to the mass. For example, in Obrecht’s mass Sub tuum presidium the texture increases by one voice in each mass movement—from three in the Kyrie to seven in the Agnus—forming an expanding structural wedge shape. Along with the addition of voices, three new chants are incorporated in free rhythm from the Credo onwards. The main focus remains on the top voice, however, because it carries the main chant throughout, repeating it without change of rhythm in each section. Whereas suddenly expanding voices at the end is a climactic way of emphasizing the Agnus dei, Obrecht’s setting accomplishes the same result in the opposite manner: a gradual and constant
development leading to an enormous finish incorporating four voices of borrowed material in the seven-part texture.

_Missa Ma bouche rit_ embraces these methods of Agnus dei enhancement but employs them by shifting the emphasis instead to the Credo. A look through the sacred output of major composers of the generation (Agricola, Brumel, Compere, de la Rue, Isaac, Josquin, Mouton, and Obrecht) reveals only one other four-voice setting that uses five voices for the entire Credo: Pierre de La Rue’s _Missa Ave Maria_. Most of the features that make the Credo of _Missa Ma bouche rit_ so extraordinary are absent in La Rue’s setting, though. The cantus firmus treatment is unremarkable, with the chant presented in long notes in one of the tenor voices in the middle vocal layout. The fifth voice is added in the same range as the tenor; it is neither above nor below the existing voices, and is instead absorbed into a typical spread of vocal ranges. The addition of another voice merely adds density to the texture, as opposed to increasing its breadth. In contrast, the fifth voice of _Missa Ma bouche rit_ is in a new range above the superius, extending to an F outside of the hand. The chanson material undergoes segmentation in the superius, a more readily audible register. This Credo setting finds roots in several preexisting constructions, but it is through the skillful remixing of these techniques that a thoroughly original structure is created.
But why the emphasis on the Credo, when traditionally composers would have focused their efforts on other parts of the mass? Josquin and Obrecht reserved their showiest compositional tricks for the final Agnus. Or why not highlight the Benedictus, which accompanied the transubstantiation, the most important moment of the mass for fifteenth-century worshippers? Yet there is an aesthetic appeal to this Credo-centric structure: it is as though the composer hoped to draw attention to everything that makes the Credo unique within the cyclic mass. The increased vocal texture sets it apart from what precedes and follows, rooting it firmly as the center of the symmetrical arc formation, with two smaller movements leading to and away from it on either side. The more relaxed approach to text setting does not just act to lengthen the movement. It also draws out the words being sung, instead of glossing over them in the rush to get through the large amount of text in a reasonable amount of music. Perhaps the goal was in fact to break away from the tradition of piling compositional tricks into the Agnus dei for an impressive ending, and instead draw attention back to the essence of the center of the mass: the declaration of basic beliefs that is the Nicene Creed.

While the main focus is on the Credo, the Benedictus also deserves attention because of its atypical use of cantus firmus material. The setting is divided into three sections: two duets (Benedictus and Qui venit), each with different pairs of voices, and a

---

22 This is not to say that other four-voice Masses do not utilize an increased number of voices outside of the Agnus dei. There are a small handful of predominantly four-voice settings by Jean Mouton—Alma Redemptoris Mater, Alleluia, and L’oseraï-je dire—that do, but the technique is not the same. In the first two the extended voicing only applies to sections of Mass movements, and in the third the five-voice Credo is followed later by a six-voice Agnus dei. None of these plans implies an emphasis on the center of the Mass cycle as is the case in M. Ma bouche rit. Josquin’s M. de Beata virgine, increases from four to five voices in the Credo and continues for the rest of the mass in five voices, but for purposes of this discussion will be discounted because of indications that it may actually be a juxtaposition of two separate settings. (Patrick Macey,
four-voice In nomine that refers to the opening of the Kyrie. What is distinctive is the presence of the first phrase of the chanson superius in each. Typically, reduced voice sections were freely composed without any borrowed material, as is the case earlier in the mass in the three-voice Pleni sunt and later in the duet of the second Agnus dei. That the composer chose to follow convention in those two sections but not in the Benedictus only places more importance on the break from tradition. Here, the music set to the phrase “Ma bouche rit et ma pensée pleure” is clearly heard twice with only a single voice of counterpoint against it, and then a final time in the highest voice of four-part polyphony. The melody is clearly presented in original note values, bearing a distinctly secular poetic message at the most holy of moments in the mass.

TEXTING

This last example would likely invoke secular notions during the mass, which leads to the question of whether the chanson text itself might have actually been sung in certain parts of the mass. A study of the text underlay in the manuscript reveals uncertainties regarding performance. The standard mass text is used in its entirety, but in several instances a single voice makes reference to the chanson text.

Some of these situations have probable explanations: for instance, the tenor of the Et in terra and superius of the first Kyrie are both underlaid with the words ‘Ma bouche rit’ in addition to the standard mass text. The Kyrie is straightforward: because of its physical location at the very start of the mass, the words ‘Ma bouche rit’ most likely

appear there as a title heading. The situation in the Et in terra may be plausibly explained when the physical attributes of the manuscript are considered alongside the cantus firmus treatment: from the Kyrie to the Gloria, the borrowed material simultaneously migrates voices, quotes a new section of the chanson, and is subjected to segmentation for the first time. The Gloria begins on a new manuscript opening following a page turn, so the placement of the words ‘Ma bouche rit’ under the chanson-carrying tenor line may have functioned to draw attention to the unexpected new location of the cantus firmus.

The bassus of the Crucifixus is underlaid with only the words ‘Ma bouche rit’. In this situation, the words might indicate that the first line of the song should be sung instead of the mass text, since in this section the bassus consists exclusively of the opening line of the chanson repeated five times as an ostinato. The repetition of a single phrase accommodating only nine syllables makes the setting of the eighty-six syllable Crucifixus text rhythmically awkward and—without splitting notes—mathematically impossible. Workable readings can be arrived at if portions of the mass text are omitted, but it is unclear what the most acceptable solution is. The same situation occurs in the underlay of the Patrem superius: no mass text is set, and only the words ‘Ma bouche rit’ appear. Again, it is impossible to set the mass text as in the other voices since the quoted material does not provide enough notes (106) to accommodate the syllables (158). The possibility that the song text should be sung in this situation is hard to accept. The sentiment of the chanson would not readily align with Christian dogma, yet the words would be unmistakable because of both the high vocal register and different mensuration (C versus cut-C in the other voices), resulting in longer note values in the superius than

23 “My mouth laughs but my thoughts weep.” The line is quoted only so far as the first syllable of ‘pleure’, the second syllable of which comes after several melismatic notes; anyone familiar with
the other voices.

This mixed practice presents difficulty in drawing a conclusion about which texts should be sung. It is possible that the scribe realized that the necessary mass texts would not fit the borrowed material in those sections, and—deciding to allow singers to devise their own solutions—underlaid the words ‘Ma bouche rit’ so that the space in the manuscript would not be completely blank. A similar problem occurs in the attempts to text Josquin’s Missa Fortuna desperata. In the New Josquin Edition, editor Barton Hudson concludes that the unworkable Gloria, Credo, and first Agnus sections were not meant for vocal performance, and for consistency chooses to leave the lines carrying the cantus firmus untexted throughout. Yet in one of the Petrucci sources for that Mass, the Credo is texted by means of dividing long notes into shorter values to accommodate all the syllables. This at least confirms that such a solution is historically plausible, since Petrucci would often interpret unspoken traditions for his readers. The Petrucci source’s validation of adjusting borrowed material to fit the text, along with the lack of anything to imply an instrumental performance of the line, suggests a tentative conclusion that the standard mass text was meant to be used in all parts throughout.

All this remains speculative, and while valuable to discuss in light of performance options it cannot reveal anything for certain. More substantial conclusions are provided by a closer look at the actual setting of the mass text. Except in the circumstances discussed above, the standard mass text appears in all voice parts, complete except in the case of intervening rests. As is expected, more care is taken with the underlay in the

---

Gloria and Credo, the sections with the greatest amount of text to be set. What comes as a surprise, however, is just how much care is given to these sections. While syllables are not visually aligned with the music, individual lines of text are specifically placed under the appropriate music, usually following rests. The lines themselves are not set arbitrarily: in only one circumstance do the syllables exceed the notes available, in bars 108–112 of the tenor line in the Qui tollis (‘suscipe deprecationem’). This seems to be an insignificant anomaly more than anything else, since the voice in question is presenting borrowed material and it may have been understood that in such situations long notes were to be divided to accommodate the text. The segmented lines also demonstrate the care given to the text underlay placement: the text in those sections flows in accordance with the other voices despite the sometimes-convoluted road map of repeats and rests.

The Et in terra demonstrates the importance of scribal accuracy in texting segmented lines. In this section, the chanson-bearing superius undergoes segmentation, with the notation indicating that each of the four segments is repeated in succession. The only other indication for the proper realization of the line is in the text layout. Each of the segments is underlain with not two but three lines of text, and the pattern they make (the first two lines under each segment are sequential, but the third is from significantly later in the text) reveals that the part is to be performed once through with the indicated repeats of each segment, and then straight through again without repeats. Singers would have known the mass text so completely as to have no difficulty in gathering what was intended in the performance of the line. No other notational indication is given—or perhaps even needed—to clarify what must happen, so the accuracy of the text setting is crucial. In that regard, the care given to the placement of certain lines of text in this
manuscript gives considerable cause for faith in the integrity of the transmission.

Still, there is even more to it: this is not simply an example of a diligent copyist being especially careful in his placement of the underlay. The music in the Gloria and Credo was without a doubt conceived with particular parts of the mass text in mind. Often, when the music is syllabic, the rhythms match the scansion of the Latin lines. For example, the music in bars 39–44 of the Et in terra (Ex. 3.3), and bars 47–51 of the Patrem (Ex. 3.5) seems to have been composed for those particular portions of the text.

Ex. 3.5: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, Patrem, mm. 47–51
At other times it is not the concordance of rhythm and textual cadence that is striking, but the deliberate highlighting of a single word or phrase, as is the case at the end of the Et in spiritum in bars 203–204 (Ex. 3.6).

Ex. 3.6: Missa Ma bouche rit, Et in spiritum, mm. 204–206

A list of these examples would read like a list of the most musically memorable sections of the work; stunning musical moments gracefully meld with the mass text, and indeed, why should they not? There are numerous examples of masses in which a satisfactory fitting of the text is an almost impossible task and it is obvious in those situations that the music was conceived without regard to liturgical text. The treatment of words in Ma bouche rit confirms the extent of planning that is apparent in all aspects of this mass.

ERRORS AND AMBIGUITIES

Despite the polished attention to detail displayed by the texting practices discussed above, there are a few lapses in the musical reading that require attention. Some of the

dissonances or contrapuntal mistakes are certainly problems in transmission, such as
minims written as semibreves or visa versa, and notes written too high or too low. (All
errors that have been corrected in the accompanying edition of the mass are noted in the
Critical Commentary, Appendix 2.) Some of the situations are more ambiguous,
however. Even though a mistake may be easily corrected and may therefore have resulted
from the fault of the scribe, when the same error occurs several times it might have more
plausibly originated with the composer. In bar 9 of the Patrem (Ex. 3.7A), the open fifths
could be amended by changing the bassus C to an E in order to provide a third. If this
were the only circumstance, it would probably be considered a transmission error, but the
same thing occurs in bar 22 of the same movement and again in bar 9 of the Sanctus (Ex.
3.7B–C). Unless the open fifths were deliberate, it is hard to accept that such easily
rectified errors—particularly in the Credo, where the extra voice provides another
opportunity to accommodate the third—would have been allowed by the composer; and
yet, it is improbable that all three could have occurred in transmission.

Ex. 3.7A: Missa Ma bouche rit, Patrem, mm. 8–9
Another puzzling situation is found in the Qui tollis (Ex. 3.8): the tenor and bassus lines move in semibreves on the words ‘Miserere nobis’, after which the musical material is immediately repeated. In the second statement, however, the bassus line acquires a ligature that was not in the first, raising a dilemma: basic musicality strongly suggests that a second statement of the text accompany the second statement of the music, but to do so would break the fundamental rule of singing only one syllable to a ligature.
This rule is one of the oldest guidelines for singers regarding text, with origins in the performance of plainchant, and described in treatises by both Lanfranco and Zarlino.\(^{26}\) Howard M. Brown, in a study of text underlay conventions based on the practices of Petrus Alamire, reinterprets the rule from the other viewpoint: ligatures can be used by the composer to specify when they wish singers to stay on a particular syllable.\(^{27}\) Either way, it seems unlikely then that these ligatures originated with the composer, but it is unclear what purpose they serve or at what point they presumably were added.

Several errors have no readily apparent solutions, and are definite flaws in the contrapuntal writing. In the Sanctus, there is an unsalvageable second-inversion chord (Ex. 3.9A). There are only three voices singing, so changing the lowest note is not an option since it would result in an incomplete chord. The other two problems occur in the first Agnus dei: parallel fifths between the two outer voices in bar 14 (Ex. 3.9B), and direct fifths between the two inner voices in bar 36 (Ex. 3.9C).


Ex. 3.9A–C: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, contrapuntal errors

One final idiosyncrasy deserves attention: a particular treatment of dissonance occurs in the same manner at least five times. In bars 49–50 of the Gloria, 61–62 of the Sanctus, and 25–26 of the Agnus dei the following occurs: two voices of the three-part texture move together, creating a suspension in the stationary third voice (Ex. 3.10A–C). Each time, this dissonance is resolved by a leap downwards of a fifth.

Ex. 3.10A–C: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, dissonances resolved by downward-fifth leaps, three-part texture

This occurs also in bars 40–41 of the Kyrie and 134 of the Gloria (Ex. 3.11A–B): the
difference is a four-voice texture, but the resolution by downward leap is the same.

Ex. 3.11A-B: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, dissonances resolved by downward-fifth leaps, four-part texture

The acceptable resolution of a suspension is of course by step, and Barton Hudson raises questions about the authenticity of a Josquin mass (*N’auray je jamais*) in part because of this same resolution.²⁸ If this example only occurred once or twice it might be easier to dismiss as clumsiness, but the concentration suggests that the composer did not share the view that it was so objectionable. In fact, the same dissonance treatment occurs in two of Josquin’s masses most staunchly authentic masses, *Missa Hercules Dux Ferrare* and *Missa Gaudeamus* (Ex. 3.12A–B).²⁹

²⁹ My thanks to Professor David Fallows for bringing my attention to the dissonance and the appropriate Josquin masses.
Ex. 3.12A–B: Moments in Josquin’s masses where dissonances are resolved by downward-fifth leaps

In light of this, perhaps it is too harsh to consider this strictly a contrapuntal error, but rather as an idiosyncrasy that is apparent in some of the most famous masses of the time.

AUTHORSHIP

In the preceding discussion of the predominant features of *M. Ma bouche rit*, it is striking how often the works of Josquin share the same distinctive traits. In particular, close parallels between *M. Ma bouche rit* and Josquin’s *M. Malheur me bat* surface repeatedly, lending weight to the hypothesis that Josquin possibly composed this work. In addition to the similarities in structural planning (i.e., use of segmentation, specific cantus firmus quotation and deployment), there are surface-level stylistic traits that support this conclusion: two final examples from each of the Gloria settings show an actual thematic

---

and stylistic relationship between the masses. Each setting of the Et in terra (Ex. 3.13A–B) opens with a ten-bar duet between the highest voices based on chanson superius material and are imitative at the unison with the second voice entering after two bars, as happens in the chansons.

Ex. 3.13A: Missa Ma bouche rit, Et in terra, mm. 1–11
In both, the cantus firmus tenor enters on ‘Laudamus te’ in the eleventh bar. It is as though one of the masses served as a schematic blueprint for the other. Another example is the settings of ‘suscipe deprecationem’ (Ex. 3.14A–B).

---

Ex. 3.14A: *Missa Ma bouche rit*, Qui tollis, mm. 106–113
Ex. 3.14B: Josquin, *Missa Malheur me bat*, Qui tollis, mm. 105–111

---

Ibid., 10.
It could be argued that the matching rhythm is merely coincidental because of the natural scansion of the word ‘suscipe’, but the concordance of rhythm and pitches in all the freely composed voices is surely beyond any act of chance. If the opening of the Gloria is an example of two masses following the same compositional blueprint, then this is evidence in the form of a musical fingerprint. One of the masses borrows material directly from the other, but which is the model and which is the imitation?

Knowing which mass came first would provide an indication about the possible composer of *M. Ma bouche rit*. If *M. Malheur me bat* were the predecessor, it would imply that the anonymous mass was the work of another composer imitating the very famous Josquin, and indeed doing it rather well. This discovery would deepen our understanding of how other composers modeled their own works on Josquin’s.\(^{33}\) (In this case, there is also the possibility that both works are by Josquin, but if *Missa Ma bouche rit* is the later of the two, it seems unlikely that it would circulate without attribution at that point in his career.)

In the converse situation, accepting *M. Ma bouche rit* as the first of the two settings opens the door to suggesting that it was an earlier effort of a younger Josquin, a compositional trial run, later overshadowed by the more skilled reworking of the same mass layout. This contribution would add considerably to the understanding of Josquin’s early oeuvre. Another interpretation would be that Josquin was imitating a lesser-known composer, a situation that would also enrich our understanding of musical influence during this time.

\(^{33}\) On our evolving understanding of Josquin’s early years, see Lora Matthews and Paul Merkley, "Iudochus de Picardia and Jossequin Lebloitte dit Desprez: The Names of the Singer(s)," *The Journal of Musicology* XVI/2 (Spring 1998), 208–15; Fallows, *Josquin*. 
Remarkably, the answer is provided in the very same excerpt that raises these questions. To look again at the beginnings of Gloria settings (Ex. 3.13A–B), the entry of the second voice is imitative as in the chanson, and therein lies the key. Both Gloria settings give the opening statement to the lower of the two voices, but in the chansons only *Malheur me bat* begins with the lower voice. The *Ma bouche rit* chanson starts with the higher voice. As one mass is copying the other, the original must be the setting that correctly follows the example of the chanson; the reversed voice entry in *Missa Ma bouche rit* is illogical unless it is copying a pre-existent setting. Based on this, Josquin’s *Missa Malheurme bat* can be identified almost certainly as the earlier of the two works.\(^{34}\)

CONCLUSIONS

The discovery regarding the authorship of *Missa Ma bouche rit*—that it is most likely not by Josquin—has ramifications on several levels. To return to Fabrice Fitch’s question about the degree to which stylistic evidence can be weighed alongside attributions, this example provides support for the relevance of stylistic data in certain situations. In this work, the musical material itself suggests “hard” evidence regarding who composed (or in this case, did not compose) this mass. Stylistic evidence can be weighed as heavily as the evidence that an ascription might provide in another situation, showing that this mass is not by Josquin. (In this situation, though, it is easier to prove a negative: to establish who did not compose the work.)

But knowing that the work is most likely not by Josquin, where does this leave

\(^{34}\) I arrived at this conclusion during a discussion of the passage with David Fallows, and am indebted to him for his input on the matter.
us? To view *Missa Ma bouche rit* as the product of a young composer imitating a famous master makes a certain amount of sense. The lack of widespread distribution and occasional contrapuntal mistakes suggest a less-practiced composer rather than someone from the inner circle of masters, but despite the minor flaws the music is infused with a certain innovation and originality in combining pre-existing concepts. The shift in emphasis in the creation of a Credo-centric setting, in particular, is an architectural design not explored in any other mass, an original idea gracefully executed nearly 500 years ago and then all but forgotten. The inclusion of so many unusual features would be the mark of someone imitating the remarkable traits of works by famous composers. By closing the door on the possibility that this mass is by Josquin, we simultaneously open another, by lending insight into how composers around this time viewed the works of their contemporaries.

In a somewhat similar situation, Jesse Rodin analyzes an anonymous mass modeled on Josquin’s chanson *Bergerette savoysienne*, examining its use of Josquin’s music in order to draw conclusions about Josquin’s fame before 1500.35 After exploring several noteworthy features of the anonymous mass on its own terms, Rodin brings the focus back to Josquin, pointing out that “All of this is interesting enough in its own right, but in fact the anonymous *Missa Bergerette savoysienne* has potentially much more to tell us about Josquin’s status in the eyes of his contemporaries.”36 That is, he positions the anonymous music as a lens through which to judge the cultural status Josquin held at the time the anonymous mass was composed. Likewise, the anonymous *Missa Ma bouche rit* in VienNB 11883 potentially has much to tell us about traits that were

stylistically significant to its nameless composer.

Among these traits, most striking are the five-voice Credo that expands that movement as a climax, the usage of all voices of the chanson model in the appropriate voices of the mass, and the segmentation of the cantus firmus. Likely, the five-voice Credo came from the example set by Pierre de la Rue in his mass on Ave Maria; the precedent for structural sculpting through manipulating voicing might be found in Obrecht’s wedge-shaped Missa Sub tuum presidium. Most clearly, the adoption of all voices of the chanson model, the segmentation structure, and cantus firmus construction are all modeled on Josquin’s architecture in Missa Malheur me bat and Missa Fortuna desperata. Given this connection, it is possible that the numerous examples of suspended dissonance left by leap are so apparent because they were purposely added in imitation of Josquin’s use of them.

These readings add to the body of evidence regarding the high status Josquin held in the eyes of his contemporaries, but the implications go further: the anonymous composer was not drawing solely from Josquin when modeling his mass on pre-existing materials, but rather interweaving ideas from other composers as well. This is more unusual than the more widespread examples of works written in emulation or homage of a single composer. Our anonymous composer has not just absorbed the ideas of one composer, but synthesized exceptional traits from several, manipulating techniques borrowed from the most skilled masters of his time, while also infusing the work with his own ideas. In creating a collage of traits drawn from multiple skilled composers, he gives a glimpse of not only the traits he valued in his contemporaries, but also contributes a

---

36 Ibid., 26.
singular mass—something greater than the sum of its parts—that stands alone as something entirely unique in the world of Renaissance musical borrowing.
CONCLUSIONS

I first approached this project with my own “Great Man” paradigm guiding me. Originally I was interested only in the Missa Ma bouche rit, preserved in fascicle XXVII of VienNB 11883, because of David Fallows’ suggestion that it shared many traits in common with certain masses by Josquin; I dove in, excited to be the person who unearthed a “new” mass by the famous composer. After much consideration of the stylistic evidence within the mass, however, I established quite the opposite. Indeed, in one of the few instances of musical analysis where it seemed possible to “prove” a negative, I showed instead that the mass was likely not by Josquin, but rather closely modeled on his work. Furthermore, I concluded that this anonymous mass is intriguing instead for how it borrows a myriad of traits from top composers of the era, tying them together in a hybridized mixture not often seen during this time.

I then moved to the watermarks of that particular fascicle, intent on finding a tiny overlooked detail about the single Gothic P contained within the paper that would help us date the mass. My focus was still on Josquin, since the anonymous mass was almost certainly composed after Josquin’s Missa Malheur me bat, and dating it could provide a terminus ante quem for the more famous work. That too proved futile. The Gothic P watermark in fascicle XXVII turned out to be far too common a design to be able to make any strong statements about date or location based on it, and the trimming of the fascicle’s edges meant that it was not possible to compare the exact size of the sheet and the position of the mark within the chain lines. Despite the clarity I had hoped to bring to this manuscript, the picture became even murkier when I turned to fascicle XX, containing Ockeghem’s Missa Prolationum. Hudson had asserted that the fascicles
XXVII and XX contained the same Gothic P watermark, so I hoped to cross-check that latter fascicle for any evidence pointing to dates or locations for both. Instead, I realized that the two Gothic P watermarks did not match, raising questions about the longstanding watermark identifications Hudson had made for the rest of the manuscript’s fascicles.

The further I went down the rabbit hole, the more watermarks turned up, many of them similar but not actually identical as once thought, and in the end I came to conclusions contradictory to the previous scholarly consensus interpretation of the manuscript: rather than most fascicles being related by a shared watermark, I showed instead that most of the fascicles do *not* share a watermark with another fascicle. Furthermore, when faced with the multitude of new watermarks I uncovered—many of them ubiquitous designs during this period—I realized the enormity of the task and the inherent difficulties anyone will face in trying to date or locate this manuscript based on watermark data.

In the end, I was left with tatters, albeit useful and important ones: no longer can we assume that most of the fascicles are interrelated by virtue of shared watermarks, and therefore we can no longer conjecture that the entirety of this manuscript is connected to Alamire based on the few fascicles definitively linked to him. As a result, this manuscript can no longer offer a glimpse into Alamire’s workshop as has previously been hypothesized—another “Great Man” narrative destabilized. Stepping back and surveying the damage, it seemed that everything I had touched had crumbled, and I had little in the way of an alternative narrative to offer in its stead; I had dismantled a series of historiographical and musicological arguments, but had no reconstruction at hand.
It is not that I have approached this manuscript with a wrecking ball instead of the more commonly accepted set of musicological tools; the problem is that this manuscript has at each turn resisted standard methods. The preponderance of masses without attribution or a known model means that much of the repertoire is overlooked, since our methods are often based on comparing traits of a particular composer or settings of a certain mass model. The trimmed pages that, in some cases, caused the masses to lose their attributions and titles also cut away the physical data about paper size that could have helped identify more of the dozens of newly excavated watermarks. And the myriad of different paper types resisted easy cross-referencing between fascicles, and harbored far more watermark types than found in a more typical manuscript composed of just a few varieties of paper. With each tool blunted, it began to seem that it would be impossible to establish very much in the way of a replacement for the narratives I was dismantling. If most of the fascicles are not related by a shared watermark as once thought, and thus not necessarily linked to a scriptorium tradition, then how did they come together? If the Missa Ma bouche rit is likely not by Josquin, then who did compose it?

The more I worked with VienNB 11883, the less it seemed to matter: the manuscript and anonymous mass no longer fit within neat narratives that nicely complement our musicological paradigms, but the actual story is more enticing when we trade “tidy but misleading” for “messy but real.” It may seem like a negative contribution to dissolve ties rather than knit them together, but in a sense, that’s the point: this manuscript helps us see the limits of what can be known.
As I write this in the closing days of 2017, the phrase “alternative facts” still hangs heavy in the zeitgeist. Working on this project while absorbing the ever-growing accusations of “fake news” and reports of targeted manipulation of American media and social networks has made me increasingly wary of taking any fact at face value. As Carl Dahlhaus wrote in the 1970s, “the historian must resist the deeply ingrained habit of thinking that the word ‘fact’ refers to something tangible since, to put it bluntly, an historical fact is nothing more than a hypothesis.” And indeed, what I had assumed to be tangible facts—the watermarks nestled within the papers of VienNB 11883—retreated into hypothesis the more I pursued them. Dahlhaus also underscores how our categorical paradigms shape our narratives, reminding us that “history is not the past as such, but what the historical faculty is able to make of the past—what the historian pulls in when he casts his net. The structure of this faculty—its capacity to select, measure and classify—leaves its mark on the objects it apprehends.” There is no doubt that by approaching the anonymous Missa Ma bouche rit through a Josquin-centric paradigm, I highlighted particular aspects and overlooked others, which shaped my narrative even as I rejected the possibility of Josquin’s authorship. Further analysis of this mass would hopefully highlight new discoveries, particularly if approached from a more neutral vantage point.

As with any project, and certainly in this dissertation, there are many directions for further research that scholars may take up. For example, we could spend more time looking for stronger watermark matches to continue the work in Chapter 2 of this

2 Ibid., 40.
dissertation; working to date and locate the individual fascicles would help to establish chronologies for this manuscript. In addition to replacing tracings with beta-radiographic reproductions, there are newer emerging methods that would make this process easier by drawing on computer analysis rather than relying on the human eye. Catalog and database search tools such those at the Bernstein Memory of Paper website speed up the process of finding likely matches among the hundreds of similar designs. The Bernstein website also offers a watermark analysis “kit” that works with MatLab software to compare images of watermarks or isolate remnants of chain lines from images of a manuscript page. In this vein, a 2008 dissertation in the field of Computer Science uses image processing functions that simulate backlit photography to extract watermarks from images of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Islamic manuscripts, and then applies statistical analysis to compare the results to known watermarks, bypassing the chance of human error entirely.

Given the growth of the digital humanities, I can imagine new layers to existing online databases like the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (DIAMM), in which one could click through networked manuscripts based on watermarks with comparison tools nested within, allowing comparison not just of the watermarks by mathematical analysis, but even the shape of a scribe’s minims, the color of the paper, and other traits apparent to a trained eye. The ability to move laterally by not just composer or name of mass, but also watermark, scribe, cantus firmus, even musical technique, would be liberating.

---

3 www.memoryofpaper.eu

This last option would allow us to focus instead on detaching the technique from the composer. For example, rather than thinking “Obrecht” when we see segmentation, we can instead start back at the beginning with a repository of works in which segmentation appears, with cross-referenced links connecting the specific moments for easier comparison. This general concept has been suggested previously by Dahlhaus as focusing on “dates of greatest influence or effect” rather than specific moments of composition, and by Rodin as networks of influence within which “it is often more interesting, and more useful, to ask How common is this technique? than From whom is it borrowed?” The findings of Chapter 3 of my dissertation suggest there is much to be learned by continuing down this path.

Since cause and effect is so tenuous in early music, perhaps this focus on circles of influence rather than lines of influence will be more fruitful going forward than continuing our efforts to identify composers of works. Focusing so singularly on composer-driven paradigms invites upheaval when new biographical discoveries change even the most basic understandings of relationships between composers. In the same way the “Old Josquin Edition” (the Werken) was out of date scarcely before it was completed, likewise the still in-progress New Josquin Edition is already finding itself made outdated by continuing discoveries about Josquin's biography and style. In the late 1990s, with the New Josquin Edition more than a decade underway, discoveries of new archival documents necessitated moving Josquin's presumed birthdate more than a decade later, altering the chronology of his career significantly. No longer is Josquin a composer

---

5 Dahlhaus, “What is a fact…,” 39; Rodin, Josquin’s Rome, 308.
born in the 1440s, a contemporary of Agricola and Compère who spent his early years in Milan; he is now a younger Josquin, born around 1455, who spent his formative years in France, perhaps learning from Agricola and Compère rather than influencing them as previously assumed. This discovery necessitated a new reimagining of not only Josquin's chronology and stylistic development, but also those of all his contemporaries, leading to a flurry of deattributions and reevaluations continuing still.

This point speaks to a current debate regarding the power of style criticism as a method of determining authorship. Speaking of the mired state of Josquin attribution, Rob Wegman proposes that in situations of unopposed ascriptions—works that are ascribed to Josquin in all extant sources, with no conflicting attributions to another composer—we should “give hard evidence the benefit of the doubt.” That is, even knowing that Josquin’s name was often attached to works by other composers to boost their value, we should count attributions to Josquin as weightier than our own critical judgments of music style. In response, Fabrice Fitch questions whether an ascription is necessarily “harder” evidence than stylistic traits—whether subjective assessments of the music itself can equal or even outweigh the allegedly more objective information that attributions offer.

From this dissertation, I can suggest caution in even relying on such categories to define our types of evidence: the “hard” evidence of immutable watermarks in VienNB 11883 itself proved mercurial when viewed by a different musicologist. Likely, future

---

musicologists will find flaws in my own approach (though I hope not too many). All of this suggests that the approaches spearheaded by Fitch, Rodin, and others, in which we invite previously ignored works to be investigated alongside the more usual suspects, might have a lot to offer our wider contextual nexus of defining a shared musical language of this period. Perhaps it is now time to move beyond a “Great Man” music history and truly embrace a new cultural music history.

I would not go so far as to say that this project has underscored Dahlhaus’s perhaps facetious closing lines of his essay “What is a fact of music history?”—that, “to put it bluntly, historical facts have no other reason for being other than to substantiate historical narratives or descriptions of historical systems, unless it is to serve the negative purpose of revealing flaws in the opinions of earlier historians.”¹⁰ But in many ways, the main contribution of this dissertation is to remind ourselves that even the most stable of “facts” can be skewed through the subjectivity of lenses we do not realize we are wearing. In doing so, I also showed a need to remain precise in investigating even the more quantitative data, and to not allow probable conclusions from more traditionally constructed manuscripts inflect what we see in things that fall outside the norm. A little evidence can be a dangerous thing, and if we can remain aware of our motivations and biases, we may gain a richer sense of what we have been missing.

¹⁰ Dahlhaus, “What is a fact…,” 43.
APPENDIX 1: FASCICLE OVERVIEWS
Fascicle I
Folios 2–11
Contents: Missa Malheur me bat, Josquin
Comments: Texted; four voices; chanson model
Fascicle I
Watermarks
Fascicle II
Folios 12–19
Contents: Kyrie, Gloria, and Credo of Missa [Ghy syt die wertste boven], [Ghiselin].

Comments: Inscription of “Missa van Verbonnet”; texted; four voices; modeled on Flemish secular song
Fascicle II

Watermarks

F. 12

24 mm
60 mm

27 mm

F. 14
(flipped)

28 mm
Fascicle III
Folios 20–29
Contents: Missa Sine nomine (1), Anonymous
Comments: Texted, four voices
Fascicle III

Watermarks

F. 20
(flipped)

F. 27
(flipped)
Fascicle IV
Folios 30–41
Contents: Missa Crux fidelis, Anonymous
Comments: Texted; four voices; modeled on a sacred hymn/antiphon for Good Friday
Fascicle IV

Watermarks

F. 33

F. 41 (flipped)
Fascicle V
Folios 42–51
Contents: Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, and Sanctus of Missa Quant j’ay au cueur, [Isaac]
Comments: Partially texted; four voices; modeled on a chanson by Busnois; scribe(s) associated with Alamire scriptorium
Fascicle V

Watermarks

23 mm

55 mm

F. 42

24 mm

54 mm

F. 48
Fascicle VI
Folios 52–63
Contents: Missa L’homme arme, Obrecht
Comments: Texted; four voices; chanson model; inscriptions include both French and Flemish spellings of Obrecht/Hobrecht
Fascicle VI
Watermarks

F. 56 (flipped)

F. 58 (flipped)

F. 62

F. 63
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Fascicle VII
Folios 64–75
Contents: Missa la plus gorgiase (Missa per Alamýr in Index), Winters [=Vindrs?]  
Comments: Texted; four voices; chanson model; notation of “p. alamyr” on first page
Fascicle VII

Watermarks

F. 68

F. 73
Fascicle VIII
Folios 76–89
Contents: Missa Sine nomine (2), Anonymous
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle VIII

Watermarks

F. 78

F. 82

F. 86
Fascicle IX
Folios 90–100
Contents: Missa Depuis q'une josne fille, Faber
Comments: Texted; four voices; French text incipit in Kyrie
Fascicle IX

Watermarks

F. 98
(flipped)
Fascicle X
Folios 101–110
Contents: Missa De angelis, Prioris
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle X
Watermarks

F. 103
(flipped)

F. 109
Fascicle XI
Folios 111–120
Contents: Missa Waer is die alter liefste, Severdonck
Comments: Texted; four voices; Flemish incipit; modeled on a popular song
Fascicle XI

Watermarks
Fascicle XII
Folios 121–132
Contents: Missa De tous biens plaine, Obrecht
Comments: Texted; three voices; chanson model; Flemish spelling “Hobrecht”
Fascicle XII
Watermarks
Fascicle XIII
Folios 133–144
Contents: Missa Faulx perversa, Barbireau
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle XIII

Watermarks

F. 134 (flipped)

F. 139
Fascicle XIV
Folios 145–163
Contents: Missa Misericordia domini, Isaac
Comments: Untexted; four voices; scribe(s) associated with Alamire scriptorium
Fascicle XIV

Watermarks
Fascicle XV
Folios 164–175
Contents: Missa Dicit dominus, Pipelare
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle XV

Watermarks

F. 165

F. 164 (flipped)

F. 166
Fascicle XVI
Folios 176–189
Contents: Missa Salve sancta parens, Carlir
Comments: Texted; four voices; inscription: “Nicholaus Carlir sang Meyster In Anthorff”
Fascicle XVI

Watermarks
Fascicles XVII & XVIII
Folios 190–195 (XVII) & 196–203 (XVIII)

Contents and Comments:

- Missa De tous biens plaine (Kyrie, Glora, Credo, Sanctus), Notens [Compère?] (ff. 190–193; texted, with abbreviations; four voices; chanson model)
- [Regina celi letare] Quia quem meruisti, Anon. (ff. 193v–194; texted; eight voices; based on a Marian antiphon)
- Missa La sol fa re me [Kyrie, partial Gloria], Josquin (ff. 194v–195; texted; four voices)
- Missa Pourquoy alles vous seullette, Anon. (ff. 195v–198; texted; four voices; chanson model)
Fascicles XVII & XVIII
Watermarks
Fascicle XIX
Folios 204–207
Contents: Agnus dei, Anonymous
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle XIX

Watermarks
Fascicle XX
Folios 208–221
Contents: Missa Prolationum, Ockeghem
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle XX

Watermarks

F. 215

F. 219

F. 221
Fascicle XXI
Folios 222–229
Contents: Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, and Agnus dei from Missa Quam pulchra es, Lupus
Comments: Texted; four voices; modeled on motet by Mouton on text from Song of Songs
Fascicle XXI
Watermarks
Fascicle XXII
Folios 230–251
Contents: Missa [L'amour de moy], Anonymous
Comments: Texted; four voices; chanson model; Kyrie and Agnus incomplete, so outer sheet was likely lost and replaced by ff. 230/251
Fascicle XXII

Watermarks

F. 235

F. 250

F. 251
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Fascicle XXIII
Folios 252–257
Contents and Comments:

• Agnus dei, Anonymous (f. 252; texted; four voices)
• Missa Noch weth ic ein so scoen jonefraw (ff. 252–265, continued into next fascicle; texted; four voices; Flemish song model)
Fascicle XXIV
Folios 258–265
Contents: Missa Noch weth ic ein so scoen joncefraw, Anonymous
Comments: Continued from previous fascicle; texted; four voices; Flemish song model
Fascicle XXIV
Watermarks

F. 258

F. 264
Fascicle XXV
Folios 266–276
Contents: Missa Se j'avoye porpoin de veleur, Sticheler
Comments: Partially texted; six voices
Fascicle XXV

Watermarks

F. 268

F. 276

F. 270

45 mm

46 mm

52 mm

52 mm

67 mm
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Fascicle XXVI
Folios 277–284
Contents: Missa Auditorium, Anonymous
Comments: Texted, with abbreviations; four voices
Fascicle XXVI

Watermarks

F. 281

F. 282
Fascicle XXVII
Folios 285–294
Contents: Missa Ma bouche rit, Anonymous
Comments: Texted; four voices (five in Credo); chanson model; French incipit in Kyrie
Fascicle XXVII
Watermarks

F. 285
(flipped)

F. 293
(flipped)
Fascicle XXVIII
Folios 295–304
Contents: Missa Johannes Christe care (incomplete Gloria)
Comments: Texted; four voices
Fascicle XXVIII

Watermarks

F. 304

F. 298
Fascicle XXIX
Folios 305–325

Contents & Comments:
Two inscriptions: “Dese Coopie salmen gheuen Meester heynrije van loouen Ende Niement anders” and “Duas missas Pipelare”
- Missa Floruit egregius infans Livinus, Pipelare (ff. 306–315; texted; four voices)
- Missa Sine nomine, Pipelare (ff. 315v–325v; texted; four voices)
Fascicle XXIX
Watermarks

*Note: folios 312 and 317 do not contain a watermark. This sheet is not as wide as others in the fascicle, which might suggest that it was a larger sheet of paper that was trimmed, losing its watermark in the process.
APPENDIX 2: MUSICAL EDITION
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The aim of this edition is to provide a modern transcription of the Mass that is of value to both performers and scholars. Changes of the reading in the source are listed in the following format: measure number in the transcription, separated by a slash from voice part and number of notational symbol within that bar (rests included) and the reading of the source. Semicolons separate each listing. Pitches are given as lowercase letters without octave indications (the correct octave is always the one nearest to the note in the transcription). Clef changes are included in the list, and the position in the bar is indicated by the notational symbol they precede; i.e., 1/ B3 F4 would indicate that in the bassus voice of the first bar, the clef changes to an F clef on the fourth line of the staff directly before the third notational symbol of that bar.

The following abbreviations are used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>bassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>contratenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>breve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dot dotted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mimim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbr</td>
<td>semibreve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm</td>
<td>semiminim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>superius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>tenor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the intentions of this edition is to provide a satisfactory musical reading for performance, so contrapuntal errors have been amended whenever possible. All changes have been recorded so that the original source may be easily reconstructed. For the benefit of scholars, locations of editorial changes are indicated in the transcription by means of an asterisk above the appropriate place on the stave. Clefs have been modernized, but note-lengths are left unreduced. Incipits showing clef, mensuration sign(s), and the beginning of each voice are included before the start of each movement and section. Changes of mensuration are noted above the stave of the appropriate voice within the transcription. All final longs have fermatas in the source that have not been reflected in the transcription.

Ligatures are indicated by horizontal closed square brackets; coloration, including minor color, is indicated by open square brackets. Text added by the editor is italicized. As discussed in chapter 3, in a few situations the fitting of underlay to the music requires dividing notes into smaller rhythmic values; these moments are left to the discretion of the performer, and reflect the source underlay in this edition. Added material not in the source is enclosed in brackets: [ ]. Accidental in the source are placed on the staff and apply until the end of the bar; editorial accidentals are placed above the staff and apply to only the single note.
MISSA MA BOUCHE RIT

INTRODUCTION

Unique Source:
VienNB 1 1883: Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Handschriften- und Inkunabelsammlung, Ms. 11883
Folios 285r - 294v, Anonymous, no ascription

Model:
The Mass takes as its model all three voices of a famous chanson by Ockeghem.

The chanson voices are adopted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kyrie:</th>
<th>Kyrie I:</th>
<th>chanson S, mm. 1-26, in S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christe:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 27-46, in S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie II:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 47-72, in S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria:</td>
<td>Et in terra:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 1-46, in T; divided into six segments, each of the first three repeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qui tollis:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 47-72, in T; divided into six segments, each repeated: first segment in C-mensuration, second through fifth segments in cut-C, final segment first time in C-mensuration, second time in cut-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo:</td>
<td>Patrem:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-46, in S; in C-mensuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucifixus:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in B; beginning on d, repeated five times with a varying number of rests between each statement, forming an ostinato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et in Spiritum:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 47-72, in S; divided into four segments, each repeated, then entire section stated again without repeats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus:</td>
<td>Sanctus:</td>
<td>chanson C, mm. 1-46, in T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleni sunt:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osanna:</td>
<td>chanson C, mm. 47-72, in T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui venit:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in C; beginning on d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nomine:</td>
<td>chanson S, mm. 1-6 (downbeat), in S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus dei:</td>
<td>Agnus I/III:</td>
<td>chanson T, mm. 1-46, in T; with canon indicating removal of rests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus II:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL COMMENTARY

Kyrie
5/B3 m; 5/B4 m; 73/B4 sbr; 74/T1–3 see explanation below

Gloria
7/S1 dot sbr; 7/S2 m; 10/S2 a; 28/B2 d; 41/B1 F3; 60/C2 g; 132/B2 g

Credo
45/T4 e; 144/S1 e

Sanctus
24/T3 d; 28/B1 F3; 101/S1 dot m; 104/S4 m

Agnus dei
1/S1 dot br; 16/B1 F4

The reading in bars 74–75 of the tenor in the Kyrie is corrupt. Both the number of notes provided and the pitch content are clearly incorrect, and would read as follows if left uncorrected:

A suggested correction of those bars is provided in the musical edition.
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Et ascen dit in cel um.

Se det ad dexter am Patris.

Et ite rum ven - tur us est cum glo - ri a ju - di ca - re vi - vos et
glo ri a ju - di ca - re vi - vos et
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Et in Spiritum Sanctum
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APPENDIX 3: MANUSCRIPT INVENTORY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicle</th>
<th>Barton Hudson’s WM ID¹</th>
<th>Barton Hudson’s WM information²</th>
<th>Comments on Hudson’s identification</th>
<th>New WM ID</th>
<th>New WM information</th>
<th>WM links to other fascicles</th>
<th>Comments and Implications</th>
<th>Contents of Fascicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyleaf</td>
<td>1; Reaping hook = BriquetF 6152”</td>
<td>“Vienna, Salzburg; 1553. So few examples are known that the paper must have been rare.”</td>
<td>Misidentified by Hudson; recorded as Reaping Hook rather than ADICM.</td>
<td>ADICM</td>
<td>Similar to mark(s) from the mid-eighteenth century.</td>
<td>None (except the other flyleaf).</td>
<td>Flyleaves were likely added much later than 1553.</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>1; Reaping hook = BriquetF 6152”</td>
<td>“Vienna, Salzburg; 1553. So few examples are known that the paper must have been rare.”</td>
<td>Briquet 6152 measures 33 mm between chain lines; VienNB mark is only 29 mm between chain lines.</td>
<td>Reaping Hook</td>
<td>Near perfect match to Eineder WM 1644, (Salzburg, 1553 as well). This and several other similar designs linked to Lengfelden paper mill in 1550s.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Likely dates to Vienna or Salzburg in 1550s.</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2; Pot, one handle; Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, and 12635”</td>
<td>“Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551”</td>
<td>Differs from most of the other WM 2 designs deemed the same by Hudson.</td>
<td>QF Pot 1</td>
<td>Pots Family A (very likely linked to V, XIV, and possibly XXVIII).</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Severs supposed link with other WM 2 fascicles.</td>
<td>Josquin, M. Malheur me bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3; Hand; Similar to BriquetF 11419”</td>
<td>“Netherlands, northern France; 1522–1523; generally similar to numerous papers common in the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France in the first quarter of the 16th century”</td>
<td>Briquet 11419 is 10 mm taller and noticeably wider than the VienNB 11883 mark.</td>
<td>QF Hand 1</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Opens the possibility of a broader chronological and geographical range than once thought.</td>
<td>Verbonnet [=Ghiselin], M. Ghy syt die wertste boven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4; Sun = BriquetF 13930”</td>
<td>“Netherlands, northern France, Germany, 1492–1506”</td>
<td>Briquieff 13930 has seven rays; Vienna mark has eight.</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Probable match with Piccard 41230.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Expands the date range from Hudson’s suggestion, and adds the possibility of a German origin for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² Ibid., 181–82.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fascicle</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Severs' Notes</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>&quot;5; Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = Briquet F 8652&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1494–1510&quot;</td>
<td>Narrower &amp; shorter than Briquet 8652</td>
<td>QF Gothic P 1</td>
<td>Similar to XIII, XV, and XXIX</td>
<td>Severs supposed match with other WM 5 fascicles</td>
<td>Anon., M. Sine nomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>&quot;8; Shield, letter R; Similar to Briquet F 8992–8994&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Papers of the same general type were common in the Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, and Germany from c. 1495 to the mid-16th century&quot;</td>
<td>Shield w/ R 1</td>
<td>Probable link to X. F. 103 is very similar to f. 41, but without a corresponding match between the twins (ff. 33 and 109).</td>
<td>Similar to watermark dating from 1496/1503</td>
<td>Anon., M. Super crux fidelis inter omnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>&quot;2; Pot, one handle; Similar to Briquet F 12629, 12633, and 12635&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551&quot;</td>
<td>Differs from most of the other WM 2 designs deemed the same by Hudson.</td>
<td>QF Pot 2</td>
<td>Pots Family A (definitely linked to XIV, likely to L, possibly to XXVII).</td>
<td>Same scribes as XIV, including Alamire.</td>
<td>Isaac, M. Quant jay au cueur (KGCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>&quot;5; Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = Briquet F 8652&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1494–1510&quot;</td>
<td>Has a slash; shorter &amp; narrower than Briquet 8652</td>
<td>QF Gothic P w/Slash</td>
<td>Similar to Piccard P XII 80</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Severs supposed match with other WM 5 fascicles. Similar to watermark dating from 1485/1488 in Aachen, Culemborg, and Köln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not recorded by Hudson]</td>
<td>[Not recorded by Hudson]</td>
<td>[Not recorded by Hudson]</td>
<td>QF Hand 2</td>
<td>Similar to Piccard Hand 1096, Frankfurt-Main, 1485, and several other papers from the same decade.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Close similarity to a number of designs dating from the 1480s in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany suggests that this is a likely decade for this paper.</td>
<td>Hieronymus Winters [=Vinders?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>&quot;6; Hand = Briquet F 11465&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, Germany;&quot;</td>
<td>Wrong number of petals.</td>
<td>QF Hand 3</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Hieronymus Winters [Vinders?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1516–1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1516–1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1516–1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1516–1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1516–1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII

- "5: Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = BriquetF 8652"
- "Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1494–1510"
- Longer stem, narrower chain lines, more pinched prongs at bottom of P when compared to Briquet 8652. Taller than the other QF P’s in the MS.
- QF Gothic P 2
- Similar to Piccard P VII/1546
- None.
- Severs supposed match with other WM 5 fascicles. Very similar to watermark dating from 1520/21 in Braunschweig and Ghent.

### VIII

- "6: Hand = BriquetF 11465"
- "Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, Germany; 1516–1540"
- TF Hand I
- Similar to Piccard Hand II/447.
- None.
- Very similar to watermark dating from 1522 in Culemborg, Ermland, Fellin, and Schwerin.

### IX

- "7: Paddle-wheel = BriquetF 13564"
- "Central France; 1484–1514"
- No dispute, but small date error in Hudson’s listing (should be 1481 for 1484).
- Paddle Wheel
- None.
- Actual Briquet 13564 listing says 1481–1514. The VienNB mark also shows some wear, with parts of the design moving slightly suggesting that the paper dates from the later end of the mold’s lifetime.

### X

- "8: Shield, letter R; Similar to BriquetF 8992–8994"
- "Papers of the same general type were common in the Netherlands, Belgium, northern France, and Germany from c. 1495 to the mid-16th century”
- Shield w/ R 2
- Very similar to WZIS AT8100-RKM46_60.
- Probable link to IV. F. 103 is very similar to f. 41, but without a corresponding match between the twins (ff. 33 and 109).
- Similar to watermark dating from 1496/1503.

### XI

- "9: Pot, one handle; Belongs to the type represented by BriquetF 12564-12579"
- "Widely used in northern France from the late 15th through the 16th centuries; see BriquetF IV, p. 626"
- The watermark in VienNB 11883 are 49 mm tall and have 23–24 mm between chain lines, while the marks that Hudson cites from Briquet vary
- Simple QF Pot
- None.
- Likely opens a wider range of possible geographical provenances previously suggested, extending beyond northern France to also include, for example, Bewegen-Rheine.
XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10: Hand; Belongs to the type represented by BriquetF 11399–11410 and many variants[... ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudson's reproduction shows chain lines that match my own tracings in width, but the hand itself is about half the size of my own tracings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrecht, M. De tous biens plaine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = BriquetF 8652</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands, northern France, 1494–1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sewing dots and is narrower and shorter than Briquet 8652.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Gothic P 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to III, XV, and XXIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to other WM 5 fascicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberiaw, M. Faulx perversa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2: Pot, one handle; Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, and 12635</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sewing dots and is narrower and shorter than Briquet 8652.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Pot 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pots Family A (very likely linked to I and V, and possibly to XXVIII).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same scribes as XIV, including Alamire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to most other WM 2 fascicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac, M. Misericordi as domini cantabo in aeternum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11: Shield, 3 fleurs-de-lis; Most similar to BriquetF 1743, 1744, and 1746 (1480–1526), but larger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Belongs to a type of French provenance used over a period of some two centuries&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to, but does not match XVI's Shield 2 &amp; 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to XVI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelare, M. Dicit dominus nihil tulerunt in via</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = BriquetF 8652</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands, northern France, 1494–1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sewing dots and is narrower and shorter than Briquet 8652.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF Gothic P 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to III, XIII, and XXIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed match with III, VI, VIII, IX, XI, XIII, XV, XXIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to XVI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11: Shield, 3 fleurs-de-lis; Most similar to BriquetF 1743, 1744, and 1746 (1480–1526), but larger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Belongs to a type of French provenance used over a period of some two centuries&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to, but does not match XV, Shield 1 (and Shield 3 in same fascicle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to XVII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus Carlir, M. Salve sancta parens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Not recorded by Hudson]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps chain lines rather than being bisected by one (like the other two WM 11s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to, but does not match XV, Shield 1 (and Shield 2 in same fascicle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severs supposed link to XVII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pot, 2 handles; Similar to "Netherlands, northern France," Pot, 2 Handles 1

QF Pot 5
| XXII | “15; Hand; Has some features in common with the type represented by Briquet F 11418–11423 (1480–1530), others with Briquet F 11461–11466 (1516–1567)” | “Both known in the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France” | Mark has three petals, not four as most of the marks that Hudson suggests from Briquet. | TF Hand 2 | None. | Anon., M. L’amour de moy si est encluse [incomplete K and AIII] |
| XXIII | “16; Letter P; surmounted with shield with starred arrow = Briquet F 8796” | “Vienna; 1537. So few examples are known that the must have been rare.” | Top tills left rather than right. Though rare in Briquet, not as rare when consulting Austrian-focused catalogs. | Gothic P w/Shield | None. |
| XXIV | “2; Pot, one handle; Similar to Briquet F 12629, 12633, and 12635” | “Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551” | Does not have a quatrefoil, as the other WM 2 designs do. | Pot, 1 Handle | XXIV by repertoire and scribe, but not by WM. | Same scribe as XXIV. Severs supposed link to other WM 2 fascicles, except following fascicle. |
| XXV | “17; Pot, two handles; Similar to Briquet F 12861, 12862, 12864” | “Netherlands, western Germany, northern France; 1517–1527; similar to WM 14” | Pots Family C (somewhat similar to XIX). Also linked to XXII by repertoire and scribe, but not by WM. | Pot, 2 Handles 2 | None. | Anon., M. Noch weth hic en so scoen Joncraw fijn [continued] |
| *** | “8; Shield, letter R; Similar to Briquet F 8992–8994” | “Papers of the same general type were common in the Netherlands,” | Has a filigree below the shield, not an R. | Shield w/Filigree | None. | Date range does not apply since this is not the same mark as WM 8. Severs supposed links to the other
| XXVI | “2; Pot, one handle; Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, and 12635” | “Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551” | None. | WM 8 fascicles. |
| XXVII | “12; Simple Gothic letter P; Similar to BriquetF 8534, 8535, 8536, 8538” | “Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1502–1516” | Does not match other WM 12: tracings and difference in chain line width confirms that these are not the same watermark. | Gothic P 2 | None. |
| XXVIII | “2; Pot, one handle; Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, and 12635” | “Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551” | Diffs from most of the other WM 2 designs deemed the same by Hudson. | Pots Family A. | Severs supposed link with other WM 2 fascicles. |
| XXIX | “2; Pot, one handle; Similar to BriquetF 12629, 12633, and 12635” | “Netherlands, Belgium, northern France; 1515–1551” | Diffs from most of the other WM 2 designs deemed the same by Hudson. | None. | Severs supposed link with other WM 2 fascicles. |
| | “18; Gothic Letter P; Not in BriquetF” | | | Small P | None. |
| | “5; Gothic letter P with 4-petalled flower = BriquetF 8652” | “Netherlands, northern France, Germany; 1494–1510” | Narrower and shorter than Briquet 8652. | Similar to III, XIII, and XV. | Severs supposed match other WM 5 fascicles. |
| Flyleaf | “1; Reaping hook = BriquetF 6152” | “Vienna, Salzburg; 1553. So few examples are known that the paper must have been rare.” | Misidentified by Hudson; recorded as Reaping Hook rather than ADICM. | “ADICM” | Similar to mark(s) from the mid-eighteenth century. |
| | | | None (except the other flyleaf). | | Flyleaves were likely added much later than 1553. |

Severs supposed link with other WM 2 fascicles.

Anon., M. Aduitorium [sic] meum

Anon., M. Ma bouche rit

Pipelare, M. Johannes Christe care [G incomplete]

Pipelare, M. Floruit egregius [infans] Livinus; Pipelare, M. Sine nomine
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