

NEIL HARRIS – ILARIA PASTROLIN

*BRIQUET RELOADED*

Lyon  
Institut d'Histoire du Livre  
2018



# Briquet Reloaded

Toute feuille de papier filigrané porte en elle-même son acte de naissance, le difficile est de le déchiffrer. Rappelons qu'une telle feuille a reçu en effet l'empreinte de la forme sur laquelle elle a été faite; c'est donc un objet moulé, comme une médaille ou une monnaie, dont tous les exemplaires sont semblables entre eux. Or, une forme à papier est promptement mise hors de service; sa durée moyenne ne dépasse pas deux ans. Lorsqu'elle est usée, elle est remplacée par une autre, qui n'est jamais absolument identique à la précédente; elle en diffère par la vergeure, par le nombre et l'écartement des pontuseaux, par les contours ou les dimensions du filigrane ou par la position qu'occupe ce dernier sur la forme. Pour pouvoir préciser la date de fabrication d'une feuille de papier, il ne suffit donc pas qu'elle porte un filigrane analogue à celui d'un papier d'une date connue; il faut que les deux filigranes soient identiques, placés au même endroit de la forme, il faut que le format, la vergeure et les pontuseaux des papiers comparés soient les mêmes. Il convient encore de rappeler que, dans la fabrication du papier, on se sert toujours simultanément de deux formes et que, bien qu'exactement contemporaines, ces deux formes offrent toujours quelque dissemblance.<sup>1</sup>

The black cat walks across the doorway.

A moment later, the black cat walks across the doorway.

One cat or two? or *déjà vu*? that strange sensation of having seen something before, an episode already experienced, signifying a disturbance to the system?

The reference is easily recognisable. One of the more memorable moments of *The Matrix* (1999), whose second episode also inspires our title.

But how does it relate to Briquet?

First published 110 years ago and, bibliographically speaking, a single edition, since all the subsequent impressions, including the 1923 Leipzig version, which introduces a valuable biography of the author written by his nephew, and the 1968 "Jubilee edition", with new material mainly by Allan Stevenson, as well as a major rearrangement of the relation between text and image, are all photographic reprints of the one and only original, *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques de papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, by C.M. Briquet (as he signs himself on the titlepage) is and remains the best known and most authoritative repertory in the field of paper and watermarks.

Assembled in some thirty years of incessant travel around Europe, entirely at the author's own private expense (no research grants in those days), it is a peerless achievement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles-Moïse Briquet, 'De la valeur des filigranes de papier comme moyen de déterminer l'âge et la provenance de documents non datés', *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et Archéologie de Genève*, tome I, livre 2 (1892), pp. 192-202, reprinted in *Briquet's Opuscula. The Complete Works of Dr. C.M. Briquet without "Les filigranes"*, Hilversum, the Paper Publications Society, 1955, pp. 235-240. Translation: Every sheet of watermarked paper is in itself its own birth certificate. The difficulty is in deciphering it. Remember that every such sheet bears the imprint of the mould on which it was made. It is therefore a moulded object, like a medal or a coin, of which all the copies are alike. Now, a papermaking mould does not last long, on average not more than a couple of years. When it is worn out, it is replaced by another one, which is never absolutely identical to the previous one; it will differ in the wires, in the number and the distances between the chain lines, by the shape and the size of the watermark or by the placing of the same on the mould. In order to be able to state the date of fabrication of a sheet of paper, it is not enough therefore that it has a watermark similar to that on a dated piece of paper; the watermarks have to be identical, positioned at the same point on the mould, and the sheet-size, the wires and the chain lines must also be the same. It should be remembered moreover that, when making paper, two moulds are used at the same time and therefore, although made and shaped simultaneously, these two moulds always present some differences.

It was an example and a system, and produced numerous epigones, some useful, some less so, but all subsequent works in the field are in debt to its example and method. It has been criticised, sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly; indeed, it would be fair to say that its greatest admirers and adepts have also been its most fervent critics. And, by the way, that includes us<sup>2</sup>.

Even after a century and more, however, it is still there and time can do nothing to weary its infinite variety, while most other scholarship produced at the time has faded into deservedly peaceful obscurity. It is a name to conjure with, a block of four heavy volumes that still have pride of place in the reading rooms across the globe, except when away for repair, since, as any rare book librarian will readily testify, it is always heavily used, frequently to the point of disintegration.

Of course there have been developments. The digital age could hardly leave such a book alone.

In the 1990s, under the aegis and guidance of Ezio Ornato, the Laboratoire de Médiévistique Occidentale de Paris (LAMOP), transcribed the entire contents of Briquet into a pioneering database and duly named it *Briquet Online*. More recently, the running of this resource has passed to the *Bernstein. Memory of Paper project* and at the present moment it is hosted on the website of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (where, if you are reading this, you most likely already find yourself). To Twenty-first century eyes the interface might appear a trifle antiquated, since, by digital standards, it is an old project, simplistic even in terms of its conception and execution. Nevertheless, it functions well in terms of basic interrogation, is empathetic, and is enormously convenient, since few, if any, of us can afford to keep the four volumes of the original Briquet at home. One of its most useful features is that it provides a downloadable image of individual watermarks in pdf, something that save complicated manoeuvres over photocopying machines. The other project, which needs to be mentioned here, but which, strictly speaking, does not deal with the published version of Briquet, is that conducted by the Gravell Watermark Archive coordinated by Daniel Mosser. It aims to put on line the large collection of unpublished images in the Briquet archive in Geneva. In a first stage of the project, all the tracings were photographed in black and white in the late 1990s (again, old by digital standards), and perhaps about 20% of the total has been put on line. Criticism has been voiced, however, about the cumbersome interface and about the quality of the cataloguing, especially as regards the transcription of place names and dates. The major convenience for us (and for which we thank the Gravell Watermark Archive) is that the whole collection is consultable also on terminals inside the Bibliothèque de Genève, which has also permitted us to acquire the tracings pertinent to our project.

Both projects raise interesting queries.

In particular, how does one integrate, or dare one say “improve”, a repertory as prestigious and authoritative as Briquet, even with the best intentions in the world, without inflicting irremediable damage?

Wisdom suggests that it is best to go by stages and learn from past experiences.

In his magisterial (re)edition of Briquet in 1968, Allan Stevenson added 32 pages of *errata et corrigenda*. Few subsequent scholars, however, seem aware of this improvement and consult them; hardly surprisingly, given the general practice of looking at Briquet in the first copy to happen to hand, even the bad modern reprints that distort the dimensions of the original. They have been ignored, so far, also by the *Briquet Online* resource, though of course this can easily be remedied. But the omission also shows the weakness of traditional *corrigenda* in a digital environment.

---

<sup>2</sup> For a fuller discussion of Briquet and the significance of his repertory in the history of filigranology, see Neil Harris, *Paper and Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Lyon, Institut d’Histoire du Livre, 2017, on the website of the Institut d’Histoire du Livre di Lione (<http://ihl.enssib.fr>). Available also as a downloadable pdf. References to this work in the following notes are on the basis of the pdf.

Briquet requires, and deserves, a deeper, more thorough revision, more in keeping with the resource he created. It needs to enhance the original, without destroying its fundamental characteristics of synthesis and ease of consultation, as well as taking advantage of the technical and technological resources of an expanding electronic environment, in particular the simplicity of modern-day digital photography.

Any serious re-working also has to take account of a century and more of scholarship in the field of paper and watermark studies, or, to put matters more simply, of just one article: ‘Watermarks are Twins’ by Allan Stevenson, published in *Studies in Bibliography* in 1951.

Charles-Moïse Briquet knew that watermarks were twins (the epigraph cited above shows it unequivocally). Nobody is accusing him of ignoring this fact. He grew up in the family business, a large-scale stationery shop and distributor, also a publishing house, in Rue de la Corraterie and Rue de la Cité (with entrances on both) in the centre of Geneva, which in his youth still handled significant quantities of handmade paper. As a young man, in order to gain expertise, he worked for about a year in a paper mill, La Bâtie, not too far from Geneva. He therefore knew about twin moulds, because he had seen them with his own eyes, witnessing the constant interchange between the vatman and the coucher as they work. No doubt he had inspected the racks of moulds, and seen how each pair was carefully fashioned to fit the same deckle, and, equally likely, in apprentice fashion, just of the fun of it, he tried his own hand at making a sheet of paper.

The defect is not in Briquet’s grasp of his subject; it is rather in our understanding of Briquet, what he set out to do, and how he achieved it.

The criticism most frequently voiced against *Les filigranes*, most importantly by Allan Stevenson, is that Briquet failed to record twin watermarks and thus substantially reduced the utility of his repertory<sup>3</sup>. Taken at face value this judgement has some substance, since there can be no doubt that the inclusion of twin watermarks, appropriately documented, would be a vast improvement, whatever the repertory. Only on a handful of occasions does Briquet specifically claim that his tracings refer to twin watermarks, and in about half of these he is wrong. In a couple of other instances he included twin watermarks without being aware of the fact, as happened with a pair of Unicorns from the archives in Metz in Eastern France<sup>4</sup>, and also in Lyon with what he

---

<sup>3</sup> See C.M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes ... a Facsimile of the 1907 Edition with Supplementary Material contributed by a Number of Scholars*, edited by Allan Stevenson, Amsterdam, The Paper Publications Society, 1968, p. 18\*: “As all handmade paper has been manufactured on twin moulds, employed together at the vat, collections of watermarks should show both members of a pair. Together the two marks that make one paper greatly increase the ease of identifying that paper, even when they occur underneath type, for one of the marks may be confusingly similar to another mark. Briquet was misled by an imperfect understanding of these companion marks and their function for paper study, and was hampered by the economic necessity of presenting as many marks as possible. As it was, he cut his collection from some 60,000 to 16,112, thus jettisoning numerous twins, as we learn from examining the Briquet Archive at Geneva. The fact that inclusion of twins would have made a more valuable work is apparent in those few instances where twins did get in”. This criticism is cited also on the site of the Gravel Watermark Archive, while Stevenson unfortunately does not provide his list of the “instances where twins did get in”.

<sup>4</sup> Again in the introduction to the 1968 Jubilee edition, with reference to a pair of Unicorn watermarks found in a Dutch blockbook, Stevenson provides the following instance of involuntary twins in Briquet: “The British Museum impression [IB. 16; BMC I, 6] contains just one paper, marked with twin prancing Unicorns: Br. 9991 and 9993! If I had my doubts, I resolved them at Metz through making photocopies and sketches, both showing sewing dots. What is notable is that Briquet here gives us both members of a pair: twins. This happened because he found one Unicorn in the departmental archives at the Prefecture and the other in the municipal archives across the road from the Bibliothèque, and failed to recognise them as twins because the first is a copied document” (p. \*26). In the plates following p. \*36, Stevenson also provides two excellent  $\beta$ -radiographs of the said twin unicorns.

classified once as a Heart and once as a Fleur-de-lis<sup>5</sup> And the matter is compounded by the fact that what Briquet himself tells us, or claims, about *filigranes identiques* is wholly misleading<sup>6</sup>.

An immediate and obvious counter-objection, however, is that the inclusion of twin watermarks would necessarily have doubled the scale of the repertory. So, instead of 16,112 images, the total would have been 32,224; well, perhaps less, given that some are singletons, while in other instances the plurality of watermarks makes it impossible to say which twin goes with which. Nevertheless, the repertory would most likely have had to be in six volumes, instead of four, in order to accommodate the extra images, and there is no saying how complex the textual apparatus might have become.

The question of the method, however, goes much deeper and enters the realm of practicality. Briquet took little or no account of twin watermarks for two reasons, in a word, or two words, *technology* and *time*. The technique he employed of tracing watermarks on sheets of transparent paper is substantially inaccurate, even in hands as skilful as those of Briquet, as can be seen when a modern photograph of exactly the same watermark is compared with his published image (as we are doing in our ongoing project). Sheets of paper with watermarks are moulded objects, produced in hundreds of thousands of copies, and so there is always the possibility of meeting the same watermark in two far distant archives. Since tracings are never perfectly accurate, it is difficult to be sure that the watermark is the same, or otherwise. Briquet is very good at knowing when his tracings match up and, so far as is known, never committed the heinous sin of including more than once exactly the same watermark<sup>7</sup>. Other scholars are not so canny, for instance the immense repertory of Gerhard Piccard, for all its merits, is sometimes guilty of furnishing multiple versions of the same watermark, most notoriously those of the Gutenberg Bible<sup>8</sup>. Even the smaller scale, more specialist repertories, that set themselves the task of reproducing the twin watermarks in their chosen corpus, such as the census of Greek Renaissance manuscripts conducted by the Dieter and Johanna Harlfinger, remain questionable in terms of accuracy<sup>9</sup>. Our own comparisons between the original watermarks found in the documents consulted by Briquet over a century ago, the tracings in the Geneva archive, and the final published result found numerous, small, subtle, inevitable changes. The watermarks remain recognisable, but there is always enough discrepancy to sow doubt.

The other factor militating against the inclusion of twin watermarks in Briquet's repertory was time. Some scholars have chosen to concentrate on the watermarks found in a particular locality, most notably Johann Lindt's 1964 study of the watermarks of Berne in Switzerland or Theo Gerardy's 1980 survey of those in the archive at Freiburg im Üechtland<sup>10</sup>. Both instances provide detailed information about the twin watermarks in the collections, and obviously such studies are of immense value, but they have the advantage that they can be conducted at leisure, since the scholar conducting them lives *in situ*. Briquet was quite the opposite; he was extraordinarily mobile,

---

<sup>5</sup> See Briquet 4297 and 7029 in the analysis here by Ilaria Pastrolin.

<sup>6</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 68-70.

<sup>7</sup> On those instances, in which he may have included twins, see Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 71-72 After tracing Briquet 611 twice over in the archive at Udine, he does however make the mistake of citing it once as a primary reference and once as a "variante divergente", see the analysis for the same by Neil Harris in the associated entry here.

<sup>8</sup> See Paul Needham, 'The Paper Supply of the Gutenberg Bible', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 79 (1985), pp. 303-374: 318, who draws attention to the fact that in *Wasserzeichen Frucht*, nn. 1147-1160, Piccard reproduces the twin grape watermarks found in therein a total of fourteen times.

<sup>9</sup> See Dieter und Johanna Harlfinger, *Wasserzeichen aus griechischen Handschriften*, Berlin, Verlag Nikolaus Mielke, 1974-80, 2 vols.; also the extension of the project to Spanish libraries by Mark L. Sosower, *Signa Officinarum Chartariorum in Codicibus Graecis Saeculo Sexto Decimo fabricatis in Bibliothecis Hispaniae*, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert, 2004.

<sup>10</sup> See Johann Lindt, *The Paper-Mills of Berne and their Watermarks, 1465-1859*, with the German Original, Hilversum, The Paper Publications Society, 1964; Theo Gerardy, *Das Papier der Seckelmeisterrechnungen von Freiburg i. Ue. 1402-1465*, Schinznach-Bad, Schweizer Papierhistoriker, 1980.

especially given that his chosen conveyance was the railway, which in his lifetime grew from a few miles of track to a vast network covering the whole of Europe. His diaries in the library at Geneva show his various progresses and they are impressive, often lasting for months at a time, but they came at a price. If and when the records recording the watermarks in a particular collection are analysed, especially those more distant from Geneva, where he didn't make a second visit, we see Briquet relentlessly progressing down the chronological scale from the oldest documents towards his cut-off in 1600. But many times he didn't get there and stopped short, fifty, eighty, a hundred years previously. It was not that the later watermarks were unimportant, or that he had lost interest. Quite simply, it was time to pack up, go to the station and begin the journey again.

For Briquet, wherever he went, the hours and the minutes were always counted, and the clock was always ticking; on the other hand, he was capable of working at quite extraordinary pace. One visit that has been reconstructed in some detail is his stay in Udine in North-east Italy in the summer of 1898. It was part of an enormous trip through Germany, Austria, and Eastern Europe, beginning in June and ending in November. His diary shows that he reached Udine from Klagenfurt, travelling down the Pontebbana railway between Austria and Italy opened in 1879, on Monday 15 August (which, unlike today, was not a public holiday), and was back in Klagenfurt on Tuesday 23 August. Briquet had written ahead to the director of the City library, Vincenzo Joppi, inquiring about the sort of material he might have found there and advising about his imminent arrival, so he was expected. The library was open for six hours every day, and also the Sunday morning, but it is plausible, given his acquaintance with Joppi, with whom he had been in correspondence since 1884 and to whom he had sent extracts of his articles, that he was accorded privileged treatment. Nevertheless, his total stay cannot have been more than seven days and, considering travelling time, was probably less.

The first thing Briquet did was to compile a list of the manuscripts in the library that he intended to see, within the limits of his stay, and this pencil-written listing forms part of the diary of his journey. It is an impressive statement of intent, comprising in particular the important sequence of the *Annales*, or acts of the city council, running from 1347 to 1797, though Briquet, as was his practice, went no further than the end of the Sixteenth century and so he recorded only volumes 1 to 66. Although some of the items he noted, especially in the notary archive, are mere letters, the majority were substantial volumes, comprising multiple gatherings with a wide variety of different watermarks.

For Briquet, and indeed for any serious filigranologist, it was a bonanza and, despite the brevity of his stay, Udine ranks high among the sources in *Les filigranes*. According to the breakdown available through *Briquet Online* and the Bernstein interface (invaluable, since the original work does not contain indexes), Udine is the source for 131 primary references, i.e. it is the first document cited, including the pressmark, and the image is reproduced; and for another 144 secondary references, i.e. in which the reference is subordinated to another source and the image is not reproduced. A count done in the archive of Briquet's unpublished drawings in the library at Geneva, from which most of the secondary references are taken (see below), gives a larger total of 215 (though this should still be considered provisional). Summing up the first and third totals therefore, in not more than a week, including journey time, in Italy in the peak of the summer, Briquet looked at something between 130 and 150 manuscripts, most of them bulky, and made just under 350 tracings, an average of at least fifty a day. Anyone who has experimented with making tracings of watermarks and knows how laborious the process can be, even with modern equipment such as light sheets, will admit how skilful Briquet's drawings are and the excellence of his eye. His rate of progress therefore was quite astonishing.

Now in this rapidity there is a *contradizion che nol consente*. Establishing that a pair of watermarks are twins is a painstaking and time-consuming matter. Quite a few leaves in each gathering have to be examined in order to discover the twins and observe the differences between

them, which sometimes are very subtle. In some instances there is more than one pair, at times from the same original pattern (i.e. the block of wood with nails around which the watermark was shaped), and sorting them out can prove nigh impossible, as happens with some Unicorns in the Municipal archive at Lyon, so that rather than twins we have to talk about families<sup>11</sup>. There are also situations in which only one of the twins is clearly visible, as happens with the watermark of a Griffon in 1462 in Udine: one mark, reproduced by Briquet, appears on a blank leaf in glorious isolation; the twin, however, is always on leaves that are heavily written over and its shape is almost indecipherable<sup>12</sup>. Of course, nowadays there are methods, from the now obsolete  $\beta$ -radiographs to Soft X-ray imaging, or some more recent digital technologies, that allow us to remove the layers of ink and reacquire the obscured images, but, quite apart from the cost, the issue is again one of time. Had Briquet paused every time to discover the twins in each set of watermarks, his rhythm would have slowed notably, perhaps only five pairs of marks in a day, at most ten, and the whole vast construction of the repertory would have changed. Maybe not for the better.

At the end of the day what has to be understood is that Briquet is not a repertory of watermarks pure and simple, though it can be used as such. It is instead a repertory of watermark designs, and Briquet's real aim is to determine when a certain design, or variant of that design, appeared for the first time. From this point of view, by general admission, Briquet is insuperable. It is not easy to find pre-1601 watermarks with significantly earlier dates than those he has recorded, and this fact is a witness to the extraordinary quality of his research, which stands up to all the tests of time.

Time evolves, society evolves, research evolves. New tools are created, old ones disappear. Even a repertory as authoritative and timeless as Briquet can take on new form.

The question is how.

Briquet himself has laid the groundwork for this operation by telling us the precise source (in the majority of cases) of his primary references, and by supplying enough information about the thirty odd thousand secondary references to make them recognisable (with the further option, as we shall see, of returning to the Geneva archive and recovering the tracing behind many of the same, wherein the source is indicated in an exact fashion).

There are therefore three levels, or three complexities, in this process, and it is important to understand them, as follows:

- The 16,112 primary references, where the image is published in *Les filigranes*, together with an indication of the precise source. The original tracings were made by Briquet in pencil on small rectangles of transparent paper, mostly measuring 120×95 mm, and are held in three boxes, numbered *Papiers Briquet* nn. 75-77 in the library at Geneva, together with the rest of the archive donated by his heirs after his death<sup>13</sup>. The designs are arranged by nomenclature, in the same order in which they appear in *Les filigranes*, and are grouped thematically in yellow envelopes. In order to find and identify the tracings in the archive it is sufficient to employ the Briquet number in the published repertory.

Quite often the tracings contain small additional details and annotations that are illuminating, or we discover that in the printed version the image was turned upside down or reversed. Since they were redrawn for lithograph printing, the originals are inevitably closer to the real watermark than the printed version. At present there is no digital copy of this part of the archive and, with the kind permission of the library, the images have been recovered directly from the

---

<sup>11</sup> See Ilaria Pastrolin, 'Filigranes polyamoureux', 18 novembre 2017, <https://lyonnais.hypotheses.org/2887>.

<sup>12</sup> See our entry for Briquet 7464.

<sup>13</sup> A typescript of the inventory of the Briquet archive is available on the site of the Gravell Watermark Archive.



archive itself with hand-held snapshots. Obviously it is to be hoped, if our project goes forward, that a complete and more professional reproduction of these images will one day be available.

For our purposes, this is the easiest part of the operation to interpret and explain, as well as to link to the established images in *Briquet Online*.

- The secondary references, where Briquet cites a watermark found in another source as *identique* or *similaire*, terms that have generated a certain amount of controversy, and whose appropriateness or accuracy we shall not discuss here<sup>14</sup>. In some entries in the repertory no secondary reference appears, in others they can be numerous, anything up to fifteen or twenty.

The main source for the secondary references are the unpublished tracings, held in five boxes, numbered *Papiers Briquet*, nn. 79-82. These have all been reproduced in an initiative of the Gravel Watermark Archive, according to which they number 29,728, and a part has been put online in a series of tranches between 2007 and 2013, totalling at the time of writing 5,547 items, or 19% of the total. On the other hand, the Gravel Watermark Archive has made no attempt to establish the relationship between the unpublished images and the secondary references<sup>15</sup>.

Older than the Gravel Watermark Archive, but similar as regards the exploitation of the unpublished archive of watermarks in Geneva, are the two volumes by Vladimir A. Mošin-Seid M. Traljic, *Vodeni znakovi XIII. i XIV. vijeka = Filigranes des XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> ss.*, Zagreb, Jugoslavenska Akad. Znanosti i Umjetnosti, Historijski Inst. = Académie Yougoslave des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, Institut d'histoire, 1957. They include 7,271 reproductions of watermarks, of which approximately 40% are "Briquet inédits", acquired by retracing Briquet's drawings, with a consequent further distortion. Obviously, this represents a considerable extension of the original repertory, although again no attempt is made to exploit this information in order to interpret and link up with Briquet's secondary references<sup>16</sup>. Just to get a measure of its significance, for Udine it adds 21 images to the 131 primary references provided by Briquet.

Secondary references can also derive from annotations made by Briquet on the tracings made for the primary references, usually when he found further examples of the same watermark, or of a similar watermark, in other documents in the same archive<sup>17</sup>.

The final source for secondary references are previous published works on watermarks that include reproductions of tracings found in collections of manuscripts or in printed books. In the event of wishing to go back to the original watermark, obviously the operation here conducted with Briquet has to be taken a stage further, i.e. looking up the repertory concerned and in turn returning to the source indicated therein (albeit with the difficulty that these are often much less precise than those provided by Briquet). At present, however, this is hardly a priority.

- The archive of unpublished watermarks described in the previous paragraph, which obviously in considerable part overlaps with the secondary references, but not always and not invariably. To repeat the instance of Udine, the secondary references are 144, the unpublished tracings are 215, so the wholly unused images are notionally 71. Recovering these unused images, which obviously have no links with the published text of Briquet, poses the problem of how to introduce them and link them to other material in the repertory. In one instance the unused image is simply a first version of a tracing, obviously judged unsatisfactory, which Briquet drew a second time<sup>18</sup>. For Lyon there is an additional complexity, due to the circumstance that many of the tracings are taken from

---

<sup>14</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 68-70.

<sup>15</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 64-67.

<sup>16</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 71-73. The tracings in the Mošin-Traljic repertory have recently been made available online as part of the Bernstein project.

<sup>17</sup> See the tracing for Briquet 13158 described by Ilaria Pastrolin.

<sup>18</sup> See Briquet 611 in Udine, Biblioteca civica, Annales 32.

documents of the 17<sup>th</sup> and even 18<sup>th</sup> centuries: plausibly, at an early stage in his project, Briquet had not decided to make his cut-off point in 1600 and so gathered material from later periods.

Unpublished tracings are cited on the basis of the box, the envelope, and the individual tracing, as found in the Briquet Archive at Geneva. For instance, the tracing of the Glove or gantelet watermark found in manuscript 10.G.79 at the Archives Départementales at Lyon becomes *Papiers Briquet*, Box 80, Envelope 3, Tracing 4<sup>19</sup>. In the online watermark archive at Geneva this reference is codified as: ms\_Briquet\_80\_03\_004. These references unfortunately are not available in the instances in which they have been published in the Gravell Watermark Archive.

To take this material and to go back to the archives and libraries where it was originally found, after more than a century, sometimes is easy and sometimes encounters obstacles.

In some archives the references no longer match those supplied by Briquet: at the Departmental Archives in Lyon his pressmarks were no longer extant and no concordance was available; with patience, however, and with the professional guidance of the archive, the problem was gradually overcome and it proved possible to identify almost all of his references. Elsewhere, due to the absence of pressmarks for individual volumes, his references are chronological: such is the case for possibly the most important archive of all, Bologna, where in most of his entries the only indication is “Podestà” and where it has proved impossible (up to now) to find the original of the earliest watermark in the repertory, Briquet 5410, a Greek cross dated “1282”, albeit with a question mark<sup>20</sup>. Sometimes also there have been shifts of material: in Clermont-Ferrand, for example, Briquet makes reference to both the Archives Municipales and the Archives Départementales du Puy-de-Dôme, but in the 1920s the former deposited all its early material with the latter, where what Briquet saw has, so to speak, to be re-identified. In other instances, unfortunately, documents have been lost or mislaid: this appears to be the case of a collection of watermarks in six volumes held at Bruxelles, either at the Archives or at the Royal Library, about which no record seems to exist since Briquet made ample use of it in *Les filigranes*. The terrible collapse of the city archive in Cologne in 2009, though much material has since been recovered and is being restored, means uncertainty about the sources for over seventy primary references in Briquet. A small number of Briquet’s references are to private collections of watermarks or of tracings, whose whereabouts are no longer known and which may have been dispersed or destroyed<sup>21</sup>. On the other hand, in the vast majority of cases the documents cited and described by Briquet are still where they were when he saw them; well, not quite, often they are in much newer buildings, because important libraries and archives are like hermit crabs, and from time to time change their shells for something larger, as is the situation with the two archives in Lyon, which when Briquet visited were in the attics of the Hotel de Ville, but nowadays are in impressive, new, state-of-the-art structures. In these cases there is no difficulty in taking the documents in hand and viewing the leaves with the watermarks Briquet traced a long time ago.

What this research therefore proposes is a reloading.

---

<sup>19</sup> See our entry for Briquet 2627.

<sup>20</sup> See Nicolangelo Scianna, ‘Le filigrane bolognesi di Charles Moïse Briquet’, in *Belle le contrade della memoria. Studi su documenti e libri in onore di Maria Gioia Tavoni*, a cura di Federica Rossi, Paolo Tinti, Bologna, Patron editore, 2009, pp. 365-378; Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 46-47, 125.

<sup>21</sup> In his famous pioneering article ‘Papiers et filigranes des Archives de Gênes 1154 à 1700’, 1888, p. 28 of the extract, Briquet mentions a collection of 115 tracings belonging to “M.<sup>r</sup> Villa, antiquaire bien connu de Gênes et membre de la Société d’histoire de cette ville”. In entry n. 3912 of *Les filigranes*, he makes reference to the same collection, which seems however to have disappeared. The figure of the cavaliere Villa can be identified with the sculptor, Giovanni Battista Villa (1832-99), who is described in the 1884 albo of the members of the Società Ligure di Storia Patria as “Villa Giovanni Battista, Pittore, Accademico di merito dell’Accademia Ligustica di belle arti, membro della Commissione conservatrice dei monumenti, Cav. *Via S. Benedetto*, 10 (22 dicembre 1861)”.

In three important collections, the Departmental Archives and the Municipal Archives in Lyon in France and the Historic archive held in the City Library at Udine in Italy, the project has returned to the original documents traced and recorded by Briquet in his visits in about 1887 and in the summer of 1898. Two different stages in his research; two very different countries, but relatively little difference in the way he conducted his research.

His primary references to these collections number respectively 87, 109, and 131. For the first, the pressmarks indicated by Briquet no longer correspond and so the identification conducted by Ilaria Pastrolin of the original documents has been a rather slow and painstaking operation, with five items still missing from the final count<sup>22</sup>; for the second, again researched by Ilaria Pastrolin, the pressmarks have remained constant and, apart from the odd error of transcription by Briquet, there have been no difficulties in finding all his original watermarks; for the third, so far done by Neil Harris, work still has to be completed, but no difficulties are anticipated.

The secondary references to these collections are 320 for Lyon (they have to be grouped together, since the archives are not distinguished and also include a couple of references to printed books), and 144 for Udine. Except for the handful of items included in the sample expounded here below, this particular labyrinth has not been entered into.

For the unpublished watermarks, the count can be precise, albeit with the *caveat* that in a preliminary trawl through a sequence of 29,000 images, something might have been missed: for the Departmental Archives in Lyon, 234; for the Municipal Archives in Lyon, 332, and for the City Library in Udine, 215. For the moment we have limited our discussion to the sample described here below.

The heart of the project therefore is very simple.

Once the reference to the watermark given by Briquet is acquired, a return is made to the archive in order to examine the document, find the watermark, in many instances identifying the exact leaf traced by Briquet, and photograph it with the assistance of a lightsheet and a modern digital camera. Subsequently, the structure of the manuscript is established together with the distribution of the watermarks in the document in its entirety. This operation concentrates on discovering how many sheets are watermarked with the design drawn by Briquet, and how many by the twin, which is also described and photographed.

Making this information available, on the other hand, is quite another issue.

So, as an experiment, we have chosen to assemble and present in a first instance a sample of fifteen of Briquet's primary references, five for each of the archives where we have so far worked, as follows:

### **Lyon, Archives départementales et métropolitaines**

Briquet 2627 [10.G.79 = St. Jean G.5]

Briquet 9796 [12 G 26 = St. Just 11]

Briquet 13158 [10 G 114 = St. Jean G 41]

Briquet 13167 [15 G 32 = St. Nizier G 2856]

Briquet 15686 [12 G 19 = St. Just 6]

### **Lyon, Archives municipales**

Briquet 4124 [CC 158]

Briquet 4297=7029 [BB 1]

---

<sup>22</sup> Briquet, *Les filigranes*, cit., nn. 3952, 5816, 9086, 11225, 13348.

Briquet 6356 [BB 1]  
Briquet 9359 [CC 146]  
Briquet 14944 [CC 3]

### **Udine, Biblioteca civica “Vincenzo Joppi”, Archivio comunale antico**

Briquet 78 [Annales 3]  
Briquet 611 [Annales 32]  
Briquet 5959 [Annales 32]  
Briquet 7464 [Annales 32]  
Briquet 16035 [Annales 3]

The complexities begin with a fundamental choice of method. Rather than concentrating on the single watermark, in abstract, as was Briquet’s essential practice, here the focus is on the vehicle, or the original manuscript.

Paper does not furnish its own topical and chronological indications; these derive instead from what is written and printed on it, and so it is essential to establish the authority of the source and the quantity of paper in the source. For the several reasons explained above, Briquet pays no attention to the scale of the witness and it is not uncommon for him to reproduce a singleton, i.e. watermarks that are found in only one or two sheets, without the twin being present<sup>23</sup>. The all-important “runs and remnants” rule, formulated by Allan Stevenson with reference to printed books, also holds true for the analysis of archive documents<sup>24</sup>. The larger the quantity of paper, consistently marked with the same pair of watermarks, the more reliable the dating; isolated sheets, on the other hand, may be remnants or fragments of supplies recycled at a later date.

The description begins therefore with a codicological analysis of the manuscript and the watermarks it contains in its entirety. Since in the Municipal Archives at Lyon and in the City Library at Udine these are often composite manuscripts, formed of multiple gatherings and bound up at a later date, there is a large variety of watermarks and the description consequently is often a lengthy one. There are, however, instances in which the entire manuscript, even quite a substantial one, is made up with paper from only one source<sup>25</sup>.

The other complication, as far as our exposition goes, is that Briquet, especially in the case of Udine, often reproduces multiple watermarks from the same manuscript. The record for the moment seems to be *Annales* 35 in the City Library at Udine, covering the years 1476-81, which furnishes no less than fifteen primary references and is also the source for seven unpublished tracings<sup>26</sup>. (Fortunately, and wisely, on account of the limited size of the sample, we have chosen not to deal with it here.)

Our subsequent entry therefore divides into two main parts.

The first is a description of the original manuscript, in two sections. This description is necessarily common to all the watermarks, both published and unpublished, found in the document, and therefore it is repeated every time one of these watermarks is described in the reloading. Of course, in those instances where the whole manuscript is watermarked with the same pair of marks,

---

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, Briquet 632, an Angel watermark, in *Annales* 32 at Udine; or Briquet 14944, a Bull’s head watermark, at the Municipal Archives in Lyon.

<sup>24</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 78, 136.

<sup>25</sup> See Briquet 13167 in the Municipal Archives at Lyon.

<sup>26</sup> See Briquet 82, 813, 2529, 2563, 2569, 2576, 3380, 5467, 5557, 7036, 9874, 14511, 14563, 16071; while the unpublished marks are a pair of Scales (Box 78, envelope 21, n. 307), another pair of Scales (n. 328), a Hat (Box 79, envelope 4, n. 55), a pair of Scissors (envelope 5, n. 321), a Cross (envelope 13, n. 333), a Bird (Box 81, envelope 11, n. 126), and a Bull’s head (Box 82, envelope 7, n. 517).

or there is only one citation in Briquet, there is no real distinction between the two parts. The two sections are as follows:

1) the location, topical and chronological, of the document and a brief summary of its historical content, including the use Briquet made of it, both for his published and unpublished references.

2) a synthesis of the structure of the document, on a gathering by gathering basis, including Briquet's primary references, brief references to the archive of unpublished watermarks (with a note of the box, envelope, and number in the sequence), and identification of the secondary references, where relevant. Note is also taken, where relevant, of their presence in the repertory of Mošin-Traljić and in the Gravell Watermark Archive. Obviously, a fuller "reloading", in which Briquet's unpublished tracing is reproduced, together with an analysis of eventual secondary references, as well as a full description and reproduction of the twin watermarks that are the source, would be a wonderful project, which for the moment has to remain in abeyance.

One final large category of watermark has to be considered. These are the watermarks to which Briquet paid no attention whatsoever. Since our project involves a description of the source manuscript, inevitably we have noted their presence and provided a basic description, in some cases to distinguish them from similar watermarks which Briquet did trace and describe. For the moment we have not done anything more. Potentially, however, there is no reason why, on the basis of an agreement with the holding institutions, these watermarks cannot be made available through a large international watermark catalogue coordinated by the Bernstein project.

The second part of the description involves the twin watermarks, of which one in the pair has been described, traced, and published by Briquet. This description therefore is unique to that particular Briquet number.

We furnish a breakdown of the distribution of the twin watermarks in the gathering or gatherings of the source manuscript. To our knowledge, although several scholars, most notably Theo Gerardy and Paul Needham, have suggested approaches and even provided examples of sample schemes for such descriptions<sup>27</sup>, no instances have been published of the distribution of watermarks in an extended document, so it is necessary to define the criteria followed with extreme clarity.

The terminology is kept as simple as possible.

A watermark in the left-hand side of the original mould is designated L and its twin in the right-hand side of the original mould is designated R. It is necessary to acknowledge that many watermark scholars have preferred the other way round and have described watermarks from the mould side of the sheet, which is also usually the best side for seeing the watermarks, and we have adhered to this practice in our photographs. On the other hand, since watermarks are made as mirror images, the issue of which side is described is not overwhelmingly important, so long as the chosen method is practised with clarity, consistency, and coherence. Critical references therefore describe them as "Left (Mould-side Right)" and "Right (Mould-side Left)", abbreviated as L (MsR) and R (MsL).

When, as is quite common up to the middle of the Fifteenth century in Italy, and even later in France, both watermarks are placed in the same half of their respective moulds, the first instance is designated L and the second LL or, alternatively, R and RR. (In the entries written in French for the archives at Lyon, the terms are *gauche* and *droit*, so G and GG, and D and DD).

Most Medieval and Renaissance watermarks have a self-evident Up and a self-evident Down, almost always with reference to the long side of the mould. It is usually straightforward therefore to decide which half is Left and which half is Right. But there are ambiguous cases, where

---

<sup>27</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 49-51.

the distinction is not clear and where consequently the difference between left and right also becomes unclear. In these instances, our decisions have been arbitrary, though in general we have conformed to Briquet's usage, for example, in choosing that unicorns from the Auvergne should gallop up chainlines rather than down them. Where there is a directional ambiguity, however, we take care to draw attention to it.

The tables showing the position of the watermarks in the manuscript and in the gatherings are largely self-explanatory.

Let us illustrate the example in Table 1, taken from *Annales* 3 in the City Library at Udine, describing the pliers watermarks from 1362 that Briquet traced as his n. 16035, albeit without identifying what it represented. The gathering is the sixth in the manuscript, containing twenty sheets in folio format (eleven L and nine R), folded to make forty leaves, numbered in the original document from 169 to 208. The first column lists the leaves in the first half of the gathering, with their watermarks, when present, recorded in the second; the third column, reading from the bottom to the top, lists the leaves in the second half of the gathering, with its respective watermarks in the fourth column. Consequently, each horizontal line represents the two conjugate leaves that make up the same sheet, and allows the reader to see immediately which half contains the watermark.

leaf	watermark	leaf	watermark
169		208	<b>R</b>
170	<b>L</b>	207	
171	<b>R</b>	206	
172		205	<b>R</b>
173	<b>L</b>	204	
174	<b>R</b>	203	
175	<b>L</b>	202	
176		201	<b>R</b>
177	<b>R</b>	200	
178		199	<b>R</b>
179	<b>L</b>	198	
180	<b>L</b>	197	
181		196	<b>L</b>
182		195	<b>L</b>
183		194	<b>L</b>
184	<b>R</b>	193	
185		192	<b>L</b>
186	<b>L</b>	191	
187		190	<b>L</b>
188		189	<b>R</b>

Table 1. Example of the distribution of the watermarks in Udine, Biblioteca civica "Vincenzo Joppi", Archivio Comunale Antico, *Annales*, vol. 3.

The reporting and description of the watermarks in each manuscript again require careful thought.

The twin watermarks are identified and described. Our descriptive language is kept as discursive, simple and untechnical as possible.

How can it be determined that two particular watermarks are twins, given that the moulds on which they were made have long ceased to exist? By constructive inference, for the most part.

Exactly as when we see two lookalike little boys, or little girls, or a boy and a girl, and by size and appearance, and sometimes the fact that they are dressed in identical fashion, recognise that they are twins, without any need for DNA testing. The most valuable evidence comes from gatherings with a consistent number of sheets, containing the same pair of marks, and without the intrusion of other marks. Another important element is that the two moulds that made the sheets should not only be of the same size, in order to fit the deckle, but have the same construction, with chain and wirelines at identical distances.

In a table, with reference to the criteria proposed by the International Association of Paper Historians (IPH), we provide a complete description of the twin sheets and watermarks, conducted from the mould side of the sheet<sup>28</sup>. The IPH Standard has been conceived and presented primarily as a set of norms to facilitate the description of sheets of paper and watermarks in a database. Our approach and description differ therefore in a number of respects. In particular, although the IPH standard make allowance for a reference to a twin mould, its main purpose is the description of an individual watermark. Our objective is instead comparative and sets out to describe the twin moulds, and associated watermarks, with an emphasis on how to tell them apart. Most of the changes we have made derive therefore from our own practical experience.

As an example, here is the table with the description of the Anvil in circle watermark in volume 32 of the *Annales* in the Biblioteca Civica at Udine. The watermarks are found in gathering 8, ff. 265-285, [285 bis], with a total of 22 leaves or 11 sheets, all regularly quired, though the two innermost have the Angel watermark Briquet also published as his number 611. There are five L watermarks and four LL watermarks. On his visit to Udine in 1898 Briquet traced an L watermark and published it as his n. 5959.

Description of the mould	L	LL
Sheet measurement in mm	298 × 442 mm trimmed	Same
Ratio width/height of sheet	1,48	Same
Principal motif of the watermark and IPH code	Anvil in circle Amboss im Kreis enclume en cercle incudine in cerchio.  N1	Same
Percentage in total of sheets	56%	44%
Difficulty in distinguishing the watermarks (scale of 1 to 10)	5	5
Direction of the watermark	The point of the anvil is towards the centre.	Same
Height of watermark in mm	46 mm	47 mm
Width of watermark in mm	45 mm	46 mm

<sup>28</sup> See the *International Standard for the Registration of Papers with or without Watermarks = Internationale Norm für die Erfassung von Papieren mit oder ohne Wasserzeichen = Norme internationale d'enregistrement des papiers avec ou sans filigrane*, IPH Standard 2.1.1, in the most recent revision of 2013. Available on the IPH website. On the IPH standard, see Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 51, 60-61, 129-130.

Position of the watermark on the chainlines	Between 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> chainlines, overlapping the outer by 3.5 mm and the inner by 7 mm.	Between 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> chainlines, overlapping the outer by 4 mm and the inner by 5 mm.
Smallest distance between watermark and outer chainline.	31 mm	31 mm
Smallest distance between watermark and inner chainline.	29 mm	31 mm
Distance from watermark to top of sheet	136 mm	125 mm
Distance of watermark to bottom of sheet.	116 mm	125 mm
Number of chainlines in sheet	12	12
Distance between chainlines, if regular	35/36 mm	35/36 mm
Presence of a supplementary chainline	No	No
Presence of tranchefiles	No	No
Number of wirelines in 20 mm	Approx. 25	
Notes		

Table 2. Example of the description of the twin Anvil in circle in Udine, Biblioteca civica “Vincenzo Joppi”, Archivio Comunale Antico, *Annales*, vol. 32.

The categories are as follows.

*Description of the mould.* The mould is defined by the position of the watermark on the same, seen in its original position. Both watermarks were placed in the left-hand side of their original mould and so are classified as L and LL. When the sheet is viewed from the mould side, the watermark falls in the right half (MsR).

*Sheet measurement in mm.* The sheet measurement is given as a broadside, i.e. viewed with the long side horizontal and the short side vertical. When the volume is tightly bound, the horizontal measurement is necessarily approximate. We follow Briquet’s practice in noting when the leaves have been trimmed by the binder.

On the whole matter of measurements a word of cautionary advice might be helpful. Sheets of paper shrank on drying, but shrinkage varied according to the thickness of the same, the sorts of fibres, and the amount of pressing while the sheet was still damp. If the sheet has been washed in modern times for conservation purposes, further shrinkage is frequently a consequence. Deckles were usually made to overlap slightly the mould, providing a visible and distinctive edge, which we note if it is clearly visible. Likewise, the shapes of chainlines and watermarks are not always easily



distinguished, especially when obscured by writing or print, and therefore small differentials should always be taken into account.

*Ratio width/height of sheet.* In the Middle Ages and Renaissance mould sizes conformed to the invariant rectangle, in which, if the short side is equivalent to 1, the long side measures 1.4121 *ad infinitum*, or the square root of two<sup>29</sup>. The property of this rectangle is that, no matter how much it is divided or multiplied, the proportions remain the same. Mould makers of course were not able to do the complicated mathematics, but they knew the general shape required, and therefore we provide an indication of how close they are to the norm.

*Principal motif of the watermark and IPH code.* A description is furnished based on the Thesaurus terminology of the IPH standard. If the mould also contains a countermark, placed in the half of the sheet opposite to the main watermark, it is also noted here.

*Percentage in total of sheets.* The presence of paper from each mould in the manuscript is given as a percentage. In terms of distribution, it would be unreasonable to expect twin watermarks to occur always in a precise ratio of 50% and 50% (see, however, Briquet 9796, at the Departmental Archives in Lyon, with twelve of each), though in many cases the percentages are close enough. Occasionally anomalies do appear, for instance, Briquet 2627 at the Municipal Archives in Lyon, where L is found in five sheets (83%) and LL in only one (17%). Albeit not in the sample presented here, such disproportions do occur on a much larger scale and so require explanation. The most plausible reason is that in the papermaking factory, on a certain day or part of a day, someone worked alone, perhaps with an apprentice to help him place the felts on the post, and so performed the roles of both the vatman and the coucher. It might have been an occasional phenomenon, as our statistics suggest, but it ensured that for a few hours, perhaps the space of a day, reams of paper were made using only one mould, although both were available.

*Difficulty in distinguishing the watermarks.* It is useful to include a rule-of-thumb indication of how easy or difficult it is to tell the twin watermarks apart, on the basis of a scale ranging from 1 to 10. The lowest figure means that the twin watermarks are easy to distinguish; the highest that they are difficult to separate.

*Direction of the watermark.* The majority of watermarks do not have a direction on the horizontal axis of the sheet, but there are exceptions, for instance human figures or animals. At times these are placed so that in one twin the watermark is pointing inwards and in the other outwards, making it easy to tell them apart. Experience teaches that the direction of the watermark might not always be helpful or significant in a photograph or in a tracing, where our awareness of its placing in the source is lost, but it can prove extremely valuable when we are face to face with the watermark itself in an original document.

*Height of the watermark in mm.* Measured from the outermost point to the opposite outermost point.

*Width of the watermark in mm.* Measured from the outermost point to the opposite outermost point.

*Position of the watermark on the chainlines.* The position of the watermark is given relating to the chainlines counted from the outer edge in the half of the sheet containing the watermark.

Here we differ significantly from the IPH standard, which, in its English version, requires that a description of the sheet from the mould side always be viewed from left to right (the French

---

<sup>29</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 37-39.

version of the standard, on the other hand, prescribes a description taken from the felt side). Rather than *left* and *right*, which in describing the position of watermarks on the mould can prove ambiguous, we employ the terms *inner* (i.e. towards the centre of the sheet) and *outer* (i.e. towards the edge of the sheet). Likewise, in describing the position of the watermark with respect to the chainlines, it is simpler to provide a count from the nearest edge, with the consequence that in describing a R (MsL) watermark our count proceeds from left to right and in describing a L (MsR) watermark, as in the example here, our count goes from right to left. If the IPH criterion were applied, in the said instance the count would instead number all the chainlines in the blank half of the leaf before coming to the watermark in the other half. Not only is this operation more complex and lengthy, but with tightly bound volumes the numbering presents an element of uncertainty. In our view and experience, it is simpler and more practical to relate always the watermark to the side of the sheet that is closest.

*Smallest distance between the watermark and the outer chainline.* Watermarks can be placed between two chainlines, or alternatively centred on a chainline, especially if it is a supplementary chainline (i.e. unsupported by a wooden rib). Again we differ from the IPH standard in preferring to refer to the position of the watermark in terms of the sheet in its entirety. So, rather than *left* and *right*, reference is to the outer chainline. i.e. the closest one between the watermark and the short side of the mould. In the example provided here, the watermark slightly overlaps the third chainline from the right-hand edge of the sheet viewed from the mould side, and so the measurement refers to the second chainline.

*Smallest distance between the watermark and the outer chainline.* As above, albeit with the distinction that in the example the measurement refers to the fifth chainline from the right-hand edge of the sheet viewed from the mould side.

*Distance from watermark to top of sheet.* Two watermarks can be very alike, but have different positions on the mould. In the example given here, the L watermark is almost a centimetre lower than the LL watermark. In such measurements it is necessary to take account of trimming of the sheet and so both distances should be compared.

*Distance from watermark to bottom of sheet.* As above.

*Number of chainlines in sheet.* Again we differ from the IPH standard, in which all the chainlines are considered equal. In our practice, we prefer to distinguish supplementary chainlines, commonplace in Italian moulds, especially Fabriano and associated centres, as a bearer for the watermark unsupported by a wooden rib. Supplementary chainlines are recognisable by the shorter distance to the proper chainlines on either side and, though they are part of the count, they are marked. Likewise tranchefiles, which are characteristic of French and Northern European moulds from the 1480s, placed at the two extremities of the mould, are noted separately.

*Distance between chainlines, if regular.* Given the difficulties of measuring precisely, small oscillations are not considered. Where significant differences do appear, individual measurements are provided, as suggested by the IPH standard. Again where we differ is giving the measurement on the basis of the half containing the watermark. In other words, with a R (MsL) watermark our indication reads from left to right; with a L (MsR) watermark, our indication reads from right to left. Symbols therefore identify the spaces between the chainlines that contain the whole of the watermark or the main part of the watermark (W), or, in the case of a small overlap, a part of the watermark (w). For example, in the case here the distances can be described as: [R>L] ?-35-35w-

35W-35w-35-35-35-35-35-35-??). Where a manuscript is tightly bound, the distances involving the chainlines in the centre of the sheet are either hypothetical or given as a question mark.

*Presence of a supplementary chainline.* As above.

*Presence of tranchefiles.* As above.

*Number of wirelines in 20 mm.* In a sheet of laid paper made at the vat, the pulp passes through and deposits itself between the wires, so that once dried they appear as dark and the corresponding wires as light lines on the surface of the sheet. The measurement is taken in the vicinity of the watermark, from the first wire to the last one completely within the distance of 20 mm.

*Notes.* Any further distinctive or unusual features of the mould or the watermark are noted here.

Following on from the table, **links are provided** to photographs of the twin watermarks, again taken from the mould side of the sheet. If the watermark is not fully visible in one image, for the most part due to writing ink, more than one image is provided.

The twin watermark traced by Briquet is identified, where possible, with reference to the exact leaf. Briquet's preferences were naturally for the blank leaves often found at the end of gatherings and, having followed in his footsteps for so long, we have acquired an instinctive appreciation of the choices he made. A brief commentary is provided about the main distinctions between the watermarks, in order to help less experienced readers to see the differences. At times, in a long run of paper, small differences of state appear, due to the watermark shifting on the mould, and attention is duly drawn to them.

**A link is provided** to a photograph of Briquet's tracing.

Notes are provided about the tracing, including a transcription of all the textual elements. Briquet's handwriting is perfectly readable by the standards of his time, but it does pose the occasional complexity, especially where numbers are concerned, and therefore, to facilitate understanding for non Francophone readers, we transcribe everything. Briquet generally notes the name of the archive, the date and pressmark of the document, and the measurements of the sheet, including whether it has been trimmed. Other more variable elements are the position of the watermark, if unusual, and characteristics of the paper. He also sometimes notes the discovery of other similar or identical watermarks in other documents, usually in the same archive, which at times become secondary references<sup>30</sup>.

One matter that requires interpretation and commentary is the presence of several different numbers on all the tracings. These have been written at different moments, sometimes in pencil, sometimes in differently coloured inks (one problem in the black and white digital reproductions of the unpublished watermarks done for the Gravell Watermark Archive is the loss of these colours). In the published sequence all the tracings have received a number corresponding to the final number in the repertory, written in a variety of fashions (green ink with underlining, red or black ink in a circle). All the tracings, whether published or unpublished, also contain a number in red ink, which identifies the document in the archive or library of provenance, and is to be found also in Briquet's travel diaries. The hand is the same one as writes the entries for the numbers in the final repertory and is not Briquet's own, though who it belongs to still has to be established. This number can refer to a single item, or to an extensive series, for instance that for the 66 volumes of the *Annales* in the

---

<sup>30</sup> See the example of the Dragon watermarks discussed by Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 67-69.

City Library at Udine is 9024<sup>31</sup>. These numbers are potentially helpful in establishing the chronology of Briquet's journeys. The third number that almost always appears, in pencil in a circle, puzzled us for a while, but the plausible explanation is that it is internal to the sequence, i.e. corresponding to the container represented by the yellow envelope.

Any significant divergences between the tracing and the original watermark, or between the tracing and the published result, are also pointed out and commented on.

At the end of the day our result is not an earthshaking one, nor something that is going to transform radically watermark and paper studies.

The sample presented here is a mere 0.09% of Briquet's original total; the sum of the two Lyon collections, where Ilaria Pastrolin has completed the survey of the primary references, only amounts to 1.2%, and even here the whole matter of the secondary references and the unpublished part of the archive still has to be taken in hand. In truth, we have only scratched the surface of Briquet's immense enterprise. What we do believe is that this research, albeit complex, has a huge potentiality.

This example of fifteen entries is published to show how a project to "reload Briquet" might be conducted. Obviously we should welcome criticism and observations of any and every kind.

*All communications should be sent to Ilaria Pastrolin at the Ecole Nationale des Chartes, Paris. E-mail: [ilariapastrolin@gmail.com](mailto:ilariapastrolin@gmail.com).*

*We express our gratitude to the institutions that have assisted and supported us in this research: at Geneva, the Bibliothèque de Genève, and in particular the directeur, M. Alexandre Vanautgarten, and the conservator of manuscripts, M. Nicholas Schaetti; at Lyon, the Archives Départementales et Métropolitaines, and in particular Mme. Sophie Malavieille; the Archives Municipales de Lyon and, in particular, the director M. Louis Faivre d'Arcier; and at Udine, the Biblioteca Civica "Vincenzo Joppi", and the conservator, dott.ssa Francesca Tamburlini. The property of the images remain with the above institutions and all further reproduction is forbidden.*

---

<sup>31</sup> See Harris, *Paper and Watermarks*, cit., pp. 63-64, 72-73.