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Abstract

In the musical repertory of the medieval Gregorian liturgy, office chants have more diversity among sources than mass chants. The diversity sometimes results in the conflicting modal assignments of given chants which have been one of the chief concerns of the theorists throughout medieval centuries. By finding the conflicting modal assignments in the office antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost through a comparison of seven German antiphoners, and also by consulting with contemporary theoretical treatises about the antiphons of problematic modal assignments, this study inspects the real circumstances of modal problems in the medieval practice. One of the causes of the conflicting modal assignment of antiphons is the change of criterion of modal decision. In the early middle ages, singers selected the psalm tone according to the melodic incipit of an antiphon, while later they decided the mode of every chant based on the *finalis*. The other cause of conflict is that medieval singers often transposed a melody either entirely or in part, in order to avoid a certain interval or a chromatic tone, or in order to ease excessively high or low notes for certain singers. These modal conflicts, even among the sources produced in rather closely located geographical places, along with the theoretical discussions on modal problems of such antiphons, can be regarded as evidence of the struggles of medieval musicians to systematize the vast repertory they inherited.
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Introduction

In comparison with the history of the so-called Old-Roman and Milanese chant, the prominent element in that of the Frankish plainchant, usually called Gregorian chant, is the development of notation and modal categorization. Although there still remain significant questions and problems in the historical relationship between Frankish and Old Roman chant repertories, and also between Frankish and Milanese chant repertories, it seems clear that the Carolingian musicians, very probably at imperial command, with knowledge of the Byzantine liturgy, undertook to notate their chants in order to maintain or standardize the orally transmitted versions,¹ and also undertook to develop the modal theories to systematize their vast repertory of chant, in a way that the Roman and Milanese musicians did only later and to a lesser extent.

With respect to the modal system with which the present study is concerned, while the earliest source from the Frankish Empire indicating the modal classification dates back to the end of the eighth century,² there is no evidence of modal taxonomy in Old Roman sources before the thirteenth century.³ The system of eight modes was adopted only late and gradually into Rome from the Frankish Empire. In the Milanese liturgy too, musicians developed their own practice for recitation tone, termination of psalmody and antiphon. It

¹ The first thorough study is that of Solange Corbin, “Les notations neumatique en france à l’époque carolingienne,” 
is far different from the systematic ecclesiastical modal theory, the slight impact of which on Ambrosian chant was late.\textsuperscript{4}

The classification of liturgical chant according to this eightfold modal system seems to have been of great concern to Carolingian music theorists and singers. Some point out problematic chants in modal assignment, others argue the practice containing the shifts of modes. Regino of Prüm is one of the former musicians. In the preface to his tonary he reported that choirs sometimes sang melodies of psalms in confusion because of the disagreement of mode. He eventually made a tonary, distributing the antiphons according to their proper modes.

Cum frequenter in ecclesiae vestrae dioecesibus chorus psallentium psalmorum melodiam confusis resonaret vocibus, propter dissonantiam toni, et pro huiuscemodi re vestrarum venerationem saepe commotam vidisset; arripui antiphonarium, et eum a principio usque in finem per ordinem diligenter revolvens, antiphonas, quas in illo adnotatas reperi, propriis, ut reor, distribui tonis.\textsuperscript{5}

He then mentions that agreement of modal assignment among musicians is not easily recognized in certain antiphons which contain the conflicting modalities within a single chant.

Sunt namque quaedam antiphonae, quas nothas, id est, degeneres et non legitimas appellamus, quae ab uno tono incipiunt, alterius sunt in medio, et in terto finiuntur.\textsuperscript{6}

He specified fourteen office antiphons and twelve introits which cause ambiguities and fluctuations of modes.


\textsuperscript{5} Regino of Prüm, \textit{De harmonica institutione}, in Sister Mary Protase LeRoux, \textquote{The \textit{De harmonica institutione} and \textit{Tonarius} of Regino of Prüm\textquote} (Ph.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 1965), Chapter II: Translation and Commentary, 23.

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 27.
Of the latter group of musicians, the anonymous author of the treatise entitled *Dialogus de musica* blames singers for their slight consideration of mode.

In maximum saepe errorem vulgares cantores labuntur, quia vim toni et semitonii, aliarumque consonantiarum minime perpendunt. Id enim unusquisque eorum eligit, quod primum auribus placuerit, vel quod facilius ad discendum pronuntiandumve provenerit: fitque magnus error in multis cantibus ciusmodi sint.\(^7\)

Here "vim toni et semitonii" means the arrangement of tone and semitone. Some singers seem to change melodies without respect for such intervallic composition of melodies.

In *Micrologus*, Guido of Arezzo describes the change of mode which resulted from inaccurate performance, which probably means careless transposition.

Dissonantia quoque per falsitatem ita in canendo subrepit, cum aut de bene dimensis vocibus parum quid demunt gravantes, vel adiectum intendentes, quod pravae voces hominum faciunt; aut cum ad praedictam rationem plus iusto intendentes vel remittentes, neunam ciuslibet modi aut in alium modum pervertimus, aut in loco qui vocem non recipit, iachoamus.\(^8\)

These three documents are only examples of a large corpus of medieval writings on the problems on modal theories.\(^9\) Harold S. Powers regards these writings, either theoretical treatises or commentaries of tonaries, as indicative of the efforts made by Carolingian musicians to deal with the discrepancies between the closed and symmetrical modal system.

---


and the chant repertory, which had been inherited and developed in oral tradition before the advent of the eight-mode schemata. As he states, tracing these efforts could furnish essential insights into the processes of medieval musical thought. The theme of the present study is, however, not to trace the history of these theoretical writings. Instead, this study will examine the liturgical books with musical notation to see the reality of modal conflict in practice which inspired the medieval theorists in the above mentioned discussions. Since Regino reports that there were disagreements of modal assignment even in a choir, and since the author of the dialogue and Guido mention that performers sometimes deviated from the proper mode, it is appropriate to infer that there must have been different transmissions of melodies and different categorizations of mode among many musical sources. Therefore, a comparative study of given chants among several sources will detect the variations or disagreements of their modal assignments in medieval transmissions. After locating such conflicts, it is a pertinent procedure to examine the intervallic composition of the melodies that were assigned to different modes in various sources.

An overview of the studies by other researchers will situate this study in the field and make clear its focus which differs from others. Concerning the mass chant, Urbanus Bomm was among the first who has made a comparative study of sources in order to

---

The Journal of Musicology 4 (1985): 330-349, treats the medieval theoretical writings which treat the change of melodies caused by transposition and usage of b-flat.

inquire into conflicting modal assignment.\textsuperscript{11} He deals with nearly one hundred mass chants which occur with different designations of mode, although his commentary on the causes of the conflicting modal assignment is not sufficient.

Limiting themselves to only introit antiphons, Eulmee Park and Hendrik van der Werf made comparative studies of sources. The former examined three out of twelve introits which are treated as problematic in Regino’s preface.\textsuperscript{12} She compared seven sources (tonaries, including Regino’s, as well as other liturgical books in which these three introits survive) and described the differences of melodies and modal assignments. Based on a theoretical treatise, in her case in the preface to Regino’s tonary, she treats three antiphons, which lead her to discuss only one cause for the problem of modal assignment. Other causes are outside of her concern in this short paper.

The point of departure for Hendrik van der Werf’s work is the practical repertory itself.\textsuperscript{13} His The Emergence of Gregorian Chant is the result of a comparative study encompassing hundreds of melodies of introits in twenty-six manuscripts which are well distributed geographically. They include Frankish gradualls as well as Old Roman and Milanese antiphoners.\textsuperscript{14} Although he tries to give consideration to accentuation and

\textsuperscript{11} Urbanus Bomm, Der Wechsel der Modalitätsbestimmung in der Tradition der Messgesänge im IX. bis XIII. Jahrhundert und sein Einfluss auf die Tradition ihrer Melodien (Einsiedeln: Benzinger, 1929; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1975)


\textsuperscript{14} In the earliest Roman system and Ambrosian liturgy as well as in the very beginning of Carolingian liturgy, all types of chant were written in a book, an antiphoner. It is in the subsequent Gregorian system that Mass chants were collected in a gradual separated from Office chants which were collected in an antiphoner.
duration in chant, the main part of his study is devoted to the issues of melodies and modes. He evaluates the differences and similarities of given melodies among the medieval versions, finally speculating upon the origin and the development of plain chant in the whole scope of the medieval liturgy, encompassing the Gregorian, Old Roman and Ambrosian liturgies. He regards the differences as the amelioration of Frankish versions so as to make them fit with the modal theories.

No similarly complete study about the problem of modal assignment pertaining to office chant had existed until just recently. Instead, for office antiphons, the musicological studies have been devoted to classifying the repertory according to melody types. It was François Auguste Gevaert and Walter Howard Frere who first attempted such categorizations about a century ago.\(^\text{15}\) This kind of work has its roots in medieval tonaries, liturgical books which classify chant by their modes, and in the case of antiphons also by their *differentiae*, i.e., subdivisions of modes, which are identified by the termination patterns of the concomitant psalmody.\(^\text{16}\) The recent studies of this type, however, intend to argue for a composing method by adaptation of prototype melody and a development process for the antiphon repertory.\(^\text{17}\)


\(^{16}\) The termination patterns were called variously, *distinctio* or *divisio* besides *differentia*. Here *differentia* is chosen because this term was the most common nomenclature.

\(^{17}\) Edward Nowacki presented an analytical technique which takes the syntactic elements into account and enables the grouping of almost all chant. At the end of this paper, he states that this method offers an way of explaining the evidence that shows the process of composition of chant. See his paper read at the International Musicological Congress: “Syntactical Analysis of Plainchant” in *Report of the Twelfth Congress Berkeley, 1977*, 191-201; Under the leadership of the Hungarian chant scholars, László Dobszay and Gábor Prószék, an European chant study group started a large-scale enterprise of classification of antiphons in the project “Corpus Antiphonaliúm Officii- Ecclesiarum Centralis Europae (CAO-ECE).
With respect to the modal problem of office antiphons one had to wait for a comprehensive comparative study of sources until the work of Paul Merkley. He inspects antiphons in tonaries covering a wide range, i.e., in Italy and then the region north of the Alps.\textsuperscript{18} By thoroughly locating the conflicting assignments of mode in these tonaries from the wide regions, he describes the history of the melodic classification of office antiphons in a comprehensive point of view including modal theory and practice, source transmission, and social environment of the institutional patronage.

As for the office antiphons limited only to the Paschal triduum Easter liturgy, which are some one hundred and forty in number, Joan Halmo compared twelve manuscripts.\textsuperscript{19} The criterion of the source selection seems to be based on the principle of the Solesmes edition which requires the earlier and "the more important manuscripts" from each region.\textsuperscript{20} Her examination of these antiphons takes into account their modes, melodic characteristics, text, and liturgical meanings. Without focusing on any of them, she aimed to give the full particulars of the antiphon repertory within the medieval triduum-Easter office.

Dobszay and his colleagues are indexing, analyzing and systematizing the antiphons of a large number of manuscript sources from Central Europe. He expects this classification can assist to make clear the process of development of this repertory. But the result of this work has not yet come about. See László Dobszay, "Experiences in the Musical Classification of Antiphons," \textit{Cantus Planus: Papers read at the Third Meeting of the International Musicological Society Study Group, Thany, Hungary, 1988} (Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Science, 1990) 143-156.

\textsuperscript{18} Paul Merkley, \textit{Italian Tonalies} (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1988); \textit{Modal Assignment in Northern Tonaries} (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1992).

\textsuperscript{19} Joan Halmo, \textit{Antiphons for Paschal Triduum-Easter in the Medieval Office} (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1995)

The emphasis of the present study is much more on an analysis of the variants of modes and melodies among sources as well as an analysis of the causes of conflicting modal assignments. In other words, this exploration of the variants is directed towards considering how and why these conflicts have come about. It enables us to understand how the eightfold system of modal categories troubled the medieval musicians from the practical point of view. This research into music repertory not only confirms the theoretical discussions in the Middle Ages, but also gives us comprehensive observation about the practical problems of mode with more data than those which medieval writers mentioned.

In concrete terms, office antiphons in the antiphoners of the Germanic region are the subject of this study. Antiphons have been chosen for the present study because antiphonal psalmody affords the opportunity to investigate three elements bearing on mode: the antiphon melodies, psalmodic recitation, and the termination formulas. Because of these triple elements of modal determination, antiphons often caused the modal problems and became topics of argument among medieval musicians as represented by Regino of Prüm. Within antiphonal psalmody, office antiphons are the oldest and most numerous genre. In addition, the sources of the divine office are more varied in the selection and the order of chants, compared with the sources of the mass in general. The office books reflect the customs, preference and designs special for a certain region or a certain community. Therefore, more variants can be expected also in musical practice of office antiphons.

Regarding sources, both antiphoners and tonaries could be sources for the study of modal assignment; nevertheless, tonaries are excluded here in consideration of their
character. Some tonaries are written with only textual incipits and without musical notation and indicate their character of compilation for didactic or administrative purposes rather than liturgical usage. The tonary has somehow made a bridge between theoretical writing and practice. In contrast, antiphoners are witnesses of the musical practice of the period.

The following seven antiphoners are chosen from those that originated in the German monasteries.

1. Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, 611 (abbreviation: Eins)
2. Graz, Universitätbibliothek, 29-30 (Graz)
3. Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug, LX (Karls)
4. Mainz, Dom- und Dioezesanmuseum, Codices, A,B, C, D, E (Mainz)
5. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 390-391 (Hartker)
7. Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, Rh.28 (Rheinau)

There are several groups of chant transmission or dialects in conformity with cultural regions, as René Jean Hesbert as well as the chant scholars of Solesmes as a group try to demonstrate statistically through the studies of an enormous number of sources. If a researcher cannot cover as many sources as the group of Solesmes is doing, it is necessary to make a selection of manuscripts. Instead of choosing manuscripts from all the regions as Joan Halmo and van der Werf did, here the manuscripts are limited to the ones from

---

monasteries of the German-speaking region. Choosing only one region makes it easier to find the counterpart of a given chant among sources, because the sources of one region tend to have a common selection of chant. The German monastic sources are particularly interesting because of their innovation in modal classification, perhaps related to theorists of that region.

Except for Hartker and Rheinau, the chants of all these antiphoners used here are listed in the CANTUS database\textsuperscript{22}. CANTUS is made up of indices of the chants in some thirty-five sources of the divine office from all over Europe, and these indices are expanding by the on-going project whose center was originally at Catholic University of America in Washington, DC and now has moved into the University of Western Ontario at London, Ontario. Each file index of the antiphoners contains the following components about each chant: the actual number of the folio in the manuscripts, the name of the feast, the text incipit, the mode, the differentia, the serial number assigned by Hesbert in his catalog of chant, Corpus antiphonarium officii (the number is usually called as CAO number after the title of his catalog), the initial characters of the sources surveyed by Hesbert in which the chant appears, and the name of the Hour.\textsuperscript{23} Eins, Graz, Karls, Stutt are the ones which are ordered by the monastic cursus among the German manuscripts in CANTUS. Mainz is ordered in the secular cursus; nevertheless, it was used in a Carmelite monastery and contains many unique modal assignments. Hartker is an important antiphoner among the earliest musical documents of this area. Rheinau is the oldest antiphoner among those of the provenance of Reichenau, an important place

\textsuperscript{22} CANTUS database. http://publish.uwo.ca/~cantus

\textsuperscript{23} Hesbert, Vol. 3.
regarding the history of music theory because of Berno of Reichenau and Hermanus Contractus.

The following is a description of each antiphoner which is used in this study. Eins is a fourteenth-century antiphoner from the monastery of Einsiedeln, Switzerland. This book with 281 numbered folio consists of the Temporale, Sanctorale, the Common of the Saints and other feasts (Dedication of a Church, the Office of the Dead, Invitatorium, etc.). Music is written in square notation on the four-line staff with F and c clefs. Differentiae are notated on the staff after each antiphon. The whole manuscript is written mainly in one hand, and there are many corrections with the traces of erasure in the second hand.

Graz is a fourteenth-century antiphoner in two volumes from St. Lambrecht Abbey of Steiermark, Austria. Volume one, 382 folios, contains the Winter Temporale and Sanctorale, the Common of the Saints, the Office of the Dead, a tonary, and polyphonic hymns. Volume two, 376 folios, consists of the Easter Temporale, Summer Sanctorale and the Common of the Saints. There are some overlaps between these two volumes in the Common of the Saints and Sanctorale. It is striking that this antiphoner includes a number of polyphonic pieces (responsory verses and hymns). The last part of the first volume shows a different hand writing from almost all of the body of this antiphoner. This is notated in the four-line staff with F and c clefs. Differentiae are indicated in the margins with the two-letters of German tonary style: one for the mode and one for the differentia.

24 Mette Kjaergaard, CANTUS database: gopher://vmsgopher.cua....us_text%5D_eins611.abt

25 Charles Downey, CANTUS database: gopher://vmsgopher.cua....us_text%5D_graz.abt
These letters for the *differentia*, usually called tonary letters, are used in five of the seven antiphoners examined in this study: Graz, Karls, Hartker, Stutt and Rheinau. Medievalists attribute the tonary-letter system to the St. Gall monk, Hartker, who is the compiler of Hartker because the tonary attached to this antiphoner is the first document in which the tonary letters are used.\(^{26}\) This system was widely used in the German region. In this system, each of the eight modes is indicated by vowels: five vowels of Latin alphabet \((a, e, i, o, u\ or\ v)\) and three Greek letters, eta \((\varepsilon)\), upsilon \((\upsilon)\) and omega \((\omega)\) and *differentia* is indicated by an alphabet of consonants. The following is a table of tonary letters used in Hartker to indicate mode and *differentia*.

Mode 1: \(a, ab, ac, ad, ag, ah, ak, ap, aq\);

Mode 2: \(e, eb\);

Mode 3: \(i, ib, ic, id, ig, ih\);

Mode 4: \(o, ob, oc, od, og, oh, ok, op\);

Mode 5: \(u, ub\);

Mode 6: \(H, Hb\);

Mode 7: \(y, yb, yc, yd, yg, yh\);

Mode 8: \(\omega, \omega b, \omega c, \omega d, \omega g, \omega h\).

As regards the origin of Karls there has been a long debate. There are several different types of handwritings of letters and music notation. Recent research can identify three scribes of letters in the main part of this antiphoner with those of other Zwiefalten

manuscripts of the twelfth century. Thus, Karls was proved to be a twelfth-century antiphoner from Zwiefalten, Germany. This antiphoner was brought from Zwiefalten to Reichenau in 1516 by the Abbot Georg Fischer and Gregor Dietz, who added the final section with the initial letters of his name, G.D.

This book of 276 folios contains the Temporale, Sanctorale, the Common of the Saints, the Office for the Dead, the Ferial Office and others. Many of the initial letters of the text are fully decorated. Speaking of musical notation, Hartmut Möller distinguished seven types. The main part is notated on the four-line staff with red F-line and yellow c-line during the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries after the erasure of the original neumatic notation. Furthermore there are also some additions by Gregor Dietz. Some differentiae are indicated by German tonary letters and others are notated on the four-line staff. Many of antiphons (705), however, lack the differentiae signs.

Mainz is an antiphoner written in 1430s for the use by the Carmelites of Mainz, Germany, which is composed of five volumes, 278 folios, 302 folios, 334 folios, 281 folios and 249 folios respectively. Although the content is normal, such as the Temporale, Sanctorale and Invitatorium, it follows the rite of the Carmelite Order as defined in the fourteenth century. It is noteworthy that this book contains also some rhymed office like the office for Thomas of Canterbury. Music is notated in Square Roman notation on the four-line staff. The differentia melody is notated after each antiphon.

---

27 Hartmut Möller, Introduction to The Zwiefalten Antiphoner: Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. perg. LX, printouts from an Index in Machine-Readable Form: A CANTUS Index, ed. by Joseph P. Metzinger and Keith Falconer (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1996)

28 James Boyce, CANTUS database: gopher://vmsgopher.cua....ntus._text%5D_mainz.abt
Hartker is an antiphoner and a tonary copied and compiled by Hartker (d 1011), a monk of the St. Gall monastery. It is dated 980-1011 in *Paléographie musicale*, ser. 2, vol. 1. This antiphoner contains the office of the special Saint for this monastery besides the ordinary contents of an antiphoner: *Temporale*, *Sanctorale*, the Common of the Saints, the Office of the Dead etc. The music is notated in St. Gall neumes with significative letters. The *differentiae* are indicated in the margins with the tonary letters.

Stutt is a twelfth or thirteenth century antiphoner from the Benedictine abbey of Weingarten, Germany. This book of 194 folios contains the *Temporale*, *Sanctorale*, the Common of the Saints, the Office for the Dead, a tonary (mode four through eight) and so on. The music is notated in St. Gall neumes, that means, in non-diastematic notation. *Differentiae* are indicated doubly: in the outer margins with neumes and in the inner margins with tonary letters.

Rheinau is a breviary from the monastery in Reichenau, and its main part dates back to the thirteenth century. There is an interpolated section in the fourteenth century. This breviary of 321 folios begins with a liturgical carender, and then is continued with hymns, *Collections*, an *Ordo officii*, a lectionary for the whole year, litany and so on, before the office antiphoner begins. The part of the antiphoner consists of the *Temporale* and *Sanctorale*, including the office for special saints of this area and also of this monastery. The musical notation is in St. Gall neumes. The *differentiae* are indicated with tonary letters and neumes in one side of the margins.

---

30 Keith Glaeske, CANTUS database: gopher://vmsgopher.cua.s_text%5D_weinart.abt
The first task of this project is to make a list of modes and *differentiae* for the antiphons in these seven manuscripts. I have chosen the antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost of the liturgical year. The antiphons examined here are 551 in number, many of which are not found in all the seven antiphoners, and some of which are found only in three sources. A computer program enables one to locate the antiphons which have conflicting modal assignments among manuscripts. Ninety-nine antiphons are found with modal conflicts.

The second task is to make a parallel transcription of those antiphons and to analyze the differences of modes and melodies. In the analysis, the following points are taken into consideration:

1. the place in which the melodies of a given antiphon differ from source to source;
2. the type of difference: transposition or variation of a melody, or totally different melodies;
3. the use of accidentals;
4. presence or absence of a problematic interval like diminished fifth or tritone.

After this analysis, one can arrange the antiphons with modal conflict into several groups according to the following factors:

1. the modes which are given to a certain antiphon in a different way;
2. the type of difference of the melodies of a given antiphon with modal conflict;
3. the possible factors which cause the difference of the melodies resulting in conflicting assignment of mode.

The main part of this study is divided into three parts. The first part deals with the antiphons with modal conflicts caused by the dual criteria of modal decision: the modality
of opening melodies and the modal theory of final note and ambitus. The second part
treats transposition either entire or partial, which results in the conflicting modal
assignment of antiphons. The third part is a consideration of the stability or ambiguity of
each mode concerning office antiphons.

Volume two is a parallel transcription of all antiphons which show different modal
designations among sources. They are ordered by the groups which are to be discussed in
part I and part II, and by alphabetic order of the text incipits in a group.
Part I

Modal conflicts caused by the coexistence of two elements concerning the decision of the mode, i.e., the modality of opening figures of antiphons on the one hand and the theory which decides the mode based on their final notes and ambitus on the other hand, have been the subject of considerable study. As seen in the introduction, Regino refers to the several antiphons and introits which begin in one mode and end in another mode. As for this type of chant he maintains that “illud autem summopere prudens cantor observare debet, ut semper magis principium antiphonae, introitus, vel communionis attendat in toni sonoritate quam finem.”¹ Aurelianus Reomensis, in the mid-ninth century, that is almost a half century before the time of Regino, also states that

Notandum sane quia in offertorii et responsoriis atque invitatoriis non aliubi requirendi sunt toni nisi ubi fines versuum intromittuntur, maximeque servandus est sensus litterature quam modulationis. In introitis vero, antiphonis necne communionibus semper in capite requirantur.²

It is noteworthy that both of these early medieval theorists think that in responsorial chants, that is, office responsory, offertory or gradual, the mode should be sought at the end. At least until the very early Middle Ages, as compared to responsorial songs, specific to antiphonal chant, introit, communion and office antiphon, is that antiphon is repeated after every verse. Accordingly, the connection of an antiphon and the verses of the psalm, especially the connection of the incipit of the antiphon with the end of the psalmody, that is the differentia, was an important issue for singers, and therefore, from the practical


² Aurelianus Reomensis, Musica disciplina, ed by Lawrence Arthur Gushee, Corpus Scriptorum de Musica 21 (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1975) 89; An English translation is in Joseph Ponte,
point of view, the opening melody of an antiphon must have been a clue to the selection of psalm tone.

The *Commemoratio Brevis*, a kind of didactic tonary contemporary with Regino’s tonary, however, instructs readers to wait until the end of an antiphon to decide its mode. Its author states:

Hoc vero admonendum quia quaedam non eiusdem toni antiphonae indiscretam iniciorum similitudinem habent, ut in sequentiis cui melo quaeque aptanda sit videatur, et maxime cuiusque cantus attendatur finis in quo cuiusque toni proprietas evidentius claret.³

Since this treatise, because of its use of the *Enchiriadis* scale and the *dasia* notation, is often grouped in a series of *Enchiriadis* theories developed around St. Armand in the north of France, it is appropriate to speculate that the author of *Commemoratio brevis* was familiar with the theory of Hucbald and the other *Enchiriadis* treatises which discuss the modal decision based on the end of chant. It is needless to say that by the beginning of the eleventh century when two celebrated Italian theoretical works, *Dialogus de musica* and *Micrologus* of Guido d’Arezzo were written, the theory that decides the mode of chant according to its final and *ambitus* became established.

Most antiphons were not affected by this duality of modal decision, while some antiphons, especially those in Regino’s list of “antiphonae, quas nothas, id est, degeneres et non legitimas appellamus,”⁴ resulted in conflicting assignments of mode among sources. Thus, there are three groups of antiphons which show modal conflicts among sources.

---


⁴ Regino, 24.
caused by the particular modality of opening melodies in some sense besides the modal
criteria of final note and *ambitus*: first, antiphons with the modal conflicts among sources
caused by the dual criteria of opening melody and *ambitus*; second, antiphons with modal
conflicts caused by the dual criteria of opening melody and final note as seen in the
conflict between the fourth mode and the seventh mode; third, antiphons with modal
conflicts caused by the dual criteria of opening melody and final note as seen in the
conflict between the third mode and the eighth mode.
Chapter One

Conflicting modal assignment between authentic and plagal

Among the antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost, twenty antiphons are to be found with the disagreement of modal assignment between authentic and plagal, which is one of the conflicts resulting from the incongruity of dual criteria, i.e., in this case, melodic incipit and ambitus. The description of the rationale for dividing chants with the same final into authentic and plagal is, however, rather imprecise in the ninth-century treatise *Musica Enchiriadis*:

\[ \text{videlicet quod simplex et legitimus cantus inferius non descendit quam usque ad sonum quintum a finali suo, in primo dumtaxat tono et secundo ab } f' [D] \text{ archoo vel proto finali usque in eundem gravem } \# [GG], \text{ in tertio et quarto a } f' [E] \text{ deuteru finali usque in eundem gravem } \varphi [A], \text{ in quinto et sexto. . . . At vero in acumine a quocumque finali sono usque in tertium eiusdem nominis sonum efferri valet, id est usque in excellentes.}^1 \]

According to the author, both authentic and plagal melody can descend to the fifth note from the *finalis*. As for the difference of authentic from plagal, he explains that a melody of the plagal mode does not ascend beyond the fifth tone from its *finalis*.

\[ \text{praeterea cum eodem sono autentus quisque tonus et qui sub ipso est regantur et finiantur, unde et pro uno habentur tono, in hoc tamen different, quod minoribus tonis minora in elevando sunt spacia, et inferior quisque tonus non nisi ad quintum usque sonum a finali sono ascendet, sed et hoc raro.}^2 \]

In the eleventh century, music theorists become to be more specific in describing the difference of the division, as Berno of Reichenau states.

---


2 Ibid. 9.
Animadvertendum nunc est: cum omnis authenticus a suo finali incipiens licenter in nonum sonum ascendat; non quod semper id eveniat, sed quod haec eius scandendi sit potestas, et non nisi in sibi vicinum et aliquando, in tertium, ut supra etiam aliquid tetricum, descendat. Subiugalis vero eius in quintum locum ascendat, in quartum autem nec non et quandoque in quinum descendat; et ex hoc facilis sit cognitio authentici ver sui subiugalis.  

Berno, then, continues to explain the differentiation between authentic and plagal, referring to the several cases of antiphons whose ranges are problematic and needed to be discussed.

Berno's long explanation on *ambitus* itself implies that it was not easy to know to which of authentic or plagal a melody belongs. The manuscripts of liturgical books of the medieval ages also reveal that the decision was not without trouble in practice. Among the antiphons examined in this study, twenty have conflicts between authentic mode and plagal mode. Their *ambitus* is actually ambiguous from the theoretical point of view of the high Middle Ages. Most of them are narrow, that is, of a range of a fifth or a sixth. Others extend over the fifth above the final but do not extend to the octave, and at the same time they descend below the final but do not extend to the fourth. Nevertheless, given many antiphons which do not have any modal problem even with such ambiguous *ambitus*, it is evident that the range is not the only reason for this type of conflict.

Michel Huglo refers to a few cases of conflicting assignments of modes between authentic and plagal in introits and communions among various tonaries.  

---

3 "Musica Bernonis seu Prologus in tonarium," GS vol.2, 72. "What should be noticed now is that beginning from the *finalis*, all the authenticus melodies can ascend to the ninth note; it does not always happen, but it is the possibility of their ascending. As we reach a higher note, the melodies descend to near it [*finalis*] and sometimes to the third [below from the *finalis*]. Their plagal are, however, ascend to the fifth note and descend to the fourth and sometimes to the fifth; From this, it is easy to discern authentic from plagal." Translation mine.

the cause of this kind of conflict is the differences in the criteria in making a decision of mode: the compilers of some earlier tonaries decided between authentic and plagal by the melodic formulas, especially those of initium, but others decided it, based on the medieval modal theory about ambitus. However, Huglo maintains that especially in some protus chants, even the early tonaries do not agree with each other because of the ornaments around the fifth note from the finalis. Huglo conjectures that in the early stage of the Middle Ages, such chants were expanded to the lower degree in the case of plagal and expanded to the higher notes in the case of authentic, so that the ambitus of the melodies made it possible to discern clearly between authentic and plagal.

It is noteworthy that the conflicts of modal assignment of this type concentrate on the protus mode and the tetrardus mode in the twenty antiphons which are to be discussed in this chapter. The following is a reticular analysis of these conflicts, from the points of range, melodic formulas of the initium, and the manuscripts.

Eleven of these antiphons are in the protus mode. The range of A porte inferi erue domine (vol.2, no.1) is from C to a in all of the seven sources, although there are a few minor melodic variations among these versions. The scribe of Mainz assigns it to plagal, and the others assign it to authentic. This antiphon is classified as theme 10 by Gevaert. Even though Gevaert includes some other antiphons with quite different melodies in this category, it is clear that there is a group of antiphons that have this melodic incipit in common, and most of them are in the first mode in many sources without conflicts. Therefore, the scribe of Mainz, a fifteenth-century manuscript, must have assigned it to the second mode because the melody does not ascend beyond the fifth from its finalis,

---

5 Gevaert, La melopée, 253.
which should be considered as the plagal mode based on the modal theory of *ambitus*. The other scribes classify it to the authentic mode, presumably following the convention of paying attention to the melodic family of opening formula.

*Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat* (vol.2, no.7) can be included in the same group of *A porte inferi*, as Gevaert does. This antiphon also ranges from *C* to *a*, and was sung as authentic except for in *Karls*. In this case, however, since the melody of the Solesmes version, *Antiphonale Monasticum*,\(^6\) ascends up to *b-flat* at *ardens erat*, one may consider that there must be other several sources of the medieval origin, in which the melody ranges up to *b-flat*. With *b-flat* the authentic modal assignment is more natural.

*Circumdantes circumdederunt* (vol.2, no.3) and *Reges terrae et omnes populi* (vol.2, no.8) belong to a group of antiphons with a cohesive melodic formula. Gevaert lists them in theme 8, many of the antiphons of which are assigned to the first mode by Regino, and Frere categorizes them as I-e.\(^7\) *Reges terrae* is a very short antiphon and covers only the range of a fifth degree, from *D* to *a*. Although it is obvious that the formula of this opening melody belongs to the first mode like the other antiphons of this group, the scribe of *Mainz* assigns it to the second mode, probably because of its narrow *ambitus*. Also in the case of *Circumdantes*, not only the scribe of *Mainz* but the one of *Graz* as well assign this antiphon to the second mode and show that they are on the side of the modal theory of *ambitus* rather than theme. The melody of *Circumdantes* consists of the whole melody of *Reges terrae* and a coda which covers a lower range, *A* to *D*, resulting in a rather low

---

\(^6\) *Antiphonale Monasticum: pro diurnis horis*, edited by the monastery of Solesmes, (Paris, Desclée, 1934), 495.

\(^7\) Gevaert, 247-8; Frere, vol.1, 67.
range as a whole, from $A$ to $a$. The scribes of Mainz and Graz are, therefore, correct in their decision of mode as plagal when we take only the modal theory into account. Only when judged from the melodic incipit as Regino recommended, the reciting tone of this antiphon would become authentic like that of Reges terrae and other antiphons of this melodic type.

The melodies of Ego sum qui sum et consilium (vol.2, no.5) and Unus est enim magister vester (vol.2, no.9) are also theme 8 in the Gevaert’s categorization, even though the similarity is not sufficiently obvious. Frere does not classify them. Since along with the three sources of non-diastematic notation, that is, the antiphoners of Hartker, Rheinau and Stutt, and the antiphoner of Eins, which must be considered to be a product of a long tradition of singing in the monastery of Einsiedeln, Regino assigns them to the first mode in spite of the lower ambitus, $C-a$, the authentic assignment represents the early stage of the history of this antiphon. Nevertheless, the reason for the authentic assignments in these earlier versions cannot be determined, whether it is because of the theme which are to be classified to the first mode or because of the preference for the authentic assignment in the earlier period.

Vade ad eum qui me misit (vol.2, no.11) is not classified by Gevaert but categorized as I-f by Frere. Among the German sources examined here, only the scribe of Eins assigns it to the first mode, and Rheinau, Stutt and Karls assign it to the second mode. Hartker, Graz and Mainz do not include this antiphon in their liturgy.

--
8 The scribes of the antiphoners of Lucca, Worcester, Sarum as well as Regino in his tonary assigned it to the first mode; Antiphonaire monastique XIe siècle: codex 601 de la Bibliothèque capitulaire de Luques (Tournai: Decrée, 1906); Antiphonaire monastique XIIIe siècle: codex F160 de la Bibliothèque de la Cathédrale de Worcester (Tournai: Decrée, 1922; reprint, 1971); The Sarum Antiphoner is in the edition of Frere.
Surveying these conflicting modal assignments, one may ask to what extent the compilers or scribes of these antiphoners found some of the antiphons problematic or troublesome. In the case of this antiphon, this may well have been true in Eins. On folio 98r of the manuscript of Eins there is an erasure at just this assignment, and we may conclude that the different scribe from the original one changed the differentia of this antiphon. Alterations like this are scribal initiatives, and show the active process of decision making, during the time of compilation, and no doubt afterwards as well, as concerns arose during practice. Rheinau, Stutt and Karls assign it in the same way, probably because these three manuscripts have a close relationship with each other. They must have relied on the lower ambitus, C-G, resulting in the plagal assignment.

Usque modo non petistis (vol.2, no.10) is much like Vado ad eum. Both melodies ascend in the first phrase from C to G gradually and descend to D with a reiteration on D, and in the last half the melodic contours are almost the same. The range is C to a in both of them. Nevertheless, none of the manuscripts used in this project assigns them to the same mode. Even Regino assigns them differently. In addition, Gevaert does not make any classification about these antiphons. Frere categorizes only Vado ad eum in the first mode as before mentioned. It is noticeable, however, that here again Rheinau, Stutt and Karls agree on the assignment of Usque modo to the first mode and are in opposition to not only Eins but to the other sources as well that assign it to the second mode. The conflict must have existed from an early stage of the history, presumably between the tradition of St. Gallen-Einsiedeln and that of Reichenau, although the reason of the conflict cannot be explained from the thematic point of view.
*In spiritu humilitatis* (vol.2, no.6) is assigned to authentic only in Hartker and to plagal in the rest of the sources. Regino also assigns it to the authentic protus. Therefore, the authentic mode seems to be the earlier assignment to this antiphon, kept in both Regino and Hartker whose compiler, i.e., Hartker, lived around the turning of the millennium. This antiphon belongs to theme 9 in Gevaert’s taxonomy. Gevaert suggests, in addition, that although this antiphon was authentic, it had acquired a plagal assignment since the time of the tonary attached to the treatise *De modorum formulis* which we know from Coussemaker’s edition erroneously as the tonary of Guido of Arezzo.\(^9\) Berno also refers to this antiphon in the explanation of each case after his general statement about the differentiation between authentic and plagal. He maintains that an antiphon like *In spiritu*, which has a fourth below the *finalis*, should be plagal, even if it ascends beyond the fifth note from its *finalis*.

Sin autem inferius diatessaron habuerit, subiugalis erit, ut in hac ant. *In spiritu humilitatis* ubi in eo loco: *sic fiat*, diapente tono supergregitur: sed quia diatessaron habet inferius hoc loco: *hodie*, subiugalis, ut supra diximus, erit.\(^10\)

The sources other than Hartker, all written after the twelfth century, follow these leading theorists’ instruction of the eleventh century. Furthermore, the melody of Mainz retains below a and that of Karls below b-flat instead of reaching c as in Graz and Eins. There are good reasons for their decision of mode as plagal from a theoretical point of view.

*Assumpsit Jesus* (vol.2, no.2) is in the first mode in Karls and Graz, and in the second mode in the other antiphoners. Its ambitus is from B-flat to b-flat in Graz and Mainz, C

---

\(^9\) Gevaert, p.250; This antiphon in *De modorum formulis* is in *Scriptorum musica medii aevi*, edited by Edmond Coussemaker (Paris, 1864; reprint, Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1963), vol. 2, 89.

\(^10\) Berno, *Prologus*, in GS, vol.2., 73; “However, if it has diatessaron below [the *finalis*], it should be subiugalis (plagal). In the antiphon *In spiritu humilitatis*, at the point of *sic fiat*, the fifth note is
to b-flat in Karl's and C to c in Eins. Singing B-flat in the medieval practice is not common because B-flat was regarded as outside the contemporary gamut. Gevaert conjectures that this antiphon originally ended on G, but it took the closing melody of the protus mode and was transposed down a fifth over the course of time.\textsuperscript{11} The scribe of the Brussels manuscript of Regino's tonary, which is smaller than that of Leipzig, assigns this antiphon to the eighth mode.\textsuperscript{12}

There are two possible reasons for this transposition even though Gevaert did not give an explanation. The first is an attraction by other chants. Here attraction means the change of a melody or a mode under the influence either of another chant sung in the same hour or of one which has similar melodic contour. In the case of Assumpsit Jesus, the latter is applicable. While the melodic figure of the incipit which moves around a and c is rather rare in the tetrardus mode, its transposed melody down a fifth, the melodic segment around D and F is quite common in the protus mode. It bears a close resemblance to theme 9 of the protus mode. Therefore, it is possible that originally a G-ending antiphon happened to be attracted by a melody of the protus mode, resulting in the transposition down a fifth. The second reason is an avoidance of f-sharp. If the highest note of this antiphon, which is set to ascendit as if word painting, is b-natural instead of b-flat in the protus version, the note of counterpart in the tetrardus version would be f-sharp, which was not permitted to be written down in that era. Among the sources examined here, we do not find any one which has b-flat at this place. Gevaert, however, transcribed this

\textsuperscript{11} Gevaert, 201 and 317.

\textsuperscript{12} Regino, De harmonica institutione and Tonarius, ed. by Sr. LeRoux, 196.
melody with $b$-flat without specifying his source. Accordingly, this cause operates only under the condition that the $b$-natural is the case.

In Eins this antiphon is assigned to the plagal mode but is written at the upper fifth position from the height of the other sources but with the finalis of the protus mode on $a$. Whether this notation demonstrates the original range to which Gevaert referred, or whether it is a result of re-transposition, is not clear. The plagal modal assignment is correct from the theoretical point of view. The reason of authentic assignment of Graz and Karls cannot be known.

We have considered the conflicting assignments between authentic and plagal of the protus mode. Concerning a few antiphons, the reason of the conflicting modal assignment cannot be specified. The majority of antiphons with conflicting assignments of this type are, however, the ones which are composed based on a prototypical melody of authentic mode and range below the final. In addition, as for these antiphons which have conflicts between sources, Hartker, an early eleventh-century antiphoner, Rheinau and Stutt, both the thirteenth-century antiphoners, show an obvious preference for authentic assignment rather than plagal (authentic 7 : plagal 2 in Hartker, authentic 7 : plagal 3 in Rheinau and Stutt), and on the contrary, Mainz, a fifteenth-century antiphoner, has more plagal assignment than authentic (authentic 1 : plagal 7). Also in Eins there are more authentic assignments than plagal (authentic 6 : plagal 4). In Graz and Karls, no marked tendency is observed (authentic 5 : plagal 4 in Graz, authentic 5 : plagal 5 in Karls). Consequently, plagal assignment seems to have come into frequent use in the later period of the Middle Ages, probably after the prescriptions into detail have been made by the eleventh-century
theorists, with the result of conflicts caused by the dual criteria of assignment between the authentic mode in the early sources, and the plagal mode in newer sources.

Almost the same things are to be said of the conflicts in the tetradus mode. Many of them have melodic incipits which can be categorized in the seventh mode even in the case which Gevaert does not treat, and these melodies range from below the final up to one note above the fifth or the fifth note itself from the final, i.e., e, or d.

An exception is Dixit Dominus mulier (vol.2, no.15). It is one of the longest antiphons, and instead of a narrow ambitus like others, it has an extraordinarily excessive range, stretching out from C to e. Gevaert conjectures, without giving any specific reason, that the original melody of the first half (until the point of the word “edunt”) was up a fifth from the one which we know, and had a more lively melodic incipit which cannot be separated from the seventh mode by a certain point of time before Regino. Inasmuch as the opening melody which is seen in these four diastematic sources, $D E F G G G G \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{G-\textit{a} a G G}$,\textsuperscript{13} is like neither authentic nor plagal of the tetradus mode but rather like the protus mode, Gevaert’s thought might be true. It is only Graz, however, that assigns it to the seventh mode.

As for the proportion of authentic assignments and those of plagal of these antiphons, Hartker again shows a prominent preference for the authentic mode (authentic 7: plagal 1). Rheinau, Stutt, Karls and Eins also have more authentic assignments than plagal (5 : 3, in Rheinau, Stutt, and Karls, 6 : 2 in Eins). On the contrary, the scribes of Mainz and Graz assigned more antiphons to plagal than to authentic (2 : 5 in Mainz, 3 : 5 in

\textsuperscript{13} Two notes linked with a dash are placed for one syllable.
Graz). Also in the case of the *tetrardus* mode, therefore, the older sources have a tendency to assign this kind of antiphon to the authentic mode.

In other words, as far as the antiphons whose incipit belong to the authentic mode and whose *ambitus* are plagal are concerned, the scribes of older sources were apt to assign them to the authentic mode according to their melodic formulas of the opening melodies, while those of newer sources were apt to assign them to the plagal mode based on their *ambitus*. The overview of these antiphons which have the conflicting modal assignments between the authentic mode and the plagal mode reveals the process of the medieval musicians’ effort to systematize the repertory by the modal theory through centuries. At an early stage of the Middle Ages, the division between authentic and plagal was not clear as seen in the description in *Musica enchiriadis*. The singers seem to have performed based on the convention of paying attention to the melodic formulas of the opening as they were taught from the senior singers. In the course of time, however, they realized that the differentiation was ambiguous and they made the theory more specific in order to choose the psalm tone according to the rational theory of differentiation of the authentic mode and the plagal mode. Consequently this change of criteria in making decision of mode, over the course of time, generated the conflicting modal assignments between authentic and plagal.
Chapter Two

Conflicting modal assignment between the fourth mode and the seventh mode

There are twenty-nine antiphons which are assigned to the seventh mode in Mainz manuscripts and assigned to the fourth mode in the other sources (vol.2 no.21-49). All of these antiphons belong to the unique melody type which Gevaert classifies as theme 29, including its variation “a” and “b”, and which Frere classifies as IV-b.1 The antiphons of this group are from seventy to nearly a hundred in number as a whole repertory of Gregorian office antiphons and sung almost throughout a liturgical year. In the season examined here, from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost, this type of antiphon is found through Lent and on the Sunday of the Ascension. A survey of these antiphons reveals that this is a strikingly stable melody type which consists of four phrases, although each melody is, of course, different to a certain extant from one to another according to the number of syllables and the accent of words.

Among the sources which assign these antiphons to the fourth mode, the scribe of Eins notates the melodies transposed up a fourth from those of Graz and Karls, resulting in making the melodies as a whole at the same level with those of Mainz. Hartker, Rheinau and Stutt do not indicate the exact pitches. At first, therefore, a comparison of the melodies of Eins and Mainz is convenient to demonstrate the differences of melodies between the fourth-mode versions and the seventh-mode version. In most of the cases, except Sicut suit Ionas (vol.2, no.46), whose melody in Mainz is totally different from the others, the decisive difference which causes the modal conflict lies only in the last phrase.
In the case of *Alieni insurrexerunt* (vol.2, no.21), one of the antiphons of the largest group that have the same type of difference between these two versions, the ending melody in Mainz is $F-a c b-a G G$, while that of Eins is $F-G a c a a a$. The other slight disagreements besides the ending phrases between these two versions are to be found here and there. In *Alieni*, for example, the notes at *fortes* are altered: $a d$ in Eins and $b d$ in Mainz.

In the discussion of mode, one cannot fail to mention the following two disagreements between Eins and Mainz as well as the ending figures. First, although most of the antiphons of this type begin with the formula $G a c d d$, some melodic incipits in Mainz, i.e., those of *Angelus domini* (vol.2, no.22), *Popule meus* (vol.2, no.43), *Magister dicit* (vol.2, no.35), *Faciem meam* (vol.2, no.32), and *Ascendit deus* (vol.2, no.23), are changed into $G b c d(-e) d$. In principle, only the second note of this segment is altered from $a$ to *b-natural*. This opening with *b-natural* is, however, exactly the same as the *initium* representative of the seventh mode, which is theme 19 in Gevaert’s categorization, and VII-a and VII-b in Frere. Furthermore, the incipits of the two antiphons of Holy Saturday, *Factum suum* (vol.2, no.33) and *O mors ero* (vol.2, no.39), show another difference. The *initium* of these antiphons in Eins, $c-d d$ and $c c-d d$ respectively, are themselves exceptional for the prototype of theme 29 through dropping the first two notes, $G a$. They are theme 29, variant “a” in Gevaert’s catalogue. In Mainz, however, these incipits are altered further to $G G-d d$ in *Factus sum* and $G-d d$ in *O mors ero*. This leap of a fifth from $G$ to $d$ is again a typical motion to the seventh mode. Accordingly, the closing figures of these seven antiphons of Mainz seem to fit well as the seventh mode,

---

1 Gevaert, 321-330; Frere, 70 in vol.1.
either attracted by the resembling opening figures or avoiding the fourth mode ending on \( a \).\(^2\)

The second point which should be noticed in this context is that there is a \( b\)-flat signature in the fourth phrase of some antiphons in Eins. This signature is not written in all of the antiphons of this group, but is found even in the melodies which do not contain \( b\)-flat there. The scribe of Eins, therefore, apparently intended the transposition and the fourth-mode ending on \( a \) with this signature. A close reading of this manuscript, however, reveals that many of the antiphons of this group have been erased and written over in a different hand, namely with the different shape of square for notes and the different length of stems from those of the main hand (for example, Alieni is in Eins folio 84v). Although this scribe, here we call him the second scribe, usually rewrote the differentiae as \( d c d f c \ a \ c \), he left only the differentiae of a Holy-Thursday antiphon, Exhortatus es (vol.2, no.31, Eins folio 83v), and two Good-Friday antiphons, Alieni insurrexerit and Confundantur et reverentur (vol.2, no.25, Eins folio 84v) untouched. The melody of those differentiae is \( a \ G \ a \ c \ G \ E \ G \). He also shifted the \( c\)-clef of Alieni down, resulting in the change of the melody of the differentia. This must have happened by mistake; nevertheless, since these differentiae seem to be one of the fourth-mode psalmody connected with an antiphon ending on \( E \), they prove the fact of transposition, i.e., that these antiphons of theme 29, which were overwritten, were originally a fourth lower than they are now and had endings on \( E \).

\(^2\) The argument of the medieval theorists on the transposition up a fourth with \( b\)-flat will be discussed later.
As for *Commendemus nos* (vol.2, no.24), *Satiavit dominus* (vol.2, no.45) and *Ubi duo vel tres* (vol.2, no.48), the second scribe of Eins for some reason did not attempt to rewrite the melodies or did not do so inadvertently. Their melodies in the lower position are written at the same height as the melodies of all the antiphons of theme 29 in Graz and Karls. Among them, *Ubi duo vel tres* in Eins has the *finalis* on D instead of E, accordingly it is written in the *protus* mode (Eins folio 64v). Also in Graz, there can be found an antiphon which ends on D. Concerning this antiphon of Graz, that is *Elevata est* (vol.2, no.28), one may be able to say that this is a scribal error, because this antiphon has one of the tonary letters of *differentia* of the fourth mode, that is "o" and also because in *Asumbo celo*, an antiphon sung at the second from *Elevata* in the same service of the Matin of the Ascension Sunday, the identifiable scribe erased its ending melody on D and changed it into the one closing on E (Graz-30 folio 22r). In the case of *Ubi duo vel tres* of Eins, however, it is evident that the scribe dared to modify it with the ending on D, without any change of its *differentia* of the fourth mode at the lower position. This scribe rewrote the notes and darkened the four-line staff in the third and fourth phrases of this antiphon. It is, however, hard to say who this scribe was, whether the main scribe, the second scribe, or another. Here one may wonder why this scribe modified only this antiphon among many with the same melody type.

This correction reminds one of a statement in the *Commemoratio brevis* which designates the antiphons of this group to the second mode, but as the one with a special psalm tone. After the explanation of the relationship of the antiphons and psalmody regarding each mode, the anonymous author of this treatise mentions a small group of
antiphons which have the other psalm intonations. The group of antiphons examined here is mentioned as the first of them.

Extra has quoque ad plerosque desupradictis tonis et aliae psalmorum modulationes aptantur, utpote ad antiphanas istas: Benedicta tu in mulieribus et Ex Egypto vocavi filium meum et reliquas his similes, quae secundo deputan dae sunt tono quae per duos diversos modos alternativam inter choros cantari, ut suo modo unus chorus suum versum pronuntiat et alter alio modo respondeat.³

It is therefore the fact that there existed a tradition in the Middle Ages in which the musicians assigned these antiphons to the second mode.

In fact, there are several antiphons of this theme which have the protus-mode assignment in some sources other than Ubi duo veltrès and Asummo celo. They are not counted in the twenty-nine antiphons of this chapter because of the different type of modal conflict. First, Thesaurizate vobis (vol.2, no.54), an Ash Wednesday antiphon, is composed with the same melodic theme entirely. The scribe of Mainz, however, assigns this antiphon to the first mode instead of to the seventh mode, and the others assign it to the fourth mode. In the Sarum Antiphoner this is notated as a first-mode antiphon. The melodies in the first mode in Mainz and the Sarum Antiphoner are a major second lower than the one of the fourth mode. The second, an antiphon of Holy Thursday, Ipsi vero (vol.2, no.51) has also very similar theme to the antiphons of this group, especially in the first half part. This antiphon is assigned to the first mode in Rheinau, Stutt, Eins, Graz and Karls, to the fourth mode in Hartker, and to the seventh mode in Mainz. Furthermore, two antiphons of Ash Wednesday, Nesciat sinistra tua (vol.2, no.52) and Ubi est thesaurus tuus (vol.2, no.55) have the same melody each other entirely. This melody also bears some resemblance to the theme 29 in question in this chapter even
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though the resemblance is limited only to the opening phrase, because these antiphons are
very short. Both antiphons are in the fourth mode in Hartker and in the first mode in the
rest of sources except Mainz, which does not include them in their liturgy. Hartker is
consistent in the assignment of these antiphons to the fourth mode. Rheinau, Stutt, Eins,
Graz and Karls assign Thesaurizate, which is exactly the same melody as the other
antiphons of theme 29, to the fourth mode and Ipsi vero, Nesciat and Ubi est thesaurus,
which are similar to but not the same as theme 29, to the first mode. In Mainz
Thesaurizate is in the first mode and Ipsi vero is in the seventh mode. Thus, this theme
has been proven to be related to the designation of the protus mode, even though in the
antiphons which are involved in the protus-mode assignment, there are many conflicts
among sources. The scribe of Eins might have attempted to make an example of the
protus mode for this theme.

The majority of antiphons at the lower position in Eins, Graz and Karls end on E.
The melody with the ending on E, however, is not the exact transposition of that with the
ending on a. Again Alieni provides an example that shows the detail of the difference.
The melody of Graz at the words of fortes quasi- is E a F G whose transposition up a
fourth is supposed to be a d b-flat c, on the one hand, and the melody of Einz at the same
words is a d b-natural c whose transposition down a fourth should be E a F-sharp G, on
the other hand. The melody of Karls at this point is further different, i.e., E a G G,
avoiding both F and F-sharp. In the other example, small modifications are to be found at
the same point of this melody type, a d c b-natural in Eins and E a G in Graz, etc. In the
version of Eins, the scribe’s notation of b-flat in the fourth phrase results in a melodic

\[3\] \textit{Commemoratio brevis}, 50, English translation, 51.
segment with *b-natural* and also another segment with *b-flat* in a single chant, even though *Alieni* does not have the actual note of *b-flat* in the fourth phrase. Since *Faciem meam* (vol.2, no.32), *Factus sum* (vol.2, no.33) and *Magister dicit* (vol.2, no.35) have the note, *b-flat* in their fourth phrase, these antiphons really include both *b-natural* and *b-flat*. Although the melodies of *Graz* do not have *F-sharp* at the place of the counterpart of *b-natural* of *Eins*, it does not prove that the singers who used this antiphoner did not sing *F-sharp*, because medieval musicians did not often notate accidentals, especially the ones that were not legitimate in the theory of the period. That the melody of *Karlis* at this point iterates on *G* instead of rising from neither *F* nor *F-sharp* to *G* seems to be the result of the avoidance of this chromatic tone.

Berno of Reichenau introduces transposition as a recommended way to solve this problem of legitimizing chromatic tones like *F-sharp*. By being transposed to the upper fifth or to the upper fourth position, a melody including a note outside the orthodox medieval gamut is able to be sung without detriment to any pitch and ends quite properly on the associated final. Some of the antiphons of theme 29, including two examined in this study, are the example he uses to illustrate the upper fourth transposition.

Ut enim hoc clarius elucescat, ex quarto tono ponamus haec sib exemplo. Ant. *Factus sum*, Ant. *O mors ero*, Ant. *Sion renovab*, Ant Sion noli timere, Ant. *Vade iam*. Si has antiphonas tertio a finali loco, id est, a *lichanos meson* [*G*] incipere volueris, in modulando dejicis, dum semitonium, ubi esse dubuit, minime reperis. Sin autem quartum locum, id est *mese* [*a*], attendas, ac interposito primum semitonio in *synemmenon* [semitone between *b-flat* and *b-natural*], deinde tono, sicque tertio loco, hoc est, *paranete synemmenon* [*c*], easdem inchoaveris, totam cantilenam absque laellone videbis decurrere, donec ad finalis sui comparem, id est, *mese* [*a*] eam contingat in sine pervenire.4 (The alphabetical note names are added.)

---

Further, he continues the same explanation with other examples. It is noteworthy that he repeatedly uses expressions like “minus convenire” (to agree less well), “defectus neumarum” (defect of melody), “absque ullius soni diminutione,” or “absque neumarum dispensio” (without distortion of tones or damage of melodies). Here, with these expressions Berno seems to state that if these melodies are sung without transposition up a fourth, they are to include the notes which lie outside the legitimate gamut, or to be altered in order to avoid such notes. Therefore, he also denounces the musicians who modify the melodies which he inherited from the senior singers, as the scribes of Graz and Karls avoid F-sharp and change the melodies. The second scribe of Einz follows exactly Berno’s instruction so that the singers can perform the chant without using any illegitimate notes and without any distortion.

That in Einz the second scribe erased the melodies at the lower position and transposed them to the upper fourth, probably following Berno’s description, does not necessarily mean that in the history of the antiphons of this theme, the version in the upper position with the ending on a is newer than the one at the lower position. There is good reason to speculate that the melody of the upper fourth is also old, because Aurelianus Reomensis in the ninth century and Regino of Prüm in the tenth century ascribe at least the opening melody of some of these antiphons to the seventh mode, which is more likely to be Ga c d than down a fourth from it. Aurelianus, who lists a few chant as examples for each category of mode, designates Gaude Maria virgo of this type of antiphon, to the seventh mode, judging from its beginning. In his De Harmonica Institutione, Regino lists Ex Aegypto vocavi, Ad te Domine, Sion renovaberis, O mors ero and Vade iam et

---

5 Aurelianus, Musica disciplina, 109.
noli peccare as the examples of those which begin in the seventh mode and end in the fourth mode, although they are assigned to the fourth mode even in the oldest manuscripts of his tonary. Berno of Reichenau is also critical of the assignment of this initium to the seventh mode as he states that:

Quod quidam minus intuentes, magis has et huiusmodi putant septimo, quam quarto regi tono; quamquam non negent, easdem finem fortiri in quarto.

It is hard to find any direct relation between the assignment of these antiphons to the seventh mode in Mainz, which is a Carmelite antiphoner of the fifteenth century, and the early music theorists’ opinion that these antiphon begin with the seventh mode as seen in Aurelianus’s Musica Disciplina and Regino’s De Harmonica Institutione. James John Boyce examined several antiphons of theme 29 in another Carmelite antiphoner of the late fourteenth century from Florence along with in Mainz, and reports that they are designated to the seventh mode also in the Florentine Carmelite antiphoner as they are in Mainz. It seems that in the Carmelite tradition presumably they sang all of this type of antiphon as the seventh mode with the ending on G, although each Carmelite community had freedom from the musical point of view to a certain extent according to Boyce.

Whatever the relation between these practices of ending theme 29 on G and the early medieval theorists like Aurelianus and Regino is, one may suggest that the assignment of the antiphons in question to the seventh mode with G finalis in the Carmelite liturgy was

---

6 Regino, Harmonica Institutione, 25.

7 As Hugo points out, in Regino’s tonary, only these antiphons are assigned based on their finalis among the antiphons in the “notae antiphonae” in which the modality of incipits does not agree with the modes of endings. See Hugo, Les Tonaries, 85.

8 Berno, GS, vol. 2, 75; English translation in Apel, 162.
caused by the attraction of the melodic incipit which bears a close resemblance to the seventh-mode initium, and which the early musicians actually regard as the seventh mode.

In addition, the alteration of ending from the fourth mode to the seventh mode can be explained from the point of view of psalmody. Aurelianus and Regino as well as the early medieval communities lead by them would have recited the psalm on d as the seventh mode for the concomitant psalmody of these antiphons because it is the beginning of antiphons which is the decisive tonal criterion. Since the psalm tone of the fourth-mode antiphons which are transposed up a fourth is also d, it is quite possible that in the course of time, in some of communities and in some regions the musicians might have changed the finalis of the antiphons because of the same psalm tone and because of the resemblance of the opening melodies of the antiphons intentionally or inadvertently.

Thus, in the medieval practice, there is quite a diversity in the assignments of the antiphons of theme 29 examined in this chapter. Many music theorists are also involved into the discussion on their modal assignments. This history of the various assignments of these antiphons reveals that the modal theory developed in the middle ages could not well encompass the whole repertory inherited from the ancient time, and that there were struggle and effort of the medieval musicians to fit the repertory of chant with the rational system of the eight-fold modal theory. To shed light into the whole picture of this history and to search the reasons for this diversity, however, we have to wait for more comprehensive historical study including theoretical treatises, tonaries and antiphoners.

---

Chapter Three

Conflicting modal assignment between the third mode and the eighth mode

There is a group of twelve antiphons whose modal assignments conflict between the third mode and the eighth mode among the seven antiphoners. Although only the scribe of Mainz disagrees in the modal assignment of the three antiphons from other sources, Non dico tibi Petre, Dum compleantur dies and Ego sum qui testimonium, the melodies of these three antiphons in Mainz are totally different from those of the other sources. Therefore, these antiphons are not relevant to this study, which will concentrate on the other nine (vol.2, no.56-64).

These seven antiphoners assign the nine antiphons either to the third mode or to the eighth mode; nevertheless none of the seven antiphoners is consistent in the assignment. This is in contrast to the case of the antiphons of theme 29, all of which only Mainz assigns to the seventh mode and the others designate as the fourth mode. Concerning five antiphons of the nine, one source assigns them to the third mode and the other sources agree in the decision of the finalis on G (to the third mode, only Graz assigns Ego sum alpha et o[mega], Nonne sic oportuit, and Pax vobis ego sum; and only Mainz assigns Et respicientes and Malos male perdet). In contrast, only the scribe of Mainz assigns Et intravit cum illis to the eighth mode, and the other six sources assign it to the third mode. The other three antiphons, Iste sanctus prolege, Nemo te condemnavit and Nemo tollit a me, are designated either to the third mode or to the eighth mode in several sources. No specific tendency is to be found in any of these seven antiphoners, but they show several of the same phenomena in the treatment of the antiphons as in the case of theme 29, from
which it is inferable that the conflict between the third mode and the eighth mode is also caused by the duality of modal criteria, that is, the opening melody and the final note.

Before a consideration of the cause of these conflicting assignments, a survey is needed to inspect how the melodies of a given antiphon of the third mode and the eighth mode differ from each other. It is, as in the case of theme 29, the difference of closing gestures that results in the conflicting modal assignment. An Easter antiphon, Nonne sic oportuit (vol.2, no.63), which Graz assigns to the third mode and the other sources assign it to the eighth, is an extreme example. Up to the third note from the last, the melodies of the three diastematic sources except Mainz, which omits this antiphon in its liturgy, are almost the same with only a few minor variations, then continuing to the different endings of repetition on each final note. Hence the melodies for the last word, alleluia, are E F-G G G in Eins and Karls, E F-G E E in Graz. Since the neume of these last two repeated notes in Hartker is tracturus which indicates a lower note than its adjacent notes, Hartker, who assigns this antiphon to the eighth mode, must have meant other melody with ending on G than that of Eins and Graz, while the scribes of Rheinau and Stutt use virga which indicates either an equal note with or a higher note than those around it and probably mean F-G G G like that of Eins and Karls.

The last word of the other Easter antiphon, Et respicientes (vol.2, no.58), which Mainz assigns to the third mode and the others to the eighth mode, is also alleluia. It is only this last phrase that the decisive melodic difference affecting modal assignments is found among the seven sources. In the case of this antiphon, however, the contour of the closing figures in Mainz is different from that of the other six sources including the three non-diastematic ones. In Mainz the ending melody is G G-F E E, and in Eins, Graz and
Karls G-α a G G. The latter melody does not disagree with the melody indicated in the three neumatic sources. It is noteworthy that in Eins a different hand erased a melody for this alleluia and rewrote it as it is seen now (Eins folio 90r). The melody which this scribe erased cannot be clearly read but seems to be F E E as far as the last three notes are concerned. The overwriting of the ending melody after all reveals that this antiphon was problematic on the modal decision for the musicians in the monastery of Einsiedeln.¹

In most of the remaining seven antiphons of this group, the melodic modification is in the same degree as that of Et respicientes. Regarding Et intravit and Ego sum alpha et o[mega], however, there are more variants within the antiphons than there are in the other antiphons of this group. Et intravit cum illis (vol.2, no.57), which is also an Easter antiphon, is in the eighth mode in Mainz and in the third mode in the others except Graz which omits this antiphon in its liturgy. In the case of this antiphon, especially the melodies of the second phrase are quite unlike each other. The melody of Mainz hits the highest note e at factum, while that of Eins and Karls remains on d. Ego sum alpha et o (vol.2, no.56), which is also an Easter antiphon, is in the third mode in Graz, in the seventh mode in Hartker and perhaps Karls, and in the eighth mode in the other antiphoners. Also in this antiphon, the most prominent difference among versions is located at the uppermost note. In the middle of this antiphon for et stella matutina, there is a reiteration of the highest note, e e e in Eins, f f e in Karls, but d d e in Graz. Nevertheless, these differences cannot have anything to do with the selection of the final note. Here again the variant which affects the modal assignment is seen just at the last word, alleluia.

¹ In addition to Mainz, the scribes of Lucca antiphoner and Sarum antipher assigned this antiphon to
One may consider two possible reasons which might have caused this conflicting assignment between the third mode and the eighth mode for these antiphons. The first reason is that the both antiphons of the third mode and of the eighth mode have the same reciting tones for the psalmody, that is, c. Of course it should be taken into account that the reciting tone of the third mode was originally b and was shifted to c over the course of time. However, c must have been used, particularly in the German region, from an earlier time because the singing on c and F instead of b and E was a well known German dialect in general. On that account, supposing that there is an antiphon originally with a termination on G, there is a possibility of this ending figure being attracted by and altered to one of the third mode because of the same reciting tone of psalmody between the third mode and the eighth mode, and vice versa.

The second reason is the modality of the opening melodies. These nine antiphons retain a close resemblance in the melodic structure especially of the first phrase, even though the resemblance is far less clear than the theme 29. In these melodies G and c compose a frame, that is to say that the two core notes of a particular phrase are continued within this range and the units are emphasized or outlined. Most of these antiphons begin with a figure, G a c, being intervened either by a reiteration on c or by a melody moving around c, and go down to G again. This c, as one of the structural notes of this melodic incipit, might have been shifted from b, as the reciting tone of the third-mode psalmody. In any case, these antiphons are somehow related to each other with a coherence, some of them originally, if there is any original version, closing on E and others closing on G. Gevaert categorizes five of them, Et respiciectes, Et intravit, Malos male

the third mode with the same closing melody as that of Mainz.
perdet, Nemo te comdenavit, and Nemo tollit a me, in theme 36 of the third mode. He does not classify the other four antiphons. Frere classifies only Et respicientes in III-d, but does not classify the other antiphons.

In this context, Regino's reference to Et respicientes as an example of the antiphons with the modal ambiguity which begin in the third mode and end in the eighth mode is noteworthy to remember. In his tonary, Regino assigns this antiphon to the third mode, judging it from the modality of its initium. There is a high probability that the melodic incipit of Et respicientes was regarded as retaining the modality of the third mode and caused alteration in its ending from the eighth mode to the third mode in the liturgy of Mainz as well as in the liturgy in which the Lucca Antiphoner and the Sarum Antiphoner were used.

Furthermore, Aurelianus Reomensis gives a comment on Malos male perdet (vol. 2, no. 60):

Antiphona autem quae inicium habuerit authenti deuteri et finis eius desierit de plagis triti, non finietur de plagis triti sed de autentu tetrardi, quia insemet retinent quandam connexionem autentus deuterus et autentus tetrardus in sui fine; antiphona huius modi haec est: Ant. Malos male perdet.3

Since Aurelianus speaks of an ending of the sixth mode which is replaced by an ending of the seventh mode, the circumstance is not totally the same as that of Et respicientes; nevertheless, it is true that Aurelianus regards some antiphons like Malos maie perdet, which he lists as an example, as retaining the nature of the third mode in their initium. Thus, since the early medieval musicians considered at least these two antiphons, Et

---

2 Regino, 25.

respiciens and Malos male perdet, as beginning in the third mode. Consequently, it is not unreasonable to suppose that in the tradition of the liturgy of Mainz, awareness of the modality of these opening melodies influenced the antiphons as a whole. In other words, the singers in this tradition might have altered the ending from G to E so that the ending is in accordance with the modality of the opening melody as they did so for the antiphons of theme 29. In addition, it should be noticed that Aurelianus sees a certain similarity at the end of the third mode and the seventh mode. The similarity of the end could have promoted the alteration from the closing melody on G to the one on E.

Et respicientes and Malos male perdet are among the nine antiphons being examined in this chapter. However, it is not necessarily possible to generalize what we speculated about these two, i.e., that the third-mode versions are the results of alteration from the eighth-mode versions, concerning all of the nine antiphons. None of the seven antiphoners gives a consistent assignment of mode to these nine antiphons. In addition, there is an antiphon which is in the eighth mode only in Mainz and in the third mode in the other six sources. In the case of this antiphon, which is Et intravit, it is not reasonable that the eighth-mode assignment in Mainz is original rather than the third-mode assignment in all other six sources. Also concerning Nemo tollit a me, there must be another reason for its conflicting modal assignment. Rheinau, Stutt and Karl assign it to the eighth mode differently from the other four sources. Since those three sources have shown a close relationship, this must be a difference of tradition between Reichenau and St. Gallen-Einsiedeln. These antiphons must have been assigned to the third mode from the earlier stage of the Middle Ages, if no one can tell their original version. Furthermore, in his tonary, Regino assigns two antiphons of this group, Nonne sic oportuit and Pax vobis to
the eighth mode, while he assigns four of the nine antiphons, \textit{Ego sum alpha and o, Malos male perdet} and \textit{Nemo tollit a me} to the third mode as well as \textit{Et respicientes}. Therefore, Regino sees not the third mode, but the eighth mode in the beginning of \textit{Nonne sic oportuit} and \textit{Pax vobis}.

Hence, although no one can make a definitive statement about the circumstance of the conflicting modal assignments of these antiphons of this group, and also although no one can tell which is older, either the ending on \textit{E} or the ending on \textit{G} for each antiphon, one may presume that, besides \textit{Et respicientes} and \textit{Malos male perdet}, there must have been other antiphons whose opening melodies caused the change of the finals, because the opening melodies of these antiphons bear a close similarity to those of \textit{Et respicientes} and \textit{Malos male}. Accordingly, the antiphons in whose \textit{initium} neither Aurelianus nor Regino saw the third mode could have been subjected to the same confusion because of their resemblance of the melodic incipits as \textit{Et respicientes} and \textit{Malos male}. Especially for singers at that time, the melody of the beginning was important to make a connection with the termination of the psalmody. This awareness could have caused the singers to change the closing figures of this group of antiphons either intentionally or inadvertently.

Two antiphons, \textit{Pater manifestavi nomen tuum} (vol.2, no.65) and \textit{Vade satanas non tentabis} (vol.2, no.66), have the modal conflict between the first mode and the sixth mode. The melodic variances affecting the modal decision are located in the last few notes also in these antiphons. As for \textit{Vade satanas}, other researchers mention the conflicting modal assignment. Hugio states that this antiphon is consist of the sixth-mode melody in the tonaries of the East but it is found as the first mode in the tonaries of the West by the
modification of the final cadence.⁴ In his study of Italian tonaries, Merkley found the conflict among the first mode, the sixth mode and even the eighth mode as to this antiphon.⁵ In Regino’s tonary this antiphon is placed in the eighth mode. This conflict must have existed since an early period. Although the modality of the opening melodies of these antiphons cannot be specified, it is not impossible that the variance of the termination occurred under the influence of the *initium*.


⁵ Merkley, *Italian Tonaries*, 86, 216.
Part II

It was not uncommon to transpose melodies to other levels in the medieval ages. As we have seen, in Eins the most antiphons of theme 29 are transposed up a fourth with b-flat, while these antiphons keep the same order of the tone and semitone (interval structure) in their melodies. Musicians of the period seem to have transposed melodies not only to avoid certain intervals or tones, for example, as discussed in chapter two, when Berno of Reichenau recommended the transposition of certain antiphons (of theme 29) in order to avoid E-flat, but also they have transposed melodies in order that singers could perform a given melody that was beyond their range (too high or too low). The author of the Scolica Enchiriadis states in the explanation of the species of transposition,

Altera est concordatio paulo minor, dum vel elationis difficultatem mitigare volentes vel submissiorem gravitatem ergere aut in sursum aut in iussum quintana transpositione subiungimus. Est et tertia concordatio, quae fit octava sonorum regione, id est dum in novam vocem vel acutiorem melos mutamus.¹

The author here is referring to three kinds of interval of consonance (concordatio) by which one is able to transpose melodies. The present passage is the citation of last two of them. The first is the same tone. The third is up an octave, which is probably for boys (in novam vocem). The second is concerning the transposition up or down a fifth, which is to ease the difficulty of range.

Since the second half of the ninth century, i.e., the age of Musica et Scolica Enchiriadis and Hucbald, the musicians have considered the theoretical basis and possibility of transposition.² In the eleventh century, however, they began to discuss

¹ Scolica enchiriadis, ed. by Schmid, 76; English translation by Erickson, 44.
transposition from the practical point of view. Berno's reference to transposition is an example of explanation of its practical usage. The other theorists, however, warned against transposition which caused problems in their practice. A typical example for these cautions can be seen in the excerpt from the chapter 10 of Guido's *Micrologus* in Introduction. Guido's point of argument is that transposition can cause change of mode and that transposition drive a melody to begin "ubi nulla vox est."³

In this study of antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost, several antiphons are to be found with the modal conflicts caused by transposition. They are the conflict between the *tritus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode, and the conflict between the *protus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode. The conflicts of the first type are caused either by the transposition of an entire melody or by the transposition of a certain part. The latter type of conflict is caused by the transposition to the different levels of the different parts. An overview of these antiphons shows that the reason for these transpositions is not always clear and that the circumstances of the medieval performance of transposing melodies are not simple as is described (or prescribed) in theoretical treatises. An inspection into details is needed. In part II, we discuss first the transposition of entire melody, then the so-called partial transposition, a term which has been used by chant scholars only recently.

² As for the history of the theory of transposition, see Dolores Pesce, "The concept of the Affinities."

³ Guido, *Micrologus*, ed. by Smits van Waesbergh, 137; "at the place where any note does not exist" (translation mine) means the notes which lie outside the medieval gamut, for example B-flat, E-flat F-sharp etc.
Chapter Four

Modal conflict caused by the transposition of entire melody

As for the conflicts between the tritus mode and the tetrardus mode, two kinds of conflict are present in the antiphons examined here; the conflict between modes five and seven on the one hand, and the one between modes six and eight on the other. The conflict between the seventh mode and the fifth mode is found in two antiphons, the initia of which resemble each other strongly; Gevaert categorizes both of them as theme 24 and Frere classifies them as VII-d. An antiphon of Holy Saturday, Caro mea requiescet in spe is very short but interesting to examine (vol.2, no.67). This antiphon is in the seventh mode in Hartker and Karls, and in the fifth mode in the other five documents. In addition, Regino’s tonary, upon which Gevaert based his work, the Sarum antiphoner which Frere used for his classification, and the Lucca Antiphoner assign it to the seventh mode. These are all rather earlier sources.

The comparison of Karls and the other diastematic sources reveals that the seventh-mode melody is up a major second from the fifth-mode version. It is noteworthy that two of the diastematic versions of the fifth mode, Eins and Graz, have the key signature of $b$-flat. With this $b$-flat signature the hexachord of the fifth mode above the finalis has the same arrangement of tone and semitone as that of the seventh mode, i.e., two tones, a semitone, and two tones: $F G a b$-flat $c d$ and $G a b c d e$. Therefore, the melodic movements of both modes are the same within this hexachord. There arises a difference at

---

1 Since the scribe of Mainz does not use accidentals often, the musicians in Mainz conceivably sang $b$-flat here.
the note which is beyond the range of this hexachord. At Caro mea of the fifth-mode version, the melody in Mainz hits e, which has a tone between it and the lower neighboring note. In Eins and Graz this note is shifted to f, probably because of the German dialect. The note at the same place in the seventh-mode version of Karls is g. Among the seventh-mode versions, many French sources which we do not deal with here, however, put f at this point as the compilers of the Liber Usalis did\textsuperscript{2}, and the interval of f and the note beneath it is a semitone. This f forms a diminished fifth with b-natural which is the lowest, and therefore a prominent note in the first phrase. Gevaert argued that singers of the high Middle Ages might have transposed this melody to avoid a diminished fifth and put b-flat to avoid the tritone which came up in the transposed version.\textsuperscript{3} But one may doubt whether a diminished fifth and an augmented fourth bothered the early medieval musicians such as Regino and Hartker. However troublesome these intervals were, there was another way to avoid them. The highest note in question was subjected to the change up a major second in Karls.

Concerning the next antiphon Proprio filio suo (vol.2, no.68), the scribes of four sources, Rheinau, Stutt, Eins and Graz, which give the fifth-mode assignment to Caro mea, assign this Proprio filio suo to the seventh mode, even though the melodic incipit is obviously the same as that of the previous antiphon. Only the scribe of Mainz keeps the assignment to the fifth mode. Since the Antiphonale Monasticum notates the melody down a fifth from Eins and Graz with a result of avoiding a diminished fifth,\textsuperscript{4} there must

\textsuperscript{2} Liber Usalis, 714.

\textsuperscript{3} Gevaert, p.198.

\textsuperscript{4} Antiphonale Monasticum 438.
be found the same transposition among the other medieval sources which we did not examine here. The highest note in question is g in Eins and Graz as is the corresponding uppermost note of counterpart of Caro mea in Karls. In the manuscript of Karls (folio 91r), we can trace the trouble and debate which the singers might have experienced in their practice of this antiphon. The entire part of this chant is rewritten in a different hand from the other antiphons surrounding it. The finalis is F, which this scribe darkened, but evidently it was G in the previous writing.

An antiphon of Cena Domini, Liberavit dominus pauperem, also begins with the same melodic incipit and is classified as theme 24 in the Gevaert catalogue. All the scribes of these seven antiphoners, however, agree in its assignment to the seventh mode. If the musicians were disturbed by the diminished fifth, they would also have transposed Proprio filio and Liberavit dominus as they did Caro mea. It is not impossible to speculate that Caro mea is easily transposed when written down because it is a very short antiphon. The real reason of these transpositions, however, cannot be specified because the scribes of the seven sources did not have the same attitude to these three antiphons which are thematically related each other. It can be said that the b-flat enabled this transposition and resulted in this modal confusion. The medieval musicians regard the melodies with the ending on F including b-flat as belonging to the tritus mode, although the arrangement of tone and semitone of the melodies are the same as that of the tetrardus mode closing on G.

---

5 As seen in the introduction, this manuscripts was written in neume at first and then overwritten almost entirely on the four-line staff. The rewriting of this antiphon is by the third scribe.
The conflicting assignment between the sixth mode and the eighth mode can be seen in four antiphons in this study: an antiphon of the first Sunday of Lent, *Dominiun Deum tuum adorabis*, and three antiphons of the Paschal season, *Alias oves habeo, Ego sum pastor bonus*, and *Jesum quem quaeritis non est*. In *Alias oves*, there are two different melodies for the same text which bear a close resemblance. One must first distinguish these melodies. One of these melodies has no conflict in its eighth-mode assignment. The other has conflicting assignments between the sixth mode in Stutt, *Eins* and *Graz* on the one hand, and the eighth mode in *Reinau* and *Karl* on the other hand. *Hartker* and *Mainz* do not include this melody in their tradition (vol.2, no.69).

The melody of the sixth-mode version is transposed up a fifth and ends on c. Berno of Reichenau mentions this antiphon as an example of the transposition to the upper fifth.

Idipsum in quintis locis evenire solet; verbi gratia. Nisi enim hae antiphonae: *Alias oves habeo. Domine qui operati sunt*. quae sexti sunt toni, in quintum transponantur locum, hoc est, a parypate meson in trite diezeugmenon, nequaquam in regulari monochordo servare poterunt ordinem suum.\(^6\)

The melodies of *Eins* and *Graz* are the transposed versions as recommended by Berno. Given the \(b\)-flat signature in a few places in both *Eins* (folio 97v) and *Graz* (30-folio15v), this melody of the sixth mode would have \(E\)-flat, which lies outside of the regular monochord of the Middle Ages as Berno points out, unless it had not been transposed. Berno’s reason for this transposition is the same as that for the transposition of the antiphons of theme 29 to the upper fourth, i.e., the avoidance of illegitimate chromatic tones. In *Eins*, there is an evidence of erasure and overwriting of the melody around the

\(^6\) Berno, Prologus, GS vol.II, 76. “The same thing happens in the upper fifth [level], for example. Unless the antiphons, *Alias oves habeo* and *Domine qui operati sunt*, which are the sixth mode, are
first b-flat signature by the second scribe. In any case, the transposition up a fifth does not cause modal conflict.

The melody of the sixth-mode versions in the transposed position and that of the eighth-mode versions differ by a fourth degree in almost the entire part except for a few small variations. In the transposed version with b-flat, the modi vocum in Guido’s terminology, i.e., the arrangement of tone and semitone, of the sixth-mode melody virtually becomes the same as that of the tetrardus mode. Therefore, the conception and notation of this melody as the tetrardus mode is apt to come about even not in error or carelessly. In the same way, the melody of the eighth mode can be written down as tritus mode in its notation. In this sense we cannot affirm the statement of Gevaert concerning this antiphon that the eighth-mode version which is seen in newer sources is a product of the avoidance of the diminished fifth between E and b-flat at quae non sunt ex hoc ovili of the sixth-mode version of the lower position closing on F. This argument by Gevaert of the diminished fifth of E and b-flat contradicts Berno’s reference to E-flat, which should be transposed to the upper fifth. In our sources of mode six, the diminished fifth is avoided because the melody in question is different from the Gevaert’s transcription. Rather in the eighth-mode version of Karls, a tritone is found.

In the case of Ego sum pastor bonus, Hartker and the scribes of Rheinau, Karls and Mainz assign it to the eighth mode and Stutt, Eins and Graz to the sixth mode (vol.2, no.71). In the versions in the sixth mode, the melody of Eins is transposed up a fifth with the finalis on c, while the melody of Graz remains at the lower position. This melody of

transposed to the [upper] fifth, that is, from parypate meson [℅] to trite diezeugmenon [c’], they cannot make its order [of notes] in regular monochord.” Translation mine.
Eins is written by the second scribe over an erasure; this scribe did the same thing for the melodies of theme 29 and Alias oves. Keeping in mind the b-flat, which must have been E-flat in the lower position, one can speculate that the second scribe avoided this illegitimate note. Thus this second scribe can be described as faithful to Berno’s comment of transposition in order to avoid irregular chromatic notes. A comparison of the melody of Eins with that of Graz shows a slight melodic difference between these two versions of the sixth mode. At the mediatio with the text of alleluia, the melody of Eins is c a b-flat a G, with the interval of a minor third between b-flat and G at the last three notes of the first phrase, while that in Graz at a lower level is F D E D C, with the interval of a major third.

It is, however, noticeable that being transposed up a fifth with b-flat, the melody of the sixth mode in Eins again has the same modi vocum as that of the melody of the eighth mode in Karls and Mainz in spite of the different modal assignment. The melody of mode eight is entirely down a perfect fourth from that of the mode six of Eins. Therefore, the melody of Eins in the sixth mode, transposed up a fifth with b-flat, differs from the melody at the lower position with the same modal assignment, but is the same as the melody in the eighth mode.

To both antiphons of Alias oves habeo and Ego sum pastor bonus, Rheinau and Karls give the same eighth-mode designations. Here again we can see the evidence of a close relationship between Rheinau and Karls. Although Stutt has a tendency to demonstrate a close relationship with these antiphoners, it assigns these two antiphons to the sixth

\[7\] Gevaert, 199.
mode. However, this manuscript shows the overwriting of the tonary letters of the *differentiae* for these two antiphons, that is "H", in a different hand (both antiphons are in folio 91v). Furthermore, the neumatic sign of the *differentia* of *Ego sum pastor bonus* is one of the eighth mode, and that of *Alias oves habeo* is erased and is not overwritten.\footnote{The signs of *differentia* are written in the inner side of a page and their neumes are in the outer side as stated above.} One may speculate that they were assigned to the eighth mode and then altered to the sixth mode. In any case, this kind of emendation shows that these antiphons were also problematic for the musicians from the modal point of view.

As for *Domum Deum tuum adorabis* (vol.2, no.70) and *Jesum quem quaeritis* (vol.2, no.72), the conflicting assignment between mode six and mode eight can be described in principle to be a result of transposing by a major second. In the case of these antiphons, however, the degree of melodic variation is so great that it is hard to figure out the exact relationship between the sixth-mode version and the eighth-mode version. In her study of twelve antiphons, Joan Halmo states that *Jesum quem quaeritis* appears with a different number of *alleluias* in the concluding phrase in nearly every source, and that the second half of the antiphon seems almost to be in the process of development and change from source to source.\footnote{Joan Halmo, 153.}

*Multa quidem et alia signa* (vol.2, no.73) and *Pastor bonus animam suam* (vol.2, no.74) have conflicting assignments among the third, the sixth and the eighth modes.
These two antiphons bear resemblance in their opening melodies of the chants.\textsuperscript{10} Hartker, as well as the compiler of the Lucca Antiphoner, and Regino consistently assigns them to the third mode. The scribes of Stutt and Mainz assign both antiphons to the sixth mode. And it is to be noted that the \textit{differentiae} signs of these antiphons in Stutt are rewritten over the evidence of erasure again in these cases. Rheinau and Karls are consistent in the assignment of both antiphons to the eighth mode. The scribe of Eins assigns \textit{Multa quidem} to the sixth mode and assigns \textit{Pastor bonus} to the eighth mode.

The third-mode assignment must be old because rather old sources, Hartker, Regino and the Lucca Antiphoner, agree in the third-mode assignments. Using the version of the melody in the Lucca Antiphoner to check against Hartker, which is in Saint-Gallian notation, one will find that the difference between the third-mode melody in the Lucca Antiphoner and the eighth-mode melody in Karls lies in the last few notes. The rest of the melodies are almost the same except for several minor variants. This is the same type of difference as was seen in the nine antiphons of Chapter Three which have the conflicts between mode three and mode eight. Of course, there is no proof that the melody of Hartker is identical with that of the Lucca Antiphoner even though they have the same assignments. Regino includes \textit{Multa quidem} in his list of “notae antiphonae,” saying that it begins in the third mode and ends in the sixth mode.

The conflict between the sixth mode and the eighth mode is caused by transposition with \textit{b-flat} in the same way as the four antiphons dealt with previously in this chapter. The melodies of the sixth mode with \textit{b-flat} are generally a major second lower than those

\textsuperscript{10} They are in theme 36 of the third mode in Gevaert's classification.
of the eighth mode. The only difference of the modi vocum between the sixth mode and
the eighth mode is the subfinalis. The subfinalis of the sixth mode is a minor second
below its finalis, while that of the eighth mode is a major second from its finalis. Thus,
the melodic difference between these two versions arises when the melodies go down
beyond their finalis. However, the melody of each of these two antiphons includes only a
short segment below finalis. Therefore, as a whole, both melodies of the sixth mode and
the eighth mode give the impression of being almost the same tune.

This overview sheds light on the circumstance of the conflicting assignment between
modes five and seven, as well as the conflict between modes six and eight. With b-flat, a
melody of the tritus mode has the same movement of tone and semitone as that of
tetrardus mode except the subfinal note. Furthermore, a melody of the tritus mode
transposed up a fifth with b-flat and with an ending on c has exactly the same tone-
semitone movement as the tetrardus melody ending on G. Therefore, it is likely that a
tritus melody is easily written as a tetrardus mode and vice versa.

One may be tempted to think that this type of transposition came about by mistake.
The author of Dialogus de musica, however, implies that it is acceptable to transpose a
melody from the sixth mode to the eighth mode.

Itemque in antiphona: Domine qui operati sunt haec diligientius probare poteris:
nam si eam incipias in sexto mode, ut multi probant, in F littera, non discrepabit ab
eo modo, usque ad semitonium, quod est in tabernaculo tuo, in una syllaba. Sed
quia in usu ita est, et bene sonat, emendari non debit. Sed inquiramus, an forsitam
in alio tono incipiatur, totaque in eo modo consona inveniatur, eamque emendari
opus non sit. Incipe itaque eam in G littera, hoc est, in octavo modo, et regulariter
in eo stare probabis. Unde quidam incipiant Domine sicut Amen dico vobis.11

11 Dialogus de musica, GS vol. 1, 256; English translation in Source Reading, revised edition, 206.
The author refers to this transposition in order to avoid *semitonium*, that is, in this case *E-flat*. Berno prefers transposing the sixth-mode melody with *E-flat* of *Alius oves* up a fifth as above mentioned. Thus the author of *Dialogus de musica* proposes another possibility for avoiding *E-flat* in the sixth-mode melody regardless of the change of mode.

It is this kind of confusion that Guido warns about the use of *b-flat*. In Chapter eight of *Micrologus* he states,

> In codem vero cantu maxime b molli utimur, in quo F, f amplius continuatur gravis vel acuta, ubi et quandam confusionem et transformationem videtur facere, ut G sonet protum, a deuterum, cum ipsa b sonet tritum. Unde eius a multis nec mentio facta est; altera vero b [natural] in commune placuit.\(^\text{12}\)

Although he does not refer to the “confusion” or “transformation” of *c* sounding *tetrardus*, it is natural for readers to complete Guido’s list after *G* sound as *protus*, *a* sound as *deuterus* and *b* [probably *flat*] as *tritus*. The *tetrardus* mode on *c* is, Guido says, not a transposition but a transformation. Here these conflicts between *tritus* and *tetrardus* found in this chapter are probably illustrative of the practice which existed at the time of Guido’s warning.

While the practice of transposing a melody to any different level with identical tone and semitone movement took place very often, the modal theory of the period was well attached to the note which closed the melody. In the *Micrologus*, Guido states that the *protus* mode ends either on *D* or *a*, the *deuterus* mode on *E* or *b*, the *tritus* on *F* or *c* and the *tetrardus* mode ends on *G*. Accordingly, the melodies with different final notes could have been assigned to the different modes even with the same *modi vocum*. Since Guido,

\(^{12}\) Smits van Waesberghe ed., 124-125; Babb’s Engl. Translation, 64.
music theorists had argued the importance of considering the intervallic structure in the context of hexachord. However, it was in the fourteenth century that theorists began to relate the mode to one of the syllables of the hexachord and located it in any of the seven hexachords of the medieval system. Thus, the conflict between the *tritus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode seems to have been one of the topics of debate for the musicians of the middle ages.
Chapter Five

Modal conflict caused by the partial transposition

A group of antiphons presents the feature of partial transposition and transposition by two different levels within a single chant. One may wonder how this came to occur. Was it caused by melodic variants, or a musical preference to avoid certain problematic notes or intervals? In the *Micrologus* of Guido d’Arezzo, there is the surprising passage, which challenges our musical sensibilities.

Quod si ipsam b mollem vis omnino non habere, neumas in quibus ipsa est, ita tempera, ut pro F G a et ipsa b[flat] habeas G a b[natural] c; aut si talis est neuma, quae post D E F in elevatione vult duos tonos et semitonium, quod ipsa b facit, aut post D E F in depositione vult duos tonos, pro D E F assume a b[natural] c quae eiusdem sunt modi et praedictas depositiones et elevationes regulariter habent. Huiusmodi enim elevationes et depositiones inter D E F et a b[natural] c Clare discernens confusionem maxime contrariam tollit.¹

Readers may have wondered when considering this passage whether such a seemingly bizarre practice ever occurred. Indeed as we shall see below, it happened frequently. Whatever our conception of the grammar or continuity of chant melodies is, and however we seek to define that continuity as it was understood and practiced in the high middle ages, this definition must include the possibility, indeed the frequent occurrence of the transposition of small sections of a melody to a different level from the rest of it. The medieval conception of modality and theme encompassed more than the *initium* and *finalis*, and, if we are to make sense of the performance and perception of chant in this period, so must ours.

¹ *Micrologus* ed by Smits van Waesberghe, 125-126; Babb’s English translation, 64; This passage follows the excerpt in the previous chapter.
As we have seen in Chapter One, Gevaert thinks that the first half of *Dixit Dominus mulierī Chananeae* was transposed down a fifth, inferring from "leur début extraordinairement grave." It is conceivable that this kind of partial transposition was not rare in the practice of the medieval period. When this type of transposition occurs in the last part of a chant, it sometimes results in modal conflict among sources. The shifts of the last few notes as seen in the conflict between mode three and eight in Chapter Three also can be regarded as one of the examples of partial transposition. Here two antiphons illustrate the conflicting modal assignments caused not only by the alterations of few notes near the end, but by the transposition of longer melodic segments of termination.

*O vos omnes* is an antiphon of Holy Saturday which usually appears in the eighth mode (vol.2, no.75). Among the seven sources in this study, six antiphoners give it the eighth-mode assignment. Only the scribe of *Eins* assigns it to the fifth mode. In *Graz* (29-folio 163v), however, in spite of the *differentia* sign of the eighth mode, i.e., ω, this antiphon has the same closing melody of the sixth mode as that of *Eins*. Thus, in the last one third of the entire melody for *si est dolor sicut dolor meus* lies the difference between the closing phrase on *F* in *Eins* and *Graz* and that on *G* in the other two diastematic antiphoners. The melody with an *F* ending is down a major second from that of the eighth-mode version in *Karls* and *Mainz*. Since the closing melody on *F* has b-flat, and this melody does not move down to the *subfinalis*, again its interval structure of tone and semitone is identical to that of the eighth mode. Inferring from the circumstance that in the manuscript of *Karls* this part of the melody is rewritten by the later scribe, this antiphon must also have been problematic to some extent at that time.
Questions naturally arise: how did this problem come about? Why did the scribe of Eins transpose this part of the antiphon by a major second degree lower than its counterpart of the eighth mode? Why did the scribe of Graz notate the melody with an $F$ ending regardless of his assignment of the eighth mode *differentia*? Why was only this part of the melody involved in the conflict? One may be tempted to think that the eighth-mode version resulted from the partial transposition of the melody for the avoidance of $b$-flat. This seems possible because the first two-thirds in which both melodies coincide, does not have $b$-flat, and only the last one-third contains $b$-flat. In addition, the scribes of Karls and Mainz generally show the tendency to avoid writing down $b$-flat. However, among the scribes of rather old sources, like Hartker, Regino, and the compiler of the *Lucca Antiphoner*, there is general agreement in giving the eighth mode assignment to this antiphon. Therefore, it is not reasonable to think that the melody of the *tritus* mode was altered to the eighth mode to avoid notating $b$-flat.

The more likely reason is here again the similarity of the arrangement of tone and semitone movement between the *tritus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode. As said above, the melodies of these two modes can be easily notated in the other mode. Nonetheless, this similarity cannot explain why this antiphon was transposed only in the last one-third part instead of in the entire melody. The nature of the opening melody should be noticed in this context. The melody composed of a descending third, $c$ $a$ $c$ $a$ $G$ $a$ $G$, is much like one of the *tritus* mode. Attracted by the sixth-mode modality of the melodic *incipit*, the transposition into the *tritus* mode might have been effected for the last part of this antiphon, so that the melody would end in the same mode as the beginning. Given the two
witnesses of the closing on $F$, one can suppose that this transposition is not just a scribal error in one source but a kind of tradition within a region.

An antiphon of the Paschal season, *Sicut novit me Pater* (vol.2, no.76), is in the eighth mode only in *Mainz* and in the *tritus* mode in the rest of the antiphoners (in the sixth mode in *Eins* and in the fifth mode in the rest of sources). Taking into account of the fifth-mode designation in Regino's tonary and in the *Lucca Antiphoner*, as well as in *Hartker*, one can suppose that the fifth-mode assignment must be old.

In the last phrase of this antiphon for the text *pro ovibus meis alleluia*, the melodic alteration is to be found. Since the melody of this part of *Mainz* retains less similarity to that of the other sources, it is hard to regard the melody of *Mainz* as the transposition from the eighth-mode version. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that in the manuscript of *Eins* there is a clear evidence of erasure and rewriting for this last part and the melody of *differentia*, and also it should be noticed that the erased melody ends on $G$. The $G$ ending melody is presumably neither unique to *Mainz* nor caused by the scribal inaccuracy.

Therefore, the conflict between the *tritus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode is found not only in the antiphons with entire transposition but in the antiphons with partial transposition as seen in these two examples as well. Also in the case of the partial transposition, the usage of $b$-$flat$ is the direct cause for the confusing transposition.

The six antiphons in this study show the conflict between the *protus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode. As far as the antiphons inherited in the four diastematic sources are concerned, in the main part of the antiphons, the melodies of these two modes are
different by a fifth, and in closing phrases, they differ by a fourth, however the length of the phrases varies.

_Deus meus eripe me_ appears in the second mode only in **Hartker** and in the eighth mode in the other sources (vol.2, no.79). Although **Hartker** does not inform us of the exact height of the chant, there can be found a diastematic witness of the same second-mode assignment in the _Sarum antiphoner_ which Frere edited.\(^2\) The larger part of the melody of the _Sarum antiphoner_ is a fifth lower than that of the eighth-mode version in Eins, Graz, Karls and Mainz. Both melodies of this antiphon seem to fall within the framework of psalmody which consists of the tetrachord beneath the reciting note: semitone-tone-tone, but at the different levels. In the last three notes, however, the _Sarum_ melody becomes a fourth lower than the melody of mode eight, resulting in the conflicting modal assignment. If the melody of the last phrase in the _Sarum antiphoner_ were a fifth below its counterpart of the eighth mode, it would be _D B-flat C C_ instead of _E C D D_. In addition, the melody of the main part would have included several _F-sharps_, if it were kept down a fourth from the eighth-mode version. Since _B-flat_ and _F-sharp_ lie outside the contemporary gamut, transposing to the different degree in each part is necessary.

As for this antiphon, both Merkley and Halmo discuss its modal conflict among several sources.\(^3\) In two Italian tonaries among many sources which Merkely studied, the second-mode assignment is found for this antiphon. Among twelve sources which Halmo surveyed, the compilers of six sources including **Haltker** assign it to the second mode. Thus, the second-mode assignment is not rare at all. In addition, inferring from the

---


circumstance that Hartker, an earlier version assigns it to the second mode on the one hand, but Regino, another earlier document, assigns it to the eighth mode, this conflict might have existed since the early period as different traditions of performance.

In this context, the way of notating this antiphon in the Lucca antiphoner comes to light. Judging from the melody of differentia, the scribe of the Lucca antiphoner assigns it to the eighth mode. However, he notated the entire melody down a fifth including its differentia. The melody begins with the reciting notes on $F$ and ends on $C$. Given an observation that the scribe of the Lucca antiphoner does not write down accidentals and that $B$-natural forms a diminished fifth with $F$, the concluding figure of this antiphon must have been sung as $D\ B\text{-flat}\ C\ C$ instead of $D\ B\ C\ C$. This version of the eighth mode, therefore, is written at the same level as the second-mode version except for the last repeated note.

In any case, it is pertinent to conjecture that this melody was sung at the higher level in some places and was sung at the lower position in other places, and that the difference of the levels resulted in the conflicting assignment between the second mode and the eighth mode in course of time, especially by the time when the melody was written down.

_Ipsi vero in varum_ (vol.2, no.51) was mentioned in relation to the antiphons of theme 29 in Chapter Two because the first half of the melody is much like theme 29. The melody of the fourth mode in Hartker cannot be specifically determined as to its pitch. The difference of the melodies between the seventh-mode version in Mainz and the first-mode version in the rest of the diastematic sources is just the same as in the case of Deus meus eripe me, the antiphon previously examined. In the main part, the melody of Mainz

---

4 Since there in not staff line below $F$, the notes are not clear enough to read.
is up a fifth from the others in the first mode, and the last several notes are up a fourth. In the case of this antiphon, however, there is neither a diminished fifth nor B-flat. The assignment to the fourth mode in Hartker and the assignment to the seventh mode in Mainz are given presumably because of the opening melody of this antiphon.

The following two antiphons illustrate the transposition to the two different levels in longer parts than the previous examples. As for Abraham pater vester (vol.2, no.77), there are three different modal assignments among the seven sources. Three of the non-diastematic manuscripts, Hartker, Rheinau and Stutt, assign it to the first mode. The scribes of Eins and Mainz assign it to the second mode. Herein lies a disagreement between authentic assignment and plagal assignment. As seen in the previous chapter, the scribes of older manuscripts assign it to authentic rather than plagal. Graz and Karls, on the other hand, assign it to the seventh mode. Accordingly, a comparison of Graz with Eins explains the circumstance of the difference between protus and tetrardus. The opening note, G, and the closing phrase for vidit et gavisus est in Graz of the seventh mode, are up a fourth compared to their counterparts of Eins of the second mode, except for one note near the end, which is considered a passing note. In the rest of this antiphon, the melody of Graz is up a fifth from that of Eins except for two ornamental notes at videre. The melody of the protus-mode version must be older because this antiphon was assigned to the first mode in the older manuscripts like Hartker and Regino. In the practice of Graz and Karls, musicians must have inherited the melody which was altered for some reason.

Why did this change come about? One may conjecture two possible reasons which are mutually exclusive. It should be noticed here that the initium of the melody in Graz, G b-
c-d d, is like a seventh-mode theme, theme 19, in the Gevaert catalogue, and that of Eins, D E-F-G G, is theme 7 of the first mode, to which Gevaert himself classified this antiphon. These two themes bear a close resemblance to each other. Therefore, if the melody of Graz and Karls was attracted by the initium of theme 19 of the seventh mode, it begins with the initium of theme 19 and becomes up a fifth from that of Eins to pursue the melody line, except for the very first note which is a part of the theme. But the closing figure of Graz must be up a fourth from the other version so that this antiphon ends on G in accordance with the modality of the initium of theme 19. In contrast, there is also a possibility that transposition occurred first for some reason, and then it caused the change of the initium of the melody. In this case, the performance at the two different positions must have existed as two different traditions, since the early stage of the Middle Ages.

In the case of Domine non habeo, there are two modal assignments, the first mode in Stutt and Graz, and the seventh mode in Hartker, Eins and Karls (vol. 2, no. 80). Since this antiphon is assigned to the second mode in the Leipzig manuscript of Regino’s tonary and to the seventh mode in its Brussels manuscript, this conflict has existed since an earlier period. Accordingly, one may suppose that this antiphon also was sung at a higher level in one area than in another area, and ended up being assigned to the seventh mode in that area, and to the first mode in another area, even though the reason for this practice at the different levels cannot be explained. In comparison of Eins and Graz, it becomes clear that here again the distinction of these two versions concerns the levels at which they have been notated, and here occurred the transposition of a segment of the melody to a different level from the rest of it. In the version of mode seven in Eins, the melody of the

---

5 Gevaert, p. 245-47, 297-301.
first phrase for *Domine non habeo hominem ut* and the closing part for *in piscinam* are up a fourth from those of *Graz* of the mode one, although the opening figure is quite unlike the other. In the middle part of this antiphon for *cum mota fuerit aqua mutat me*, the melody of *Eins* is up a fourth from that of *Graz*. This interval of a fourth causes the conflict between the *protus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode. If one wants the melody of *Eins* to be up a fourth entirely, one has to use *b-flat* many times in the part which is transposed up a fifth in the actual version. In contrast, in order to keep the melody of *Graz* being below a fourth from *Eins*, *F-sharp* comes about twice in the melody of this part. Medieval singers or scribes must have avoided these accidentals, either being aware of them or not.

In the repertory of this study, there are three more antiphons which demonstrate the modal conflict between the *protus* mode and the *tetrardus* mode. The lack of diastematic witness keeps us from the analysis of these three antiphons concerning the detailed circumstances and the causes of the conflicting assignments. The melodic contours demonstrated in the neumes of three adiastematic sources are the same as those of diastematic sources. Deducing from the examples which we have analyzed in this chapter, it is not unreasonable to speculate that these conflicts also have been caused by the transposition of the entire melody or the transposition to different degrees of different parts.

Thus the analysis of the antiphons with the modal conflict between *protus* and *tetrardus* brings to light the condition of the transposition. The transposition to the upper fifth does not cause any modal problem except in the case of the *tetrardus* mode, while the
transposition to the upper fourth produces conflicts in modal assignments. This is exactly what Guido points out in his argument of the theory of *affinitas*. The antiphons which we have observed here are all transposed in principle up a fifth, but for some reason, either in order to avoid a certain interval or a certain note, or under the influence of the modality of a opening phrase, they end with the closing melody transposed to the upper fourth. This difference of a fourth results in the conflicting modal assignments among sources.

---

6 Chapter Four, 60.
Part III

After a survey of the conflicting modal assignment of antiphons, it is a pertinent procedure to assess the stability or the ambiguity of mode as a whole as well as those of each mode. Out of 551 antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost which were examined in this study, 99 antiphons are found with modal conflicting assignments among the seven antiphoners. For 17 out of the 99 antiphons, there are two different melodies transmitted for a text. Therefore 82 antiphons have real modal conflicts, and they account for about fifteen per cent of all antiphons studied here. Considering this rather high degree of frequency in modal conflicting assignment, one can understand the reason why the medieval theorists had to repeat cautions concerning the change of mode.

Table 1 shows the modal distribution of antiphons from Ash Wednesday to Pentecost in each source. According to this table, there is a decided preference for the modes one and eight, and a relatively weak representation of the tritus mode, especially of the mode five. Table 2 is the numbers of antiphons by the group of conflict as discussed in each chapter. Table 3 shows the numbers of conflicting assignment of each mode. According to the table 3, there are found the most conflicting assignments in the antiphons of the fourth mode and of the seventh mode. Many of them are the antiphons of theme 29. Therefore, we have to say that theme 29 itself is often subjected to modal change.

Among the antiphons of the mode five, there are only two antiphons with modal conflict. Both of them have the same theme, as stated above. Since the antiphons of the fifth mode are very few, as shown in the table 1, it is not possible to state that the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Hart</th>
<th>Rhein</th>
<th>Stutt</th>
<th>Graz</th>
<th>Mainz</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>124.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>au-pl</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>4 &amp; 7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Combinations</td>
<td>Count</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>Mode 1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 2</td>
<td>2 &amp; 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &amp; 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &amp; 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 3</td>
<td>3 &amp; 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 6 &amp; 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 4</td>
<td>4 &amp; 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 &amp; 7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 5</td>
<td>5 &amp; 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 6</td>
<td>6 &amp; 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 &amp; 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 6 &amp; 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 7</td>
<td>7 &amp; 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 &amp; 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 &amp; 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 8</td>
<td>8 &amp; 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 6 &amp; 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 &amp; 7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
melodies of the antiphons in mode five have modal stability. Rather, it should be noticed that the fifth mode itself was avoided in composing antiphons in those days.

Besides the fourth mode and the seventh mode, the most frequent conflicting modal assignments are found in the antiphons of mode three and mode six. The antiphons of the sixth mode are around twenty in number in each source, and ten of them have conflicting assignments. Except for two, they are all conflicts with mode eight. In this case, $b$-flat is the actual cause of the modal confusion. With this $b$-flat, the arrangement of tone and semitone of the melody of the tritus mode is identical with one of the tetrardus mode. One may suspect that the reason why this mode is not very often used in the original composition may be this confusion with the tetrardus mode.

The antiphons of the third mode are also around twenty as a whole, and the eleven out of them (more than half) have conflicts of mode. All of them, without exception, are involved in the confusion with mode eight, resulting from the alteration of the concluding phrases. The melodies of the third mode also have modal instability to some extent. This may be also related to the less frequent use of this mode in the practice of antiphons.

Both the protus mode and the eighth mode can be described to be rather stable modes. In modes one and eight, the number of the antiphons with conflicting assignment is not few; nevertheless, they are rather stable not only because the antiphons of these mode as a whole are many in number but also because the large number of the conflict is concerned not with the maneria, i.e., the system of the four modes based on the finalis, but with the difference between authenticus and plagalis. Specifically in both the protus mode one can find modal stability. Out of some 100 antiphons, twenty-one contain modal conflicts, and eleven of them are conflicts between authentus and plagalis. There are around twenty
antiphons of mode two. Only two of the thirteen antiphons are involved in the conflicting assignment with another mode. In the antiphons of the mode eight, twenty illustrate the conflict among modes besides the conflict between authentic and plagal. The number twenty is not very large as a proportion in the antiphons of this mode, since there are more than 120.

The eight-fold modal system which medieval musicians developed was the means to classify their repertory inherited from the previous generation. Especially in the practice of antiphons, the musicians needed to decide the mode for each chant in order to sing the concomitant psalmody in unison in choirs. This theory of the eight-fold mode, however, did not always work well in practice. Some of the eight modes have more stability, but others include rather instability. The modes which lack the modal stability, like modes three, five and six, are also few in number of the antiphons as a whole.
Conclusion

Having inspected the factors which cause modal conflicting assignments of office antiphons among sources, and the stability or ambiguity of each mode, we are in a position to place this observation in a historical context. The first factor of the cause of conflict is the duality of modal criteria. In the process in which modal theory was formed and developed, the modal criteria of the antiphon were changed, and that change produced different modal designations of the antiphon among sources. As for the difference between the authentic mode and the plagal mode, some relatively old sources assign antiphons according to the melodic incipit and other rather new sources assign them based on the theory which was developed during centuries. Furthermore, in the early medieval treatises, the antiphons of theme 29 were described as beginning with the seventh mode and ending on the fourth mode. In some sources were the antiphons of theme 29 changed to the melodies with the ending on the seventh mode so as to avoid the confusion. Here arose the conflict between the fourth-mode assignment and the seventh-mode assignment. Probably the conflict between modes three and eight must have caused by the same procedure. The deuterus mode is relatively frequently involved in conflicting modal assignment.

Thus in the early stage of the medieval ages, musicians chose the tone of psalmody according to the melodic incipit of antiphon. The most important concern for them was the smooth connection of the termination of psalmody and the initium of antiphon, to which the ninth- and the tenth-centuries music theorists bear witness. Therefore, the decision of which initium of an antiphon is linked to which differentia of psalmody was
based on convention to some extent. This conventional practice of the antiphon was gradually replaced by the practice based on the modal theory, that is, the modal decision by the final note and the range.

Although the introduction of this theory produced the conflict among sources or among transmissions, it actually reduced the modal ambiguity in practice in a liturgical community. Joseph Dyer argued that the change of psalm rendering from solo chanting to choral psalmody in the monastery stimulated the creation of systems of music theory.¹ In the early medieval ages, every monk knew all the psalms by heart and was expected to take turn as a solo cantor. By the ninth century choral psalmody seems to have been more common, and there must have arisen the great confusion among singers in a group. Thus choral rendering of psalmody demanded the development of some general principles that could be followed by the entire choir. This process is considered to have been promoted with the mentality of the Western world that is well inclined to rationality and science.

The second factor of the cause of conflicting modal assignments is transposition. The versions of given antiphons which conflict in the modal assignment have difference by a major second degree or a forth degree, and also have $b$-flat in many cases. Although some music theorists in the Middle Ages explain the need for the transposition, to ease the difficult range for a singer to perform and to avoid an illegitimate note in the medieval gamut, and others warn the confusion, especially the modal confusion caused by transposition. The confusion resulted mainly from the circumstance that, among the antiphons with modal conflicting assignments, the tone-semitone arrangement of melody is the same, but the $finalis$ is different. The problem of this confusion was solved by the time
at which the music theory made it possible to transpose any melody freely in the medieval hexachord system, linking the *finalis* to the syllable of the hexachord instead of special height of note. The conflicting modal assignments caused by transposition came about in the struggle to attain this systematic theory. Consultation of the theoretical treatises of the period and an overview of the office antiphons with conflicting modal assignments enable one to have an insight concerning the discrepancy between the practice and the theory. They also unveil the struggles and the efforts of the medieval musicians to deal with this discrepancy and to reconcile the practice of the inherited repertory and the theory developed in the Western world.

---
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## Chapter 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text incipit</th>
<th>CAO</th>
<th>Fer</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>GZ</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>MZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A porta inferi</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>sancto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assumpsit Jesus</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2Quad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Circumdantes</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Palmis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dixit discipulus ille</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D1 \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ego sum qui sum</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 In spiritu humilitatis</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1Quad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nonne cor nostrum</td>
<td>3943</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4Pascha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Reges terrae et omnes</td>
<td>4593</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4Quad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Unus est enim magister</td>
<td>5278</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2Quad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Usque adodo non</td>
<td>5284</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5Pascha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Vado ad eum qui me misit</td>
<td>5304</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4Pascha</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G1 \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Apparueunt apostolis</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pente</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Avertatvirum retorsum</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CenaD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yg</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yg</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cum autem venerit ille</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4Pascha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dixit dominus Mulleri</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2Quad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ego veritatem dico vobis</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4Pascha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Loquentur variis</td>
<td>3634</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pente</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>y?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yb</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Recordare mei domine</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Undecim discipuli</td>
<td>5271</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>O Pascha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Venite Benedicti patris</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1Quad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Incipit</th>
<th>CAO</th>
<th>Fer</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>GZ</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>MZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alieni insurrexerunt in me</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>paraseve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angerus domini</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>oc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>oc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendit deus</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ascensio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>oc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendamus</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confundantur et</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>paraseve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confundantur qui</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Palmis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desidero desideravi</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevata est magnificentia</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ascensio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevatis Manibus</td>
<td>2635</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ascensio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaltare domine in virtute</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ascensio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhortatus es in virtute</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cena D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faciem meam non</td>
<td>2833</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>oc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factus sum sicut</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicasti domine</td>
<td>3518</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magsiter dicit</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multa bona opera</td>
<td>3827</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non haberes in me</td>
<td>3916</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numquid redditur</td>
<td>3972</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O mors ero mors tua</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O multier magna</td>
<td>4046</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oves deae vocem</td>
<td>4203</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plangent eum quasi</td>
<td>4295</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popule meus quid feci</td>
<td>4312</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potestatem habeo</td>
<td>4349</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiavit dominus quinque</td>
<td>4818</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut fuit Jonas</td>
<td>4934</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempus meum nondum</td>
<td>5131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi duo vel tres</td>
<td>5258</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vade mulier semel</td>
<td>5302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Quad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text incipit</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Fer</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>GZ</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td>MZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A saeculo non est</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Quad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>eb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsi vero in vanum</td>
<td>3408</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesciat sinistra tua</td>
<td>3876</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cinerum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepulto domino signatum</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesaurizate vobis</td>
<td>5142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cinerum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubi est thesaurus tuus ibi</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cinerum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text incipit</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Fer</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>GZ</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td>MZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Ego sum alpha et o</td>
<td>3589</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Et intravit cum illis</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Et resipisceres</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Inat sanecus pro legem</td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Mantis male perdit</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2Quad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Nemo te condemnavit</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4Quad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Nemo tollit a me</td>
<td>3874</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Nono sac opornit</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2Pascha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Pax vobis ego sum</td>
<td>4254</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Pater manifesti</td>
<td>4237</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ascenso</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Vade sanctus non tenetibus</td>
<td>5303</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>IQuad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ag</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text incipit</th>
<th>CAO</th>
<th>Fer</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>GZ</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>MZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caro mea requescet in me</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprio filio suo</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parasceve</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias oves habeo</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 Pascha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominus deum tuum</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1Quad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego sum pastor bonus</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2Pascha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesum quem queritis</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pascha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multa quidem et alia</td>
<td>3828</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>O Pascha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor bonus animam</td>
<td>4223</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2Pascha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text incipit</th>
<th>CAO</th>
<th>Fer</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>GZ</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>MZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O vos omnes</td>
<td>4095</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sancto</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>w?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wb</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut novit me pater</td>
<td>4943</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2Pascha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ub</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>vb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>vb</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham pater vester</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeperunt omnes turbae</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Palmis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deus meus eripe me</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cena D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>eb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>wg</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine non habeo</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1Quad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aq</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnes inimici mei</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yc</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postquam surrexit</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cena D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. *A porta inferi* (CADO 1191. Sabbato Sancto)

HK 225 (1a)

Rhe (1a)

St 80v (1a)

Ein (181)

Gr 29 (168v)

Kp 93r (1a)

Mg 238v (2v)
2. Assumpsit Jesus disciplos suos (CAO 1501 D. 2 Quad.)

HK 149 (2e)
Assumpsit Jesus disciplos suos et ascendit in montem et transfiguratus est

Rh (2e)

SI 55x (2e)

Ein 58r (2D1)

Gb 29-06v (19)

Kr 69v (4a)

Mg Bahr (2.1)

ante eos
Circundantes circumdederunt me
et in nomine Domini
vindi-ca-bor in e-is
4 Dixit discipulus ille (CAO 2270 4 Paschae)

HK -

Rh (2e)  / / / / / / / ( ? )

St 87r (2e)  / . / / / / / / . . . . A / / / / / / / . . . . . / / / / ( ? )

Dixit discipulus ille quem diligebat IHS petro dominus est alle-lu-ia

Ein 93v (2D4)

G3 -

Kr 98v (1 )

M3 -
5. Ego sum qui sum et consilium (ca 2549 D. Paschae)

Ego sum qui sum et consilium meum non est eum impi-is sed in le-ge Domini

voluntas mea est allelu-ia
6. In spiritu humilitatis (CAO 3288 D 1 Quad.)

In spiritu humilitatis et in animo contributo suscipiamur Domine a te et sic sit at

Sacrificium nostrum ut a te suscipiat hodie et placeat tibi Domine Deus
7. Nonne cor nostrum

HK 234
Rh
St 86r
Ein 93r
Gy 90-7r
Kr 96v
Mg

Non-ne cor nostrum
audent in nobis
de Jesu
dum loquere
tur

in vi-a
al-le-lu-ia

??
9. Unus est enim magister vester

HK 452
(G1a)

U-nus est enim magis-ter ves-ter qui in caelis est

Rh
(G1a)

St 58v
(G1a)

Ein 60v
(2D1)

Gg 244-Hbr
(G1a)

Kp 72r
(2)

Mg B45r
(6.1)

christus

Do-mi-nus

di-tit Do-mi-nus
Usque modo non petistis (CAO 5284 D 5 Paschae)

HK 244am. (2e) - o / / / / / / / / -
                    Usque modo non petistis quidquem

Rh (lab) - o / / / / / -

St 98v (lab) - o / / / / -

Ein 98v (2D4)

Gg 30-20v (2e)

Kr 102v (1)

Mg 304v (2,4)

in nomine me-o
12. Apparuerunt apostolis (ca 1454 D. Pent)

HK
(8w)am.

Apparuerunt apostolis dispersitates lingue tangum ignis seditques supra

Rh
(79c)

St
(79c)

Ent
(79c)

G
(79c)

K
(79c)

Mg

Singulas eorum spiritus sanctus alleluia
Avertantur retrosum
(CAO 1547 Cena Domini)

HK 178
(749)

Avertantur retrosum et erubescant qui cogitant mihi male

Rh
(749)

St 73r
(749)

Ein 81r
(714)

G 8
(828)

Kr 87v
(739)

H 3
(8.2)

michi
Cum autem venerit ille spiritus (ciso 1990 D. A paschae)

HK 244 am (749)
Cum autem venerit ille spiritus veritatis docebit vos omnes veritatem et que Ventura

Rh (8w)

St 98 v (79c)

Ein 98 v (79c)

Gp 30-20r (79c)

Kr 102 v (8)

Mg C30 v (7.2)

sunt annuntia-bit vobis alle-luia

annunciabit
45. Dixit Dominus mulieri  (cAo 2287  D.2 Quad.)

HK 452  
(80g)

Rh  
(80w)

St 58r  
(80w)

Ein 60v  
(86r1)

Grg 29-112v  
(79c)

Kr 72v  
(80w)

Mg B49v  
(8.1)

Di-xit Dominus mulieri  chanane-e  non est bonum  su-me-re panem  fi-li-o-rum  et mittere

cani-bus ad manducandum  uti-que  domi-ne nam et catelli  edunt de-mi-cis que cadunt
(15) Dixit Dominus mulierī

de mensa domino-rum suorum ait illi iē-sus mu-lier magna est

fides tua fiat ti-bi si-cut pe-tisti
Ego veritatem dico vobis (CAO 2607 Fer. 2 4 Paschae)

HK 244am (Vb)
Ego veritatem dico vobis expedit vo-bis ut ego va-dam nisi ego abi-ero

Rh (Vc)

St 98v (Vc)

Ein 98v (VH)

G8 30-I IV (Vc)

Kr 402 (V)

Mg c 28v (V.1)

par-ac-li-tus non veni-et alle-lu-ia

oly

sepulum
Loquebantur variis linguis (CAO 3634 D. Pent.)

HK 271 (74)
Loquebantur variis linguis apostoli magnalia Dei

Rh (74?)

St 101v (79b)

Ein 445v (77d)

Gg 3034r (80b)

Kr 454r (7)

M3 c7or (6, 2)

alleluia alleluia alleluia
Recordare mei domine (CAO 4577 D. Passione)

HK 476 (75) Rec- corda-re mei domi ne tue-re me ab his qui persecuntur me

Rh (8wg)

St 73r (8vo)

Ein 78r (774)

Gj 446v (8vo)

Kr 85v (8wg)

M3 -
Undecim discipuli in Galilaea (CAO 527f Fer. 6 Oct. Paschae)

HK 298 am.
(74c) "Undecim discipuli in Galilaea videntes dominum adoraverunt alle-lu-ia"

Rh
(74d?) ""

St 88 r
(74d) ""

Ein 94 v
(74c) ""

Gy

Kr 98 v
(8) ""

Mg 8277
(7.4) ""
20. Venite benedicti patris mei (CAO 5350 Fer. 2 4 Quad.)

HK 148 (7yb)
(HK 148 (7yb)
Venite benedicti patris mei percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est
Rh (8w)
St 55w (8w)
Ein 57r (8A1)
Gz 29-105r (8w)
Kr 64r (7yc)
Mz B 23v (8.4)

ab origine mundi

...
Alieni insurrexerunt in me (CAO 1924 Parasceve)
22: Angelus domini (ca 1442 Fer. 6 1Quad)

HK 148
(40)
Angelus domini descendebat de celo movebatur aqua et sanabatur usmus

Rh
(40c)

St 55x
(40c)

Ein 57v
(40l)

G3 2x 106v
(40c)

Kr 69v
(4)

M3 B28v
(7.2)
23 Ascendit deus in iubilatione (ca 1490 Ascensio)

HK 262
Ascendit deus in iubilati-one et dominus in vote tube alle-luia

Rh

St 99r
Commendemus nos metipsos (CAO 1857 D 1 Quad)

HK 147 (40)

Commendemus nos metipsos immulta patientia per arma iustitiae virtutis dei

Rh (401)

St 54r (40)

Ein 56r (451)

Gp (40)

Kr 69r (40)

M5 B24v (7.2)

in ieiunis multis per arma iustitiae
25 Confundantur et reverentur (c191883 Parasceve)

HK218
(40)
Confundantur et reverentur qui quaeunt animam meam ut afferant meus

Rh
(40)

st
(40)

Ein 84v
(491)

G3 16v
(40)

Kr 90r
(40)

H3 B58v
(782)
afferant

aufferant

aufferat
26 Confundantur qui me (CAO 1884 D Palmis)

Confundantur qui me persequeuntur et non confundar ego domine deus meus

persecuntur
Desiderio desideravi pascha (CAO 2161 Fer.5 Passione)

HK469 (40)
Desiderio desideravi pascha manducare Vobisum antequam patiar

Rh (2)

St 65r (40)

Ein 72v (441)

G9 28 (40)

Kr 82v (40)

M3 BH42v (72)
28. Elevata est magnificentia tua (câ 2634 Ascensio)

HK 262
(40) E·le·vata est magnificenti·a tua super celos de·us alle·luia

Rh
(40)

St 991
(40)

En 108v
(441)

G 30–
(22r)
magnificenti·a

Kr 144v

M 3 c 87v
(7,2)
29 Elevatis manibus serebatur (caO 2635 Ascensio)

HK 265 (40)
Elevatis manibus serebatur in cœlum et bene-dixit e-ös alle-lu-ia

Rh. (?)

St 400v (40)

Ems 441r (4G1)

Gb 30-37v (40)

Kr 151r (4)

Mg 497v (7.2)
30 Exaltare domine in virtute (ca0 2759 Ascensio)

HK262  
(40)  
Exaltare domine in virtute tua cantabimus et psallamus alleluia

Rh  
(40)  

St  
(40)  

Ein 408v  
(401)  

G3  
(40)  

Kr  
(44v)  

M3  
(41v)  

(7.2)
31. *Exhortatus es in virtute* (CAO 2784 Cena domini)

HK 481 (40)  
Exhortatus es in virtute tua et in refectio-ne sancta tua domine

Rh (2)

St 75 (40)  
Exhortatus

EIn 83v (46)  
1st hand

G 87 (40)  

K 7 89 (4)  

M 88 747 (72)
32 Faciem meam non averti (CAO 2833 Fer 2 Maj)

HK 176
(4ob)
Faciem meam non averti ab increpantibus et conspu-entibus in me

Rh
(4ob)

St. 711
(4oc)

Ein 781
(491)

Gb 3944r
(4oc)

Kr 85v
(4oc)

Hg B166r
(7.2)
34. Judicasti domine causam (CAO 3518 D. Passione)

HK 167  (40)  
Judicasti domine causam anime meae defensor vitae meae Domine deus meus

Rh  (8)  

St 67 f  (40)  

Ein 74v  (444)  

G3 29-134v  (40)  

Kr 81 f  (40)  

M3 8126v  (7,2)  

...
Magister dicit (CAO 3657 Fer 5 Passione)

HK 169 (4ob)
Magister dicit tempus meum prope est apud te facio paschaaum discipulis meis

Rh (??)

St 68r (4oc)

Ein 78v (4E1)

Gp 28-496v (4o)
aput

Kr 82r (4oc)

Mg BH 4 (72)
36 Multa bona opera operatus sum (CAO 3827 Fer 4 Passione)

HKAG4 (40)

Multa bona opera operatus sum vobis propter quod opus multit me occidere

Rh (40)

St 65r (40)

Ein79v (4G1)

G72 356v (40)

Kr 82r (40)

V3 BM4v (72)

Magnificat
37. Non haberes in me potestatem (cA0 3916 Fer 2 Maj)

HK 176
(40)
Non habe-res in me potes-tatem nisi desuper datum tibi fu-isset

Rh
(40)

St 714
(40)

En 78r
(461)

G3 146v
(40)

Kr 85v
(40)

H2 B168r
(72)
Numquid redditur pro bono (CAO 3972 D. Passione)

HK 467
(40)
Numquid red-di-tur pro bono malum quia foderunt soveam animae meae

Rh

St 67r
(40)

Ein 74
(464)

G 329
(464)

Kr 81r

M 3 B
(127 v)

(72)
39. O mors ero mors tua (CAO 4045 Sabbato Sancto)

HK 224
(40)  O mors ero mors tua morsus tuus ero inferne

Rh
(40h)

St 30 V
(40h)

Ein 88v
(4A1)

G 29
(40)

Kr 93r
(40h)

M9  B 237
(7.2)
40 O mulier magna est (CAO 4046 Fer 5 I Quad)

HK 152
(40)
O mulier magna est fides tua fiat ti-bi sicut petisti

Rh
(0)

St 55x
(40)

Ein 57v
(401)

Gy 28-106r
(40)

Kr 69v
(40)

H 843v
(7.2)
41 Oves meae vocem meam audient (4203 Fer 4 Passione)

HK169
(40) O-ve-s me-e vocem meam audient et ego Dominus agnosco eas

Rh
(40)

St68r
(40)
42 Plangent eum quasi unigenitum (cAo 4295 Sabbato Sancto)

HK 225  (40)
   - / √ / - / √ / / / / / √ /  √ /  / / / / / -
   Plangent eum quasi uni-genitum qui-a innocens dominus occisus est

Rh  (40)

St 80v  (40)

Ein 88v  (441)

Gb 28-1607  (40)
   immortus ceri-tus est

Kr 93r  (40c)

NdB 238r  (7.2)
43. Popule meus quid feci tibi (CAO 4312 D Passione)

HK 167 (40b)
Popule meus quid feci tibi aut quid molestus fui respondi mihi

Rh (?)

St 67r (40c)
fui tibi

Ein 71v (40d)

Gy 494v (40c)
fui tibi michi

Kr 81f (4)

Hb B127r (7.2)
44 Potestatem habeo ponendi (CAO 4949 Fer 2 Maj)

HK 177 (40)
Potestatem ha-be-o ponendi animam meam et iterum sumendi eam

Rh (40)

St 72v (40)

Ein 78v (491)

G 29 140v (40)

Kr 86v (40)

Mg 81v (7.2)
45 Satiavit dominus quinque (Cao 4818 D. 4Quad)

HK 162 (40)
Satiavit dominus quinque millia hominum de quinque panibus et duobus piscibus

Rh (?)

St 64r (40)

Ein 68r (494)

Gb 28 15r (40)

Kr 78r (409)

Hb 84r (7.2)
46 Sicut fuit ionas (CAO 4934 Ter 4 1 Quad)

HK 448
(40)

Rh
(40)

St 550
(40)

Ein 574
(441)

G3 29-105
(40)

Kr 624
(40c)

H3 B27r
(7.2)

Sicut fuit ionas in ventre ceci tribus diebus et tribus nactibus i-ta

...
47 Tempus meum non dumi advenit (CAO 5131 Fer 3 Passione)

HK 169 (40)
Tempus meum non dumi advenit tempus autem vestrum semper est paratum

Rh (40)

St 67v (40)

Ein 73r (441)

G3 23-136v (40)

Kr 82r

Mg
Ubi duo vel tres

HK 158 (15)

Rh (?)

St 67v (40)

Ein 66v (49)

G 82 (12)

Kr 79v (4)

M 87v (7)

sum dicit dominus
49. Vade mulier semel tibi dixi (CAO 5302 Fer 5 Quad)

HK 164 a.m. (40)
Vade muli-er semel tibi dixi si credideris videbis milabilia

Rh (40)

St 55x (40)

Ein 57v (49)

Gd 106v (40)

Kr 69v (40)

Mb 843t (7.2)
50 A saeculo non est auditum (CAO 1194 Fer 4 4QuaD)

HK 163
(2eb)

Rh
(Ce?)

St 65r
(2e)

Ein 68v
(2D4)

G3 7191
(2eb)

Kr 75r
(2e)

M3 B103v
(72)

nati
nisi

sfilius
dei

x-ti

m-
Ipsi vero in vanum (ca 3408 Fer. 4 Maj)

HK 477
(C 40)

Rh
(1 ab)

SI 7356
(1 ab)

Ein 80v
(1 D 1)

Gb 1481
(1 ab)

Kr 877r
(1 ab)

Mdb 177
(7 2)

que

in inferi o ra terrae

...
Nesciat sinistra tua quia (ca 3876 Cinere)

HK 443 (40)

Nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextra tua

Rh (lab)

St 53r (lab)

Ein 53r (ADJ)

Gy 28-98r (la)

Kr 66r (1)
53 Sepulto domino signatum est (CAO 4868 Sabbato Sancto)

HK 225
(40b)

Rh
(0?)

St 80v
(1a)

Ein 80v
(4E1)

G3

Kr 93r
(4?)

H3
55 Ubi est thesaurus tuus ibi (CINO 5260 Cinerum)

HK 462
(40)
- / / / / / - / -
Ubi est thesa-urus tuus ibi est et cor tuum

Rh
(1a)
- / / / d - / - d -

St 53r
(1ab)
- / / / d - / - d d .

Ein 53r
(ADA)

G3 29-97v
(1ab)

Krat 66r
(1)

Mg -
Ego sum alpha et o
primus et novis-simus et stella matutina

ego clavis david alleluia
Et intravit cum illis (CAO 2708 Fer. 5 3 paschae)

HK 234 (3ic)
Et intravit cum illis et factum est dum recumberet cum illis acceptit panem et

Rh (3ic)

St 86r (3ic)

Ein 93v (3m1)

G3

Kr 96v (3ib)

M3 B294v (8-4)

benedictx ac fregit ac porti-gebet illis alle-luia

\[ ... \]

Et respicientes  (CAO 2718  Oct. Paschae)

HK 230
(8ω)
Et res-pi-ci-en-tes vi-de-runt verolatum lapidem erat quippe magnus valde alleluia

Rh
(8ω)

St 83r
(8ω)

Ein 90r
(891)

G(3) 30-4r
(8ω)

K(3) 94v
(8 )

M(3) 254r
(C:ω)

LA
(C 3 )
59 Istæ Sanctus pro lege (CAO 3435 De Sanctis TP)

HK 254
(8ω)
(8ω)
St 99ν
(?)
Ein 404ν
(341)
Gj 30-120
(36)
Kr 145ν
(8)
M3

Iste sanctus pro lege de-i su-i morti se tra-di-dit non dubitavit

allelu-ia allelu-ia
60 Malos male perdet (CAO 3687 Fer 6 2 Quad.)

HK 453 (8w)
Ma-los male perdet et vine-am suam locabit ali-is agricol-is

Rh (8w)

St 58 v (8w)

Ein 61 v (8G1)

G3 29-46 v (8w)

Kr 72 v (8)

H3 BAVV (3.)

qui reddant ei fructum tempo-ri-bus su-is

/ / - a - s - - - v. / d - -
/ p - p - / u / - / -
/ / - h - / v / / / /
61 Nemo te condemnavit mulier? (CAO 3873 D.4 Quad.)

HK 158 (3i)
Nemo te condemnavit mulier Nemo Domine Nec ego te condemnabo

Rh (8w)

St 62r (8w)

Ein 65r (844)

G 29-123r (8w)

Kr 76r (8)

My 385v (3.4)

jám amplius nóli pecca-re
Nemo tollit a me (CAO 3874 Fer 3 Mai)

HK 477 (5i)  
Ne-mo tollit a me anima meam sed ego pono eam et i-terum sumo eam

Rh (8w)  

St 72v (8w)  

Ein 77v (3a1)  

G3 29-447r (3i)  

Kr 86v (8w)  

M3 649r (3.1)
Nonne sic oportuit (CAO 3950 Fer 6 2 Paschae)

HK 234 (8vo)
Nonne sic oportuit pati Christum et intra-re in glori-am suam alle-lu-ia

Rh (8v)

St 84v (8v)

Ein 94v (8v)

G3 90-10r (3v)

Kr 96r (8)

M3-

LA 248 (3.1)
64 Pax vobis ego sum  (ca0 4254  D 3 paschae)

HK -

Rh
(86w)

Pax vo- bis ego sum nolite timere alle-lu ia

St 86v
(86w)

Ein 92v
(861)

Gr3 30-Hv
(3i)

Kr 97r
(8)

Hz -
65 Pater manifestavi nomen tuum (ca 4237 D. Ascensione)

HK 261
(6H)
Pater manifestavi nomen tuum homini bus quos dedisti mihi nunc autem proeis

Rh
(6H)

St 99r
(6H)

Ein 108v
(6H)

G3 30-22r
(6H)

Kr 449v
(6)

Mg C36r
(1)

Rogo non promundo quia ad te vado alleluia

\[ \ldots \]

\[ \ldots \]
66 Vade satanas non tentabis (CINO 5303 D.1 Quad)

HK 146
(61H)
Vade satha-na non tempta-bis dominus de-un tuum

Rh
(1aq)

St 55v
(1aq)

Ein 56r
(1G2)

Gb 29-104r
(1aq)

Kr 68v
(1aq)

Mg B20r
(1-1)

LA 499
(6)

sathana
sathanas
67 Caro mea requescet in spe (CAO 1775 Sabbato Santo)

HK 222
(C7c)
\[\text{HK 222 (C7c)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} \\
\text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} & \text{HK 222 (C7c)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Rh
(5v)
\[\text{Rh (5v)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} \\
\text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} & \text{Rh (5v)} \\
\end{array}
\]

St 79r
(5v)
\[\text{St 79r (5v)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} \\
\text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} & \text{St 79r (5v)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Ein 86v
(5M)
\[\text{Ein 86v (5M)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} \\
\text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} & \text{Ein 86v (5M)} \\
\end{array}
\]

G3 264r
(5V)
\[\text{G3 264r (5V)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} \\
\text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} & \text{G3 264r (5V)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Kr 94v
(7yd)
\[\text{Kr 94v (7yd)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} \\
\text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} & \text{Kr 94v (7yd)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Mg 224v
(5A)
\[\text{Mg 224v (5A)}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} \\
\text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} & \text{Mg 224v (5A)} \\
\end{array}
\]
68 Proprio filio suo (cho 4395 Parasceve)
69. Alias oves habeo (CIO 1320 Fer. 5 2 Paschae)

HK -

Rh (8w)
Ali-as oves habeo que non sunt ex hoc ovili et illas oportet me adduce-re et vocem meam

St 41v (6H)

Ein 97v (6F)

G3 30-10v (6H)

Kr 40iv (8)

Mg -

- audi-ent et fi et unum o-vi-le et unus pastor alleluia
70 Dominus Deum tuum adribis (CAO 2347 D.1 Quad)

HK 146 (8vo)
- e / / / - / - / - / - e / / / - / -
Dominum Deum tuum adorabris et illi soli servi-es

Rh
(6H)
- J / / / - / - / / J / / / - / -

St 55v (6H)

Ein 56r (842)

G 57-104r (6H)

Kr 68r (8vd)

Mg -
71 Ego sum pastor bonus (CAO 2596 D. 2 paschae)

HK 242
(8w)
(8w)

Ego sum pastor bonus alleluia quipasco oves meus alleluia

Rh
(8w)

St. 91v
(6H)

Ein 97r
(6H)

G 930-hv
(6H)

Kr 404v
(6)

Hc 18r
(6.4)
72. Jesum quem quaeritis non est (CAO 3483 D. Paschae)

HK 230
(8w)
Incipit quem queritis non est hic sed surrexit recordami mini qualiter locutus

Kh
(8w)

St 83v
(8w)

Ein 96v
(8Gr)

G3 -

Kr 95r
(8)

M3 291v
(6.1)

est vobis dum ad huc in gali-lea esset Alle-luia
cum

cum

Oc. 2. 2

zə sərdbo
Multa quidem et alia signa (cA03828 Oct Paschae)

Multa quidem et alia signa fecit iesus in conspectu discipulorum suorum alleluia

que non sunt scripta in libro hoc alleluia

[1] different hand

\[\text{Cithare}\]
74 Pastor bonus animam suam (CAO 4223 D. 2Paschae)

HK 242am.
(36)
Pastor bonus a-

animam suam ponit pro o-

vibus suis alle-lu-ia

Rh
(8am)
- u is / ...

Saint
(6H)
- u is / ...

Ein97v
(864)

O - vi bus

G0.45p
(6H)
O - vi bus

Kr10tv
(8)
O - vi bus

M216v
(64)
O - vi bus

L.A 233
(3)
O - vi bus
O vos omnes (ca 4095  Sabbato Sancto)

HK 225 (8wb)
Rt  
O vos omnes qui transi-tis pervi-am

Rh (8wb?)

ST gov (8wb)

Ein 88v (5A1)

G3 29-168v (8wb)

Kr 93r (8wb)

Mg B-239r (8.2)

si est do-lor
sicut do-lor me-us
Sicut novit me Pater

HK 243am (5ub)
Rh (5vb)
St 91V (5vb)
Ein 97v (6T4)
Gf 3015v (5ub)
Kr 401v (5)
My C47v (8.4)

pro o- vibus me-is alle-luia
Abraham pater vester (CAO 1210 D. Passione)

HK 467 (4a)

Rh (4a?)

St 67r (4a)

Ein 72r (204)

G 90-435r (79c)

K 81r (79c)

H 3 Bl 234 (2-1)

...vidit et ga-vi-sus est...
Coeperunt omnes turbae (CAO 1840 D. Palmis)

Ce-perunt omnes turbe descendent-i-um gauden-tes laudare deum voce magna super

om-ni-bus quas viderant virtutibi dicentes bene-dictus qui venit rec in
(78) Coeperunt omnes

HK
\textit{nomin-ne domi-ni pax de ce-li et glori-a in excelsis}

Rh
\textit{in terra}

St
\textit{in terra}

Ein

Kr
79 Deus meus eripe me (CAO 2174 Cena Domini)

HK 478
(2eb)

De-us me-us e-ripe me de manu peccatoris

Rh
(8wg)

St 73r
(8wb)

Ein 81r
(8c2)

G7 39
(8wg)

Kr 87v
(8wg)

M5 B180
(8.2)

LA 189
(8)

SA 215
(2.16)
Domine non habeo (CAO 2362  Fer. G 4 Quad.)

HK 449
(79d)

Rh
(4aq)

St 55x
(4aq)

Ein 581
(C701)

G3 29-106v
(1aq)

Kr 69v
(C799)

M3

muttat me in piscinam

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Domine non habeo} & \quad \text{hominem} \quad \text{ut cum mota} \quad \text{fu-erit} \quad \text{aqua} \\
\text{muttat me in piscinam} & \end{align*} \]
81 Omnes inimici mei (cæo 4126 Fer 4 Maj)

HK 477 (74b)
--- / / / / / - audi-erunt malum me-um Do-mine

Rh (lab)
--- / / / / / -

St 73r (74c)
--- / / / / / -

Ein 80v (74a)

G 29-44v (74c)

Kr 87r (74c)

Mg ? (7.2)
--- \- e - / / -
laeta-ti sunt quoni-am tu fecisti
--- / / - / / -
--- / / - / / -
8.2 Postquam surrexit dominus (CAO 4340 Cena Domini)

HK 484
(?) Postquam surrexit Domminus a coena misit aquam in pelvim coepit lavelre

Rh

St 76v
(?)

Ein -

Gj 29-19v
(?)

Kr 266v
(2e)

pedes discipulorum

hocs exemplum reliquit eis