

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/33233> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Roelvink, Véronique

Title: Gheerkin de Hondt : a singer-composer in the sixteenth-century Low Countries

Issue Date: 2015-06-24

Appendix 2 London, British Library, Add. MS 25050

In 1958 D.P. Oosterbaan published an edition of a chronicle of the Nieuwe Kerk in Delft, Add. MS 25050 in the British Library in London.¹⁷⁷⁰ Oosterbaan's book contains very useful additional information, not repeated here, but also raises questions about the transcriptions, for example in relation to the meaning of the original texts. Inspection of the original brought new facts to light.

As noted by Oosterbaan, the parchment book of about 24.6 x 16.7 cm can be divided into four main parts:

- ✚ fol. 2r-9v and 19r-25r:¹⁷⁷¹ copies of documents and charters in Latin which at the time were in the possession of the church masters;
- ✚ fol. 10r-14r: description of the origins of the Nieuwe Kerk and the sculpture of Maria ter Nood Gods (the Pietà);
- ✚ fol. 14v-18v and 26r-63r:¹⁷⁷² descriptions of eighty-nine miracle stories related to the sculpture;
- ✚ fol. 64r-81r: summary of the origins of the Nieuwe Kerk and notes on the history of the church concerning building activities, the interior, liturgy, et cetera.

Folio 83r-v contains an annex by Michiel Vosmeer, one of the first owners of the manuscript, who lived from 23 August 1545 until 17 April 1617. The appendix gives information on the years 1546, 1548 and 1559 and an explanation of the notes that were made by Vosmeer in the margins of the manuscript.¹⁷⁷³

The main part of the manuscript was very carefully and beautifully written, by one scribe. Remarkable and even exceptional is that the scribe is very consistent in his spelling; where sixteenth-century scribes would frequently use several spellings for one word in the same text (for example *dair* and *daer*), the scribe of the chronicle only uses one version maintained throughout the manuscript. Furthermore, his handwriting is very regular and very tidy; now and then we can see that he had to use new ink, but that is all. The scribe was also very careful and consistent in his punctuation: he placed dots where a reading pause is necessary, or he

¹⁷⁷⁰ Oosterbaan 1958.

¹⁷⁷¹ The modern page number on the right top of the page is used.

¹⁷⁷² Oosterbaan incorrectly mentions fol. 68 instead of fol. 63 (p. 11).

¹⁷⁷³ Among these remarks are references to another manuscript that was in the possession of Joost Henricsz., one of the church masters of the Nieuwe Kerk (Oosterbaan 1958, p. 8-9). The initials IH in the margins probably refer to this Joost Henricsz. (not mentioned by Oosterbaan).

used red ink for (parts of) letters to achieve the same effect.¹⁷⁷⁴ This is especially useful for the interpretation of the texts. The title of a new paragraph is always written in red ink. Furthermore, the manuscript contains blue and red initials, some of them beautifully embellished.

We do not know when the manuscript was written, but since the last entry by the original writer is from 1516 and the handwriting is very consistent, it probably dates from about that time. We have no information on the identity of the scribe either. From his texts, Oosterbaan already concluded that he had access to the original charters and books of the Nieuwe Kerk, and that he cared for his church very much.¹⁷⁷⁵ If we take a closer look at the original charters and documents still in the archives of the Nieuwe Kerk, one manuscript immediately attracts our attention in relation to the chronicle: GAD 435, Inv. no. 175. It is a ledger of graves in the Nieuwe Kerk, started in approximately 1493 and kept until 1623. The resemblances between the chronicle and the original part of this ledger are striking: the script, the use of red ink for initials, the initials themselves,¹⁷⁷⁶ the use of dots and red ink in letters to indicate reading pauses, the consistent spelling, the tidy handwriting. It seems to have been the same person who wrote both manuscripts. To decide definitively, the manuscripts should be compared side by side, but their distance probably makes that impossible. In any case: either one of the scribes copied the ideas of the other (and according to the dates, in that case the chronicler copied the scribe of GAD 435, Inv. no. 175), or the scribe of both manuscripts is the same person. That does not mean, however, that the scribe of the chronicle is also the author of the text. We have to consider that someone else compiled the chronicle and hired a professional scribe to copy it in the best and most elegant possible way.¹⁷⁷⁷

¹⁷⁷⁴ Oosterbaan did not always follow the punctuation of the scribe, and therefore some of his transcriptions are perhaps interpreted in a different way than the scribe meant.

¹⁷⁷⁵ Oosterbaan 1958, p. 24 concludes that he is not objective, but I think that is far too negative a judgement.

¹⁷⁷⁶ Especially the capital I; compare, for example, the chronicle, fol. 15-r onwards and GAD 435, Inv. no. 175, p. 14. Also almost completely identical is the way both scribes write the word *Voort*: starting with red ink and underlining the word (see chronicle fol. 12v and GAD 435, Inv. no. 175, fol. 12).

¹⁷⁷⁷ If this is the case, it is also possible that the manuscript has to be dated later, because the scribe might have had to stop writing suddenly, leaving his work unfinished.