

# Two Versions of the First-Mode Gradual *Sacerdotes eius* in the Manuscript: Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, II 3824

Jeffrey WASSON

DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois

**Abstract:** The manuscript Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 3824 is a chant manuscript in French notational style. It was written for Saint-Bénigne of Dijon. The writing of the gradual, *Sacerdotes eius*, twice in close placement to one another (folio 244r, 255 v) is to be regarded as unusual. It seems probable that the Brussels manuscript was copied from one or more exemplars. The important manuscript, Montpellier H 159 also originated in Dijon. There are several minor differences between the readings of *Sacerdotes eius* in the two manuscripts. The melodic versions are not identical. They are not organized in the same fashion. The appearance of two variant versions of *Sacerdotes eius* is tied to the copying process, either from one or more exemplars. The copying process was wedded to the process of faithful copying rather than critical editing.

**Keywords:** manuscripts Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 3824 and Montpellier H 159, gradual *Sacerdotes eius*

The manuscript housed in the Brussels, *Bibliothèque royale*, II 3824 is a chant manuscript in French notational style that originated in Dijon. It is:

A Gradual with sequences for the feasts, followed by a *Kyriale*, the antiphons for processions and an appendix of sequences; from the time of the 13th century. The manuscript was written for *Saint-Bénigne* of Dijon, [this is evident] because the arrangement (order) of the Sanctorale coincides in the smallest details with that of the Ordinary of Saint-Bénigne edited by [L.] Chomton ([in the] *History of the Church of Saint-Bénigne*, 1900, 419ss). The second strophe of the sequence for All Saints is in honor of Saint-Bénigne. The transcription [or writing] of the manuscript [dates] places it after the canonization of St. Francis [of Assisi] (1228) and before the Revelation of *Saint-Bénigne* (1288). The notation is written on four red lines.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Le Graduel Romain: Édition Critique par les Moines de Solesmes*, vol. II: *Les Sources*, p. 38. Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 3824 (Fétis 1173), DIJ<sub>2</sub>. Gradual avec séquences aux fêtes, suivi du Kyriale, des antennes de procession et d'un supplément de séquences; milieu du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le manuscrit a été écrit pour Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, car l'ordonnance du Sanctoral coïncide jusque dans les moindres détails avec

It must be noted that the extraordinarily important manuscript, Montpellier H 159 also originated in Dijon and is associated with the same church. In the *Le Graduel Romain* (on page 75) it is stated in the description of H 159 that "... the manuscript is identical to Brussels II 3824 (= DIJ 2)".<sup>2</sup> There is further expansion of this concept in Michel Huglo's 1956 article on Montpellier H 159 in *Annales Musicologiques*. Here, it is stated that: "The work of the neumatic classification of the manuscript of the Gregorian Gradual project at Solesmes after some years, it concluded ... that the tonery of Montpellier and the gradual of Brussels written at Saint-Bénigne are identical ..." This is based on 150 comparisons between the two manuscripts.<sup>3</sup>

Unfortunately, this statement is not completely accurate. If you consult the hand-out of the comparative versions, there are several minor differences between the readings of *Sacerdotes eius* in Montpellier H 159 and Brussels II 3824. Additionally, there are several more notable differences. I should like to demonstrate this with four reasonably significant discrepancies between the manuscript readings. A "significant discrepancy" has been defined as being a variant reading or omission of pitch between the reading in Montpellier H 159 and both readings in the Brussels manuscript. See the second page of the musical examples in the second brace/system at the syllable 'sul' of *exsultatione*

Here, there is a liquescent pitch 'g' in the Brussels manuscripts which is omitted in H 159

page 3, first brace/system at the syllable 'ta' of *exsultabunt*

In this instance there is an inclusion of a pitch in the reading in

---

celle de l'Ordinaire de Saint-Bénigne édité par Chomton (*Hist. De l'égl. de Saint-Bénigne*, 1900, 419ss). La 2<sup>e</sup> strophe de la séquence de la Toussaint est en l'honneur de S. Bénigne. La transcription du manuscrit se place après la canonisation de S. François (1228) et avant la *Revelatio* de S. Bénigne (1288). Notation carrée sur 4 lignes rouges. *Catalogue de la bibl. de F. J. Fétis ...no 1173*.

<sup>2</sup> "Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine H. 159, DIJ, Tonaire du Graduel, originaire de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon; XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Les pièces liturgiques sont classées par genres et par tons. Quant à la série des versets alléluïatiques, au choix des pièces et aux variantes mélodiques, le manuscrit est identique à Bruxelles II 3824 (= Dij 2). La notation est double: notation neumatique française et, au-dessous, notation alphabétique avec emploi de signes complémentaires."

<sup>3</sup> Dom Michel Huglo, "Le Tonaire de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon", *Annales Musicologiques*, vol. 4, (1956), 7–18. "Or, l'examen du choix et de l'ordonnance des pièces variables fournit le moyen de déceler l'usage liturgique qui a été suivi par le copiste et le notateur chargés de compléter et d'adapter le tonaire. L'usage liturgique qu'ils ont suivi est celui de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, tel qu'on le dans le graduel écrit et noté dans le célèbre monastère dijonnais entre 1228 et 1288 et tel qu'il trouve dans le graduel écrit et noté dans le célèbre monastère dijonnais entre 1228 et 1288 et tel est codifié dans l'Ordinaire de Saint-Bénigne au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Toutes ces additions déposent donc dans le même sens et prouvent bien que le manuscrit de Montpellier fut adapté – moins d'un demi-siècle après sa transcription – à l'usage de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon. Faut-il en conclure que le Tonaire y fut composé, transcrit et noté? Des travaux du classement neumatique des manuscrits du Graduel grégorien entrepris à Solesmes depuis quelques années, il résulte tout d'abord que le tonaire de Montpellier et le graduel de Bruxelles écrit à Saint-Bénigne sont identiques entre eux sur les cent cinquante cas étudiés et, en second lieu, que ces deux manuscrits forment un îlot dans le grand groupe des graduels de l'ouest de l'Europe: ils présentent toutefois des relations avec les manuscrits de Rouen, de Sens et avec les anglo-normands."

Brussels II 3824 (the repeated pitch ‘c’ in the version written on folio 244 recto; and the pitch ‘a’ in the versions written on folio 255 verso) which is not present in the Montpellier manuscript.

page 3, first brace/system at the syllable ‘bunt’ of *exsultabunt*

This observation concerns the fourth pitch following the previous observation. At this point Manuscript H 159 has the pitch b-flat while both readings in the Brussels codex have the pitch c.

page 3, second system/brace on the syllable ‘cor’ of the word *cornu*

In this place both Brussels Manuscript readings have the pitches ‘a – liquescent g’, while the Montpellier codex has neither pitch in its version.

I think that these four examples are sufficient to demonstrate that the melodic versions in the two manuscripts are not identical. While the manuscripts may have an interdependent relationship, I do not consider that they can be termed “identical”.

Not to belabor the issue, but there are additional obvious differences between the two manuscripts. First, they are not organized in the same fashion. H 159 is organized by chant type and tone or modal assignment. Although there was an attempt to add liturgical assignments to specific chants, at a date later than its creation, for further reference to this matter, Finn Egeland Hansen’s comments regarding this issue are informative.<sup>4</sup> In comparison, Brussels II 3824 is organized by fairly traditional means for use in services. Montpellier H 159 does not contain the multiple complete versions of *Sacerdotes eius* and the first mode gradual, *Ecce quam bonum* as does Brussels II 3824, and most evidently the Brussels manuscript was designed for liturgical use and it is not a tonary. Additional comments about the relationship between these two manuscripts will be found later in this article.

To expand upon the description of Bruxelles II 3824 given in the *Gradual Romain*, there is an outline of the contents of the manuscript in the appendix of

<sup>4</sup> The liturgical indications are found in the marginalia and have been collected into an “Index of Mass Cycles according to the marginalia” by Finn Egeland Hansen in his edition of the manuscript, *H 159 Montpellier: Tonary of St Bénigne of Dijon* (Copenhagen: Dan Fog Musikforlang, 1974), 532–537. In the “General Description of the Manuscript” (18), Hansen comments on the liturgical assignment question as follows: “A MS arranged like H 159 is unsuitable as a practical service book.... At one time, presumably in the latter half of the 11th century, an attempt was made to adapt it so that it could be used as a service book. The adaptation consists firstly in supplying each Introit (as far as f. 35r), with a list, in the margin of items of the Proper of the Mass together with the Introit in question constitutes a Mass and with an indication of the Psalm of the Introit. Secondly, the repertory is expanded, as a great number of the chants used in the liturgical year are lacking in the original repertory, which was compiled with the intention of exhibiting the theoretical aspect of Gregorian chant.... At any rate, the project was abandoned unfinished and the marginal indications of Mass cycles cease abruptly on fol. 35 in the middle of the *tritus authenticus* group.” Within these Mass Cycles, the ones containing first-mode graduals have been identified and compared to their normal liturgical assignments in the *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex*; most of these cycles align with the order of chants given for the specified feast in *Sextuplex*.

this article. This Gradual is organized in a fairly traditional manner with some of its own variants of liturgical order and logic. A few uncommon features include: numerous “sequences” which are titled *prosa* in the manuscript. These are included for virtually every Sunday and important feast day of the Temporale. The Sanctorale is ordered about Christmas as the central point. Hence, it commences with the Feast of St. Stephen (December 26th) and continues through the calendar year until the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (December 8th). Following the Sanctorale is a series of Masses for the Common of the Saints [beginning with *In dedicatione ecclesiae* (at the bottom of folio 223 recto) and concluding with *In nativitate uinus virginis* (on folio 265 recto)]. It is organized by categories, such as the Dedication of a Church or Feast of a Martyr. Each of these categories contains several Introits, Graduals, Alleluias, Prosas, Offertories, and Communion chants. The manuscript concludes with a Kyrie (folios 265 recto through 278 recto); processional chants (folios 278 verso through 282 recto); and a group of prosas (folio 282 verso through the end of the notated manuscript on folio 296 verso).

It is reasonably common to have certain chants appear more than once in a liturgical calendar. Typically, a goodly percentage of chants with multiple liturgical assignments, first appear in the important part of the liturgical year, i.e., from the first Sunday in Advent through Pentecost Sunday. Repeated employment of a specific chant may occur in the *ferias* of the season in question, an octave Sunday within the season, a Sunday or *feria* after Pentecost, on a saint's day, or being appointed to one of the Masses for the Common of the Saints. This statement has many exceptions and may be considered to be an over simplification of the complexity of liturgical assignment and reuse of proper chants. In the cases of the second or third incorporation of a chant for a separate liturgical observation, the full musical and verbal text of the chant normally is not written out. Rather, a musical and textual incipit of the chant is provided and is usually quite short. An example of this may be found on folio 16 recto of the manuscript where the incipit for the Introit *Puer natus est* followed by an incipit for the Gradual *Viderunt omnes*. At this point in the manuscript these chants are assigned to the Sunday within the Octave of Christmas but are drawn from the third Mass for Christmas Day. It is interesting to note that the first-mode gradual *Timete Dominum* is found, fully notated, in the Common of Saints on folio 241 recto. However, it appears prior to its musical entry, as an incipit cue in the Sanctorale on folio 215 recto, with a liturgical assignment for All Saints Day. Obviously, this tells us something about the carefully planned nature of the volume and may indicate something about the order in which the manuscript was copied.

It is within this commonly practiced context of notating reincorporation of specific chants that the appearance of the gradual, *Sacerdotes eius*, twice in close placement to one another is to be regarded as unusual. A possible explanation for this may be that each of the categories within the larger grouping of Common of Saints has completely texted and notated chants. However, this is not the case. A cursory perusing of the section encompassing chants of the Common of the Saints does not appear to have repetitions. [However, there is another unusual situation where there is the appearance of two fully written-out versions of the first-mode gradual *Ecce quam bonum*. The first reading is on folios 159 verso–160 recto in the Temporale and the second appearance of the chant is on folios 242 recto and verso in the Common of Saints.]

The first recording of the first-mode gradual *Sacerdotes eius* is on folio 244 recto and it is the last entry of ten other graduals grouped together for this category of Common of Saints.<sup>5</sup> The second appearance of the chant is on folio 255 verso and is found on the same leaf as another the first-mode gradual *Os justi*.

Upon the first comparison of these two readings, the differences do not seem to be of dramatic importance. Most could be explained away and dismissed quite easily. The types of variations that are found include:

- the pitch ‘b’ in one reading and the pitch b-flat in the other
- the addition of a repeated pitch in one of the versions (this is the most commontype of pitch variation)
- the employment of a liquescent neume in one reading and the same pitch notated with a non-liquescent (or normal) notation in the other
- step or half-step difference in pitch between readings
- a pitch difference that is the interval of a third between readings
- the omission of a “passing note” pitch in one of the versions
- the omission of the final cadential formula in the version of folio 255 verso
- differences in ligature usage for the same notational passages between the two readings.

If one were comparing readings in different manuscripts, even with in the same notational family, these fairly minor differences would not cause a much notice. However, the case is substantially different when the two versions are within several folios of one another in the same manuscript and written in what is obviously the same notational handwriting. This raises many questions.

<sup>5</sup> See the Appendix of this article for a more complete listing of the contents of this portion of the manuscript.

Additionally, it confirms that notational recording can be variable, even within the same manuscript, copied by the same scribe.

Entering the realm of conjecture, educated speculation, and logical reconstruction is part and parcel of historical research in the Middle Ages and chant studies in particular. In this particular case it is based upon knowledge of numerous readings of a modal genre of chants (i.e., first-mode graduals) in many manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> The recent literature about oral and written transmission is substantial. It is an elaborate subject and overly lengthy to recount in the present context. I refer you to writings by Leo Treitler, Helmut Huckle, Peter Jeffrey, Kenneth Levy, and Theodore Karp (selected examples of their writings on this subject may be found in the Bibliography of this article).

By the time of the copying of this manuscript (between 1228 and 1288) we are probably dealing with written transmission rather than oral transmission. While oral transmission cannot be completely dismissed as a possibility, it seems unlikely that a scribe would have sung the same chant to himself, in a slightly different variation, within a few folios of each other. Slight variations in pitch and other minor differences simply occur in almost all oral traditions. They exist today in the world around us, in all types of music from church melodies to jazz tunes and popular melodies. This could easily explain the differences between the two written accounts of *Sacerdotes eius* in the Brussels manuscript. However, it is doubtful that it happened at the time of the writing of the manuscript. It may have happened at some earlier time.

This indicates that the differences appear to be in the realm of the written transmission process. There is literature about the earliest periods of music writing, specifically by Leo Treitler and Kenneth J. Levy. Additionally, there is a written and cinematographic account of the working of a monastic scriptorium. Nevertheless, relatively little information about how the scribes practiced their art and their work has been substantiated.

What we know is that most of the information is not of a direct nature, rather, it is inferred from study of the manuscripts. After studying a number of manuscripts, it becomes evident that there was some sort of division of labor. It is fairly obvious that the physical preparation of the vellum was a series of steps probably performed by different individuals. But this division of labor goes into the planning and writing or copying of the book. In some instances the rubrics and decorative work were the providence of one craftsman; the writing of the verbal text was done by a separate scribe; the staff lines may have been done by the rubricator or another persons; and the notation was

<sup>6</sup> See the writer's dissertation: "Gregorian Graduals of the First Mode: An Analytical Study and Critical Edition", iii (v), 1440 pages (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1987).



done by yet another scribe. “While manuscripts pictures show scribes writing whole codices, the usual practice was to write one gathering at a time ...”<sup>7</sup> Other observations of a concrete nature are made in the literature. These include: “... each scriptorium had a distinctive style of writing, illumination, binding, etc., manuscripts or manuscript styles may be identified by the name of the scriptorium or the center where the scriptorium was located.”<sup>8</sup>

Preparation of the manuscript for writing and possibly for pictures followed certain definite steps ... Work was divided by ability and skills, although often enough one monk might act as scribe, proof reader and illuminator, as well as binder and librarian.<sup>9</sup>

- In the case of the Brussels manuscript, there are several observations, which may be made:
- the manuscript was planned in detail prior to its copying
- the majority of the verbal and musical texts seem to have been done by one scribe
- the rubricator or illuminator may have been a different individual
- the scribe seems to know well his subject matter, particularly that of the verbal texts of the Propers and their “correct” liturgical assignments
- the scribe who wrote out the notation was musically literate and very accurate.
- the relationship between Brussels II 3824 and Montpellier H 159 is a complex one. As Michel Huglo has pointed out, there are numerous points of agreement between the two documents.

With these observations in mind, it seems probable that the Brussels manuscript was copied from one or more exemplars. The reason for the repetition of *Ecce quam bonum* might be attributed to one of several reasons. Since they are a goodly distance from each other in the manuscript (folios 159 verso–160 recto vs folio 242 recto) it is possible that the repetition was an oversight. Or it could be that various sections of the manuscript were copied from different exemplars. However, in the case of *Sacerdotes eius*, it appears that the scribe was following an exemplar, which had the same arrangement for the section of the manuscript devoted to the Common of Saints. That is the appearance of two variant versions of *Sacerdotes eius* is tied to the copying process, either from one or more exemplars. Logical conjecture, would suggest that the

<sup>7</sup> A. C. Rigg (writer), *The Making of a Manuscript*, video recording, produced by the Centre for Medieval Studies (Toronto: Media Centre, University of Toronto, 1974), from 13:15 to 13:34 minutes.

<sup>8</sup> Bill Katz, *Dahl's History of the Book*, 3rd English ed. (Metuchen, NJ. and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1995), 87.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.

Brussels manuscript was copied from either sources of unknown date and origin or a lost or undiscovered exemplar that dated between the 11th century creation of Montpellier H 159 and the mid-13th century copying of Brussels II 3824. As musically literate as one may conjecture the scribe to have been, it seems that the copying process was wedded to the process of faithful copying rather than critical editing. Describing the pressures under which scribes practiced their craft, Marc Drogin writes: "...the threat of disapproval or punishment hung over him, because his work would be proofread by the elders (even perhaps the abbot). To make an error was to commit a sin, for an error made and uncorrected would be copied again and again as other borrowed the book."<sup>10</sup> If the scribe copying the Brussels manuscript was under the kind of scrutiny described, he may have copied exactly from his exemplar or exemplars, rather than draw attention to a redundant appearance of the same chant with variant musical content.

<sup>10</sup> Drogin, Marc, *Anathema! Medieval Scribes and the History of Book Curses* (Totowa, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun and Co. Publishers, Inc. and Montclair, NJ., Abner Schram Ltd., 1983), 12 and 14.



## APPENDIX

## Organization of BRUSSELS: Royal Library, [Manuscript] II 3824

Folio numbers	Contents
1 recto – 163 verso	<b>Propers of the Temporale</b> The First Sunday of Advent through The Twenty- fourth Sunday after Pentecost and concludes with the sequence <i>Veni Sancti Spiritus</i> (which begins on folio 162 recto)
164 recto–223 recto	<b>Propers of the Sanctorale</b> December 26th, Feast of St. Stephen and continues through the calendar year until the Feast of the Immaculate Conception (December 8th)
223 recto–265 recto	<b>The Common of Saints</b> For the Dedication of a Church ( <i>In dedicatione ecclesiae</i> ) through Masses for the Birth (Nativity) of a Virgin ( <i>In nativitate uinus virginis</i> ). Each of these categories of Masses for the Common of Saints contains several Introits, Graduals, Alleluias, Prosas, Offertories, and Communion chants
265 recto–278 recto	<b>Kyriale</b> Encompassing chants for the Ordinary of the Mass arranged by chant type and includes Kyries, Glorias Sancti, and Agnus Dei (no Credos are included)
278 recto–282 recto	<b>Processional Chants</b>
283 verso–296 verso	<b>Prosas [Sequences]</b> include added observations such as Rogation
297 recto	<b>Final page</b> written, no notation

## Chants from the Common of Saints:

[*pluriimorum Martyrum – extra tempus Paschale*]

Type of Proper Chant	Mode	“Title”	Folio Number
Introit	4	Intret in conspectu	238r
	3	Sancti tui, Domine	238v
	2	Clamaverunt iusti	238v
	3	Ecce oculi Domini	239r
	1	Sapientiam sanctorum	239r
	1	Salus autem iustorum	239v
	2	Multae tribulationes iustorum	239v
	7	Judicant sancti gentes	240r
	3	Loquetur Dominus pacem	240r
	1	Laudate pueri	240r
	2	Sacerdotes eius	240v
	3	Timete Dominum	240v
	1	Timete Dominum	241r
	1	Gloriosus Deus	241r
Gradual	7	Clamaverunt iusti	241v
		Confitebuntur caeli	242r
	1	<b>Ecce quam bonum</b> (with two verses)	<b>242r</b>

	2	Exsultabunt sancti	242v
	5	Vindica, Domine,	243r
	5	Iustorum animae	243r
	5	Anima nostra	243v
	<b>1</b>	<b>Sacerdotes eius</b>	<b>244r</b>
Alleluias	1	Verse: Mirabilis Dominus	244r
	2	Verse: Sancti tui ... benedicent te	244r
	8	Verse: Sancti tui ... floreunt	244r
		Verse: Stabunt iusti in magna	244r

**Chants from the Common of Saints:**

*In natale unius confessoris*

Type of Proper Chant	Mode	"Title"	Folio Number
Introit	3	Sacerdotes tui Domine	253r
	6	Os iusti meditabitur	253r
	1	Statuit ei Dominus	253v
	6	Sacerdotes dei benedicite	253v
	6	In medio Ecclesiae	253v
Gradual	5	Ecce sacerdos magnus	254r
	4	Domine praevenisti eum	254r
	1	Inveni David	254v
	3	Juravit Dominus	255r
	<b>1</b>	<b>Sacerdotes eius</b>	<b>255v</b>
	1	Os iusti	255v
Alleluia	2	Verse: Inveni David	256r
	4	Verse: Amavit eum Dominus	256r
	2	Verse: Disposui testamentum	256r

*Sacerdotes eius*

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montpellier MS H159

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montpellier MS H169

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

Graduale  
Romanum  
1974

Montpellier  
MS H169

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 244r

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 255v

Graduale  
Romanum  
1974

Montpellier  
MS H169

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 244r

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 255v

[ta-] -ti et san- cti e-

ius ex- sul- ti- o- ne ex- sul-

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montipellier MS H169

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montipellier MS H169

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

ta- bunt. y il- luc pro- du- [du-] cam cor- nu Da- vid

The image displays a musical score for a liturgical text, likely a Gradual, from the Roman Rite. The score is presented in eight staves, each corresponding to a specific manuscript or edition. The lyrics are: pau- ra- vi lu- cer- nam. The notation is in a single system, with the lyrics placed below the staves. The staves are numbered 1 through 8. The first staff is labeled 'Graduale Romanum 1974'. The second staff is labeled 'Montpellier MS H169'. The third staff is labeled 'Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r'. The fourth staff is labeled 'Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v'. The fifth staff is labeled 'Graduale Romanum 1974'. The sixth staff is labeled 'Montpellier MS H169'. The seventh staff is labeled 'Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r'. The eighth staff is labeled 'Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v'. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals, and is organized into measures by vertical bar lines.

Graduale  
Romanum  
1974

Montpellier  
MS H169

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 244r

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 255v

Graduale  
Romanum  
1974

Montpellier  
MS H169

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 244r

Bruxelles  
Bibl. Royale II 3824  
f. 255v

pau- ra- vi lu- cer- nam

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montpellier MS H169

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

Graduale Romanum 1974

Montpellier MS H169

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 244r

Bruxelles Bibl. Royale II 3824 f. 255v

[nam]

Chri-

-sto me-



## Bibliography

AVRIN, Leila

*Scribes, Script and Books: The Book Arts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Chicago: American Library Association, and London: The British Library, 1991) pp. 205–229.

*Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de F. J. Fétis acquise par l'État Belge [Bibliothèque royale de Belgique]* Merzbach and Falk, eds. (Bruxelles: Librairie Européenne C. Muquardt, 1887) [Leipzig: Même Maison, 1887; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1887], No. 1173, p. 133.

CHOMTON, L.

*Histoire d'église Saint-Bénigne de Dijon* (Dijon: 1900), p. 419.

DROGIN, Marc

*Anathema! Medieval Scribes and the History of Book Curses* (Totowa, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun and Co. Publishers, Inc. and Montclair, NJ. Abner Schram Ltd., 1983).

ECO, Umberto

*The Name of the Rose* (fiction), William Weaver, trans. (San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1980).

HANSEN, Finn Egeland, (ed.)

*H 159 Montpellier: Tonary of St Bénigne of Dijon* (Copenhagen: Dan Fog Musikforlang, 1974), pp. 532–537.

HUCKE, Helmut

"Toward a New Historical View of Gregorian Chant". *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, vol. XXXIII, pp. 437–467.

HUGLO, Dom Michel

"Le Tonaire de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon", *Annales Musicologiques*, vol. 4 (1956), pp. 7–18.

JEFFERY, Peter

*Re-Envisioning Past Musical Cultures: Ethnomusicology in the Study of Gregorian Chant* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

KARP, Theodore

*Aspects of Orality and Formularity in Gregorian Chant* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1998).

KATZ, Bill

*Dahl's History of the Book*, 3rd English ed. (Metuchen, NJ. and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1995).

*Le Graduel Romain: Édition critique par les Moines de Solesmes* (Solesmes: Abbaye Saint-Pierre, 1957–), 2 parts published: part II: *Les sources*, (1957) p. 38 and p. 75.

LEVY, Kenneth J.

"On Gregorian Orality", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XLIII, (1990), pp. 185–227.

LEVY, Kenneth J.

"On the Origin of Neumes", *Early Music History*, vol. vii (1987), pp. 59–90.

RIGG, A. C. (writer), *The Making of a Manuscript*, video recording, produced by the Centre for Medieval Studies (Toronto: Media Centre, University of Toronto, 1974).

TREITLER, Leo

“The Early History of Music Writing in the West”. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, vol. XXXV, pp. 237–279.

TREITLER, Leo

“‘Centonate’ Chant: *Übles Flickwerk* or *E pluribus unus?*”, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XXVIII (1975), 1–23.

TREITLER, Leo

“Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant”, *Musical Quarterly*, vol. 60, pp. 333–372.

TREITLER, Leo

“Oral, Written, and Literate Process in the Transmission of Medieval Music”, *Speculum*, vol. 56, pp. 471–491.

TREITLER, Leo

“The ‘Unwritten’ and ‘Written Transmission’ of Medieval Chant and the Start-Up of Musical Notation”, *Journal of Musicology*, vol. x (1992), pp. 131–191.

WASSON, Jeffrey

“Gregorian Graduals of the First Mode: An Analytical Study and Critical Edition”, iii (v), 1440 pages (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1987).