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Since 2014, Nijmegen University Library has had the loan of what was left of the historical library of the canonesses regular of the convent of Soeterbeeck in Deursen (the Netherlands) when the last remaining sisters left for a nursing home for elderly religious in 1997. These books—45 late medieval manuscripts, 33 loose manuscript fragments and about 600 early printed books and post-medieval manuscripts—are known as the Soeterbeeck Collection, and for the past decade they have been the subject of extensive study at Radboud University Nijmegen.

This book focuses on Arnoldus Beckers, a canon regular of the Windesheim convent of Gaesdonck, near Goch (Germany), who was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1772 to 1810. It studies the traces he left in the sisters’ books and contextualises these with the help of archival sources. The goal is not merely to understand the meaning that the books he made and used had for him, but to grasp the motivations for all of his activities of which there is still evidence.

Each of the four fields in which Beckers is known to have been active—the liturgy, the library, administration and historiography—was of central importance to him as rector. In the context of an age that was becoming increasingly hostile towards traditional expressions of religion, his work can be seen as an attempt at preserving, within the walls of Soeterbeeck, something of the spirit of the Congregation of Windesheim.
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List of Abbreviations

The following lists only include abbreviations that are used throughout the entire study. Those whose use is restricted to Tables 3.1, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7 are explained in the introductions to these tables.

1. General Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used for the titles of texts and journals and with reference to libraries and archives:

AAS  Acta Apostolicae Sedis
ACRW  Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim
ASP  Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Soeterbeeck Priory
BHIC  Brabants Historisch Informatie Centrum
CAG  Goch, Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck
DT  Duae tabellae ex superioribus rubricis excerptae (addendum to RGB; I refer to the first table (on occurring feasts) and the second (on concurring feasts) as DT I and DT II respectively, and to the list giving the ranks of feasts as DT)
ENK  Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven
JRL  Manchester, John Rylands Library
LCSA  Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Library Convent Sint Aegten
NUL  Nijmegen University Library
RGB  Rubricae generales breviarii
RHCE  Eindhoven, Regionaal Historisch Centrum Eindhoven
RHCL  Maastricht, Regionaal Historisch Centrum Limburg
RL  Royal Library
UL  University Library

2. Abbreviations Used for Liturgical Texts and Chants

In tables, and occasionally also in the main text, the function of liturgical texts and chants is described by means of a string of abbreviations. These are as follows:

1Mar  one martyr
1Vir  one virgin
2Mar  several martyrs
2Vir  several virgins
A  antiphon
Adv  Advent
ApEv  apostle(s) and/or evangelist
Asc  Ascension of the Lord
AT  Ascensiontide (from the Ascension of the Lord to Pentecost)
Aug  August
B  Benedictus antiphon
BV  Blessed Virgin
C(#)  Compline
CC  Corpus Christi
Col  collect
Com(#)  commemoration antiphon
Conf  confessor
ConfBis  bishop-confessor
Ded  dedication of a church
Doc  Doctor of the Church
Eas  Easter
Ep  Epiphany of the Lord (6 January)
ET  Eastertide (from Easter Sunday to the Ascension of the Lord)
F(#)  feria(s)
In addition to these abbreviations, the names of saints are used, in abbreviated form, to refer to their feasts, e.g. AugustineHippo for the feast of Augustine of Hippo (28 August).

The abbreviations are stringed together to go from the general to the specific. For example:

- Asc.OS.V.P1: the first psalm antiphon at either Vespers of the Sunday within the octave of the Ascension of the Lord
- InventionCross.V2.Com.MonicaHippo: the commemoration antiphon for the feast of Monica of Hippo at second Vespers of the feast of the Invention of the Cross
Note on Shelf Marks

As is explained in the introduction,¹ the shelf marks of volumes in the Soeterbeeck Collection at Nijmegen University Library are:

III #
IV #
V #
Mater #
Fr. #
Add. #

Books with shelf marks of these types are only explicitly said to be part of the collection when there is danger of confusion.

In order not to clutter the text, the place and library where volumes outside the Soeterbeeck Collection are kept are only mentioned when their shelf mark is referred to for the first time in each chapter. Exceptions are made for volumes that are only rarely referred to and for Brussels, Royal Library, IV 1064, whose location is always given to avoid confusion with books from the Soeterbeeck Collection whose shelf marks also begin with IV.

When a book is part of a composite, this is indicated either according to the practice of the institution where the volume is preserved (such as the addition of dl # in the shelf marks of Utrecht University Library), or else by a colon followed by an arabic numeral: e.g., Düsseldorf, University and State Library, DGV 888:2.

Some books do not number all of their pages or folia consecutively, but restart at the beginning of certain sections. In those cases where this practice may lead to confusion as to which part is meant—most often because more than one division uses arabic numerals, instead of alternating between arabic and roman numerals—I indicate which of these sections I refer to by a comma and an arabic numeral, e.g. IV 58, 2 for the proper of saints in IV 58.

¹ See p. 1.
Editorial Conventions

In quotations from manuscript sources, capitalisation has been entirely modernised. Abbreviations have been silently expanded, except for &c., names of months, currencies, terms of address such as weleerw. (for weleerwaerden), and the various forms of St. (for Sint) and Sr. (for Suster). Punctuation has been very slightly standardised in a few instances to avoid confusion. Periods are omitted after entries in lists but added at the end of paragraphs, and those used simply to set off numerals, dates or expanded abbreviations have been omitted, except when the numbers identify entries in lists. Parentheses with deviant forms such as :/ and {: and } are transcribed simply as ( and ). T as an abbreviation for het is given as ’t, even in contractions, s’Hertogenboschs as ’s Hertogenboschs, et cetera. The use of i and j has been modernised. Many sources use y, i j and dotless ij interchangeably. In these cases ij is used, except in case of the name of Sister Aloysia Verkleij, whose name is spelt with a y throughout Van Dijk 1982a, on which I based the spelling of the names of sisters, rectors and boarders of Soeterbeecks. When i is used for l in numerals it is transcribed as a l. The use of u, v and w has been modernised. Authorial corrections have been silently incorporated. Errors, whether orthographical or factual, are not corrected or identified, unless they obscure the sense, in which case they are either accompanied by an explanatory note or discussed in the main text. Uncertain readings are in brackets, and editorial additions are in square brackets.

Printed sources are quoted exactly as printed.
Note on the Text

During a significant part of the period when I was writing this thesis on Rector Arnoldus Beckers, I was also working with Hans Kienhorst on a forthcoming book on the historical library of Soeterbeeck in general. In addition to a catalogue, a list of previous owners and a generous selection of pictures, this volume will also contain a study on various aspects of the collection. The fact that I worked on my thesis and this additional book simultaneously meant that it was impossible, and indeed undesirable, to prevent them from cross-pollinating each other. Although every word of the study that follows is my own and I accept full responsibility for everything in it, some parts could only have been written because of my collaboration with Kienhorst. In the capacity of one of my supervisors, he helped shape many aspects of my thesis, but in the introduction and Chapter 1, on the archaeological approach, and in Chapter 5, on Soeterbeeck’s library, the particular influence of our co-authorship makes itself felt. The form in which I am able to present the archaeology of a book collection is the result mainly of countless conversations between Kienhorst and myself. In addition, the second paragraph of the introduction and the second paragraph of the fifth chapter are heavily based on preliminary versions of sections in our mutual book, which have only been adapted to match the different context in which they appear here. It should go without saying that these acknowledgements, which I am obliged to make for the sake of integrity and gratitude, are not intended in any way to belittle the indispensable help which my other two supervisors, Johan Oosterman and Daniela Müller, provided by advising me and diligently reading and commenting on my work.¹

¹ Cf. the Acknowledgements (p. 319).
Figure A: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 63, front board
Introduction: In the Hands of Arnoldus Beckers

1. The Soeterbeeck Collection
In the autumn of 2010 I was one of a small group of students at Radboud University Nijmegen who attended a course taught by Hans Kienhorst on the old books of the convent of Soeterbeeck in Deursen (the Netherlands). During one of his lectures, our instructor showed us a picture of the binding of an early printed book, drawing our attention to the conspicuous marks that appeared on each of the boards (Figures A and 8).1 These were places where the black paint that had been applied to the leather that covered the cardboard had worn off as a result of the frequent handling of the volume by its erstwhile owner, a certain Arnoldus Beckers who had helpfully written his name on the title page (Figure 5). We were told, partly though not entirely in jest, that picking up this book would be like putting one’s hands in his even today, centuries after the man has died. By making this observation, Kienhorst unwittingly provided a very fitting description of the purpose of this thesis, as I hope to explain hereafter.

This study is chiefly concerned with the before-mentioned books of the canonesses regular of Soeterbeeck. The majority of those that survive are currently on long-term loan at Nijmegen University Library, where they make up the Soeterbeeck Collection. This consists of 45 late medieval manuscripts, 33 loose manuscript fragments, and around six hundred other volumes, most of which, besides several post-medieval manuscripts, are early printed books from the fifteenth to the twentieth century.2 The manuscripts are almost exclusively in Latin and liturgical in nature, whereas the printed books are mostly in Dutch and of a devotional character, although there are also a fair number of liturgical volumes among them. From a refurbishment of the conventual library room in 1958 to Soeterbeeck’s closure in 1997, the bulk of the collection was kept in three bookcases numbered III to V, and the shelf marks of most volumes reflect this distribution. Where the fragments (Fr.) were stored, is not clear.3 Of the remaining 32 books and documents, thirteen were kept in the prioress’ room and therefore have a shelf mark beginning with the word Mater,4 and the others either had anomalous signatures that do not disclose their location or none at all, and are therefore designated as Add. 1-19.

The single most defining characteristic of the Soeterbeeck Collection is the fact that almost all of its books show traces of intensive use. These range from ownership notes and textual additions or alterations to material wear and attempts at restoration or reuse. Indeed, so prevalent are these features, that it is no exaggeration to say that it is impossible to consider many books in the collection without also taking into account what happened to them after they had been written or printed. The state of the manuscripts, in particular, forces one to recognise that these are not simply old books, produced somewhere in the past and happily surviving to the present day, but objects with a history of their own that is deserving of study.

1 The book in question was IV 63, a copy of the edition of the Windesheim Officia propria sanctorum ordinis printed in Maastricht by Jacobus Lekens in 1753. For more information on this volume, see p. 241.
2 A complete catalogue of the Soeterbeeck Collection, largely compiled by Eefje Roodenburg, will be published as part of a study that is currently in preparation by Hans Kienhorst and myself. Catalogues of the manuscripts and many of the manuscript fragments were published by Kienhorst in 2005, 2006 (2006a; 2006b) and 2009.
3 The fragments’ current shelf marks, used in this book, differ from those in Kienhorst 2009. A full concordance between the two will be part of the forthcoming catalogue of the Soeterbeeck Collection. It should be mentioned here that the fragments of breviaries from the library of Soeterbeeck of which Kienhorst 2009, 92 says that they were donated to Nijmegen University Library by the Dutch province of the Dominican Order in 2006 were immediately incorporated into the Soeterbeeck Collection, where they are currently Fr. 33:1-3. Curator Robert Arpots informs me that the university library was of the opinion that these fragments should return to their original context (personal communication with the author, 25 August 2016).
4 Literally ‘mother’, for ‘prioress’.
Time and use have not only wrought their changes in each individual volume, but also in the Soeterbeeck Collection as a whole. A clear understanding of this was perhaps the most important result of research as it began to be carried out on these books at Radboud University Nijmegen in the first decade of the twenty-first century, especially by Kienhorst in preparation for the exhibitions *Rijksdom in eenvoud* (2005-2006) and *Verbruikt verleden* (2009-2010), and by Johan Oosterman. Before I go on to explain the consequences of this realisation and how it eventually led to this study, I will demonstrate its validity by providing a brief description of the interconnected histories of Soeterbeeck and its library, which simultaneously provides some helpful context for the chapters that follow.

First, however, I must take away all possibility of confusion by defining a key term that I just used. It must be distinctly understood that when this study speaks of a ‘library’, it refers to a collection of books, not to any specific place where these may have been stored. The ‘library of Soeterbeeck’, then, is not a room, but consists of all books that were in the convent, either at a particular moment in time or cumulatively during its entire existence, both those that were communal property and those that were in private possession. The term excludes all archival documents, even those that happen to have the shape of a codex. It is synonymous, in other words, with the conventual book collection.

A subcategory that is highly useful for this particular study is that of the ‘historical library’, by which I mean a collection of old books. The adjective, in other words, refers to the age of the individual components, not to that of the whole. The latter option would be meaningless with reference to Soeterbeeck, whose entire library has belonged to history ever since the convent was closed in 1997. It survives only in part. By far its most substantial remnant is the Soeterbeeck Collection, but the two cannot be equated, for some books are also preserved elsewhere, whereas others are lost. What is more, the collection also includes various notebooks and documents, particularly among the books of the prioress, that would be more at home in the conventual archives and cannot be said to have been part of the library as it has just been defined. The latter does not subsist integrally or in isolation, and in its diachronic development never truly existed anywhere at any one time, except as a concept.

Most books that survive from Soeterbeeck predate 1900, and therefore were once part of its historical library, often for a considerable amount of time. This is the reason why the entirety of those volumes that currently survive from the convent is so reflective of its history, as I go on to argue now.

2. A Brief History of Soeterbeeck and its Library

The convent of Soeterbeeck had its origin in a small community of Sisters of the Common Life that had been founded in 1448 by Henricus Sanders, the parish priest of Nederwetten. In 1454, John of Heinsberg, prince-bishop of Liège, granted these women permission to adopt the Rule of Augustine. Some years later, in 1462, the canonesses regular moved from...

---

1 The fruits of the preparation of the two exhibitions were published in Kienhorst et al. 2005 and in Kienhorst 2009.

2 Oosterman 2011.

3 On the private possession of books at Soeterbeeck, see pp. 235-237.

4 On the grey area between the archives and the library occupied by Beckers’ works of history, see pp. 267-268.

5 An overview of all known books from Soeterbeeck outside the Soeterbeeck Collection will appear in the forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.

6 Sanders was born in Someren around 1409 and studied in Cologne and Louvain. He was parish priest of Someren from 1431 onwards, and of Nederwetten from 1436 to 1469 (Bijsterveld 1993, app. 5, 354, no. 3492*). Two daughters of his, Jenneke and Geertruid, were among Soeterbeeck’s first sisters (Frenken 1931/32, 176).

7 The historical information in this paragraph is taken from publications by Soeterbeeck’s principal historians, Frenken 1931/32 and Peijnenburg 1982a; 1982b. A more detailed description of the interconnectedness of the history of Soeterbeeck and that of its library will be provided in the forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.

8 On John of Heinsberg, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 94-95, no. 81.
Figure B: *Christian Sgrooten*, Nobilissimus Brabantiae ducatus, qui Mosa et Schaldi fluminibus orbiculariter fere circumscribitur et includitur, 1573 *(Brussels, Royal Library, Ms. 21.596 D, f. 24r, no. 13, detail)*. © Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België
their first dwelling place to Nuenen, where they were enclosed on 30 August 1467. In 1485 the sisters joined the Chapter of Venlo, which had originally been established thirty years earlier to accommodate four other women’s convents in the Liégeois diocese. It provided an institutional context for female communities who wished to live in the spirit of the Chapter (and later the Congregation) of Windesheim, but were prevented from joining it because Pope Eugene IV had forbidden it to adopt any more women’s convents in 1436.¹

During the first decades of its existence as a proper convent, Soeterbeeck must have been in dire need of books, both for the liturgical services that were the most important part of the canonesses’ life, and for devotional reading and study. The sisters’ demand for books was probably at least partially met by the canons regular of the Windesheim convent of Mariën hage in Woensel, who from 1454 onwards provided Soeterbeeck with rectors for nearly three centuries.² Many of the fifteenth-century liturgical manuscripts from the library of Soeterbeeck are tentatively attributed to the scriptorium of Mariën hage. In addition, there are also four printed books from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century whose ownership notes reveal that they were first owned by canons regular from this convent before they came to Soeterbeeck.³ It is certain, therefore, that books were transported from Mariën hage to Soeterbeeck until the former was suppressed in the eighteenth century, and the rectors were probably instrumental in this.

Throughout Soeterbeeck’s history, external circumstances affected its library. On 20 March 1539 the convent suffered a fire, which is reported not only to have destroyed parts of the buildings but also some of the sisters’ breviaries.⁴ And this was only the first of many calamities to befall the sisters during the sixteenth century. In 1543 the convent was sacked by the Guelderian field marshal Maarten van Rossum, and in 1583 and 1587 the sisters had to flee to Helmond to escape marauding troops of the Dutch States’ army. It is likely that the regional troubles and the Eighty Years’ War (1568-1648) caused many books to be lost.

The convent did not only lose books, however. There is evidence that sisters of Soeterbeeck were copying manuscripts in the sixteenth century.⁵ Around 1600 the convent probably also acquired significant numbers of new books from other places as a result of the closure and amalgamation of many women’s convents in the region. Several, predominantly liturgical, books from the library of Soeterbeeck are believed to have been among the property that seven sisters of the convent of Sint-Annenborch in ’s-Hertogenbosch took with them when they moved to Nuenen in 1613. The production or provenance of these books is associated with other convents of the Chapter of Venlo, such as that of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage in Helmond.⁶ This community had first merged with that of Sint-Annenborch in

¹ The four founding convents of the Chapter of Venlo were its titular member Mariaweide in Venlo, Sint-Agnes in Maaseik, Mariagaa rde in Roermond and Sint-Geertruid in ’s-Hertogenbosch. For more information on the chapter, see Frenken 1931/32, 180-184; Van Dijk 1986, 591-608.
² On the convent of Mariën hage, see Weiler and Geirnaert 1980.
³ On some of the manuscripts attributed to Mariën hage, see pp. 57-60. The printed books are III 12, owned by Rector Joannes Verheijden (1705-1744) when he still lived in Woensel (cf. Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 1); III 97, owned by Rector Joannes van Bredael before he became rector in 1680 (cf. Sloots 1943, 102, no. 18); and IV 42 and IV 67, owned respectively by Wilhel mus Aaspers and by Gerardus Nelissen, whose connections with Soeterbeeck, if any ever existed, are not known. Aaspers was procurator of Mariën hage in 1754 and still in 1761; organist, teacher and subprior in 1786, and the latter still in 1798 (Sloots 1949, 63, 73, 269, 275-276, 278, 331, 407). Nelissen was born on 17 July 1670, invested at Mariën hage on 28 May 1691, professed on 1 June 1692 and ordained to the priesthood on 18 September 1694. He is known to have been procurator in 1701 and subprior at a later date (IV 67, front pastedown; Sloots 1948, 247, 269, 275).
⁶ On the books that are thought to be from Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage, see Van den Berg 2012, 72 n. 16. She is currently writing a PhD thesis on the scribal activities of this convent. An overview of the other manuscripts
1543, after its convent house had been destroyed to prevent occupancy by the troops of Van Rossum. In 1572, the sisters of Sint-Annentroon in Kerkdriel had also joined Sint-Annenborch, and this convent, founded in Rosmalen, had been forced to take refuge in ’s-Hertogenbosch the next year. It fell apart some forty years later, in 1613, when its home—formerly a beghards’ convent—was reassigned to a Jesuit community.\(^1\) Seven of the remaining sisters agreed to continue their religious life at Soeterbeeck, and apparently took some books with them.

The Peace of Münster in 1648 ushered in the last period of the ‘old’ convent of Soeterbeeck. The Protestant authorities of the Dutch Republic forced the community to die out by refusing admission to any more novices. The sisters succeeded in surviving this adversity and other anti-Catholic measures for many decades, and they even received at least two of the remaining sisters of the neighbouring convent of Hooidonk, near Nederwetten, when this ceased to exist in 1650. One of these, Catharina van Pollaert, probably brought along her books.\(^2\) In 1732, however, Soeterbeeck was finally summoned to leave its age-old dwelling place. That year, the sisters settled on Den Bongaert, a rural estate near Deursen in the independent Land of Ravenstein, where Catholic worship was not impeded because it was not part of the Dutch Republic but ruled by the Count Palatine of Neuburg.\(^3\)

At the end of the eighteenth century, Soeterbeeck repeatedly offered hospitality to priests who had fled the French Republic after having refused to swear an oath of fidelity to the post-revolutionary government. Some of these refugees may have taken books with them that ended up in the sisters’ library.\(^4\) Soeterbeeck itself was closed and its possessions confiscated by the Napoleonic government on 3 January 1812. This date marked the beginning of an extended period of great difficulties, during the first years of which the sisters were scattered to the winds and mostly lived with their families. They returned to their convent in 1813-1814, but continued to live in great poverty and were not permitted to take in new novices until this ban was lifted by King William II in 1840.

Despite these troubles, a remarkable number of printed books from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries survive from Soeterbeeck’s library. It should be noted, however, that the precise moment and manner of acquisition by the convent of many of these is entirely unclear. Among those books whose provenance is known, there are quite a few that belonged to lay boarders who lived at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,\(^5\) but most came from all over the place. Two books, for instance, were first owned by Guilielmus Moraeus, priest of the Teutonic Order,\(^6\) who gave them to Sister Clara van den Bogaert in

---

1 On the complicated history of the home of the Jesuit college in ’s-Hertogenbosch, see Hensen 1921/22.
2 Van Pollaert died circa 1724. The sister who had come with her to Soeterbeeck was Anna Vaeck (Frenken 1931/32, 209). Her ownership note appears in III 75, III 79 and V 64. On the history of Hooidonk, see Frenken 1948/49.
3 Van der Ree-Scholtens 1993, 79-80. On the political history of the Land of Ravenstein from the twelfth century to the present day, see ibid., 29-36, 55-58, 76-80, 240-248.
4 This possibility is discussed, though tentatively discarded, on p. 195 with reference to the printed Roman Missal IV 24, whose binding bears the name of Pierre de Werchin, seneschal of Hainaut, and his motto: Je maintiendrai.
5 On the boarders who lived at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Sluijters 1982a, 122-128. For a list of books from the library of Soeterbeeck that bear ownership notes of some of these ladies, see p. 229 n. 2.
6 Moraeus was rector of the chapel of Our Lady of Handel from 1606 to probably 1648, and parish priest of Bakel in 1652 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 183; 4: 23).
1661 and 1665 respectively.1 There are also at least three books with ownership marks referring to the Carmelite sisters of Boxtmeer,2 one that came from the Bridgettine monastery of Mariënhoek in Kalkar,3 and another from the convent of St Francis in Cincinnati, OH.4 The examples could be multiplied almost endlessly, and taking everything into consideration, we cannot but come to the conclusion that the library of Soeterbeeck did not develop linearly, but was rather a hodgepodge of books from many different origins.

The last two centuries of the convent’s existence in Deursen witnessed two important changes in the sisters’ attitude towards their old books. Until the eighteenth century, these had either been used, or, if their contents had for some reason ceased to be of interest, reused to bind or repair other volumes.5 During the rectorate of Christianus van Gerwen (1871-1875, 1875-1909),6 however, a period of estrangement set in, which seems mainly to have affected the late medieval manuscripts. An unknown number of them, apparently no longer in active use, were either given away or sold to generate income in financially meagre times.7 The turning point of these activities probably occurred in the first half of the twentieth century, when the value of these books as witnesses to Soeterbeeck’s history became more and more apparent as scholars began visiting the convent to study its historical book collection.8 Damaged manuscripts, often no more than incomplete carcasses, were amateurishly repaired, reassembled and rebound by means of cardboard packaging.9 Some of these books have white labels pasted on their front cardboards, bearing a shelf mark in black ink.10 This would seem to mean that, when these manuscripts were rebound, they were stored in a proper conventual library room, or intended to be shortly afterwards. The existence of such a space is confirmed by the presence of discoloured labels of woody paper on the spines of several manuscripts which have not been stripped of their bindings. Some of these labels are blank, but four of them have shelf marks belonging to the same series as the ones on the cardboard bindings.11 Indeed, the same woody labels are also present on the majority of the printed books, and they appear to have been applied circa 1950.12

In 1954, the convent of Mariëndaal in Sint-Oedenrode merged with Soeterbeeck, and these sisters once again brought along a large number of old books, including some manuscripts.13 Four years later, the manuscripts and early printed books of both communities were given pride of place amidst the more recent books in the community’s renovated library

---

1 Van den Bogaert was born in Gemert, and is known to have been a choir sister at Soeterbeeck by 1635. In 1645 she was procuratrix, which she probably remained until her death on 7 May 1693 (Frenken 1931/32, 297). The books she was given by Moraeus are IV 26 and V 50.
2 III 130, III 188 and V 210.
3 V 28.
4 Add. 11.
5 For an example of the reuse of a medieval manuscript in the eighteenth century, see p. 197.
6 Van Gerwen was born in Liempde on 20 December 1825. He served as rector of Soeterbeeck from 30 May 1871 until 31 March 1875, and again from 30 September of that year until his death on 9 February 1909 (Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 11).
7 For examples of manuscripts sold or given away during Van Gerwen’s rectorate, see p. 94.
9 On this type of binding, see Schrijen 2005.
10 IV 87 has Hs. 2, IV 94 has Hs. 8, IV 90 has Hs. 12 and IV 89 has Hs. 13.
11 IV 50 has no. 7, III 240 has no. 9, IV 58 has no. 11 and IV 78 has no. 14. These numbers belong to a series of at least fourteen shelf marks, which correspond to anonymous manuscript descriptions on loose sheets that are kept in a green notebook entitled Boeken voor 1800 chronologis genummerd. Schriften uitgaven Tijdschriften (ASP 545).
12 A survey and a discussion of these labels of woody paper and their shelf marks will appear in the forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.
13 An overview of all books known to be from Mariëndaal on the basis of ownership notes will appear in the forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.
room. They were stored practically and aesthetically according to size and type of binding in three adjacent cases, numbered III, IV and V, apart from the modern books but in the centre of the room, where they were no longer in active use but reminded the community of its past (Figures C-D). As noted before, the new shelf marks, which appear on white labels with blue borders at the tail of the spines in combination with a year of printing when applicable, reflect this distribution.

The final stage of the history of Soeterbeeck’s library began in 1997, when the convent was closed and the remaining sisters moved to Sint Jozefoord, a nursing home for elderly religious in Nuland. The modern books were either taken along, sold or given away, and the ownership of the old ones eventually passed to the Stichting Kunspatrimonium Soeterbeeck. In 2004, the late medieval manuscripts and manuscript fragments, and in 2011 also the early printed books and post-medieval manuscripts, were transported from Deursen to Nijmegen University Library, which has officially had the Soeterbeeck Collection on long-term loan since 2014. These events marked the definitive development of books that had already passed from active use to reuse and resale to being part of a monastic remembrance culture, into a museological collection that is the subject of studies such as this one.

3. An Archaeological Approach
The description of the history of the convent of Soeterbeeck and its library in the previous paragraph will have made the interconnectedness of the two abundantly clear. The presence, for instance, of books from Mariënhage is due to the fact that, for many centuries, this convent provided Soeterbeeck with rectors, whereas most of the volumes from Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage will have come to Soeterbeeck with the seven sisters of Sint-Annenborch in 1613. Links like these only go to emphasise that the remains of Soeterbeeck’s library cannot be understood without taking into account the circumstances surrounding its development. The same is obviously true for any collection of books, so this is not in itself a noteworthy conclusion. However, when the specific ways in which Soeterbeeck’s library was shaped by its history began to emerge during Kienhorst and Oosterman’s research five to ten years ago, these results, in combination with the notable prominence in many of the surviving books of various kinds of traces of use, led to a fundamental rethinking of the way in which this historical collection should be studied. It became clear that an approach would need to be developed that could do justice to the continuous state of motion both of Soeterbeeck’s library as a whole and of the individual volumes that made it up, and to the context by which the motion was determined. The result was an archaeology of a book collection.

The mention of archaeology with reference to old books will immediately bring to mind the archaeological method as proposed by Léon Delaissé in his famous article ‘Towards a History of the Medieval Book’. His main point was that medieval manuscripts should be understood as artefacts, that is, in their entirety as physical objects. Rather than simply mining them for information on, for example, script or illumination, book historians should take into consideration all aspects of these books, including what happened to them after their initial production had been completed. The same integrated approach can, and has been, profitably applied to historical book collections, in the sense that there have been several studies which consider them as unified objects with a proper history. Most library scholars, however, seem to be primarily concerned with reconstructing earlier phases of collections that have been

1 On the renovation of the library room in 1958, see pp. 227-228.
2 Van Dijk 2000, 56.
4 Delaissé 1976, 78-82.
5 A prominent example of a study which explicitly takes an integrated approach to historical libraries is The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, edited by Peter Hoare (2006).
Figure C: The library of Soeterbeeck, 1958 (from Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, no. 1508). © Martien Coppens / Nederlands Fotomuseum

Figure D: Sisters in the library of Soeterbeeck, ca. 1975 (from Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, no. 1523)
partially or completely lost.\textsuperscript{1} Although Jennifer Summit describes the study of libraries as ‘historical artifacts’ as being long-established, she also points out that the implications of this practice have not yet been thought through sufficiently.\textsuperscript{2} The term ‘artefact’ refers to an archaeological concept which, along with the word ‘archaeology’ itself, is applied with casual ease in library studies. However, the only example that I know of the application of actual archaeological theory in the field is the scholarship of Scott Nicholson,\textsuperscript{3} who writes on digital rather than physical libraries and therefore addresses very different realities than those with which we are concerned here.

Similarly, although traces of the use of books have received much attention, no general and theoretically founded approach to their study has yet been put forward, to my knowledge. This is not to say, of course, that no conceptual frameworks exist that could be appropriated. The most obvious candidate would probably be Gérard Genette’s theory of paratexts, which are defined by him as the elements—textual, iconic, material or factual—that form the threshold between a text and its audience.\textsuperscript{4} Because no author or publisher has anything to do with them, traces of use such as readerly marginalia are beyond the boundaries of the classical definition of what paratexts are,\textsuperscript{5} but the latter can be expanded to include them. After all, once added to a book, such notes do become part of the threshold between that particular copy of a text and all of its future readers, whoever may have been responsible for them. However, this solution only throws into relief a more fundamental problem, which is that, on a conceptual level, paratexts refer to a text, whereas traces of use refer to a physical object, a book. Genette has not taken into consideration the other uses to which a book can be put in addition to reading, such as cutting it to pieces for the restoration of another volume. This definitely leaves its traces, but these are not paratexts by any stretch of the imagination. The conclusion must be that Genette’s concept is not broad enough for the study of the use of books—let alone that of an entire library.

Equally inadequate are the typologies of traces of use that are presented in most studies on the use of books.\textsuperscript{6} These tend to focus heavily, if not exclusively, on written traces of reading, which is insufficient for our present purpose. Not only may books bear many material traces of other uses than reading, their contents may also be such that they were never meant to be read in the conventional sense of the word, as is the case with liturgical volumes. Such books do not display the usual types of annotation, and their traces of use do not fit the current typologies.

In the absence, then, of a ready-made model or alternative, the archaeological way of thinking about Soeterbeeck’s book collection that originated in the first decade of the twenty-first century was developed into a full-fledged approach to historical libraries based on archaeological theory.\textsuperscript{7} This archaeology of a book collection is discussed in full in the

\textsuperscript{1} An emphasis on reconstruction is apparent, for instance, from editions of historical library catalogues, such as the \textit{Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues}, published by the British Academy and the British Library (Sharpe 1990-present), and Albert Derolez’s \textit{Corpus catalogorum Belgii} (1966-2011).

\textsuperscript{2} Summit 2008, 5.

\textsuperscript{3} Nicholson 2005a; 2005b advocates the application of the principles of post-processual archaeology to digital library studies—a curious parallel to the approach described and applied in this book.

\textsuperscript{4} Genette 1997, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{5} On the responsibility of the (putative) author and the publisher as an essential element of paratexts, see Genette 1997, 8-9, 337.

\textsuperscript{6} Examples of important English-language studies on traces of use are Jackson’s \textit{Marginalia} (2001), a general history of readers writing in books, the various contributions to Myers, Harris and Mandelbrote’s \textit{Owners, Annotators and the Signs of Reading} (2005) and Sherman’s \textit{Used Books} (2008), on traces of reading in books from Elizabethan England.

\textsuperscript{7} Earlier descriptions of an archaeology of a book collection have been provided by Pointers 2010a; 2013a; 2013b and Oosterman 2011, but these are all more or less incomplete and outdated by now.
following chapter, but in order for me to be able to introduce the purpose, contents and development of this book, I must briefly address some of its basic premises here as well.

As already explained, the archaeological approach had its origin in the necessity of finding a way to deal with the history of Soeterbeeck’s library and the state of its books. It has a twofold theoretical foundation in the concept of stratigraphy and the principles of interpretive archaeology. The former is, of course, the study of layering, which can be applied to books because these can be said to be stratified in a metaphorical sense. At the lowest level are their production layers, which are made up of the various phases of their initial creation, such as the arrangement of the lay-out, the writing or printing, and the decoration. On top of this historical core, new layers are added every time a given book is used, and many of these strata are visible through the material traces that these instances of use often leave, even inadvertently or unconsciously. The large numbers of traces of use contained in the books that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck almost thrust this stratigraphical way of thinking upon anyone studying even a single volume, but the specific circumstances surrounding the history of these objects mean that it is particularly helpful with reference to the collection as a whole. It contains several groups of books that have been produced in the same scriptorium, and many volumes have been used and preserved together for a long time—some even for centuries. This means that some elements of these books cannot be properly understood when they are considered in isolation. Often, layers of production and use extend beyond the boundaries of individual volumes to cover a larger part of the collection, for example when the hand of one scribe, or the same textual change, appears in more than one book. Instances like these offer glimpses of the stratification of the collection as a whole, turning Soeterbeeck’s entire library not so much into an artefact as into an archaeological site of which the books are cross-sections. This conception, which arose unavoidably out of the need to be able to grasp and describe both the current state and the development of Soeterbeeck’s book collection, provided the original impetus for the development of an archaeological approach to historical libraries.

Although the application of stratigraphy to both individual books and an entire book collection provided a helpful way of thinking and writing about the library of Soeterbeeck, this metaphorical use of an archaeological concept still needed to be theoretically embedded before it could be applied in practice. Because it had become evident that the study of Soeterbeeck’s history was able to provide answers to many questions surrounding the current state of the remnants of its library, recourse was had to a movement in archaeological thinking that puts great emphasis on contextualisation. This was interpretive archaeology, championed since the 1970s by the Stanford archaeologist Ian Hodder. Put simply, it argues that material culture should be considered in its various contexts in order for its meanings to be understood. The hermeneutical focus of this type of archaeology makes it particularly suitable for adoption in the context of the humanities, and for application to the study of the production and use of books. With reference to the library of Soeterbeeck, it provides the framework within which it is possible to study groups of traces of production and use—referred to as stratigraphic units—in the contexts of the lives and times of the people who left them, and thereby to arrive at an understanding of the meanings that the books in which these traces appear had for their producers and users.

4. Development and Plan of this Book

Having described the way in which the initial exploration of the historical library of Soeterbeeck at Radboud University Nijmegen resulted in the development of a full-blown archaeological approach to book collections, I now turn to how it led to the present study.

---

1 Hodder’s most comprehensive statement of interpretive archaeology occurs in his Reading the Past, whose third edition he co-revised with Scott Hutson in 2003.
Over the course of this discussion, I will introduce not only the topic of this book, but also the main questions it seeks to address and the way in which it is set up.

In 2010, when I was introduced to the library of Soeterbeeck in the before-mentioned course by Kienhorst, the archaeology of a book collection as briefly presented was quickly developing. The concept of stratigraphy was firmly in place, and although the details had not yet been fully worked out, it was already apparent that it could be applied in various ways. Within the limits of the course it was only practicable to study the stratification of individual volumes, but opportunities for research on a larger scale also presented itself. Some of these consisted of studying the layering of identifiable groups of books within the library, such as the Latin books of hours. More general topics like these would enable a scholar to trace the temporal development of the meaning attached to particular genres. Another possibility, however, was to focus on one particular layer, and to isolate it within the entire collection. One way of doing this would be to identify all traces of production and use left by a particular person, and to interpret this stratigraphic unit for what it reveals about the meanings that this individual attributed to the various types of books in which it appears.

Within the library of Soeterbeeck, the best opportunity for taking the latter course is undoubtedly provided by the traces left by Arnoldus Beckers, a canon regular of the Windesheim convent of Gaesdonck, near Goch, who was rector of Soeterbeeck from 19 June 1772 until his death on 23 July 1810. Various kinds of notes in his distinctive hand appear in very many, different volumes, both manuscript and printed, and he also wrote some books himself. His traces in the late medieval antiphonaries had already been noticed as being worthy of study by Rudolf van Dijk, Soeterbeeck’s final pastor. Other published references, particularly to Beckers’ historical writings, which had been an important source of information for Johannes Acquoy’s seminal work on the convent and the Congregation of Windesheim, inspired confidence that it would be possible to find out enough about Beckers’ personal biography and motivations, and about the convent in his days, to enable the interpretation of his traces. For these reasons, when I was invited by Kienhorst and Oosterman to apply for funding for a PhD position, there was no doubt which stratigraphic unit the proposed research should be about.

Various grant applications were written, and it was at this stage that the archaeological approach began to take its final shape by the embedding of the concept of stratigraphy as applied to book collections in the theoretical framework of interpretive archaeology. This is why, when I began working on this thesis, the main question I sought to answer was not simply what it was that Beckers had done with the books from the library of Soeterbeeck that bear his traces of production and use. Rather, I wanted to know what his stratigraphic unit reveals about the significance which these books had had for him and the meaning that he had attached to his interaction with them. Obviously, the straightforward functional meaning of his books and notes—the practical side of what he sought to accomplish by writing and leaving them—would provide a large part of the answer, but I also wished to try to go beyond this to find out what his traces signified on a symbolic level, for instance with reference to the way in which he perceived his position as rector.

In order to achieve this, I began to do three things. First and most urgently of all, I worked out the archaeological approach in even more detail than my supervisors and I had

1 Cf. Poirters 2010a and 2010b for the results of my study of the layering of IV 72, a fifteenth-century manuscript with a Middle Dutch translation of Jordan of Quedlinburg’s *Opus postillarum et sermonum de tempore*.

2 On Gaesdonck, see Hövelmann 1977.

3 Van Dijk 2000, 68. See also Van Dijk 2005, 14 (cf. 2012, 229).

4 Cf. Acquoy 1984, 2: 6 n. 1, 22 n. 4, 221-222, 227-228. He makes continuous use of Beckers’ works throughout vol. 3 of the same book. For other references to the rector’s historical texts, see p. 265.
done with an eye to the grants. The resulting description of an archaeology of a book collection was the first version of Chapter 1, and it provided the theoretical and methodological basis for my thesis. Based on the dual foundation of stratigraphy and interpretive archaeology, my second priority was to outline Beckers’ stratigraphic unit by taking stock of all his traces within the Soeterbeeck Collection. The third step I took was to begin studying his personal biography, in order to be able to provide the necessary context for my interpretation of what he had done with the books. My findings in these two directions are at the heart of what are currently Chapters 3 to 5 and 8, respectively.

It did not take long, however, until my stock-taking and contextualisation got out of hand. The material that I was studying led me further and further afield from Beckers’ traces in the Soeterbeeck Collection. One way in which this happened was that, when tracing some of the books that had been alienated from the sisters’ historical library by having been sold or given away before 1997, it turned out that there were many that contained notes by the rector. Thankfully, the unavoidable decision to include these in my investigations could be accounted for very easily on a methodological level by determining that they had all belonged to Soeterbeeck’s book collection at some point in time. This means that, even though Beckers’ stratigraphic unit extends beyond the limits of the Soeterbeeck Collection, all of his traces are nonetheless part of the library of Soeterbeeck when the latter is considered diachronically, which was what stratigraphy invited me to do.

The most important ways in which the scope of my research gradually broadened, however, were all related to context. I quickly found out that, although there were ownership notes of sisters in Beckers’ hand that I had not known about beforehand, his traces of production and use appeared most extensively in liturgical books. In order, therefore, to be able to properly assess most of what the rector had been trying to do, it was necessary for me to know what Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice had been like in his days. My investigations in this direction led me far beyond the temporal limits of Beckers’ rectorate and resulted in a description of the convent’s entire liturgical history, from 1448 to 1997, in Chapter 2.

Another contextual area whose exploration entirely escalated was Beckers’ biography. My attempts to find out as much as possible about the rector’s life uncovered much more information than I had expected. In particular, there was an interesting and uncommonly well-documented episode in Beckers’ first years as rector of Soeterbeeck, discussed at length in Appendix E, which added nothing concrete to my understanding of his use of Soeterbeeck’s books or the significance of those which he wrote himself, but which I studied carefully for the light which it shed on his character and motivations. For the same reason, I also considered his notes in various archival sources, and of course the works of history for which he is best known. I quickly became aware that the administrative and historiographical activities underlying these writings must have been just as important for Beckers as, if not more so than, those whose traces appear in books from Soeterbeeck’s library. I therefore decided that I could not relegate them to the contextual Chapter 8, but needed to treat them on the same level as the rector’s ownership notes and liturgical work. They are therefore discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Over the course of implementing these expansions, it gradually became clear that I was actually writing a very different book than I had originally thought. My research question had changed as well and become much broader and simpler. Setting out, I had wanted to know what Beckers’ traces of production and use in certain books from the library of Soeterbeeck could tell me about the meaning that these objects had had for him as material culture. Now, I was merely asking what I could find out about what the rector had been doing and what had motivated him to do these things. Beckers’ person had become much more central to the book, and the contextual chapter on his life had transformed into its conclusion.
As it is, then, this thesis seeks to answer the question what Arnoldus Beckers’ writings and traces of use in books both within and without the Soeterbeeck Collection reveal about his activities as rector of Soeterbeeck from 1772 to 1810, and what his motivations were for undertaking these. The first chapter describes the archaeological approach that I used in this study, and simultaneously introduces Rector Beckers and Soeterbeeck as it was in his days. It is followed in Chapter 2 by a review of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history, which is intended to provide the necessary context for the discussion of Beckers’ renovation of Soeterbeeck’s books for the divine office in Chapter 3 and of his other liturgical works in Chapter 4. A glossary of the many liturgical terms that are used in these chapters is provided at the back of the book. Chapters 5 to 7 discuss the rector’s other areas of interest, which are the management of Soeterbeeck’s library, the conventual administration and historiography respectively. Finally, Chapter 8 briefly interprets Beckers’ activities in the context of his life, to arrive at an elementary understanding of why he did what he did that goes beyond the merely practical side of things.

The study in this book is accompanied by a volume of appendices and tables. Appendices A and B contain biographical information on the community members of Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate (1772-1810) and those of Gaesdonck in 1774-1775. These were the years of so-called Coninx Affair, a reconstruction of which is presented in Appendix E as a supplement to the more summary account in Chapter 8. Appendix C provides a reconstruction of the liturgical calendar of Soeterbeeck on the basis of the proper of saints of a diurnal in Dutch written by Rector Beckers.1 The next one, D, consists of complete transcriptions of both versions of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck. The tables, finally, have no independent value and are intended merely to support the text of this study. Their contents are referred to where necessary.

5. The Approach Assessed

Having briefly indicated what the contents of this book are and how it has grown out of ongoing research into the library of Soeterbeeck at Radboud University Nijmegen and subsequently developed according to its own dynamic, I am acutely aware that some reflection is also in order. If I am allowed the impertinence of beginning by expressing my hope for what this book may achieve by studying the activities of Rector Beckers, I would say that it is twofold. First, I have tried to evoke something of life as it was lived in a Dutch convent of canonesses regular at the turn of the eighteenth century, and thereby to draw attention to and shed light on a number of relatively underdiscussed topics, in particular the no man’s land of the liturgy between the Council of Trent and the reforms of the twentieth century. Second, I hope that my presentation and application of the archaeology of a book collection enunciates and demonstrates some theoretical truths about the study of old books and historical libraries. This statement, I realise, needs an explanation, and rather than providing this in an additional theoretical conclusion, or interrupting the narrative flow of the main chapters by attaching it to the end of the first chapter, I present it here, in the form of an assessment of my archaeological approach. Hopefully this also anticipates some of the questions that may be raised by the study that follows, and answers some of those that have perhaps already been evoked by this introduction.

Before going on to assess the archaeology of a book collection, I should reiterate that the books that survive from Soeterbeeck practically compel one to adopt this approach. The many traces of use almost automatically make one think stratigraphically, and the most straightforward way of understanding them is by contextualisation. This means that, although there are some aspects of the approach that require further comment, its basic outline fits the
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1 On this diurnal, see pp. 110-127.
material like a glove and is therefore beyond discussion. The potential danger that an approach that is tailor-made for a particular collection may not be usable elsewhere is not present here. It is true that there are few historical collections that are simultaneously of the right size and age, and whose books are accessible enough and display sufficient interconnected traces of use from throughout the centuries to allow for a one-to-one application. However, the concepts of stratigraphy and hermeneutics are useful in almost every circumstance. What is more, some of the insights they provide into the remains of the library of Soeterbeeck may also help to shed light on aspects of other book collections that survive less fully.

The usefulness of the archaeological approach for research into Soeterbeeck’s library is beyond doubt. There were numerous instances where it indisputably helped me reach a certain conclusion. Its emphasis on the unity of the collection, which forced me not to limit my investigations to the books in which Beckers appears by studying these in isolation, and the importance of contextualisation, were particularly influential in this regard. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this. First, and most straightforwardly, I was looking for administrative notes by Beckers in Soeterbeeck’s archives when I encountered a charter among the certificates of authenticity of the convent’s relics that mentioned the bones of some of Ursula’s virgin companions. The presence of these noteworthy remains at Soeterbeeck provided a much-needed explanation for the mysteriously high rank that the feast of Ursula and her companions is given in a manuscript breviary that Beckers compiled. A second example of the efficacy of the archaeological approach is provided by the way in which I reached the important conclusion that Beckers was not the first to work on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical manuscripts, but that notes similar to his were already being made in them a century earlier. Of course, I had already noticed that these books contained traces of use in various other hands than Beckers’, but in the absence of any conclusive evidence I had always just assumed that these were more or less contemporary to his and had been left by cooperators. The breakthrough came when I was studying IV 77, a sixteenth-century manuscript for Vespers in which no notes by Beckers appear, but which was relevant to me because it contains several chants which are also present in IV 55, a book of liturgical chants that the rector had compiled. Leaping through the first-mentioned book, I came across a prayer against the plague that had been added on an empty page in a hand which can be identified as that of the seventeenth-century sister Anna Hovelmans on the basis of ownership notes with her name in several printed books in the Soeterbeeck Collection. The hand was already very familiar to me, but it was only when I encountered it for the umpteenth time in the context of a liturgical volume that I recognised it as one of those which also appeared in the choir books on which Beckers worked. This realisation allowed me to redate the beginning of the revision of Soeterbeeck’s books of chant by a hundred years, which in turn forced me to completely rethink the nature of Beckers’ work on these manuscripts.

My intention in presenting these two examples is not to argue that the conclusions which they represent could not have been reached in any other way, or without the specific direction of the archaeological approach. Contextualisation is, after all, one of the most common of scholarly procedures, the conventual relics are a logical place to look for an explanation for the unusually high rank of a particular feast, and I might eventually also have made the Hovelmans connection in another way. But all of this is beside the point, which is

1 ASP 250, certificate of authenticity 12 February 1589.
2 IV 58, 2: p. 136. On the feast of Ursula and her companions, and its rank at Soeterbeeck, see p. 250. On manuscript IV 58, see pp. 110-127.
3 On IV 77, see pp. 162, 166. On IV 55, see pp. 208-212.
4 The prayer appears on IV 77, ff. 183v-184r. On the reasons for attributing the hand in which it is written to Sister Hovelmans, see pp. 162-167. On Hovelmans herself, see p. 162.
simply that I applied the archaeological approach and that it was of help to me. If this study is found to have any value at all, that constitutes sufficient justification for the way in which it was carried out.

Still, this conclusion raises the important question whether the application of archaeological theory to old books does not merely describe, in archaeological terms, what book historians have always been doing anyway. Does it not all, in practice, simply come down to the careful study, description and contextualisation of whatever aspects of books a scholar is interested in? Perhaps, but this is not quite the whole truth.¹ The approach’s constituents, of course, are not new—stratigraphy and hermeneutics are as old as scholarship itself, and the methodological centrality of contextualisation has its literary-theoretical analogue in Stephen Greenblatt’s New Historicism,² for instance. What is new, however, is the unified, explicit and consistent adaptation and application of these elements to historical book collections. The archaeological approach is like a newly-shaped lens through which to study old books and historical libraries. The fact alone that it provides a full-fledged and unified theoretical basis for the understanding of historical book collections means that the approach is not all stale news. Because the way in which we approach our sources always influences how we understand them, it will ultimately lead to different kinds of results than other approaches. The issue at hand, then, is to determine in what ways my application of an archaeological approach resulted in a different book than I would otherwise have written, and whether these idiosyncrasies are acceptable or not.

The most important area in which the archaeological approach was clearly influential is the very nature of this study. Traditionally, my investigation of Beckers’ traces would probably have resulted in a monograph on the history of the liturgy at Soeterbeeck as representative of that of the Congregation of Windesheim, or else in a biography of Beckers as an example of a rector of a women’s convent in the Netherlands at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. These hypothetical studies would have been valuable, but this book, though it contains elements of both, has actually become something very different. It is a tour of various aspects of Beckers’ life and works as rector of Soeterbeeck. In his own person he provides the unity among the many different topics that are addressed, and is in fact the raison d’être of the entire book. Ultimately, I simply want to understand Beckers, and even this relatively modest goal turns out to be more than enough for a lengthy thesis. I certainly hope that my findings may prove to be useful for the study of other convents and rectors, but any true comparison with them is beyond the scope of this book and indeed impossible without an equally thorough study of a comparable case, and I have not attempted it.

Besides influencing the nature of the book, the archaeological approach also shaped its structure. The set-up of this thesis regularly puts the reader’s patience to the test, because the order of the chapters is somewhat unusual, with Beckers’ biography only given at the very end instead of at the beginning. Also, the length at which certain topics are discussed is not particularly well-balanced. Digressions and particularly technical or detailed sections are printed in a slightly smaller size so that the reader who is so inclined may easily save them for another occasion, but elsewhere, too, the amount of evidence provided for an argument may occasionally be felt to be a little extravagant. None of these imperfections are entirely due to the author’s laziness or editorial incompetence, however. Rather, they are the side effects of a conscious and indeed fundamental choice that is motivated by the hermeneutical nature of the approach itself. I will address this issue and its ramifications in greater detail in the following chapter,³ but for now it will be enough to remind the reader that the process of interpretation.

¹ A similar accusation was countered in a comparable way by Hodder 1995, 238.
³ Cf. pp. 42, 47.
is not only driven by the material under consideration, but necessarily also greatly influenced by the interpreter’s background and personal choices. This phenomenon need not be problematic if it is properly acknowledged and if the interpretation is diligently checked against each part and the whole of the evidence. For this reason, Ian Hodder went so far as to have those who participated in one of his excavations of the Neolithic proto-city Çatalhöyük, in present-day Turkey, keep diaries of their research, in order to record what he refers to as their hermeneutic spiral.1 This book does not quite go to this extremity, but it does take the duty to provide insight in my interpretive journey, and to report on the choices I made during it, very seriously. This is why this introduction has paid so much attention to the origins and development of this thesis. In fact, this entire book is largely structured to reflect my research process, from the choice for the archaeological approach, to the outlining of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the library of Soeterbeeck and a discussion of his writings outside of it, to their contextual interpretation. In essence, the following chapters simply tell the story of where my material has led me. This is not the route anyone else need have taken, and it is certainly not the shortest, but it was mine, and I have no other to present.

Perhaps the reader is not convinced, and tempted to conclude that the book’s unusual structure and its emphasis on the interpretation of meaning and the large part played by the interpreter are unscholarly. To this, I can only answer that it is not up to me to judge the quality of my thinking, my choices or my writing, but that I did my best to describe my every step, document my sources and substantiate my conclusions. All of my claims are verifiable to an extent that I consider to be reasonable. For those who think that this is insufficient in principle I should like to stress the difference between the sciences and the humanities. I firmly believe that the latter’s value resides precisely in their ability of interpretation, the ultimately immeasurable and non-reproducible meeting of human minds.2

The chapters that follow chronicle the meeting of my mind with that of Rector Arnoldus Beckers. Returning to the image with which I began this introduction, I might conclude that by studying his traces I am indeed laying my hands in his, coming as close to him as is still possible, more than two hundred years after his death. Another way of putting this would be to say that reading and interpreting his written words means giving voice to him again even though he has been silenced.3 To open ourselves up, to listen to and contemplate the meaning of another human being, and subsequently to be intellectually stimulated and possibly even inspired by him, is worthwhile in itself.
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1 Hodder 1999, 121-124, 194. On the concept of the hermeneutic spiral, see pp. 41-42.
2 For a much fuller and more eloquent presentation of this argument, especially in the context of Western society at large, see Nussbaum 2010, 6-7, 95-120, 123. Cf. also Hodder 1995, 175-179, 183-188.
3 Cf. Greenblatt’s famous opening line: ‘I began with the desire to speak with the dead’ (1988, 1).
Figure 1.1: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 55, p. 38
Chapter 1: An Archaeology of a Book Collection

1.1. Introduction
The most noticeable characteristic of the manuscripts and printed books that survive from the historical library of the convent of Soeterbeeck are their traces of use, and among the most conspicuous of the latter are those of Rector Arnoldus Beckers (1772-1810). This must be distinctly understood, or nothing meaningful can come of the observations I am going to make. If we were not perfectly convinced that there is hardly a single volume from Soeterbeeck that has not been bescribbled, damaged, repaired or rebound, and that one of the individuals who are most visibly responsible for this is Rector Beckers, there would be nothing more remarkable in the books to be discussed in the chapters to come than there would be in countless others. However, the significance of the subject of the following pages will quickly become apparent if the state of the books from Soeterbeeck’s library and the prominence of Beckers in many of them are kept in mind. These circumstances enabled me to write this study and also determined how I went about it. To explain what I mean by this statement is the goal of this first chapter.

The way in which the very nature of the books that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck has led to this dissertation and the approach behind it has already been discussed in the general introduction, but like Marley’s death, the point bears repeating. Many of Soeterbeeck’s old books were evidently subjected to intensive use for considerable periods of time, and cannot therefore be properly studied without consideration of the visible traces that this process has left. Because of their state, they need to be approached in a way that does justice to every stage in their existence as material objects. The same is also true for the library as a whole, since significant numbers of its books were produced in the same scriptorium, used in tandem or at least preserved together. The connections on the level of production and the many traces of use ask for Soeterbeeck’s library to be studied as a layered unity, and enough of it survives, preserved largely in one place as the Soeterbeeck Collection, to actually make this possible. The books themselves, therefore, inexorably lead to the development of an approach that is based in archaeology. It is in the application of the latter that a large part of the broader significance of this study resides.

Among the many traces of production and use in the Soeterbeeck Collection, and in the books that were alienated from the convent’s historical library, those of Arnoldus Beckers are a particularly suitable object of study, for multiple reasons. They are so numerous that, speaking in archaeological terms, the layer which they represent within the unity of the library of Soeterbeeck is the most readily apparent within it. His traces’ sheer numbers are an important reason why they are such an appealing subject for an archaeology of a book collection. In addition, they are also multifarious and widespread, covering two major areas of interest. First and most important of these is the conventual liturgy. The rector revised and expanded several of the sisters’ liturgical books, and also wrote some himself. Second is the conventual book collection, for Beckers also added ownership notes to his own books, to those of individual sisters and to some that were in communal use.

The traces left by Beckers’ production and use of books are supplemented by his other notes and writings. Some of these were part of his administrative duties, which included bookkeeping and the maintenance of the archives. More substantial are his works of history. As is well known, Beckers produced two versions of a chronicle of Soeterbeeck, as well as elaborate historical descriptions of his own convent Gaesdonck and of the Congregation of
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1 See pp. 7-13.
2 ASP 45, 1: pp. 1-29 and ASP 4, pp. 1a-18b. On these chronicles, see pp. 268-270, 279-283. For a transcription, see Appendix D.
Windesheim. Together with his traces of production and use of books from the historical library of Soeterbeeck, these writings make up all the available pieces of firsthand evidence of the way in which Beckers led his life as a rector, covering four areas of activity. The prospect of learning more about liturgical worship, the use of books, and the administration in a Dutch convent of canonesses regular around the turn of the eighteenth century, as well as about one of Windesheim’s last historians, adds a level of attraction to the theoretical concerns of my research.

Besides being compelling subject matter, the rector’s traces and writings are also surrounded by enough contextual information to actually make their study possible. Beckers’ rectorate is the first period of Soeterbeeck’s existence about which we are somewhat well-informed. Archival sources from this phase, in which Soeterbeeck went from leading a perfectly settled and prosperous existence in Deursen under the Elector of the Palatinate to beginning to have to fear for its survival as part of the French Empire, are relatively numerous. It is possible to use these documents to arrive at a patchy but workable understanding of various aspects of the rector’s life as well as of that of his community, facilitating the interpretation of his traces by reconstructing essential context.

In short, then, the remnants of the historical book collection of Soeterbeeck ask for an approach based in archaeology, and the traces and writings of Rector Arnoldus Beckers present themselves as an attractive opportunity for its application. The question that remains is what an archaeology of the library of Soeterbeeck looks like in practice. Therefore, the remainder of this chapter is devoted to explaining the theoretical principles underlying the archaeological approach, and to giving an account of their application in the study of the traces of Rector Beckers. I begin by defining some of the approach’s basic concepts, and continue by discussing its two pillars—stratigraphy and interpretive archaeology—and applying each of these in turn to the study of the rector’s traces.

1.2. A Useful Metaphor
At the basis of this dissertation’s approach to the historical book collection of Soeterbeeck is the metaphor of libraries as archaeological sites, which relies on a fundamental conceptual similarity between the two. Both are deposits of material traces of human activity in the past. This is true for the information codified and preserved in the books’ contents, but the statement has a more straightforward application as well. Books do not only record the texts that they contain, but also the interaction with their makers and users. Being physical objects, they are inevitably affected by what is done with them, and the production and use of a book leaves material traces in ink, paper, leather et cetera that are preserved as long as the parts of the book that are affected survive. These traces can be studied, and therefore books can, metaphorically speaking, be dug off in order to lay bare the remains of people’s doings.

The archaeological metaphor implies that my approach emphasises the materiality of books, that is, understands them as material objects in their own right rather than as open gateways to information. One of the many consequences of this emphasis is that it allows, and indeed calls for, an unusually wide-ranging definition of the use of books. Books are not only used for reading texts, music and images, but for anything that can be done with them as material objects. A book’s use extends from the moment that its initial production cycle is complete, when the materials it consists of have first been used to make up that particular object, to its final destruction, when those materials cease to exist. This expanded definition of the use of books implies an equally comprehensive understanding of the nature of traces of use. These are not limited to readers’ notes, but include all material signs of human interaction.
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1 CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 46 and Höv 45, respectively. On these works, see pp. 270-279, 283-286.
with books, including finger-marks in the margin, cracked spines or the reuse of fragments to repair other volumes.

It is by studying the production and use of books and their traces that an archaeology of a book collection attempts to understand history. The traces provide insight into the significance attached to books by their makers and users. Like all material objects, they can be meaningful on various levels that range from the purely functional to the symbolic, and interpreting these types of meaning as they are evident from traces of production and use is potentially revealing about the people who left the latter. This is the approach’s ultimate goal, simultaneously humble and ambitious: to arrive at a better understanding of the producers and users of books by studying the evidence of the way in which they made and used these and why. Tailored to this particular study, this purpose could be rephrased as trying to find out what motivated Rector Beckers to add to and use Soeterbeeck’s library in the way he did. As explained in the introduction,¹ my goal will eventually turn out to have become somewhat broader, but for the moment the formulation just given suffices, as it was my point of departure when I began developing an archaeology of a book collection.

In order to allow for Beckers’ traces to be studied properly, the archaeological approach adheres to the before-mentioned principles of stratigraphy and interpretive archaeology. The former provides the concepts that are necessary for describing books, collections and traces of production and use in archaeological terms, and I will discuss these first in general terms. Afterwards, I will apply them to the library of Soeterbeeck and the traces of Rector Beckers, and give a similar treatment to the principles of interpretive archaeology after that.

1.3. Stratigraphy

Stratigraphy, the study of a site’s stratification or layering, is at the heart of all archaeological research. Its most important principles derive from geology, and were definitively adapted and expanded for application to archaeology in 1979 by Edward Harris.² He identified four laws of archaeological stratigraphy, on the basis of which it is possible to determine with some reliability the order in which the elements that make up an archaeological site succeeded each other in time.³ In other words, the study of stratification enables scholars to discover the relative chronology of a site’s history.

Stratigraphy is necessarily among the most important elements of an archaeological approach to historical book collections. It will be apparent, however, that it cannot be applied to books without adaptation, primarily because layers are not present in books as they are in the earth; one cannot dig for them.⁴ Although layering is physically present, for instance, where Beckers revised a liturgical book by pasting slips of paper with different or additional chants on top of the original contents,⁵ this is not the case for all of a volume’s successive elements. A book can therefore generally only be described as being stratified on a conceptual level. Even more so than in the case of geological or archaeological strata, layers in books are constructs which are understood to be there by the scholar. Despite its conceptual nature, however, the application of stratigraphy to books does refer to a material reality, for it is enabled and regulated by visible traces of production and use. Because of this link with the

³ Harris 1989, 36. He identifies the laws of superposition, original horizontality, original continuity and stratigraphical succession. Because the relevance of the latter three relies on the physical properties of archaeological sites, only the first one is relevant for an archaeology of books, on which see p. 22.
⁴ This also means that it is not feasible to describe the stratification of old books by using purely archaeological systems such as the so-called Harris matrix (on which see Harris 1989, 34-39), but that another method must be developed.
⁵ E.g., IV 7, pp. 35-36.
material world, stratigraphy provides terms that are actually useful in the discussion of historical books and collections.

Conceptually speaking, then, all books are stratified, and the more so the older they are. Like archaeological stratigraphy, that of books is governed by the law of superposition, which Harris defines as follows:

In a series of layers and interfacial features, as originally created, the upper units of stratification are younger and the lower are older, for each must have been deposited on, or created by the removal of, a pre-existing mass of archaeological stratification.¹

What this boils down to is the straightforward fact that if layer A is on top of layer B, and the site has not been disturbed, B must have been deposited before A and therefore be older. This law of relative chronology does not only hold for the layers of an archaeological site, but it is as true, on a conceptual level, for the layers in a book. Deepest down are its production layers, which are evident from the book’s parchment or paper, script or type, decoration, and all other material elements which made it up when it was initially complete and ready for use. Book-historical research is usually restricted to one or more of these oldest elements in a book, but such traces of production only form its deepest core. New layers are added every time a book is used, in whatever way, and these layers of use are often also manifested by material traces that are left in the process.

Because a book’s layers of production and use seldom take the form of physical stratification, it would be inaccurate to equate material traces with the conceptual layers to which they belong. The traces are part of a certain layer, but they do not actually make it up. Rather, they may, when studied, lay bare some of the book’s stratification, and provide tangible evidence for its presence. They are therefore most analogous to the artefacts found on an archaeological site, which, having distinct characteristics as a result of their different origins in time and space, may reveal to the archaeologist some of the site’s multi-layered history. It should be stressed, however, that even this analogy only goes so far. In archaeology, the relationships between layers and artefacts are not absolute: Harris explains that, because artefacts can remain in use for a very long time, and because the development of their stylistic features is not always linear, it is not desirable to use these characteristics as primary evidence when distinguishing between layers. Archaeological strata are best identified by studying their interfaces.² In books, however, the relationships between layers and traces of production and use are absolute: because each layer is, conceptually, the result of a distinct phase in the production process or a unique instance of use, each stratum necessarily contains its own unique traces. This means that it is possible for a book’s stratification to be identified on the basis of the sequence of its traces of production and use, and indeed it must, for these traces are its only material manifestation.

Although, strictly speaking, each individual instance of use generates its own layer, it is often desirable, or unavoidable in practice, to think of all layers generated by a given person as a single layer, defined temporally by the moment of his or her first and last interaction with the book. This is in fact analogous to archaeology, where a layer must be of a certain width to even be able to be recognised as such. Distinctions between individual instances of use by a single user may nonetheless still be useful or necessary, for example, when the traces of those instances turn out to be incompatible, such as when a user goes back to his own marginal notes to correct them at a later date.

It will often also be necessary, in the stratigraphy of books, to refer to groups of traces of production or use. Because of the direct relationship between layers and traces, the basic category with which to define a group like this is the layer itself. Whereas archaeological and

¹ Harris 1989, 30. He seems here to use the word ‘feature’ as a synonym for ‘stratigraphic unit’, on which see pp. 23 n. 1.
² Harris 1989, 29-30, 36.
geological strata are defined by time and space, layers of production and use are defined by the moment when they were added and by the individuality of the producer(s) or user(s). The basic grouping of traces, then, consists of those left by a single person, or by more people simultaneously, at a specific time. It may, in a derivative sense, be called stratigraphic, because it corresponds to one or more of the book’s strata. Groups of traces of production and use are therefore best referred to as stratigraphic units, although it should be stressed that this does not correspond to the use that archaeology usually makes of the term. More importantly, the layers of which traces are part are not the only dimensions on the basis of which a stratigraphic unit can be identified. Like layers, stratigraphic units are constructs on the part of the observer, and they can therefore be defined by any of the traces’ other contextual dimensions—such as position, type and function—and by any combination of these, as they may be relevant.2

So far, the stratigraphy of books has only been discussed with reference to the production and use of individual volumes. The notion can be extended, however. For example, books that were copied at the same scriptorium or published by the same printer clearly share at least one production layer. In historical collections whose books were or have been used side by side for an extended period of time, layers of use can also be said to extend beyond the boundaries of individual books. With luck, such interconnections may even partly have been made visible by the presence of stratigraphic units that extend over a larger part of the collection, as is the case, for instance, when the same person has written several books, or added ownership notes to them. In such cases, the scholar should be able to relate the traces in individual volumes to each other and thereby chart a greater or a lesser part of the collection’s entire stratification of production and use. In this way, the application of stratigraphy to a book collection lays bare what is left of its history.

The consequences of a stratigraphic approach to books, and collections of books, for book historical research are potentially far-reaching. A few general remarks about this may conveniently be made here. It should be noted, for instance, that, in a sense, a book archaeologist does not study books, except indirectly as a medium. His direct objects of study are the traces of production and use that appear in them, or rather, the stratigraphic units that these traces can be said to comprise. The books are merely the digs in which the traces are discovered, or, to put it more precisely, the depositional context in which they have been preserved. Careful study of this context is indispensable for arriving at a reliable understanding of the archaeological finds, as is discussed in greater detail below,3 but it is not itself the focal point of research. The books themselves are only studied by way of the traces of human interaction that appear in them. In a way, this dissertation is about the traces that Beckers left, and not about the books he left them in.

A focus on stratification and traces of use has great influence on the way historical collections are perceived. On the most general level, applying stratigraphy to a collection emphasises its unity as an archaeological site. A book is not only a unique object in its own right, but also a small dig on a larger site that cannot be entirely understood in isolation. By becoming part of a collection, the books have been woven together, as it were, and the warp and woof of this structure are the shared layers of use that make it into a collection.4

---

1 Within archaeology, the term ‘unit of stratification’ or ‘stratigraphic unit’ is usually applied to layers and their interfaces (cf. Harris 1989, 160), and applying it to groups of traces of production and use therefore runs the risk of confusing traces with layers. I feel, however, that this danger is preferable to the use of the term which is generally reserved for groups of artefacts: the horribly vague ‘archaeological unit’. As explained, the application of the former term to traces of production and use is merited because of the absolute relationship, in the stratigraphy of books, between layers and traces.

2 On the contextual dimensions of traces of production and use, see pp. 43-44.

3 See pp. 43-44.

4 The textile metaphor is adapted from Hodder and Hutson 2003, 170.
identification of stratigraphic units highlights the various connections between books, blurring
their individual boundaries and thereby encouraging an integrative approach to the collection
as a unique product of historical circumstances.¹

Because it involves taking a collection’s interconnectedness as its fundamental, most
defining characteristic, the stratigraphy of books invites the abandonment of the preconceived
distinction between manuscripts and printed books within a single collection like that of
Soeterbeeck. This distinction, which is of relatively recent origin,² is generally handled as if it
defines one of the most important aspects of historical libraries, and codicologists and
bibliographers seldom meet. It is based, however, on differences on the level of the books’
production layers, whereas the acts that bring books together in a single collection are often
unrelated to their production. Books are not necessarily produced to be part of the library of
which they eventually become part, and that library may contain books of highly diverse
origin. A collection is therefore primarily defined by its layers of use. Taking these as a
starting point, there is not only no a priori reason to distinguish between manuscripts and
printed books in a library that includes both, but doing so could actually hinder the study of
the layers of use that brought these books together. Of course, it would be absurd to claim that
making a distinction between manuscripts and printed books, or distinguishing between books
on the basis of their production layers, is never merited. Research may reveal when there are
reasons for considering certain differences between books as more significant than the layers
they have in common, but stratigraphy favours taking a collection’s unity as a starting point in
library studies.

The application of stratigraphy to old books also draws attention to the fact that these
are no longer the books they once were. This is made abundantly clear by the worn-down
state of many of the volumes from the library of Soeterbeeck, but it is just as true for the best-
preserved book imaginable. There, too, time and use must have left their traces, even if these
are not immediately apparent. Strictly speaking, then, medieval and early modern books as
such do not exist anymore; all that is left to us are their present-day transformations. Although
it is often perfectly possible to study much of a book’s historical core, it is necessary, in order
to do so, first to identify and discard layers of a later date, just as archaeologists are forced to
dig off the layers of an archaeological site in reverse chronological order. Of course, layers of
use are not always as opaque as this comparison suggests, for not all of them are even made
manifest by visible traces. It is often justified, for practical purposes, simply to proceed as if
the scholar is directly confronted with the production layers as they originally appeared.
However, even though a book is not noticeably affected by every user, it is still important on a
conceptual level to establish that they all did use it, and in doing so did change it, even if only
to an infinitesimally small degree.

The image, central to the stratigraphy of books, of the remains of an old volume’s
historical core as being buried beneath layers of later accretions has significant practical
consequences as well. It will very likely lead to different research questions being asked, for it
challenges the general scholarly preference for studying a book’s production layers. This
predilection is practically justified, of course, but it does not have much theoretical support
beyond the importance of origins. To focus on a book’s oldest layers is really just one option
of many, and it is equally justifiable to concentrate on any one of its other layers, including
the very latest layers of use. In fact, by drawing attention to the stratified nature of books,
their stratigraphy actually encourages a focus on their history rather than on their beginnings.

¹ As already quoted in the general introduction (p. 9), Jennifer Summit makes the same point when she says that
‘individual libraries, like books, are historical artifacts’ (2008, 5). Her use of the word ‘artefact’ implies that a
book collection is itself not only a unified object, but also the product of human agency, on which see pp. 35-38.
² On the introduction in many European libraries of the distinction between manuscripts and printed books
around the middle of the seventeenth century, see McKitterick 2003, 11-15.
The most important consequence of the stratigraphy of books may be the foregrounding of the insight that even old books are redefined by their present context. This means that they can be reconstructed at best, and that the result of this process is in fact not a reconstruction at all but a modern construct, a new product that did not exist before, but has resulted from contemporary circumstances—from a dialogue between the modern scholar and his object of study in its present state. This is not to say, of course, that nothing can actually be known about the medieval layers of a fifteenth-century manuscript or a particular phase in the development of a historical library, or that their reconstruction cannot be a legitimate goal. The book historian should be fully aware, however, that the process of studying a volume’s historical core or one of a library’s previous iterations is not as straightforward as it seems; the data are not actually given, but must be dug up and constructed in a meaningful way. The question that arises is how to go about this, and for its answer, my archaeological approach to book collections takes recourse to insights from interpretive archaeology. Before turning to these, however, I will first try to explain what the stratigraphical concepts that I have just discussed mean for the study of the traces of Rector Beckers in books from the library of Soeterbeeck.

1.4. Defining the Stratigraphic Unit of Arnoldus Beckers

I have already stated that the book archaeologist’s actual object of study are the traces of production and use which are present in the books that he investigates, and the stratigraphic units that they can be made to form. Methodologically, this means that the first thing that I had to do as part of my investigation into Beckers’ motivations was to define the scope of his stratigraphic unit in the library of Soeterbeeck. On a conceptual level, this is just about the most basic unit imaginable, consisting of the traces left by one man over a well-defined period of time. In practice, therefore, the definition of Beckers’ unit simply consisted of identifying all the traces of production and use for which he was responsible. The primary means of doing so was, of course, his hand.

The identification of Beckers’ hand was greatly facilitated by the fact that Beckers is generally known to have written four historiographical works of some length, which do not only contain internal references that confirm his authorship,1 but are also all in the same hand and can therefore be used as extensive script samples. In two liturgical manuscripts, he also left notes identifying himself as the person responsible for what he called their renovation.2 Instances like these, where Beckers attaches his name to a piece of writing, are fairly numerous, both within the Soeterbeeck Collection and outside of it. Examples of the latter include a number of written statements pertaining to his last will,3 whereas the former consist for the most part of ownership notes with his name in it.4 Of somewhat more substance is the collection of liturgical chants with shelf mark IV 55, which was entirely written by Beckers and in which he left a colophon.5 On the basis of the material that could be reliably attributed

---

1 In the first version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck, for example, the author refers to himself as *ick Arnoldus Beckers* (‘1, Arnoldus Beckers’, ASP 45, 1: p. 21; cf. ASP 4, p. 5a), and when he reaches his own name in the list of canons which he provides in his description of Gaesdonck, the monastery where he was professed, Beckers identifies himself as the *schrjyer deezes* (‘author of this work’, Höv 46, p. 12b). His book on the Congregation of Windesheim (Höv 45) is preceded by a title page in another hand which identifies Beckers as the author (Figure 7), as is the case with the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck (ASP 4).

2 *Renovatum ab A. Beckers rectore* (‘Renovated by Rector A. Beckers’, IV 6, verso pasted down front flyleaf); *Renovatum ab A. Beckers rectore 1787* (‘Renovated by Rector A. Beckers, 1787’, IV 7, verso front flyleaf). On these books, Beckers’ work on them and the significance of these colophons, see pp. 146-160.

3 Beckers’ wills are preserved among the papers in CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21 (and photocopies appear in ASP 183). Some of these texts are discussed on pp. 242-243, 300, 303; vol. 2, p. 111 n. 3.

4 For transcriptions of Beckers’ ownership notes, see Table 5.4.

5 IV 55, p. 38. On this manuscript and the colophon, see pp. 208-212.
to him in this way, I am able to identify both Beckers’ hand and the different scripts that he employed.

There were three of these, which I distinguish mainly on the basis of their intended level of execution, in relationship with the use to which they were put. I only consider individual letter forms in the second instance, for, not being a professional scribe, Beckers did not distinguish between or adhere to these with sufficient consistency to enable me to base a classification of scripts on them. It is possible to identify a number of letter forms which are closely associated with a particular script, but this association is hardly ever exclusive. Indeed, Beckers used so many different constellations of letter forms that these cannot all be the result of deliberate choice.

Since it is impossible to distinguish between Beckers’ scripts solely on the basis of isolated characteristics, I focus primarily on their general aspect. This allows me to use an entirely relative classification that is based on the scripts’ levels of formality, and which ties in perfectly with the contexts in which they appear and the texts for whose writing they were used. Approached like this, Beckers’ different scripts can be identified as a set, a hybrid and a cursive minuscule. These are all book scripts, in the sense that they are highly legible and clearly meant to be readable by others, but they differ in their intended level of execution and in the context of their use.

Beckers’ set script, which is an imitation of the humanist minuscule and may have been intended to look like type, is the clearest and the most formal. He reserved it for the text of chants in books written entirely by himself or added to books in a similar script. Least formal is the cursive minuscule, which was used for the writing of prose, both in Latin and Dutch. The hybrid script, finally, combines features of both other ones, and was used for the text of chants added to late medieval manuscripts in Gothic script. This distribution reflects a conscious choice on the rector’s part and displays an awareness both of the depositional context of his writings and of their purpose and audience. He used his most legible scripts for those texts which were meant to be sung in the liturgy, perhaps by multiple persons at the same time, and reserved his cursive script for texts that were to be read in private.

**EXCURSUS: THE HAND OF ARNOLDUS BECKERS**

I will describe the most important characteristics of Beckers’ scripts, with the help of samples in the figures. Beckers’ set minuscule was used almost exclusively for writing the text of the chants in his own liturgical manuscripts (IV 10b, pp. 1-4, IV 55 and Mater 5, f. 1r), and for the addition of chants to two eighteenth-century manuscripts in a practically identical script (IV 8, ff. 143r-144r and the pasteddown of Add. 10). The most extensive example occurs in IV 55 (Figure 1.1), which, except for the ownership note on the second flyleaf and the colophon on p. 38, was written entirely in the set minuscule. The script is very straight; there are no loops, and except for the t none of the letters have an oblique foot. The letters are not connected to each other, except for the occasional ct.

---

1 The adjectives are borrowed from the seven-grade classification commonly used for seventh- to ninth-century Insular Phase II scripts (Roberts 2005, 14-15). They have very specific and different meanings in that context which obviously do not apply here, but I have adopted them as conveniently indicative in a general sense of the various intended levels of execution of Beckers’ scripts.
2 On the liturgical use of choir books, see pp. 59-60, 145-146. On the intended audience of Beckers’ historiographical works, see pp. 268, 278-279, 284.
3 An exception occurs in IV 6, f. 1r (Figure 1.5), where Beckers used his set minuscule for the header of the six chants which he had written in his hybrid script: *Dominica 3ta post Pascha Patrocinium sancti Josephi* (‘Third Sunday after Easter, Patronage of St Joseph’). The letter forms are not entirely pure: the u and the m of *Patrocinium* have oblique feet and the ascender of the h in *Josephi* has a loop, probably because of the influence of the hybrid script used for the chants below. Beckers’ unusual choice for the set script in this case is easily explained: it provides the header with a more formal aspect than the chants which it heads.
4 On these manuscripts and Beckers’ work on them, see pp. 179-181, 191-193, 208-222. For reproductions, see Figures 1.1-2, 3.4 and 4.2-3.
and st ligature. The only individual letter form that is absolutely distinctive is the two-compartment a, which occurs in none of Beckers’ other scripts.

The set minuscule has a rather stiff, inelegant look to it, betraying that Beckers was not very comfortable using it. Despite this fact, however, he continued to do so over an extended period of time, and a gradual change is apparent in some of the letter forms. Manuscript IV 55 is dated by Beckers’ colophon to 1788, which means that it was written during the second decade of his rectorate. Another, later example of his set script occurs on ff. 143r-144r of IV 8, where Beckers wrote down at least the first four Magnificat tones (Figure 1.2).1 It is interesting to note that the script he used for the text of these chants differs in several respects from that of IV 55. The entire aspect is less broad and straight and more crabbed and shaky, and the ear of the g and the apex of the t have acquired a much more pronounced character than they generally had before. The a is sometimes more slanted and in other cases has almost acquired an oblique foot, whereas the u is sometimes entirely footless. If I am right in assuming that at least some of these features are characteristics which Beckers’ set minuscule acquired over time, then this allows his undated writings in this script to be dated very roughly in relation to each other. The noted antiphon and psalm verse on f. 1r of Mater 5 (Figure 4.3), for example, have all the confidence of the script of IV 55, and, like in that manuscript, there are only footed us. The a is not all as straight anymore, however, which would seem to indicate that they belong to a slightly later period. On the basis of different arguments, the book in which the antiphon and the verse appear can be dated to 1796.2 By contrast, the first three pages of IV 10b (Figure 4.2) and the hymn Deus tuorum militum, for the feast of St Stephen (26 December), which Beckers added on the pastedown of Add. 10 (Figure 3.4), are much closer to the script of the rector’s addition to IV 8, with its footless us, slanted as, big-eared gs and extended ts.3 These would therefore seem to date from the first decade of the nineteenth century.

Beckers’ cursive minuscule occurs in his chronicles, the prose text of the Magnificat tones that he added to IV 8 and the liturgical manuscripts IV 58 (Figure 1.3) and Mater 5,4 and also in the notes which he left in many printed books. Letters generally have loops, but the degree to which they are connected to each other differs between and even within texts. The letters a, e and u are most often connected to the next letter, especially when this is a round r. Most letters acquire a very pronounced oblique foot when they occur word-finally, although this is not invariably the case. This cursive minuscule’s most distinctive letter forms, in comparison to the set script, are the single-compartment a, the round d (which is occasionally relieved with a straight d), the ‘Gothic’ g, the looped r and the exclusive use of a round s. There are various grades of formality to this script: its form in Beckers’ chronicles, for instance, is marginally more current than that in Mater 5, IV 8 and IV 58, whereas the headings in the latter manuscript generally have a straight d which stands out from the round d which is most common in the main text. In addition to these variations, it is also evident from a comparison of Beckers’ book on Gaesdonck (Goch, Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck, Monastic Library, Höv 46), which he was writing in 1808 (Figure 1.4),5 with IV 58, which can be dated to between 1785 and 1787,6 that his cursive script also suffered when his hand became shakier and crabbed with age.

In between Beckers’ set and cursive minuscules are an endless number of hybrid forms, which combine letter forms and other aspects of both scripts to varying degrees. There are so many different combinations that it is clear that Beckers did not succeed and may not even have intended to distinguish between them. For convenience’s sake, therefore, I refer to all of them as a hybrid minuscule. What binds this conglomerate together, besides its hybridity, and what simultaneously distinguishes it from the other two scripts, is the fact that it is more slanted than the set but less

---

1 On this book and the tones added by Beckers, see pp. 191-193.
2 See p. 216.
3 The relative date might be confirmed by the colour of the ink. The ink of IV 55, which dates to 1788, is discoloured and has turned brown, and the same is true for that of Mater 5. In comparison, the ink in IV 8 and Add. 10 is still noticeably darker.
4 On these manuscripts, see pp. 110-127, 191-193, 216-222, 265-287. For reproductions, see Figures 1.2-4 and 4.3.
5 See p. 283.
6 See pp. 112-113.
Figure 1.2: Soeterbeeck Collection. IV 8, f. 143r
Van geselde feesten van Heere Izaak volgens den Brevier der Canonise Regulieren van de Congregatie van Windesem tot dienste der Religieusen van Soeterbeek landes van Ravestein.

Den 18den Januarius.

De besnijdenis, ons Heere Jezus Christus, en de offerte van Zijn Geboorte.

De Octave van den He. Stephanius den eersten der Nastelen. den tweden Januarius.

De Octave van den He. Sannul Apostol, en geziene den vierden Januarius.

De Octave van den He. Annunziate kinderen. den vijfden Januarius.

De vijfde van de openbaringen der Heere, of twee koningen avond. den zesden Januarius.

De openbaringen der Heere, of drie koningen dag. den zeven Januarius.


Antiphons in de Vespres.

1. Alle die den Naam des Heere zal aangeroepen hebben, zal geliefd zijn.
2. Heilig en schijnlijk is zijne naam, het bezinnet den wijsheid, de vreugde, de Heere.
4. Van opgang tot godt, tot de Heere, in de Heere, gezeghen, worden.
Figure 1.4: Goch, Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck, Monastic Library, Höv 46, p. 1
current than the cursive minuscule. Almost none of the letters are connected with each other, except in the \textit{st} ligature, which is common. The \textit{a} has only a single compartment, and many letters have prominent oblique feet at the end of words. The proportion of looped and loopless ascenders and descenders, of Gothic and humanistic gs and of straight and round ds and rs differs greatly, but some combination of these is usually present. Beckers used his hybrid script for the texts of the chants which he added to late medieval liturgical manuscripts, such as IV 6 (Figure 1.5) and IV 7 (Figure 3).\textsuperscript{1} The explanation for this is probably that he felt that his humanistically-inspired set minuscule did not match the Gothic script employed in these books,\textsuperscript{2} whereas his cursive minuscule would be difficult to combine with music notation and not be clear enough to sing from.

Less distinctive than his hand in writing, but also important for the identification of his traces of production and use, is Beckers’ music notation. He uses staffs of four lines. There does not appear to be any relationship between the shape of his neumes and the type of script used for the text of the chant underneath, which is either set or hybrid. Beckers always uses square notes without tails, except for custodes, which are diamond-shaped and have a tail pointing in the upper right direction. Each square note has a small vertical stem on either side which is extended to connect it to the preceding or the following notes if these are to be sung on the same syllable. Beckers has no special notation for compound notes such as pes or porrectus; these are simply represented as single notes strung together in the way described before. The strings of notes in which this notation results is a feature that Beckers’ chant has in common with that of the surviving printed books from the library of Soeterbeeck, and it is a general characteristic of chant notation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with which he must have been most familiar.\textsuperscript{3} The flat symbol generally has the shape of a loopless minuscule \textit{b}, although Beckers occasionally also used a looped variant, especially where the text has looped \textit{bs} as well. The only remarkable development in the shape of Beckers’ neumes is the fact that the notes in his earlier works tend to be slightly broader than those in later ones, which seems to be completely in line with the increasingly crabbed character of his writing.

Beckers’ hand is highly legible and distinctive, which makes it relatively straightforward to identify. On the basis of this characteristic, then, I have been able to attribute to him books and notes that do not bear his name. Most of these occur in the Soeterbeeck Collection, but I also identified Beckers’ hand in a number of books that have been alienated from the convent’s library and are now preserved elsewhere. There can be no doubt that these notes should also be taken into account in my investigations, but the question is how their inclusion is to be justified conceptually. In what sense are these notes in alienated books part of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit, if the latter were to be defined as the total of his traces in the Soeterbeeck Collection? The solution lies in the fact that this definition is not accurate. Alienated books can be said to be part of the conceptual site that we are excavating, as the layers of use in the latter evidently extend also to them. For some period of time in the past, these books were part of the library of which the present collection is the remnant, and from a diachronic perspective they are therefore still part of our dig. To limit the latter entirely to the Soeterbeeck Collection would not be correct; rather, it covers the library of Soeterbeeck in all its historical manifestations, and therefore includes alienated books.

\textsuperscript{1} On these manuscripts and Beckers’ work on them, see pp. 146-160.
\textsuperscript{2} It may conveniently be noted here that the script of three of the four sixteenth-century antiphonaries in which Beckers’ notes appear most prominently (IV 6 in the Soeterbeeck Collection; Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs and Tilburg, UL, KHS 28) does not fit the usual classification of medieval scripts. With reference to IV 6 it has been characterised as a \textit{littera textualis} (Kienhorst 2005, 57) and in KHS 28 as a \textit{hybrida libraria} (Van de Ven 1997, 26). The latter is clearly an error, but the former is not entirely correct either. The script is loopless and has a two-compartment \textit{a}, but the long \textit{s} is footless and tends to extend below the baseline, as is also true for the \textit{f}. This type of script does not occur in Gumbert’s palaeographic cube (1976, 47, fig. 2), which emphasises that it is not truly medieval anymore.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Bank 1947, 144; Kat 1939, 101.
Identifying the books and notes in Beckers’ hand is the most important step towards defining his stratigraphic unit. It is not the only one, however, for the production and use of books does not only leave written traces. Attributing the results of activities like rebinding and restoration to a particular person is always difficult if they have been carried out anonymously, but sometimes contextual information makes it possible. Beckers’ name, then, is connected in the literature to the rebounding of the manuscript book of hours IV 47, and the same can also be done with the production and rebounding of the book of prefaces IV 53 and the book of chants IV 10b. In each of these cases, the basis of the association is the presence of notes in the rector’s hand in the respective volume. I discuss these three connections, and assess their validity where the issue becomes relevant in the following chapters. The reader will probably concur that Kienhorst’s attribution of the wear on the boards of IV 63 to Beckers, mentioned in the general introduction, though only based on the fact that the book was in the rector’s possession for a while and therefore not entirely sound from a methodological perspective, should be allowed to stand in the interest of poetic license. Beyond this, I cannot go. It is highly probable that Beckers’ stratigraphic unit contains many more material traces of use, but in the absence of positive evidence I cannot act upon this likelihood.

Despite these limitations, however, it is still evident that Beckers’ unit covers a very considerable part of the historical library of Soeterbeeck. Anyone studying the remains of the latter is almost certain to bump into Beckers’ traces of production and use at some point, and these, in their turn, practically force their student to consider the largest part of the collection. Because Beckers’ unit consists of many different kinds of traces in many different kinds of books, it is impossible, when trying to fully understand it, to restrict oneself to a single genre or only to manuscripts. This is all the more true because Beckers’ traces are connected to a wide range of others. As is discussed in greater detail in the following chapters, there are many persons, from various centuries, who left similar notes in books in the library of Soeterbeeck, dealing both with the liturgy and with the ownership of books in analogous ways. Beckers’ traces can therefore be regarded as the hub of various stratigraphic units, and thereby illustrate the potential as well as the necessity of a stratigraphic approach to book collections.

1.5. Interpretive Archaeology

It will be clear by now that the application of stratigraphic principles to identify Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the historical library of Soeterbeeck is relatively straightforward. However, stratigraphy alone is not enough to make the archaeology of a book collection into a well-rounded approach. A foundation in archaeological theory is needed in order to suitably interpret the meaning of a stratigraphic unit. The views collectively known as interpretive archaeology appear to be most suitable for this, because they make use of theories that are based in the humanities and are therefore most easily applicable to the study of books. I will therefore discuss these, and apply my findings to the interpretation of Beckers’ unit afterwards.

1.5.1. Processual and Post-Processual Archaeology

In order to describe its theoretical characteristics, it is necessary first to establish that interpretive archaeology began in the 1970s and 80s as a reaction against the views known as

---

1 Poirters 2013a, 102-103.
3 See pp. 1, 16. For reproductions of the boards, see Figures A and 8.
processual archaeology. This latter current in archaeological thought, most clearly represented in its original form by the writings of the archaeologists Lewis Binford and David Clarke from the 1960s, was itself a reaction against traditional approaches to archaeology, motivated by a desire to make archaeology a more scientific discipline than it had been.\(^1\) Whereas archaeologists had traditionally focused on describing historical artefacts and mapping cultural boundaries on the basis of these artefacts’ material and stylistic characteristics, the processualists took a step beyond their discipline’s antiquarian roots and sought to explain why there exist similarities and differences in material culture at all. In order to make this explanation possible, archaeology was redefined as a branch of anthropology and allied to the natural sciences.\(^2\)

In its classical form, processual archaeology embraces both materialism and positivism. It considers material culture to be a product of the way in which human beings adapt to their social, economical and technological environment. Cultural expressions are thought only to reflect human behaviour as caused by observable phenomena in the world, and not to have an additional, independent metaphysical source; even thoughts and ideas are considered to be predictable on the basis of a person’s position in the material world. The direct causal relationship that is believed to exist between a person’s material environment and his behaviour even when culturally expressed has two important methodological consequences. First, it means that it should be possible to attain objective knowledge of the production and use of material culture by the application of traditional empirical research methods and theories of the natural sciences. Second, it also means that cultural change must be regarded as an adaptive process for which universally applicable theories can be formulated. This conviction caused systemic adaptive theories to become a central component of this new type of archaeology, which is why it came to be called processual.\(^3\)

Another key aspect of processual archaeology is its application of Middle Range Theory, a term adapted by Binford from sociology. In interpreting the elements of an archaeological record, it is necessary to reason from the data—the material remains that have been preserved—to their role in behavioural processes in the past. Because they define material culture as the product of adaptive processes which are governed by universally applicable laws, processualists believe that the gap between material remains and the past can be bridged by making use of ethnographic or even experimental information from other cultural contexts with comparable environments.\(^4\) The theoretical link can be both cross-temporal and cross-cultural; for example, Binford himself studied several modern hunter-gatherer cultures to help explain the material traces left by prehistoric hunter-gatherers.\(^5\) Middle Range Theories like these are supported by the materialist assumption that, as long as the behaviour of two societies is more or less the same because they have similar socio-economical environments, the material culture they produce will be comparable in many aspects as well. In this way, processual archaeology encourages cross-cultural generalisation.

From the 1970s onwards, the positivist and materialist viewpoints of processual archaeology began to receive more and more sustained criticism. Although the critics had a wide variety of theoretical backgrounds that were often in many respects mutually exclusive,
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1 Classic statements of the case for processual archaeology include Binford 1962; 1965; 1968; Binford and Binford 1968; and Clarke 1968. For a more recent example, see Binford 2001.
2 Binford 1962, 217. The historical context of the origin and development of processual archaeology is described in Trigger 2006, 386-444.
3 Shanks and Hodder 1995, 3-4; Hodder and Hutson 2003, 13-44.
4 Binford 1967; 1977; Hodder 1999, 27. Low Range Theories, by contrast, are designed only to explain aspects within a single cultural context, whereas High Range Theories are meant to be universal.
5 Binford 2001.
they can collectively be referred to as post-processual.¹ The most influential post-processual theorist is Ian Hodder (1948), currently of Stanford University. His ideas were primarily formed by his Cambridge education, and developed during his work on the Neolithic town of Çatalhöyük, in central Turkey.² It is on his insights, particularly as presented in Reading the Past, the classic statement of post-processual archaeology whose third edition (2003) he co-wrote with Berkeley archaeologist Scott Hutson, that the following account is based.

The main difference between processual and post-processual archaeology is that the latter is idealist rather than materialist, which means that it argues that human behaviour is not only determined by causes in the material world, but also has a metaphysical origin in people’s minds.³ Contrary to what the processualists would claim, these ideas do not simply adhere to universally applicable laws that can be inferred from observable phenomena, but instead result from what Hodder and Hutson describe as ‘individual social strategies within particular cultural-historical contexts’.⁴ This does not mean that human behaviour is not subject to any universal principles at all, but only that the archaeologist should be aware of the potentially unique way in which a given behaviour’s particular circumstances relate to larger systems and processes.⁵ Human action, including the production and use of material culture, is the result neither of objective causality nor of an absolutely individual choice. Rather, it is (often unconsciously) embedded in a person’s socially, culturally and historically constituted understanding of the world: his personal hermeneutic, or framework of meaning.

Post-processual archaeology does not only acknowledge the role that meaning plays in the production and use of artefacts, it also takes this for its object of study. After all, to fail to do so would be to neglect an important aspect of what makes up material culture. This may seem fairly self-evident to scholars of the humanities, but within archaeology, a discipline which straddles the divide between the natural and the social sciences, this is a highly significant decision. By choosing to study meaning in the past, archaeology can no longer restrict itself to using research methods that belong to the natural sciences. The methodology proposed in processual archaeology would not be wide-ranging enough for the task. Meaning cannot be measured or empirically observed and it cannot be explained solely as the result of universally applicable processes; it can only be interpreted and, hopefully, understood.⁶ The consequences which the attempt to do so has for the study of material culture in general and of books in particular are discussed in the following paragraph.

1.5.2. Meaning and Agency in Material Culture

As has been said, post-processual archaeology acknowledges material culture to be meaningful. Objects are meaningfully produced and in use continue to be attributed with meaning.⁷ It must be stressed that these meanings are not restricted to the physical and functional levels to which processual archaeology restricts itself, for artefacts cannot be reduced to the materials from which they are produced or the practical uses to which they are put. People inevitably attribute conceptual and symbolic meanings to material culture as well.⁸ That this is true for books is evident, for instance, from the reverence with which the evangelistary is treated during Mass. It is borne aloft in procession, placed on the altar, accompanied by candles, crossed, incensed, kissed and displayed, and may itself be used to

¹ The historical context of the origin and development of post-processual archaeology is described in Trigger 2006, 444-483.
² Hodder 1995, 84, 185; 1999, 119.
³ Hodder and Hutson 2003, 13-22.
⁴ Hodder and Hutson 2003, 16.
⁵ Hodder 1999, 65, 70-71, 79.
⁶ Hodder and Hutson 2003, 163-164; Shanks and Hodder 1995, 5.
⁷ Hodder and Hutson 2003, 1-6.
bless.\textsuperscript{1} All of these acts are analogous to the veneration accorded to the Blessed Sacrament itself, because the book of the Gospels, rather than just being taken as a text carrier, or even a random collection of leather and paper, is perceived as ‘a sign of the presence of Christ in his word proclaimed’.\textsuperscript{2} The evangelistary is not only used to read from, but also to be a symbol for Christ, largely apart from its material characteristics.\textsuperscript{3}

Of course, the particular example of the book of the Gospels is not entirely typical because the context in which it is used, Holy Mass, is unusually symbolically charged. The symbolical meanings of the acts and objects associated with it are actively foregrounded and consciously experienced to a degree that is rarely attained in everyday life. However, the fact that the attribution of meaning to objects often happens unintentionally and unconsciously does not mean that it may not be present in these cases. Hodder and Hutson stress that meanings are usually ‘public and social concepts which are reproduced in the practices of daily life’.\textsuperscript{4} The user or producer of material culture is part of a particular, socially defined framework of meaning, and he applies this to whatever he does even if he is not conscious of it. Both consciously and unconsciously wielded hermeneutics cannot but have at least some effect on the objects that are produced and used within them.

It can be gathered from this discussion that material culture derives its meaning from the specific contexts in which it is produced and used. Meaning, particularly that of the symbolical type, is relational; it is arbitrary in the sense of not being inherent to an object, but attributed to it by its producers and users, and although it may be experienced as such, it is neither universal nor stable. As time goes by, the meaning intended in the object’s production context is often replaced by other ones. Indeed, the meaning any person attributes to it can be highly individual, as it is at least partly determined, apart from the object itself, by personal background and intentions and may be unrecognised by others.\textsuperscript{5} To a certain extent, however, meaning is always socially constituted as well, for a person’s social background constrains and partly determines his or her understanding of the world.\textsuperscript{6} In its turn, the relationship between society and the individual varies greatly over time and between cultures.\textsuperscript{7} The shape that individual meaning takes and the extent to which it can be voiced or acted upon are very different in a monastic community such as that of Soeterbeeck around the turn of the eighteenth century, from what they are in modern Western society. The way in which material culture is understood is largely dependent, therefore, on the personal, social, cultural and historical contexts in which it is produced and used. In other words, its meaning is historically non-arbitrary, which means that Middle Range Theory, which depends upon cross-temporal and cross-cultural generalisation for giving explanations that are widely applicable, is not suitable for studying it.\textsuperscript{8}

The main types of meaning which Hodder and Hutson identify as being attributed to material culture may be summarised as follows.\textsuperscript{9} With reference to its content, meaning is functional and symbolical. Functional meaning refers to an object’s practical use as defined

\textsuperscript{1} Institutio generalis Missalis Romani, nos. 120, 122, 133-134, 172-175, 194-195, 273, 277 and 349. (I made use of the edition published in Missale 2002, 19-86, esp. 45-47, 52, 54, 63-64, 76.)

\textsuperscript{2} ‘Book’ 2012, 370, no. 7.

\textsuperscript{3} Although the Oxford theologian Lesley Smith 1994, 223 points out that the medieval practice of copying of the words of Scripture onto parchment—animal skin—can be considered analogous to the Incarnation.

\textsuperscript{4} Hodder and Hutson 2003, 172; cf. Hodder 1995, 13. Erik Kwakkel 2007 stresses the role that functional and typological meaning plays in the production of manuscripts, even though the application of these types of meaning often does not happen consciously. He calls the traces of these, often unnoticed, meanings ‘cultural residue’, also stressing their social character.

\textsuperscript{5} Hodder and Hutson 2003, 157-158.

\textsuperscript{6} Hodder and Hutson 2003, 158-159.

\textsuperscript{7} Hodder and Hutson 2003, 7, 16.

\textsuperscript{8} Hodder 1995, 14-15, 83-84.

\textsuperscript{9} Hodder and Hutson 2003, 158-159, 165-166, 236.
by its physical properties. Symbolical meaning includes all functions of a conceptual nature. Functional and symbolical meanings are generally present simultaneously and therefore strongly intertwined, though they are not always attributed equally consciously. With reference to its origin, meaning is individual and social, that is, belonging to one or more persons. Individual meaning that is also intentional may be called operational, and the type of social meaning which constrains and enables the attribution of individual meaning is properly called constitutive. Because individual meaning (operational or not) partly depends upon constitutive social meaning, these two types of meaning always occur together. It is impossible, therefore, in practice to distinguish absolutely between different kinds of meaning that are present at any one time even for a single person.

The various types of meaning may be clarified by returning to the example of the evangelistary just introduced. Functionally, it is a collection of paper on which the texts of the Gospel readings have been written. Symbolically, it may represent Christ, especially in the context of Mass. The book’s symbolical meaning, therefore, is part of the constitutive social meaning attributed to it by the Church, whose liturgy is being celebrated. The functional meaning is intentionally employed by the priest or deacon reading from the book during Mass, and the operational meaning he attributes to it is therefore that it can be used by him to read the Gospel from. The people in the pews will be aware of this functional meaning, but the symbolical meaning may not be present to all of them: not everyone will consider the book to be a symbol for Christ. In that case, the socially constituted symbolic meaning of the book is not part of the operational meaning attributed to it by these particular persons. These examples do not exhaust the possibilities—for instance, the meanings of the people responsible for the book’s production have not been considered. It will be clear, however, that the patchwork of meanings of even a single material object can be very complex.

Some aspects of the concept of meaning introduced here may need clarification. First, the fact that meaning is partly socially constructed should not be misunderstood to mean that it is determined by society as an abstract whole. One of post-processual archaeology’s most important characteristics is its emphasis on objects as always produced by someone and therefore as always having meaning for someone. Social systems or processes do not make and use things or attribute meaning to them; it is the social actors—individuals or groups of individuals—who do so. People are, of course, affected by the laws and processes that are at work in the social, economical and natural systems of which they are part, but they are not absolutely governed by them. Ultimately, therefore, material culture and its meanings are the products of human agency, of a particular person’s or group’s purpose and power of realisation. The truth of this is very clear when it comes to the creation of old books, as these are the product of artisanship, but it is in fact also evident in the traces of their use, all of which have been left by persons. Each of them is an expression, therefore, of someone’s agency, and if the trace is textual, this fact is visually conveyed by the individuality of the hand in which it has been written.

Second, the relational aspect of meaning should not be regarded as a one-way street. The attribution of meaning on the part of human agents is not the only result of the interaction between objects and their producers and users. Material culture has influence on human beings as well, for it has a tendency to make people dependent upon them and subsequently force them to do things. The evangelistary mentioned earlier has not only been produced and used in a certain way because of the Christological significance attributed to it within Mass, but is itself one of the things that enables Mass to be said in the first place. What is more, if it is used often enough, the book will wear down, and force its users to repair or replace it. In a figurative sense, then, objects can be said to have agency of their own, at least in their

---

1 Hodder and Hutson 2003, 6-10, 157.
relationship with human beings. As products of human agency, they do not only reflect the preoccupations of groups and individuals, they interact with and thereby partly shape them.¹

Once it has become clear that the past is imbued with meaning, an archaeological site and all the artefacts within it may be metaphorically regarded as a highly fragmentary and confused text that must be deciphered and read.² The main challenge facing the archaeologist can therefore be said to be to read aright the remnants of the past.³ When it comes to the vast majority of material culture it is clear that reading is only a metaphorical way of describing one’s engagement with it, as it often does not use language but other signs for the expression of meaning. This is just as true for books; text is but a part of them, and all other aspects can only be read in a metaphorical sense. However, whether the word is used figuratively or not—to describe the engagement with text or that with matter—it is clear that the most pressing problems generated by post-processual archaeology’s emphasis on meaning are not scientific but hermeneutical, and it is for this reason that it is also called interpretive.

Interpretive archaeology seeks to understand the variety of meanings attributed to material culture in the past. Hodder explains that these meanings exerted their influence on and are therefore most readily apparent from the way objects are ‘made, used and discarded’.⁴ For the book archaeologist, this means that the best sources of information on the various types of meaning attributed to books are the traces of production and use that appear in them. After all, these traces, and the stratigraphic units they comprise, are the observable part of the influence exerted on the books by the people who were involved with them, and the particular shape this involvement took was determined by the meanings that the books had for these people. Studying traces of production and use therefore does not only provide information on the way in which books were made and used, but thereby also on the meanings attributed to them, to the extent that they are or can be adequately interpreted. I repeat that this dissertation is about traces and not about books, for I set out to understand the meaning of the latter for Beckers by studying that of the former.

The process of interpretation is governed by what is traditionally known as the hermeneutic circle. This concept is based on the observation that a reliable understanding of a text is achieved only by interpreting the text as a whole in the terms of its parts, and the parts in terms of the whole.⁵ The concept has a wider, non-textual application as well, however, for the human mind is incapable of instantaneously interpreting for the first time even a bounded aspect of reality in all its particulars. The mind must first analyse at least some of these particulars on their own—although it cannot interpret any one of them outside the context from which they derive their meaning either. This idea can be easily applied to the interpretation of finds on archaeological sites, and Hodder uses it to provide the following bipartite principle at the basis of all archaeological reasoning:

The first [strand] is that an argument has to be presented that is not internally contradictory – all the different parts fit into a coherent whole. The second strand is that all the different types of data have to be accounted for by the argument.⁶

With reference to an archaeology of a book collection, this means that a stratigraphic unit is only fully understood when that understanding takes into account the entire unit and its contexts, and is simultaneously supported by each individual trace of which the unit consists.

¹ Hodder 2012, 56-58; Hodder and Hutson 2003, 6-9, 14.
² On the reading of a text as a metaphor for the interpretation of material culture, see Hodder and Hutson 2003, 166-170, 204-205.
³ Hodder and Hutson 2003, 166-170, 204-205.
⁴ Hodder 1995, 161. Cf. ibid., 12, where he expresses the same thought by saying that meaning influences the way material culture is ‘used, embellished and discarded.’
⁵ For the hermeneutical circle as understood by the influential hermeneutical theorist Hans-Georg Gadamer, see Gadamer 1975, 259.
⁶ Hodder 1999, 33.
Such complete understanding may not actually be achievable in practice, but Hodder and the other interpretive archaeologists argue that it is most nearly approached when archaeological research is both dialectical and contextual, as will be discussed now.

1.5.3. The Dialectic of Interpretation

The dialectical character of archaeological research has already been touched upon, but it merits closer attention. Hodder argues that interpretation is a dialogue, and this is as true for traces of production and use in books as it is with reference to archaeological finds. Material culture is never just a given; it does not form a passive record of history. Rather, it is meaningful, which is another way of saying that it confronts the observer with the meanings associated with it by other people either in production or use, and it can therefore be said to speak for them. Because he is studying meaning, an interpretive archaeologist will have to engage in a dialogue with the objects he studies by bringing his own interpretations to bear on them.1 Similarly, a book archaeologist interprets the material traces left by the individuals who produced and used the volumes he studies, and by doing so he may be said to speak with them.2

The dialectic of interpretation is kick-started by the scholar’s pre-understandings of his research material. Examples given by Hodder include the definition of the object of study, the criteria used to identify which facts are significant or not, the perceived research goals and expected results, the choice of tools, methods and skills to be applied, as well as the scholar’s institutional and socio-political context,3 to which I would add his engagement with and position in the general scholarly debate. If all is well, most of these pre-understandings have been largely determined by what the scholar believes he knows about his material, based on general knowledge, the literature and experience or on preliminary investigation. In their turn, the pre-understandings determine, at least initially, what is investigated and in what way. They form, in other words, the scholar’s personal hermeneutic; the lens through which he must perceive his sources.

On the basis of his pre-understandings, the scholar then proceeds to confront his sources. One would, perhaps, be tempted to think that this confrontation takes the form of testing hypotheses based on the scholar’s foreknowledge against the actual data. When it comes to the interpretation of meaning, however, this hypothetico-deductive approach is unsuitable, for the simple reason that there is no absolute distinction between the scholar’s hypotheses and his data. The human mind is incapable of observing without simultaneously interpreting, and so reality always appears to the scholar as interpreted. The data, therefore, have in a sense been interpreted to be there by the scholar himself, and this interpretation is based on the same pre-understandings as his hypotheses. An example of this is the identification of layers and stratigraphic units in book collections, which have been explained to be constructions on the part of the scholar. When these layers and units are investigated on their meanings, they are the data on which this investigation is based, but they have themselves been construed within a certain pre-understood framework of meaning, and they are not entirely objectively given. It is clear, then, that there can be no such thing as the objective testing of hypotheses concerning meaning.

Because the testing of hypotheses is inappropriate for the questions asked by interpretive archaeology, Hodder argues that the scholar should instead seek to make his understanding of the sources fit the data. Fitting may seem very similar to the testing and discarding of hypotheses, but it does not rely for its validity on having objectively given data.

1 Hodder 1995, 161; Hodder and Hutson 2003, 161.
3 Hodder 1999, 33, 49-51.
at its disposal. Rather, it depends solely on the relative autonomy of reality. What Hodder means by this is that reality exists independently from people’s interpretations of it, despite being always understood. Whether a shard of pottery is interpreted as a remnant of a pot or of an urn, for instance, it has certain physical qualities that are unequivocal. This relative autonomy is just as much a property of the past as it is of the present: it may be true that we can only have our own understanding of it (as those to whom it was present could only have theirs), but it did exist, and no less for having passed. Whatever the archaeologists make of it, the shard they interpret once belonged to only one particular object, and that is a matter of solid fact.

Hodder’s argument in favour of the autonomy of reality also holds for meaning. Interpretations of reality have a relative independence as well, in the sense that they are historical phenomena that exist independently from other people’s reconstructions of them. The meaning attributed to the before-mentioned pot or urn by a given person at a given moment is as solid a fact as the object’s particular existence. Meaning is, of course, more ephemeral than matter, but the process of its attribution may leave material traces. These traces must be interpreted in their turn, but they, too, have a relative autonomy. If the pottery shard, for instance, bears ash stains this may have various causes, and it may not even indicate that the complete object had the functional meaning of an urn, but the presence of the stains themselves cannot be denied. This also goes for traces of production and use in books: their interpretation may be complicated, but they are what they are. The identification of a stratigraphic unit in a group of books is a matter of interpretation on which opinions may vary, but there is usually no doubt about whether or not the traces which are interpreted to make up the unit actually exist.

If matter and meaning in past and present are real, this means that they are not entirely unknowable, and that the scholar is accountable to them, within reasonable limits. This, in turn, means that reality constrains the interpretations that are possible of it. Interpretation and the way in which data are constructed should have a basis in reality, and as long as interpretation is guided by the material properties of the sources, it has what Hodder calls a ‘guarded objectivity’. The scholar’s duty is to make sure that his understanding of the material remains of (other people’s readings of) the past is grounded in the autonomy of reality and consonant with it. In other words, he should make it fit.

The actual process of fitting understanding to reality is driven by misfits and led by the data. The scholar’s pre-understandings determine the questions initially asked and thereby start the process of investigation, and although they continue to shape it, the direction which the process subsequently takes is primarily determined by his sources. Sooner or later, the conscientious observer of the remains of the past will have to acknowledge that his understanding of their historical meanings is imperfect: it will not only turn out to be incomplete, but it will also turn out not to fit all aspects of his sources. This is the result of the autonomy of reality of which the scholar’s data partake, for if they were merely the scholar’s production, they would fit the theory behind that construction perfectly. Instead they do not: they will, inevitably, cause the scholar to ask questions that he cannot answer. This means that the data will have to be studied more elaborately to see if they can be made to yield more information, and a scholar should get to know his sources as thoroughly as possible. Over the course of this process, the data may actually turn out to be in flat contradiction with the
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1 On the concepts of fitting and testing in archaeological theory, see Hodder 1999, 59-62, 64-65 and Hodder and Hutson 2003, 198-199.
2 Hodder 1995, 163.
3 On the reality of the past and our reconstruction of it on the basis of its traces, cf. Ricoeur 1984.
scholar’s understanding of them, in which case the theory needs to be adapted, or even entirely replaced. In both cases, the scholar is forced to continue his interpretive process by the data. Interpretation according to this approach, then, does not consist of developing a hypothesis and then determining if the sources allow its acceptance or demand its dismissal, but rather of confronting the data and letting these raise questions which lead to a deeper understanding.

Interpretation involves going back and forth between the scholar’s understanding of the data and the data themselves, until a fit between them is achieved, that is, until the scholar’s interpretation accounts for all the individual parts and combines them into a coherent whole. Hodder points out that, if dialectically implemented in this way, the hermeneutic circle is not in fact a circle at all, but a spiral. The scholar’s understanding of reality changes as a result of his encounter with it, and so does not end up where it began. Because an interpretive archaeologist’s data are meaningful, another way of saying this is by pointing out that the hermeneutic spiral generates new meaning. In trying to understand the meanings attributed to material culture by one of its producers and users, the interpretive archaeologist’s own hermeneutic, the framework of meaning within which he interprets, meets that of another interpreter, that is, the earlier user. This meeting is a dialogue, as has been said, but because the two hermeneutics differ as a result of differences in personal, social, cultural and historical context, translation between the two is needed. The scholar will have to interpret the earlier framework of meaning in terms of his own and to accommodate his own hermeneutic to the one that he encounters, and the result cannot therefore be the same as either one of them. It is a hybrid, a merging of interpretations or a fusion of horizons which constitutes a new meaning which has not yet been attributed to the interpreted cultural expression before.

The coming chapters provide the results of the practical operation of my personal hermeneutic spiral, but a straightforward example of the process just explained may conveniently be presented here. Many of the books from the library of Soeterbeeck contain ownership notes of sisters. Upon first seeing these notes, I assumed, on the basis of my modern, secular understanding of the ownership of books and the procedure of writing ownership notes in them, that they had all been written by the sisters themselves. Whereas this turned out to be true in some cases, I soon also came across ownership notes with the names of sisters that were clearly in the hand of Rector Arnoldus Beckers. This discovery had several consequences. Most straightforwardly, it forced me to change my assumptions about the origins of the ownership notes, acknowledging that they had not all been written by the sisters themselves and that the unidentified hands among them could not be attributed out of hand to the sisters mentioned. More significantly, it raised questions concerning the private use and ownership of books in a monastic setting and the circumstances surrounding the writing of these ownership notes. These topics are all discussed in one of the following chapters, but at present this example will suffice to illustrate the initial operation of a

1 Hodder 1995, 238-240; Hodder and Hutson 2003, 199. Cf. Gadamer 1975, 347. Of course, the hermeneutic spiral is like a circle in the sense of being intrinsically endless, for the data will always point to more and more data that are to be accounted for, and the scholar could always decide to expand the whole he wishes to interpret. Any end to the hermeneutic spiral must therefore retain a measure of arbitrariness (cf. Hodder 1999, 43).


3 Hodder 1995, 213-240; 1999, 33-45 also provides some practical examples of this process.

4 A discussion of many ownership notes in the library of Soeterbeeck will be part of a forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters. This will include a catalogue of the Soeterbeeck Collection with transcriptions of all ownership notes.

5 For examples, see pp. 232 n. 9, 237 n. 1.

6 On the books which Beckers assigned to sisters, see pp. 232-237 and Table 5.1.

7 See pp. 232-237.
hermeneutic spiral, in which the autonomous reality of the ownership notes forced me to adapt my initial interpretation and evoked additional questions, setting in motion and steering my investigations.

At first glance, the hermeneutic spiral may seem like an unscholarly process, because it consists of a continuous and unforeseen accommodation of the argument and depends upon the personal and social context of the individual interpreter. It is neither perfectly methodical nor replicable. Hodder’s first answer to these objections is that the hermeneutic spiral seems nonetheless to be an accurate description of how archaeologists actually work even if the process is not generally made explicit. In the humanities, too, scholars are often expected to report on their research as if they applied the hypothetico-deductive method, and to start their publications with the formulation of hypotheses (which usually turn out, not altogether unexpectedly, to have been confirmed by the sources). In my experience, however, research is often not guided by hypotheses but by questions, and in such cases the hypothesis presented at the beginning of an article is actually the product of mature understanding reached at a relatively advanced stage in the process. Scholars may not be up-front with or even aware of it, then, but fitting rather than testing is already common practice. By way of a second answer to the accusation that the hermeneutic spiral is not scholarly, Hodder stresses that the interpretive process should be self-reflexive. Archaeologists should describe the form which their hermeneutic spirals take; they should give an account of and contextualise their own position by being explicit about their pre-understandings and describe the misfits between these and the sources, as well as the accommodations that they were forced subsequently to make. They should not only report on the outcome of their investigations, but also be transparent about the way in which they reached these results, for in interpretation that process is itself the main result. If the process is reported on, it still remains unique and unrepeatable, but it can at least be followed every step of the way so that subsequent scholars can make their own fit between their understanding and the sources, where they judge this to be necessary.

Hodder and Hutson also stress that the verification of an interpretation is not altogether impossible. It is true that it is likely, because of the uniqueness of the interplay between material culture and its interpreter, that different scholars will arrive at somewhat different understandings of the same archaeological site. However, although data are construed, this happens on the basis of an experience of reality, which limits the possibilities of interpretation and ensures a guarded objectivity. It is often possible, therefore, to identify when an interpreter is simply in error. To accept multivocality is emphatically not to embrace relativism.

Ultimately, the most important quality of the dialectical nature of interpretation is simply that a scholar must constantly adjust his understanding of his subject. He must seek for the right fit between other people’s meanings and his own. Ideally, the initial disparity between the two will lead him to allow more and more room for the data to speak. If research is truly a dialogue, the scholar is forced to be open-minded, self-reflexive and accommodating; he must be able to listen carefully and change his mind. These are attributes that belong to a general scholarly attitude, but, with its emphasis on dialogue, hermeneutics seeks to cultivate them too, in its own particular way.
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2 Hodder 1995, 238; 1999, 5, 30-31. For an example of the interpretive process itself being reported on, see the diaries kept by the project team of the excavation of Çatalhöyük (Hodder 1999, 121-124, 194).
1.5.4. Contextual Archaeology

The interpretive archaeologist’s continuous dialogue with earlier users of material culture, the back-and-forth that results from trying to make his interpretation fit the remains of the past, is only one way in which he must try to make sure that his understanding of the data is valid. As identified by Hodder, the other major safeguard to keep the hermeneutic spiral from spinning out of control is contextualisation. This topic can be treated with relative brevity, since most of its elements have already been touched upon.

The importance of the contextualisation of material culture will already be apparent. It has been argued that meaning is relational and derived from context. Therefore, if material culture should be considered without any context at all, it would remain mute, as Hodder and Hutson say, and it would be impossible to engage in an interpretive dialogue with it. One could describe its material properties and perhaps deduce some aspect of its functional meaning, but certainly not understand its symbolic meanings. Furthermore, it has also been said that meaning is historically non-arbitrary, in the sense that the attribution of individual, operational meaning is constrained and enabled by interpersonal, constitutive meaning. In other words, any person’s own hermeneutic is part of a larger, socially, historically and culturally determined framework of meaning. Therefore, in order to understand the meanings attributed to an object by a given person, it is necessary to take into account that person’s private and social context. It is for these reasons that a particular element in the archaeological record can only be understood when considered in its context. This is one of the core elements of the hermeneutic circle (or spiral), which is why contextualisation is so central also to the archaeological approach to book collections.

Hodder and Hutson define context as the ‘totality of the relevant environment [of an object], where “relevant” refers to [...] a relationship necessary for discerning the object’s meaning’. The associative chain that emerges from this definition is potentially endless, but because the relevance of relationships is determined by the interpreter’s background and intentions, the context can be kept to manageable size. The difficult criterion of relevance is discussed later on, but first it is necessary to briefly turn to some of the most important dimensions on the basis of which an object’s relationships can be identified and its environment defined.

According to Hodder and Hutson, the environment of finds on an archaeological site depends primarily upon their temporal, spatial, depositional, typological and functional dimensions. All five of these can be reapplied to traces of production and use in books. The temporal dimension is the moment in time when a given trace was left, and provides a connection with its historical context. A trace’s spatial dimension refers primarily to its physical location in the collection, that is, the book, the page, or the specific position on the page. It is therefore related to such contextual information as the material characteristics and the content of the book in which it has been left, but also the presence of other traces. The depositional dimension of a trace is its position in a particular layer; if two or more traces can be said to be from different layers it means that they differ from each other along this dimension. The context to which the latter refers are the other traces of production and use in the same layer, with which a trace makes up the most basic stratigraphic unit. The typological dimension refers to a trace’s formal characteristics, such as the hand, the language and the ink

---

2 This is, as Hodder 1995, 166 points out, one of the reasons why it is relevant to study history in the first place: our understanding of the world is built upon understandings that were reached in the past.
4 Hodder and Hutson 2003, 188 (italics in original); cf. Hodder 1995, 14.
5 Hodder and Hutson 2003, 188-190. On the endless interconnectedness of things, see Hodder 2012, esp. 179-205.
6 Hodder and Hutson 2003, 176-183.
in which it may have been written, and is therefore related, for instance, to the person who left it and his or her institutional context. The functional dimension, finally, of a trace denotes what it is actually understood to do. This includes intended functions as well as inadvertent results, ranges all the way from the highlighting of an important passage and the correction of a textual error to the deletion of text, and refers directly to the use to which the book in which the trace appears is put.

Two comments must be made with reference to this list of dimensions. First, it enables the conceptual redefinition of a stratigraphic unit as the immediate context of the traces that make it up. It is an environment that has been identified on the basis of similarities in one or more contextual dimensions and judged to be especially relevant within the stratigraphic approach. Second, it will be seen that, whereas the dimension of space can be more or less objectively described, those of time, deposition, type and function often depend much more on the personal interpretation of the book archaeologist. This only drives home the intrinsically subjective nature of the definition of context.

Most subjective of all, however, is the decision whether or not a shared dimension is relevant or not for making up the context of a particular stratigraphic unit. The dimensions of a trace are based in reality, but within that limit and the possibilities provided by the sources, the choice between them to identify a stratigraphic unit or a broader context is the scholar’s. The identification of context, in other words, depends partly on a person’s own framework of meaning. As everyone comes to traces of production and use with his own knowledge and intentions, each scholar’s definition of their context will be different to a certain degree. This is why multivocality is an integral aspect of the contextual approach to archaeology, and it will be seen that this is in fact a good thing, as it means that the object of study is considered from more than just one point of view.

To conclude, it should be mentioned that contextualisation also provides a different perspective on the problem that archaeological interpretation always involves understanding one framework of meaning (in the past) by means of another (the scholar’s, in the present). No matter how carefully an archaeological find is put in its historical context, nothing can change the fact that this context is not ours. Although we are inseparably bound up with it, history has passed, and we do not belong to it. Interpretation, therefore, always involves translation of meaning from one context to another and generalisation across them. How can this be done reliably and without recourse to the processualist and materialist assumptions of Middle Range Theory? The answer already given was to keep dialectically engaged with the sources, to try to get to know them as best as possible and then to fit your understanding onto them and allow it to be adjusted where necessary. This can now be restated in contextual terms: the translational generalisations which the scholar is forced to make should be ‘accommodated to the “other” context’, as Hodder says. Paradoxically enough, the generalisation should be made context-specific, catered for the particular context the scholar is dealing with and adapted to it.

1.6. Clarifications
Only a few things remain to be noted before I can go on to discuss the application of the principles of interpretive archaeology to the study of Beckers’ traces of production and use.

---

1 Cf. Hodder 1995, 14-15; 1999, 43; Hodder and Hutson 2003, 188. The degree should not be exaggerated: an individual’s hermeneutic, shaped by his pre-understandings, is always determined also by his context, and so scholars can and do make identical choices as part of their research process.

2 The problem of Middle Range Theory can itself be restated as follows: it involves trying to understand an ‘other’ context in terms of a second ‘other’ context that is as foreign to the first as it is to the scholar’s. It is impossible, however, to adequately translate between more than one context simultaneously.

The first of these is that the post-processualists’ purpose is emphatically not methodological. Beyond stressing the importance of contextualisation, they do not seek to distil from the theoretical position of hermeneutics a clear-cut, universally applicable methodology. After all, to attempt to do so would all too easily lead to the very generalist trap that they seek to avoid. Every excavation should instead be allowed to call for its own, tailor-made methodology. Scholars should let the sources they interpret guide that process and raise the questions, and the method used should match the questions asked. Methodology should, in other words, be allowed to be interpretation-dependent. Of course, when a book historian does the interpreting, it is very likely that the methods needed will generally turn out to be precisely those which have always served him—the trusted tools of palaeography, codicology, analytical bibliography, art history, et cetera.

To recognise that methodology is one of a scholar’s pre-understandings, and that it belongs to the framework of meaning that he brings to his object of study, is no mere witticism, however. It draws attention to how all-important the expertise of the scholar, in terms both of knowledge and of methodological skill, is for the success of his research. Interpretive archaeology’s celebration of multivocality, of the fact that every scholar will produce his own interpretation of the sources within the limits set by the material possibilities, might seem to imply that it does not matter who the scholar is and how he chooses to carry out his research. In fact it is exactly the other way around: the freedom of interpretation places great demands on a scholar, for he should be knowledgeable and observant enough to see when his understanding does not fit the data and to recognise the questions that the data are asking of him and where they are leading him instead. In order, therefore, for a book archaeologist to be able to let his interpretation of traces of production and use be guided by the material itself, he has to be a better book historian, not a worse.

Another possible misconception about interpretive archaeology may be that the emphasis on agency and individual meaning, as well as on a scholar’s duty to adapt his interpretation to the particular context that he is studying at the moment, means that it is never possible to rise above the level of individual case studies. The contextual approach provides an excellent incentive to go beyond mere casuistry, however, for it makes sure that individual cases are not studied in isolation. Individual meaning is always partly socially constituted, and therefore its study potentially says as much about the social, cultural and historical background of the individual as about his personal interpretation. Contextualisation sheds as much light on the context as on the individual stratigraphic unit. In my case, this means that by studying the meaning of Beckers’ traces, I also hope to discover much about the meaning of books in his entire social context, and about that context itself.

The most distinctive and challenging characteristic of interpretive archaeology is, perhaps, its emphasis on research as a dialectical process. Applied to book collections, this means that the scholar is forced to engage in an open-minded dialogue with the books as they are. This has several significant consequences. Most straightforward, probably, is the realisation that it is only possible to engage in a dialogue with the book collection as it is now, incomplete and different though it may be from what it was before. One of the ramifications of this conclusion is that the reconstruction of the historical core of historical collections will not be as important as it has traditionally been in library research. It can be necessary to try to reconstruct an earlier phase in the collection’s history when interpreting a particular stratigraphic unit, as the collection in general may be part of the unit’s relevant environment, but this reconstruction is never the main goal. This is to interpret the meaning of the material remains in which the past is still present to us.

---

1.7. Interpreting the Stratigraphic Unit of Arnoldus Beckers

The reader will remember that the question to which this study seeks to provide an answer was, at least initially: what did Beckers do with the books in the historical library of Soeterbeeck and why? The way a book is produced or the use to which it is put by someone are important indications of its meaning for this person, and so the principles of interpretive archaeology allow me to rephrase my query as: what meanings did the books he made and used have for Beckers? The key to this question are the rector’s traces of production and use, because these are the direct result of his meaningful interaction with the volumes in which they appear. Clearly, then, the definition of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the historical library of Soeterbeeck along its temporal and typological dimensions, as reported on,¹ should be followed by an interpretation of its operational meanings by placing it in its relevant environments.

Interpretive archaeology has given me several important methodological clues on how to go about this. First, there are matters of distinction to consider. In order to make the amount of material to be interpreted manageable, I divide Beckers’ unit along its functional dimension—a decision which is reflected by the structure of this study. Roughly speaking, there are two types of traces to be considered: those that were meant to produce, revise or expand liturgical books, and those that had to do with the distribution and maintenance of books in the convent. The former can be said to have functioned in the context of the liturgy and are discussed in Chapters 3 and 4; the latter refer the library and are treated in Chapter 5.

One of the most important divisions that Hodder makes is that between functional and symbolic meanings. The former are much more straightforward to interpret and in fact are a sine qua non for the latter. The following chapters therefore first discuss what Beckers’ traces in each of the two contexts were intended to do on a practical level. Less concrete considerations on the rector’s part will become apparent over the course of my interpretation of the traces’ functional meaning and their context, and are therefore reserved for Chapter 8.

The way in which I interpret the functional meanings of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit is by placing it in its contexts, which are Soeterbeeck’s liturgical praxis and library management. For this reason, the chapters on the liturgical traces are preceded by an unavoidably lengthy analysis of the available evidence on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practices in Chapter 2. With reference to the management of the conventual book collection a briefer discussion suffices, which is provided in an introductory paragraph to Chapter 5.

When it comes to contextualisation, my most important methodological guideline is post-processual archaeology’s emphasis on the historical non-arbitrariness of meaning, which urges me to be hesitant about using information on other convents or from other periods for my interpretation of Beckers’ traces. I therefore rely as much as possible on sources on Soeterbeeck from the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. Because these are very scarce for the practical details of everyday life, I am regularly forced to go further afield either temporally or spatially, knowing that in such cases the evidence carries less weight and should be treated with care. I have made the conscious decision, however, to be reticent about devoting attention and space to sketching the broader context beyond eighteenth-century Soeterbeeck by engaging with the literature on other communities at other times. Instead, my approach has driven me to focus primarily on conducting as exhaustive—and occasionally exhausting—an investigation as possible of the available evidence on Beckers’ convent.

Although there is only little concrete information on Soeterbeeck’s liturgy and library during Beckers’ rectorate, one of the main reasons that his stratigraphic unit is such an appealing object of study is that contextual evidence is very rich in other areas, particularly

¹ See pp. 25-33.
along the typological dimension with which it is connected to the rector himself. As already mentioned multiple times, there are several important sources on Beckers’ personal life, and he also left many writings outside Soeterbeeck’s historical book collection. I discuss these with an eye to an interpretation of the symbolic meanings of the rector’s stratigraphic unit, that is, of those motivations for his use of books that go beyond the practical.

My personal interaction with Beckers’ writings and written traces outside the library goes beyond what is strictly necessary for the contextualisation of his traces within it. I already explained in the general introduction that this caused the scope of my research to gradually become broader than it originally was and has been presented so far in this chapter for rhetorical purposes. Reporting at the end of my research process, I should say that the question that I try to answer in the following chapters is not what meanings Beckers attributed to the books in the historical library of Soeterbeeck, but what motivated him, as a rector of this convent, to do and write the things of which we have the traces. This broadening changes nothing on a methodological level, however. Although Beckers’ other writings are not part of his stratigraphic unit, which is strictly limited to the library of Soeterbeeck, they are closely associated with it as part of its context, and can be treated almost in the same way. Although the depositional dimension of the rector’s traces within the historical library of Soeterbeeck plays no role there, the ones outside of it have temporal, spatial, typological and functional dimensions too. I divide them according to the last one, that is, into administrative activities, discussed in Chapter 6, and historiographical writings, which are the subject of Chapter 7. And also like the traces, I discuss their functional meaning first and leave my interpretation of their symbolic meaning for Chapter 8.

I trust that by giving this methodological justification of the set-up of this book, which supplements the explanation from a historical perspective that is provided by the general introduction, I have gone a long way towards heeding Hodder’s call for an explicit account of my pre-understandings and the hermeneutic spiral in which I was engaged during the writing of this study. The chapters that follow are placed in an order that reflects my research process. They do not offer a blow by blow account of it, however, and are cheerfully silent about its many dead ends and wrong turns—the worst misfits between the material and my interpretation of it. I have occasionally tried to present my findings by reproducing sanitised versions of the trains of thought that led to them, rather than by providing a substantiated conclusion, but in the interest of readability this attempt has in no way been carried through consistently. I feel that this is about as far as I can go within the limits of the genre of a dissertation.

1.8. Conclusion
In summary, the archaeological approach to historical collections that has just been outlined can be characterised as an attempt to go beyond the description of books and the reconstruction of libraries to the interpretation of the meanings historically attributed to them, similar to the development from traditional to post-processual archaeology. Disregarding the preconceived distinction between manuscripts and printed books, it asks for an integrative approach to historical book collections, in which the stratigraphic units rather than the individual books are the primary object of study. It can be applied to traces of both production and use, although it has a natural tendency to focus on the latter. It regards such traces as the products of the interaction between the books and their makers and users, that is, of the interplay of their agencies, which are themselves embedded in a complex network of socio-historical and -cultural contexts. Using the principles of hermeneutics and contextualisation, it

---

1 See pp. 11-12, 20.
2 See pp. 11-13.
3 For an answer to those who feel that I have actually gone too far, see p. 16.
seeks to attain a dialectically and contextually formed understanding of the functional and symbolical meanings attributed to books by the people who produced and used them. Ultimately, an archaeology of a book collection is an attempt to reach a grounded interpretation of the past, not only in its materiality but also of such immaterial realities as the attribution of meaning.

With this, my approach having been described and the way in which it governs the plan of this book having been explained, the stage is set for an interpretation of the traces of use and the writings of Rector Arnoldus Beckers in the following chapters. I would therefore like to raise the curtain and briefly mark the outlines of Soeterbeeck as it was in Beckers’ days. There is no better and more concise way to do so than by quoting the vivid picture that is painted by a letter of 9 April 1814.¹ In it, Beckers’ successor, Joannes van den Broek (1811-1842),² provides the mayor of Deursen with information about Soeterbeeck that had been requested of the latter by the Napoleonic government:

Het klooster bestaat uijt een opperste of mater, welk voor een zeker tijd uijt hun midden of religieusen verkoren wierd, onder assistentie van mede religieuse hebbende tot hun dienst in geestelijke zaeken een eigen priester, die als rector door hun word gesalarieert buijten kosten van het goevernement of andere, wordende met consent van de mater aan de geestelijke den uitgang buijten het klooster toegelaten, ook om hunne familien of andere bekende bij hun in het klooster te ontvangen. […] De religieuse staan onder den prinsbiscop van Luijk. De religieuse hebben ider respective hunne privative eigendom behouden […]. Dit klooster was ingerigt tot een geestelijk doel in welkers kerk vreemden wierden toegelaten, als mede tot een institut onder de instructie van een meesteres tot het leren schrijven in d’Hollandse en France taalen, en voorts tot alle zoorten van vrouwelijke handwerken voor kinderen, zo wel van de protestantsche als roomsche religie […], voorts tot het houden van pensionieren en welke alle door hunne familien en bekende konden bezorgd worden. Een groot aantal kinderen en pensionaire bevonden zig tijde der suppressie in het zelve, enige […] hebben dezelve uijt liefde voor hun mede mensch voor niets gehouden. Zo als een groot getal armen ingezetene van deze plaats [Deursen] als van die van Ravenstein door hun wierden ondersteund.³

More elaborate descriptions follow shortly, and this sketch will be elaborated upon in many ways. At present, let us settle for this little vignette, possibly slightly exaggerated to please the officials, of Soeterbeeck as Van den Broek’s predecessor had left it behind. Just after Beckers’ days, the community flourished and was financially self-sufficient, engaged in corporal works of mercy and not enclosed. The combination of a convent of canonesses regular, a boarding house and a boarding school provides a rather bustling impression, which is confirmed for Beckers’ days by the fact that he had about twenty choir and ten converse sisters in his care at any given time, as well as varying numbers of boarders and pupils.⁴ These

---

¹ ASP 443, letter of 9 April 1814.
² Van den Broek was born in Boekel on 17 February 1778 and baptised as Johannes Gerardus (Jan) Arts. He assumed the name ‘Van den Broek’ during his studies at the Latin school in Uden. He was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1811 until his death on 11 June 1842 (ASP 184 and 405; Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 5).
³ ‘The convent consists of a superior or mater, who was chosen, for a time, out of the midst of them, that is, the religious, with the assistance of her fellow religious. They have at their service in spiritual matters a priest of their own who, being rector, is paid by themselves without any expense to the government or anyone else. With the mater’s consent, it is possible for the religious to leave the convent, and to receive their families or other acquaintances with them in the convent. […] The religious are subject to the prince-bishop of Liège. The religious have each kept their own private property […]. This convent had been set up with a spiritual purpose, people from outside being admitted in its church, and as an institute for the teaching, under the instruction of a schoolmistress, of the Dutch and French languages as well as of all kinds of feminine occupations, for children both of the Protestant and the Roman denomination […], and also for the keeping of boarders, who could all be visited by their families and acquaintances. A large number of children and boarders were in the convent at the time of the suppression, and some of these […] the religious accommodated for free, out of love for their neighbours. A large number of poor inhabitants of this village [Deursen] and of Ravenstein were also supported by them’ (ASP 443, letter of 9 April 1814).
⁴ A survey of biographical data on all sisters and boarders at Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate is provided in Appendix A. In the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck (transcribed in Appendix D), Beckers reports that in 1806, the convent’s boarding school counted twenty-nine pupils and one teacher (ASP 4, p. 12a-b).
were the people whom he served as rector, and this was the context in which he left the traces and produced the writings which are the subject of the following pages.
Figure 2.1: Right choir stall at Soeterbeeck, 1948 (from Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, no. 1506). Photograph by Cis van den Heuvel.

Figure 2.2: Left choir stall at Soeterbeeck, 1948 (from Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, no. 1506). Photograph by Cis van den Heuvel.
Chapter 2: Soeterbeeck’s Liturgical History

2.1. Introduction
Defined along its typological dimension by the identity of the person responsible for it, Rector Beckers’ stratigraphic unit spans a considerable part of the historical library of Soeterbeeck. It can, however, be divided into more manageable subunits according to the traces’ functional dimension. Judging from the books that bear traces of his involvement, Beckers was active in two fields, which can be summarily identified as the liturgy and the library. An interpretation of the functional meaning of the material traces of Beckers’ activities in each of these areas is presented in the following chapters, beginning with that of the liturgy as the most substantive.

In order to be able to understand the practical motivations behind Beckers’ activities in this area, however, I must first consider the context in which he undertook them. This background is formed by the convent’s liturgical practices in his days, a topic which so far has not been addressed in any detail.1 The contents of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books have been the subject of a small number of studies,2 but their use has remained largely unexplored. The only author who presents original research on the convent’s liturgical history is the priest-historian Adrianus Frenken, and he does so only in brief. Still, the present chapter is entirely structured around an assessment of his views on the matter, because, as will be seen, the acceptance or rejection of these has far-reaching consequences for the way in which the context of Beckers’ liturgical traces must be understood. Because Frenken’s conclusions are evidently based on a network of evidence that covers the period between 1452 and 1906, this discussion of them takes up many pages and moves far beyond the temporal boundaries of Beckers’ rectorate. This is unavoidable, however, as there are no useful archival sources at all on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical praxis in the eighteenth century with which to contextualise the rector’s notes, and the few pieces of evidence that do exist for other phases are often so vague or ambiguous that the only way in which they can be properly interpreted is by considering them in light of each other. So although this chapter may tax the reader’s patience by its length and its focus on periods other than Beckers’, its use of Frenken’s brief statement as a point of departure is actually a very efficient way to investigate the practical context in which the liturgical activities that are discussed in the next two chapters took place.

In order to properly address Frenken’s claims regarding the history of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practices it is necessary to cover so much ground already, that it would only be going a small step further to describe the convent’s liturgical history in its entirety, from 1452 to 1997. I feel that it is merited to take this golden opportunity to tell a rounded story,

1 I treated the issue of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history very summarily in an earlier publication (Poirters 2013a, 106-111), but the scope of the present study allows for a much fuller treatment. Also, additional evidence has since come to my attention which caused me to change my mind on certain aspects of it.

2 The most important source on the contents of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval liturgical manuscripts and fragments are the catalogues by Kienhorst 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2009. Boogaarts wrote an unpublished graduate thesis (1971) in which he described and analysed the contents of many liturgical books, both manuscript and printed, in the library of Soeterbeeck (ASP 49). He also published an article on the sequence Gaude cunctis veneranda for St Anne in manuscripts IV 52:4 and IV 135:2 in 1992, and a short note on the musical notation in the manuscripts of Soeterbeeck in 2005. Van Zitteren wrote an unpublished MA thesis (2006) in which he identified the liturgical tradition of many of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript antiphonaries. Summaries of his findings, on which see pp. 60-62, were published in the Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse kerkgeschiedenis (2009b), and, for a wider audience, in Brabants heem (2009a). A typology of the late medieval breviaries in the Soeterbeeck Collection that are attributed to the scriptorium of Mariënhage is provided by Rekers 2010, who is currently preparing a dissertation on the same topic. Van den Berg 2012, 75 briefly characterises the contents of the three vespersal IV 77; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294; and RHGe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkhed Helmond, inventariser. 699. Finally, Bossmann and Welle have published a popularizing article on Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts for the divine office (2007). I have personally published an article on the text of the Little Office of the Virgin in books of hours in the Soeterbeeck Collection (Poirters 2013a).
particularly because it is one of a kind that is not often heard. So although this chapter’s basic structure is based on Frenken’s statement, it expands upon this framework in two ways. First, many of the sources that come up provide information concerning the conventual liturgy beyond what is required for an assessment of Frenken’s argument. Such pieces of evidence are considered here in order to shed more light on the concrete manifestation of the liturgy at any given time in the convent’s history. Second, Frenken was obviously not able to take into account the developments that took place after his article on the history of Soeterbeeck was published in 1931 and 1932. This chapter, however, also covers the final decades of the convent’s existence, including the period following the liturgical upheavals of the Second Vatican Council. None of this is strictly necessary within the context of this dissertation, and it makes a lengthy chapter even longer. I hope, however, that presenting as complete an overview as possible of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history may prove to be exemplary for and helpful in the study of the practices of other convents.

2.2. Frenken’s Statement

Frenken’s description of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history only spans several lines, but it is of great significance for the purpose of this study. What he writes is this:

Te Zoeterbeek gebruikte men het Breviarium der Windesheimers tot aan bovenvermelden brand (1539); van toen af tot 1906 heeft men er bij wijze van privilegie altijd het Officie van O. L. Vrouw gebeden, waarschijnlijk met commemoratie’s der dagheiligen uit het Proprium, dat de Windesheimers hadden. In 1906 namen zij het Romeinsch Brevier aan met het Proprium Sanctorum der Reguliere Kanunniken van St. Jan van Lateranen.¹

This statement, brief and unsubstantiated as it is, must be studied carefully. After all, it is made by a careful and reliable historian, who in the 1930s may well have had access to many written sources and oral traditions which have since been lost.

The passage just quoted includes many important details that come up for further discussion below, but its general thrust is that from 1539 to 1906 the sisters of Soeterbeeck restricted their daily celebration of the liturgy of the hours to the recital of the Little Office or Hours of the Virgin and omitted the great, canonical or divine office whose parts make up the chief contents of the breviary. Within the Western Church, the most widespread manner of celebrating the liturgy is the Roman rite, which for many ages had a large number of variants called uses. The Windesheim Breviary which Frenken mentions represents the use according to which the canonical office was celebrated by communities within and associated with the Chapter (later the Congregation) of Windesheim. The sisters of Soeterbeeck are said to have abandoned this breviary in exchange for the Little Office, which is a liturgical devotion that is shaped after the great office and also exists according to various uses, but is considerably shorter and simpler and by the end of the Middle Ages was often contained in books of hours.² Being specifically devoted to the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is usually said in addition to the canonical hours,³ but Frenken claims that for most of Soeterbeeck’s history, it was the community’s sole realisation of the liturgy of the hours.

By far the most of Beckers’ liturgical traces of production and use, which are the subject of the two following chapters, appear in books for the canonical office. It will be evident, therefore, that my assessment of the reliability of Frenken’s statement significantly influences the way in which I understand the fundamental meaning of the best part of the rector’s stratigraphic unit. If the books on which Beckers worked—mostly, as will be seen, in

¹ At Soeterbeeck the Windesheim Breviary was used until the abovementioned fire (1539); from then on until 1906 only the Office of Our Blessed Lady was prayed, by way of privilege, probably with commemorations of the saints of the Windesheim propers. In 1906 they adopted the Roman Breviary with the proper of saints of the canons regular of St John Lateran³ (Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 2).
² The best single source on the history and meaning of the Little Office of the Virgin remains Taunton 1903.
the final quarter of the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{1}—were not used liturgically, his involvement with them must have served some other purpose. For this reason, as has already been argued, Frenken’s remarks merit close attention.

The most problematic aspect of the historian’s claims is that he makes them without providing any substantiation, so that it is not entirely certain on what sources he based himself, and in what ways he explained the evidence to the contrary. This is to be lamented all the more because even at face value there seems to be much of the latter, especially with reference to the sisters’ supposed neglect of the canonical office for almost four centuries. First, from the moment Soeterbeeck had adopted the Rule of Augustine in the 1450s it was a convent of canonesses regular. The very name refers to the fact that a canoness participates in the Church’s canonical life in some way, and because she does so chiefly on a spiritual level through her celebration of the canonical office, her title loses an essential link with reality once she abandons this liturgical duty.\textsuperscript{2} True, until the upheavals of the 1960s, Soeterbeeck did make a distinction between the choir and the converse sisters in its community. Both groups took the three monastic vows of poverty, obedience and chastity, but only the former prayed the divine office.\textsuperscript{3} Still, the choir sisters, at least, were characterised by this obligation and their lives centered around it,\textsuperscript{4} making it is almost inconceivable that for four centuries they would have shirked it by saying only the Hours of the Virgin. Although he does not say so, it is probably this line of reasoning that makes Koen Goudriaan claim without qualification, and with complete disregard for Frenken, that the sisters of Soeterbeeck celebrated the canonical office.\textsuperscript{5}

Another reason that would have allowed the latter to be assumed out of hand if it were not for Frenken’s claims to the contrary are the large numbers of books for the great office, both manuscript and printed, that survive in the Soeterbeeck Collection or can otherwise be proven to have once been part of the convent’s library. A tally which excludes the books that survive only in fragmentary form but includes the ones that are merely incomplete might look as follows.\textsuperscript{6} I use only very broad categories, and ignore a small number of manuscripts that do not fit these, usually because they mostly contain texts that are not meant for the divine office or in their present condition combine fragments of multiple distinct books.\textsuperscript{7}

1. There are seventeen Latin breviaries, including some for the complete office and others for the nocturnal hour of Matins or the diurnal hours, either for the entire year or only for the winter or the summer half of it, which went from the first Sunday in Advent to Holy

\textsuperscript{1} See pp. 112, 132-133, 148.

\textsuperscript{2} Vissers 1958, 434-438. He says that the nineteenth-century Congregation of the Missionary Canonesses of St Augustine (known, since 1963, as the Missionary Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary), whose foundress Marie Louise De Meester had wanted to preserve the great office but had been forced to conclude that this was not possible, had thereby been changed in nature (428). Cf. also his strong expressions of astonishment at the fact that, in the twentieth century, various congregations of Hospital Sisters only celebrated the canonical hours on certain feasts and the Little Office on other days (426).

\textsuperscript{3} That is, until 1954, when the converse sisters first started saying a condensed version of the great office. Later still, they would join the choir sisters in reciting it in full, see pp. 102-104.

\textsuperscript{4} For a moving description of the place the divine office must have occupied in the life of a choir sister of Soeterbeeck, see Van Dijk 2012, 236-240.

\textsuperscript{5} Goudriaan 2008, 190.

\textsuperscript{6} In order to avoid skewing the picture, this survey excludes liturgical books known or suspected to have come to Soeterbeeck from Mariëndaal in 1954, either because they contain notes or stamps to that effect or because they do not bear the shelf marks that had been added to the books at Soeterbeeck before this event (cf. p. 6). These include an antiphonary-cum-processional (IV 17; cf. Kienhorst 2005, 64-65), a series of fourteen printed psalters (III 201-III 214) and five printed books for the Holy Week (III 171, III 172, III 178, V 179, V 212).

\textsuperscript{7} These are IV 51:3-4, IV 52, IV 78, IV 81, IV 92:1-2 and IV 130, on which see Kienhorst 2005, 84-87, 98-99, 106-107, 128-129, 132-133.
Saturday and from Easter Sunday to the final Week after Pentecost, respectively.\textsuperscript{1} There is also one diurnal breviary in Dutch, written by Beckers.\textsuperscript{2}

2. In addition to these, there are thirteen books that serve as supplements to breviaries and contain only the texts that are proper to the offices of feasts celebrated within the Congregations of Windesheim and the Lateran.\textsuperscript{3}

3. There are nine Latin psalters, some of which include the psalms in their biblical order whereas others are ferial.\textsuperscript{4} Most of the latter may actually have been part of a breviary once. Many psalters do not only contain psalms but also additional texts, most often hymns.

4. There are also two independent hymnals.\textsuperscript{5}

5. The next main category of books consists of eighteen antiphonaries. These are either complete or exclusively for the winter or the summer half of the year, and cover all hours or focus specifically on Vespers.\textsuperscript{6}

6. Also especially produced for this hour are eight vesperals, two of which also include a printed psalter and hymnal.\textsuperscript{7}

7. There are three books in Latin and Dutch for Mass and office in the Holy Week and the octave of Easter.\textsuperscript{8}

8. Finally, there are also three copies of a Dutch translation of the Roman Martyrology.\textsuperscript{9}

In all, these are more than seventy books for the convent’s two most important liturgical duties. These books have not all been at Soeterbeeck

\textsuperscript{1} The manuscripts among these are the first unit of IV 16 (ff. 1-147), IV 74, IV 79, IV 79A and its fragments Fr. 33:1, IV 80, and IV 83 and its fragments Fr. 33:3, on which see Kienhorst 2005, 62-63, 92-93, 100-105, 110-11; Kienhorst 2009, 92-95. The printed books are IV 26, IV 51:2, IV 57, IV 60, IV 61, IV 62, IV 65, IV 66, IV 69, IV 70, and Add. 7, to which the two folia of IV 51:1 also belong if they were not part of another copy of the same edition. For more on these books, see pp. 128-130.

\textsuperscript{2} This is manuscript IV 58, on which see pp. 110-127.

\textsuperscript{3} These are the printed books IV 40, IV 41, IV 42, IV 63, IV 64, IV 67, IV 68, IV 125, IV 126, IV 127, and ASP 252, ASP 253 and ASP 254. For more on these books, see pp. 83-88.

\textsuperscript{4} These are the manuscripts IV 82, IV 86 and IV 89 (on which see Kienhorst 2005, 108-109, 116-117, 122-123) and Tilburg, UL, Haaren hs. 23 (on which see Van de Ven 1990, 48-50, no. 17), and the printed books IV 36, IV 37, IV 71, IV 75 and IV 92.3.

\textsuperscript{5} These are the manuscript IV 54 and Add. 10, on which see pp. 179, 182.

\textsuperscript{6} These are manuscripts IV 4, IV 6, IV 7, IV 15, the second unit of IV 16 (ff. 148-291), IV 21, IV 22, IV 25, IV 131 and IV 132 (on which see Kienhorst 2005, 53-63, 66-71, 134-137); IV 8 (on which see p. 144); The Hague, RL, 130 G 18 and its fragment Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection (on which see Boeren 1988, 185-189, no. 76; Kienhorst 2009, 12-15); JRL, Latin 439 (on which see Cooper 1997, 41, no. 57); Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs (on which see Van Sluys 2007, 155); and Tilburg, UL, KHS 28 (on which see Van de Ven 1997, 25-29, no. 1); and the printed books IV 3, IV 18 and IV 19. For more on these books, see pp. 143-146.

\textsuperscript{7} These are the manuscripts IV 76 (with a printed psalter and hymnal), IV 77, IV 84, IV 88, IV 90 (on which see Kienhorst 2005, 94-97, 112-113, 120-121, 124-125); Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294 (on which see Van den Berg 2012, 73-83); RHCe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699 (on which see Van den Berg 2012, 73-79, 83-84; a facsimile was published by Scheepers 2014) and Los Angeles, Richard and Mary Rouse Collection, MS 169 (with a printed psalter and hymnal) (on which see Light 2015, 60, no. 11).

\textsuperscript{9} These are the printed books III 225 and IV 110 (which once formed one book), V 181 and V 207. For more on these books, see pp. 89-90.

\textsuperscript{8} These are the printed books IV 97, IV 98 and IV 102.

\textsuperscript{9} These are the printed books IV 79, IV 93 and IV 130.

\textsuperscript{10} Excluding fragments, and a printed gradual (V 193) and a manuscript book of epistles and gospel readings in Dutch (IV 10) from Mariëndaal, the following books for Mass once belonged to the library of Soeterbeeck: three printed Roman Missals (IV 9, the one that is now divided across IV 24 and IV 53, and Add. 16), the manuscript graduals IV 31 and IV 135:2, on which see Kienhorst 2005, 72-73; 2009, 120-125; and Utrecht, Catharjineconvent, ABM h61 (on which see Kruitwagen 1910, 56-61); fifteen printed Roman Graduals (IV 11-IV 14, IV 20, IV 27-IV 30, IV 32-IV 35, IV 45, IV 120); and four printed books of epistles and gospels in Dutch (III 36, IV 111, V 11, V 15).
for the same length of time, but they have certainly been preserved and were probably also used there. Most of them display notes and other traces of use, including Beckers’, that date from the sixteenth all the way to the nineteenth century, showing that they were not simply shelved for their entire existence. In contrast, only six books with the Hours of the Virgin survive from Soeterbeeck’s historical library: three manuscript and three printed books of hours, all heavily used.\textsuperscript{1} There will undoubtedly have been many more volumes like these,\textsuperscript{2} as they tend to be small and fragile and are therefore easily lost or worn out. Still, just as these six books of hours represent a collection that was once much larger, the same can also be said for the far more numerous books for the canonical office, as is argued below.\textsuperscript{3} If the latter are assumed to have played no self-evident liturgical role between 1539 and 1906, their survival and well-used state remain to be explained. How counterintuitive this is, is proven by Van Dijk, who, once more without any reticence or reference to Frenken, claims the traces of use point to nothing else than continuous liturgical employment.\textsuperscript{4}

Significant as is the counter-evidence, consisting of the very nature both of Soeterbeeck’s community and of its historical book collection, the fact that Frenken still came to his conclusions in spite of it is perhaps even more important. It means that his claims cannot simply be brushed aside, and it suggests that he had highly persuasive reasons for making them. This is only reinforced by the fact that Jan Peijnenburg, another one of Soeterbeeck’s most important historians, accepted them without reserve.\textsuperscript{5}

Given the seriousness of Frenken’s statement, the following pages are devoted to an exhaustive discussion of all that I have been able to discover about the history of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice in light of his understanding of the latter. I discuss each element of his claim in chronological order. It will become evident that it is possible, to a large extent, to identify his sources and reconstruct his interpretation of them, and that, although right in many respects, he was probably largely mistaken about the long period from 1539 to 1906.

2.3. The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

Frenken’s first claim is that the community of Soeterbeeck used the Windesheim Breviary from its foundation until a fire in 1539. By this he probably means that at this time the choir sisters said the canonical office according the use of Windesheim—as opposed to that of the diocese of Liège, where they were situated. Needless to say, sources on the earliest phases of the convent’s existence are scarce, but those that do survive show that there is no reason to doubt that Frenken is right.

2.3.1. Soeterbeeck’s Foundation Charters

The earliest piece of information on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practices occurs in the charter in which the papal legate Nicholas of Cusa gives provisional permission for Henricus Sanders, parish priest of Nederwetten, to found a convent of canonesses regular, pending the approval

---

\textsuperscript{1} The manuscript books of hours with the Little Office are IV 46, IV 47 and IV 48, all dated to the sixteenth century (Kienhorst 2005, 74-79). The printed books of hours are III 146 (Venice: Joannes Baptista Pasquali, 1740), IV 123 (probably Antwerp: Plantin Offices) and IV 136 (Schoonhoven: canons regular of Sint-Michiel in Den Hem, ca. 1500). In addition, there is also the fragment IV 94, which includes the second and third nocturns of Matins in the Little Office of the Virgin (ff. 15v-18r; cf. Kienhorst 2005, 130-131). For more on these books, see pp. 202.

\textsuperscript{2} The Soeterbeeck Collection also includes two incomplete manuscript books of hours from the sixteenth century, IV 49 and IV 50, which at present do not contain the Hours of the Virgin but probably did at some point in the past. On these books, see Kienhorst 2005, 80-83.

\textsuperscript{3} See pp. 145-146.

\textsuperscript{4} Van Dijk 2000, 66; 2012, 234-236.

\textsuperscript{5} Peijnenburg 1982b, 56.
of the prince-bishop of Liège. This document, dated 12 February 1452, determines that the community should celebrate the horas canonicas minores singulis diebus consuetis ac debitis horis per moniales huilusmodi ordinis fieri solitas, et alia divina officia ac ceremonias ad ipsum monasterium requisitas.¹ The charter’s modern editor, Ludovicus van Miert, takes this to mean that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck were envisioned by Cusa to fulfil their obligation to the divine office by praying only the minor hours—Prime, Terce, Sext and None—,² and he is probably right. Because the lesser hours are explicitly singled out like this, the unspecified alia divina officia and ceremonies that are also mentioned cannot be the other hours of the canonical office—Matins, Lauds, Vespers and Compline. Instead, they probably refer to Mass, processions and other devotional exercises such as the Little Office, the Vigil of the Dead and similar texts, for which recourse would have been taken to books of hours. Cusa says nothing about the liturgical use which the sisters should adopt, although the fact that he links their liturgical practice to that of other sisters of the Augustinian order suggests that he may well have been thinking of the use of Windesheim.

The entire issue is moot, however, because when the prince-bishop of Liège, John of Heinsberg, gave the requested approval for Soeterbeeck’s foundation in a charter dated 16 February 1454, his orders concerning the convent’s liturgical life are noticeably different from Cusa’s. He says that the sorores in exordio assumpti habitus Horas Beate Virginis alta voce ac deinde horas canonicas, donec ad illas decantandum sese congruent ab inglegere […], teneantur.³ The most likely reading of this stipulation is again given by Van Miert: that it presents a training schedule. The choir sisters should begin by saying only the Little Office of the Virgin, then switch to saying the canonical office, and in the meantime practise until they were able to sing the latter.⁴ In light of this scheme, it is very likely that Cusa had also meant for the abbreviated version of the canonical hours that he commanded the sisters to pray to merely be a placeholder while they worked towards celebrating the full office. The minor hours were not only short but also mostly the same from day to day, and for this reason their recital was much more straightforward than that of the other hours, most of which contained many more variable texts and chants. However, even though the papal legate had probably anticipated the prince-bishop of Liège by envisioning a similar start-up phase, Heinsberg clearly had a different idea about what it should look like. He prescribed the use of the Little Office, which, though not part of the canonical office as the minor hours were, had the advantage of training the sisters to say the complete round of daily prayer services, from Matins to Compline.

It seems to have been common practice for semi-religious communities that were adopting a monastic rule to initially limit themselves to the Little Office. For example, upon the foundation in 1448 of the convent of Sint-Geertruid in ’s-Hertogenbosch, which would go on to become one of the founding members of the Chapter of Venlo that Soeterbeeck joined in 1485, Heinsberg first stipulated that both the choir and the converse sisters pro canonicis horis certum numerum de Oratione Dominica et Angelica salutatione una cum cursu beatae Virginiis indies legere.⁵ Five years later, when the community, which had

---

¹ ‘The lesser canonical hours, customary to be said every day at the habitual and obligatory hours by the nuns of this kind of order, and other divine offices and ceremonies necessary to this monastery’ (ASP 59; cf. Van Miert 1921, 147).

² Van Miert 1921, 148.

³ ‘The sisters […] are held […] in the beginning of the habit having been taken, to daily read, in a loud voice, the Hours of the Blessed Virgin and afterwards the canonical hours, until they will have enabled themselves to sing them harmoniously’ (ASP 62, charter 16 February 1454). The entire charter was edited by Hermans 1848-1850, 2: 388-391 n. 1, but with several errors.

⁴ Van Miert 1921, 149.

⁵ ‘Daily read, instead of the canonical hours, a certain number of the Lord’s Prayer and the Angelic Salutation, together with the Office of the Blessed Virgin’ (Van den Elsen and Hoevenaars 1905-1907, 2: 216).
originally been limited to eight persons, became a proper convent, the prince-bishop gave the same advice he would later give in more condensed form to Soeterbeeck:

Disponant se sores cum consilio suorum visitatorum ad cantandas horas canonicas, vel saltem assuescant paulatim ascendendo, in primis ut alta voce legant cursum B. Mariae Virginis, secundum quod faciunt sanctimonialia ejusdem ordinis S. Agnetis in Thenis monte, et B. Mariae Virginis in Diest et Undecim milium Virginum in Lovanio. Et dehinc legant horas canonicas; postque diebus festivis cantent, donec pedetentim assuefactae, perfecte die ac nocte, ad laudem Dei Omnipotentis cantent horas canonicas integraliter.

1 The need for arrangements such as these ties in with the broader phenomenon that communities adopting the Rule of Augustine initially often lived as converse sisters: they took the three vows, but did not yet say the canonical office. According to Goudriaan, the motivation behind this was not only that the sisters would gradually have to acquire the skills that were necessary for choral prayer and chant, but also that they would initially need to spend most of their time working to create a firm financial basis for their community. Only after this had been achieved could a certain number of women devote themselves to the recital of the divine office as choir sisters. 2 Goudriaan indicates that, especially after the middle of the fifteenth century, some communities, when they adopted the Rule, were made to consist entirely of converse sisters on a permanent basis, 3 but this was clearly not what John of Heinsberg envisioned for Sint-Geertruid or Soeterbeeck.

2.3.2. Manuscripts for the Divine Office
So far, then, Frenken’s contention that Soeterbeeck’s choir sisters initially used the Windesheim Breviary has been partly confirmed, inasmuch as they were ordered to start saying, and afterwards singing, the canonical office as soon as they were able to. The precise moment when they actually began doing so cannot be determined with certainty, but that they eventually did is beyond doubt after consideration of the manuscript evidence.

As indicated above, the remnants of Soeterbeeck’s library include a large number of liturgical books for the canonical office, some of which seem to have been especially produced for this convent, around the time when the sisters were ready to begin praying the canonical office. The oldest of these are a group of manuscripts consisting of four antiphonaries (IV 4 and IV 22 for the winter and IV 21 and IV 25 for the summer half of the year), a currently highly incomplete nocturnal breviary (IV 79), a nocturnal breviary-antiphonary for the winter half of the year (IV 16), and a nocturnal and a diurnal breviary that survive only in fragmentary form. 4 The books, though not the fragments, have been dated between 1475 and 1480 on the basis of their watermarks. The antiphonaries and IV 16 are cautiously attributed to Mariënhaeghe in Woensel on the basis of their illumination, and the breviaries show great similarity with IV 16 when it comes to their script, a highly uniform

---

1 ‘The sisters should dispose themselves, in consultation with their visitators, to the singing of the canonical hours, or at least get used to it by gradually improving, so that at first they read, in a loud voice, the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, according to what the nuns of the same order at Sint-Agnes in Tienen, Mariëndaal in Diest and Sint-Ursula en de Elfduizend Maagden in Louvain do. And afterwards they should read the canonical hours; and after that they should sing them on feasts, until, having been accustomed to it step-by-step, they are able, in praise of God Almighty, day and night to sing the canonical hours in their entirety’ (Van den Elsen and Hoevenaars 1905-1907, 2: 221).

2 This is what happened with the Chapter of Sion, whose members were given permission to limit themselves to the Hours of the Virgin and a number of Our Fathers when the chapter was originally established in 1418, but which made the recital of the canonical office obligatory in 1449, after many convents had already made the switch (Goudriaan 2008, 186).

3 Goudriaan 2008, 207.

4 The fragments IV 79A and Fr. 33:1 are from a diurnal breviary. Fr. 33:2 consists of a bifolium and a single folium. The bifolium is from a nocturnal breviary. The folium can be from either one, but because it contains two hymns and, in the Soeterbeeck Collection, only diurnals have a hymnal section, the former is likeliest.
littera hybrida. Whatever the origin of these books may be, however, they were certainly produced for a women’s convent, as some of them contain rubrics in Dutch or with feminine words in references to their users. Although the earliest proof of this group of books being at Soeterbeeck are traces of use in seventeenth-century hands that are discussed below, taking their date, possible origin and feminine forms into consideration it seems very likely that they were made for this convent.

There is a single piece of evidence in the books that might be taken to contradict this final conclusion, which is a note that was added in the antiphony IV 4 and says that dit boeck hoort toe ’t convent van Soeterbeeck 1607. The most straightforward interpretation of this ownership mark, which is the only one to appear in these early manuscripts in their current state, is that it represents the moment when the book was acquired by Soeterbeeck, which would necessarily mean that it was not produced for this convent. But this conclusion raises the questions where the manuscript came from and if it is the only book that came to Nuenen at the beginning of the seventeenth century. If this is the case, how is it possible that a manuscript that is clearly part of a group of eight volumes came to be separated from the other seven? And if all eight books came to Soeterbeeck in 1607, how come that none of the other manuscripts contains any ownership notes at present, not even the four that still have bindings (IV 16, IV 21, IV 22 and IV 25)?

An interpretation of the ownership note in IV 4 as marking the moment of acquisition is highly problematic, but the alternatives are little better. Because of its singularity, the note cannot be part of a library census, and since antiphonaries are not likely to be loaned, it cannot be a reminder to return the volume its rightful owner either. The only remaining option seems to be that the note marks the moment when the book returned to Soeterbeeck after having

---

1 On the dates of these manuscripts and fragments, see Kienhorst 2005, 53, 63, 67, 69, 71, 101, 103; 2009, 92. On their illumination, see De Beer 2005, 33-35. The single folium of Fr 33:2 uses a littera textualis for the text underneath the first three staffs, but is otherwise also written in a littera hybrida.

2 For example, a rubric for Maundy Thursday in IV 4, f. 208v; IV 16, f. 240r and IV 22, f. 157r refers to the hebdomadary sister and/or to the prioress. I thank José Rekers for pointing out to me that another rubric for the same day in IV 16, f. 91v instructs the sisters not to ask for a blessing before reading the lessons at Matins, and refers to the phrase that is otherwise used for doing so as lube domna benedicere (‘Vouchsafe, lady, to bless’), also with a feminine form.

3 See pp. 169-171.

4 Van Dijk 2012, 229 suggests that at least some of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical manuscripts may have been discarded and handed down by the canons of Mariënhage because the latter had started using printed breviaries. He provides no evidence for this, however, and in light of the books’ feminine forms it seems unsuitable as a general explanation for the presence of these volumes at Soeterbeeck. This is not to say that the convent did not own some manuscripts that the canons of Mariënhage had originally produced for themselves. For instance, the antiphony for the winter part of the year that is currently preserved at the Royal Library in The Hague as 130 G 18, which the sisters sold in the nineteenth century (cf. Officie 1975, xv) but part of which survives in the Soeterbeeck Collection as Fr. 1, has a scribal colophon with the name of the 11th canon to be professed at Mariënhage, Godefridus Boemns (130 G 18, f. 105v; cf. Sloots 1943, 103, no. 8). The paper on which the manuscript was written has been dated to ca. 1440-1444 (Kienhorst 2009, 12), when Soeterbeeck did not even exist. Boems probably wrote the book for his own convent, as it contains no feminine forms and identifies Anthony Abbot, Mariënhage’s second patron saint (cf. Weiler and Geirnaert 1980, 223), as patronum nostrum (‘our patron’) in a rubric on f. 68r. A similar line of reasoning can be applied to Haaren hs. 23, a ferial psalter with various other texts that also identifies Anthony as the conventual patron in the calendar (f. 1r) and has a colophon (f. 188r) saying that it was copied in 1496 by Henricus de Busco, who may be Henricus Cupers of ’s-Hertogenbosch, the 27th canon to be professed at Mariënhage (cf. Sloots 1943, 104, no. 15; Van de Ven 1990, 50, no. 17). However, the book was at Soeterbeeck by the seventeenth century, as it bears the name of Sister Agnes van Aer (cf. Frenken 1931/32, 296) with the year 1608 on its back pastedown, and because a marginal note has been added in the calendar saying that the feast of Clement I (23 November) should be solemnne quia patronus (‘solemn, because he is our patron’, f. 6r). This note directly contradicts the original text of the calendar, but can be explained by the fact that Clement was the patron saint of Nuenen (Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 204), the village where Soeterbeeck was situated from 1462 to 1732.

5 ‘This book belongs to the convent of Soeterbeeck, 1607’ (IV 4, f. 1r; cf. Table 5.3, no. 1).
been away for a while for another reason, perhaps to be rebound or restored, although there is no firm evidence for this. The book does have a second spine of chamois leather that may have been added later, but it is impossible to say when. It also contains an additional diurnal office for the feast of Anthony Abbot (17 January) in a hand that is roughly contemporary to but different from that of the main body of the manuscript, but it is not certain that the two quires in which this office appears are themselves a later addition, and even if they are, there is still no basis for claiming that the rebinding that this must have entailed happened in 1607. What is more, the same office for Anthony Abbot, in the same hand, was also added to IV 22, but this manuscript has no ownership note that says the book belongs to Soeterbeeck, so if the one in IV 4 is like a welcome home after a stay in the hospital, its author failed to greet the other book. It is simply impossible, in other words, to provide a satisfactory explanation for the ownership note in IV 4. For this reason, it does not throw enough weight by its own to seriously impair the assumption that Soeterbeeck’s oldest group of liturgical manuscripts was produced for this convent and always preserved there.

During the final decades of the fifteenth and the first of the sixteenth century, several more manuscripts for the great office seem to have been produced for Soeterbeeck in the convent of its rector, or of at least one nocturnal (IV 74), a diurnal breviary (IV 80) and a ferial psalter (IV 82) as well as three antiphonaries (Tilburg, University Library, KHS 28 and Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs for the winter, and IV 6 for the summer half of the year) survive. These later additions were probably necessitated by the expansion of Soeterbeeck’s community, which grew from twenty sisters (nineteen of which were devoted to the choir service) in 1467 to forty-eight (of which four were not yet professed) in 1526. Given that a large antiphonary on a stand could be used by only three to five sisters simultaneously, and a

1 IV 4, ff. 337-352.
2 IV 22, ff. 273-277, plus the next, unnumbered folium that was pasted down on top of the pastedown.
3 The breviary IV 74 and the psalter IV 82 are both dated between 1485 and 1502 on the basis of their watermarks, and are attributed to Mariënhaage because of their decoration (De Beer 2005, 35-36; Kienhorst 2005, 93, 109). The breviary IV 80 is dated to ca. 1478 (Kienhorst 2005, 105), but this date is based on only a single watermark among the book’s many unidentified ones, and on the basis of its illumination it belongs rather with these later breviaries than to the earlier ones, which is why I group it here. Feminine forms that prove that the books were produced for a women’s convent appear in a rubric for Maundy Thursday in IV 80, f. 14r, the request for a blessing before reading a lesson at Matins in IV 74, f. 8v and in the lesson at Compline in IV 82, f. 81r. The three antiphonaries are all dated to the sixteenth century; in the case of IV 6 and PBF 6168 Hs to the first decades on the basis of the watermarks (Kienhorst 2005, 57; Van Sluis 2007, 155), and in case of KHS 28 to the middle on that of unspecified criteria (Van de Ven 1997, 25). IV 6 is attributed to Mariënhaage because of its decoration (De Beer 2005, 35; Kienhorst 2005, 57), and the two winter parts are so alike in size, lay-out and script (a *littera hybrida* with a two-compartment *a*) that they must have the same origin. Feminine forms occur in a rubric for Maundy Thursday in PBF 6168 Hs, f. 133v and KHS 28, f. 136v. Also attributed to Mariënhaage on the basis of its decoration is IV 132, an antiphonary for the entire year dated to circa 1487 on the basis of its watermarks (De Beer 2005, 34; Kienhorst 2005, 137).

4 Frenken 1931/32, 193.
5 Van Dijk 2012, 239. In an earlier version of this article, he speaks of three to six or seven sisters (Van Dijk 2005, 21). It is unclear what caused him to change his mind and what his sources were, but the lower number does indeed seem more reasonable. That a single choir book of significant size could be used by up to five people is confirmed by Allen 2009, 131, who, when, speaking of miniatures in Italian manuscripts, says there are some which depict four or five people singing from a single book on a central lectern. This is a different situation from that in choir stalls, however, where there is less room to move and gather round a book. The only picture I know of multiple persons singing from the same book in the stalls themselves is that of male religious in the miniature on f. 131v of the fifteenth-century Llangattock Hours (Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, Ms. Ludwig IX 7; the miniature is reproduced in De Hamel 1994, 208). This shows three secular canons in a stall to the left and three in a stall to the right, each group singing communally from a book on a lectern that is attached to the choir stall. The smaller numbers of people per book in this case may not reflect reality but be due to the compositional restrictions of the picture, but I confess that I have difficulty understanding the practicalities of more than three people using a single lectern in the stalls.
breviary served only a single person,¹ these numbers mean that several choir books must have been lost, although not every sister need necessarily have had a breviary of her own.²

The upshot of this is that, despite the obvious losses, the number of extant books for the canonical hours that presumably were at Soeterbeeck by the beginning of the sixteenth century is still such, that there can be no doubt that Frenken is right that the choir sisters were celebrating the great office at the time. A convent does not acquire this many books to put them on a shelf. Looking at the books themselves, the evidence suggests that he is also correct in saying that Soeterbeeck followed the use of Windesheim. This circumstance is not surprising, for although the community did not actually belong to this chapter, in 1485 it did join that of Venlo, which was heavily inspired by Windesheim.³ Also, from 1452 until Beckers’ death in 1810 the sisters consistently had rectors who were canons of Windesheim convents.

2.3.3. The Manuscripts’ Use

Soeterbeeck’s oldest liturgical books, as briefly described above, seem to follow the Windesheim liturgy. Very little research has been done on this particular use,⁴ so it is as yet impossible to make this claim with absolute certainty. However, an attempt at identifying the textual tradition to which seven late medieval antiphonaries in the Soeterbeeck Collection belong has been made by Christian van Zitteren.⁵ He studied the incipits of the antiphons, psalms, responsories, versicles and hymns given or referred to in the proper of saints. This is the section in liturgical books that contains the texts for the offices on feasts of saints rather than those for feasts that commemorate events in the life of Our Lord, which are given in the proper of time, or those that are common to groups of saints, which are in the common of saints. Van Zitteren found that, although not all saints’ offices were present in all antiphonaries, or included as fully, the texts that were there corresponded almost exactly

¹ For the individual use of breviaries, see the famous miniature of Poor Clares singing in a choir stall on f. 74v of the fifteenth-century psalter of Henry VI (London, British Library, Cotton MS Domitian A XVII), which depicts the sisters as each holding their own book.
² On the number of antiphonaries that must have been lost, see pp. 145-146.
³ On the Chapter of Venlo and its relationship to that of Windesheim, see p. 4.
⁴ A preliminary bibliography of primary and secondary sources on the liturgy of Windesheim has been prepared by Persoons and Lourdaux 1966. Pfisterer 2009 provides suggestions towards using Hesbert’s Corpus Antiphonalium Officii (1963-1979) as a starting point for the identification and description of the peculiarities of the Windesheim use. Claudia Heiden, of the University of Rostock, is currently preparing a PhD thesis which takes these suggestions as its point of departure. The works of one of the chapter’s most influential liturgical scholars, Radulph of Rivo, were studied and partially edited by Mohlberg 1911-1915 and Farrington 1948; cf. Mannaerts 2013. Various iterations of the chapter’s liturgical calendar were studied by Van der Woude 1949, Hermans 2004 and Mulder 2007 and 2011. Many printed liturgical books are described in the usual bibliographies, such as Campbell 1874, Nijhoff and Kronenberg 1923-1971, Bohatta 1924; 1963, Kommission 1925-present and Amiet 1990. More elaborate bibliographical descriptions of editions of the Windesheim Breviary were prepared by Kruitwagen 1914 and Kronenberg 1923, 101, no. 17. Several Windesheim libri ordinarii were studied by Gugumus 1978, Franke 1981 and Lutz 2010. On manuscript martyrologies from Windesheim convents in the dioceses of Utrecht and Liège, see Overgaauw 1993, esp. 1: 317-421. On the Windesheim book of hours, see Gorissen 1968, Marrow 2007, Ottosen 2007 and Korteweg 2013. On Windesheim’s liturgical practice, especially with reference to chant, see Ewerhart 1953, 135-157 and Hascher-Burger 2002, 95-205. Windesheim liturgica have also been described in entries in several exhibition catalogue, such as Heireman 1973, 112, no. A 131; Ampe et al. 1981, 446-448, nos. 225-226; Geurts, 1984, 231-239, nos. 83-86.
⁵ Van Zitteren 2006. He studied IV 6, IV 7, IV 21, IV 22, IV 25, IV 131 and IV 132. Five of these manuscripts have already been introduced above (pp. 57-60). IV 7, an antiphonary for Vespers (and Compline), is believed to have been decorated by the Brethren of the Common Life in Den Bosch and produced circa 1530 (Kienhorst 2005, 59), and IV 131, an antiphonary for the entire year, is dated to circa 1540-1549 on the basis of its watermarks (ibid., 135).
between manuscripts.¹ This confirms that the books, though of different origin, represent a single liturgical tradition.² He then compared the proper of saints in the Soeterbeeck antiphonaries for the winter half of the year, which cover the period from Andrew the Apostle (30 November) to the Annunciation of the Lord (25 March), with corresponding liturgical books from three distinct backgrounds. First, he used a copy of the edition of the winter part of the Liégeois Breviary printed in Paris in 1513 for Henricus Eckert de Homberch in Antwerp to exemplify the use of the diocese of Liège,³ between whose borders Soeterbeeck was situated until the establishment of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch in 1560.⁴ Second, the twelfth-century antiphonary Utrecht, University Library, Hs. 406 was chosen as a representative of the use of the diocese of Utrecht,⁵ which the Chapter of Windesheim followed during the few years after its foundation before it developed its own liturgical books, and on which the latter were closely modeled.⁶ Third was the use of Windesheim itself, which Van Zitteren chose to represent with the fifteenth-century winter antiphonaries Tilburg, University Library, Haaren hs. 30 and Haaren hs. 31.⁷ Comparing the manuscripts of Soeterbeeck with these books, Van Zitteren found that the former differ from the Liégeois Breviary and the antiphonary from Utrecht, but correspond exactly with the antiphonaries in Tilburg, and he therefore concluded that the Soeterbeeck manuscripts follow the use of Windesheim.

Before going on, it must be noted that Van Zitteren’s methodology was quite severely flawed. His choice of books for comparison is infelicitous, for several reasons. For example, although he writes that Haaren hs. 30 and 31 were copied at the convent of Windesheim near Zwolle for the sisters of Mariënveld in Amsterdam, which belonged to the same chapter,⁸ this may be concluded only for the second and not for the first manuscript.⁹ Haaren hs. 30 is instead believed to have been decorated at Mariënhalge,¹⁰ and it is not known where it was written or what its provenance is. This means that it is, in principle at least, less trustworthy as a witness of the Windesheim liturgy than Haaren hs. 31. Of course, the fact that the contents of the two Tilburg manuscripts correspond exactly—something which Van Zitteren does not state explicitly, but which must be concluded from the fact that he groups them together as representatives of the Windesheim liturgy without comment—, means that the uncertain background of Haaren hs. 30 is not, in fact, a significant problem. It is indeed reasonable to assume that an antiphonary finished at Windesheim in 1409 and probably owned by another

¹ Van Zitteren 2006, 90, app. 14 reports to have found a very small number of textual variants among the manuscripts in the Soeterbeeck Collection, all restricted to the proper of saints for the summer part of the year, but concludes that these were probably due to scribal error. Although this explanation is slightly facile, the manuscripts’ agreement is so overwhelming despite the differences that Van Zitteren’s conclusion that the books all belong same textual tradition need not be questioned.
² Van Zitteren 2006, 100.
³ To verify Van Zitteren’s statements, I made use of NUL, P.Inc 401.
⁴ On the establishment of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch and its borders, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 15-18.
⁵ On this manuscript, see Van der Horst 1989, 4, no. 6.
⁶ Persoons and Lourdaux 1966, 401.
⁷ On these manuscripts, see Van de Ven 1990, 66-70, nos. 23-24.
⁸ Van Zitteren 2006, 91.
⁹ That Haaren hs. 31 was made at Windesheim is evident from the colophon on f. 208v: Finitus in Windesem monasterio monialium canonicularum regularium. Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo nono Deo gracias (‘Finished at Windesheim, a monastery of canons regular. In the year of Our Lord 1409. Thanks be to God’, qtd. in Van de Ven 1990, 69). The conclusion that it was produced for the sisters of Mariënvelde is based on the presence in the manuscript of a loose slip of paper that says: Liber monasterij monialium canoniciarum regularium prope Aemstredam (‘A book of the monastery of the canonesses regular near Amsterdam’, qtd. in Van de Ven 1990, 70). The presence of this note, on a loose piece of paper, does not support the conclusion that the manuscript was produced for Mariënvelde, but may indeed mean that it was kept and used there for a time.
¹⁰ Van der Vlist 1991, 48.
Windesheim convent represents the chapter liturgy as it had been determined around 1400,1 and if another manuscript corresponds with it, it necessarily belongs to the same tradition.

More problematic, however, is the book that Van Zitteren chose to represent the use of Utrecht. Hs. 406, which was used by the collegiate church of St Mary and produced in the twelfth century, cannot be used to represent the diocesan liturgy at the time when Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries were produced, which was the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. In fact, when the manuscripts from Soeterbeeck are compared with a late fifteenth-century printed edition of the Utrecht Breviary,2 it appears that most of the differences which Van Zitteren observed between the liturgical books of Soeterbeeck and Hs. 406 are not present there.3 This means that the manuscripts of Soeterbeeck are actually much closer to the use of Utrecht of the same period than Van Zitteren concluded. A small number of the differences that he lists do remain, however, and in all of these instances Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts correspond not only with the two manuscripts in Tilburg but also with a contemporary printed Windesheim Breviary.4 This means that, despite his unfortunate choice of material for comparison, Van Zitteren’s conclusion that the proper of saints in the Soeterbeeck antiphonaries for the winter part of the year is closer to that in the Windesheim Breviary than to that in the breviaries of Utrecht and Liège appears to remain valid. One can, of course, still ask if this observation by itself provides a broad and firm enough basis for the conclusion that Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts follow the use of Windesheim. However, the fact that these books were probably written by Windesheim canons for a convent of the Chapter of Venlo—one that would continue to celebrate proper Windesheim feasts until the eighteenth and again in the twentieth century, as will be seen below5—clinches the matter. I see no reason to doubt that the antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck indeed represent the use of Windesheim.

2.3.4. The Fire of 1539
The only part of Frenken’s first claim that remains to be considered now is that he says Soeterbeeck’s recital of the Windesheim canonical office ended because of a fire that broke

---

1 For a discussion of what little is known about the historical circumstances of Windesheim’s revision of the liturgy, see Franke 1981, 11-19.
2 I made use of a digital copy of The Hague, RL, 170 E 32, a copy of the Breuarium Traiectensis dioceos (Gouda: collation brethren, 1497).
3 For surveys of the differences between the Soeterbeeck manuscripts and Hs. 406, see Van Zitteren 2006, 93 and app. 18-2. Some of these divergences do not in fact exist: the different verses which Van Zitteren says appear in Hs. 406 for the responsories at Matins on all feasts except for those of the Conversion of Paul (25 January) and Peter’s Chair at Antioch (22 February) are not given at all in the manuscript’s list of contents in Koláček and Lacoste’s CANTUS (2015) database (<http://cantusdatabase.org/index?source=374064>), on which he based himself for his comparison (Van Zitteren 2006, 91). Instead, the database lists exactly the same verses as those given by Van Zitteren for Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts. This curious error may be based on a misreading of the database, or on faulty data in an earlier version of it. Instances where the list of contents of Hs. 406 in CANTUS does differ from the Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts, but the Utrecht Breviary of 1497 does not, are the order of the two final responsories in the third nocturn at Matins on the feast of Nicholas of Myra (6 December), the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers, the hymn at Compline, the third responsory of every nocturn at Matins, the Benedict antiphon at Lauds, and the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers on the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin (8 December), the versicle at Lauds on the feast of Lucy of Syracuse (13 December), the responsory at first Vespers and the hymn at second Vespers on the feast of Agnes of Rome (21 January), the Magnificat antiphon at first and second Vespers and the psalm antiphons at Matins for the feast of the Conversion of Paul (25 January), the order of the two final responsories of the first nocturn at Matins on the feast of Agatha of Sicily (5 February), the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers on the feast of Peter’s Chair at Antioch (22 February) and the order of the final two responsories of the third nocturn at Matins and the versicle at Lauds on the feast of the Annunciation of the Lord (25 March).
4 See Table 2. For the Windesheim Breviary I made use of a digital copy of The Hague, RL, 170 E 14, a copy of the Breuarium canonicorum regularium secundum ordinarium Capituli de windesim (Delft: Henricus Eckert de Homberch, 1499).
5 See pp. 81-88, 95-96, 104.
The reasonable conclusion that this event disrupted the convent’s liturgical life for a time is supported by a number of accounts of it. A document dating to 1556 and quoted by Frenken reports that the fire originated in the church and caused severe damage to the convent in general. This is confirmed by Ludovicus Schutjes, the historian of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch, who knew a source that said the fire had consumed the church, the dormitory and the women’s house, and also by both versions of Rector Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck, which reports that the convent was bijnaar door ’t vier geheel vernielt. Describing the sisters’ material losses on the basis of an unknown source, the rector singles out for special mention, in addition to their black copes and ecclesiastical valubles, their breviaris. In his chronicle’s first version these are simply called haere brevieren, but in the second version these have become haare Roomse Bevrieren. This specification does not reflect any fundamental change in meaning, however, for in the first version, too, Beckers immediately goes on to conclude that the fact that his source says the fire destroyed the breviaris must mean that the sisters voor eerst de getijden van ’t Rooms officie hebben geleesen. The story that Beckers tells, then, is exactly the same in both versions of his chronicle: the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck had been using the Roman Breviary for praying the divine office when a fire destroyed their copies of it. It is necessary to analyse this statement in some detail, not only to assess what it says about the influence which the fire had on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life, but also to understand Frenken’s interpretation of it.

The first thing to note about Beckers’ account of and conclusion concerning the fire’s consequences is that, when taken at face value, it is demonstrably inaccurate in two ways. First, although the bland statement that de religieusen haere brevieren […] hebben verlooren means that the fire destroyed all of the sisters’ breviaris, this cannot be the case. As was argued above, a significant number of manuscript breviaris and other liturgical books survive from Soeterbeeck’s library that were certainly produced and can also be expected to have been at the convent before 1539. These books do not only survive, but do not show any trace of fire damage either. Second, the identification on Beckers’ part of the breviaris mentioned in his source with copies of the Roman Breviary is a mistake, because this book was first promulgated in 1568, several decades after the fire.

The first error may already have been present in Beckers’ source and cannot be solved. It must be assumed that the damage caused by the fire was exaggerated and that only some of Soeterbeeck’s breviaris had perished. However, this leaves the problem of how it is possible that the surviving liturgical books, which one would expect to have been kept in the

---

1 Frenken 1931/32, 196.
2 The fire is described as den brandt in huer goidshuis (‘the fire in their place of worship’), but is also said to have forced the sisters die huysinghe van den convente wederom op te timmeren (‘to restore the convent’s housing’, qtd. in Frenken 1931/32, 197). I interpret goidshuis to refer to the church, but it can also refer to the convent as a whole, cf. the way it is used in the seventeenth-century statutes of Soeterbeeck that are quoted on p. 72.
3 Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 219. The women’s house (domus feminarum) was probably a room or a building for female servants or commensals.
4 ‘Almost completely destroyed by the fire’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 5). The second version of the chronicle slightly exaggerates this and states the convent was bijnaar of geheel door de vlam vernielt (‘almost or completely destroyed by the flame’, ASP 4, p. 2b).
5 ‘Their breviaris’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 5).
6 ‘Their Roman Breviaris’ (ASP 4, p. 2b).
7 ‘At first read the hours of the Roman office’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 5). The second version of the chronicle clarifies that ‘at first’ means voor deezen brand (‘before this fire’) and speaks of de Romeinse getijden (‘the Roman hours’, ASP 4, p. 2b).
8 ‘The sisters lost their breviaris […]’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 5). As indicated above, the chronicle’s second version says that de religieuse […] haare Roomse Bevrieren […] hebben verlooren (‘the sisters […] lost their Roman Breviaris […]’), ASP 4, p. 2b).
9 On the revision and promulgation of the Roman Breviary, see Bäumer 1895, 410-467.
conventual church or a nearby room such as the sacristy, were not lost or even damaged in a fire which, by all accounts, originated in the church and severely affected that space. The only possible answers are either that the surviving books were not kept in or near the church at all but somewhere beyond the fire’s reach, or that they could somehow be saved. Perhaps the sisters had stopped using their liturgical manuscripts in favour of newer printed copies of the Windesheim Breviary, and it was the latter which perished in the flames, whereas the older books had been safely stored away and survived. But this, in turn, leaves unexplained the survival of the manuscript antiphonaries, as these did not have a printed equivalent by which they could have been substituted. The possibility that my earlier conclusion was wrong and that Soeterbeeck’s fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts only came to Soeterbeeck after 1539 can be almost entirely discarded. Where would such a large number of closely related manuscripts have come from, all of a sudden?

The second error is certainly Beckers’, and although it can be explained more easily, it has far-reaching consequences. The books destroyed in the fire cannot have been Roman Breviaries in the post-Tridentine sense of the word, and the possibility that they followed the pre-Tridentine use of Rome of the papal Curia is entirely negligible. Beckers must have been well aware of this, since he displays great interest in the specific contents of the convent’s oldest liturgica, as will be seen in the following chapters. And even if he had not been a liturgical historian of sorts, the very title pages of most Roman Breviaries of his days would still have informed him of the fact that the book had been revised by decree of the Council of Trent and published by command of Pius V. He will therefore have intended the word ‘Roman’ to describe another aspect of the sisters’ books and liturgy as these were before the fire, an aspect which distinguished them from those thereafter.

The most likely interpretation is given, implicitly, by Frenken, who knew Beckers’ chronicles and even refers to their descriptions of the fire. It seems safe to conclude that they also informed his thinking on the conventual liturgy. The fact itself, then, that he says that the fire of 1539 marked a switch from the use of the Windesheim Breviary to that of the Little Office of the Virgin is a sign that he interpreted the rector’s text in such a way that what the rector’s words imply, then, is that the fire destroyed so many of the sisters’ breviaries that they were unable, afterwards, to pray the canonical office. After all, because Beckers concluded that the sisters had prayed it voor eerst voor dezen brand, there can be little doubt that he also believed that they had stopped doing so afterwards. It must be stressed that this is a conclusion which he drew himself on the basis of his sources, as is evident from his contention that the description of the breviaries’ loss is something waer uijt blijckt that the sisters had been saying the canonical office before the fire. The significance of the fact that Beckers went out of his way to draw this conclusion and write it down is discussed at a later

---

1 The Soeterbeeck Collection contains two incomplete printed copies of the Windesheim Breviary, on which see p. 128. It is not known, however, when these books came to Soeterbeeck.
2 Cf. Persoons and Louraux 1966, 407, where no printed Windesheim Antiphonary is listed.
3 On the history of the divine office according to the use of Rome before the Council of Trent, see Bäumer 1895, 303-409.
4 Frenken 1931/32, 196-197.
5 ‘At first, before this fire’ (ASP 4, p. 2b).
6 ‘That shows’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 5). In the second version this is stated even more confidently: waar uijt claartelijn blijckt (‘that clearly shows’, ASP 4, p. 2b).
stage.\(^1\) What is most relevant for the purpose of this chapter is that Frenken accepted the rector’s reconstruction of events, and subsequently identified the fire of 1539 as a watershed moment in Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history.

It may conveniently be noted here that Frenken was not the first to do so. In 1913 a letter was sent in the name of Jacobus Pompen, vicar general of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch,\(^2\) to the Congregation of the Affairs of Religious in Rome, in which Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice is described. The precise contents and context of this letter are discussed below,\(^3\) but it needs to be mentioned here that a draft survives in the diocesan archives, which says of the sisters of Soeterbeeck:

*Recitabant tamen Officium Parvum B. Mariae Virginis etiam choraliter, ast anno 1906 assumperunt cum consensu episcopi officium canoniceorum regularem sancti Augustini sancti Joannis Lateranensis, quia sibi officium Capituli de Windesheim sibi procurare requirerint.*\(^4\)

This passage is commented upon on the verso of the preceding folium in an unidentified hand that writes in French:

> Il faudrait mentionner la raison face laquelle elles ont cessé à Deursen la récitation du grand office: c’est à dire l’incendie qui a détruit leurs bréviaires. C’est à ce moment là que l’Ordinaire aurait dû intervenir pour réparer cette perte et ne pas les laisser si longtemps sans leur office propre. Mentionner aussi l’année de cet incendie. Laissées à elles seules trop longtemps, ignorant absolument l’existence des autres chanoinesses ou chanoines, elles ont repris leur Propre dès qu’elles l’ont pu.\(^5\)

In response to this comment, the following clause was prefaced interlinearly to the letter’s original sentence: *quia anno 1543 eaurum breviaria incendo perissent, necessitate coactae, ut videtur.*\(^6\) The year 1543 is probably based on Schutjes, who erroneously speaks of two fires—the real one on 20 March 1539 and a second one that never happened in 1543.\(^7\) The explanation for this immaterial error is probably that Schutjes had a source providing the correct date and also misinterpreted Beckers’ chronicles, which do not treat of the fire in its chronological place but only after describing the ravages of the field marshal Maarten van Rossum that had taken place four years later.\(^8\)

However this may be, the addition of the clause on the fire means that the letter of 1913, although it differs from Frenken’s account in several ways, is identical in essence to his second claim. It, too, states that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck abandoned the canonical office for the Little Office around the middle of the sixteenth century, and that this situation lasted until 1906. The letter’s author, Pompen himself or someone writing for him, was handed this narrative by the commentator writing in French. It is this person, then, who is first known to have used the sixteenth-century fire to explain the fact—to be discussed below.\(^9\)

\(^{1}\) See p. 306.

\(^{2}\) On Pompen, see *R.K.* 1925, 106.

\(^{3}\) See pp. 95-96.

\(^{4}\) They recited only the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, even in choir; but in the year 1906 they adopted, with the bishop’s consent, the office of the canons regular of St Augustine of St John Lateran, because they had not been able to obtain for themselves the office of the Chapter of Windesheim’ (’s-Hertogenbosch, Diocesan Archives, File Soeterbeeck, not inventoried; emphasis and deletion in original).

\(^{5}\) *The reason* should be mentioned why in Deursen they discontinued the recitation of the great office: that is to say, the fire that destroyed their breviaries. It is at that moment that the ordinary should have intervened to repair this loss and not let them remain without their proper office for so long. Also mention the year of this fire. Left to themselves for too long, completely ignorant of the existence of other canonesses or canons, they picked up their proper again as soon as they were able to’ (’s-Hertogenbosch, Diocesan Archives, File Soeterbeeck, not inventoried; emphasis in the original).

\(^{6}\) ‘Because in the year 1543 their breviaries were lost in a fire, forced by necessity, as is evident’ (’s-Hertogenbosch, Diocesan Archives, File Soeterbeeck, not inventoried).

\(^{7}\) Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 216, 219.

\(^{8}\) When speaking of Schutjes’ error, Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 1 says that Beckers himself dates the fire to after the pillaging of Maarten van Rossum, but this is not actually the case; the narrative only treats the two events in non-chronological order.

\(^{9}\) See pp. 88-94.
that in the period immediately preceding that when Pompen’s letter was being written, the sisters of Soeterbeeck only said the Little Office. Frenken later accepted this explanation, which probably goes back to an oral tradition current in the convent itself. Far from drawing entirely original conclusions, then, the historian is clearly indebted to others in this respect.

2.4. The Seventeenth Century

The question must now be addressed if Frenken is right to make his second claim that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck abandoned the divine office for the entire period between 1539 and 1906. It is plausible enough that the destruction by fire of the convent’s place of worship and at least some of its liturgical books, together with the other troubles and the extreme poverty that followed,¹ forced the community to switch to the much shorter Little Office. However, for reasons already discussed,² one would expect this switch to have been temporary, and not to have lasted for almost four centuries.

For clarity’s sake it is important to make clear from the first that there is no doubt at all that the year 1906 did mark a moment in which Soeterbeeck switched from the Little Office to the canonical office. As just promised, the circumstances surrounding this particular event are discussed in their chronological place below.³ The question under consideration here is if there is enough archival evidence to accept that the sisters had at that moment been limiting themselves to the Little Office uninterruptedly since 1539. I would argue that this is not the case, and that there are in fact signs of the opposite.

2.4.1. Episcopal Visitation Reports

The first thing that must be noted in this regard is that the French comments on Pompen’s letter of 1913 do not appear to be a very reliable source. Although their author was clearly well enough informed about the history of Soeterbeeck to know about the fire of 1539 and Beckers’ interpretation of it, the fact that he was not able to date it probably means that he was not entirely familiar with the sources themselves. More importantly, he completely misconstrues Soeterbeeck’s history when he goes on to say that the community was left to its own devices and remained isolated from other convents of canons and canonesses regular. From the moment they had adopted to the Rule of Augustine to the end of Beckers rectorate, the sisters had been served by rectors who were canons regular of the Chapter, and later the Congregation, of Windesheim, they had repeatedly admitted sisters from other convents, and in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries they had been regularly visited by the bishops of ’s-Hertogenbosch.⁴ If, before 1906, Soeterbeeck had indeed been omitting the canonical office for centuries, it was certainly not because of its isolation, as the unidentified commentator suggests.

Frenken is, of course, a much more reliable witness. He may well have seen the draft of Pompen’s letter and the French commentary on it, and certainly had first-hand knowledge of Beckers’ chronicles and other sources on Soeterbeeck’s history, including some which are no longer traceable today. For his narrative of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history, he must have combined the rector’s account of the fire of 1539 with information from other sources. There can be no doubt about this, for although the passage in Beckers’ chronicles can be read as implying that the sisters temporarily abandoned the canonical office, it does not say for how long or what the alternative was.

The first additional source which appears to have contributed to Frenken’s conclusions regarding the period after the fire is a Latin report of a visitation that had been carried out on

² See pp. 53-55.
³ See pp. 88-89.
22 October 1627 by Bishop Michael Ophovius of the diocese of 's-Hertogenbosch,\(^1\) to which Soeterbeeck belonged after it had been established in 1560. Frenken does not explicitly use this document to support his theory, which, as indicated, he puts forth without any documentary evidence. Rather, he quotes from the report when discussing Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century episcopal visitations, and goes out of his way to say that it reveals that de zusters het Klein Officie van O. L. Vrouw baden; op Zon- en feestdagen werd het gezongen, op werkdagen gelezen.\(^2\) Because the original document is lost,\(^3\) it is impossible to verify what the report actually said, but if Frenken’s paraphrase is accurate neither confirmed nor denied that the community was replacing the canonical office with the Little Office in 1627. Instead, it seems only to have affirmed that the Little Office was prayed, and described the way in which this was done.

The visitation reports which Frenken edited for his history of Soeterbeeck do not provide a definitive answer either, but they do seem to point in a certain direction.\(^4\) Oldest are Bishop Ghisbertus Masius’ directions after his visitation on 8 May 1613,\(^5\) the first of which is that allen religieusen sullen vervollegen allen die Getijden van den Godsdienste ende daermede voerierste ende voerald soecken het Ryck Gods ende syn rechtverdicheyt.\(^6\) The words Getijden van den Godsdienste seem to represent the Latin horae officii divini, but there is no way to be certain that Masius uses the phrase in its proper sense, and not with reference to a liturgical devotion such as the Hours of the Virgin. There is no way, in other words, to make this stipulation definitively prove that the canonical office was being recited at Soeterbeeck in 1613. It seems safe, however, to interpret the fact that the bishop thought it necessary to exhort all choir sisters to completely pray all hours of whatever office they were using to mean that they had not always been doing so equally faithfully. The situation cannot have been too dire, for Masius and his successors all sung Soeterbeeck’s praises, but their visitation reports do show that the convent’s devotional life and its liturgical practice suffered a little during the first two decades of the seventeenth century.\(^7\) Perhaps Frenken took these indications of spiritual slackening as a confirmation of his conclusion that the choir sisters limited themselves entirely to the Little Office.

Where Masius’ report leaves room for doubt, Frenken’s interpretation seems hardly tenable in the case of the report of Bishop Nicolaas Zoesius’ visitation of 25 July 1615.\(^8\) Several sisters who are quoted in this document refer to the conventual liturgy, and although none of these references are entirely unambiguous about what specific service they refer to, they are suggestive. Sister Maria van den Bosch, for instance, dicit Patrem aliquando omittere Officium et Missam.\(^9\) Whereas this statement, taken by itself, could be interpreted as criticism only on the rector’s private prayer life, the words of Sisters Maria van Camphuysen van den
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1. On Ophovius, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 122-127, no. 6.
2. ‘The sisters prayed the Little Office of Our Lady; on Sundays and feasts it was sung, on weekdays it was read’ (Frenken 1931/32, 201).
3. The reports of Bishop Ophovius’ visits to Soeterbeeck, which took place on 22 October 1627, 27 May 1630, 27 June and 12 November 1632, are probably kept in the diocesan archives in ’s-Hertogenbosch (cf. Peijnenburg 1982a, 36 n. 24). However, according to both Jef van Gils, staff member of the archives, and the late Jan Peijnenburg, archivist emeritus, they cannot now be found there (personal communication with the author).
4. For these visitation reports, see Frenken 1931/32, 271-283.
5. On Masius, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 113-118, no. 4.
6. ‘All religious shall fulfil all hours of the divine office and in doing so first and foremost seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness’ (Frenken 1931/32, 271). The bishop is, of course, referring to Matthew 6:33.
9. ‘Says the rector sometimes omits the office and Mass’ (Frenken 1931/32, 272). Sister Van den Bosch was born circa 1584, professed in 1601 and still alive in 1632 (ibid., 296). Frenken says that she was also known as Van den Hout or Van Houten, and the fact that these names refer to one and the same person is probably confirmed by the biographical information provided in the visitation reports he edits (ibid., 296, 272, 278).
The former rogat quatenus Patri detur socius, ne aliquando Sacro careant et Officio, and the latter dicit etiam expedire, ut sit quis Primissarius, aliasquin accidere soreos esse sine quotidiano exercitio religionis aut Sacro. The sisters were clearly affected by the rector’s failure to regularly say his Mass and office, which therefore constituted negligence of his pastoral duty towards them. In order to remedy this, they asked for the canon who was rector at the time, Wouter Willems, to be assisted by a socius. This request was probably never granted, as no socius is known for his particular rectorate.

The general situation described in the report is clear enough, and although many of the details are not, upon further inspection they do allow for interpretations that seem sufficiently secure. The text clearly shows that the sisters depended upon their rector not only for Mass but also for the celebration of the hours. The precise form which this dependence took is unclear, although other sources provide additional hints that are discussed below. However, the very fact that the reliance existed strongly suggests that the sisters were saying the canonical hours. Although Windesheim canons also said the Little Office of the Virgin every day, praying the great office was their primary liturgical duty in addition to celebrating Mass. If a canon’s office is mentioned without any qualification, it is probably the divine office. It is therefore most likely that the office which Rector Willems is said by Sister Van den Bosch to omit, consisted of the canonical hours. If this conclusion is correct, the fact that the other two sisters say that the rector’s omission caused them to be without their office means they must

---

1 Van Camphuys was born in 1587 and professed in 1607. She was chantress in 1632 and still alive in 1640. Van Zeelst was born in Nuenen around 1583 and professed at Sint-Annenborsch in ’s-Hertogenbosch in 1599. In 1613 she was one of the sisters to move to Soeterbeeck, where she was subprioress from 17 May 1618 until probably 29 June 1623, when she became council sister and nurse. She still occupied the latter office in 1632, and was still alive in 1642 (Frenken 1931/32, 296).

2 ‘Asks how long it will be until the rector be given a socius, that they may not sometimes be without Mass and office’ (Frenken 1931/32, 272).

3 Also says that it should be arranged that there be some priest to say early Mass, that otherwise it happens that the sisters are without their daily religious exercise or Mass’ (Frenken 1931/32, 272).

4 Willems was born in Boxtel and professed as canon regular of Mariënhaage. Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 222 says that he was rector in 1604 and stayed so until 1649, whereas Frenken 1931/32, 301 claims that he was only rector from 1610 to 1644. The gap of five years which appears between Willems’ rectorate and that of his successor in Frenken’s scenario, is filled by Sloots 1943, 102, nos. 14-15. He says that Gualterus or Wolterus Willemsen or Willems, whom he identifies as the 111th canon to be professed at Mariënhaage and who died on 22 November 1649, was succeeded as rector before that time by Gualterus Colen, also of Boxtel, who was the 122nd to be professed and died on 22 March 1649. Soeterbeeck’s book of benefactors lists no Rector Wouter for November, but does mention onsen eerv. pater rector Walerus van Boxtel (‘our rev. father rector Walteurs van Boxtel’, ASP 267) for March. In addition, no Gualterus Colen appears on the list of rectors given at the back of the seventeenth-century volume that includes Soeterbeeck’s statutes, which mentions only heer Wouter Willemesen van Boxtel gestorven 1649, directly followed by heer Henricus vanden Beemden gestorven 1656 (‘reverend Wouter Willemsen van Boxtel died 1649 […] reverend Henricus vanden Beemden died 1656’, ASP 92, f. 51v). One of two things happened here. If Sloots is right, the statutes mention Willems and omit Colen, whereas the Welderdooendersbose mentions Colen and omit Willems. On the other hand, it is also possible that Sloots is wrong about the two successive rectors named Wouter, given that he says that Willems and Colen came from the same town and both died in the same year on the 22nd day of the month. I am inclined to believe that Soeterbeeck only had one rector named Wouter of Boxtel, and that he was rector until his death in March 1649.

5 A list of socii appears at the back of the seventeenth-century volume that also contains Soeterbeeck’s statutes (ASP 92, f. 52v). The names closest to Willems’ rectorate are those of Matheus Boockemans van Westerhoven, who is said to have died in 1605, and of Joannes van Bredael, who had not even been born yet in 1615 (Sloots 1943, 102, no. 18).

6 See pp. 78-79, 91.

7 Van Dijk 1986, 397. Cf. p. 135, par. 21 of the constitutions of the congregation of Windesheim that were printed in Louvain by Jacobus Zegerus in 1639 (on which see Van Dijk 1986, 42; I made use of The Hague, RL, 852 B 17, 2).
have said the canonical hours too, and together with the rector. Additionally, the canonical office is textually more elaborate and complicated than the Little Office, and the ritual with which its celebration in choir was accompanied would probably have reflected this. It is therefore much more logical for the rector’s presence to be required by the sisters during the canonical hours than at the recital of the Little Office. Of course, if Frenken is right and the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck did restrict themselves to the Hours of the Virgin, there is a very real possibility that they, in an effort to stay true to their position, said those with the ritual solemnity normally reserved for the canonical hours. However, this pomp and splendour would in turn have compromised the primary benefit of the restriction to the Little Office, that is, that text’s brevity and simplicity. It would seem, therefore, that the sisters’ complaints of the rector’s liturgical shortcomings and their effects on their own prayer life indicate that they were at least attempting to say the canonical office.

This reading of the evidence is possibly confirmed by a further statement made by Sister Camphuys in the visitation report of 1615. In addition to the comment quoted earlier, she also *dicit posse ordinari, ut Parvae Horae singulis diebus decantentur*.1 Camphuys’ interest in the chanting of the hours can be explained from the fact that she is known to have been chantress in 1632,2 and may indeed indicate that she already held this office in 1615. The more pressing question raised by her words, however, is what exactly the *Parvae Horae* were of which she speaks. Were they the *Officium Parvum*, the Little Office of the Virgin, or the *horae minores*, the minor hours of the canonical office? And is she suggesting that these hours should be sung every day because they were not being prayed at all, or only said and not sung, or only said or sung on certain days? It is tempting, especially in light of Frenken’s paraphrase of the visitation report of twelve years later, to conclude that she is speaking of the Little Office, which in 1627 was apparently sung on Sundays and read on weekdays. If the *Parvae Horae* are indeed the Little Office, the fact that Sister Camphuys is reported as having distinguished them by choice of words from the *Officium* of which she spoke earlier would suggest that the latter is the canonical office. Although all of this is far from certain, especially when the declaration on the *Parvae Horae* is considered in isolation, I would say that when the sisters’ statements in this visitation report are all taken together, they do indicate that the rector and the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck prayed more than just the Little Office in the early seventeenth century.

**EXCURSUS: MORE ON THE VISITATION REPORTS**

There is one final aspect of the visitation report of 1615 that gives pause, and although it is strictly ancillary to the issue at hand, it merits discussion for its own sake. The word Sister Elias used to refer to the socius for whom she was asking is rendered in the Latin text as *primissarius*, which is literally a priest whose duty it is to say the early Mass. This raises the question how many Masses were being said at Soeterbeeck and how many of them the sisters regularly attended. Van Dijk says that although on some days the Windesheim canons did celebrate two conventual Masses, this was normally not done in female convents.3 Soeterbeeck, may, of course, have deviated from the norm and celebrated more Masses than usual. However, since there is no solid evidence for this, I can only conclude that Sister Elias used the word which the report represents by *primissarius* without any consideration of herself and her sisters, but strictly with reference to the socius in relation to the rector. Her line of thought may have been that, because the conventual Mass, at which the sisters were present, would normally be celebrated by the rector, the socius could be expected to say another Mass privately earlier in the day. This would have been the case fairly regularly if not daily, either out of the socius’ personal piety or out of necessity, for instance because an additional

---

1 ‘Says that it can be arranged that the little hours be sung every day’ (Frenken 1931/32, 272).
2 Frenken 1931/32, 296.
3 Van Dijk 1986, 409. The Windesheim constitutions of 1639 do mention on p. 175, par. 6 that two conventual masses are occasionally prescribed by the Roman Missal even for women’s convents. Cf. Fortescue 1910, 790.
Requiem Mass was due on the anniversary of the death of a benefactor. What confuses the matter is that in this case the primissarius would actually be appointed with an eye to saying the later conventual Mass if necessary.

There is one more visitation report to consider that goes into liturgical matters, and it may be discussed here even though it does not touch upon the divine office explicitly. This document, which describes a visitation conducted on 20 and 21 June 1683 by Guilielmus Bassery, the vicar apostolic of 's-Hertogenbosch, was introduced, edited and annotated for publication by Frenken, but the article did not actually appear during his lifetime. A typed copy, including photocopies of the seventeenth-century document, is preserved in the archives of Soeterbeeck, and it is to his source that I refer. This time around, the choir sisters appear not to have said anything about their liturgical practices, but two converse sisters did. First, Sister Christina Adriaenssen of Ravenstein says: *Hora septima praecipe legi debent septem psalmit, quod non ita exacte observatur, sed vix congregantur.*3 This shows that the liturgical duties of Soeterbeeck’s converse sisters included the communal recital of the seven penitential psalms, although this was not always done. Second, and more relevant to our present purpose, Sister Willemken Hendrickx says that the rector, Joannes van Bredael (1680-1705),5 *deberet citius dicere Sacrum diebus dominicis et prima saltem hora octava. Hoc provenit ideo quia excitit confessiones mane, adeo ut hora duodecima subinde adhuc concionetur.*6 The general thrust of this statement is probably that Van Bredael should take care to plan his liturgical activities on Sunday morning so that he had enough time left for hearing confessions afterwards. The moment when the rector said Prime is singled out for special mention, and because it strongly influenced even the converse sisters’ order of the day a case could be made that he and the choir sisters said this hour together, at least on Sundays. This reinforces the evidence from the 1615 report that the sisters partially depended on the rector for the celebration of the divine office, and suggests that this was still the case over half a century later.

2.4.2. The Oldest Statutes

So far, the evidence seems rather to dispute than to support Frenken’s conclusion that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck had abandoned the recital of the canonical office, at least for the seventeenth century. However, the historian probably did not only base himself on Beckers’ chronicles and episcopal visitation reports, but also involved another source, to which it is now time to turn. This is the oldest surviving copy of the statutes of Soeterbeeck,7 dated by Van Dijk to the middle of the seventeenth century,8 and believed by Frenken to have been written by a rector.9 Indeed, the hand is probably that of Antonius Gast, who served Soeterbeeck in this capacity from 1656 until his death in 1680.10 The text itself goes back indirectly to the Latin statutes of the canonesses regular of Windesheim,11 although it differs

---

1 On the moment at which the conventual Mass was celebrated at Soeterbeeck in the seventeenth century, see pp. 79-80. On anniversaries, see p. 100.
2 On Bassery, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 141-142, no. 5.
3 ASP 39. Frenken’s article was published by Korpershoek 1999, but there the Latin text of the report was replaced by a Dutch translation.
4 At seven o’clock sharp the seven psalms should be read, which is not so exactly observed, but we scarcely converse’ (ASP 39, p. 5). The only thing that is known about Sister Adriaenssen is that she died in 1703 (Frenken 1931/32, 300).
5 Rector Bredael was professed as canon regular of Mariënhage on 24 March 1671, and served Soeterbeeck as its 12th socius and as rector from 1680 until his death at the age of 54 on 26 March 1705 (Sloots 1943, 102, no. 18; 1948, 409, no. 3).
6 ‘Should say Mass earlier on Sundays, and Prime at eight o’clock at least. This arises for this reason, because in the morning he hears confessions until at twelve o’clock he immediately preaches again’ (ASP 39, p. 5).
7 ASP 92, ff. 1r-46v. The complete text has been edited by Frenken 1931/32, 213-255.
8 Van Dijk 1982b, 74.
9 Frenken 1931/32, 253 n. 2.
10 Gast, born in ’s-Hertogenbosch, was the 127th canon to be professed at Mariënhage, served as procurator of that convent, and as rector of Soeterbeeck from 1656 until his death on 27 October 1680 (Sloots 1943, 102, no. 17; 1948, 206-207, 239, 275, 387, 407, no. 2). On the identification of his hand, see pp. 161-162.
11 Van Dijk 1982b, 98.
from them in many important respects. It cannot be said with certainty when the version whose oldest surviving copy is under discussion here was prepared. The only thing that can be safely assumed is that these statutes were in force at Soeterbeeck in the seventeenth century, because that is when they first survive, in a book that was also used by another hand to list lay brothers, servants, rectors, socii, priorresses and, apparently in the order of investment, choir and converse sisters.¹ As initially drawn up, these lists ran until the seventeenth century, but they continued to be updated into the first half of the nineteenth century.² Although the fact that the book in which they appear continued to be updated does not actually prove the continued validity of the statutes, it is suggestive of that. Another piece of supportive evidence is the existence, in the conventual archives, of a copy of the same version of the statutes in the hand of Magdalena Verhoeven,³ who entered Soeterbeeck in 1801 and was prioress from 1840 until her death in 1853.⁴ Again, the fact itself that the statutes were copied does not prove that they were still in use, for there are several copies of the oldest surviving statutes that date from the twentieth century, when other statutes were in force.⁵ Verhoeven’s copy, however, bears on its cover and its first page a stamp of the diocesan archives of ’s-Hertogenbosch, and although these stamps are obviously later than the book itself, they suggest that the statutes were at one point sent to the diocese for consultation. This would probably not have been done unless they were still in effect at that point, or about to be revised. In fact, the first surviving revision of these statutes is dated by Van Dijk to the middle of the nineteenth century, and he says that because the new version is very close in wording to the old one, it is likely that there was no intermediate version now lost, and that the seventeenth-century statutes had indeed remained in force for about two centuries.⁶

Granted, statutes belong to a prescriptive genre whose contents do not necessarily describe the actual situation in a convent at any given time, and two hundred years will have seen some dramatic changes in the way life was lived at Soeterbeeck, especially after the move to Deursen in 1732. However, the continued use of both the text and the book in which they appear, strongly suggests that the seventeenth-century statutes remained constitutively meaningful for the sisters, and therefore influenced, to an unknown extent, the things they did and the way in which they did them. This means that whatever this text says about Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life is relevant for the entire period from the second half of the seventeenth to that of the nineteenth century. This includes Beckers’ rectorate, and the text therefore merits close attention in the context of this dissertation. It is also one of the most important sources of Frenken’s statement on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history.

Although pieces of information concerning the celebration of the liturgy at Soeterbeeck are scattered throughout the entire text, the statutes contain five chapters that deal specifically with liturgical matters. These are the eleventh on the sacristan,⁷ and the thirteenth to sixteenth on the chantress, the hebdomadary sister (the one whose turn it was to officiate at the liturgy of the hours in a particular week), and the choir sisters’ conduct during the

---

¹ ASP 92, ff. 48v-57v. On ff. 62v-63r appears an account of the foundation of Soeterbeeck in another seventeenth-century hand.
² On f. 55r the final sisters added in the same ink and the same hand as the earlier ones include Maria Jacobs, who died in 1707, and Aldegundis van Hal, who died in 1731 (Frenken 1931/32, 298). On f. 56rb is a list of the sisters who officially entered the community in 1840 (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 186-187, nos. 84-95).
³ Verhoeven’s hand can be identified on the basis of a letter which she signed that is preserved in the diocesan archives in ’s-Hertogenbosch (File Soeterbeeck, not inventoried).
⁴ ASP 95. On Verhoeven, see Appendix A.1, no. 31.
⁵ These are ASP 94, in an unidentified hand, and Mater 9, finished by Rector Nicolaas Nuijens (1913-1949) on 27 July 1915, according to its colophon. On Nuijens, see p. 222 n. 1.
⁶ Van Dijk 1982b, 76.
⁷ Frenken 1931/32, 228-230.
celebration of the hours and sung conventual Mass.\textsuperscript{1} Much can be gleaned from these pages, but the crucial passage for the purpose of this chapter occurs at the beginning of the section on the sisters’ behaviour during the hours. It reads as follows:

Aensiene dat oootmoedich fundament, ende privilegie der susteren ende haere godshuijsje, soo sullen de susteren die te choor gaen, dagelijckx te gesetten tijden devotelyckx naer cloosters maniere, Onser Lieve Vrouwe getijden te choor lesen int Latijn, voor die canonicklijkije getijden, om hen mede te gelijken de gewoonte der heijliger Kercke, ende dat inder manieren hier naer beschreven.\textsuperscript{2}

The next paragraph consists mainly of a description of how the three nocturns of the Hours of the Virgin should be spread across the week: the first should be read on Mondays and Thursdays, the second on Tuesdays and Fridays, and the third on Wednesdays and Saturdays.

It is implied, though not stated, that on Sundays all three nocturns were to be read. The passage finishes with the directive that de laudes ende aender getijden des daegs sullen zij lesen ten gesetten tijden naer inhout haerder boecken ende anders niet.\textsuperscript{3}

Frenken does not make his interpretation of this passage explicit, but that it informed his thinking on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice can be confidently inferred. First, he refers to the statutes’ directions concerning the division of the nocturns in a note to the passage on the mention of the Little Office in the visitation report of 1627.\textsuperscript{4} Second, in his edition of the statutes he adds a note to the clause that instructs the Hours of the Virgin to be read voor the canonical hours, saying that the stipulation in question proves that the text dates from after the fire of 1539.\textsuperscript{5} Because he connects this part of the statutes with his contention that the fire caused the sisters of Soeterbeeck to abandon the canonical hours for the Little Office, it is clear that Frenken took it to mean that the sisters had been given a privilege that allowed them to say the Hours of the Virgin instead of the canonical hours.\textsuperscript{6} But this is not the only possible interpretation, and in light of the visitation reports discussed above, it comes as no surprise that a better one is available.

The entire question hinges on the word voor. Frenken takes this to mean ‘instead of’, but it can also indicate ‘before’, in the sense that the celebration of each hour of the Little Office of the Virgin should precede that of the corresponding hour of the canonical office. Given the uncertainty about the way in which it should be interpreted, the first thing to draw attention to about the passage dealing with the recital of the Little Office is its place, at the very beginning of the chapter on the liturgy of the hours. If Frenken is right, this prominent position could be explained from the fact that it would be necessary in a community of canonesses regular to establish as soon as possible that they were not to pray the divine office, and that the choral ritual described in the rest of the chapter applies instead to the Little Office. However, if Frenken is wrong and the statutes are saying that the Hours of the Virgin should be prayed before the canonical office, the paragraphs’ place in front makes just as

\textsuperscript{1} Frenken 1931/32, 231-239.

\textsuperscript{2} ‘With an eye to the humble foundation, and the privilege of the sisters and their convent, the choir sisters should, daily at fixed times and after the manner of a convent, say the Hours of Our Lady in choir in Latin, voor the canonical hours, in order that they conform to the custom of Holy Church, and this in the way described hereafter’ (ASP 92, f. 19v-20r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 232). In his paraphrase of this passage, Jespers 1988, 126 refers to Onser Liever Vrouwe getijden as the groot Maria-officie (‘great office of Mary’). It is not clear to me what he means by this, unless it is a commemorative office of the Virgin that is part of the great office in practice because it replaces the regular office of the day on particular occasions (e.g., Saturdays), in contrast to the Little Office, which is an additional observance (cf. Harper 1991, 134). If this is indeed what Jespers means, it is unlikely that his reading is correct, as I know of no examples of convents who structurally replaced the canonical office with a commemorative office rather than the Little Office of the Virgin.

\textsuperscript{3} ‘They shall read Lauds and the other diurnal hours at fixed times according to the contents of their books, and in no other wise’ (ASP 92, f. 20r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 232).

\textsuperscript{4} Frenken 1931/32, 201 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{5} Frenken 1931/32, 232 n. 1.

\textsuperscript{6} Cf. also Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 2, where he says the substitution of the divine office happened bij wijze van privilegie (‘as a privilege’).
much sense. In that case the positioning contrasts with where the, otherwise completely incomparable, passage on the Little Office is in the constitutions of the canonesses regular of Windesheim as they were before 1559, and in the fifteen-century statutes commonly attributed to Mariaweide, the eponymous mother house of the Chapter of Venlo. In these texts, the Hours of the Virgin are discussed after the description of the way Matins of the canonical office should be said. The late medieval constitutions of the canonesses regular of Windesheim explicitly say that they should in most cases be said after the corresponding hours of the canonical office: *Cursus autem beate Marie, cum ad chorum servatur, post horas canonicas dicitur, exceptis primis et hora que immediate missam conventuale sequitur.* The statutes of Mariaweide have the same stipulation: *Ende altoes leestmen Onser Liever Vrouwe getijden indt choer ter stont na die grote getijden mer die priem leestmen voer die grote priem ende oec dat getijke nader hoeghe missen leestmen Onser Vrouwen getijden voer.* The reason why Prime of the Little Office must precede canonical Prime is because that hour, though it begins in choir, ends in the chapter-room with the conventual chapter. It would be inconvenient if afterwards the sisters had to return to the church for the Little Office. Why the same inverted order was kept for the hour after Mass, which in Mariaweide was None on fasts and Sext on other days, is less clear to me. The important thing to get away from these quotations, however, is that the canonesses regular of Windesheim and Mariaweide were instructed to say the Little Office after the canonical hours in the late Middle Ages, and that this chronology is reflected in the order in which these two liturgical exercises are discussed in the statutes. The fact, then, that the statutes of Soeterbeeck start with the Little Office can be seen as supporting the interpretation that they say that the Hours of the Virgin should be said before the canonical hours.

There is also another and more substantial reason to not simply accept Frenken’s interpretation of the statutes out of hand. This is the fact that, except for the two opening paragraphs on the Little Office of the Virgin, the rest of the chapter on the sisters’ behaviour during the hours applies more readily to the canonical office. The ritual with which the communal prayer is to be accompanied according to the text is highly elaborate and in many respects dependent on the liturgical rank of each day—to the extent that nearly a third of the chapter is devoted to describing the resulting variants. This is reflective of the length, complexity and variability of the canonical hours. The Little Office, in contrast, is a simple text that is more or less the same throughout the year, by its very nature not being very much affected by the liturgical calendar and its alternating feasts. If the text is of modest scope and

---

1 A critical edition of these is presented by Van Dijk 1986, 726-833.
2 These statutes have not been edited, and are preserved in Brussels, RL, IV 1064. On the manuscript, see Deschamps and Mulder 2006, 66-67. The arguments brought forward in favour of the attribution of these statutes to Mariaweide are their dialect (Deschamps 1977, 8-9) and the fact that they were supposedly the only extant constitutions for a convent in the Chapter of Venlo to include separate chapters on visitations and the election of a prioress, passages which would be highly relevant for the prior general in the mother house (Van Dijk 1986, 615-617). However, the twentieth-century transcription of the seventeenth-century statutes of Mariagaarde in Roermond also includes a chapter on visitations (RHCL, 14.D051, inv. nr. 95, ff. 5r-54r), thereby rendering the second argument less strong. On the relationship of the statutes in Brussels with the statutes of Soeterbeeck, see Van Dijk 1982b, 81-113.
3 ‘The office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, when it is said in choir, is said after the canonical hours, except after Prime and the hour that immediately follows the conventual Mass’ (Van Dijk 1986, 787). The qualification *cum ad chorum servatur* refers to the preceding stipulation that if the canonical office was of the Blessed Virgin, the Little Office would not be said but replaced by the gradual psalms.
4 ‘And the Hours of the Blessed Virgin are always read in choir immediately after the great hours. But Prime is read before great Prime and the hour of Our Lady is also read before the hour after high Mass’ (Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 20r).
6 Brussels, RL, IV 1064, ff. 22v-23r.
never changes materially, would its performance not reflect this? Frenken would probably have countered this argument by arguing that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck wished to stay true to their vocation and therefore prayed the Little Office with the same complex ritual they had brought to the canonical hours before the fire of 1539. A community that celebrated both the great and the Little Office would probably have distinguished between the external solemnity of the two, whereas a convent saying only the latter may have had the inclination to do so very elaborately. This may be true, although, again, investing the Little Office with great ceremonial runs counter to the brevity and simplicity that must be its primary benefits for a community that chooses it over the canonical hours.

So far, my reasons for doubting Frenken’s understanding of the statutes have been a matter largely of perspective. He is positively confirmed to be wrong, however, by the fact that the chapter on the liturgy of the hours includes two stipulations that are only relevant for the canonical office. The statutes say that, during the recitation of the psalms the two choir halves across which the sisters are divided in church should alternatingly stand and sit, so that one choir is sitting and the other standing for each psalm. An exception is made, however, for the psalms at Matins and Lauds and the Athanasian Creed at Prime, when both choirs are instructed to sit. In Soeterbeeck’s late medieval liturgical manuscripts the latter text, also known by its opening words as the Quicumque vult, was said every day after the psalms

---

1 Frenken 1931/32, 234.
2 Frenken 1931/32, 235. The way in which the Athanasian Creed is introduced in Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century statutes requires comment. It is said that the sisters should sit during psalms at Matins and Lauds and during the Quicumque vult inde prieme des sondachs alsmen nocturnen hout buijten den tijt van Paeschen (‘during Prime on Sundays when nocturns are held, outside Eastertide’, ASP 92. f. 23r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 235). This refers to certain characteristics of the use of Windesheim, which Soeterbeeck may or may not yet have abandoned for the Roman Breviary by the time the statutes under consideration here were written (cf. pp. 103-104). The passage clarifies the use of the plural nocturnen by referring to den tijt van Paeschen. This is because, in many late medieval manuscripts, including that of Windesheim, all Sundays had three nocturns at Matins except for those in Eastertide, which had only one (cf. Hughes 2004, 54, no. 406). According to the Roman Breviary, however, the only Sundays with one nocturn were those of Easter and Pentecost (cf. RGB I.5; I made use of the text as printed in IV 69, ff. ***5v-***9r), which obviously do not cover all Sundays in Eastertide. As it is, then, the passage cannot refer to the Roman Breviary, either in error (cf. pp. 75-76), or because the sisters of Soeterbeeck had not abandoned the use of Windesheim yet when it was written. The statutes of Mariaweide only give the general stipulation that the sisters should stand during the Quicumque vult (Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 16r-v), without any more qualifications. In addition, the wording in Soeterbeeck’s statutes also differs from that of the late medieval constitutions of the canonesses regular of Windesheim, which speak of Prime dominice diei, quando nocturnus servatur extra tempus paschale (‘on Sundays, when a nocturn is held, outside Eastertide‘), Van Dijk 1986, 785-786). In this case nocturnus does not refer to a nocturn in the proper sense of the word as a division of Matins, but to the ordinary psalms for Matins in the ferial psalter. On this use of the word, especially in the Sarum Breviary, see Seager 1843, lvi, 14 of the winter part. It is also very clearly used in this way in the Cologne Breviary published at Cologne by Hermannus Bungart in 1500, where the running header above the psalms at Matins on Sundays in the ferial psalter identifies them as the nocturnus dominicalis (‘dominical nocturn’, f. ir; I made use of a digital copy of Düsseldorf, University and State Library, PRTHEOL-2-147:INK). In many uses, the psalms at Matins in the ferial psalter were said on all Sundays of the year when the dominoical office was not replaced by that of a feast, except on Sundays in Eastertide, when the psalms were distributed differently because there was only one nocturn rather than the usual three. The phrase from the Windesheim statutes should therefore be understood to refer to Prime on ‘Sundays when the ordinary dominoical psalms are said at Matins, outside Eastertide’. Another example of this particular use of the word nocturnus in a Windesheim context occurs in the Windesheim Breviary published in Delft by Henricus Eckert de Homberch in 1499. There, a particular set of psalms for Prime that are only to be said on Sundays outside Eastertide is identified as belonging to Sundays quando dicitur nocturnus (‘when a nocturn is said’, f. e4vb; I made use of a digital copy of The Hague, RL, 170 E 14). The corresponding rubric in one of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript breviaries is more precise, though considerably less grammatically correct, and refers to dominicis quando cantatorum de tempore ferialibus psalms (IV 80, f. 149r-v), which is presumably intended to mean ‘Sundays when the psalms of ferial time are sung’ at Matins. This shows that the psalms said at Matins affected not only the rituals that were to be observed but also the text that was to be said at Prime.
during canonical Prime, and according to the Roman Breviary it was said on Trinity Sunday and all Sundays without a proper office. The text is not part at all of the Little Office, however. Second, the statutes stipulate that the hebdomadary sister should not rise to give the blessing that is asked of her before the lessons at Matins, except when it is the prioress who does the asking, or when datmen H. evangelielie esed. It is most likely that this refers to the verse from one of the Gospels that precedes the three homilies that are usually read in the third nocturn on Sundays and on feasts with three nocturns rather than one. Indeed, the word evangeliulium is used as pars pro toto for the entire third nocturn in Soeterbeeck’s manuscript breviaries. The statutes are saying, then, that the hebdomadary sister should give the blessing preceding the Gospel passage and the first of these homilies while standing. However, no such Gospel pericope and homilies occur in the Hours of the Virgin, so that it is quite clear that this stipulation can only apply to the canonical office. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the statutes, as they are, do not at all support Frenken’s thesis that the sisters of Soeterbeeck were only saying the Little Office when they were written, and actually contain instructions to the contrary.

Frenken’s interpretation of the paragraph on the Little Office is incompatible in fact and in spirit with much of the rest of the chapter on the liturgy of the hours. The only possible way to reconcile the two would be to assume that the opening passage is an editorial addition made without consideration of the text as a whole. This is highly unlikely, even though it is certain that the statutes of Soeterbeeck under consideration here have been edited, either by Rector Gast when he copied his version or before. For instance, the chapter on confession and the reception of Holy Communion ends with a passage in the first person singular that presents an alternative way of receiving Holy Communion that differs from the procedure outlined in the chapter’s main body. Clearly, the final paragraph was an inelegant later addition. The text of the statutes also displays several infelicities that appear to be due to sloppy editing, such as the fact that both the chantress and the librarian (with the prioress) are said to be responsible for drawing up schedules for the refectory readings. In the late medieval constitutions of the canonesses of Windesheim and the statutes of Mariaweide, this task is reserved for the chantress, so it would seem that it was transferred to the librarian at Soeterbeeck and that this change was not consistently implemented in the statutes. However, a small inconsistency such as this one is of an entirely different order than the fundamental contradictions that exist between the passage on the Little Office and many other passages on the liturgy if Frenken’s interpretation of the former is accepted. To accept these

---

1 Cf. IV 80, ff. 154r-155r.
2 RGB XXXIII.2.
3 ‘The holy Gospel is read’ (ASP 92, f. 25r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 237). The constitutions of the canonesses of Windesheim and the statutes of Mariaweide say exactly the same thing: the hebdomadary sister does not rise unless for the Gospel or nisi evangeliulium legendum fuerit (‘unless the Gospel should be read’, Van Dijk 1986, 786) and ten waer totter ewangelije (‘unless for the Gospel’, Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 17v).
4 The possibility that the text is referring to Gospel readings at Matins can be discarded because none of these occur in the Roman Breviary, and only one in the use of Windesheim. The latter is the genealogy from Matthew 1 that is added after the ninth lesson and responsory on Christmas Day (cf. IV 16, f. 21v; IV 74, f. 104v). Secular uses usually also had the genealogy from Luke 3 after the ninth lesson on the Epiphany (Hughes 2004, 61-62, no. 417), but there is no hint of this in the manuscripts of Soeterbeeck.
5 E.g., IV 79, f. 78r refers to the seventh, eighth and ninth lessons at Matins on the feast of Maurice of Agaunum and his companions (22 September) as follows: Ewangelium Cum audieritis prelia, require in communi (‘Gospel “And when you hear of wars”, seek in the common of saints’). This is a reference to the passage from Luke 21:9 and the three accompanying homilies in the third nocturn of the common of several martyrs on f. 124r-v.
6 Frenken 1931/32, 253.
7 Frenken 1931/32, 230-231. For what may be another small error in the passage on the Quicumque vult, see p. 74 n. 2.
8 Van Dijk 1986, 771; Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 47v.
inconsistencies as a result of the imperfect implementation of a change in liturgical praxis would entail the assumption that, even though the best part of the chapter had become obsolete, it was nonetheless retained without change. To err is human, but carelessness of such magnitude entirely undermines the purpose of texts like the statutes under discussion here, and I cannot, for this reason, envision it.

In conclusion, it is almost entirely certain that the word voor in the passage on the Hours of the Virgin instructs the sisters to say these before and not instead of it the canonical office. But how should the rest of the paragraph be interpreted? Its emphasis seems to be, not on the moment when, but on the way in which the Little Office was to be said, that is, daily, at fixed times, communally—naer cloosters maniere is the equivalent of Latin conventualiter—, in choir, and, above all, in Latin rather than in the vernacular. The text justifies this practice in two ways: by referring to Soeterbeeck’s ootmoedich fundament, ende privilegie der susteren ende haere godshuijse, and by saying it is in conformity with de gewoonte der heijliger Kercke.

The invocation of the sisters’ humble foundation and privilegie is a reference to their origin and to the foundation charter of 1454, or at least its contents.1 These were relevant to the way in which the community celebrated the Little Office, because they had made the sisters into canonesses regular, with the duty to communally and chorally recitate the divine office as soon as they had acquired the necessary skills. This obligation could be used as a justification for the instruction to treat the Hours of the Virgin similarly. There is no reason to assume that the word privilegie refers to a specific privilege rather than to the convent’s foundation in general, much less to treat it as evidence for a privilege to substitute the Little for the great office, as Frenken suggests.2

This is not to say, of course, that such privileges did not exist for certain other communities of canonesses regular.3 The choir sisters of Mariëndaal, the convent that would

---

1 On the charter of 1454, see p. 56.
2 Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 2.
3 Three statutes associated with convents in the Chapter of Venlo suggest that these communities were not obliged to celebrate the divine offices, at least originally. The first of these belong to Mariagaarde in Roermond and are discussed in the main text. The other two, however, are so ambiguous (cf. Goudriaan 2008, 191) that they are best relegated to this note. Mater 2 in the Soeterbeeck Collection includes late sixteenth-century statutes that are commonly, but probably wrongly, attributed to Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage in Helmond (edited by Frenken 1935/36, 212-234; cf. p. 230 n. 3 on why the attribution is almost certainly wrong). These include a chapter on the liturgy of the hours which distinguishes between the getijden ende toegetijden, both of which are referred to in the next sentence as getijden vander orden (‘hours and additional hours […] hours of the order’, Mater 2, f. 27r; cf. Frenken 1935/36, 230). For the hour of Compline, the main getijden are explicitly said to be the Little Office of the Virgin (Frenken 1935/36, 231–232), and presumably this is also the case for the other hours. The toegetijden are identified as the Long and the Short Hours of the Cross, the Hours of Eternal Wisdom and the Hours of the Holy Spirit. In addition to these getijden vander orden, however, which the sisters are obliged to celebrate bij gehorsaemheijt, there are also ander getijden, which they may say nae onsen kunnen, ende vermoogen, doch en sullen wij die niet achter laeten sonder orloff ende dispensati des paters (‘out of obedience […] other hours […] according to our capacity and ability, although we should not omit them without the rector’s consent and dispensation’, Mater 2, f. 28v; cf. Frenken 1935/36, 232). If the obligatory getijden vander orden are the Hours of the Virgin and the additional offices, then the ander getijden are probably the divine office, as Frenken 1935/36, 232 n. 1 concludes too. This means that, whatever convent these statutes were actually meant for, the sisters mainly fulfilled their obligation to the liturgy of the hours by celebrating the Little Office, adding the divine office only if the circumstances admitted. Referring to the Hours of the Virgin and the other additional offices as the getijden vander orden may seem odd, but it probably means that these should be said according to the use of Windesheim, whereas the optional ander getijden, the divine office, should be celebrated according to the Roman Breviary, which had been promulgated in 1568 and subsequently adopted by Windesheim (cf. pp. 82-83). The statutes of Sint-Annenborch, which do not survive but were partially edited by Van den Elsen and Hoevenaars 1905-1907 from the papers of Gijsbertus Coeverincx, bishop of Deventer, also contrast de getijden […] van der orden with die ander getijden, which in this case are paired with the Vigilie of Seeven psalmen (‘the hours of the order […] the other hours […] Vigil [of the Dead] or the seven [penitential]
merge with Soeterbeeck in 1954, had been given permission to limit themselves to the Little Office because of their workload upon their foundation in 1422, although they adopted the Roman Breviary by 1619.  

Something similar must have happened at Mariagaarde in Roermond, a member of the Chapter of Venlo to which Soeterbeeck also belonged. A twentieth-century transcription of the statutes of this convent, dated to 1660, contains the following note:

Het is hier gestelt tot een onvergetelicke memorie dat het convent van den Mariegaarde der canonikerssen reguler binnen Ruremundt des Regels van den H. vader Augustinus, aangenomen hebben de Roomsche getijden, niet door bedwanck maer vrijwillich, op den vierden october des jaers duijsent ses hondert negen en vijftig, mets conditie dat int aennemen des selver getijden, de overste met ons, ende ons naecomelingen ooemsche egels van den H. vader Augustinus have adopted the Roman hours, not by obligation but voluntarily, on 4 October 1659, under the condition that precisely this quality is also singled out for special mention in the statutes of Soeterbeeck. However, the faithful celebration of both the Little Office and the divine office is, as the words themselves already signify, the obedient fulfilment of a duty in service of God, and therefore inherently an expression of humility. But all of this is probably beside the point anyway, as the use of the phrase ootmoedich fundament in the statutes of Soeterbeeck seems primarily intended to bring to mind the convent’s roots in the Modern Devotion.

---

1 Van de Laar 1970, 6, 19. He says that, despite their adoption of the Roman Breviary in 1619, the sisters of Mariëndaal were certainly not saying Matins according to the great office in the eigteenth century.

2 ‘It is set down here for an eternal memory that the convent of Mariagaarde of the canonesses regular in Roermond of the Rule of the holy father Augustine have adopted the Roman hours, not by obligation but voluntarily, on 4 October 1659, under the condition that by adopting the same hours, our superior and we and those who come after us have arranged that we will not be held to read the Hours of Our Lady on ferial days, and likewise with the seven penitential psalms and the gradual psalms during Lent, and also with the Office of the Dead throughout the entire year, except on All Souls, and on days of anniversaries, and beyond that on all days on which we are obliged to it according to our documents’ (RHCL, 14.D051, inv. nr. 95, f. 55r).

3 On the date of Mariagaarde’s foundation, see RHCL, 14.D051, inv. nr. 95, f. 54r.

4 See p. 56.

5 On the recital of the Divine Office by canonesses regular as a privilege, see Vissers 1958, 427, 437.

6 Goudriaan 2008, 182, 184-186 mentions several communities of Augustinian converse sisters who were explicitly forbidden to say the canonical hours, among which the convents of Maria Magdalena in Gouda, Roma in Leiden and Sint-Elisabeth in Schoonhoven.

7 Goudriaan 2008, 185 says that the foundation charter of the convent of Roma in Leiden mentions the community’s humility as the motivation for their restriction to such offices as those of the Virgin, the Cross, the Holy Spirit and Eternal Wisdom in the vernacular.

8 On humility in the context of the Modern Devotion, see Scheepsma 1997, 131 and Van Dijk 2012, 228.
In addition to being in line with Soeterbeeck’s fundamental identity as a community of canonesses regular, the statutes’ stipulations regarding the Little Office are also said to help the sisters te gelijken de gewoonte der heijliger Kercke. If taken to apply to the Little Office preceding the canonical office, this might seem to be in contradiction with the reality that, as mentioned above, the opposite order seems to have been the norm. But again, it is not the order of the two services that is being emphasised, but the Little Office’s choral recitation in Latin. The practice of doing so, while by no means universal, was widespread, and is therefore probably the custom of Holy Church to which the sisters are made to conform.

The conclusion must be, then, that Frenken’s reading of the statutes cannot be substantiated at all from the text, and should therefore be abandoned. Rather than replace the canonical hours, the Little Office should precede them. Far from supporting Frenken’s claim that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck only prayed the Hours of the Virgin between 1539 and 1906, the seventeenth-century statutes prescribe the recital of the great office as well. They do not amount to proof that the canonical hours were actually celebrated, but at least they have been invalidated as even a secondary argument for the latter’s complete substitution by the Little Office during the period when they were valid. If this conclusion is taken together with the evidence provided by the episcopal visitation reports, which also seem to refer to the divine office, it is more likely than not that the latter was celebrated at Soeterbeeck in some way during at least some part of the seventeenth century. There certainly is no proof to the contrary.

2.4.3. More on the Oldest Statutes
Before moving on to consider the evidence for Frenken’s statements on Soeterbeeck’s interpretation of the liturgy of the hours in later days, I would like to take advantage of the fact that the seventeenth-century statutes contain many other pieces of information concerning the convent’s liturgical life at the time. Because they were probably still in force in Beckers’ days, it is possible that they also reflect some of the practices of the time. It is therefore worthwhile, in order to gain a better understanding of the functional context of Beckers’ own liturgical activities, to discuss some of the text’s stipulations regarding other aspects of the liturgy before continuing my appraisal of Frenken’s claims on the divine office.

Most importantly, the statutes allow for a better understanding of why the visitation reports discussed above directly connect the rector’s personal failure to say the office with the danger of the sisters being deprived of it as well. The present text indicates explicitly that the rector had a part to play in the sisters’ recital of the divine office: in maioribus duplicibus, begint den rector tot vesperen Deus in adiutorium ende antiphon ad Magnificat, en thurificeert, en seet de collecte. In other words, on feasts with the rank of greater double and presumably higher, the rector should begin Vespers by saying the first verse of the opening versicle Deus in adiutorium, intone the antiphon for the Magnificat, and say the collects at the end. This instruction is a roundabout way of saying that he officiates at this hour. After all, starting the office and saying the collects are both things which ordinarily fell to the hebdomadary sister, and although the statutes do not explicitly say so, it is very likely that

---

1 See p. 73.
3 ‘On greater doubles, the rector at Vespers begins Deus in adiutorium and the antiphon at the Magnificat, and incenses, and says the collect’ (ASP 92, f. 25v; underscore in the original; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 237). This is almost a literal translation of the corresponding passage in the late medieval constitutions of the Windesheim canonesses, except that the latter explicitly says that the rector should do these things on greater doubles et supra (‘and up’, Van Dijk 1986, 788). On the ranks of liturgical feasts, see pp. 114-115.
this was also the case for intoning the Magnificat.¹ That the arrangements are slightly different on feasts with the rank of greater double and up also appears from the chapter on the prioress, where she is instructed to take over the hebdomadary sister’s task and preside over the recital of the divine office on these occasions.² The text does not explicitly state here that this stipulation excludes Vespers, when the rector should be officiant,³ but there is no doubt, considering the passage quoted above, that this nonetheless was understood to be the case. This means that, although there may also have been other sides to it, one of the ways in which the sisters depended upon the rector for the celebration of the divine office was that he was needed to officiate at Vespers on certain feasts.

**EXCURSUS: MASS, AND THE ORDER OF THE DAY**

Another element of the visitation reports that the statutes allow to be understood more fully is Mass. As indicated,⁴ an entire chapter is devoted to the way the sisters should behave during it,⁵ but it is also mentioned throughout the text. In those cases where Mass is not simply called a *Misse* it is referred to more specifically as *conventsmisse, conventuale Misse* or *Mises des convents* on the one and *hoochmisse* on the other hand.⁶ That the two descriptors actually refer to one and the same thing, as Van Dijk assumes,⁷ is clear from the fact that investments of novices are said to take place during the latter, and professions during the former,⁸ whereas both occasions would seem to merit a similar solemnity. The words also translate two Latin terms, *Missa conventualis* and *Missa maior* respectively, that are used interchangeably in the Latin constitutions of the canonesses regular of Windesheim.⁹ It should be stressed, therefore, that since *hoochmisse* is not a translation of *Missa solemnis*—a solemn, sung Mass with deacon and subdeacon—it does not refer to the ritual’s external solemnity but rather to its central place in the order of the day, being the conventual Mass connected with the divine office and attended by the entire community. It contrasts with *Missa privata* in the sense of a Mass celebrated by a priest in private, without a congregation.¹⁰ Van Dijk says that these private Masses were rare in female convents,¹¹ but that seems unlikely with an eye to the fairly large number of additional obligations the rector must have had, for instance to say Requiem Masses, and the likelihood of the presence of a socius who was also a priest.

The moment when the conventual Mass was celebrated cannot be determined with certainty, but a likely option emerges. Van Dijk says that in the Middle Ages it was usually said immediately after Terce,¹² but the seventeenth-century statutes seem to prescribe something else. Many aspects of the order of the day are mentioned in the chapter on the sacristan, whose task it was to ring the

---

¹ This line of thought is corroborated by a description of the ceremony of the divine office as it was observed in the early twentieth century, written by Rector Nuijens and preserved as a bundle of loose sheets in Mater 11, p. 7, which says that the Magnificat should be intoned by *de eerste van het koor, onverschillig van welke zijde zij is* (‘the first of the choir, irrespective of what side she is on’). In this context, the first of the choir is clearly the hebdomadary sister.

² Frenken 1931/32, 215. That the *meeste feesten* (ASP 92, f. 3r) refer to greater doubles and up is clear from a comparison with the text of the late medieval constitutions of the canonesses of Windesheim, where the corresponding passage speaks of what should be done *in maioribus duplicibus festis et supra* (Van Dijk 1986, 750). On the ranks of feasts, see pp. 114-115.

³ This is made explicit, however, in the late medieval constitutions of the canonesses of Windesheim (Van Dijk 1986, 331, 750).

⁴ See pp. 71-72.

⁵ Frenken 1931/32, 238-239.

⁶ ‘Mass’ (Frenken 1931/32, 228, 229, 233, 238); ‘conventual Mass’ (ibid. 226, 229, 232, 238, 243, 246, 249, 253); ‘high Mass’ (ibid. 242, 253).

⁷ Van Dijk 2012, 238.


⁹ ‘Conventual Mass […] major Mass’ (Van Dijk 1986, 768-769).

¹⁰ For this use of the term in the constitutions of the canons regular of Windesheim, see Van Dijk 1986, 101, 404 n. 2. It is very clear on pp. 175-176, par. 7 of the constitutions of 1639 (on which see p. 68 n. 7).

¹¹ Van Dijk 1986, 359.

¹² Van Dijk 2012, 238.
bells for the various moments of prayer.\(^1\) It is said that there were two signals for every service, except on solemnities, when there were three for Matins and Vespers. The first sign for Matins was given at 4 a.m., and the second sign a quarter of an hour later. Lauds immediately followed Matins, as is evident from the description of the accompanying rituals.\(^2\) The first sign for Terce was usually given at 8.30 a.m., except on fasts, when Terce immediately followed Prime and therefore needed no signal of its own.\(^3\) In that case, the bells should be rung in such a way that all services celebrated in the morning—that is, up to the minor hours and including Mass—were finished by eleven o’clock. During Lent, however, the sisters should be finished at noon. The statutes prescribe no specific times for Prime, Sext, None and Mass, other than the fact that the latter should take place noticeably earlier on the first of the days during which the sisters are bled.\(^4\) However, mention is made of bells being rung for Sext and Mass, in that order, which probably means that these particular services were not directly preceded by any other office,\(^5\) and that Mass took place before None.

The schedule for the afternoon was more complicated, because the moment at which Vespers was celebrated depended on when and where the daily Vigil of the Dead was said and what its length was.\(^6\) On most days of the year the latter was not said in choir, but probably sometime during work,\(^7\) and had only one nocturn of three lessons at Matins. On these days, the first sign for Vespers was given at 3 p.m., except on fasts, when it came an hour later. On days when the Vigil was said in choir, however, it immediately followed Vespers, and the signals for that hour had to be given earlier to accommodate the extra office. This happened, first of all, on Sundays and feasts with a rank of semidouble or less. The Vigil still had only one nocturn, and the first sign for Vespers was given half an hour earlier. However, on anniversaries the Vigil was also celebrated in choir, but with three nocturns and nine lessons in total at Matins. On these occasions, the bell for Vespers was rung an entire hour before its usual time. Finally, the Vigil was also said in choir on every day from Quinquagesima Sunday to the Friday before Palm Sunday and on the feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin, except on the eves of feasts of nine lessons at Matins and up. During this period, however, the Vigil was only said after Vespers on Sundays; on weekdays it came half an hour before the collation was served, which happened at 5 p.m.\(^8\) Also, the nocturns were spread across the week in such a way that the first one was said on Sundays and Wednesdays, the second on Mondays and Thursdays and the third one on Tuesdays and Fridays. It seems likely that this distribution also pertained outside Lent.

The first sign, finally, for Compline was given while grace was being said after the evening meal or after the collation on fasts, when the sisters ate only one full meal a day. The second sign was given at 7.00 p.m. between Easter and the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September), and at twilight during the other half of the year.

2.5. The Eighteenth Century

Having discussed the most important prescriptions which the seventeenth-century statutes provide with reference to Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life, I can now return again to my discussion of Frenken’s claim regarding the divine office. The second part of this, that the choir sisters did not pray the canonical hours but limited themselves to the Little Office of the Virgin between 1539 and 1906, has been shown to be without support in the seventeenth-century visitation reports and Soeterbeeck’s oldest surviving statutes. If anything, these texts provide arguments in favour of the assumption that the divine office was being celebrated in some way, at least in the seventeenth century.

\(^1\) Frenken 1931/32, 229-230.
\(^2\) Frenken 1931/32, 234.
\(^3\) Frenken 1931/32, 235.
\(^4\) Frenken 1931/32, 226.
\(^5\) Frenken 1931/32, 229, 246.
\(^6\) Frenken 1931/32, 236.
\(^7\) Cf. the stipulations in the nineteenth-century statutes discussed on pp. 92-93.
\(^8\) Frenken 1931/32, 224.
2.5.1. The Revision of Books for the Divine Office

In addition to the sources that have been considered so far, there is also the large number of liturgical books for the great office that survive from Soeterbeeck to consider. Many of these contain revisions in seventeenth-century hands, which strongly suggests that they were used liturgically during this period, unless the revision is discarded as an intellectual exercise without use, or as a failed project that never reached its goal. This chapter is intended to provide a basis for the interpretation of the functional meaning of traces like these, so I cannot use their liturgical function as an argument in the present discussion without committing the sin of circular reasoning, but I do want to repeat that the burden of proof is firmly on the one who claims that such notes did not serve a practical liturgical purpose.

The same is even more strongly true for the time of Beckers’ rectorate, as he also subjected many of the same books to even more thorough revisions. This could technically be laughed off as the private hobby of a man with too much time on his hands, but that would be a little too facile. Again, it would be methodologically unsound to formally involve Beckers’ traces of use in the argument of this chapter, but there is actually a very strong external reason to believe that their functional meaning had a practical, liturgical element. The list of rectors at the back of the seventeenth-century statutes, briefly referred to before, includes an obituary for Beckers in the hand of Prioress Verhoeven. This brief text identifies the rector as one of Soeterbeeck’s benefactors, and commends him for the zeal with which he carried out his ministry as rector, particularly by *sijne schifte voor de koor.* Again, this note is discussed in detail in other chapters, but it is clear that it provides proof that Beckers’ liturgical activities were not just a personal pastime but actually had consequences for the sisters’ choir services.

There can be little doubt, then, that during Beckers’ rectorate the sisters of Soeterbeeck were still liturgically using their books for the canonical office. Details on the particular way in which they did so—the specific functional meaning attached to these volumes—emerge from my discussion of Beckers’ revisions later on in the following chapters, but for now the most important conclusion is that Frenken’s contention that the sisters only said the Little Office is probably false not only for the seventeenth but also for the eighteenth century.

2.5.2. Commemorations from the Windesheim Proper of Saints

Before I go on to discuss the evidence regarding the celebration of the liturgy of the hours at Soeterbeeck in the nineteenth century, this may be a convenient place to consider a secondary aspect to Frenken’s claim concerning the period between 1539 and 1906 which has not yet been addressed. He surmised that, at this time, the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck limited themselves to the Little Office of the Virgin, but expanded it with commemorations of feasts based on the proper of saints that was used by the canons of Windesheim.

Before I can go on to provide my opinion on the validity of this conclusion, it is necessary first to determine precisely what Frenken is talking about when he writes about commemorations. These are essentially condensed offices, consisting of an antiphon, a versicle and a collect, that are included at the end of full offices at Lauds and Vespers, to venerate saints or observe feasts that for some reason cannot be given a more complete treatment. In a scenario where the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck merely say the Little Office, the only way for them to celebrate any feasts at all in the liturgy of the hours would be to add

---

1 This is suggested casually by Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 164, fig. 30, but cf. his more serious characterisation of the functional meaning of Beckers’ work in later publications (p. 55).
2 See p. 71.
3 ‘His writings for the choral prayer services’ (ASP 92, f. 51v).
4 See pp. 147, 302-303.
5 See p. 185.
mini-offices like these. The manuscript books of hours from Soeterbeeck’s library that include the Hours of the Virgin actually provide for this, because they include commemorations both of saints who are to be remembered on a daily basis,\(^1\) which I henceforth refer to as suffrages,\(^2\) and others of specific feasts and liturgical seasons.\(^3\) Frenken, however, says that the sisters probably also constructed their own commemorations on the basis of the Windesheim proper of saints.

It is easy to see how this view arose, for it is clearly an attempt to square the presence in Soeterbeeck’s library of a remarkably large number of propers of saints for use in the canonical hours with the contention that the community did not actually pray the latter for most of its history.\(^4\) The theory is also a good one, for it is supported by the fact that commemorations are a part of the Little Office, and describes a way in which the propers could have actually served some liturgical purpose which they are indeed able to fulfil, containing, as they do, both a calendar and proper texts. However, only employing these books as sources for commemorations leaves them unused for the most part, which does not tally with the costs that were supposedly involved in their acquisition. Furthermore, in the absence of any solid archival evidence for Frenken’s claim that the sisters restricted themselves to the Little Office, and given that there seem to be several reasons to actually assume the contrary, there is no reason to doubt that the propers were used in their proper way, that is, to provide texts to be used in complete offices during the canonical hours.

**Excursus: The Windesheim and Lateran Propers of Saints**

Frenken’s mention of the Windesheim proper of saints raises the ancillary question what this consisted of between 1539 and 1906. Given how little research has been done on the Windesheim liturgy in general and on its characteristics after the Council of Trent in particular, the issue deserves to be addressed here, even though it takes us beyond the walls of Soeterbeeck for a few pages.

It must be understood that Windesheim’s liturgical practices changed dramatically shortly after Soeterbeeck’s oldest manuscripts had been produced in the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century. Frenken describes the post-medieval history of the congregation’s liturgy as follows:

De Windesheimers hadden een eigen Breviarium tot 1570. In dat jaar namen zij (ingevolge de voorschriften van Pius V in 1568) het Romeinsch Brevier aan met behoud van een eigen Proprium Sanctorum, dat waarschijnlijk bijna geheel conform was met dat der Reguliere Kanunniken van St. Jan van Lateranen; toen er echter later in de Windesheimsche kloosters meerdere Heiligen-Propriums in omloop waren, die nog al veel van elkaar verschilden, stelde de Generaal Aug. Schepers 24 Jan. 1731 het Proprium der Reguliere Kanunniken van St. Jan van Lateranen (aan wier kerkelijke privilegie de Windesheimers deelachtig waren) voor de geheele congregatie verplichtend, met behoud evenwel van het Officium Divisionis Apostolorum.\(^5\)

This reconstruction of the development of Windesheim’s liturgical practices, and the sources on which it is based, first needs some clarification before its reliability can be assessed.

The Pian prescriptions of 1568 that Frenken refers to are the apostolic constitution *Quod a nobis*, dated 9 July, by which the first edition of the Roman Breviary was promulgated. In this bull, Pius V abolished all other breviaries that had not been in use for at least two hundred years either

---

\(^1\) IV 46, ff. 18r-19r, 30r-31r; IV 47, ff. 35r-36r, 55r-56r; IV 48, ff. 21v-23r, 37v-39r.
\(^3\) IV 46, ff. 35v-69v; IV 47, ff. 56r-67v; IV 48, ff. 39r-45v.
\(^4\) On the propers that survive from Soeterbeeck’s library, see p. 54.
\(^5\) The Windesheim canons had their own breviary until 1570. In that year they adopted the Roman Breviary (because of the prescriptions of Pius V in 1568), while keeping their own proper of saints, that probably conformed almost entirely to that of the canons regular of St John Lateran. However, when later on several, rather diverse propers of saints became current in the Windesheim convents. Prior General Aug. Schepers made the proper of the canons regular of St John Lateran (whose privileges the Windesheim canons shared) obligatory for the entire congregation on 24 January 1731, though keeping the office of the feast of the Dispersion of the Apostles (Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 2).
by institution or by custom. The pope furthermore ordered those who lived outside Italy to switch to the new breviary within six months, or else as soon as they were able to obtain copies of it.¹ This would also have affected the Chapter of Windesheim, whose breviary, as was already noted above, had only been composed circa 1400.²

Frenken says that Windesheim duly adopted the Roman Breviary in 1570.³ This is later than Quod a nobis prescribed, but the historian probably bases this date on the fact that this was the year when, on 18 December, the motu proprio Licet Ecclesia Dei sponsa was issued. This bull is addressed to the canons regular of the Lateran, whom it allowed to celebrate a certain number of proper feasts, thereby paving the way for the publication of a proper of saints of the order, to be used in conjunction with the Roman Breviary.⁴ Because Windesheim shared the privileges of the Lateran canons, as Beckers testifies in his historiographical work on his own congregation,⁵ it could celebrate the same feasts. It did, too, but instead of simply adopting the Lateran proper it produced its own, which, while incorporating all of the Lateran saints, was different in several ways.

Soeterbeeck owned many copies of the Lateran and Windesheim proper of saints, and there are still ten of them in the Soeterbeeck Collection and three more in the conventual archives.⁶ All of these were printed in the seventeenth or eighteenth century, with one exception that is discussed later on.⁷ A comparison of IV 125, the earliest copy of the Lateran proper, printed in Mons by Franciscus Waudraeus in 1635, on the one hand with IV 126 and IV 127, two copies of the edition of the Windesheim proper printed in Brussels by Joannes Mommartus in 1652, on the other, shows that the most significant difference between the two was already singled out for special mention by Frenken. This is the presence of the office for the feast of the Dispersion of the Apostles (15 July) in the Windesheim proper. On the level of the calendar there are other, less spectacular but still noteworthy discrepancies as well, however. I briefly discuss these in order to provide an impression of what Frenken meant when he said the Windesheim proper was nearly, but not entirely, identical to that of the Lateran congregation. Needless to say, this description is in no way intended to be exhaustive or representative of the liturgical tradition of either congregation as a whole; it ignores the texts of the offices themselves and merely provides what can be glimpsed from a superficial comparison of the calendars in three nearly contemporaneous books.

Most of the differences between the calendars of the above-mentioned seventeenth-century proper feasts of the Windesheim and Lateran congregations have to do with the dates on which particular feasts are celebrated. For instance, the Lateran proper lists the feasts of Herculanus of

¹ Bäumer 1895, 438-439, who also quotes the relevant passage from Quod a nobis on p. 438 n. 4.
² Before that, during the first years after its foundation in 1395, the Chapter of Windesheim used the liturgy of the diocese of Utrecht, with some small changes (Acquoy 1984, 3: 305; Persoons and Lourdaux 1966, 401).
³ Axters 1960, 207 n. 5 writes that the Congregation of Windesheim adopted the Roman Breviary in 1637, and substantiates this by referring to f. 1r-v of the Windesheim constitutions of 1639. However, the passage in question reads: Anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo trigesimo septimo maturâ deliberatione pr. et tera additis, vel mutatis, quæ propriæ officium Breuarij Romani assumptum, & propter temporum vicissitudines desiderabantur (‘In the year of the Lord 1637, mature deliberation having been held, it pleased the general chapter that the book of our constitutions be reprinted and put in the following shape: with the constitutions that were confirmed in the past years appointed to their proper places, and furthermore with a few additions or changes that were necessary because of the office of the Roman Breviary having been adopted and because of the vicissitudes of the times’). This merely dates the adoption of the Roman Breviary to between the publication of the previous version of the constitutions in 1553 and 1637, and does not indicate a specific date.
⁴ For the text of Licet Ecclesia Dei sponsa, I referred to IV 63, ff. *3r-*6r.
⁵ CAG, Monastic Library, Hov 45, 1: p. 1, no. 1. See also Acquoy 1984, 2: 79-81, 3: 296, 298; Paquay 1934, 57.
⁶ There are two for the Lateran Congregation: IV 125, printed in Mons by Franciscus Waudraeus in 1635, and ASP 254, printed in Tournai by Desclée, Lefebvre and companions in 1893. The rest are all for Windesheim: IV 126 and IV 127, printed in Brussels by Joannes Mommartus in 1652; IV 67, printed in Brussels by Franciscus Foppens in 1672; IV 40 and IV 41, printed by Foppens in 1699; IV 42 and IV 68 printed in Maastricht by Lambertus Bertus in 1731; and IV 63, IV 64, ASP 252 and ASP 253, printed in Maastricht by Jacobus Lekens in 1753.
⁷ The exception is ASP 254, which was printed in 1893. It is referred to on p. 95.
Perugia and Albinus of Angers on 1 and 2 March respectively,¹ whereas the order is exactly the other way around in the Windesheim books.² The latter explain this, in a five-page commentary following the liturgical calendar,³ with a reference to *Licet Ecclesia*, where the feast of Albinus is explicitly assigned to 1 March and that of Herculanus to the next day.⁴ The same text also indicates, however, that the feasts actually both fall on 1 March, and their occurrence probably explains why the Lateran proper gives a different order. When two feasts of the same rank, like those of Albinus and Herculanus, occur, the feast of the saint with greater personal dignity causes the other feast to be transferred to another date. Because Herculanus is a martyr, he is more important than Albinus, who is only a confessor, and his feast therefore takes precedence.⁵ This probably explains why the Lateran proper ignores the order prescribed in the papal bull, but Windesheim followed the latter.

Another interesting case is presented by the feast of Marcellinus of Deventer. The Lateran proper transfers it from 14 July to the day after;⁶ but because of the feast of the Dispersion Windesheim celebrates it on 16 July instead.⁷ The before-mentioned commentary in the Windesheim propers explains the need for the transference of Marcellinus’ feast by pointing out that 14 July is the feast of Bonaventure of Bagnoregio in the universal calendar, and says that universal feasts cause the transference of occurring feasts of the order that have the same rank,⁸ a rule which was inverted in the eighteenth century.⁹ The same reasoning is behind the transference in the Windesheim books of the feast of Alpius of Tagaste from 16 to 18 August, which is explicitly said in the commentary to be on account of the universal feast of Hyacinth of Poland on the former date.¹⁰ In the Lateran proper, however, it is Hyacinth’s feast that is transferred,¹¹ probably with an eye to the fact that, although the two feasts have the same rank, Alpius has greater personal dignity on account of being a bishop-confessor instead of just a confessor like Hyacinth—even though the personal dignity among confessors is of less importance for arranging their transference than their feasts’ propriety.¹²

Other differences are due to the inclusion in the calendar of the Windesheim propers of feasts that, though not (yet) universal, are not marked as being strictly proper to the order either. These are the feasts of Hubert of Liège (3 November) and Elizabeth of Hungary (19 November), the latter of which was only made obligatory for the universal Church by Pope Clement X (1670-1676).¹³ The commentary on the calendar explains their presence by saying that Windesheim had been celebrating their feasts for a very long time.¹⁴ Hubert’s feast is listed as either a double or a semidouble, depending on where it was celebrated,¹⁵ and where it was the former, it caused the transference of the proper feast of Malachy of Armagh, actually supposed to be celebrated on the same day, to 5 November.¹⁶ This possibility is not envisioned in the Lateran proper, simply because Hubert’s feast was not celebrated in that congregation. The same goes for the feast of Elisabeth. In the Windesheim propers, this causes the proper feast of Fridian of Lucca to be transferred to 20

---

¹ IV 125, f. *8v.
² IV 126, f. **1v.
³ IV 126, ff. **6v-**8v.
⁴ IV 126, f. **7v, no. VII. For the text of *Licet Ecclesia Dei sponsa*, see IV 63, f. *4v.
⁵ Cf. A Carpo 1885, 255, no. 148.VII.
⁶ IV 125, f. **1r.
⁷ IV 126, f. **3v.
⁸ IV 126, f. **8r, no. VIII.
⁹ Cf. A Carpo 1885, 254, no. 148.V.
¹⁰ IV 126, f. **8r, no. VIII.
¹¹ IV 125, f. **1r.
¹³ A Carpo 1885, 573, no. 240.
¹⁴ IV 126, f. **8r, nos. VIII-IX. Indeed, Elisabeth’s feast appears as a commemoration on the Windesheim calendar (for the diocese of Utrecht, cf. Mulder 2011, 21) of 1488, edited by Van der Woude 1949, 469, and hers and Hubert’s are listed as a double and a feast of nine lessons respectively in a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century calendar of Groenendaal, in the diocese of Cambrai, edited by Hermans 2004, 120-121.
¹⁵ IV 126, p. 130. On the ranks of liturgical feasts, see p. 114-115.
¹⁶ IV 126, f. **5v.
November. The canons regular of the Lateran, who did not have to deal with Elizabeth, instead used this day for the transference of the proper feast of Gelasius I, which was in turn necessitated by the fact that the latter’s proper day, 21 November, was also that of the feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin. It is not usual, however, for feasts to be transferred to an earlier day, and the Windesheim propers, which also have the transference of Fridian’s feast to reckon with, therefore transfer Gelasius’ feast to 26 November.

The remaining differences between the Lateran and Windesheim propers, three in all, are not addressed in the commentary on the calendar, and their explanation is therefore somewhat more speculative. All have to do with the presence of universal feasts with deviating ranks in the Windesheim calendar. The bull Licet Ecclesia decrees that in all months when no feast of Augustine is celebrated, a day on which the office is not already devoted to another saint may be used for the celebration of a commemorative office in his honour with the rank of double. The calendar in the Windesheim propers does not include these monthly commemorations, except for the one in January, presumably by way of example. The calendar in the Lateran proper, however, does list them all, and in doing so draws attention to two additional divergences. For a start, it dates the commemorative office of Augustine in July to the 8th, whereas the Windesheim calendar indicates that this day is not available, because it is the seventh day in the octave of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin (2 July). However, the universal Church did not celebrate this feast with an octave at all when the books under discussion here were published, but just as an ordinary, lesser double. Could it be that its high rank in the mid-seventeenth-century Windesheim propers, that of a second class double with an octave, is a relic of the pre-Tridentine Windesheim Breviary, where the feast also had an octave? The commentary on the calendar confirms the general viability of this idea because it uses custom as the explanation for the presence and the rank of other feasts, even though it does not mention the Visitation.

The possibility is also supported by the way in which the feast of Barbara of Nicomedia (4 December), which does not appear in the commentary either, is treated. The universal calendar says that it should only be commemorated, leaving the date free for the commemorative office of Augustine in December, which the Lateran proper indeed assigns to it. The calendar in the Windesheim propers, however, indicates that Barbara’s feast is a semidouble, except where it is a double ex usu. In other words, the high rank with which it is celebrated in particular convents is a matter of tradition, and indeed, the feast had nine lessons at Matins in the old Windesheim

---

1 IV 126, f. **5v. Because the feast of the Presentation was only added to the calendar of the Roman Breviary by Sixtus V (A Carpo 1885, 570, no. 233), Licet Ecclesia, which was issued in 1570, says that 21 November is the feast of Gelasius I (IV 63, f. *4v).
2 The feast of Gelasius would later be transferred again to 1 December, cf. IV 63, f. *8v.
3 IV 63, f. *4r.
4 The Windesheim propers IV 126 and IV 127 assign the commemorative office of Augustine in January to the 31st. The Lateran proper IV 125 instead lists it for the 30th, the day on which the calendar in the Windesheim propers lists the feast of Martina of Rome. The reason for this difference is merely that Martina’s feast was only added to the universal calendar by Urban VIII in 1635 (Schober 1891, 194), so that it had not yet formed an impediment when IV 125 was made ready for publication in that same year, but did when IV 126 and IV 127 were printed.
5 The commemorative offices of Augustine on the Lateran calendar also introduce a difference that is related to one already discussed above. IV 125 is able to list the commemorative office of Augustine in November on the 27th, the date to which the Windesheim propers assign the feast of Clement I due to its displacement from the 23rd by the proper feast of Trudo of Sint-Truiden. The Lateran’s celebration of the commemorative office of Augustine on the 27th allows for the feast of Clement to be celebrated on the 26th, since that of Gelasius, which occupies this date in the Windesheim propers, is transferred to the 20th.
6 IV 125, f. **1r.
7 IV 126, f. **3v.
8 A Carpo 1885, 522, no. 146.
9 At least this is the case on the Windesheim calendar for the diocese of Utrecht of 1488, edited by Van der Woude 1949, 468.
10 ‘By custom’ (IV 126, f. **6r).
Breviary.\(^1\) If custom affected the rank not only of the feasts that are mentioned in the commentary but also that of Barbara, could it not also have influenced that of the Visitation?

Similarly, pre-Tridentine tradition may also be behind the fact that the Windesheim proper list 1 September as the semidouble feast of Giles of Athens, with the fifth day within the octave of Augustine (28 August) only being commemorated,\(^2\) whereas the Lateran proper has it the other way around.\(^3\) Giles’ feast, although universally simple,\(^4\) is included in the Windesheim Breviary as one of nine lessons,\(^5\) and this may have left its trace in the congregation’s seventeenth-century propers.

A full comparison of the calendar in the seventeenth-century Windesheim propers IV 126 and IV 127 with a contemporary Roman Breviary will probably reveal more differences that might be relics of the medieval use of Windesheim. The results of such a collation would need to be thoroughly contextualised before they could be safely interpreted, however, and more research would also be necessary to confirm when and under what circumstances the first edition of the Windesheim proper was prepared, what it looked like, and if any specific papal permission was given for its publication and use. At present, all that can be said in answer to these questions is that numerous editions of the Lateran-based Windesheim proper were published, that the earliest known of these dates to 1626,\(^6\) and that all they contain in the way of papal approval is the bull Licet Ecclesia. This shows that, whenever and under whatever circumstances Windesheim may have first published its own proper, the move was perceived to find its ultimate justification in the sixteenth-century privilege of the Lateran congregation.

**EXCURSUS: THE WINDESHEIM PROPER AFTER 1731**

Frenken was right when he said that the Congregation of Windesheim produced its own proper on the basis of that of the canons regular of the Lateran. It is clearly on the presence of Licet Ecclesia in Soeterbeeck’s copies that he based his conclusion that this happened in 1570. The rest of his account is also based on a document that can be found in books from the library of Soeterbeeck: a foreword-cum-approbation by Prior General Superior Augustinus Schepers,\(^7\) dated 21 January 1731, to the edition of the Windesheim proper that was printed by Lambertus Bertus in Maastricht later that same year. This text begins as follows:

Postquam S. Congregatio nostra Windesemensis dudum in votis habuit ut omnes per utramque Germaniam incorporati & sibi subjecti Canonici Regulares unum eundemque ritum servarent in celebrando Festa Ordinis, sed hactenus absque effectu, dum hodiehum alius hoc, alius alio Libello utitur; tandem, ut desiderata uniformitas efficacius introduceretur, per iterata sua Decreta ordinavit, quatenus celebriendo Festa Ordinis, sed hactenus ab...tandem, ut desiderata uniformitas efficacius introduceretur, per iterata sua Decreta ordinavit, quatenus celebriendo Festa Ordinis, sed hactenus ab...tandem, ut desiderata uniformitas efficacius introduceretur, per iterata sua Decreta ordinavit, quatenus celebriendo Festa Ordinis, sed hactenus ab...

---

\(^1\) This is the case on the Windesheim calendar for the dioecese of Utrecht in 1488 (Van der Woude 1949, 470).

\(^2\) IV 126, f. **4v.**

\(^3\) IV 125, f. **1v.**

\(^4\) A Carpo 1885, 457, 550, no. 194

\(^5\) This is the case on the Windesheim calendar for the dioecese of Utrecht in 1488 (Van der Woude 1949, 469).

\(^6\) Persoons and Lourdaux 1966, 409; Amiet 1990, 507.

\(^7\) Schepers was prior of the convent of St John the Baptist in Aachen, and served as prior general of Windesheim from 23 April 1715 until his death shortly before 9 May 1740 (Acquoy 1984, 3: 320).

\(^8\) After our H. Congregation of Windesheim has for a long time desired that all canons regular incorporated into and subjected to her in either Germany [i.e., in the provinces both of Upper and Lower Germany] should keep one and the same rite for the celebration of the feasts of the order—but thus far without effect, while until today the one uses this and the other another book—she has finally arranged by her repeated decrees, in order that the desired uniformity be more effectually introduced, that on this point we should conform ourselves to the Lateran Congregation (in whose privileges we participate)—only the office of the Dispersion of the Apostles having been retained—to the extent that this matter has now at last passed into a statute by which we are bound. Eager, therefore, by reason of the execution of this obligation of ours, we have brought about that the new book of our order, necessary above all else, has been entrusted to the printer, just as it has been both compiled and, revised as
Schepers then goes on to officially approve the new edition and abolish all other Windesheim propers. The preface just quoted is clearly Frenken’s source for stating that in 1731 the Congregation of Windesheim abandoned its own propers for that of the canons regular of the Lateran, retaining only their own feast of the Dispersion. However, neither the foreword nor the book itself entirely support this interpretation. The date of the preface only represents the moment when Schepers, after noticing a distressing lack of uniformity among the liturgical books used by his confrères, had a new edition of the Windesheim proper published and made its use obligatory throughout the congregation. This obligation had the force of law, and was thereby expected to contribute to the often attempted but still elusive uniformisation of Windesheim’s liturgical practice. The latter takes the shape of complete conformity with the Lateran congregation except with regard to the feast of the Dispersion, but the prior general’s words make it clear that this particular aspect was not new. What changed, is that the conformity was now finally mandatory. Far from revealing, as Frenken concluded, that 1731 marked Windesheim’s adoption of the Lateran proper, Schepers’ preface actually says that this had been attempted many times before.

There can be little doubt that the prior is referring to the earlier editions of the Windesheim proper (whose use was apparently not ubiquitous). It has been illustrated, however, that the calendars of these books deviated from those in the Lateran ones in several ways even in addition to the presence of the feast of the Dispersion. The new edition of 1731, which is said to have been newly collated with the Lateran and the Roman books, even retains two of these calendrical differences. The inversion of the feasts of Herculanus and Albinus and the transference of the feast of Alipius to 18 August are both still there. Granted, possible relics of the late-medieval use of Windesheim such as the octave of the Visitation, the feast of Hubert and the high rank of that of Giles, which were still present in the mid-seventeenth-century propers, no longer play a role. This can be inferred even though the calendar of the new book is not complete and only lists proper feasts. After all, new feasts have been added on 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 July without any mention of commemorations of the Visitation, Malachy’s feast is not transferred from 3 November, and the fifth day within the octave of Augustine is not reduced to a commemoration because of the feast of Giles. It should be noted, however, that the edition of 1731 is not the first to implement these changes, for the one published by Franciscus Foppens in Brussels in 1672, of which the Soeterbeeck Collection also contains a copy (IV 67), has some of them as well. In this book, too, Giles is only commemorated on 1 September and the feast of Malachy is celebrated on 3 November, as is to be expected on the basis of the Roman Breviary. This shows that, although Schepers’ claim that the text of the Windesheim proper which he authorised had been newly collated is undoubtedly true, on the one hand his edition was not the first to move noticeably closer to conformity with the Lateran proper, and on the other the agreement remained more incomplete than he suggests, at least on the level of the calendar.

To conclude, Frenken’s account of the development of Windesheim’s liturgical practice can be refined as follows. At some point after the publication of the Roman Breviary in 1568 the chapter abandoned its own use for that of Rome, but it also published a proper of saints. This was almost, but not entirely based on the proper which the Lateran canons had been allowed to use since 1570, because Windesheim shared their privileges. Over the course of time, the proper grew closer to its model, but it did remain distinct from it, not only because it included the feast of the Dispersion of much as it could be after the example of the Lateran and the rules of the Roman Breviary, newly made to see the light under the revision and correction of two venerable fathers of Sint-Elisabethsdal [near Roermond] and [the convent of canons regular in] Tongeren, exceptionally well-versed in rubrical matter. (IV 42, f. *2r-v).

1 IV 42, ff. *7r-*8v.
2 It is technically impossible to be absolutely certain if the feast of Barbara was not still considered to be a semidouble, because the new proper double feast on 4 December, that of Peter Chrysologus, would in that case simply have caused its translation (cf. RGB X.5.-6; DT I; for the DT, I made use of IV 69, ff. **9v.-**11v). In fact, however, there is no reason to doubt that in this respect the proper of Windesheim had also been made to conform to the Roman Breviary. As explained above (p. 84), by 1731 this book also included an office for Elizabeth of Hungary, so that the clear influence of her feast on the proper calendar was no longer a Windesheim anomaly either.
3 IV 67, f. *8r-v.
the Apostles, but also in other ways. This means that, when Frenken says that between 1539 and 1906 the choir sisters of Soesterbeeck expanded the Little Office with commemorations based on the proper of the Windesheim canons, he is wrong to equate the latter with the Lateran proper. The two were not exactly the same even in the eighteenth century.

2.6. The Nineteenth Century

The point has now been reached where the reader may be excused to take the leap to the conclusion of this chapter, as the intervening pages consider Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice during the two centuries of its existence after Beckers’ rectorate. The evidence concerning this period is given a slightly more summary treatment, but because it is of vital importance for a proper understanding of the background of Frenken’s claim that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck only prayed the Little Office between 1539 and 1906, it cannot be entirely dismissed.

2.6.1. The Revision of the Statutes

It is in the final phase of the lengthy period covered by Frenken’s statement, the nineteenth century, that we encounter several documents that must have contributed greatly to this reconstruction of events. Chief among these is the first revision of the conventual statutes in at least two hundred years, which was approved by Joannes Zwijsen, archbishop of Utrecht and apostolic administrator of ’s-Hertogenbosch, on 10 August 1853.¹ The new text was already in existence in 1851, however, as that is the date of a pasted-in ownership note of Rector Johannes van de Laar (1848-1857) that appears in one of the two surviving complete versions.² Van Dijk argues that, because this particular booklet (ASP 98) also contains a certified version of Zwijsen’s approval,³ it is to be considered the earliest of the two.⁴ Besides the other complete copy (ASP 100), the conventual archives of Soeterbeeck also contain two extracts with only the chapters on the novic Peace, the investment and the profession (ASP 102).

Although the nineteenth-century statutes adhere very closely to the words of the seventeenth-century ones wherever they can, their contents also differ radically in places. Both tendencies are clearly visible in the chapter on the liturgy of the hours, which begins as follows:

De choorzusters zullen dagelijks, volgens de fundatie van hunne godshuizen, en om hunne previlegie in de plaats van de canonike getijden, de getijden van Onze Lieve Vrouw in het Latijn lezen, op de volgende wijze.⁵

There can be no doubt about the meaning of this passage, which clearly states that the Hours of the Virgin replace the divine office for the choir sisters, but that the latter should remain faithful to their foundation by reciting the former in Latin. It constitutes clear proof, then, of the switch that Frenken dated—almost baselessly, as we have seen—to 1539. But why, if it was not caused by a sixteenth-century fire, did it happen in the nineteenth century?

When Soeterbeeck was suppressed by the Napoleonic government in 1812, the sisters were scattered to the winds.⁶ This made choral prayer of any kind impossible, and although it was undoubtedly resumed as soon as most sisters had returned within the next two years, the question is what form it took. The convent’s financial situation was deplorable, forcing the sisters to work heavily for their own maintenance, thereby leaving less time for prayer.⁷ Part

¹ On Zwijsen, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 165-174, no. 1.
² ASP 98, verso title page. Van de Laar was born in Beek en Donk on 11 June 1810. He was rector from 1848 to 1857 and died on 11 November 1871 (Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 8).
³ ASP 98, verso folium of which p. 55 is the recto.
⁴ Van Dijk 1982b, 78 n. 12.
⁵ ‘In accordance with their convent’s foundation and their privilege, the choir sisters shall daily read the hours of Our Lady in Latin instead of the canonical hours, in the following way’ (ASP 98, pp. 30-31).
⁶ Peijnenburg 1982a, 52.
⁷ On Soeterbeeck’s financial situation during the nineteenth century, see Peijnenburg 1982b, 57-59, 62-64.
of this development was the foundation in 1845 of the convent of Nazareth, an annex to the mother house in the nearby Ravenstein, where a small number of sisters went to run a school, and later also a boarding house, for girls.\footnote{Peijnenburg, 1982b, 56-57.} Soeterbeeck had had an in-house school since the year after they moved to Deursen in 1732,\footnote{Peijnenburg, 1982a, 42-43.} but that one had ceased to exist after the convent’s temporary dissolution, and the institution at Nazareth clearly took the sisters’ teaching activities to another level. According to Patricia Romijn, these were not only geared at making money that was needed for the convent’s prolonged existence, but also at practicing an active apostolate.\footnote{Romijn 1986, 59.} Among the inhabitants of the new convent were several choir sisters,\footnote{Romijn 1986, 59.} who would not have been able to combine their daily responsibilities with the recitation of the full canonical office. The fact that the new statutes were prepared six years at most after Nazareth’s foundation, and, according to the title page, applied to the sisters of that convent just as much as to those of Soeterbeeck, suggests that the text had been specifically designed to cater to the dual situation that had arisen. Whether the new liturgical stipulations actually effected the abandonment of the divine office or codified a change in practice that had already arisen due to the sisters’ financial troubles, their goal was certainly to allow the two communities of Soeterbeeck and Nazareth to celebrate the liturgy of the hours in unity. It is likely, in other words, that the immediate cause of the sisters’ complete replacement of the canonical hours with the Little Office in the period before 1906 was not a fire in the sixteenth century, but the sisters’ hardships and the following decision to split up and run a school in the nineteenth. The abandonment of the great office was part of a general attempt that they made at the time to find ways to combine their traditional focus on contemplation with a more active life.\footnote{Peijnenburg, 1982b, 56-57, and cf. ASP 105, p. 213, where choir and converse sisters are both mentioned as being present at Nazareth.}

**EXCURSUS: THE HOLY WEEK**  
The substitution of the canonical with the Little Office was not the only instance of a drastic simplification of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practices in the nineteenth century. On 26 March 1879, Bishop Adrianus Godschalk of ’s-Hertogenbosch officially granted the sisters of Soeterbeeck written permission to celebrate the liturgy of the Holy Week according to the *Memoriale rituum*, also known as the *Caeremoniale* or *Rituale parvum* and first promulgated by Pope Benedict XIII in 1725.\footnote{On Godschalk, see Smits 1911.} This was a simplified version of the Roman Ritual and certain sections of the Roman Missal, prepared especially for use in smaller parochial churches that did not have the means or the manpower to perform the full rites. For these, the presence of a deacon and a subdeacon were necessary, whereas the *Memoriale* adapted them for a single priest. This would have been a very helpful adjustment for convents like that of Soeterbeeck, which generally had only the rector to serve them after large numbers of socii had fallen out of custom towards the end of the seventeenth century.\footnote{Romijn, these were not only geared at making money that was needed for the convent’s prolonged existence, but also at practicing an active apostolate.\footnote{Romijn 1986, 59.} Among the inhabitants of the new convent were several choir sisters,\footnote{Romijn 1986, 59.} who would not have been able to combine their daily responsibilities with the recitation of the full canonical office. The fact that the new statutes were prepared six years at most after Nazareth’s foundation, and, according to the title page, applied to the sisters of that convent just as much as to those of Soeterbeeck, suggests that the text had been specifically designed to cater to the dual situation that had arisen. Whether the new liturgical stipulations actually effected the abandonment of the divine office or codified a change in practice that had already arisen due to the sisters’ financial troubles, their goal was certainly to allow the two communities of Soeterbeeck and Nazareth to celebrate the liturgy of the hours in unity. It is likely, in other words, that the immediate cause of the sisters’ complete replacement of the canonical hours with the Little Office in the period before 1906 was not a fire in the sixteenth century, but the sisters’ hardships and the following decision to split up and run a school in the nineteenth. The abandonment of the great office was part of a general attempt that they made at the time to find ways to combine their traditional focus on contemplation with a more active life.\footnote{Peijnenburg, 1982b, 56-57, and cf. ASP 105, p. 213, where choir and converse sisters are both mentioned as being present at Nazareth.} As far as can be determined from the surviving documents on this topic, 1879 was the first time Soeterbeeck was granted the privilege to use the Memorial for the Holy Week, and this was extended at least twice, in 1886 and again in 1893, that time to last until 1897.\footnote{ASP 218, letter of 26 March 1879. On Godschalk, see Smits 1911.}

How and if the rectors had previously solved the problem of the number of clerics needed during the Holy Week cannot be said with certainty, although it stands to reason that they may have requested the help of some of the convent’s acquaintances. If the contents of the liturgical books

---

1 Peijnenburg, 1982b, 56-57.
2 Peijnenburg, 1982a, 42-43.
3 Romijn 1986, 59. To safeguard the sisters’ privacy, Romijn anonymised Soeterbeeck as Groenewoud (cf. 1986, ix-x) and Klaarwater (cf. 1990, 208 n. 1), but the contents of her publications as well as correspondence in the conventual archives (ASP 56 and 57) show clearly that Soeterbeeck is meant.
4 See the sisters mentioned by Peijnenburg 1982b, 56-57, and cf. ASP 105, p. 213, where choir and converse sisters are both mentioned as being present at Nazareth.
5 On this development in general, see Romijn 1986, 59-61.
6 ASP 218, letter of 26 March 1879. On Godschalk, see Smits 1911.
7 The last socius given on the list at the back of Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century statutes is the later rector Joannes Veheijden, presumably under the rectorate of his predecessor Joannes van Bredael (ASP 92, f. 52v).
8 ASP 218, letters of 23 March 1886 and 28 February 1879.
from Soeterbeeck’s library can be taken at face value, it seems they found a way, however. The convent owned at least three, and therefore probably more, eighteenth-century copies of Den dienst van de Goede-Weke en van den Paesch-weke, a book with the complete text of all services of Mass and office for the Holy Week and the Easter octave in a Dutch translation, but often also with the Latin text in a parallel column, so that it could be used liturgically by sisters, for instance. This publication represents the complete, unsimplified version of the rites of the Holy Week, and its presence at Soeterbeeck suggests that the community there had at one point at least intended to celebrate them that way—provided, of course, that the books’ contents reflect their actual use, which is admittedly not necessarily the case.

Returning now to the nineteenth-century statutes, I must first admit that there is no direct evidence that Frenken was aware of them, since they are not mentioned in his article, which focuses on Soeterbeeck’s history before the move to Deursen in 1732. It is very likely that he did come across them in his study of the convent’s archival sources, however, and that the text influenced his thinking. If so, it is possible that he used its unambiguous declaration that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck should pray the Hours of the Virgin instead of the great office as a guide for his interpretation of the more uncertain phrasing of the corresponding passage in the seventeenth-century version of the statutes. But that would have been like putting the cart before the horse. A revision is dependent on the original, and the new statutes should therefore be interpreted in light of the old, not the old in light of the new. Besides, close study of the rest of the relevant chapter in the seventeenth-century statutes proves that it is about the canonical office, so that there is no real uncertainty left concerning it at all. Given that the two versions of the statutes are clearly about two different things, the rephrasing of the passage on the Hours of the Virgin in the nineteenth-century revision is not simply a matter of the removal of ambiguity, but an actual change. It is accompanied, furthermore, by a thorough reworking of the entire chapter in which the passage occurs, clearly with the intention to make the original text on the canonical hours applicable to the Little Office instead.

The most important aspect of the nineteenth-century revision of the chapter on the liturgy of the hours, from the perspective of the present discussion, is the fact that it was carried out in such a way that the two provisions that could only apply to the canonical hours are absent in the new version. No mention is made of the Athanasian Creed anymore, and the hebdomadary sister is only instructed to stand when it is the prioress who asks her blessing before a lesson, without any reference to Gospel readings. It must be admitted that these changes are not the result of precision editing, but rather of the omission of larger pieces of text of which the problematic passages were merely a part. Although the entire chapter has been recast by the rearrangement of certain paragraphs in a more logical order, the most important way in which it differs from the original version is that it is substantially shorter.

---

1 These copies are V 207 (Ghent: Cornelius Meyer, 1725), V 181 (Ghent: Dominicus vander Ween, 1736) and the one that has been split across III 225 and IV 110 (Ghent: Jan Meyer, 1768). (III 225 contains only the part from Monday in the Holy Week up to and including the Easter Vigil.) In 1954, when Mariëndaal merged with Soeterbeeck, the new sisters brought along two additional copies, III 171 (Ghent: Dominicus vander Ween, 1736) and V 212 (Ghent: Jan Meyer, 1759), as well as three copies of French editions: III 172 (Brussels: Simon t’Serstevens, 1738), III 178 (Paris: Dessain, 1779) and V 179 (Paris: La Compagnie des Libraires associez au Livre de la Semaine Sainte, 1700). That these five books are from Mariëndaal is proven by the presence in them of notes or stamps to that effect. That the three copies mentioned first were not among those that only came to Soeterbeeck in 1954 can be concluded from the presence on their spines of the shelf marks that were added before the merger with Mariëndaal (see p. 6), and in the case of V 207 also from that of an ownership note of Sister Augustina van Groenland, who was at Soeterbeeck from 1835 to 1888 (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 186, no. 85). There is no way to be certain, of course, if they were already in Deursen in the eighteenth or the early nineteenth century.

2 On these provisions in the seventeenth-century statutes, see pp. 74-75.

3 ASP 98, p. 34.
This has been effected primarily through the wholesale deletion of the more detailed sections on Matins, Prime and Compline and of almost all prescriptions regarding ceremonial variants that are dependant on the liturgical rank of the day, which made up about a third of the original text. The passages in which the mention of the Quicumque vult and the Gospel readings occur were among the victims. The coarse nature of the editing process does not mean, however, that the editor did not reflect upon the contents of the passages that were culled, so that it is entirely reasonable to assume that the deletion of the problematic stipulations was the result of a conscious decision. In other words, it is eminently probable that the statutes were edited to be able to cater for the Little Office.

The nineteenth-century text represents a drastic simplification of the ritual for the divine office, but this is the result of the deletion of detailed descriptions and not of change. The parts of the old version that were not left on the cutting-room floor but carried over into the new were only altered on the level of the language. This means that although there are material changes that reflect the fact that the original statutes were about the canonical hours but the nineteenth-century version about the Little Office of the Virgin, the bones of the ritual that is described are still the same. It also means that the nineteenth-century text retains some elements about which I argued above that they apply more easily and intuitively to the great office and therefore support a reading of the seventeenth-century statutes as being about that.¹ These are the mention of the Hours of the Virgin in the very first paragraph, and a small number of remaining passages that have to do with the ranks of feasts. For example, the passage which divides the nocturns at Matins of the Little Office across the days of the week says that all three nocturns should be read on zon- en heiligdagen, which are probably Sundays and feasts of a higher than average rank.² Similarly, the rector is still instructed to officiate at Vespers on hooger feesten als duplex.³ Als het festa duplicia zijn zullen de oudste zusters de lessen lezen en de priorin de laatste,⁴ and op hooge feestdagen luidt men onder den Te Deum laudamus totdat gezongen wordt Patrem immensae majestatis.⁵ Finally, a distinction is made in several places between the reading and singing of certain elements of the office,⁶ a feature of the office’s external solemnity that is also dependent on the rank of

¹ This may be an appropriate place to point to an argument on a related point that has been put forth by Goudriaan 2008, 190-191. He uses the absence of chapters devoted to the chantress and the hebdomadary sister in a convent’s statutes as an argument in favour of that community consisting entirely of converse sisters, and also connects these particular offices with the recital of the divine office. Soeterbeeck’s nineteenth-century statutes, however, are only about the Little Office, retained the chapters on the chantress and the hebdomadary sister (ASP 98, pp. 29-30). This is of course only to be expected in the context of a community that partly consisted of choir sisters and had a tradition of saying the canonical hours, but it shows that the connection between the offices of chantress and hebdomadary sister and the great office is not absolute. This means that the presence of chapters on these ministries in the statutes of a convent does not by itself prove that the canonical hours were said there. Conversely, the seventeenth-century statutes of the convent of Mariagardae in Roermond explicitly state that the Roomsche getijden (‘Roman [canonical] hours’, RHCL, 14.D051, inv. nr. 95, ff. 13r, 55r) are said there, but nevertheless do not contain chapters on the chantress and the hebdomadary sister. It is clear, then, that Goudriaan’s argument should be used with care.

² ASP 98, p. 31.


⁴ ‘On double feasts the eldest sisters shall read the lessons, and the prioress the final one’ (ASP 98, p. 34). Cf. Frenken 1931/32, 234 for the same stipulation in the seventeenth-century statutes.

⁵ ‘On higher feasts the bells are rung under the Te Deum laudamus until Patrem immensae majestatis is sung’ (ASP 98, p. 35; underscore in original). Cf. Frenken 1931/32, 237 for the corresponding passage in the seventeenth-century statutes, which specify that the ringing of the bells should take place on feasts of nine lessons at Matins and up, and during the octaves of Easter and Pentecost.

⁶ ASP 98, pp. 32, 34. Cf. Frenken 1931/32, 234, 236 for the corresponding passages in the seventeenth-century statutes, the second of which speaks rather of doen of singen (‘do or sing’, ASP 92, f. 24r) than reading and singing.
feasts. I argued above that arrangements like these are best explained in the context of the canonical office, but here they re-appear with reference to the Hours of the Virgin.

On the level of the text of the statutes themselves, all of this can be explained easily enough. As I suggested parenthetically in the context of the seventeenth-century version, the chapter on the liturgy of the hours in the new text may well open with the stipulation that this was to be realised only by the choral recitation, in Latin, of the Hours of the Virgin, because this was not the default option in a community of canonesses regular, and also a deviation from Soeterbeeck’s previous practice. The passages that show that the ritual with which the Little Office was to be performed was dependent upon the liturgical calendar by which the text of this office was largely unaffected, are probably due to the choir sisters’ desire to remain true to their particular vocation in the way in which they celebrated the liturgy.

That I now embrace these explanations while I discarded them with reference to the old statutes is simply because they were not necessary in that context, where more intuitive interpretations of the elements that they explain were not only sufficient but also called for. The place which the passage on the Little Office occupies in the text and the complexity and variability of the ritual described naturally point to the great office, and cannot therefore be anything but supportive evidence in addition to the decisive argument formed by the stipulations that can only apply to the canonical hours. The entire chapter must necessarily be understood in this light. In the nineteenth-century statutes the situation is radically different, however, for these are explicitly about the Hours of the Virgin and must therefore be using the elements that naturally seem to point to the great office in a less intuitive way.

Although, as I said, it would be methodologically unsound to interpret the old statutes with the help of the new ones, the latter do in fact confirm one aspect of my understanding of the former. The nineteenth-century version begins the chapter on the liturgy of the hours in the same way as the seventeenth-century text, by justifying its stipulations concerning the Little Office by invoking the community’s fundatie van hunne godshuizen, en […] hunne privilegie. I argued above that these words are referring to the sisters’ status as a community of canonesses regular, and the concomitant obligation to say the divine office, in order to explain that saying the Little Office in choir and in Latin is in line with their identity. The realibility of this reading is definitively confirmed by the reuse of the passage in the revised statutes, because in that context it is the only interpretation available. Soeterbeeck may have abandoned the divine office in the nineteenth century, but by saying the Little Office in Latin and with the full choral ritual the choir sisters remained true to their historical status.

**EXCURSUS: MORE ON THE REVISED STATUTES**

Before going on to consider additional evidence for the fact that Soeterbeeck limited itself to the Hours of the Virgin in the decades before 1906, I will briefly discuss how the nineteenth-century statutes develop another aspect of the convent’s liturgical life apart from the questions surrounding the Hours of the Virgin.

A significant change is that the order of the day, which formerly had to be pieced together from various passages, especially the chapter on the sacristan, is now set out in a special section between the preface and the first chapter. There are important differences between the earlier version and this one: Matins and Lauds were now at 4.30 a.m., Terce at six o’clock, and Sext, None and Mass at 7 a.m. Ten o’clock was listed as the moment for *de psalmen*, which are either the seven penitential or the fifteen gradual psalms, to be said in the workplace. On Sundays and feasts, however, these were replaced by the rosary said in the chapel. The Vigil of the Dead was said at 1 p.m., also in the workplace, except on ordinary Sundays, anniversaries and during the days in Lent.

---

1 See p. 72.
2 ‘Their convent’s foundation and […] their privilege’ (ASP 98, p. 30).
3 ASP 98, pp. 4-5.
4 ‘The psalms’ (ASP 98, p. 4).
that were not vigils of feasts with nine lessons at Matins, when it was said in choir after Vespers, with the same number of nocturns as described in the seventeenth-century statutes. Vespers began at five in the afternoon, and was immediately followed by Compline and the rosary, except, presumably, on Sundays when the rosary had already been said in the morning due to having been displaced by the Vigil.

In addition to the well-defined liturgical moments, the day is also said to begin at 4 a.m. with a morning prayer, and end at 8 p.m. with an examination of conscience and an evening prayer. These were not said in the chapel or the workroom, and were therefore probably done individually by the sisters in their cells, though this is not explicitly stated. It is not known whether their contents were in any way predetermined or if they were moments of truly personal prayer.

The scheme was slightly different during Lent, although it is not exactly clear how. The only concrete piece of information is that during this period Vespers was celebrated solemnly in the morning instead of the afternoon and began so that it was finished, somewhat astonishingly, at 11 a.m. already.

Finally, the way the bells were rung for the liturgical services has been simplified: the sacristan should ring just once, except for Vespers and Mass, for which she always rings twice. In addition, however, the hebdomadary sister should also give a signal with the large bell five minutes before the beginning of every service.

2.6.2. Additional Evidence for the Little Office of the Virgin

Besides the approval of the revised statutes themselves in 1853, there is also documentary evidence of the continued endorsement of its stipulations regarding the liturgy of the hours from a few years later. The recto of the final folium of a book with lists of deceased sisters and pensioners, anniversaries and confraternity members, begun by Beckers and discussed in Chapter 6, bears a note by Rector Antonius van der Heijden (1857-1862) that says:

It is not entirely certain in what year this note was written, but because it follows a similar entry on the preceding page that is dated to 1857, that seems to be the most likely option. It cannot have been any earlier, for Van der Heijden apparently reports something which he personally discussed with Archbishop Zwijsen, and he only became rector of Soeterbeeck in 1857. Whatever the date, it is clear that Zwijsen sanctioned a practice that already existed, and it is obvious that Frenken, if he was aware of this particular note, will have interpreted this in light of his contention that the sisters had been replacing the canonical office with the Hours of the Virgin ever since the fire of 1539. However, the word usus, even if it is taken to mean ‘custom’ rather than ‘practice’, does not by itself say anything about the custom’s age. Even though the sisters had probably only been limiting themselves to the Little Office since around 1851, that practice had certainly become an usus six years later.

1 ASP 98, p. 31.
2 On the morning and evening prayers as treated by the constitutions published in 1906, see p. 99.
3 ASP 98, p. 27.
4 ASP 98, p. 27.
5 ASP 98, p. 5.
6 ASP 129, on which see pp. 257-261.
7 Van der Heijden was born in Vught on 16 February 1823 and ordained to the priesthood on 17 June 1848, and he served as rector from 1857 until his death on 13 October 1862 (Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 9). His hand can be identified on p. 29 of ASP 3, where he writes that he was appointed rector in 1857.
8 On 29 October the archbishop of Utrecht and vicar apostolic of ’s-Hertogenbosch [Joannes Zwijsen] conceded orally that the sisters may recite the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary instead of the ecclesiastical office until determined otherwise by him. They may henceforth continue this practice‘ (ASP 129).
9 It should be noted, however, that since 4 March 1853, Zwijsen was no longer vicar apostolic but rather apostolic administrator of ’s-Hertogenbosch (Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 170-172).
It is noteworthy that the second half of the nineteenth century, when the sisters did not say the canonical office anymore, was also a period in which several of the convent’s liturgical manuscripts were sold or given away. Many of the old books that were once part of the conventual library but have since been identified outside the Soeterbeeck Collection are manuscripts for the canonical office, and several were alienated during the rectorate of Christianus van Gerwen (1871-1875, 1875-1909).¹ The conventual archives preserve a letter addressed to him in which the Jesuit Victor Becker writes that the English antiquary Edmund Waterton had been interested in buying a manuscript breviary but died before he could do so.² Around the same time, two sixteenth-century vespertals were sold to silversmith Toon Hermans, or given away in return for his services.³ Two unidentified liturgical manuscripts were given to the sisters Theresia and Emilia Smits van Oyen in the 1880s.⁴ Two antiphonaries for the winter half of the year were both acquired by antiquarian booksellers at the end of the nineteenth century and will have been sold by the sisters not long before then. One of these final two books, which is currently preserved in the Royal Library in The Hague with shelf mark 130 G 18,⁵ is a perfect example of another one of the sisters’ nineteenth-century customs. Before they decided they could make money by selling this book, they had been systematically taking away its parchment and paper folia from the top of the text block downwards, probably to use them to restore other books with. The result is that only a few of the folia of the proper of time survive.⁶ Another manuscript antiphony for the winter part of the year appears to have been entirely reused in this way.⁷ This practice will have stopped once the sisters realised the potential monetary value of their old books. Whether they were cut to pieces or sold, however, both courses of actions were possible only because the manuscripts in question were no longer in active, liturgical use. Although there are earlier examples of the reuse of liturgical books,⁸ the profound changes in Soeterbeeck’s praxis around the middle of the nineteenth century seem to have taken it to a different level.

2.7. 1906

With this conclusion it is time to turn to the final element of Frenken’s claim concerning Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life, which is that the period during which the sisters completely replaced the canonical hours with the Little Office came to an end in 1906. Although he was probably wrong about the moment when this practice started, he was right about its ending.

---

¹ On Van Gerwen, see p. 6 n. 6.
² ASP 545, letter dated 1 August 1887 and preserved loosely in the green notebook entitled Boeken voor 1800 chronologis genummerd. Schriftuur uitgaven. Tijdschriften.
³ Van den Berg 2012, 72 n. 17. These manuscripts are currently Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294 and RHCe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699.
⁴ Frenken 1931/32, 212, 288.
⁵ On the provenance of 130 G 18, see Officie 1975, xv, although Jos Smits van Waesberghe, who wrote this part of the introduction, did not realise that the manuscript had been at Soeterbeeck for a time. The other antiphony that was acquired by a bookseller in the nineteenth century was PBF 6168 Hs, on which see ibid., xi-xii.
⁶ In its present state, 130 G 18 begins with the proper of saints (ff. 1-67), expanded by the office of St Anthony (ff. 68-75), and ends with the proper of time (ff. 76-105), rather than the other way around. (The common of saints is missing.) The reasons for this reversal are obvious: the proper of saints begins with the only elaborately decorated initial in the entire manuscript, and the proper of time is largely incomplete because of the sisters’ reuse of the book’s first pages. When they decided on selling it, they rebound the manuscript in a transplantation binding with its constituent parts in the wrong order to present a more attractive picture. The remnants of five quires from the proper of time are currently Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection, on which see Kienhorst 2009, 12-13.
⁷ Some fragments of this manuscript are identified and reproduced in Kienhorst 2009, 4-5; on more fragments see p. 145 n. 9. The corresponding summer part ended up as JRL, Latin 439 by way of the collection of Ernest Hartland of Chepstow (Cooper 1997, 41, no. 57).
⁸ For an example from Beckers’ rectorate, see p. 197.
2.7.1. The Constitutions of 1906

In 1906 the sisters of Soeterbeeck and Nazareth once more revised their statutes. The new version was published by the diocesan presses of ’s-Hertogenbosch at the Institute for Deaf Mutes in Sint-Michielsgestel and entitled *Regel van den H. vader Augustinus en constitutiën der zusters kanonikessen van den H. Augustinus in de kloosters Soeterbeek te Deurzen en Nazareth te Ravenstein*. The new booklet has an entirely different structure than both of the earlier versions, and consist of the Rule of Augustine, the statutes proper (called constitutions), a directory that provides a more in-depth explanation of certain topics—among which the ritual to be observed during the liturgy of the hours—,\(^1\) and a number of additional texts such as the order of the day and several common prayers. The compilation had been approved by the bishop of ’s-Hertogenbosch, Wilhelmus van de Ven, on 4 May.\(^2\)

Concerning the celebration of the liturgy of the hours, the constitutions say:

> De Koorzusters zullen dagelijks de getijden in het Latijn lezen, volgens het Romeinsch Brevier, met bijvoeging der eigene feesten van hare Orde, volgens aanwijzing van het daartoe vervaardigde Directorium. Dit moet geschieden gezamenlijk in het koor op vastgestelde tijden.\(^3\)

This shows that in 1906 the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck were praying the canonical office again, using the Roman Breviary expanded with the proper feasts of their order. Frenken’s third claim is that this was the proper of saints of the canons regular of the Lateran,\(^4\) and he was probably right in saying so. The conventual archives still contain a copy of the Lateran *Officia propria* (ASP 254) which, given that its was published at Tournai by Desclée, Lefebvre and companions in 1893, may well have been bought by someone at Soeterbeeck around 1906.

The draft of the Latin letter which Pompen, the vicar general of ’s-Hertogenbosch, wrote to the Congregation of the Affairs of Religious in Rome about Soeterbeeck’s liturgy in 1913, already introduced above because the French commentary on it clearly influenced Frenken’s thinking by what it says about the consequences of the fire of 1539, also addresses the motivation for Soeterbeeck’s choice for the Lateran proper. I will quote the relevant passage once more:

> Quia anno 1543 earum breviaria incendio perissent, necessitate coactae, ut videtur, recitabant tantum Officium Parvum B. Mariae Virginis etiam choraliter; ast anno 1906 assumperunt cum consentu episcopi officium canonicorum regiarum sancti Augustini sancti Joannis Lateranensis, quia sibi Officium Wi Capituli de Windesheim sibi procurare nequiverint.\(^5\)

That the clause on the fire probably goes back to an oral tradition, current at Soeterbeeck in the early twentieth century, of which Frenken’s narrative is a part, has already been argued.\(^6\) In that context, I also pointed out the errors behind those specific words, but now it should be noted that the reliability of the rest of the passage is also questionable. On the one hand, the statement that the assumption of the Roman Breviary in 1906 happened with the bishop’s consent is true enough, given that Van de Ven had approved the sisters’ constitutions. The claim, on the other hand, that the sisters used the Lateran proper because they were not able to obtain the Windesheim proper is misleading in two ways. First, Soeterbeeck owned plenty of

---

\(^1\) ASP 105, pp. 109-118, nos. 45-52.

\(^2\) ASP 105, p. 4. On the constitutions of 1906, see Van Dijk 1982b, 78-79. On Van de Ven, see Sicking 1975.

\(^3\) The choir sisters must daily read the hours in Latin, according to the Roman Breviary, with the addition of the proper feasts of their order, according to the directory prepared for that purpose. This should happen communally in choir at set times’ (ASP 105, pp. 43-44, no. 32).

\(^4\) Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 2; cf. Peijnenburg 1982b, 56.

\(^5\) ‘Because in the year 1543 their breviaries were lost in a fire, forced by necessity, as is evident, they said only the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, even in choir; but in the year 1906 they adopted, with the bishop’s consent, the office of the canons regular of St Augustine of St John Lateran, because they had not been able to obtain for themselves the office of Wi of the Chapter of Windesheim’ (’s-Hertogenbosch, Diocesan Archives, File Soeterbeeck, not inventoried; emphasis and deletion in original).

\(^6\) See pp. 65-66.
copies of this book, as we have seen, but all of these were printed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and were therefore severely antiquated. Second, saying that the sisters were unable to buy new ones is a non-statement, because the Congregation of Windesheim had perished entirely in the nineteenth century,¹ so that no copies of its proper had even been printed recently. The real reason, then, why the sisters of Soeterbeeck chose to adopt the Lateran proper in 1906 is because they had no other option.

It is not clear if there was any specific reason why the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck chose to revise their statutes and start praying the great office according to the Roman Breviary again in 1906 specifically. There are two additional sources in the conventual archives that describe the event, but neither of them goes into the motivations behind it. First, a late continuation, in an unidentified hand, of the second version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck mentions the revision of the statutes and ends with the following statement: Van 1906 af baden de zusters weer het Romeinsch Brevier volgens de oude instelling: haar proprium is sedert dien tijd dat van St. Jan v. Lateranen.² The convent’s Memoriale monialium, or memorial book of the nuns, contains a slip of paper that has been pasted in between pp. 153 and 154, on which Rector Van Gerwen wrote a very brief account of the official proclamation of the new constitutions on 13 November 1906. Underneath this he wrote: Vervolgens is men overgegaan tot [...] den Romeinschen Brevier voor het bidden der getijden aangewezen.³ Although these statements do not reveal any of the background of the adoption of the Roman Breviary, they at least confirm that it followed the revision of the statutes rather than merely being codified by them. The fact, furthermore, that the switch is twice singled out for special mention is evidence that it was considered to be the most important consequence of the new text.

2.7.2. The Context of the Re-Adoption of the Roman Breviary
Although no written sources survive that specify the motivations for Soeterbeeck’s switch to the great church, it is possible to further contextualise it, for it did not only coincide with the revision of the statutes. The same year 1906 also saw the building of an entirely new conventual church, as an extension of the convent’s oldest wing that had been erected in 1733.⁴ The architecture of this structure provides a clue to the background of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical revival, for its set-up differed radically from the old situation on several levels.

Although the sisters had had a beautiful church in Nuenen,⁵ in Deursen the chapel had always been situated in one of the ordinary rooms on the ground floor of the old wing—one that, until structural renovations carried out during Beckers’ rectorate in 1777, had even double-functioned as workroom.⁶ Despite being part of the convent’s interior, this chapel had at one time actually been open to laypeople. These included not only the sisters’ in-house students and lay boarders, but also people from outside. This is evident, for instance, from the fact that in 1804 the chapel of Soeterbeeck was appointed as one of the places of worship in

¹ On the demise of the Congregation of Windesheim in the nineteenth century, see pp. 287, 308.
² ‘From 1906 onwards the sisters prayed the Roman Breviary again in accordance with their old establishment; from that time forward their proper is that of St John Lateran’ (ASP 4, p. 37a).
³ ‘Then they proceeded to use the Roman Breviary which had been designated for the praying of the hours’ (ACRW 1112, p. 153a). Van Gerwen’s hand can be identified in Mater 5, ff. 4v-5r, where he identifies himself as the author of three biographies of sisters celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of their investment (nos. 12-14).
⁴ Buijks 1982, 142.
⁵ The qualification of Soeterbeeck’s conventual church as beautiful is based on the testimony of Augustinus Wichmans (qtd. in Frenken 1931/32, 196). An artistic impression of the church’s exterior as it was in 1682 is reproduced by Frenken 1931/32, facing p. 174.
⁶ Buijks 1982, 134, 137-138. See also the map of the ground floor of the convent drawn by carpenter Renier van Helmond in 1835, reproduced by Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 136, fig. 12. On the renovation of 1777, see also p. 231.
the districts of Ravenstein and Megen where the faithful could go to gain a plenary indulgence by worshipping the Blessed Sacrament as part of the Forty Hours’ Devotion.¹ Furthermore, during Beckers’ rectorate and beyond, the convent was also home to a Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration that was open to laypeople and involved the veneration of the Sacrament for at least one hour every year.² It is likely that the members who lived nearby went to Soeterbeeck to fulfil their obligation.

Although the community continued to host fraternities during most of the nineteenth century, their attitude towards the outside world gradually started changing. To be sure, the convent Nazareth was founded in 1845 with the express purpose of allowing the sisters to practise an active apostolate of teaching and the housing of boarders,³ but in 1844 Joannes Zwijsen, titular bishop of Gerra and vicar of the districts Ravenstein and Megen, had also re-established the monastic enclosure at Soeterbeeck for the first time after the move to Deursen.⁴ Although the precise nature of the restrictions imposed by the enclosure is not entirely clear, it seems very likely that outsiders could no longer visit the chapel. The building of the new church in 1906 provided a solution. It was an additional structure, attached to the existing convent but separate from the sisters’ living space, and the places it included for outside visitors were behind a wall and a screen of stained glass. In the 1920s, these seats were even removed to a side-chapel with bars and a mirror that allowed the celebrant but nothing else to be seen.⁵ This arrangement was Soeterbeeck’s way of simultaneously honouring the public nature of all worship and safeguarding its own refound seclusion. In other words, the new church was not just a significant improvement in the community’s liturgical life, both in terms of the space where this was lived but also in the way that space could be used, but an improvement that was intentionally more in line Soeterbeeck’s origins as an enclosed community of canonesses regular. This is the background against which the return to the canonical office should also be understood.

EXCURSUS: PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE INCREASING DISTANCE BETWEEN CHOIR AND CONVERSE SISTERS

The liturgy and the enclosure were not the only areas in which the sisters’ increasing awareness of their origins and traditions found expression. Over time, a situation had gradually arisen where sisters could have money of their own and use it in consultation with the prioress.⁶ Because this could easily lead to practices that were at odds with the vow of poverty, Zwijsen once again forbade the sisters to have private funds.⁷

Another aspect of Soeterbeeck’s monastic life that was gradually experienced more and more strictly was the difference between choir and converse sisters. The former’s return to the great office had again widened the liturgical gap which had temporarily been much narrower when they had only said the Little Office, albeit in Latin and in choir, and it was followed by several other measures. Six years after the new church had been built it was furnished, at the personal expense of

¹ The documentary evidence concerning this indulgence consists of a letter, surviving in Latin and a Dutch translation, by Albert Lejeune, vicar general of the districts Ravenstein and Megen, dated 27 April 1804 (ASP 204). Soeterbeeck’s turn to host the devotion came on the feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (8 December).
² On this confraternity, see pp. 259-260.
⁴ On the history and the status of Soeterbeeck’s enclosure, both of which are shrouded in uncertainty, see Frenken 1931/32, 191 n. 4; Peijnenburg 1982b, 55-56 and Romijn 1986, 60-61. Romijn’s discussion is the fullest, and she argues that the convent originally had a papal enclosure and solemn vows, but that the former was lifted because of the move to Deursen in 1732 and restored as an episcopal enclosure in 1844, after the institution of simple vows in the Napoleonic era.
⁵ Romijn 1986, 62.
⁶ On this phenomenon during Beckers’ rectorate, see pp. 235-236, 254-255.
⁷ ACRW 1112, p. 35.
Prioresse Constantia Coolen (1906-1912, 1915-1921),\(^1\) with a nuns’ gallery (Figures 2.1-2), whose front side was set off by a screen that was even covered with a curtain for a time.\(^2\) Before this, the choir sisters had shared their liturgical space with the converse sisters, only sitting a little apart during Mass, but now the two groups were radically separated. In the same year of 1912 the habits of the converse sisters were also changed from white to black to make their appearance underscore their different status.\(^3\) Effected liturgically, spatially and outwardly, the traditional division between choir and converse sisters had once again become complete.

Soeterbeeck’s more and more emphatic observance of an increasingly strict interpretation of its traditional way of life did not take place in a vacuum. The sisters of Soeterbeeck sought continuous external confirmation of this development, not only of the local ordinary, the bishop of ’s-Hertogenbosch, but also higher up. It is in this context that Vicar General Pompen in 1913 wrote the letter to the Congregation of the Affairs of Religious in Rome whose draft version has already been quoted multiple times. It was motivated by doubts that had arisen over the canonical status of Soeterbeeck, Nazareth, Mariëndaal and the Bridgettine convent of Maria Refugie in Uden. The text of the document that was finally sent does not survive, but the answer, of which copies and Dutch translations are preserved both in the conventual and the diocesan archives,\(^4\) reveals that its main point was that the four convents had all had solemn vows and a papal enclosure upon their foundation, but had developed in such a way as to have to be characterised now as communities with simple vows and an episcopal enclosure. Pompen asked for ratification of this conclusion, and in line with it also addressed the convents’ liturgical practices. His request regarding the three Augustinian convents is rendered as follows in the Congregation’s answer:

> Ut sororibus de St. Oedenrode pergere liceat in recitatione divine officii canonicorum regularium St. Augustini, atque sororibus de Deursen et de Ravenstein in recitatione divini officii canonicorum regularium St. Joannis Lateranensis.\(^5\)

This favour, as well as the other ones Pompen asks for—among which that Mariëndaal, Soeterbeeck and Nazareth would be allowed to share in all the privileges, favours and indulgences of the canons regular of St Augustine—were granted by the Congregation on 13 December 1913. Soeterbeeck was allowed to continue reciting the divine office of the canons regular of the Lateran, that is, use the Roman Breviary with the Lateran proper. The office of the canons regular of Augustinum which the sisters of Mariëndaal were allowed to pray was probably the eighteenth-century proper of Windesheim, given that, although they had switched to the Roman Breviary in 1619, they had traditionally used the breviary of this congregation.\(^6\) In 1913, then, the only difference between the liturgy of the sisters of Deursen and those of Sint-Oedenrode was that while both used the Roman Breviary the former had switched to the more recent proper of the Lateran, whereas the latter retained the old Windesheim books, at least until they merged with Soeterbeeck in 1954.

---

\(^1\) Coolen was born in Berghem on 4 May 1868. She entered Soeterbeeck in 1887, was professed on 24 September 1888 and died on 11 June 1936. She was council sister from 1894 to 1900, procuratrix from 1900 to 1906, prioress from 1906 to 1912 and again from 1915 to 1921, and subprioress from 1912 to 1915 (Sluijters 1982b, 193-194, no. 164).

\(^2\) Buijks 1982, 144; Romijn 1986, 66. A picture of the nuns’ gallery with a view from the organ loft, probably taken by Cis van den Heuvel in 1948, appears in Tummers and Woudenberg 1999, 29, fig. 8.

\(^3\) Peijnenburg 198b2, 69; Romijn 1986, 66. Figure 2.1 shows a converse sister in black, pretending to participate in the celebration of the canonical office for the sake of the photograph.

\(^4\) ASP 86, copy dated 25 December 1913, and ’s-Hertogenbosch, Diocesan Archives, File Soeterbeeck, letter of 16 December, not inventoried. The copy in the Soeterbeeck archives has been ratified, but omits the passages that are only relevant to Maria Refugie.

\(^5\) ’That the sisters of Sint-Oedenrode be allowed to continue the recitation of the divine office of the canons regular of St Augustine, and the sisters of Deursen and of Ravenstein the recitation of the divine office of the canons regular of St John Lateran’ (ASP 86, copy dated 25 December 1913).

\(^6\) Van de Laar 1970, 16, 19, 43; Van Dijk 2012, 236.
In light of the above, it may be concluded that although it has not been possible to identify the specific occasion of Soeterbeeck’s re-adoption of the Roman Breviary in 1906, it is clear that for the sisters it was part of a broader process of reorientation on their origins and their position within the diocesan and universal Church. Having hereby sufficiently explained the background of this move, Frenken’s claims regarding the course of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history have all been considered. Before pronouncing my definitive judgement regarding them and their value for an understanding of Beckers’ traces of use in the conclusion, I first beg the reader’s patience while I briefly turn to the subsequent development of certain ancillary topics that have come up over the course of the previous pages, in order to tie up remaining loose ends and complete this overview of the convent’s liturgical practices over time.

2.8. The Twentieth Century
An ironic aspect of the choir sisters’ return to the Roman Breviary in 1906 is that they appear to have abandoned the Little Office of the Virgin, with which they had replaced the canonical hours for more than half a century, either immediately or at least shortly afterwards. A chronicle kept by Sister Isidora Goossens from 1939 to 1961 says that on 10 November 1941 the nuns began om bij het dagelijks officie nog het Officie van de H. Maagd te bidden, om door de voorspraak van de H. Maagd een spoedige vrede te verkrijgen.1 There would have been no need to take up the Little Office during the agonising suspense of World War II if it had continued to have been recited in the first place. I do not know if the sisters ceased saying the Hours of the Virgin once peace had returned.

EXCURSUS: THE ORDER OF THE DAY IN 1906
Another significant change effected by the constitutions of 1906 is that they explicitly differentiate between the order of the day at Soeterbeeck and Nazareth in a way that the nineteenth-century statutes had not. The order of the community in Deursen, itself also different from the earlier one, was as follows as far as Mass and the divine office are concerned. At 4.30 a.m. all sisters were in the church for the morning prayer, the text of which is given elsewhere in the book.2 Immediately afterwards the converse sisters left for the workroom or the refectory, where they said 28 Our Fathers and Hail Marys and then went to work. The choir sisters stayed in church and said Matins and Lauds. Mass began at 6.30 a.m. and was immediately followed by breakfast, after which the choir sisters said Prime and Terce. At 10.30 a.m. Sext and None were said, except during Lent, when these were a quarter of an hour earlier and immediately followed by Vespers. During the rest of the year that hour was said at 5 p.m. and directly followed by Compline. At 8 p.m. all sisters went to the church for evening prayer, the text of which was also codified.3 On Sundays and feasts the converse sisters were allowed to be present at the minor hours if their duties allowed this, but without actively participating. The order of the day at Nazareth differed in these respects that the choir sisters said all four minor hours immediately after breakfast, and that during Lent Vespers was said at 11 a.m. rather than half an hour earlier.4

In addition to the small changes in the way the various hours are grouped together, what stands out from the new order of the day are two things. First, the constitutions of 1906 are the first to regulate the sisters’ lives in such detail that they also specify the devotional exercises of the converse sisters, and how their schedule tied in with that of the choir sisters. Second, and more
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1 ‘To pray the Office of the Blessed Virgin in addition to the daily office, to obtain a swift peace through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin’ (ASP 6, November 1941). Goossens was born in Gemert and entered Soeterbeek on 23 April 1935. She was professed on 31 January 1937 and still alive in 1982. She was subpriorress from 1943 to 1946 and again from 1979 to at least 1982, and council sister from 1946 to 1964. (Sluijters 1982b, 197, no. 199). She was prioress from 1985 to 1991 (ACRW 1112).
2 ASP 105, pp. 214-216.
3 ASP 105, pp. 216-217.
4 ASP 105, pp. 205-214.
importantly, although there are various additional moments of prayer besides Mass and the divine office, such as the Angelus three times a day, various periods of adoration and the communal rosary, there is no trace of the daily Vigil of the Dead. Instead, there is a brief note explaining that Vespers and Compline should be prayed for the intention of the sisters’ deceased benefactors. This drastic elimination of one of the staples of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life was due to the fact that it had been part of a cluster of devotional exercises performed for the repose of deceased sisters and their parents and benefactors, which had over time become increasingly cumbersome to uphold.

The system as it used to be is described in the preface to Soeterbeeck’s Weldoendersboeck, or book of benefactors, begun by Rector Joannes Verheijden (1705-1744) in 1711. The prayers said for the dead on a daily basis were the Vigil of the Dead with one nocturn at Matins, the seven penitential psalms, three cross prayers to be said with extended arms and the Litany of Loreto. Once every month, a solemn Requiem Mass would be sung and the Vigil would be said with three nocturns at Matins. On higher feasts and days devoted to the Blessed Virgin, the sisters also received bodily mortification. In addition to this ongoing cycle, however, the anniversaries of the deceased were also observed, and on these days a low or a solemn Requiem Mass, the Vigil with three nocturns and Psalm 51 (50) were performed. It is evident from another archival source, the Memorie boeck or memorial book that was begun by Rector Henricus Erckens (1749-1772) in 1716, that the anniversaries of benefactors were observed as long as their benefactions warranted, and that sisters could count on having at least 33 Masses said for them. Taking into consideration the growing number of deceased sisters, parents and benefactors, and in light of the fact that all of these rituals and prayers were simply added to the conventual Mass and the hours of the divine office, it is understandable that the sisters had decided to simplify their observances for the dead. It may seem implausible that they did away with them almost entirely in 1906, only devoting Vespers and Compline to the repose of the dead, but there is another clear sign besides the text of the constitutions itself that this was indeed what happened. This additional piece of evidence is a certified copy of an answer, dated 19 January 1909, to a letter by Priorress Coolen to the Congregation of the Affairs of Religious, which was addressed to the sisters by Bishop Van de Ven seven days later and is preserved in the conventual archives. This document outlines the situation described above, explains that the obligations towards the dead had become too burdensome, and presents an alternative: instead of one Requiem Mass a month there would be four a year, on anniversaries the conventual Mass would be celebrated for the remembrance of the deceased, and on every day of the year Matins and Lauds would be said for the same intention. This proposal was accepted by the Congregation, and although it slightly alters the stipulations of the constitutions of 1906 in that it is Matins and Lauds, not Vespers and Compline, which are henceforth to be devoted to the memory of the departed, the result of the two texts is the same relief from an exaggerated and untenable practice.


2 ASP 267. Verheijden was born in Weert and professed as a canon regular of Mariënhaage on 13 June 1683. He became parish priest of Woensel on 27 April 1694, was rector of Soeterbeeck from 20 August 1705 to 1744, and died at the age of 85 on 7 January 1745 (Sloots 1943, 102, no. 19; 1948, 405, no. 7, 409, no. 4; Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 1). He can be identified as the author of the Weldoendersboeck because he left his initials underneath the title on the first page.

3 In the conventual Memoriale monialium, Rector Van Gerwen writes that on Palm Sunday, the Sunday before Pentecost, the Sunday before the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (15 August) and the Sunday before Christmas, the Vigil of the Dead was also said with three nocturns, and that this fulfilled the obligation of the monthly long Vigil (ACRW 1112, p. 68).

4 Erckens was born in Mulbracht on 22 September 1710. He was professed at Gaesdonck in Goch on 27 September 1730 and ordained on 10 August 1735. He was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1749 until his death on 19 June 1772 (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 29, p. 115; Höv 38, p. 59; Scholten 1906, 130; Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 3).

5 ASP 1, note dated 14 October 1788. In the Memoriale, Van Gerwen writes that the prioress also had a Requiem Mass said for her immediate predecessor every year around the anniversary of her death (ACRW 1112, p. 36).

EXCURSUS: REVISIONS OF THE ORDER OF THE DAY

The order of the day as set out by the constitutions of 1906 was revised twice, in February 1918 and again in September 1919. I will not discuss these changes here, because at this point they do not add much anymore to our understanding of life at Soeterbeeck. However, there are two aspects to the first revision that are of some interest. The first of these is that the text of the new order, as it was written down on a loose leaf that is preserved in the conventual archives, and approved by Vicar General Pompen on 26 February 1918, distinguishes between a *conventuale Mis* said at 9 a.m., and an ordinary *H. Mis* celebrated at 6 a.m. *zoo de conventuale Mis niet kan geschieden.* It is somewhat difficult to explain this. In the proper sense of the word as a Mass that was celebrated in connection with the divine office by those in the convent who were held to choral prayer, the conventual Mass should have been celebrated daily. It could not be replaced by, for instance, votive or Requiem Masses, even in case of a funeral, and it has just been shown that in 1909 the number of the latter which the community was obligated to celebrate for its benefactors had been drastically limited. Furthermore, the constitutions dictate that at Soeterbeeck all sisters had to attend Mass every day, so that its conventual character could never have been compromised through the absence of the convent. The only remaining possibility seems to be that the text of the order refers to the Mass’ external solemnity. This is odd, because the essence of the conventual Mass is its conventual nature, not its ceremonial. In principle, a conventual Mass should indeed be solemn, that is, sung and celebrated with a deacon and a subdeacon, but this requirement was not absolute and could not be fulfilled on a daily basis anyway at Soeterbeeck, where only one rector was present. However, it is possible that the 1918 order of the day actually uses the term ‘conventual Mass’ for a sung as opposed to a low Mass (*Missa lecta*), which is read. This interpretation is confirmed by the constitutions of 1906, which, though they give detailed instructions on the sisters’ behaviour during sung Mass, say that they are not obliged to keep any particular ritual at low Masses, except to bow at the consecration and to raise their hands in adoration from the elevation to the doxology at the end of the canon. This indicates that the degree of external participation on the part of the sisters was very low during Masses that were read, to the extent that these could be distinguished on that basis from sung Masses where the community participated fully. The constitutions stipulate that Masses be sung on Sundays and feasts, on All Souls (2 November) and on the occasion of the investment, profession or funeral of a sister. If my explanation is correct, these were the days when Mass was celebrated at 9 a.m., whereas it was celebrated three hours earlier during the rest of the year.

Before moving on, it may be conveniently mentioned here that Sister Catharina Simonetti writes, in the chronicle she kept from 1954 to 1959, that an unidentified Capuchin friar who performed a visitation of the convent in February 1958 told the sisters that dialogue had to be introduced at Mass. This meant the sisters would have to respond collectively to the priest’s invitations, in the way a server would have done this theretofore. It is impossible to say to what extent this actually happened, but it fits in with the ecclesiastical documents of the time, which

---

1. ASP 105, unnumbered folium pasted onto p. 205; ASP 187, folia dated 1918. In addition, Sister Goossens reports in her chronicle that the order of the day was temporarily altered in 1944 so that all church services took place in daylight with an eye to the war (ASP 6, September 1944).

2. ‘Conventual Mass [...] Holy Mass [...] if the conventual Mass cannot take place’ (ASP 187, folium entitled ‘Dagorde’ and approved by Pompen on 26 February 1918).

3. For a clear description of the conventual Mass as it was understood circa 1918, see Fortescue 1910.

4. Piacenzi 1911, 778.

5. ASP 105, 44, no. 35.

6. ASP 105, pp. 126-127, no. 59. The phrasing of the corresponding passage in the constitutions of 1930, which are introduced on p. 102, is even more suggestive: they contrast a *gelezen H. Mis* with a *gezongen Convents-Mis* (‘low Mass [...] sung conventual Mass’, ASP 112, p. 83).

7. ASP 105, pp. 44-45, no. 36.

8. Simonetti was born in Borne and entered Mariëndaal on 25 March 1944. She was professed on 11 October 1945 and moved to Soeterbeeck with her community in 1954. She was council sister in 1964-1965 and in 1967-1968 (Sluijters 1982b, 200 no. 237).

9. This is how I interpret the account: *De H. Mis zal voortaan gediagoleerd worden aldus de visitator* (‘Holy Mass will henceforth be celebrated in dialogue, according to the visitator’, ASP 10, 10 February 1958).
allowed for a growing degree of vocal participation on the part of the people who attended the celebration of the Eucharist.¹

Another interesting aspect of the revision of Soeterbeeck’s order of the day in 1918 is that it particularly affected the converse sisters. Whereas the constitutions of 1906 had presented their recital of 28 Our Fathers and Hail Marys during Matins and Lauds as their substitution of the divine office, this was arranged differently twelve years later. According to the new schedule, the converse sisters were to substitute every canonical hour by a number of Pater noster, to be said at fixed times (from which they could be dispensed by the prioress if their duties required this): Matins and Lauds at 4.30 a.m., Prime, Terce, Sext and None at 6 a.m., and Vespers and Compline after the rosary at 7.45 p.m.² A regime like this allowed the converse sisters to experience something similar to the rhythm of the liturgy of the hours, and therefore ties in with Soeterbeeck’s increasing interest in liturgical matters at the beginning of the twentieth century. It was abandoned fairly soon, however, as is evident from a revision of the constitutions and the directory, necessitated by the sale of Nazareth in 1923 due to the sisters’ realization that they were not able to combine a contemplative life with an active apostolate.³ The new constitutions were approved by Bishop Arnold Diepen on 10 December 1929 and published under the title Constitutioùn der reguliere kanunnikessen van den H. Augustinus at the Institute for Deaf Mutes in Sint-Michielsgestel the next year. This book again identifies the prayers of the converse sisters as acht en twintig maal het “Onze Vader” en het “Wees Gregroet”.⁴

EXCURSUS: THE DECREASING DISTANCE BETWEEN CHOIR AND CONVERSE SISTERS

Retrospectively, the brief experience which the converse sisters had of life according to the divine office after 1918 can be seen as a foretaste of developments that were to come. On 1 June 1954 Bishop Wilhelmus Mutsaerts gave the converse sisters permission to adopt the Klein brevier,² an abbreviated translation into Dutch of the Roman Breviary by the Redemptorist Th. Stallaert and the Norbertines of the abbey of Berne in Heeswijk-Dinther for laypeople and religious who were not held to the canonical office, first published in 1950. Hetwelk zij gezamelijk in koor bidden wat metten lauden en vespers betreft, Sister Goossens writes in her chronicle, before adding: De kleine uren bidt ieder voor zich.⁶ The implications of this event are profound, because it signals that by the middle of the twentieth century Soeterbeeck’s increasingly conservative tendencies had been completely inverted. The converse sisters went from saying a number of Our Fathers and Hail Marys to the partially communal recitation of a form of the divine office—abbreviated, in the vernacular and not entirely said in choir, but still. The exclusion of converse sisters from the choral recitation of the divine office is at the heart of what distinguishes them from choir sisters, and by their adoption and communal use of the Klein brevier this distinction was largely eradicated.

One of the practical consequences of the step that had been taken by having the converse sisters recite an abbreviated version of the Roman Breviary in choir was that the church would now be used for the divine office by two groups instead of just one. How this was arranged and what consequences this arrangement had for the order of the day of the entire community immediately after 1 June 1954 seems not to have been recorded. The topic does come up, however, where Sister

---

¹ For example, on 4 August 1922 the Sacred Congregation of Rites responded affirmatively to the question if it was licit for the people attending Mass to respond collectively to the priest as a server would, although it stressed that this was not always expedient and the issue was for the local ordinary to decide (AAS 14 (1922): 505). On 3 September of the same year in which the Capuchin friar visited Soeterbeeck, the Sacred Congregation’s instruction De musica sacra et liturgia sacra presented liturgical dialogue on the part of the people as the fullest form of participation, and recommended its gradual introduction (AAS 50 (1958): 642-643, nos. 31-32).
² ASP 187, folium dated 1918 and entitled Dagorde conversen (“Order of the day of the converse sisters”).
³ Romijn 1986, 62.
⁴ “Twenty-eight times the “Our Father” and the “Hail Mary”’ (ASP 112, p. 29; italics in original). On the constitutions of 1930, see Van Dijk 1982b, 79. On Diepen, see Peijnenburg 1985.
⁵ This date is given by Peijnenburg 1982b, 69. In her chronicle of the period from 1939 to 1961, Sister Goossens says this happened begin 1956 (“at the beginning of 1956”, ASP 6, March 1956). Because the information provided by Peijnenburg is more precise, I accept his reading of events. On Mutsaerts, see Peijnenburg 1979.
⁶ “Which they pray communally in choir as far as Matins, Lauds and Vespers are concerned. Everyone prays the minor hours individually’ (ASP 6, March 1956).
Goossens’ chronicle mentions the introduction on 1 January 1961 of the revised Code of Rubrics for the Roman Missal and Breviary as promulgated by Pope John XXIII in his motu proprio *Rubricarum instructum*. This occasion was apparently seen as an opportunity to make some alterations to the sisters’ order of the day:

1 Jan. traden in werking de nieuwe rubrieken en de vereenvoudiging van het breviar. Voortaan baden de lekezusters hun metten en lauden ’s morgens, de koorzusters verrichten in die tijd dan de meditatie en daarna hun metten en lauden. Was het voor de koorzusters toevallig eens een lang officie, dan baden de lekezusters hun metten en lauden ieder voor zich en begonnen voor de koorzusters terstond de metten. De tijd tussen lauden en primen die door de vereenvoudiging nu aanzienlijk langer was, mocht een ieder naar eigen goeddunken besteden, doch mater hadt aangeraden deze vooral te gebruiken voor gebed en geestelijke lezing. Het kortere officie beviel zeer goed en gaf rust aan de morgen.2

The new breviary did indeed represent a considerably shorter office,3 which must have taken the choir sisters noticeably less time to say than than the earlier one that took practically until noon. That the abbreviation is said to be such that the converse sisters could henceforth say Matins and Lauds in the morning, indicates that this was a new development. This probably means they had previously anticipated those hours and said them in the evening of the day before, as saying their entire office in the afternoon would not have been practical.

The adoption by the converse sisters of the *Klein brevier* was part of a gradual movement which they and the choir sisters were making in each other’s direction, and which ultimately resulted in the entire abolition of the distinction between the two groups over the course of the following decade. The habits of choir and converse sisters were unified in 1962, and the nuns’ gallery was demolished during a thorough renovation of Soeterbeeck’s church in 1968.4 After the revision of the breviary that had been called for by the Second Vatican Council had been promulgated by Pope Paul VI’s apostolic constitution *Laudis canticum* on 1 November 1970, choir and converse sisters both celebrated the divine office in Dutch together.5

An undated, typed note survives which must represent the order of the day at some point after the adoption of the new breviary, because it combines the Office of Readings and Night Prayer, which was now licit but had not been for Matins and Compline.6 The combined final hours of the day were said at 7.30 p.m., whereas the rest was ordered as follows: Morning Prayer was said at 7.45 a.m., and immediately followed by Mass. The single remaining Daytime Prayer was said at a quarter to noon, and Evening Prayer at 4.30 p.m.7

During the final decades of its existence, the convent of Soeterbeeck served as a centre of liturgical renewal that was open to everyone in the environment.8 Although the enclosure was retained, the church became publically accessible, and laypeople were involved in many aspects of the convent’s life, including the liturgy. Weekly study groups were formed that participated in the preparation of the liturgy on Sundays and feasts, and there were several choirs as well as a stable group of children who served at Mass.9 The sisters themselves

---

1 *AAS* 52 (1960): 593-595. For the Code of Rubrics itself, see pp. 597-685.
2 ‘On 1 January the new rubrics and the simplification of the breviary were put into force. From then on the converse sisters prayed their Matins and Lauds in the morning; the choir sisters would do their meditation at that moment and their Matins and Lauds afterwards. If by any chance the choir sisters had a long office, the converse sisters would pray their Matins and Lauds individually and the choir sisters would start their Matins immediately. Everyone could spend the time between Lauds and Prime, which had expanded considerably because of the simplification, as they pleased, but the prioress had recommended to use it especially for prayer and spiritual reading. The shorter office suited us very well and lent the morning some tranquility’ (ASP 6, January 1961).
3 For an overview of the changes effected by the new Code of Rubrics, see *AAS* 52 (1960): 706-721.
4 Romijn 1986, 93; Buijks 1982, 144; Van Dijk and Van der Loop 2011, 74. For a picture of the renovated church, see Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 16, fig. 3.
6 *Institutio generalis de liturgiae horarum*, no. 59. (I made use of *Institutio* 1971, 33.)
7 ASP 187, undated typed note entitled ‘Dagorde Soeterbeeck’.
8 Peijnenburg 1982b, 70; Van Dijk and Van der Loop 2011, 74.
9 Romijn 1986, 86-89; Van Dijk and Van der Loop 2011, 75, 77-78.
viewed their increasing openness to the outside world as a form of monastic hospitality for which they found a basis in their origin as canonesses regular in the tradition of the Modern Devotion in general and the Congregation of Windesheim in particular. The male branch of the latter had been revived on 25 January 1961 with the decree Laetissima pars of John XXIII, and in 1967 Soeterbeeck and a number of other convents set up a federation of female convents in the spirit of Windesheim and the order of St Victor. This eventually developed into a congregation of canonesses regular of Windesheim, which was officially acknowledged on 4 January 1971. The precise extent to which these events influenced the liturgy at Soeterbeeck is not clear, but the new congregation did have its own proper of saints, which was also used in Deursen. In this way, although many things had changed with time, the sisters continued to stay true to their historical origins, also on a liturgical level.

2.9. Conclusion
Having reviewed Soeterbeeck’s entire liturgical history in light of Frenken’s claims on this topic, it is possible, even though we are not as well informed about some periods as we are about others, to assess their value. Concerning the convent’s first period, Soeterbeeck’s most important historian appears to have been right. After an initial training period of a few decades at most, during which the choir sisters grew accustomed to the rigours of choral prayer, they probably quickly began celebrating the divine office according to the use of Windesheim, judging from the books that survive from this period. Although it stands to reason that the fire of 1539, not to mention the other troubles of the sixteenth century, disrupted their liturgical practice to a certain degree and for a certain period of time, I think there is no evidence to support Frenken’s claim that it made the sisters limit themselves entirely to the Little Office of the Virgin for almost four centuries. In fact, both seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sources seem rather to support the conclusion that the canonical office should be and indeed was being prayed at Soeterbeeck at the time.

At some point after 1570 the sisters must have traded the Windesheim for the Roman Breviary, although it cannot be said with certainty when this happened. They may have been relatively quick about it, but if the evidence discussed in the following chapter is taken into account, even then the decision had already been taken by 1617. In 1971 Prioress Monica Neijenhuis, who had been living at Soeterbeeck since 1959, was confirmed in her responsibilities. She had been trained in Windesheim, and was determined to continue with this liturgical practice. As a member of the Revived Congregation of Windesheim, she has been able to continue the Windesheim liturgy in Soeterbeeck with some small adjustments. After her death in 2016, a member of the male branch of the congregation has been appointed as Prioress of Soeterbeeck.

1 Van Dijk and Van der Loop 2011, 70, 73.
2 Van Dijk 1978, 5-6; Peijnenburg 1982b, 70-71.
3 Early interest on the sisters’ part to continue celebrating the Windesheim liturgy is evident from the presence in the conventual archives of Dutch propers for Mass according to the rubrics of 1961 (ASP 260) and of a two-part, Dutch translation by Ferdinand Sassen of the proper of saints for the divine office of the Confederation of the Canons Regular of St Augustine, which had been promulgated on 4 May 1962 (ACRW 1096).
4 This is evident from a letter by Prioress Monica Neijenhuis (1964-1985), dated January 1985 and preserved in the conventual archives (ASP 259). The document lists the proper feasts which the canonesses regular of Windesheim wished to be included in the directory of the Dutch Church province: the Annunciation of the Lord (23 March, solemnity as titular feast of Soeterbeeck), the Conversion of Augustine (24 April, memorial), John of Oisterwijk and companions (9 July, feast, replacing that of the Martyrs of Gorcum), Victor of Marseille (21 July, feast), Monica of Hippo (27 August, feast), Augustine of Hippo (28 August, solemnity), Our Lady of Windesheim (17 October, solemnity as titular feast of the congregation), all saints of the order (8 November, feast) and John of Ruysbroeck (2 December, memorial). Jos Geelen C.R.L., pastor of the Student Chaplaincy in Nijmegen, informs me that the male branch of the revived Congregation of Windesheim currently uses the proper of the entire Confederation of the Canons Regular of St Augustine, but also has a proper of its own which is largely identical to the list provided by Neijenhuis. At present, the latter consists of the feasts of Anne Catherine Emmerich (9 February), John of Oisterwijk, Monica and Augustine of Hippo, the Blessed Virgin of Windesheim, all saints of the order, and John of Ruysbroeck (personal communication with the author, 8 June 2016).
5 Cf. the convent of Hooidonk in Nederwetten, whom Bishop Laurentius Metsius of ’s-Hertogenbosch commanded to anveerden ende hauden die nieuwe Roensche getijden naet decreet vant concilium van Trenten uitgeggeven from 2 February 1572 onwards (‘adopt and keep the new Roman hours published according to the decree of the Council of Trent’, Van den Elsen en Hoevenaars 1905-1907, 2: 312).
consideration, they may also have taken longer than one would expect. As will be discussed, many of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval liturgical manuscripts show traces of having been revised with an eye to the Roman Breviary, but the earliest of these seem to date from the seventeenth century. What is more, there are also notes in these books from about the same period which may indicate their continued use in unrevised form. So perhaps the sisters only switched to the Roman liturgy over the course of the seventeenth century. Whenever they did it, however, they retained the proper of saints of the congregation with which they associated themselves.

It was only around the middle of the nineteenth century, probably in connection with financial difficulties and the consequent foundation of Nazareth in Ravenstein, that the choir sisters abandoned the great office entirely for the Hours of the Virgin. They started praying it again in 1906 in an attempt to increase faithfulness to their origins. In addition to returning to the Roman Breviary, they also began using the proper of the canons regular of the Lateran, at least until the liturgical upheavals of the 1960s and the revival of the female branch of Windesheim, after which they had their own calendar of proper feasts.

It is always easier to qualify someone else’s observations than to make your own. Frenken’s reconstruction of events was in line with a tradition that was probably current at Soeterbeeck itself, given that the draft of Pompen’s letter of 1913 tells exactly the same story. This means that what I consider to be a misjudgement on Frenken’s part in the interpretation of some of the actual sources is entirely understandable, especially because it so comfortably fits his view of Soeterbeeck’s history in general. His article paints a picture in which Soeterbeeck plays the part of a very poor and continuously struggling convent which manages to survive against extraordinary odds. That its liturgical practice should be almost irrevocably impoverished at one point, only to be fully revived later on, fitted this narrative perfectly. However, although it is undeniably attractive, the story is inherently unlikely in the context of Soeterbeeck and its books, and does not hold up to careful scrutiny.

By itself, the conclusion that Frenken was probably wrong is not saying very much, however. In a sense, claiming that there is evidence that the divine office was being prayed at Soeterbeeck from circa 1480 to circa 1850 is as misleading as Frenken’s contention that it was not between 1539 and 1906, even if it is more true in some way. The reason for this is that the liturgy of the hours is a very complicated and ever-changing entity, and it can take many different forms, as this chapter has hopefully shown. Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice at the end of the fifteenth century will have been very different in many respects from that in the early 1800s, and it is important to be aware of this.

Although the concrete results of this long chapter are modest, its significance with reference to the rest of this book will no longer be questioned. The next two chapters provide an interpretation of the functional meaning of the traces of production and use by Rector Arnoldus Beckers in Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books, among which are many for the divine office. If I had simply accepted Frenken’s claims, this discussion would have had to depart from the idea that the rector’s activities could not have had any practical application, as Beckers’ work was done at a time when the choir sisters only celebrated the liturgy of the hours by praying the Little Office of the Virgin. This chapter, however, has demonstrated that there is not enough evidence for this scenario, and also provided several arguments, primarily

1 See pp. 160-171.
2 E.g., the Windesheim calendar in the fifteenth-century ferial psalter Haaren hs. 23 was updated in various respects and brought in line with the specific situation at Soeterbeeck (cf. p. 58 n. 4; for more examples of changes to the calendar, see Van de Ven 1990, 49, no. 17), but not with the Roman calendar.
3 On additional circumstances in the seventeenth century which may have influenced the switch to the Roman Breviary, see pp. 185-186.
4 Some of the clearest passages in this regard occur in Frenken’s description of the way in which Soeterbeeck survived the calamities of the seventeenth century (1931/32, 194-202).
with reference to the century preceding Beckers’, in support of the basic assumption that the divine office was being celebrated. The study of the rector’s work in this area enables me to go a step further and present a slightly more detailed picture of the way in which this happened at a very specific moment in time. More importantly for the purposes of this book, it also provides information towards an understanding of Beckers’ personal motivations and the role that liturgical books played in these.
Figure 3.1: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 7, p. 94
Chapter 3: Beckers’ Liturgical Renovations

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter has shown that Frenken’s sweeping contention that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck entirely disregarded the canonical office and restricted themselves to praying the Little Office of the Virgin between 1539 and 1906 is too monolithic. Although it has not been possible to reconstruct the convent’s liturgical praxis in detail, it is clear that it was more changeable than the historian’s brief statement makes it seem. It should be understood, however, that, if it were taken by itself, my own conclusion on the basis of archival sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that, for much of this period, the community did indeed celebrate the divine office in some way, would be almost as simplistic as Frenken’s, and little less misleading. Thankfully, both the present and the following chapter allow me to zoom in on the particulars of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practices in a very specific and limited period of time, namely that of the rectorate of Arnoldus Beckers from 1772 to 1810, by interpreting the traces he left in several of the convent’s liturgical books.

Mention has already been made several times of the part of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit that is concerned with the liturgy. Particularly prominent in this respect are the traces of his revision of some of Soeterbeeck’s books for the divine office. The unit’s scope is considerably wider than this, however, in two respects: the rector also worked on books for Mass, and did not only revise but also expand and even write liturgical books. Although all of these activities serve a single goal—helping the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck live their vocation of celebrating the liturgy—it is not possible to discuss them all within the limits of a single chapter. The following pages therefore begin my interpretation of Beckers’ unit by discussing the functional meaning of his revisionary work on books for the divine office only, whereas the next chapter treats of his other activities, which served to facilitate the community’s liturgical worship in different ways. It must be clearly understood that this division is artificial and probably was not present in the rector’s mind, and it will in fact immediately become apparent that it cannot be strictly maintained. However, I hope my application of it makes it easier to grasp the wide range of Beckers’ liturgical activities as these are apparent from the traces which they left in Soeterbeeck’s books.

Though deliberately limited in scope, this chapter will undoubtedly be found to be more than long and wide-ranging enough, and it is structured as follows. The first paragraph defines the background against which the entire discussion takes place by outlining the practical liturgical context of Beckers’ revisionary traces of use more concretely than I was able to do on the basis of the archival sources of Chapter 2. Already breaking down the above-mentioned division, it does so with the help of the material traces of Beckers’ production of manuscript IV 58, a diurnal breviary in Dutch that the rector wrote at about the time when he revised several other books. This volume deserves to be studied in great detail, because it provides information that is necessary for the reconstruction of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical calendar and for a tentative conclusion concerning the specific way in which the choir sisters prayed the canonical hours during Beckers’ rectorate. This can be summarised as being restricted to the celebration of Vespers and Compline on Sundays and feasts. Against this background, the next three paragraphs deal with the functional meaning of Beckers’ revision and its traces, divided along their spatial dimension into groups appearing in the context of three types of books used in the great office, respectively the diurnal, the antiphonary and the hymnal. Because Beckers was neither the first nor the last person at Soeterbeeck to attempt to revise these books, each of these paragraphs also briefly discuss earlier and later stratigraphic units that appear in them, though only insofar as they provide an indispensable context for the understanding of Beckers’ notes. All of this enables me to reach several conclusions concerning both the nature and the practical purpose of the rector’s
revision of the sisters’ books for the divine office, which was not all about change but also had a clear preservational element. As indicated, my first step in this direction is to determine what Soeterbeeck’s liturgical year looked like in Beckers’ days and how it was observed, with the help of one of the rector’s own manuscripts.

3.2. A Diurnal in Dutch
The liturgical year is structured around an enormous number of feasts that can be divided into two basic categories: those commemorating events in the life of Christ, such as his Nativity, Passion and Resurrection, and those commemorating saints. In liturgical books, texts or chants used in the celebration of feasts in the first category are contained in the section known as the proper of time (proprium de tempore), whereas those for feasts in the second category are in the sections known as the proper and the common of saints (proprium and commune sanctorum). There are many exceptions to this rule, as well as feasts which do not fit any of the two categories, but in general the division holds true. This is because it is not only based on the nature of what is celebrated, but also on the rhythm of celebration. First, the feasts in the proper of time are part of seasons, longer periods of time devoted to their preparation or continued celebration that when taken together cover the entire year. Well-known examples of such seasons are Advent in preparation for Christmas, and Lent or Quadragesima in preparation for Easter. This phenomenon does not exist for the feasts in the proper of saints, which are more like blips on the radar. Second, whereas the vast majority of feasts in the proper of saints have a fixed date, the dates on which most of those in the proper of time are celebrated are dependent on the vagaries of the moon. The reason for this is that, except for the feasts around Christmas, which has a fixed date (25 December), all seasons and feasts of the proper of time are linked to Easter, which is celebrated on the first Sunday after the first full moon of spring. In short, the liturgical year is made up of two cycles of feasts that move more or less independently from each other.

The sanctoral cycle and the fixed feasts of the temporal cycle can be codified in a calendar listing exactly what feasts should be celebrated on what dates. A useful calendar does not only mention the feasts themselves, however, but also their ranks. Not all feasts are equally significant, and the ranking system determines exactly what should happen when they coincide in some way, as they always do, with other feasts, Sundays or weekdays. The interaction of the temporal and the sanctoral cycles is governed by strict rules.

Now, the date and rank of feasts do not necessarily remain the same once they have been established, but are often subject to change. Furthermore, not every region, diocese, parish, order or convent celebrates the same feasts, or does so on the same date or with the same rank. No written version of the specific calendar of Soeterbeeck around the time when Beckers revised its liturgical books survives, but its contents can be reconstructed fairly reliably on the basis of the proper of saints in a paraliturgical manuscript that he wrote himself. The following sections begins with a brief discussion of this book’s external characteristics, date, sources and purpose, because these belong to the typological, temporal and functional dimensions of the material traces of Beckers’ contribution to the volume’s production. Afterwards, I provide an analysis of the liturgical calendar on which this book, and indeed all of Beckers’ liturgical activities, are based. I end by considering what the book’s contents reveal about the liturgical context in which it was intended to function.

3.2.1. A Description of the Book, its Sources and its Function
The manuscript in question has shelf mark IV 58, and it can be most conveniently described as a diurnal breviary in Dutch, based primarily on the Roman Breviary but aimed towards use at Soeterbeeck. Still, this description is not entirely accurate, for the book contains simultaneously less and more material than the average diurnal. Such books normally include
all texts necessary for the recitation of all hours of the divine office except Matins. This is not the case with Beckers’ diurnal, first of all because it does not include two major elements: a calendar and a ferial psalter.¹ The latter is a section that includes the biblical psalms and canticles that form the heart of the divine office, distributed across the various liturgical hours of the seven days of the week. In most if not all eighteenth-century breviaries, the psalter also includes other texts—mostly antiphons, chapters, responsories, hymns and versicles—that make up most of the rest of the office as far as these are not replaced by proper or common ones. The nearly unchanged among these texts are collectively known as the ordinary, and Beckers’ diurnal, lacking the calendar and the psalter, starts with this section,² which is followed by the proper of time and the proper and common of saints. However—and this is the second way in which the contents of IV 58 deviate from those of regular diurnals—, the four sections of Beckers’ book only contain translations of a specific selection of the texts for the hours of Lauds, Vespers and Compline. The details of Beckers’ choice are discussed after the calendar to which the book testifies.³ Besides omitting several things, however, IV 58 also contains one element that does not normally appear in a diurnal. The various offices in the proper of saints are all introduced with brief martyrological texts describing the saints’ lives and deaths, as well as the history of their veneration. In other words, though for convenience’s sake I describe IV 58 as a diurnal, it should be understood that the manuscript is both an excerpt from and an expansion of the typical examples of the genre.

The volume is bound in brown leather over cardboard (22 x 13.6 x 4 cm.), with white headbands. The front and back boards are each blind-tooled with a border frame of a single line at the boards’ outer edges and a double line facing the shoulder. The spine is divided into seven panels; the three in the middle still display heavily worn gold-stamped floral motifs that have presumably disappeared completely from the other ones. Gold-stamped dots surround each of the six raised bands. The second panel from the head is covered by a label of discoloured woody paper, bearing the shelf mark I/I in black ink.⁴ The tail panel has a white label with a blue border bearing the shelf mark IV 58, also in black ink.⁵ The panel above bears traces of a third label that is now illegible. The page edges have been painted red.

The volume consists of 180 folia (21.2 x 13.2 cm.). Both ends of the book have sewn endpapers which consist of a ternion of which the outer bifolium double functions as pastedown and flyleaf, and a seventh single leaf whose stub goes underneath the pastedown and was probably added for extra support to the binding.⁶ The net text block consists of 21 quaternions. The contents are distributed across the quires as follows:

quire 1: the ordinary (pp. 1-7), and the proper of Advent (pp. 7-16)⁷

¹ Beckers might have intended to add a calendar on the blank endpapers at the beginning of the book; there is exactly one page for each month.
² IV 58, 1: pp. 1-7.
³ See pp. 124-127.
⁴ This shelf mark corresponds to an anonymous series of descriptions of fourteen manuscripts on loose sheets that are kept in a green notebook entitled Boeken voor 1800 chronologis genummerd. Schriftuur uitgaven Tijdschriften in the conventual archives (ASP 545). The description given there says: Hs. 1/1 Vertaling uit 17 of 18e eeuw van antifonen, hymnen, capitels en oraties van het brevier. De bladzijden zijn genummerd I-84 – I-162 – I-XVII, rest blank. Deze vertaling is blijkbaar door een rector gemaakt ten dienste der zusters (‘MS 11. 17th- or 18th-century translation of antiphons, hymns, chapters and collects of the breviary. The pages are numbered I-84 – 1-162 – I-XVII; rest blank. This translation appears to have been made by a rector for the benefit of the sisters’). On the date of the label of woody paper and the shelf mark, see p. 6.
⁵ On the date of this label and the circumstances of its application, see pp. 6-7.
⁶ Throughout this book, I use words ‘binion’, ‘ternion’, ‘quaternion’ and ‘quinion’ to refer to quires of two, three, four and five bifolia respectively (cf. Gumbert 2005, 7, nos. 313.10-13).
⁷ P. 16 is almost entirely blank.
quires 2-6: the proper of time from Christmas to the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost (pp. 17-84), followed by six blank folia
quires 7-18: the proper of saints (pp. 1-162) and a page whose writing area has been framed but bears no text; the common of saints (pp. i-xvii) and a blank page, followed by six blank folia
quires 19-21: twenty-four blank folia
endpapers: six blank folia

The first page bears the shelf mark IV 58 in red ballpoint pen in the upper right corner, but is otherwise blank.

The manuscript contains no colophon that identifies Beckers as its scribe, but it is written in his distinctive cursive minuscule. The rector neatly framed the writing area of the pages that have text on them with pencil. Prick marks are visible in all four corners of this frame, and also on the corners of the empty, frameless pages in quire 6. The number of lines per page varies greatly but averages at about forty, in a single column. The pagination restarts for each of the three major sections and consists of arabic numerals for the ordinary and the proper of time and saints, but of roman numerals for the common of saints. The page numbers for the ordinary and the proper of time and saints are in the centre of the upper margin; for the common of saints they are in the outer corner of the upper margin of each page. In the ordinary and the proper of time, Beckers traced all headers and rubrics with red ink.

Despite the many blank pages, it does not seem likely that Beckers used a readymade blank book that he failed to fill out. The writing area’s frame is often far too close to the gutter for this to have been possible. Rather, it seems that Beckers had the book bound with additional pages either to accommodate expansions or revisions of the diurnal, or else with an eye to an entirely different text that never materialised.

The book is not dated, but Beckers must have written it somewhere between 1785 and 1787, or at least used sources that dated from this period. For 25 June, the proper of saints provides texts for the feast of William of Vercelli, which was only extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1785. However, the same pope would two years later go on to raise the feast of the Beheading of John the Baptist (29 August) from the rank of a double to that of a greater double, and this change is not reflected in IV 58. The fact that 30 December is identified as the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord need not mean that the book was written in 1787, when 30 December was indeed a Sunday. This identification is common, at least in the printed liturgical books from the library of Soeterbeeck. The reason

---

1 Beckers made several pagination errors, numbering p. 38 as 28 and p. 53 as 23 and skipping p. 155. This is why, from p. 156 onwards, the even page numbers are on the recto of each folium.
2 Between the second and third folia of quire 18 is a loose sheet of paper, folded and partly cut as a binio (although the text is not distributed across the sheet correctly), on which an unidentified, probably nineteenth-century hand wrote the statutes of an unspecified archconfraternity and the indulgences that could be earned by joining it and taking part in its devotional exercises. The statutes command members to wear a cord that is received out of the hand of a Capuchin superior and saying five Our Fathers and Hail Marys every day in honour of the wounds of Christ, so it is clear that the Archconfraternity of the Five Holy Wounds of Jesus, or, as it was more commonly known, the Cord of St Francis, in a Capuchin convent or a parish run by Capuchins is meant. On this archconfraternity, see Verheijen 1874, 129-133, although the description of its activities and indulgences given there differs slightly from that in the document in IV 58. The Soeterbeeck Collection contains numerous copies of the archconfraternity’s statutes (V 227:2; V 232:11; V 243:1). On the fraternities at Soeterbeeck, see pp. 257-261.
3 Cf. Figure 1.3.
4 Cf., for example, IV 58, 2: pp. 122-123.
5 IV 58, 2: p. 74.
6 Schober 1891, 220.
8 IV 58, 2: p. 112.
9 IV 58, 2: p. 162.
10 E.g., IV 69, f. **5r.
for this is that the rubrics specify that the day following the feast of Thomas of Canterbury (29 December) is the only day on which the office of the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity may be said, regardless of whether it is actually a Sunday or not.\(^1\)

Beckers seems to have compiled the book himself, apparently excerpting most elements from existing publications. The liturgical texts do not correspond with those in any of the contemporary liturgical books in the vernacular that I know of.\(^2\) Instead, chapters and other texts that are based directly on the New Testament are mostly taken from the Old Catholic Bible translation by Andreas van der Schuur,\(^3\) which does not survive among the books from Soeterbeeck. Beckers slightly adapted the reading of some of the excerpts to enable them to stand on their own in a liturgical context. I have not been able to identify a source for Beckers’ translation of Old Testament chapters, non-biblical antiphons, versicles and responsories, or collects. It is quite possible that Beckers translated all or some of these himself.

The rhyming translations of the hymns and Marian antiphons, however, are not Beckers’ own. Many of them occur in contemporary printed prayer books, such as the highly popular *Christelyke onderwyzingen en gebeden*, which was first published in 1685 and continued to be reprinted far into the nineteenth century.\(^4\) No copies of this particular book survive from the library of Soeterbeeck, but copies of some of the other books that Beckers may have used as sources do.\(^5\) Although it is possible that one exists, I have not been able to identify a single vernacular printed source that includes all hymns given by Beckers, or even one in which those hymns that are included are all in his version. Furthermore, when it comes to the hymns that I have been able to find in printed books, it must be noted that there are often greater and smaller differences between the versions in the publications identified by me and those in Beckers’ manuscript. It is not clear whether these divergences, which are not limited to scribal errors or spelling variants, are due to Beckers having used one or more other sources that are unknown to me, or to changes effected on his part. This means that it is impossible to say with certainty whether or not Beckers used any of the publications in which I have found some of the hymns he gives. The only conclusion that can be reached, at present, is that he certainly derived some hymns from one or more printed sources, and probably the rest as well.

---

1. Cf. IV 69, pp. 188-189, 192-193. The only scenario in which the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity is not celebrated during the week following the feast of Thomas of Canterbury is if that day is a Saturday; in that case the Sunday is not celebrated with an office at all, but merely commemorated on the feast of Sylvester I (31 December), which would be a Sunday. Saturday is then celebrated as a day within the octave.

2. I compared IV 58 with Willibrord Kemp’s *De vesperen van alle de zondagen en heilige dagen beneffens verscheide onderregtingen en gebeden* (Utrecht: Cornelius Guilelmus le Febvre, 1729; copy NUL, OD 709 c 189) and his *De getyd en de bedestonden* (Utrecht: Theodorus van den Eynden, 1723; copy NUL, OD 141 d 15 nr. 1, and Utrecht: Cornelius Guilelmus le Febvre, 1731; copy NUL, OD 1132 c 32), as well as with the *Latynsch en Nederduitsch vesper-boek voor alle de dagen des jaars* (Antwerp: for Eustachius de Haen, 1772; copy NUL, OD 776 c 34). All of these books are Old Catholic translations (cf. Clemens 1993, 215; Polman 1968, 2: 108-109; Van Beek 1892-1893, 1: 92; 2: 12).

3. I made use of NUL, OD 137 a 3, a copy of the two-volume edition of the complete *Biblia sacra* published by Cornelius Guilelmus le Febvre in Utrecht in 1732. Van der Schuur, who had originally published his New Testament in two instalments in 1689 and 1692, and had begun translating the Old Testament, died in 1719 before completing that task. The complete Bible translation published in 1732 had been finished by Hendrick van Rhijn. On this translation, see Ouwens 1994, 122-123; Van Kleef 1953, 82-83; Polman 1968, 1: 343-344. A noteworthy instance where Beckers’ rendering of a New Testament text was not taken from this translation is the Nunc dimittis (Luke 2:29-32), whose text does not correspond (cf. IV 58, 1: p. 3 and vol. 2, p. 354b of the *Biblia sacra*).

4. On the *Christelyke onderwyzingen en gebeden* in general, see Clemens 1993. For a bibliography of the most important editions, see Clemens 1985.

5. For a list of the hymns and antiphons in IV 58 that I have been able to find in the *Christelyke onderwyzingen en gebeden* and in other printed books, see Table 3.1.
As noted above,¹ almost all offices in the proper of saints in IV 58 are introduced by brief texts, mostly of a martyrological nature. These introductions were not taken directly from any of the Dutch translations of the Roman Martyrology,² or any of the other books of saints’ lives,³ that survive from the library of Soeterbeek. They seem therefore to have been assembled by Beckers himself, primarily on the basis of the Roman Martyrology and the lessons at Matins in the Roman Breviary and the proper of the Congregation of Windesheim.

The book’s functional meaning, and consequently also that of the traces of its production, is partly made explicit by the title with which Beckers heads the proper of saints: Vastgestelde feesten van heele jaar volgens den brevier der canonike regulieren van de Congregatie van Windesem tot dientse der religieusen van Soeterbeek Lande van Ravestein.⁴ Clearly, this means that the diurnal was intended as an aid to the recital of the divine office in Latin by the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck. It will have been used to provide translations during the preparation and practice of the actual liturgical services, and may have been kept by the chantress in the room or the space which the seventeenth-century conventual statutes specify was to be set apart for this purpose.⁵

That Beckers had the sisters of Soeterbeeck in mind when preparing his diurnal is also clear from several local characteristics that are apparent in the proper of saints. The feasts whose offices are included in this section, their ranks and the dates on which they are celebrated, clearly represent the convent’s own, proper calendar of the period, shaped by its various influences. It is now time to describe this calendar and the mechanics of its composition, as these can be reconstructed on the basis of the proper of saints of IV 58.⁶ This initial discussion only concerns the feasts and the ranks that are mentioned in the headers of the entries that make up this part of the book; the rationale behind and consequences of the selection of the texts that are included is considered later on.

3.2.2. The Liturgical Calendar Underlying Beckers’ Diurnal

Before the calendar that underlies the proper of saints in IV 58 can be discussed, it is necessary, first, to determine a number of general principles. As described in the previous chapter,⁷ feasts are celebrated either with a commemoration at Lauds and Vespers consisting only of an antiphon, a versicle and a collect, or a full office. The latter can have several ranks, which in Beckers’ days were, in ascending order: simple, semidouble, (lesser) double, greater double, second class double and first class double. Double feasts have two Vespers—one on the evening of the day itself and one on the evening of the day before—and at Matins, Lauds and Vespers antiphons are said in their entirety both before and after the psalms or the canticles which they accompany. Matins usually consists of three nocturns, each with three lessons.⁸ Semidouble feasts differ from doubles in that, at the three aforementioned hours, antiphons are only said in their entirety after the psalms; before these, only the first few words of the antiphon are said.⁹ The latter is also true on simple feasts, but these also have only one

¹ See p. 111.
² IV 97, IV 98, IV 102.
³ III 3 and III 4, III 5 and III 6, IV 1 and IV 2, IV 5, V 87 and V 88.
⁴ ‘Fixed feasts for the entire year, according to the breviary of the canons regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, for the benefit of the sisters of Soeterbeeck, Land of Ravenstein’ (IV 58, 2: p. 1).
⁵ Frenken 1931/32, 231, 236.
⁶ For a reconstruction of this calendar and a reasoned comparison with the contemporary Roman and proper Windesheim calendars, see Appendix C.
⁷ See p. 81.
⁸ RGB I.3-5. On Easter and Pentecost and the first day following these feasts, Matins has only one nocturn of three lessons.
⁹ RGB II.3, VII.4. On the days within the octaves of Easter and Pentecost, which are semidouble, Matins nonetheless has only one nocturn of three lessons (RGB II.3, VII.4).
nocturn of three lessons at Matins and only one Vespers, on the evening before the day of the feast itself. Some first and second class doubles have octaves, which means that they are celebrated for eight consecutive days. Sundays and days within octaves usually have a semidouble office, whereas an octave day is usually a double.

As explained above, the ranks of feasts serve primarily to determine what texts should be used at a given liturgical hour, and what should happen if one feast coincides with another in the calendar. Such coincidences are due either to the interaction of the temporal cycle with the sanctoral, or with the introduction of proper elements into the universal calendar. They can take one of two forms: occurrence, when two feasts are to be celebrated on the same day, or concurrence, when second Vespers of one feast and first Vespers of another overlap. What course should be taken on these occasions can be determined for Beckers’ days on the basis of regular principles explained in the Rubricae generales Breviarii, the general rubrics of the Roman Breviary, and additional statements by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Depending on the importance of the two feasts or days involved, there are four possible solutions. The first three are the entire omission of one of the two offices, a reduction of one office to a commemoration, and the transference of one feast to another date. The final possibility is the construction of a hybrid Vespers, with the psalms and the antiphons dedicated to one feast and everything from the chapter onwards to the other, and finally a commemoration of the former. It is not necessary here to discuss which solution applies in what case, as these details can be readily found in any breviary or liturgical handbook of the period. The upshot is that the decision of what feast should be celebrated on any given day is not arbitrary but governed by a complex but unambiguous system of rules.

Soeterbeeck’s liturgical calendar during Beckers’ rectorate had universal, regional, congregational, diocesan, local and particular components, and the result was a hybrid that was proper to that community alone at that particular moment in time. At its basis was the general Roman calendar of the day, which the proper of saints in Beckers’ diurnal follows as it was between the years 1785 and 1787. This means that for most dates, IV 58 includes the same feasts, with the same rank, as any Roman Breviary or diurnal of this period. There are two significant differences, however, which are that Beckers ignores all simple feasts as well as most commemorations that are listed on the Roman calendar. Some of these had proper texts of their own, which have not been translated. I can discern no reason for their omission from the book, nor any common denominator in those few commemorations that were included. In the face of these inexplicabilities, I can only conclude that, since Beckers explicitly says that he prepared the proper of saints to meet the needs of his sisters, the omitted feasts and commemorations were not observed liturgically at Soeterbeeck for some reason. I return to this important conclusion later on.

EXCURSUS: THE TREATMENT OF UNIVERSAL FEASTS IN BECKERS’ DIURNAL
For the most part, the proper of saints in Beckers’ diurnal follows the universal Roman calendar as it was between the years 1785 and 1787, with the exception that the rector omits all simple feasts

1 **RGB** III.3-4, XXI.7.
2 **RGB** IV.8, VII.5.
3 See p. 110.
4 In addition to the Rubricae generales Breviarii I also made use of Aloysius a Carpo’s *Compendiosa bibliotheca liturgica* (1885) when considering Soeterbeeck’s library. Whenever possible, I have also checked that book’s pertinent rubrical prescriptions against the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Gardellini 1824-1849; *Decreta* 1898-1927), to determine if they already applied in the eighteenth century.
5 For instance, although the calendar in IV 69, a copy of the Roman Breviary printed in Liège at the office of Clementus Plomteux in 1782, lists the simple feast of Marcellinus, Peter and Erasmus on 2 June (f. **2r**), Beckers explicitly says there is geen feest (‘no feast’, IV 58, 2: p. 65) on that date.
6 See pp. 126-127.
and most, though not all, commemorations that were listed there. The only ones of the latter that he does include are those of the days within the octaves of Nativitytide in the proper of time,¹ and of the days within the octave of Peter and Paul (30 June-5 July),² the vigil of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (14 August),³ and the vigil of All Saints (31 October) in the proper of saints.⁴

Vigils are the days before certain feasts, and besides the ones whose commemorations have already been mentioned, Beckers also lists those of the Epiphany (5 January) and the Nativity (24 December) of the Lord and of the feasts of Lawrence of Rome (9 August), Simon and Jude (27 October).⁵ However, he omits many other vigils that are also present in the Roman calendar, despite the fact that they have proper collects. Most of these vigils occur on a double feast and would therefore have been reduced to a commemoration,⁶ or were possibly omitted because of the season in which they occur.⁷ None of these explanations apply, however, to the absence of the vigil of the Nativity of John the Baptist (23 June).⁸ It is very probable that this is just a mistake and that the rector intended to list all vigils celebrated with an office.

Beckers does not always list days within octaves, not even those that are not reduced to commemorations but celebrated with a full office. He does identify the days within the octave of the Epiphany (7-12 January), the second, fourth and fifth days within the octave of Lawrence of Rome (11 and 13-14 August), the fifth day of the Assumption (19 August) and the second and seventh day within the octave of All Saints (2 and 7 November),⁹ but he omits the fourth day within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist (27 June), the seventh day within the octave of Peter and Paul (5 July), the seventh day in the octave of Augustine (3 September) and the sixth day within the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (13 September).¹⁰ The reason is probably that the Roman Breviary devotes a great amount of space to describing how the divine office should be prayed during the octave of the Epiphany in the proper of time,¹¹ and has specific entries for all of the other days mentioned by Beckers in the proper of saints.¹² By contrast, the days within octaves which the rector omits are not given any proper entries in the Roman Breviary at all. In addition, the seventh day in the octave of Augustine of Hippo (3 September), which is proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, has an entry of its own in the Windesheim Officia propria (though without any proper texts for Lauds or Vespers),¹³ and Beckers still does not list it.¹⁴ This means that his treatment of days within octaves can be explained by assuming that in compiling the proper of

---

¹ Cf. IV 65, pp. 175-199.
² IV 58, 2: p. 78. On 30 June there is no commemoration of the octave of Peter and Paul except at Vespers, because the office of the other hours is entirely of Paul, whereas that of Vespers is of the day within the octave of John the Baptist (cf. IV 65, pp. 388-391). On 1-4 July the days within the octave are reduced to commemorations because they occur on double feasts (RGB VII.3; DT I). On 5 July there is no feast and the day within the octave is celebrated with an office.
³ IV 58, 2: p. 102. The vigil of the Assumption is reduced to a commemoration because it occurs on a day within the octave of Lawrence of Rome (RGB VI.5; DT I).
⁴ IV 58, 2: p. 139. The vigil of All Saints is reduced to a commemoration because it occurs on the double feast (for all of Germany) of Wolfgang of Regensburg (RGB VI.1; DT I).
⁵ IV 58, 2: pp. 1, 100, 138, 162.
⁶ The vigils that occur on a double feast in Soeterbeeck’s calendar and are therefore reduced to a commemoration and ignored by Beckers are those of Matthias the Apostle (23 February), Peter and Paul (28 June), James the Greater (24 July), Bartholomew the Apostle (23 August), Matthew the Evangelist (20 September) and Andrew the Apostle (29 November).
⁷ Cf. RGB VI.2. The vigil of Thomas the Apostle (20 December) is never observed in the divine office but only at Mass because it always occurs in Advent. The same is true for the vigils of Matthias the Apostle (23 February) if his feast falls within Lent, of Matthew the Evangelist (20 September) if it occurs on an ember day, and of Andrew the Apostle (20 December) if it falls in Advent.
⁸ Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 72.
⁹ IV 58, 2: pp. 1, 102, 105, 142-143.
¹⁰ Cf. IV 58, 2: pp. 76, 81, 116, 120.
¹² Cf. IV 65, pp. 418-419, 425, 460-462.
¹³ IV 63, pp. 196-199.
saints in IV 58 he based himself on the corresponding section in a Roman Breviary or diurnal, rather than on the calendar or any other book.

Of the feasts on the Roman calendar themselves, rather than their commemorations, vigils and octaves, Beckers neglects to list only one whose rank is higher than simple, and that is probably nothing more than an omission by mistake. It is the feast of Thomas of Villanova, whose celebration with the rank of semidouble was made obligatory by Innocent XII on 4 September 1694. Its date was 18 September, but following the extension of the feast of John of Cupertino to the universal Church by Clement XIV on 8 August 1769, for celebration on the same date, Thomas’ feast was perpetually transferred to 22 September. For the sisters of Soeterbeeck, however, this meant that Thomas’ feast occurred on the double feast of Peter of Arubé, which was proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, and that meant it had to be transferred to the next available date, which was 7 October. Beckers apparently forgot about it, however, for he explicitly states that there is no feast on that date. However, in the late medieval antiphonaries IV 6 and IV 7 he adds a Magnificat antiphon for the feast of Thomas, dated to 18 September, showing that the absence of the latter from IV 58 is only an error.

In addition to those that were celebrated throughout the entire Church, Soeterbeeck also observed a significant number of proper feasts. Partly to accommodate these additions to the calendar, and partly for other reasons, the community also celebrated some universal feasts on a different date or with a different—usually a higher—rank than indicated by the general Roman calendar.

The additional feasts and deviant dates and ranks fall into five categories. Those in the first are proper to specific political regions. Soeterbeeck’s surviving eighteenth-century breviaries present the offices of such feasts, whose celebration is reserved for certain places in its entirety or with a particular rank or date, in a separate section at the back. In these books, which were all printed in Antwerp and Liège, the division pro aliquibus locis includes proper feasts of the Kingdom of Spain, Austria and the Holy Roman Empire, and Germany. When compiling the proper of saints of his own diurnal IV 58, Beckers incorporated almost all of these. That Soeterbeeck should celebrate feasts that were proper to the final three regions is not too surprising. For most of Beckers’ rectorate, until the coming of the French in 1794, the Land of Ravenstein was ruled by Charles Theodore, Count Palatine of Sulzbach, whose lordship of Ravenstein coincided with his reign as Elector Palatine from 1742 until 1777 and as Elector of Bavaria from 1777 until his death in 1799. Entirely unexpected, however, is the inclusion in IV 58 of the Spanish feasts, which leads me to believe that the rector, though he made some inadvertent omissions, had intended to simply include all feasts pro aliquibus locis in the Roman Breviary or diurnal that he used as his source, irrespective of their regional limitation. Given that there is no basis in the rubrics for doing so, I am entirely at a loss to explain this decision from a liturgical perspective.

The second category of additions and deviations in Soeterbeeck’s calendar consists of feasts that were proper to Windesheim. As a source for the translations of their offices in his diurnal, Beckers undoubtedly used his own copy of the congregation’s Officia propria. IV 63, or any of the other contemporary ones that Soeterbeeck must have owned.1

---

1 Schober 1891, 248.
2 Schober 1891, 246.
3 Thomas’ feast would be officially reassigned to 22 September by Pope Pius VII on the occasion of its elevation to the rank of double in 1801 (Schober 1891, 248), but that was still in the future when Beckers wrote IV 58.
4 IV 58, 2: p. 130.
5 E.g., IV 65:1, pp. cxii-cxvii; IV 69, pp. cxxix-cclvii. On the surviving breviaries from Soeterbeeck’s library, see pp. 128-130.
6 On Charles Theodore, see Fuchs 1977. On his lordship of Ravenstein, see Coppens 1840-1844, 4: 17.
7 On Beckers’ ownership of this book, see p. 241.
In addition, the community of Soeterbeeck also had to take into account the calendar of the diocese of Liège—at least until 1801, when the latter was dissolved and the districts of Ravenstein and Megen, in the first of which the convent was situated, were orphaned.2 The diocesan feasts which members of religious orders who lived beyond the walls of the cathedral city should celebrate were those of the titular saint of the cathedral—who was simultaneously the patron of the entire diocese—and the patron of the episcopal city.3 In the case of Liège, these were Lambert of Maastricht and Hubert of Liège respectively,4 and Beckers dutifully included texts for their feasts (17 September and 3 November) in the proper of saints of IV 58.5

Besides the feasts of the patrons of their diocese, religious like the sisters of Soeterbeeck were also held to celebrate that of the patron of the place (locus) where they lived. This could mean anything from a realm or a province (in which case the patron was universal) to a specific diocese, city, town or village (in which case the patron was particular).6 The local patron’s feast should be celebrated as a first class double with an octave by secular clergy,7 and without one by all religious.8 The patron saint of the village of Deursen, and incidentally also that of its parish church, was Vincent of Saragossa,9 and in the proper of saints in IV 58 his feast on 22 January is indeed given the highest rank.10

On top of the regional, congregational, diocesan and local influences, the conventual liturgy finally also had some peculiarities that were all its own. First were the feasts of Soeterbeeck’s patron saints, Our Lady of the Annunciation (25 March) and Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March).11 Beckers’ diurnal includes texts for these occasions with the appropriate rank of first class double,12 but inadvertently omits the additional feasts that were devoted specifically to Mary’s and Joseph’s patronage. The rector did add references, texts and chants for the latter to some of Soeterbeeck’s other liturgical books,13 however, so that there can be no doubt that they were celebrated—on a Sunday in November and the third Sunday after Easter, respectively.

---

1 On the surviving copies of the Officia propria from Soeterbeeck’s library, see p. 54.
2 Following the dissolution of the diocese of Liège in 1801, its last prince-bishop, François-Antoine-Marie-Constantin de Méan (on whom see Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 104, no. 99) was appointed apostolic administrator of the districts of Ravenstein and Megen in 1805 (Munier 1978, 79). The latter were raised to the rank of an apostolic vicariate under Arnoldus Borret (on whom see p. 253 n. 7) after De Méan’s death in 1831, and demoted again to that of districts of the apostolic vicariate of ‘s-Hertogenbosch in 1840 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 109-110; Munier 1991, 95-96). Their liturgical directory was compiled, for the first 46 years, by Wilhelmius Roefen (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 291; on Roefen, see p. 242 n. 2), but I am not familiar with its contents.
3 Decreta 1898-1927, 1: 361-362, no. 1708 (esp. no. 1); 2: 244, no. 2691. Only religious who did not have a proper calendar of their own were held to use the diocesan calendar, expanded with the feasts assigned to the regular clergy in that diocese (Decreta 1898-1927, 2: 358, no. 2964 (esp. 1)).
4 On Lambert, see Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 1); 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 3); IV 58, 2: pp. 121-122. On Hubert, see Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 3); 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 8). The term used there, protector civitatis (‘protector of the city’), was declared to be identical to the principal patron of the episcopal city (patronus civitatis) in a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of 12 September 1840 (Decreta 1898-1927, 2: 295-296, no. 2822 (esp. II.2)).
5 IV 58, 2: pp. 121-122, 142.
6 A Carpo 1885, 271, no. 169.
7 RGB I.1; VII.1; DT I; A Carpo 1885, 272, no. 170.
8 A Carpo 1885, 273, no. 170.
9 IV 58, 2: p. 8; Schutjes 1870-1884, 3: 433. Religious were not held to celebrate the feast of the titular patron of the church of the parish where their monastery was situated (Decreta 1898-1927, 1: 480-481, no. 2148 (esp. no. 3)); 2: 295-296, no. 2822 (esp. no. II.3); cf. A Carpo 1885, 161-163, no. 308; 274, no. 171). However, because Vincent was also the local patron saint he did make it onto Soeterbeeck’s calendar.
10 IV 58, 2: pp. 7-8.
11 On the patrons of Soeterbeeck, see IV 58, 2: p. 39; ASP 4, p. 16a.
12 IV 58, 2: pp. 36-40.
13 Cf. IV 6, f. 1r; IV 7, p. 307; IV 60, p. 454; IV 65:3.
The same cannot be said of the final particular element that one would expect to be present on the conventual calendar. Although Beckers does provide a translation of the office in the common of saints, no feast of the dedication of the chapel of Soeterbeeck is mentioned in the proper of his diurnal. This is surprising, given that the dedication of one’s own church should be celebrated as a first class double with an octave. This means that the omission of the feast is either an error on Beckers’ part, or that Soeterbeeck’s chapel in Deursen had not been consecrated when he wrote IV 58, but only blessed. The latter seems more likely than the former, given the importance of the feast of the dedication. Besides, until Beckers had a separate workroom prepared in 1777, the chapel had double-functioned as one, without having been outfitted with choir stalls. It is true that, in his continuation of Beckers’ chronicle, Rector Henricus de Bruijn (1842-1844) says explicitly that *onzet kloosterkerk onder de aanroeping van O. L. Vrouw in hare boodschap gewijd is,* but this may simply be sloppy wording, as a church’s titular saint is also invoked when it is blessed rather than consecrated. The possibility that Soeterbeeck’s chapel in Beckers’ days was only blessed is strengthened, analogously, by the fact that Jacobus Pompen, vicar general of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch, states in a letter of 21 May 1931 that he believes that the new church built in 1906 had only been blessed as well.

**EXCURSUS: THE TREATMENT OF PROPER FEASTS IN BECKERS’ DIURNAL**

The proper of saints in Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 deviates from the general Roman calendar through the inclusion of texts for proper feasts and the attribution of different dates or different ranks to some universal ones. A few of these peculiarities are explicitly touched upon by Beckers himself in his aforementioned martyrological introductions. Most conspicuously, 22 January, which is universally the date of the semidouble feast of Vincent of Saragossa and Anastasius of Persia, is listed in IV 58 as the first class double feast of Vincent alone. The Spanish martyr’s isolation and high rank are explained as follows: *H. Vincentius is alhier patroon van de parochiale kerk en het dorp Deursen, warom als een feest van Imae classis moet gevierd worden.* Beckers also clarifies that, *om dat op den 22te jan. het feest van den H. Vincentius invalt, die hier als patroon word gevierd,* the Windesheim feast of Gaudentius of Novara, ordinarily celebrated on the same date, had to be transferred to 3 February. The rector’s martyrlogies also identify the Annunciation of the Lord (25 March) and Lambert of Maastricht (17 September) as patron feasts, the former of the convent of Soeterbeeck and the other of the diocese of Liège. Their presence and rank is not addressed in so many words, but the implication that these are due to patronage is clear enough.

1. IV 58, 3: pp. xiv-xvi.
2. *RGB VII.1: DT.*
3. ASP 45, 1: p. 24; on which see p. 231. It may conveniently be noted here that Soeterbeeck’s church in Nuenen had been consecrated twice. The feast of its first dedication was originally celebrated on the first Sunday of September, but was transferred on 4 August 1518 to the first Sunday after the feast of Denis of Paris and his companions (9 October). The second consecration took place in 1616, on 27 August, the vigil of the feast of Augustine of Hippo (Frenken 1931/32, 179; Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 215, 220; cf. ASP 249).
4. ‘Our conventual church was consecrated under the invocation of Our Blessed Lady at her Annunciation’ (ASP 4, p. 30b). On De Bruijn, see p. 279 n. 4.
5. Cf. the *Ritus benedicendi novam ecclesiam, seu oratorium publicam, ut ibi sanctissimum Missae sacrificium celebrari possit* in the Roman Ritual of Benedict XIV. (I made use of *Rituale* 1853, 357-366, esp. 359-360.)
7. ‘St Vincent is the local patron saint of the parish church and the village of Deursen, wherefore his feast should be celebrated as one of the first class’ (IV 58, 2: p. 8). Beckers’ explanation for the high rank of Vincent’s feast is not entirely correct; the fact that he was the titular saint of Deursen’s parish church was irrelevant for the celebration of his feast at Soeterbeeck, for only his patronage of the village mattered in this respect (cf. p. 119 n. 7).
8. ‘Because on 22 January the feast occurs of St Vincent, who is here celebrated as patron saint’ (IV 58, 2: p. 15).
10. It must be stressed, however, that it is not Lambert’s patronage of the diocese but rather that of the cathedral that causes his celebration at Soeterbeeck (cf. p. 121).
Statements on Beckers’ part concerning the reasoning behind Soeterbeeck’s calendar are exceptional, for he does not provide any beyond those just mentioned. For the most part, he silently compiles his proper of saints according to the rules that govern such matters. Some of the rector’s choices require comment, however. For instance, it has been mentioned that he includes feasts whose celebration was limited to the subjects of the King of Spain and for the Holy Roman Emperor,\(^1\) or both,\(^2\) and for Austria and Germany.\(^3\) The inclusion of the Spanish feasts is unaccountable from the rubrics, as is that of the feast of Gregory VII (25 May),\(^4\) which had been suppressed by Emperor Charles VI in 1730 for political reasons.\(^5\)

The fact that the feast of Rosalia of Sicily (4 September, but transferred to the 12th) is listed as a semidouble,\(^6\) despite the fact that Innocent XI had decreed on 30 July 1689 that it was a greater double in the Holy Roman Empire,\(^7\) may initially also give pause, but is actually easily explained. The reason for Rosalia’s low rank in Beckers’ diurnal is apparent from the fact that none of the liturgical books that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck reflect the high one, so that the rector was probably simply not aware of it. Equally explicable is the fact that the feast of Raphael the Archangel (24 October) has the rank of greater double in IV 58,\(^8\) whereas it was instituted by Innocent XI for all subjects of the King of Spain as an ordinary (that is, lesser) double on 22 May 1683.\(^9\) In this case, Beckers probably made an error by analogy to the feast of Raphael’s colleague, Gabriel (18 March), which is celebrated as a greater double in the same region.\(^10\)

The presence of Spanish feasts and that of Gregory VII in the Proper of Saints in IV 58 is probably best explained by assuming that Beckers intended to include all feasts pro aliquibus locis that appear in the books that he had at his disposal. He did not actually succeed in doing so, but all of his lapses are easily accounted for. His omission of the feast of Julian of Cuenca (28 January, for the subjects of the King of Spain) is only to be expected.\(^11\) This could be celebrated at will (ad libitum), and for that reason was entirely displaced by the Windsheim double of Ildefonsus of Toledo that occurred on the same date.\(^12\) Such a rubrical explanation is not present for the absence of the feasts of Ferdinand III (30 May) and the patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November), both for the subjects of the King of Spain,\(^13\) but this was almost certainly accidental. After all, as is discussed below,\(^14\) Beckers added a rubric for the feast of the Patronage of the

---

1. The feasts for Spain are those of Gabriel the Archangel (18 March), Rosalia of Sicily (4 September, but transferred to the 12th), Francis Borgia (10 October) as a second class double, Louis Bertrand (10 October, but transferred to the 23rd), Raphael the Archangel (24 October) and the Expectation of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November), both for the subjects of the King of Spain and the Holy Roman Emperor, whose celebration was limited to the subjects of the Holy Roman Empire, as is that of the feast of Gregory VII (25 May), which had been suppressed by Emperor Charles VI in 1730 for political reasons.
2. These are feasts of the Espousal of the Blessed Virgin (23 January) and Aloysius Gonzaga (21 June, but transferred to the 22nd) (IV 58, 2: pp. 8-9, 71-72).
3. The feast for Austria is that of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February) (IV 58, 2: pp. 19-20). The feasts for Germany are those of Henry II (15 July, but transferred to the 24th) with the rank of double, and of Wolfgang of Regensburg (31 October) (IV 58, 2: pp. 91-92, 139).
4. IV 58, 2: p. 64.
5. Roegiers 1976, 437. The reason for the office’s widespread suppression is that the lessons at Matins recount how Pope Gregory excommunicated Emperor Henry IV and attempted to depose him and suspend his subjects of their duties towards him (Huijbregts 1968, 5).
6. IV 58, 2: p. 120.
7. Analecta 1866, 1310, no. 2408.
8. IV 58, 2: p. 137.
10. Cf. IV 65:1, p. cvxvii. The feasts of Gabriel and Raphael were both extended to the universal Church, to be celebrated as greater doubles on 24 March and 24 October respectively, by Benedict XV on 26 October 1921 (AAS 13 (1921): 543-544).
11. Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 11.
12. IV 69, p. cxxvii. On the rule that feasts ad libitum occurring on obligatory feasts are not celebrated at all, see IV 69, p. cxxvi.
Blessed Virgin to the late medieval antiphonary IV 7, so that we can be certain that it was observed at Soeterbeeck. The feast of Ferdinand did not have any proper antiphons and so does not appear in the antiphonaries that Beckers revised, but it is reasonable to assume that it was also celebrated and should have been listed in Beckers’ diurnal. It seems justified, therefore, to conclude that the rector had attempted to include all regional feasts in his source.

In addition to the feasts pro aliquibus locis, Beckers also included those that were proper to the Congregation of Windesheim in his diurnal. He generally identified these by adding an o for ordinis after their rank, presumably in order to warn the sisters who would be using IV 58 that for the Latin texts they should not turn to their Roman Breviaries or diurnals, but to their copies of the Windesheim Officium proprium. There are two exceptions to this rule. First, there is the feast of Augustine of Hippo (28 August), who is venerated as the spiritual father of his canons and canonesses regular, and whose feast therefore does not have to be identified as having an office that is proper to the order. Second, those proper feasts which occur with exactly the same rank and exactly the same office in the Roman Breviary are not identified as being proper either. This is a matter of ease of use: in IV 63, all of these feasts only have a rubric saying omnia ut in Breviario Romano. There is no sense in referring the users of Beckers’ diurnal to the Officium proprium if all that does is refer them back to the Roman Breviary. However, there is one feast with the same rank and office as in IV 69 which is identified as belonging to the order: the feast of Leo the Great (11 April). This is probably another mistake.

Although it used the calendar of its order, the community of Soeterbeeck also had to celebrate some feasts of the diocese of Liège. According to the rubrics, the diocesan feasts which members of religious orders could be required to celebrate were those of the titular saint of the cathedral, the patron of the episcopal city, and the dedication of the cathedral. The first of these was the above-mentioned Lambert of Maastricht, and his feast (17 September) was celebrated as a first class double with an octave by all secular clergy throughout the entire diocese. Religious did not have to celebrate the octave, however, and Soeterbeeck did not.

As mentioned, the patron of the city of Liège was Hubert, and his feast (3 November) should be celebrated as a first class double with an octave by the city’s secular clergy and without an octave by the religious there. Being outside of the city, however, and having its own local patron saint in Vincent of Saragossa, Soeterbeeck was expected to celebrate Hubert’s feast as a greater double, and only because its celebration was obligatory. Beckers, however, gives it the rank of

---

1 IV 7, p. 307.
2 There is one feast which Beckers might have included, but which does not appear in any of the breviaries or diurnals from the library of Soeterbeeck. This is a second feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin, for celebration on the third Sunday of September in addition to the one on the Friday before Palm Sunday, which was celebrated from 1735 onwards by the subjects of the King of Spain (Koenders 1927, 3: 229). It had its origin in the Servite Order, and would be extended to the universal Church in 1814 (A Carpo 1885, 547, no. 187; Schober 1891, 244). An office for this feast is present in, for instance, the Roman Breviary published at Liège by Clemens Plomteux in 1785 (I made use of the summer volume of NUL, OD 801 b 2), where it is said to be included for use both by the subjects of Spain and those of Austria. It is probable that Beckers had no books at his disposal in which this office was present, and that he was simply unaware of it.
3 Of the order.
5 These are the feasts of Isidore of Seville (4 April), Norbert of Xanten (6 June), Anthony of Padua (13 June), Dominic de Guzmán (4 August), Nicholas of Tolentino (10 September), Bruno of Cologne (6 October) and Peter Chrysologus (4 December).
6 ‘Everything as in the Roman Breviary’ (IV 63, pp. 7, 91, 134, 137, 167, 210 and 224).
7 IV 58, 2: p. 45.
8 Decreta 1898-1927, 1: 361-362, no. 1708 (esp. no. 1); 2: 244, no. 2691.
11 Cf. IV 58, 2: pp. 121-125.
12 See p. 119.
13 Cf. Decreta 1898-1927, 1: 225 (no. 1095).
14 Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 3); 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 8).
first class double without an octave,\(^1\) which appears to be an understandable mistake by analogy to Lambert.

The third Liégeois feast, that of the dedication of the cathedral of Lambert (28 October),\(^2\) is absent from Beckers’ diurnal.\(^3\) This need not surprise us, because although religious were obliged to celebrate the feast of the dedication of the cathedral of their diocese as a second class double without an octave, this obligation only applied to those who lived within the cathedral city itself.\(^4\)

Beckers’ treatment of the local patron of Deursen has already been sufficiently discussed above,\(^5\) but the way in which he handled the four feasts that were proper to the convent of Soeterbeeck itself deserves to be considered in more detail. Beckers’ diurnal does not list the feast of the Annunciation of the Lord (25 March) as a second class double, its universal rank,\(^6\) but as a first class double, and the reason for this is that Our Lady of the Annunciation was Soeterbeeck’s patron saint.\(^7\) The feast does not have an octave, as those of patron saints normally do,\(^8\) because it always falls within the period between Ash Wednesday and Low Sunday, when all octaves are suppressed.\(^9\) If the feast of the Annunciation falls within the Holy Week or the Easter Octave and therefore needs to be transferred to Monday after Low Sunday,\(^10\) its octave would still be suppressed, because octaves are not transferred.\(^11\) Only if Easter falls on the earliest possible dates (22 or 23 March) is the feast of the Annunciation extended beyond one day, and then only by one or two days respectively. This occurs so rarely that Beckers apparently felt no need to write the possibility down.

The Annunciation is a feast of the Blessed Virgin, and therefore Soeterbeeck should also celebrate a feast entirely devoted to her patronage rather than to the specific mystery celebrated on 25 March. It has already been noted above that this feast, celebrated on a Sunday in November by all subjects of the King of Spain, has been accidentally omitted from IV 58 although Beckers does refer to it in the antiphonary IV 7.\(^12\) He also does so in the printed diurnal IV 60.\(^13\)

Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin, is identified by Beckers in the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck as the convent’s second patron, and the rector says there that his feast on 19 March is celebrated with solemnity.\(^14\) Indeed, he lists it as a first class double without an octave in IV 58, but if his chronicle means to say that Joseph is the convent’s secondary patron, this is wrong; according to the rubrics, lesser patrons should be celebrated as greater doubles.\(^15\) There are examples, however, of churches with two primary titular saints which are both celebrated as first class doubles with octaves,\(^16\) so by analogy it is possible that Beckers means that the feasts of Joseph and the Annunciation are coequal at Soeterbeeck, in which case he is right to say that both are to be celebrated as first class doubles.\(^17\) I have not been able to find any more evidence that sheds light on this matter. Beckers is right, in any event, to omit Joseph’s octave, for the same reason as in the case of the Annunciation of the Lord.

---

\(^1\) IV 58, 2: p. 142.
\(^2\) Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 6).
\(^3\) Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 139.
\(^4\) A Carpo 1885, 159, no. 303.
\(^5\) See p. 119.
\(^6\) \(\text{RGB IX.6; DT.}\)
\(^7\) IV 58, 2: p. 39.
\(^8\) \(\text{RGB VII.1.}\)
\(^9\) \(\text{RGB VII.1; DT I. Cf. A Carpo 1885, 288, no. 189. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites dated 12 September 1840 explicitly states that this rubric should be followed even if Our Lady of the Annunciation is a church’s titular patron saint (\text{Decreta 1898-1927, 2: 294, no. 2818}).}\)
\(^10\) \(\text{RGB X.1; DT I.}\)
\(^11\) \(\text{RGB X.1; DT I. Cf. A Carpo 1885, 288, no. 190.}\)
\(^12\) IV 7, p. 307. Cf. p. 154.
\(^13\) IV 60, p. 454.
\(^14\) ASP 4, p. 16a.
\(^15\) \(\text{RGB I.1; DT.}\)
\(^16\) \(\text{Decreta 1898-1927, 3: 66-67; no. 3386 (esp. nos. 1-2); 78, no. 3417 (esp. no. III); 99, no. 3469 (esp. no. II); 166-167, no. 3622 (esp. no. II).}\)
\(^17\) \(\text{RGB I.1; DT.}\)
As was the case with the Blessed Virgin, Soeterbeeck should also celebrate a feast devoted to the patronage of Joseph. None is mentioned in IV 58, however, although Beckers’ additions to the late medieval summer’s antiphonary IV 6 and the printed diurnal IV 65 show that it was in fact celebrated on the third Sunday after Easter.¹

The sources of Soeterbeeck’s feasts and the rules governing their interaction having been identified, it is possible to present some conclusions concerning the proper of saints in Beckers’ diurnal as a witness to the conventual calendar. In general, the rector was very careful in adapting the universal Roman calendar for use at Soeterbeeck by the omission of simple feasts and most commemorations, and by the addition of feasts or the adoption of ranks and dates that were proper to certain regions, the Congregation of Windesheim, the diocese of Liège, the village of Deursen and the convent itself. Most features of the diurnal’s underlying calendar are entirely regular, and conform perfectly to what one would expect on the basis of the rubrics, although there are also some irregularities. I have not been able to discern a pattern in Beckers’ choice of which commemorations to include despite his general tendency not to. His decision to include all feasts pro aliqibus locis is equally inexplicable, but was at least carried out almost consistently. Besides these major conundrums, there are also a few isolated idiosyncrasies. Most of these, however, are either unintentional omissions of texts that Beckers can be surmised to have wanted to include or understandable rubrical mistakes. As it is, then, IV 58 is a fairly reliable witness to Soeterbeeck’s liturgical calendar in Beckers’ days, and I confidently use it to contextualise his work on the convent’s other liturgical books.

EXCURSUS: A REMAINING ODDITY IN THE PROPER OF SAINTS OF BECKERS’ DIURNAL

There is only one individual discrepancy in Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 that cannot be explained as an unintentional omission, such as that of the offices of the patronages of Joseph and the Blessed Virgin,² or a mistake, such as the high ranks of the feasts of Raphael and Hubert.³ This is the fact that the feast of Giles of Athens (1 September) is not listed by Beckers as a simple but as a semidouble feast.⁴ Because of this, it caused the reduction of the fifth day within the octave of Augustine of Hippo to a commemoration rather than being reduced to a commemoration itself and ignored by Beckers.⁵ Because it affects the octave of Augustine, it seems that the unusually high rank of Giles’ feast was a conscious decision on the rector’s part rather than merely a scribal error, but if so, I am unable to explain his choice. It has already been mentioned, in the previous chapter,⁶ that the Windesheim proper of saints printed in Brussels by Johannes Mommartus in 1652, of which the Soeterbeeck Collection contains two copies (IV 126 and IV 127), also gives Giles’ feast the rank of semidouble,⁷ probably because it had nine lessons at Matins according to the pre-Tridentine Windesheim calendar.⁸ To this can be added here that the diocese of Liège celebrated the feast as a first class semidouble even in the eighteenth century.⁹ But neither of these circumstances provides

¹ IV 6, f. 1r; IV 65:3 (cf. Table 3.3). Chants for the feast are also present in the manuscript antiphonary IV 8, f. 120r-v, and texts have been added to the printed diurnal IV 77 (on the final page of IV 77:2).
² See pp. 118, 122-123.
³ See pp. 120-122.
⁴ IV 58, 2: p. 116. On the feast’s rank as a simple feast according to the Roman calendar, see A Carpo 1885, 550, no. 194.
⁵ IV 58, 2: p. 116. For the rubrics applying to the occurrence of simple and semidouble feasts and days within octaves, see RGB III.2, VII.3; DT I. For the Windesheim office of the fifth day within the octave of Augustine, see IV 63, pp. 192-195.
⁶ See p. 86.
⁷ IV 126, f. **v.
⁸ This is the case on the Windesheim calendar for the diocese of Utrecht in 1488 (Van der Woude 1949, 469).
⁹ Cf. ff. 1r, Ppp3v (p. 486) of the summer part of the four-volume Liégeois Breviary printed in Liège at the offices of Everardus Kints and Clemens Plomteux in 1766. (I made use of a digital copy of Oxford, Bodleian Library, 13841 d.5.)
an explanation in this case, as the Congregation of Windesheim had abandoned Giles’ special rank by the time of Beckers’ rectorate,¹ and Soeterbeeck could ignore the Liégeois calendar beyond the feasts of Lambert and Hubert, as has been explained.²

Still, even though Beckers’ treatment of the feast of Giles joins the liturgically inexplicable choices he made concerning the universal commemorations and the feasts pro aliquibus locis, I repeat that his diurnal mostly makes a very consistent impression. The irregularities, accidental or deliberate, that have so far been the focus of this paragraph, should not be allowed to dominate our understanding of his work in producing this book. The vast majority of the many choices he made in compiling its proper of saints were correct.

3.2.3. The Contents of Beckers’ Diurnal

With this conclusion, it is possible to turn to a more in-depth consideration of the contents of IV 58 and what these reveal about the liturgical context in which the book was at least intended to function. As has already been described in general terms,³ the diurnal contains translations of only a very specific selection of those texts which one would normally expect to find in such a book. Beckers did not translate the psalter, presumably because the community owned several copies of Dutch versions of it,⁴ and he did not provide complete versions of the proper of time and the proper and common of saints either. He entirely omitted all texts for the minor hours of Prime, Terce, Sext and None, and included only a specific selection of the texts for Lauds, Vespers and Compline.

Taking everything into consideration, and bypassing a few anomalies for the moment, the contents of IV 58 can be summarised as follows. Beckers’ diurnal contains translations of the texts that are necessary for the offices of Compline, second Vespers on all and first Vespers on seasonal Sundays, and both Vespers on all feasts celebrated at Soeterbeeck with the rank of semidouble and up. It also contains texts for commemorations of Lauds on most vigils,⁵ of Lauds and Vespers on days within octaves and the major ferias, of Lauds and first Vespers on ordinary Sundays, and of Lauds and both Vespers on those (semi)double feasts that could not be celebrated with an office because they occurred on others due to the interplay of the universal and proper elements of Soeterbeeck’s calendar.

Exкурsus: Beckers’ Diurnal Considered in Detail

Leaving aside one inexplicable instance where the book is more inclusive than expected,⁶ as well as several obviously accidental omissions,⁷ the contents of Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 were selected along the following lines.

With the exception of the ordinary at the beginning, which also contains texts for Compline and to which I turn below,⁸ Beckers’ diurnal is exclusively concerned with Lauds and Vespers.

¹ Cf. IV 63, f. *8r. In fact, Giles’ feast already has the rank of a simple feast in the proper of saints published by Franciscus Foppens in Brussels in 1699 (IV 40, ff. *8r, M8r (p. 279), M10r (p. 283)).
² See pp. 121-122.
³ See pp. 110-111.
⁴ The Soeterbeeck Collection includes copies of Davids harp-sangen (IV 104, without title page) and the two-volume De psalmen van David (Ghent: Franciscus and Dominicus vander Ween, 1725), which is present both in its entirety (III 19) and represented by an orphaned copy of the second volume (V 178). Admittedly, none of these volumes contain a trace of use that shows unequivocally that they were at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century.
⁵ On the vigils in IV 58, see p. 116.
⁶ Beckers provides the psalm antiphons for Lauds on the Nativity of the Lord (IV 58, 1: pp. 18-19).
⁷ Beckers omits the collect of the first Sunday in Advent (IV 58, 1: p. 8), the psalm antiphons for Trinity Sunday (IV 58, 1: pp. 70-71), the chapter of the second Sunday after Pentecost (IV 58, 1: p. 74), the psalm antiphons of the feast of John and Paul (IV 58, 2: p. 75), the Benedictus antiphon for the feast of Augustine of Hippo (IV 58, 2: p. 112), the collect of the feast of the guardian angels (IV 58, 2: pp. 114-116) and the Magnificat and Benedictus antiphons of the feast of Mary de Socos (IV 58, 2: p. 125).
⁸ See p. 126.
These two offices have the same structure, which, on most days of the year and excluding its almost unchanging introduction and conclusion, consists of the following elements in a fixed order. There are 1) five psalms and their respective antiphons, 2) a chapter, 3) a hymn, 4) a versicle, 5) the Benedictus at Lauds or the Magnificat at Vespers, each with its antiphon, and 6) a collect, often followed by 7) one or more commemorations, each of which consists of an antiphon, a versicle and a collect.

Except for the psalms and canticles, Beckers’ diurnal contains translations of all texts that are necessary for the recital of the full office of second Vespers on all Sundays throughout the entire liturgical year, and for both Vespers of (semi)double feasts. The same is true for first Vespers on the seasonal Sundays of Advent, Nativitytide and Septuagesima through Ascensiontide, but not on those after the Epiphany and after Pentecost. For first Vespers on these ordinary Sundays, Beckers provides only the texts that are needed for a commemoration. This also goes for Lauds on most vigils, Sundays and (semi)double feasts, and for both Vespers and Lauds on (semi)double feasts that occurred on others, on days within octaves,1 and on the major ferias—those of Advent and Quadregesima, the three rogation days before the Ascension, and the ember days in the third week of September.2 Nothing is given for either Vespers or Lauds on any other feria.

The general pattern of an office for Vespers and a commemoration for Lauds is evident throughout the book, although it is obscured in the proper and common of saints by the fact that the only proper text that many feasts have for the diurnal hours is a collect. Also, texts from the common are generally not repeated or even referred to in the proper, making many offices look incomplete without any indication that they can easily be supplemented with texts from another section of the book. The general rule is that for any feast (with its vigil) that is included, Beckers provides all proper texts needed for a commemoration of Lauds and the offices of (both) Vespers, taking into account the laws of occurrence when it comes to the latter. If the rubrics specify that an office at Vespers should be reduced to a commemoration, or split between two feasts, the contents of the proper of saints reflect this even if the headers of the entries involved in many cases do not. It goes without saying that no texts are present for the simple feasts, vigils and commemorations that are not mentioned in these headers.

There are eight instances where the principles just formulated are violated, six of which can be easily explained. The most straightforward five of these are Beckers’ failure to provide translations of the hymns Regali solio fortis Iberiae for both Vespers of Hermenegild of Spain (13 April),3 Martyr Dei Venantias for first Vespers of the feast of Venantius of Camerino (18 May),4 Caelestis Agni nuptias for both Vespers of the feast of Juliana Falconieri (19 June),5 Domare cordis impetus Elisabeth for first Vespers of the feast of Elizabeth of Portugal (11 July),6 and Gentis Polonae gloria for first Vespers of John Cantius (20 October).7 This is almost certainly due to the fact that he was not able to find any satisfying rendition of these texts in Dutch, as he had evidently decided not to translate any hymns himself.8 Also, Beckers made a clear error with the concurrence of the feast of Agnes of Rome (21 January) with that of Vincent of Saragossa on the day after. As has

---

1 Strictly speaking, the texts provided for days within octaves in IV 58 are also enough for a full office at Vespers. When a day within an octave is not reduced to a commemoration or omitted because it occurs on a feast, Vespers is almost entirely identical to that on the feast itself, and if there are any differences, these occur in the Magnificat antiphon and the collect. These two elements are always present for days within an octave, and it is impossible to be certain on the basis of them whether Beckers intended to enable the celebration of a full office (which would be possible in combination with the other texts provided for the feast itself), or just wanted to provide a commemoration. I take the limited approach to be on the safe side, although there is evidence in the antiphonaries that Beckers wished Vespers on the second day in the octave of Easter to be sung (see p. 151 n. 2).

2 There is a rubric about the major ferias that says they should always be commemorated if a feast occurs on them (DT).

3 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 45.

4 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 61.

5 Cf. IV 58, 2: pp. 70-71.

6 Cf. IV 58, 2: pp. 84-85.

7 Cf. IV 58, 2: pp. 135-136.

8 See p. 113.
been explained, the patron saint of Deursen was celebrated as a first class double, and that meant that second Vespers of the double feast of Agnes should be entirely omitted, without even a commemoration. In direct contradiction to this prescription, however, Beckers provides a second Magnificat antiphon for the virgin martyr, presumably because he laboured under the impression that she needed to be commemorated. More difficult to understand than these omissions and this error is the fact that the feasts of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February) and the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday before Palm Sunday) are only given commemorations, although they should have had at least a partial office in Vespers. I am unable to explain this situation, which seems to be the result of a conscious choice rather than a mistake.

The final section of the book that is to be discussed is the one that opens it: the ordinary. This begins with the chapter, hymn and versicle of second Vespers of Sundays through the year—without the psalm antiphons, which are given in the proper of time at the second Sunday after the Epiphany. After the texts for Vespers come a versicle and the Benedictus antiphons of the six ferias, to use for the commemoration of Lauds on vigils. These are followed by the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of ordinary Sundays that do not have an antiphon of their own, to be used for their commemoration—although the rector neglects to provide a translation of the necessary versicle. The rest of the ordinary contains the best part of Compline, omitting the introduction and starting with the psalm antiphon, skipping the preces between the Nunc dimittis and the collect, and thereafter carrying through to the end. All seasonal variants are included, except for the psalm antiphon during Eastertide, which is a quadruple alleluia that needs no translation. It is unclear to me why Beckers did not translate Compline in its entirety, or why he included the text of the Nunc dimittis despite omitting that of the Magnificat at Vespers, but beyond these peculiarities the contents of the ordinary perfectly dovetail those of the propers and the common.

The question that remains is, of course, what the selection of texts in Beckers’ diurnal means with reference to the book’s function. I have already argued that IV 58 was not itself intended for liturgical use, but to help the chantress and the other choir sisters in their preparation of the divine office. Its functional meaning was constitutive with reference to that of the actual liturgical books themselves. In addition to providing a handy directory for the sisters to follow in the proper of saints, IV 58 contains Dutch translations of those liturgical texts which Beckers evidently wanted the sisters to be able to understand. Would it be going too far to conclude that these were the very texts, indeed all of the texts, that the sisters were using in their celebration of the canonical office? I am inclined to think that it would not. After all, a diurnal that translated only part of the sisters’ divine office would have been of limited use, and the regularity of the selection of the texts included in IV 58 proves that it served a well-defined purpose. The most likely explanation seems to be that this was to provide the sisters of Soeterbeeck with a Dutch translation of those parts of the canonical hours which they

---

1 See p. 119.
2 DT II.
4 IV 58, 2: pp. 19, 41-42.
5 IV 58, 1: p. 33.
6 IV 58, 1-2. Beckers’ rubric says that the versicle and the antiphons, which are the Benedictus antiphons of the six ferias, are meant om de gedaghtenisse van de vigilien te houden ‘s morgens in de laudes door de geheele week (“to commemorate vigils in the morning, at Lauds, throughout the entire week”). This refers to the stipulation that if a vigil occurs with a feast of nine lessons at Matins or an octave day, the office at Lauds is of the feast, and the vigil is only commemorated, using the Benedictus antiphon and the versicle of the day of the week and the vigil’s collect. This is because even when the vigil is celebrated, Lauds is of the ferial office with the vigil’s collect (RGB VI 1, 3). The Benedictus antiphons which Beckers provides are also included in IV 3, pp. 393-394, IV 18, pp. 337-338 and IV 19, pp. 339-340.
7 IV 58, 1: p. 2.
8 ‘Alleluia’ (IV 58, 1: pp. 2-7). For the psalm antiphon of Compline in Eastertide, see IV 65:1, pp. 148, 150, 264, 266.
9 See p. 114.
prayed in addition to the Little Office of the Virgin, and that it omitted the parts which they did not.

That ties existed in practice between the Hours of the Virgin and Beckers’ diurnal is clear from the fact that his introductions to and translations of the offices for the feasts of the conversion (5 May), death (28 August) and translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October) and of all holy canons regular (5 March) were included by an unidentified hand in an appendix added at the back of IV 48, one of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval books of hours with the Little Office. This does not mean that these Dutch texts were used liturgically, for they follow a guide to a spiritual pilgrimage to Loreto that is also in the vernacular, and seem therefore rather to have served a meditational purpose. However, it does show that Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 was being used next to the Little Office in a broad sense.

I already warned that the previous chapter on Soeterbeeck’s liturgical history has only shown that there is no basis in the archival evidence to say that the choir sisters limited themselves entirely to the Little Office and did not pray the divine office at all in Beckers’ days. It did not reveal anything about the precise way in or extent to which they may have done the latter. Now, IV 58 may have provided a first step towards a possible answer to these final issues: on the basis of its contents, one would say that the sisters did not always pray the great office, nor celebrate it in its entirety. On those days and at those hours for which Beckers’ diurnal does not provide any texts—that is, most of the time—they probably only prayed the Hours of the Virgin. They will have expanded the latter with commemorations at Lauds on most vigils and at Lauds and Vespers on Sundays, (semi)double feasts and their octaves, and the major ferials. In addition, the divine office was probably prayed at second Vespers and Compline on ordinary Sundays, and at both Vespers and Compline on seasonal Sundays and (semi)double feasts.5

It must be kept in mind that these conclusions cannot be set in stone on the basis of IV 58 alone. Beckers’ diurnal in Dutch is a paraliturgical book, meant as an aid to the sisters. As such, none of its contents and prescriptions, inaccuracies and omissions necessarily reflect or had any influence at all on the liturgy as it was actually celebrated at Soeterbeeck. Still, it is precisely because of its functional meaning for the benefit of the sisters that its systematic condensation of the breviary is suggestive of what the religious did in practice. Again, how would an incomplete book of translations have been of any service to them? For this reason, I take what IV 58 suggests about the nature of Soeterbeeck’s celebration of the liturgy of the hours in the 1780s—the Little Office of the Virgin, expanded with commemorations at Lauds and Vespers and accompanied by the divine office at Vespers and Compline on Sundays and feasts—very seriously indeed. This suggestion provides the context in which I try to understand Beckers’ traces of use in Soeterbeeck’s truly liturgical books, to which I now turn.

3.3. The Traces of Use in Soeterbeeck’s Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani
As far as the revision of books for the canonical office is concerned, Rector Beckers occupied himself with three types: diurnals, antiphonaries and hymnals. I discuss his work on each of these in turn, beginning with the first category.

---

1 IV 48:2, ff. 68v-74v. Several folia have been torn out at the end, so that part of the office for the death and all of that for the first translation of Augustine is missing.
2 IV 48:2, ff. 64v-68r.
4 I assume the canonical hours were added to and did not replace the Little Office, its commemorations, or both.
5 It is impossible to determine from the contents of IV 58 that canonical Compline was not said every day at Soeterbeeck, as it had only very few changeable texts which are all included, but it seems more likely that its celebration was tied to that of canonical Vespers. I depart from this assumption throughout the rest of this book.
3.3.1. The Breviaries from the Library of Soeterbeeck

Diurnals are a type of breviary, and it was noted in the previous chapter that, if the fragments are ignored, the books that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck include seventeen of that more general category. The origins of this fifteenth-century book are unknown, but it was at Soeterbeeck in the seventeenth century, as is evident from traces of use that are discussed in the following paragraph. Three of the six manuscript breviaries are for Matins and three for the diurnal hours, and they can be still further divided according to the period they cover, for some of them are devoted to either the winter or the summer half of the year. In the proper of time, winter runs from the first Sunday in Advent to Holy Saturday, and summer from Easter Sunday until the final week after Pentecost, as has been noted. In the proper of saints, the first feast of winter is that of Andrew the Apostle (30 November) and the last that of Ambrose of Milan (4 April), whereas the first feast of summer is that of Leo the Great (11 April) and the last that of Saturnin of Toulouse (29 November). Of the three nocturnal breviaries, IV 79 covers the entire liturgical year, whereas the breviary part of IV 16 is for winter and IV 74 for summer. Of the diurnals, IV 80 and IV 83 with Fr. 33:3 are for the entire year, whereas the surviving parts of a third volume, IV 79A and Fr. 33:1, only cover winter.

In addition to the six manuscript breviaries, eleven printed ones from Soeterbeeck also survive. Two of these are Windesheim breviaries, and they are both highly incomplete. The first one, IV 51:2, can be identified on the basis of its printer’s colophon as a copy of the edition printed in Delft by Henricus Eckert de Homberch in 1499. The second one is Add. 7, a copy of the edition produced by the same printer in Antwerp in 1519. The two folia of the same edition which survive in IV 51:1 may also belong to this copy, or else to a second one.

The remaining breviaries are all Roman, and two of them cover all canonical hours. IV 26 is a copy of the Roman Breviary printed in Cologne by Cornelius ab Egmondt and companions in 1630, and IV 69 is the winter part of the two-volume edition published in Liège at the offices of Clemens Plomteux in 1782. None of these books contain any traces of use that need concern us at present, although it may be noted that only IV 26 was certainly at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days. It bears various ownership notes, among them two that indicate that the volume was given to the seventeenth-century sister Clara van den Bogaert by Guillemus Moraeus.

Finally, there are seven more or less complete printed Roman Diurnals, entitled *Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani*. Five of these books are from the Plantin Press in Antwerp, and two were printed by Hubert Dessain, one in Liège and the other in Mechelen. The latter are from the nineteenth century and were not yet in existence when Beckers was rector of Soeterbeeck, whereas the Antwerp ones were all printed before the beginning of his rectorate. None of these books contain ownership marks, and for three of them (IV 61, IV 62 and IV 66)
there is no evidence in the form of dateable traces of use that they were already at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century, although this is likely. The remaining two, IV 60 and IV 65, include notes in Beckers’ hand, and it is therefore with these that this paragraph is primarily concerned.

It is important, for a proper understanding of these diurnals, to know from the very first that, with the exception of IV 57, printed in Mechelen by Dessain in 1883, all of them have been rebound. In two cases this was evidently done by the sisters themselves. The first of these is IV 66, for which an original binding of black leather over cardboard was reused, although two metal clasps, of which only the impressions survive, were removed. The second one is IV 70, and in this case the sisters bound the book in cardboard boards covered with an unidentified parchment manuscript fragment subsequently painted black, and they reapplied the two clasps. The other four volumes were rebound professionally, and for IV 60, IV 62 and IV 65 this was done by a binder from Ravenstein by name of G.H. ter Haar. His name appears in a stamp in red ink on the front pastedown of the first of these books, which was given a brown leather spine and boards with cloth over cardboard, onto which the original clasps were added. The spine is decorated with gilt stamps, consisting of various decorative elements as well as the title Horae diurnae. The front board bears a blind tooled cross. Similar stamps and the same title and cross appear on the binding of the two other books, proving that these were also rebound by Ter Haar even though they do not bear a stamp with his name. There are slight differences between the various bindings, however. The diurnals IV 62 and IV 65 have gilt patterns on their spines which, though identical to each other, deviate slightly from those on IV 60, and they are bound entirely in brown leather. IV 65 has the two familiar clasps, whereas IV 62 has only one, with four metal cornerpieces. It may well be, then, that each of these books was rebound at another time. The binding of the remaining volume, IV 61, is of dark brown leather over cardboard with blind tooled decorations, and it deviates so strongly from that of the others, that this book may well have been rebound by someone else altogether.

The rebinding just described must be kept in mind during this paragraph, because all six rebound diurnals contain additional elements, both manuscript and printed and some of them quite substantial, whose chances of survival would not have been as great if they had not been physically attached to the main text block. Some loose slips of paper also survive in these volumes, but in far lesser numbers. The contents of these additional pieces consist mainly of texts for feasts whose offices were not originally included in the printed diurnals. The ever-changing nature of the calendar and the proper of saints means that these sections of liturgical books are often already obsolete very shortly after their publication, and for this reason additions, as well as revisions and deletions of the printed text, are almost inevitable. The expansions of and changes to Soeterbeeck’s diurnals are not only a matter of updates, however, but also of adaptations to the convent’s specific needs. Both of these tendencies are apparent from the traces of use in IV 60 and IV 65.

Before discussing the rector’s work on the two Horae diurnae, I need to point out that, although he concerned himself with none of the other books for the canonical office mentioned so far, these do provide a context for the books which he did revise. It is for this reason that I described them in such detail. The previous chapter lumped them all together and so arrived at an impressive total of seventeen breviaries surviving with some degree of completeness,1 and in addition to these there are fragments that show that the community must have owned many more.2 However, the more detailed description just provided will have made clear that they do not contain a uniform body of texts. Only three of the printed

1 See pp. 53-54.
2 For example, Add. 18 contains almost the entire psalter of a copy of the Roman Breviary, possibly one only for the winter half of the year, and the bifolium of Fr. 33:2 is a fragment of a manuscript nocturnal breviary.
breviaries covered the entire canonical office of the entire year when they were still complete; the other fourteen were all geared at one or more specific hours or a specific season. More importantly, their contents differ. There are eight breviaries, six manuscript and two printed, for the pre-Tridentine use of Windesheim and nine printed books following the post-Tridentine Roman use. When Soeterbeeck switched to the Roman liturgy somewhere in the sixteenth or possibly even the seventeenth century, the former eight became instantly outdated. The same also happened with IV 26, for in 1632, two years after its appearance, a new edition of the Roman Breviary was published that incorporated significant changes that had been promulgated by Urban VIII the year before. Only IV 69 and the seven *Horae diurnae* could easily be used in conjunction with each other, although the continuous changes to the liturgical calendar meant that there were many differences between them in the proper of saints. Discounting the books printed in the nineteenth century, and assuming that the surviving books printed before then were actually at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days, that leaves only six useful breviaries during his rectorate. That is far less than the seventeen with which we started out, but the fact that there certainly were more means that it is enough for me to hazard the following assumption regarding the collection of which these six books are the remnant, and its use.

During Beckers’ rectorate there were about twenty choir sisters at any given time, and I think that it is very likely that each of them had a copy of the Roman Breviary of her own, in some cases perhaps a complete one but most likely only a diurnal. The prevalence, among the surviving seventeenth- and eighteenth-century breviaries, of books for the daytime, hours, strongly suggests that canonical Matins was not being prayed at Soeterbeeck at the time. In this very general way, the very presence of the printed diurnals in the library of Soeterbeeck supports the tentative conclusion which I drew on the basis of IV 58, that the sisters largely limited themselves to canonical Vespers and Compline.

In order to test whether Beckers’ revisionary work on Soeterbeeck’s *Horae diurnae* supports this interpretation of the presence of these books, I now turn to his notes in the before-mentioned volumes IV 60 and IV 65. My discussion begins with the typological, functional, spatial and temporal dimensions of the traces of the rector’s use of both volumes, continues by discussing what these reveal about the functional meaning of the books in which they appear within the context of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice, and ends by placing them in the context of later notes.

### 3.3.2. IV 60: *Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani* (1696)

Along their functional dimension, Beckers’ notes in the two *Horae diurnae* can be divided into three kinds: revisions, references and additions. The first two occur exclusively in IV 60, Soeterbeeck’s sole surviving copy of the edition printed by Balthasar Moretus at the Plantin Press in Antwerp in 1696.

#### 3.3.2.1. Revisions

Beckers revised the offices of three feasts *pro aliquibus locis* in IV 60, and because his changes are so few, it is impossible to say very much about them, other than that they contributed to bringing the book in line with later copies of the *Horae diurnae*. In all three cases, the rector implemented a textual change that had been effected when a feast which had still been limited to specific places at the time of the printing of IV 60 was extended to the universal Church. First, he struck through four words of the collect for the feast of Pius V (5

---

1 On Urban’s revision of the Roman Breviary, see Bäumer 1895, 502-510.
2 Cf. Appendix A.1.
3 IV 60, pp. cxiii-cxxxi.
May, but transferred to 13 May at Soeterbeeck).¹ This was initially restricted to the cities of Rome and Bosco and the dioceses of Mondovi and Nepi-Sutri, but extended to the universal Church by Clement XI on 28 January or 17 February 1713.² In the diurnal IV 65, printed in 1757, the collect therefore appears in the proper of saints, where indeed it is without the phrase which Beckers deleted.³ Second, the rector crossed out the Magnificat antiphon given for first Vespers of the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July), the Ave regina caelorum, and instead added a marginal reference to the antiphon Sancta Maria succure miseris, given on p. cxxvii for first Vespers of the feast of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin (first Sunday in October).⁴ The feast of Mount Carmel, included in IV 60 for the subjects of the King of Spain, was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726,⁵ and in the proper of IV 65 the office appears with the new antiphon.⁶ Third, in the office of the feast of the Rosary, which was extended to the universal Church by Clement XI on 3 October 1716,⁷ Beckers crossed out the collect given there, Solemnitatem Rosarii beatissimae Virginis Mariae.⁸ He failed to provide an alternative, but in the proper of saints in IV 65 a different collect is indeed given: Deus, cuius Unigenitus.⁹

The reader will understand that, consisting of only these three changes, Beckers’ revision of IV 60 in light of later developments was by no means exhaustive. If this book were compared with IV 65 more fully, there would be no difficulty at all in demonstrating that the two volumes still differ considerably from each other, especially in the proper of saints as a result of the ever-changing nature of the universal liturgical calendar. Two possible interpretations of this situation suggest themselves. The first is that Beckers’ revisions were completely ad hoc, which is unlikely because it runs counter to the regularity of the liturgy. The second possibility is that the rector merely wished to update the contents of IV 60’s section pro aliquibus locis, without any regard for the rest of the book. I am inclined to favour this interpretation over the other, but it is not entirely satisfactory either, first, because it is hard to see what the context or the functional meaning of such an undertaking would be, and second, because Beckers did not even revise the offices for specific regions completely. For the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, he added a reference to a different Magnificat antiphon for first Vespers, but there are many more discrepancies between the office that was used by the subjects of the King of Spain and published in IV 60 on the one hand and that for the entire Church in IV 65 on the other. When it comes to Vespers and the parts of Lauds that are necessary for a commemoration, the two books provide different psalm antiphons, different chapters, different versicles, a different Benedictus antiphon, and even a different Magnificat antiphon for second Vespers.¹⁰ In short, only the psalms and the hymn at Vespers

¹ IV 60, p. cxxii. In its entirety, the collect says: Deus, qui ad conteréndos Ecclésiae tuae hostes, & ad divínum cultum reparándum, Piam Quintum Pontificem Máximum eligere dignátus es: fac nos ipsíus déféndi præsídiis, & ita tuis inhaerère obséquiis, ut omnium hóstium superátis insídiis, perpetua pace lætémur. Per Dominum (IV 60, p. cxxii). Beckers crossed out the words ipsíus déféndi præsídiis, &.
³ IV 65:1, pp. 368-369.
⁴ IV 60, p. cxxiii. The number of Beckers’ page reference has been trimmed off except for the c, but p. cxxvii is the first page on which the antiphon in question occurs and is therefore undoubtedly the page that is meant.
⁵ Schober 1891, 228.
⁶ IV 65:1, p. 398.
⁷ Schober 1891, 250.
⁸ IV 60, p. cxxvii.
⁹ IV 65:1, p. 448.
¹⁰ In IV 60, the psalm antiphons are Pulchra es, Sicut myrrha electa, In odorem unguentorum tuorum, Benedicta filia tu a Domino and Speciosa facta es, the chapter is Ego quasi vitis fructificavi, the versicle at Vespers is Ora pro nobis sancta Dei Genitrix and for Lauds it is Elegit eam Deum, & praeelegit eam, the Benedictus antiphon is the hymn Ave Stella matutina, and the second Magnificat antiphon is the Alma redemptoris mater (IV 60, pp. cxxiii-cxxv). In IV 65, the psalm antiphons and the chapter are from the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, the
and the collect are the same, and still the first Magnificat antiphon was the only thing that Beckers changed in IV 60. Granted, there are no such unrevised differences in the offices of Pius V and the Rosary, nor are there any in the texts for the other feasts for specific places that are included in IV 60, but the fact remains that Beckers allowed most textual variants in the office of Mount Carmel to stand. He appears, therefore, to have abandoned his revision of the feasts pro aliquibus locis in favour of another solution that we do not know about. Beyond this conclusion I see no opportunity of going, even though the explanation which it provides of Beckers’ notes is regrettably incomplete.

Beyond the three instances just mentioned, there are no other traces of revision in Beckers’ hand in any of Soeterbeeck’s surviving printed diurnals. With one exception whose author cannot be identified, none of the many changes in the liturgical calendar that were effected between the publication of IV 60 in 1696 and the beginning of Beckers’ rectorate have been implemented, either in IV 60 or IV 65. It appears that the sisters who used these books were expected to consult Beckers’ own Dutch diurnal, IV 58, or another source, to determine the status quo as far as feasts and their ranks were concerned, and that they were capable of dealing with slightly obsolete and mutually incompatible books in practice.

3.3.2.2. References

In addition to making three emendations in the offices pro aliquibus locis, Beckers also used the lower margins of IV 60’s proper of saints to add a large number of references to pages with the proper texts of feasts whose offices were not included in the printed proper, such as: X maii S. Antonini fol. cxii. These references are mostly to feasts that had been added to the calendar of the universal Church after 1696, when IV 60 was printed, although Beckers also referred to some whose celebration was still restricted to specific regions even in his days.

The temporal dimension of these notes can be straightforwardly defined. The most recent feast that they refer to is that of Fidelis of Sigmaringen (24 April), which was instituted by Clement XIV on 16 February 1771. Because no reference is made to Paschal Baylon (17 May), whose feast was extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1784, it would seem

---

1 The psalms are those of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, the hymn at Vespers is Ave maris stella and the collect is Deus, qui beatissimae semper Virginis & Gentiricis tuae Mariae data est ei (IV 65, pp. 398-399, cf. pp. 409-410).
2 The change consists of the alteration in IV 60, p. 378 of the rank of the feast of John and Paul (26 June) from semidouble to double by means of the erasure of the letters semi. This reflects a decree of Pope Benedict XIII (1724-1730) (Bäumer 1895, 524-525).
3 ‘10 May, St Antoninus, p. cxii’ (IV 60, p. 368). For an overview of the feasts to which Beckers refers in IV 60, see Table 3.2.
4 These are the feasts of the Espousal (23 January), the Patronage (November) and the Expectation (18 December) of the Blessed Virgin, the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February), Gabriel the Archangel (18 March), Aloysius Gonzaga (21 June), Mary de Socos (22 September) and Raphael the Archangel (24 October). These are not all feasts pro aliquibus locis given in IV 60 or later Horae diurnae from the library of Soeterbeeck; Beckers omits Julian of Cuenca (28 January), Ferdinand III (30 May), Rosalia of Sicily (4 September), Louis Bertrand (10 October) and Wolfgang of Regensburg (31 October) from IV 60 and John Nepomucene (16 May) from IV 65. He does not refer to the guardian angels (first Sunday of September) or Francis Borgia (10 October) either, but that is possibly because these feasts were already part of the proper of IV 60 with a lower rank, though in the case of the guardian angels that is on a different date (2 October) (pp. 442-446). The section pro aliquibus locis gives no additional or different proper texts for these two feasts, but only rubrics describing what common texts should be used if the feasts are celebrated with the higher rank (pp. cxxvii, cxxxi).
5 Schober 1891, 205.
6 Schober 1891, 212.
that Beckers added the notes during the first decade of his rectorate, or at least made use of a source that dated from this period.

Beckers’ intention in writing these notes was not to ensure that the proper of saints of IV 60 included at least a reference to every feast celebrated at Soeterbeeck, so that it could be used as an alternative calendar. Rather, his references are to places where the user of the volume could find additional proper texts that she was expected to need. Their functional meaning is not to expand the calendar, but the proper. This is the reason why there are no references to feasts whose celebration was proper to the Congregation of Windesheim during Beckers’ rectorate, or which did not have any proper texts.¹ For the feasts of the congregation it would have been clear that the user of IV 60 would have to turn to the Windesheim Officia propria, and for the feasts without any proper texts at all there would have been nothing concrete to refer to. Another conscious omission is the absence of references to texts of feasts that do not appear in the proper of saints in Beckers’ own diurnal. However, of all non-congregational feasts with proper texts that were included in IV 58 but do not appear in the proper of saints of IV 60, only one is—mistakenly—not referred to.² With this single exception, Beckers managed to add a note for all necessary proper texts that were not included in the Roman or Windesheim propers of saints, and his references are complete.

Along their functional dimension, Beckers’ references in the margins of IV 60 can be divided into two categories. The first consists of references to texts that are included elsewhere in the book, among those for feasts whose celebration was optional (ad libitum) or pro aliquibus locis, on pages with numbers in roman numerals. The above-quoted reference to Antoninus of Florence is an example of this type: his collect is included among the texts for feasts that can be celebrated at will, on p. cxii. Antoninus’ liturgical veneration had been made obligatory by Clement XI in 1707,³ however, which is why Beckers added a reference to its office in the proper of saints.

The rector also added references to offices that are not included in IV 60, however. The notes which fall in this second category all refer to pages with an arabic numeral, but no book survives from Soeterbeeck whose contents and pagination correspond precisely with these references. It is possible, however, tentatively to identify the type of document which Beckers had in mind. At the back of IV 65, the diurnal printed at the Plantin Press in Antwerp in 1757 already referred to several times,⁴ four quires of twenty-two folia in total have been

¹ The feasts to which Beckers does not refer are those of Alexius of Rome (17 July), which had been raised from simple de praecepto (‘by precept’) and semidouble ad libitum (‘at will’) to the rank of semidouble de praecepto by Innocent XI on 31 August 1697 (Schober 1891, 229); Liborius of Le Mans (23 July), which had been instituted by Clement XI (A Carpo 1885, 527, no. 153); Hedwig of Silesia (17 October), which had been made obligatory as a semidouble by Clement XI on 20 March 1706 (Schober 1891, 255); Lawrence Giustiniani (5 September), which had been made obligatory by Clement XIII (A Carpo 1885, 550, no. 194), who reigned from 1758 to 1769; and Canute IV (19 January), which was still ad libitum in Beckers’ days. The feast of Liborius is not referred to because it was only celebrated with a commemoration, and had therefore been omitted from Beckers’ diurnal (cf. pp. 115-116). The feast of Canute IV is also ignored in line of its absence from IV 58, which is due to its occurring on the double feast of Melaine of Remes. In the case of Hedwig and Lawrence, Beckers probably refrained from referring to p. cxii, where their feasts are listed as ad libitum, because no proper texts are given there but only rubrics describing what common texts should be used. Furthermore, Lawrence’s feast was proper to the Congregation of Windesheim as a double (cf. IV 63, p. 203), and Beckers did not add any references to feasts of the order in the lower margins of IV 60. For this reason, Beckers also omitted a reference to the feast of Remigius of Reims (1 October), which was proper to the order as a double (cf. IV 63, pp. 217-219). The feast of Alexius was probably ignored because it already appeared in the proper as a simple, and it did not have any additional proper texts as a semidouble, either ad libitum or de praecepto.

² Beckers failed to add a reference for the feast of Andrew Avellino (10 November), which had been instituted by Benedict XIII on 18 August 1725 (Schober 1891, 257). This feast had a proper collect (cf. IV 65:1, p. 462), so the absence of any allusion to it in IV 60 is inexplicable.

³ Schober 1891, 211.

bound with collects and other proper texts of feasts which for various reasons do not appear in the proper of saints of the printed book. It is possible that Beckers’ references in IV 60 are to an appendix like this one that has now been lost, perhaps because it was preserved loosely and not included in any rebinding.

3.3.3. IV 65: *Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani* (1757)

Next to the references and revisions mentioned before, the additions at the back of the Plantin diurnal IV 65 constitute the third kind of traces that Beckers left in Soeterbeeck’s *Horae diurnae*. They occur on a binion that makes up the first four of twenty-two added folia, all with similar texts. The other eighteen folia contain notes in other hands, but for the moment I will limit myself to the four that contain Beckers’.

3.3.3.1. Additions

On the first page of the binion, an unidentified hand added Latin collects for four proper feasts of the Congregation of Windesheim that must have been added to the calendar after 1753, namely those of Israel of Dorat (8 February, but transferred to 15 February at Soeterbeeck), Theobald of Dorat (10 February), Faucher of Aureil (10 April) and Bertrand of Comminges (16 October). The collects are the only proper texts of these offices that are used at Vespers or Lauds, which means that they were all that the sisters of Soeterbeeck would have needed for their liturgical celebrations. The next six pages of the binion at the back of IV 65 are in Beckers’ hand, and contain proper antiphons, versicles and collects in Latin for fourteen feasts whose offices had not been included when the printed diurnal was published in 1757. The first of these is that of the patronage of Joseph, already mentioned above as being celebrated on the third Sunday after Easter because the Blessed Virgin’s spouse was Soeterbeeck’s second patron saint, but not included in Beckers’ diurnal IV 58. The third is the feast of Pope Gregory VII (25 May), which had been suppressed in the Austrian Netherlands, where IV 65 was printed, since 1750, and has therefore not been included in the printed proper of saints. The other feasts for which the rector added texts fall in two categories. First, there are those that were added to the calendar of the universal Church after 1757. As was the case with IV 60, the most recent of these to be included is that of Fidelis of Sigmaringen, which means that Beckers added his notes to the binion in IV 65 before 1784, or based himself on a source from that period. He did not include even a reference to the feast of Camillus de Lellis (18 July), which had been instituted for the entire Church on 16 September 1767, but that is probably merely a mistake.

---

1 These unnumbered folia are collectively referred to as IV 65:3, because they follow the diurnal (IV 65:1) and an additional bibliographical unit containing the office for the feast of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February), a double feast for the subjects of Austria. For a survey of the contents of IV 65:3, see Table 3.3.
2 The reasoning behind my conclusion regarding the date of their addition to the Windesheim calendar is that printed bifolia with the offices of these feasts were added at the back of IV 63, a copy of *Officia propria* that was printed in 1753.
3 For completeness’ sake, it should be noted that IV 63 is not the only copy of the *Officia propria* from the library of Soeterbeeck to have been expanded like this. Handwritten copies of the collects of the feasts of Israel, Theobald, Faucher and Bertrand were also added to IV 64 (also printed in 1753), between pp. 24-25, 28-29, 102-103, 232-233, and, together with those of Peter Fourier (7 July) and John Cantius (20 October), to the back of IV 41 (printed in 1699). At the front of IV 127 (printed in 1652), an appendix of eighteen folia is included on which an unidentified hand wrote the proper texts for Vespers and a commemoration of Lauds of all proper feasts of Windesheim—including the four added after 1753—which the printed book does not contain or for which it provides different texts (IV 127:1).
4 Cf. pp. 118, 123.
5 On the suppression of the feast of Gregory VII, see p. 120.
6 See p. 132.
7 Schober 1891, 229.
The second category of Beckers’ additions consists of texts for five proper feasts of the Congregation of Windesheim, namely those of all holy canons regular (5 March) and of the conversion (5 May), death (28 August) and translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October), as well as for a suffrage in his honour.

The seventh and the eighth pages of the binion were used by another, unidentified hand to add the hymn *Magne pater Augustine*. This was used by the Congregation of Windesheim for Vespers on the feasts of Augustine for which Beckers had already included other texts.

The nature of the material with which we are dealing here should be properly understood. Almost all surviving copies of the *Horae*, including IV 60 and IV 65, have been rebound. It is impossible to say with certainty what material was lost in the process and what the original context was of the loose objects that were probably simply included where the binder found them. Both the binion and the other eighteen folia at the back of IV 65 originally consisted of loose bifolia that were only physically attached to the printed book at the moment of rebinding. If it is accepted that this collection was indeed intended as an expansion of a copy of the *Horae diurnae* and not as something else entirely, that still does not mean that it was necessarily written for the book of which it is now a part. I grant that this is the most straightforward scenario, even though the printed core of IV 65 does not contain any of the marginal references to an appendix that appear in IV 60. In theory, however, the additions could just as well have been meant for IV 66, another copy of the edition of 1757, or even for IV 61 and IV 62, which were printed in 1749. All universal feasts for which Beckers included texts in his binion postdate 1769, but the only universal feast to have been instituted between then and 1749 was that of Camillus de Lellis, which the rector apparently forgot to take into account. Unless one insists that Camillus’ omission might mean that Beckers had in mind a hypothetical edition of the *Horae* that had been printed between 1767 and 1769, the conclusion is that the rector’s binion fits the older *Horae* just as well as IV 65. Again, the only relatively certain inference is that it was preserved there when Ter Haar got his hands on the volume.

Whether or not it was meant by Beckers to be there, however, I do maintain that the binion that currently appears at the back of IV 65 is probably an example of the kind of source to which his references in IV 60 are keyed. It was certainly not that booklet itself, though. The now-lost companion to the diurnal printed in 1696 appears to have been compiled on the basis of different principles than the folia that survive in IV 65, perhaps because it was not written by Beckers or else because the rector changed his mind on what should be included.

However this may be, it is clear that, although the rector’s revisions, references and additions in Soeterbeek’s printed diurnals can be grouped together on the basis of their functional dimension because they all serve the general purpose of making the books more up to date, they do so in three distinct ways and in the context of three distinct projects. Clearly, Beckers spent a certain amount of time and care working on the *Horae diurnae*, and just as clearly, the surviving traces of this process are not nearly numerous enough to fully understand his purpose.

For example, two interesting but difficult questions are why Beckers chose to also include texts for five proper feasts of the Congregation of Windesheim—those of Augustine and all saints—in his binion in IV 65, and what his motivations were for picking only these. There is simply too little material to answer this by referring to the notes’ functional meaning in the context of the liturgy. The feasts of Augustine and all saints of the order were not selected because they had an unusual liturgical rank or because the inclusion of their texts

---

1 In Table 3.6 this is H42.
2 It may be mentioned that Bohatta 1963, 70 and Amiet 1990, 141 do not list any edition of the Roman Diurnal from this period.
would have served another practical purpose than that which those of other Windesheim feasts would have had. None of these possible interpretations fit, and so, as the functional possibilities suggested by the texts have run out, I must restrict myself to their symbolic meaning. They belong to the feasts of the sisters’ spiritual fathers. It will be remembered that texts for the same five feasts were also excerpted from IV 58 and added to one of Soeterbeeck’s books of hours. I argued above that this was not because these Dutch texts were actually used in the liturgy, but probably because the owner of IV 48 wished to meditate on them.\footnote{See p. 127.} Although the additions that survive in IV 65 are in Latin and may therefore have functioned in a liturgical context, it is no longer possible to explain their presence on this level, and they can therefore at most be said to offer a glimpse of Soeterbeeck’s Augustinian spirituality.

3.3.3.2. From Commemorations to Offices?

Having sketched the contents of Beckers’ binion at the back of IV 65 in general terms, it is now time to try to define its functional meaning with more precision, difficult as this has just been shown to be. The remarkable thing, namely, is that the rector added only those proper texts that are necessary for commemorations at Lauds and Vespers. Feasts such as those of the conversion and death of Augustine, the patronage of Joseph and John Cantius, which also have other proper texts besides a Benedictus and one or two Magnificat antiphons, a versicle and a collect, are nonetheless not given these. All other categories of liturgical texts are excluded. In short, Beckers’ notes on the folia at the back of IV 65—and presumably also the hypothetical lost ones that he refers to in IV 60—are only commemorations, not full-blown offices.

The reader will probably remember that I concluded, with reference to the rector’s manuscript diurnal IV 58 in the previous paragraph, that it seemed to indicate that the choir sisters who were its intended users only said the divine office at second or both Vespers and Compline on Sundays and (semi)double feasts. Beyond that, they limited themselves to the Little Office, though the latter was expanded with commemorations at Lauds and Vespers on the same occasions and on days within octaves and the major ferias, and at Lauds on most vigils.\footnote{See pp. 124-127.} In this light, it is likely that, if Beckers’ notes that survive at the back of IV 65 indeed served a liturgical purpose, this was to expand the Hours of the Virgin. But in this respect they differ from the traces of his production of IV 58, which did not only consist of translations of commemorations, but also of vernacular versions of complete offices for Vespers on Sundays and feasts.

If it is true that Beckers’ commemorations in IV 65, and the ones which he presumably referred to in the margins of the proper of saints of IV 60, were used to supplement the Little Office of the Virgin, their temporal dimension suddenly becomes highly relevant. It is far from certain, since it is impossible to know what books or loose documents with notes by Beckers have been lost, but his surviving traces in the printed diurnals seem to date from before 1784. Those of his production of the manuscript diurnal IV 58, however, are from between 1785 and 1787, which might lead to the attractive conclusion that the difference in the contents of the two units represents a change in Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice. This interpretation of the evidence would say that, as the printed diurnals were only expanded with commemorations, it seems likely that this was all they were being used for. This means that, for the first years of Beckers’ rectorate the sisters of Soeterbeeck were saying only the Little Office of the Virgin, expanded at Vespers and Lauds on most days with commemorations of feasts from the canonical hours, taken from the Horae diurnae. At some point before 1787, the decision was then made that on Sundays and feasts the sisters would actually say Vespers
and Compline according to the divine office, and Beckers accordingly wrote IV 58 to help them do so. This reconstruction of events would appear to be supported by the fact, discussed below,\textsuperscript{1} that the rector’s revision of Soeterbeek’s late medieval antiphonaries dates from the same period as the writing of his diurnal.

Attractive as this scenario is, it is probably not realistic. If the rector expanded some of the convent’s printed diurnals by adding commemorations to them for the Hours of the Virgin, that does not in itself prove that the divine office was not being said at all at Soeterbeek until after 1784. There are several reasons for this. First, it is difficult to imagine that the sisters should have bought or otherwise sought to obtain copies of the *Horae diurnae* in the eighteenth century only to mine them for antiphons, versicles and collects to use for commemorations in the Hours of the Virgin.\textsuperscript{2} Second, discolouration and damage to the pages containing the psalms for canonical Sunday Vespers in every single surviving copy of Soeterbeek’s *Horae diurnae* clearly shows that these were being prayed, although it cannot of course be said with certainty when this happened. Third, there is strong evidence in Soeterbeek’s antiphonaries, presented in the following paragraph,\textsuperscript{3} that canonical Vespers and Compline were already being prayed on Sundays and feasts (and within octaves) both in the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. I cannot explain why Beckers only added texts for commemorations to the binion that survives in IV 65, but it almost certainly was not because that was all for which the sisters were using the *Horae diurnae*.

Still, the evidence indeed suggests that the rector abandoned the *Horae diurnae* at about the time when he began working on his own diurnal and the antiphonaries. This needs to be explained. That there is too little evidence that the rector’s switch represents a landslide in the liturgical practice of the sisters, does not mean that his decision to stop working on the *Horae diurnae* is not problematic if their continued use for the divine office is assumed. The only solution is, once again, to assume that a thorough textual *Gleichschaltung* and further updates were no longer necessary because the books’ continued multivocality could somehow be dealt with or circumvented in practice, and the necessary additions were to be found elsewhere. Strong evidence that the latter, at least, was the case is provided by Beckers’ work on the convent’s late medieval manuscript antiphonaries, which is the subject of the next paragraph.

3.3.4. Later Traces of Use in the *Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani*

It is not possible, however, to simply abandon the *Horae diurnae* without considering what happened to them after Beckers’ rectorate. It has already been hinted that, although the surviving evidence suggests that he had personally ceased working on these books by 1784, they continued to be updated by other people until a much later date.\textsuperscript{4} This is confirmed by the remarkable number of additional texts in a bewildering number of hands that appear in IV 60 and IV 65, and indeed in most of the other printed diurnals from the library of Soeterbeek as well.\textsuperscript{5} These traces of use seem to indicate that the books in which they appear stopped

\textsuperscript{1}See p. 148.

\textsuperscript{2}Cf. p. 82.

\textsuperscript{3}See pp. 169-171.

\textsuperscript{4}Cf. pp. 129, 132 n. 2, 134.

\textsuperscript{5}Those in IV 66 are described on pp. 139 n. 9, 140. On a piece of paper that was used as front pastedown in IV 70 when it was rebound, an unidentified hand wrote the collect for the post-1753 Windesheim feast of Bertrand of Comminges (16 October). At the back of the same book, besides a printed proper of the diocese of Liège, there are two folia (referred to as IV 70:2) on which other hands added texts for the feasts of Titus (10 January), Peter Canisius (27 April), Angela Merici (31 May), Lambert of Maastricht (17 September)—the collect his feast has on p. 4 of the proper of ’s-Hertogenbosch in IV 57, not that on p. 7 of the proper of Liège in IV 70:1—, Francis de Geronimo (11 May; cf. p. 139 n. 3) and the patronage of Joseph (third Sunday after Easter). IV 61 contains, between pp. 322-323, a copy, printed in Mechelen by Dessain in 1864 of the office for the Immaculate
being used liturgically only at a very late date. The folla at the back of IV 65 extend to 1882 at least, and one of the other diurnals, with shelf mark IV 57, was printed in 1883, and includes various additions of which the most recent are handwritten collects for the feasts of John of Damascus (27 March), John of Capistrano (28 March) and Sylvester Gozzolini (26 November), all instituted or extended to the universal Church on 19 August 1890.\footnote{1} So the surviving additions to Soeterbeeck’s *Horae*, though far from complete, extend almost to the twentieth century. Considering the likelihood of many additional texts having been written on loose slips of paper that were not included in any rebinding and have therefore been lost, I do not doubt that the *Horae diurnae* continued to be used until the sisters of Soeterbeeck readopted the Roman Breviary in 1906.

**Exкурsус: Late Traces of Use in IV 60**

In IV 60, there are three hands in addition to Beckers’ that provide marginal references to places where texts for additional feasts can be found. The first of these added one for the feast of Fidelis of Sigmaringen (24 April),\footnote{2} probably to remedy the fact that Beckers’ own reference accidentally gives the wrong date (16 April).\footnote{3} The reference is to a *getijdeboek,*\footnote{4} but it is unclear whether this can be the same hypothetical appendix that Beckers seems to refer to. If the reference ever included a page number, it has been trimmed off by Ter Haar.

The second additional hand to write marginal references in IV 60 added one to the office of Lawrence Giustiniani (5 September),\footnote{5} which the diurnal includes for use *ad libitum,*\footnote{6} but which had since been made obligatory as a semidouble by Clement XIII (1758-1769).\footnote{7} Beckers had not included a reference to this feast because it did not have any proper text.\footnote{8} The other hand also remedied the rector’s omission of a reference to the feast of Andrew Avellino by writing its collect on a slip of paper now bound in the book.\footnote{9} Besides these two corrections of Beckers’ work, the first superfluous but the other necessary, the same hand also added a collect for the feast of John of Bridlington (10 October),\footnote{10} and a reference to that of Possidius of Calama (17 May) on p. 27, presumably of the same appendix that Beckers refers to.\footnote{11} Both of these feasts were proper to the Congregation of Windesheim,\footnote{12} and therefore beyond the scope of Beckers’ notes in IV 60. Why this hand singled them out for reference and addition, I cannot say.

A third and final additional hand was certainly much later than Beckers’ and made four additions to IV 60. Two of these are inexplicable to me. One is a reference to the feast of Conception of the Blessed Virgin (8 December) as it had been revised on 27 August or 25 September 1863 (Schober 1891, 181). Finally, IV 62 contains, between pp. 328-329, handwritten texts for the feast of the Most Precious Blood of Jesus (1 July), as well as, between pp. 358-359, a manuscript collect of the feast of Peter Fourier (7 July).

\footnote{1} IV 57, between pp. [142]-[143]. Earlier additional texts include printed commemorations of the Passion and the angels, preserved between pp. [146]-[147], and the office of the feast of the Rosary (first Sunday in October), issued on 5 August 1888 (Schober 1891, 250) and printed by Pustet in Regensburg in that same year, preserved between pp. 374-375. The complete votive offices not only of the angels and the Passion but also of the apostles, Joseph, the Eucharist and the Immaculate Conception, allowed for celebration as semidoubles on weekdays of the year on 5 July 1883 (cf. Bäumer 1895, 593-594), and printed in Mechelen by Dessain in that same year, are also included. These are followed by a proper, printed in Mechelen by Dessain in 1869, of the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosh that had been re-established in 1853 (cf. Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 85-87), and to which Soeterbeeck belonged.

\footnote{2} IV 60, p. 358.

\footnote{3} See Table 3.2.2, no. 3.

\footnote{4} ‘Book of hours.’

\footnote{5} IV 60, p. 425.

\footnote{6} IV 60, p. cxii.

\footnote{7} A Carpo 1885, 550, no. 194.

\footnote{8} Cf. also IV 63, p. 203.

\footnote{9} IV 60, between pp. 456 and 457.

\footnote{10} IV 60, between pp. 446 and 447.

\footnote{11} IV 60, p. 369.

\footnote{12} IV 63, pp. 124-127, 224-227.
Scholastica of Nursia (10 February), which had already been referred to by the rector,¹ and the other is a reference to Francis de Geronimo (11 May),² a Jesuit saint beatified in 1806 for whose veneration at Soeterbeeck I see no clear reason.³ The other two additions consist of a reference to the feast of Alphonsus Liguori (2 August),⁴ which was extended to the universal Church by Gregory XVI on 18 September 1839,⁵ and the addition on a slip of paper of the collect for the feast of Josaphat of Polotsk (14 November),⁶ which was extended to the universal Church on 28 July 1882.⁷ Although it is odd for these two feasts to be selected like this from among all the other nineteenth-century additions to the calendar, they are universal feasts that have not been included and therefore the presence of the references itself makes sense. Interestingly enough, the one to Alphonsus again mentions a getijboek,⁸ as does the note in the first additional hand.

The three hands mentioned so far were all involved in expanding Beckers’ body of marginal references. There are also several notes by other nineteenth-century hands in IV 60, two of which are of interest.⁹ First, the book contains a loose leaf, which was not attached to the text block when it was rebound, with the collect for Paul of the Cross (28 April),¹⁰ whose feast was extended to the universal Church on 14 January 1869.¹¹ Second, there is a note below the collect of the feast of Bernard of Clairveaux (20 August) that was largely trimmed off during the rebounding, but whose only remaining words seem to say orationem Bernardi.¹² This note is probably related to Bernard’s elevation to the rank of Doctor of the Church by Pius VIII on 20 August 1830.¹³ Because of this, the collect given by the printed text of IV 60 (Intercessio nos), which was taken from the common of abbots, had to be replaced by the appropriate collect from the common of Doctors (Deus, qui populo tuo). The note in the margin was probably meant to implement this change by means of a reference. The same change has been effected in IV 65, with a reference to the collect of Bonaventure of Bagnoregio (14 July),¹⁴ who was already a Doctor of the Church when the book was printed and therefore had the right text.

¹ See Table 3.2.2, no. 8.
² IV 60, p. 368.
³ Francis was beatified by Pius VII on 2 May 1806, and on that occasion the recitation of his proper office, with the rank of greater double, was permitted to the Jesuits and the cities and the dioceses of Taranto and Naples (Barberi, Segreti and Spezia 1835-1857, 13: 20-22, no. 426, esp. no. 4, 6). He was canonised by Gregory XVI on 26 May 1839, but on that occasion no new arrangements were made for his feast, except that the saint was to be commemorated by the universal Church on the fifth ides of May (11 May), presumably in the martyrology (Bernasconi 1901-1904, 2: 323-327, no. 114). The only explanation that I can think of for the presence of a reference to this saint in not one but two books of Soeterbeeck—for besides IV 60 his collect has also been added to IV 70 (cf. p. 137 n. 5)—is the fact that the convent owned particles of his bones (ASP 250, certificate of authenticity 9 May 1831), although these relics would not be noteworthy enough to require his office to be said (cf. A Carpo 1885, 285-286, no. 185).
⁴ IV 60, p. 402.
⁵ Schober 1891, 234.
⁶ IV 60, between pp. 460-461.
⁷ Schober 1891, 258.
⁸ ‘Book of hours.’
⁹ First, the printed rubric on p. 32, identifying one of the psalms to be said at Prime on Fridays as Psalm 1, is corrected in pencil to read 21. This was also done in IV 66. Second, the number 118 was added in ink in several places on pp. 34-35, 39-40, 42-43 and 46-47, where it identifies each of the twenty-two stanzas of Psalm 119 (118) as they are distributed across the minor hours. It is difficult to see the practical use of these notes, but since not all of the stanzas are distinguished from each other typographically, and because only the first stanza is actually identified as belonging to Psalm 119 (118) (p. 34), they do serve a real purpose of identification. The same notes were also added, by the same hand, in IV 62.
¹⁰ IV 60, between pp. 302-303.
¹¹ Schober 1891, 207.
¹² ‘Bernard’s prayer’ (IV 60, p. 425).
¹³ Schober 1891, 239.
¹⁴ IV 65, p. 419.
EXCURSUS: LATE TRACES OF USE IN IV 65

The binion with notes by Beckers that survives in IV 65 has been discussed, but I have yet to address the eighteen additional folia that follow it. These consist of three ternions, on which various hands wrote additional texts. The first two quires have been used by a single, somewhat uneven hand, to include, first of all, a collect for the feast of Camillus de Lellis, which Beckers had forgotten to include in his binion,¹ and texts for the commemoration of feasts that had been added to the Roman calendar after that of Fidelis of Sigmaringen in 1771. The most recent one that this section caters for is that of Alphonsus Liguori (2 August), which was extended to the universal Church by Gregory XVI on 18 September 1839.² The rest of the first two ternions is occupied with texts for all Windesheim feasts not added by Beckers, including those of Israel, Theobald, Faucher and Bertrand which had already been present on the first page of the rector’s binion.³ This duplication is odd, but the purpose of the additions is abundantly clear: with its appendix, the user of the Horae diurnae would be able to commemorate all the feasts of the congregation, and have no need of a copy of the Windesheim Officia propria. The remnants of an appendix with the same rationale are also present at the front of IV 66, another diurnal printed in 1754.⁴

The third and final ternion that was added to IV 65 has an irregular composition. The first folium has been pasted onto an empty page of a different kind of paper by the binder. The second and fifth folia have been joined by a guard. Still, the text on the first folium runs on onto the second, so the pages do belong together in this order. This is not the case for the innermost bifolium, which is made of a different kind of paper and has been inserted although it should have been added at the back, as will appear hereafter. The composite nature of the quire is reflected by the hands that wrote the texts that are in it, the first of which is the same as that of the first two ternions in IV 65. It adds texts for the commemoration of the feast of the Most Precious Blood of Jesus (first Sunday in July), which was extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 10 August 1849.⁵ A second hand then includes texts for the feasts of Titus (10 January) and Angela Merici (31 May), instituted in 1854 and 1861,⁶ as well as for that of Peter Canisius (27 April). The latter was allowed to be celebrated in the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch on 20 October 1865,⁷ and appears to have been observed at Soeterbeeck because Peter was a regional saint, even though the rubrics do not foresee this. After this, the first hand returns for a final time to provide for the feast of Paul of the Cross (28 April), instituted in 1869.⁸ Two more hands then add texts for Boniface of Mainz (5 June) and Cyril and Methodius (5 July), instituted in 1874 and 1880 respectively.⁹ The inserted inner bifolium, finally, is written in yet another hand and includes texts for the feasts of Cyril of Alexandria (9 February), Cyril of Jerusalem (18 March), Justin Martyr (14 April), Augustine of Canterbury (28 May) and Josaphat of Polotsk (14 November), all of which were instituted simultaneously by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882.¹⁰ In short, this final quire consists of texts for one

¹ See p. 134.
² Schober 1891, 234. In IV 60, Alphonsus is identified as bishop-confessor, and not yet as a Doctor of the Church, which he was declared to be by Pius IX on 7 July 1871.
³ See p. 134.
⁴ The remnants of the appendix in IV 66 consist of two bifolia entitled Festa nostri ordinis, conscripta a J.P.M. Broekman (‘Feasts of our order, written by J.P.M. Broekman’). No J. Broekman is known to me. The folia are bound in the wrong order; what is now the fourth folium should have been the second one. What is left of this appendix contains antiphons, versicles and collects for commemorations of the feasts that were proper to the Congregation of Windesheim as present in Beckers’ proper of saints (IV 63), from 1 December (Gelasius I) to 17 March (Patrick of Ireland). In addition, there is also a collect for Peter Damian (23 February), whose feast had been extended to the universal Church when he was made a Doctor of the Church by Leo XII on 27 September or 1 October 1828 (Schober 1891, 198). Only the main part of the first folio is in Broekman’s hand; the final entry on the first folio (4 February) and the others are all in another.
⁵ Schober 1891, 222.
⁶ Schober 1891, 197, 214.
⁷ Collectio 1914, 325-326, no. 72.II. The bull in which Pius IX announced Peter’s beatification on 20 November 1864 had only allowed the recitation of his office in the dioceses of Utrecht and Lausanne, and in churches and houses of the Society of Jesus (Rieß 1865, 563).
⁸ Schober 1891, 214.
⁹ Schober 1891, 218, 227.
¹⁰ Schober 1891, 197, 200, 205, 214, 258.
regional and eleven universal feasts, added consecutively as they were being introduced between 1849 and 1882.

It should be noted that there are a few peculiarities to the contents of the three ternions that make up the remainder of the appendix of IV 65. First, it includes the proper texts of the regional feast of Mary de Socos (26 September), despite the fact that the printed part of IV 65 already includes these.1 Second, the feast of Jerome Emilian (20 July), already added by Beckers, is also included superfluously. More problematic than these inexplicable additions, however, are the numerous omissions. Windesheim feasts that are not included are those of Anthony of Padua (13 June) and Laurence O’Toole (14 November),2 and among the universal feasts instituted after 1771, the omissions are those of Paschal Baylon (17 May), Peter Damian (23 February), Aloysius Gonzaga (21 June) and the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Friday after the Octave of Corpus Christi). Aloysius’ feast was probably omitted because the printed book includes it pro aliquibus locis, but for the omission of the other feasts I see no reason.

The gaps and doubles in the ternions raise the question whether they were written as a supplement to Beckers’ binion, or if they were only added to it when IV 65 was rebound. This possibility is suggested by the repetition of the Windesheim feasts added after 1753 and of the feasts of Jerome and Mary de Socos, although the addition of Camillus de Lellis, after Beckers had forgotten it, and the careful omission of the majority of feasts included by the rector, contradict it. Possibly the pages were written to be added to another, similar appendix by Beckers that is now lost. This hypothetical document must have omitted the feasts both of Camillus and Jerome and been added to a copy of the Horae diurnae which did not yet include the feast of Mary de Socos in its section pro aliquibus locis. Candidates that currently survive in the Soeterbeeck Collection would be IV 61 and IV 62, printed in 1749. This does not explain all of the omissions, however, and adds the additional problem that the feast of the Seven Founders, whose office has been added to IV 65 but is not currently present in the earlier books, is not included. Because the other appendices which must once have existed, such as the one referred to in Beckers’ notes to IV 60, do not survive, the question whether the appendix to IV 65 forms a uniform whole cannot be answered with certainty. Once more it seems easiest to assume that the binder simply included in each volume the additional material that he found there, and that means the additional ternions were at least kept with Beckers’ binion.

The conclusion that Soeterbeeck’s Horae diurnae were used until 1906 raises important questions concerning why and how this was the case. First, what liturgical use may the Horae diurnae have had in the period between the 1850s and 1906, when the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck and Nazareth only said the Little Office?3 Probably to supply commemorations for the Hours of the Virgin. This function was considered above and ultimately discarded with reference to Beckers’ rectorate,4 but none of the problems that applied there are present for the second half of the nineteenth century. By then, most of the Horae diurnae—as with the exception of the before-mentioned IV 57 and IV 70—had been used at Soeterbeeck for a hundred years or more, so that the relation between the cost of acquisition and the books’ intended function did not play as much of a role anymore. If the old books were only used for commemorations, that was still better than no use at all. What is more, whereas there is evidence, in Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 and in the books that are considered in the next paragraphs, that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck were saying part of the divine office during Beckers’ rectorate, it is certain that they only said the Little Office of the Virgin between circa 1851 and 1906. So whereas it was untenable with reference to the end of the eighteenth

---

1 IV 65:1, p. cxxii.
2 The reason for the omission of Anthony of Padua does not appear to be that the feast is also listed with the same rank on the universal calendar, and that the office is the same as that in the Roman Breviary (cf. IV 63, p. 137). The latter is also the case, for instance, with the feast Leo II (28 June), which is included (cf. IV 63, p. 146).
3 Cf. pp. 88-94.
4 See pp. 82, 137.
century, the conclusion that the *Horae diurnae* were only being used for commemorations during the second half of the nineteenth century is very reasonable.

Of course, the use of the *Horae diurnae* for the Little Office presupposes that the later additions and revisions in these books were all made after the complete abandonment of the divine office but before the readoption of the Roman Breviary. Because none of the hands besides Beckers’ have been identified, there is no reason to doubt that this is the case, and given that many of the added texts belong to feasts that were instituted in the second half of the nineteenth century, it actually seems likely. Also, any continued use of the old *Horae* for the divine office is entirely precluded by the two major revisions of the breviary that took place around the turn of the twentieth century, promulgated by Leo XIII on 11 December 1897,¹ and by Pius X in the apostolic constitution *Divino afflatu* of 1 November 1911.²

Another question that is raised by the ongoing use of the *Horae* in the nineteenth century has to do with their rebinding. Mention has already been made of the fact that the pages of these books have been trimmed and that this resulted in loss of text in some of the additions.³ What I have not yet mentioned is that, in the case of the appendix in IV 65, the loss is so severe that it makes the added pages almost entirely useless. It should be understood, however, that the man who is responsible for this, G.H. ter Haar of Ravenstein, cannot simply be dismissed as a sloppy hack. Although there is at least one instance where he bound folia in the wrong order,⁴ the fact that he included as much of the loose material that was in these books as he did, actually suggests some care on his part. It often happens that binders trim too mercilessly, and the fatal damage to the pages was only to be expected. Does this mean that the sisters only had these books rebound after it had ceased mattering to them whether they were up to date or not? That cannot very well have been the case as long as the books were still in use, and so the sisters may well have had their books rebound only to shelve them, sometime after 1906. Granted, this conclusion has its problems. The idea that the monastic community would make a possibly not inconsiderable investment on behalf of books that it no longer actually used, is not particularly attractive.⁵ The issue is also complicated by the fact that I cannot date the binding of IV 60, IV 62 and IV 65 with any precision, because I know nothing about the binder besides his name and his place of work. Still, I would argue that the weight of such objections is more than counterbalanced by that of the uselessness of the additions in the books’ current state. I therefore conclude that the rebinding was motivated on the sisters’ part by a desire to preserve these books after they had ceased to be in active use.

I now conclude my discussion of the traces of use in Soeterbeeck’s *Horae diurnae* by summarising my findings, which may be useful before I turn to the antiphonaries. The reader will remember that the precise functional meaning of Beckers’ revisions, references and additions in IV 60 and IV 65 defeats me when I try to move beyond the observable fact that they provide occasional corrections and (references to) commemorations of certain feasts. The rector’s traces are in Latin and may therefore have had some sort of liturgical use, but that is all that I can say. Whatever the function Beckers had meant for them to have when he added his notes, however, the *Horae diurnae* by definition point to the divine rather than the Little Office. I repeat, therefore, what I said at the beginning of this paragraph: that the very presence of these books at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century provides evidence for some

---

¹ On this revision, see Bäumer 1905, 2: 461-495.
² For the text of this constitution, and a description of its revision of the breviary, see *AAS* 3 (1911): 633-651.
³ See pp. 129, 131 n. 4, 138-139.
⁴ This happened to the preliminary matter of IV 60, which was purposefully rebound in the order ff. *2, *1, *5, *6, *3, *4, *7, *8, apparently because the binder wished the typographical title page to come before the engraved one.
⁵ However, there is at least one more example of a useless book being rebound at Soeterbeeck—although not professionally; cf. pp. 195-196.
form of celebration of the diurnal canonical hours at the time.\(^1\) Being actual liturgical books they do so even more strongly than the rector’s own manuscript IV 58. Even more certainty is provided by Beckers’ work on the convent’s late medieval manuscript antiphonaries, to which I now turn.

3.4. The Traces of Use in Soeterbeeck’s Late Medieval Antiphonaries

Leaving the *Horae diurnae* behind, I now turn to Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries, the books that contain the largest single body of notes in Beckers’ hand. In order to discuss these, it is necessary first to provide a description of the genre as well as the specific examples of it that the convent owned.

3.4.1. The Antiphonary from the Library of Soeterbeeck

Antiphonaries are not books of prose like breviaries, but books of chant. They contain noted versions of specific types of texts used in the divine office, namely antiphons and responsories. Some of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries also contain hymns, but since these were historically contained in another type of book called a hymnal and also pose their own problems with regard to Beckers’ treatment of them, they are discussed in a paragraph of their own. What distinguishes antiphons and responsories from the other texts of the office is that they can be sung to more or less elaborate melodies, that are tailor-made for them. By contrast, the other elements—the psalms, canticles, chapters, lessons, hymns, versicles and collects—are sung or recited to a common stock of usually comparatively uncomplicated tones. The antiphonary, in other words, is a companion to the breviary for use on occasions when elements of the latter are to be sung. It is built up of the same sections as the printed diurnals that were discussed above, for although it obviously lacks the calendar and the psalter, it also consists of a proper of time and a proper and common of saints.

As mentioned in the previous chapter,\(^2\) there are eighteen more or less complete antiphonaries, both in the Soeterbeeck Collection and outside of it, that are known to have been owned by the convent for some part of its existence.\(^3\) These consist of fourteen late medieval manuscripts, one eighteenth-century manuscript, and three early printed books. Ten of the old manuscripts are believed to have been produced at Mariënhage and will either have come to Soeterbeeck immediately after their production or early on in its existence.\(^4\) One was probably illustrated and bound by the Brethren of the Common Life in ’s-Hertogenbosch for the convent of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage,\(^5\) and another appears to have been made for Sint-Geertruid in the same town.\(^6\) These books may have been brought along to Soeterbeeck

---

\(^1\) See p. 130.

\(^2\) See p. 54.

\(^3\) This tally does not include manuscript IV 17 and Fr. 3, which came to Soeterbeeck from Mariëndaal in 1954. The book’s provenance is evident from a library note on the front flyleaf, and the fragment’s attribution is based on an oral tradition at Soeterbeeck that is reported on by Van Dijk in a deed, dated 24 May 2007 and preserved with the fragment itself, that describes the conveyance of this and three other manuscript fragments, whose identity I have not been able to ascertain, to the Stichting Kunstopatrimonium Soeterbeeck.

\(^4\) IV 4, IV 6, the second unit of the nocturnal breviary—cum-antiphony IV 16 (ff. 148-291), IV 21, IV 22, IV 25, IV 132 in the Soeterbeeck Collection, and The Hague, RL, 130 G 18 (to which Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection once belonged), Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs, and Tilburg, UL, KHS 28. For references to descriptions of these manuscripts, see p. 54 n. 6.

\(^5\) See p. 54.\(^7\)

\(^6\) IV 7. For a description of this manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 58-59

\(^7\) IV 15. For a description, see Kienhorst 2005, 60-61. The attribution of this manuscript, dated to ca. 1499 on the basis of its watermarks, to Sint-Geertruid is based on the fact that it contains an antiphon for a suffrage for that convent’s patron, Gertrude the Great (f. 253r-v). The literature associates the binding of this book with Windmolenberg or Bethanië, a convent of canonesses regular in ’s-Hertogenbosch that was founded in 1467 and incorporated into the Chapter of Venlo in 1485 (Van Dijk 2000, 73-74; Kienhorst 2005, 61). This is based on what was believed to be a binder’s mark, consisting of a shield in the lower border of a panel stamp of the
by the seven sisters of Sint-Annencorch who moved there in 1613, for their convent had sheltered the sisters of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage since 1543 and been in ’s-Hertogenbosch since 1573. The origin and provenance of the remaining two medieval manuscripts is unknown.

The eighteenth-century manuscript antiphonary is IV 8. Together with the hymnals IV 54 and Add. 10, which are discussed below, it is one of three books in the Soeterbeeck Collection that were written in a hand that belonged to an unidentified canon regular who lived at Gaesdonck in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The antiphonary, consisting of 152 folia (35.5 x 23.3 cm.) bound in wooden boards covered with leather, was donated to Soeterbeeck by Beckers’ confrère Joannes van Steenbergen on 10 September 1793, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the latter’s investment, according to a note on one of its flyleaves in Beckers’ hand. The library of Gaesdonck preserves another manuscript hymnal in the same hand, which has Van Steenbergen’s initials stamped on the front board in gold, as does IV 8. Gaesdonck’s book of anniversaries is also in this hand, and because that book lists Van Steenbergen’s death in 1797, the hand in which it has been written cannot actually be his but must belong to one of his younger contemporaries.

The remaining, printed antiphonaries are IV 3, published in Tournai by Adrianus Quinque in 1627; IV 18, printed in Amsterdam by the heirs of the widow of Cornelis Stichter in 1735; and IV 19, printed in Antwerp by Henricus Aertssen in 1651. Of these printed volumes, only IV 3 was certainly at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days, as is evident from the presence in it of seventeenth-century traces of use. The other ones may well have been there too, but there is no evidence to support this.

As was the case with the breviaries, these antiphonaries are not a uniform mass. Among the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts, there are six winter and five summer parts, whereas the other manuscripts and the printed books cover the entire liturgical year. Not all antiphonaries cover the complete office, however, for there are two manuscripts (IV 7 and IV 8) as well as two early printed books (IV 18 and IV 19) that focus mainly on Vespers. Besides these differences in scope, there are also discrepancies on the level of the content. Textually, the medieval antiphonaries almost certainly follow the use of the Chapter of Windesheim, whereas the printed ones are Roman and IV 8 is a hybrid whose peculiarities are discussed below. The same threefold division also holds, of course, for the melodies to which the texts in the books are set. These differences as well as the many liturgical changes that took place over time mean that, if Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries are taken as they were originally written or printed, only three of them were potentially still useful in Beckers’ days.

crowned Virgin with Child on the front board of the binding. This was thought to show a windmill, flanked by two crosses. Upon closer inspection, however, the shield appears rather to be the mark of the diesinker than that of the binder, and it probably shows his monogram, IH or HI.

1 On the history of the convent of Sint-Annencorch, and the move of seven of its last sisters to Soeterbeeck in 1613, see pp. 4-5.
2 IV 131 and JRL, Latin 439. For a description of the former, see Kienhorst 2005, 134-135, and for one of the latter, see Cooper 1997, 41, no. 57.
3 See pp. 179, 182.
4 IV 8, recto second flyleaf. On Van Steenbergen, see Appendix B, no. 16.
5 This is currently CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 54, on which see Hövelmann 1987, 69, no. 54.
6 This is currently CAG, Monastic Archives, A 89 (olim Höv 42), on which see Hövelmann 1987, 68, no. 42.
7 CAG, Monastic Archives, A 89, p. 7.
9 The winter parts are IV 4; the second unit of IV 16 (ff. 148-291); IV 22; The Hague, RL, 130 G 18 (with Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection); PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. The summer parts are IV 6, IV 15, IV 21, IV 25 and JRL, Latin 439.
10 Cf. the discussion on the use of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval liturgical manuscripts on pp. 60-62.
11 See pp. 171-172.
On the one hand there are IV 18 and IV 19, which, though old, were not entirely obsolete yet, and on the other there is IV 8. Because of differences in the melodies, these books could not be used side by side. Given that one antiphonary could be used by only three to five sisters simultaneously, one or two of these books were not nearly enough for the circa twenty choir sisters who lived at Soeterbeeck at any one time during Beckers’ rectorate.\(^2\)

Now, there are various reasons to suppose that the convent once had more antiphonaries than the ones that have survived. A strong argument can, for instance, be made from the symmetry presented by the books listed so far. The previous chapter explained that the manuscripts from the library of Soeterbeeck that are attributed to Mariënghage can be divided into groups according to their age and appearance. I distinguished between books that were probably produced for Soeterbeeck between 1475 and 1480 and later ones.\(^3\) The antiphonaries that belong to the older group are the winter parts IV 4 and IV 22, and the summer parts IV 21 and IV 25. With the exception of IV 25, which no longer has its original binding, each of these manuscripts bears a note in an unidentified and undated hand on one of its flyleaves that attributes it to one of two choir stalls in Soeterbeeck’s conventual church. IV 4 and IV 21 are for the left,\(^4\) and IV 22 is for the right,\(^5\) as was IV 25, presumably. The later Mariënghage antiphonaries are the winter parts Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs and Tilburg, University Library, KHS 28, and the summer part IV 6. Of these, KHS 28 and IV 6 bear notes saying they were used in the right stall,\(^6\) whereas PBF 6168 Hs was used at the left.\(^7\) Symmetry demands, then, that a summer part for the left stall is now missing. A similar argument can be made from one of the antiphonaries whose origins are unknown, because the summer part Manchester, John Rylands Library, Latin 439 bears a note that attributes it to the right stall.\(^8\) This means that there must have been another winter part for that side as well, which is confirmed, in fact, by the presence in the Soeterbeeck Collection of various fragments of what appears to have been, on the basis of lay-out and general appearance, just this companion volume.\(^9\) The distribution just outlined would have left the left choir stall with only two complete sets of antiphonaries where the right one had three, so that at least one more winter and one more summer part must also have been present.\(^10\) There are sound

---

\(^1\) See p. 59.

\(^2\) Cf. Appendix A.1.

\(^3\) See pp. 57-60.

\(^4\) IV 4, recto first front flyleaf; IV 21, verso front flyleaf.

\(^5\) IV 22, verso first front flyleaf.

\(^6\) KHS 28, recto torn off first front flyleaf; IV 6, recto pasted down front flyleaf.

\(^7\) PBF 6168 Hs, verso of what is now the fourth front flyleaf.

\(^8\) JRL, Latin 439, verso front flyleaf.

\(^9\) The most significant surviving fragments of this antiphony are Fr. 4:1, Fr. 5, Fr. 6:1, Fr. 7-Fr. 14, and those that survive as part of the binding of III 55, III 60, III 65, III 66, III 68, III 71-III 73, III 228, III 229, III 232, III 235, III 237, III 241, IV 53, V 160, Add. 17-Add. 19 and in ASP 404. On some of these fragments, see Kienhorst 2009, 4-5, 20-31, 62-65. It is difficult to provide a complete survey of all fragments of this particular book, as many of them have been found in the spines of printed books whose bindings have come loose, so that it is impossible to say how many are still hidden. Others have been used to cover the boards of printed books and were afterwards painted black. The Soeterbeeck Collection contains many books bound in manuscript fragments whose nature cannot be identified because of this paint. I have also identified two additional fragments, each of a winter part that does not resemble any of Soeterbeeck’s other antiphonaries. The first of these has been used in the binding of III 64. It contains part of the antiphon *Præsidis imperio vestibus* of the feast of Barbara of Nicomedia (December), which is not used in the late medieval antiphonaries or breviaries from the library of Soeterbeeck (cf. IV 74, f. 176r; IV 80, f. 16v). The other fragment appears in the binding of III 222, and contains antiphons for Lauds on Holy Saturday. Both bindings appear to have been made by the sisters of Soeterbeeck themselves, so the books out of which these fragments were taken must have been there.

\(^10\) The antiphonary whose remnants are currently preserved as Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection and manuscript 130 G 18 in the Royal Library in The Hague might be one of these. It was finished by the Mariënghage canon Godefridus Boems (cf. the colophon on f. 105v), in the 1440s (Boeren 1988, 185-189, no. 76), so it does not belong to the group of Mariënghage manuscripts that were probably produced for Soeterbeeck, but traces of use
reasons, in short, for assuming that there were at least six complete sets of two antiphonaries for each half of the year at Soeterbeeck at one point—three winter and three summer parts for each choir stall. Of these twelve manuscripts, only eight survive, with two winter and two summer parts either lost, or alienated from the conventual library and not yet identified in other collections.

So even though the antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck make up a sizeable corpus—besides the eight manuscripts that bear notes distributing them across the stalls, there are also seven manuscripts and three printed books that do not—it is also sadly incomplete. As was the case with the *Horae diurnae*, this makes a meaningful discussion of Beckers’ work on those books that do survive rather complicated. I will attempt it, though, in the order with which the reader is familiar by now: first a discussion of the temporal, spatial, typological and functional dimensions of Beckers’ traces, followed by an analysis of the functional meaning of the books in which they appear in the context of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice that also involves earlier, contemporary and later traces of use in the same books.

### 3.4.2. Beckers’ Renovation of the Antiphonaries

Of at least eighteen late medieval antiphonaries that Soeterbeeck must once have possessed, fourteen survive. Of these, four were extensively revised by Rector Beckers: the winter parts KHS 28 and PBF 6168 Hs, the summer part IV 6 and the integral antiphonary for Vespers IV 7. A small number of notes in his hand also appear in the winter part IV 22 and the summer parts IV 15 and IV 25, but these are not nearly as numerous or consistent. The ones in the first two are ad hoc, as is discussed below, and in IV 25 they were the beginning of a thorough revision that was abandoned for some reason after the first six folia. Beckers also worked on the late eighteenth-century volume IV 8, but his notes there will be shown to have an entirely different character.

Before Beckers’ traces of use in these books can be discussed, it must be understood that the incompleteness of the corpus of antiphonaries is a very relevant issue here. If we assume, for the sake of the argument at present although it is substantiated below, that the books on which the rector worked had a liturgical function, then several of them must be lost. With about twenty choir sisters, one would expect there to have been at the very least four revised books for every half of the year, that is, two for every choir stall. Because IV 7 covers the entire liturgical year, this means that one winter and two summer parts, or else one integral antiphonary and one summer part, are missing. Thankfully, these numbers are within the scope of two winter and two summer parts that were argued to have been lost from Soeterbeeck’s original corpus of antiphonaries in the previous section, but only just. So although there is, strictly speaking, no *a priori* reason to rule out that Beckers’ revision had a liturgical function, we must be constantly aware of labouring under the grave disadvantage of having presumably lost nearly half of the manuscripts which the rector revised. This knowledge should not depress us, however, for despite the losses the amount of material that does survive is still remarkable, and it certainly allows for a cheerful attempt at interpretation.

#### 3.4.2.1. Temporal, Spatial, Typological and Functional Dimensions

The rector’s work on the manuscript antiphonaries occupies a unique position among his traces of use, in the sense that he commented on them. On the otherwise empty verso of the flyleaf at the front of IV 7 is a note in his hand in which he reports that the manuscript was

---

1 See p. 170.
3 See pp. 175-176.
Renovatum ab A. Beckers rectore 1787. The verso of the pasted-down flyleaf of IV 6 bears a note that is practically the same, except that it abbreviates Beckers’ title and omits the date. These colophons, though brief, are highly informative. Most importantly, they reveal the functional meaning which the rector considered his work on these two antiphonaries—and also that on the other two books, even though he did not leave such colophons in them—to have. He describes it as a renovatio, a renewal and a restoration. The meaning is that of something ravaged by time, unfit for use and forgotten, being recalled, repaired and made useful again. Clearly, Beckers’ intention was to revise these books, which had become obsolete because of the adoption by Windesheim of the Roman Breviary, in such a way that they could once again play a part in the convent’s liturgical practice of his days. He wished not to replace them with Roman Antiphonaries, but to change them so that, while retaining something of their old character, they were also up to date. What this entailed is discussed below, but I would first point to two other aspects of Beckers’ colophons.

First, he explicitly states that the renovation was carried out by him, and in the quality of rector. This is an act of appropriation, by which he connects these books with himself, his rectorate and the memory thereof. It will quickly become apparent that Beckers’ work on the antiphonaries must have cost him a lot of time and effort, and it stands to reason that he would have wanted to be commemorated for it in the sisters’ prayers as these were themselves made possible by his labour. When the sisters used the books that he had renovated for the fulfilment of their liturgical duties, they should think of him while doing so. If this was indeed one of his goals, it appears that he was succesful, for, as was already alluded to in the previous chapter, Priorress Magdalena Verhoeven’s obituary notice on Beckers in the volume with the seventeenth-century statutes commends him for the fact that he met veel iver voor de gemeent onse gemeente bediend heeft besonde door sijne schifte voor de koor. This shows that his liturgical writings, of which the renovation of the antiphonaries is the most conspicuous and extensive, was considered by the sisters to be one of his principal benefactions to the community, and they prayed for his repose because of it.

There is another, perhaps more straightforward, reason why Beckers mentions his name and title, however, and that is that they function as a stamp of approval. The seventeenth-century statutes, still in force a hundred years later, stipulate the following in the chapter on the librarian: Geen suster en mach corrigeren de boecken sonder oorlooff des bichtvaders noch veranderen bij haer selven. The gist of this stipulation is clearly that the revision of books took place at the discretion of the sisters’ ordinary confessor, that is, the rector, and that the task was therefore primarily and in the first instance his. By adding colophons to two antiphonaries that state that he was the one to carry out the renovation of these books, Beckers takes his undeniable rectoral responsibility for it and thereby guarantees its liceity.

---
1 ‘Renovated by Rector A. Beckers, 1787’ (IV 7, verso front flyleaf).
2 On this note, see p. 25 n. 2.
3 See pp. 148-152.
4 See p. 81.
5 ‘With great zeal for our community served our community, especially by his writings for the choral prayer services’ (ASP 92, f. 51v). On Verhoeven, see Appendix A.1, no. 31.
6 On the way in which Beckers was commemorated at Soeterbeeck, see pp. 302-303.
7 See pp. 70-71.
8 ‘No sister can correct the books without the confessor’s permission, nor change them of her own accord’ (ASP 92, f. 18r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 230). The late medieval statutes of the canonesses regular of Windesheim are even more strict, and specify that liturgical books cannot be revised without the general chapter’s consent, not even on the level of accents or spelling, unless it is to bring them into accordance with one of the chapter’s approved copies, or if the rector or other competent brothers conclude there is an error (Van Dijk 1986, 773-774). Because Soeterbeeck was not a member of Windesheim, this provision never applied.
9 But see p. 166.
The final aspect of Beckers’ colophons that I need to discuss, besides the mention of his goal and his name and title, is the date that is added to it in IV 7. Because of it, we know that 1787 was the year in which he finished renovating this particular antiphonary. The revision of IV 6, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28 is not dated, but it is all part of the same project, which may have taken a considerable amount of time, but probably was a single, more or less sustained effort. It is likely that IV 7 was the first book that Beckers renovated, partly because as an antiphonary for the entire year it would be a logical place for him to start and partly because his treatment of this book was slightly more careful than that of the rest, as is exemplified below. The chronology of his work on the other books is less certain, but IV 6 probably followed IV 7 because it also contains a colophon, and there are some peculiarities to his notes in PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28 that seem to indicate that he renovated those two in tandem. The fact that Beckers left his revision of IV 25 unfinished may mean that that manuscript was the last one on which he began working.

Whatever the particular order in which it happened, it is significant that the renovation of the antiphonaries took place in or around 1787. I have argued above that this was about the time when Beckers abandoned his work on the Horae diurnae and wrote his Dutch diurnal IV 58. The traces of these activities are all interconnected along their temporal dimension. At some point the rector stopped writing the notes that appear in the printed diurnals, which appeared to have to do mostly with commemorations of feasts, and turned to the writing of a manuscript which includes translations also of full canonical offices for Compline and one or both Vespers on Sundays and feasts. This seems to indicate a shift in attention that must have taken place between 1784 and 1787, which is confirmed by the fact that Beckers’ revision of certain late medieval antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck belongs to the later phase.

Before I can go into more detail about the relationship between Beckers’ work on his diurnal and the antiphonaries on the one hand and Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice on the other, it is necessary first to discuss what his renovation of the former actually is along its functional dimension. Put simply, what did he do with the late medieval manuscripts and what was his aim?

In answering this question, a distinction must be made between the rector’s treatment of the texts and that of the melodies in these antiphonaries. As far as the texts are concerned, Beckers wished to bring the offices in the Windesheim manuscripts for canonical Vespers and Compline on Sundays and (semi)double feasts into accordance with those in the Roman books of his days, with an eye also to the particular demands of Soeterbeeck’s own liturgical calendar. Wherever the manuscripts provide different chants for Vespers on a particular Sunday or feast than the Roman books, Beckers changed the manuscripts’ contents in such a way as to make its texts agree with the latter. With reference to the melodies, however, he tried to adhere to the manuscript tradition whenever possible. In other words, the rector wished to enable the sisters to sing the contemporary version of canonical Vespers and Compline from their old manuscripts, at least on Sundays and feasts.

An example will make clear what Beckers’ revision of the late medieval antiphonaries meant in practice. Take, for instance, the feast of the Dedication of Michael the Archangel (29 September). This feast, with the rank of second class double, is one of those whose two Vespers Beckers renovated in the summer part IV 6 and in IV 7. In the Roman Breviary, the feast has a complete proper office, but because antiphonaries only include antiphons and responsories, and Vespers according to the Tridentine liturgy of Beckers’ days does not

---

1 See pp. 149-151.
2 Cf. pp. 150-151.
3 See pp. 136-137.
4 For a complete survey of all textual changes in all of Soeterbeeck’s revised antiphonaries, see Table 3.4.
5 Cf. IV 65:1, pp. 444-447.
feature the latter, the only texts we are dealing with are seven antiphons: five for the psalms in both Vespers and one for the Magnificat in each. These are:

V.P1: Stetit Angelus juxta aram templi, habens thuribulum aureum in manu sua.
V.P2: Dum praeliaretur Michael Archangelus cum dracone, audita est vox dicentium: Salus Deo nostro, alleluia.
V.P3: Archangele Michael, constitui te principem super omnes animas suscipiendas.
V.P4: Angeli Domini Dominum benedicite in aeternum.
V.P5: Angeli, Archangieli, Throni, & Dominationes, Principatus & Potestates, Virtutes coelorum, laudate Dominum de coelis, alleluia.

Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts provide an almost entirely different office, however. Only the Magnificat antiphon for first Vespers is similar, with some minor textual differences:


To renovate this particular chant, then, Beckers only had to add a marginal note identifying it as the first Magnificat antiphon, and revise the text in three places. He did so in IV 7, although in IV 6 he forgot to change Dignus es into Ignosce. This change, and that of accipere into qui aperis, did not affect the melody, for the replacement text has the same number of syllables in both instances. This was not the case, however, for the change of aperire into solvis, which forced the rector to delete the notes on the first two syllables of the old reading.

The remaining six antiphons prescribed by the Roman Breviary do not occur in IV 7, and Beckers therefore added them in the lower margins of the pages that contain the Windesheim office for Michaelmas. The melody of the second Magnificat antiphon, Princeps gloriosissime, is identical to that in the Roman Antiphonary, from which Beckers will have copied it. He also added it in the corresponding place in IV 6, but did not do so with the five psalm antiphons. The reason for this is that these were already present in that manuscript, only not as part of Vespers but with different functions. Stetit Angelus was the second psalm antiphon of the first nocturn at Matins, Dum praeliaretur was the first psalm antiphon at Lauds, Archangele Michael was the third, Angeli Domini was the fourth, and Angeli, Archangeli was the fifth. In these cases, then, a marginal note reidentifying the antiphons by giving their function in the Roman Breviary sufficed. Because IV 7 is an antiphonary for Vespers and Compline and therefore does not include chants for Matins and Lauds, Beckers needed to add the five psalm antiphons there, and did so with the melodies they have in IV 6, which differ from those in the Roman Antiphonary.

Identifying, reidentifying, adding and revising antiphons, Beckers renovated the medieval antiphonaries in such a way that, for Vespers and Compline, they corresponded textually with the Roman Breviary, but retained their own melodic tradition. He used the empty margins wherever he could, but was not afraid to cover irrelevant or outdated chants with pieces of paper on which he wrote new ones, or parts of them (Figure 3.1). He also added running headers for ease of navigation, though he did not do so consistently. They mark the offices of an apparently random selection of Sundays and feasts, sometimes in Dutch but mostly in Latin, and while Beckers used them sparingly in the proper of time, they were added much more often in the proper of saints. In IV 7, a header appears on almost every

1 IV 6, ff. 139v-145v; IV 7, pp. 291-296.
2 IV 6, f. 140v. IV 7, p. 294 spells the last word alleluya.
3 IV 3, pp. 551-552.
4 IV 6, ff. 141r, 145r-v.
5 Beckers was not the first to reidentify the psalm antiphons for the Dedication of Michael in IV 6, about which see vol. 2, pp. 241-243.
single opening of this section, with the month on the left and the feast for which the chants on the pages are meant on the right. In IV 6, the left page usually has festa and the right page the month to which the feasts in question belong. By contrast, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28 tend only to provide a header on the page where the office of a particular feast begins, with the date and the name on the feast on the same page. The headers in the common of saints naturally do not identify feasts, but the classes of saints to which the offices apply. In IV 6, Beckers used no headers in this section, but instead employed occasional identifying tags in the outer margins, directly above the notes that identify or reidentify antiphons.

The headers are not the only means of navigation that Beckers added to the four antiphonaries; also part of his renovation are pagination and foliation. In IV 7 he simply numbered all pages consecutively, whereas in the other books he gave each of the proper and the common its own system. In IV 6, these simply consist of three series of page numbers, but in PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28 the system is more complicated. In these two books, the proper and the common is paginated. What is more, in the former there are some instances, usually when there is a page on which one or more marginal annotations occur, when Beckers did not count the folia but the openings, so that both the left- and the right-hand page have the same number. Curiously enough, none of the four manuscripts were paginated or foliated completely, as in most cases except that of the proper of saints in KHS 28 and PBF 6168 Hs the numbering stops well short of the end.¹ I am not able to explain this phenomenon, as in most instances there are also several relevant antiphons in the unnumbered part, and when this is not the case, the numbering does not necessarily stop on the last page where there are. Only in the proper of time in KHS 28 and the common of saints in PBF 6168 Hs did Beckers cover the entire relevant part, and only that.

Page or folium numbers are not only helpful to the sisters using the books, they also allowed Beckers to add references to antiphons that can be found in another place than where the user would expect to find them. For instance, in the integral antiphonary IV 7, the antiphon prescribed by the Roman Breviary for the Magnificat at second Vespers of the feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin (2 July) appears as the Magnificat antiphon for Monday in the fourth week of Advent.² Obviously, a sister needing the chants for the Visitation would not automatically think of looking among those for Advent, given that they are in an entirely different section of the book, literally hundreds of pages away. Beckers easily solved this problem, however, by adding a reference on one of the pages with the office of the feast to the proper of time,³ key to a marginal reidentification of the antiphon in question on the page referred to.

Beckers’ treatment of the winter antiphonaries PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28 deviates from that of the other two volumes in that he equipped them with a unique and sophisticated system of references for the proper of saints. On each page where the office for a feast begins whose antiphons the rector considered to be relevant—usually the page with the header—he also added references to the pages where the antiphons for Vespers of that feast according to the Roman Breviary could be found. This allowed the sisters, when trying to find their place

¹ In IV 6, the proper of time (ff. 2-60) is only paginated to 80, the proper of saints (ff. 61-168) only to 170, and the common of saints (ff. 169-202) only to 11. A modern hand foliated the book consecutively. In IV 7, Beckers paginated only until 322, whereas the book actually has 372 pages. A modern hand paginated the remaining pages. In PBF 6168 Hs, the proper of time is foliated until 130 (an error for 131), whereas there are actually 142 folia; the proper of saints is complete and the common of saints is paginated until 30, whereas there are actually 40 pages to the manuscript as it was written by the scribe. A modern hand completed the foliation and pagination. In KHS 28, the proper of time is foliated until 125, whereas there are actually 144 folia; the proper of saints is complete; and the common of saints is paginated until 23, whereas there are actually 30 pages to the manuscript as it was written by the scribe. A modern hand completed the foliation and pagination.
² IV 7, p. 20.
³ IV 7, p. 235.
in these books, to skim the headers and disregard all other information until they hit upon the feast they needed, in which case they would simply have to look down at the same page to find references to all the antiphons they needed.

In renovating the antiphonaries, Beckers used large letters and employed the type of script that I have called a hybrid minuscule. This was more easily legible than his cursive writing and more easy both to read and to write in combination with musical notation, but less formal than his set script.

As indicated, the functional meaning of Beckers’ renovation of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries was to restore them for use at Vespers and Compline according to the contemporary calendar of Soeterbeeck and the text of the Roman Breviary. However, he did not identify, reidentify or add all antiphons, proper or common, for Vespers and Compline that appear in the latter. In principle, he limited himself to those for second Vespers on Sundays, to both Vespers of feasts with a rank of semidouble and higher, and to Compline in Eastertide, Ascensiontide and the octave of Pentecost. The first limitation, then, is the fact that he did not concern himself with first Vespers, not even those of the octave day of Easter (Low Sunday) or Trinity Sunday. There is only one Sunday of which the rector does identify the first Magnificat antiphon—for it is the same in both the manuscripts and the Roman books—and that is the first Sunday of Advent, probably because it is the first day of the liturgical year. Apparently, the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck only sang Vespers on Sunday evenings and feasts. For Compline the situation is less clear, but it stands to reason that it was sung on the days that Vespers was. For the final office of the day, only the antiphons for the period from Holy Saturday until Trinity Sunday have been renovated, which is almost certainly due to the fact that they were always the same on all other days of the year, so that the sisters probably knew the regular antiphons by heart.

In addition to the fundamental restriction to second Vespers on Sundays and both on feasts, there are also a few smaller limitations. In the proper of time, Beckers consistently and therefore purposefully omitted all antiphons for suffrages, and this means that they were either sung by heart or read. Also excluded are antiphons for days within octaves other than the first and the eighth, when canonical Vespers was probably not celebrated. Only in IV 7 did the rector renovate the psalm antiphons for second Vespers of ordinary Sundays without proper chants, though without even identifying them. This is probably to be explained with an eye to the familiarity of these particular texts. The fact that no antiphons for Vespers on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday are given is in keeping with the rubrics of the Roman Breviary. These specify that on these days Vespers should be said sine canto, so that there would have been no need to include any of them in the antiphonaries.

The similarity between Beckers’ renovation of the late medieval antiphonaries and the contents of his manuscript diurnal is striking. Basically, the rector renovates the antiphons of the hours for which he provided a translated office in IV 58, and ignored those of the hours for which the diurnal only gives a commemoration. The only major difference is that his revision is not concerned with first Vespers on seasonal Sundays, which are included with an office in IV 58. I argued above that the fact that this book was explicitly meant as an aid to the choir sisters probably means that it translates those parts of the divine office that they actually prayed. If this conclusion is accepted, the antiphonaries allow it to be refined, for in them,

1 See pp. 27, 32. Cf. Figure 1.5.
2 There is one exception: Beckers did identify and refer to the Magnificat antiphon for the second day within the octave of Easter (IV 6, ff. 4v, 7r; IV 7, pp. 94, 99; IV 25, f. 6r). He also did not delete reidentifications in earlier hands (cf. pp. 169-171) of the Magnificat antiphon on the second day in the octave of Pentecost (IV 6, f. 32v; IV 7, p. 127; IV 25, f. 46r), but that does not necessarily mean that he endorsed their presence. His general disinterest in octaves is clear from the fact that he did not provide any antiphon for any other day within an octave, including the second one in that of the Epiphany of the Lord (cf. IV 65:1, p. 204).
3 ‘Without chant’ (cf. IV 65:1, pp. 252, 258).
those parts of the canonical hours were renovated that the sisters were to sing. Together, Beckers’ diurnal and his renovation of the antiphonaries provide the following picture of Soeterbeeck’s celebration of the liturgy of the hours during his rectorate. The canonical offices of both Vespers on (semi)double feasts, second Vespers on Sundays, and Compline on the same occasions, were chanted. The canonical offices of first Vespers on seasonal Sundays, and Compline on these days, were read. The Little Office was read throughout the year, and it was expanded with commemorations at Lauds on most vigils and at Lauds and Vespers whenever canonical Vespers and Compline were prayed, on days within octaves and on the major ferias.

This is the conclusion which an interpretation of the functional meaning of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit allows us to reach concerning Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice during his rectorate, and this is the alternative to the untenable position that the sisters limited themselves to saying the Little Office. Whether it can be accepted still remains to be proven, of course. The rector’s Dutch diurnal is not actually a liturgical book, and so does not constitute absolute proof of liturgical praxis. The antiphonaries may turn out to do so, but the fact that Beckers renovated them with a certain goal in mind, does not necessarily mean that they were actually used that way afterwards. The rest of this paragraph is devoted to determining whether they were, over the course of a number of steps. First, I determine the extent to which Beckers’ evident intentions concerning his renovation of the convent’s antiphonaries were consistently carried through—that is to say, whether or not their operational meaning actually applies. Did he succeed in renovating the books so that they could actually be used in the way he wanted? Next, I consider Beckers’ renovation in the context of earlier, contemporary and later attempts at the revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries, to determine if it is consonant with these. Finally, I turn to what little evidence there is concerning the use of these books beyond their renovation, and thereby come to my conclusion.

3.4.2.2. Level of Success

The various dimensions of Beckers’ renovation of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries having been described in general terms, it is now time to assess the degree to which it was successfully carried out, with an eye to the liturgical use of these books. Upon close inspection, it becomes clear that, though almost all the rector’s notes are consistent with his aim, and the revision is admirably thorough, it is not entirely perfect.

On the level of the texts of the antiphons there are some gaps and superfluities, and also inconsistencies of treatment and differences between the manuscripts. Most errors that the rector makes are small, and consist of the failure to implement a minor textual change.\(^1\) Slightly more serious are those cases in which Beckers failed to reidentify an antiphon that should have been given a new function,\(^2\) or vice versa.\(^3\) Occasionally he also added an

---

\(^1\) As in the above-mentioned example of the first Magnificat antiphon of the Dedication of Michael (p. 149).

\(^2\) Chants which Beckers forgot to reidentify in one or more books but not in all are the third psalm antiphon at first Vespers of the Nativity of the Lord in IV 7, p. 27; the commemoration antiphon of John the Evangelist on the feast of Stephen the First Martyr (26 December)—also used as the Magnificat antiphon on the seventh day of his octave—in PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 51r; the second Magnificat antiphon for the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September) in IV 6, f. 132v; and the five psalm antiphons of the common for the dedication of a church in IV 6, ff. 167v-168r.

\(^3\) Chants which Beckers superfluously reidentified in one manuscript but not in all are the five psalm antiphons for first Vespers of the Commemoration of Paul (30 June). This feast concurs with that of Peter and Paul (29 June), and the rubrics of the Roman Breviary specify that, unless its first Vespers is said in a church that is dedicated to the Apostle of the Gentiles, the office should be entirely of the former feast (IV 65:1, p. 387-388). Because second Vespers of Paul’s Commemoration uses different psalm antiphons, and no other Pauline feast occurs in the summer half of the year, the reidentification of these five chants in IV 6 was superfluous. Conversely, it was not enough for the feast of the Conversion of Paul (25 January), which also has two proper
antiphon to one or more manuscripts but not in all.1 Most of the time, however, he did not make the same mistake or omission in all books, so that these errors would only have caused a little inconvenience for the sisters and did not fundamentally affect the success of his project—as is witnessed also by the fact that they have not been corrected by later hands. For this reason, and because they are described in detail in Table 3.4, I will not dwell upon such minor errors here. In what follows, I will only address major peculiarities that are consistently displayed.

Most problematic are a number of liturgically inexplicable but consistent omissions. It can be difficult to differentiate these from cases where feasts simply do not have a full office of ten psalm antiphons and two Magnificat antiphons, but instead use chants from one or both of these two categories in each Vespers, or fill in the gaps with antiphons from the common of saints. Also, the rules of concurrence need to be taken into account. As described above,2 there are many instances when second Vespers of one feast and first Vespers of another overlap, and that means that one of two options applies. Either the office of one Vespers is reduced to a commemoration with which that of the other one is expanded, or a hybrid office is formed, with the texts of one feast used up to the chapter and that of the other from that point onwards, followed by a commemoration of the first. Whatever the solution in each particular case, in general concurrence means that less than the full number of antiphons are needed for at least one of the two feasts involved. In the case of a hybrid office, the antiphons for the feast that occupies the section up to the chapter are all used, because its Magnificat antiphon is the one that appears in the commemoration at the end, but of the feast to which the section after the chapter is devoted, only the Magnificat antiphon is used. The latter is also true, of course, of offices that are reduced to commemorations.

All of this having been taken into account, a small number of peculiarities can be identified in Beckers’ renovation. There is one instance where chants that would not have been used according to Soeterbeeck’s calendar were nonetheless consistently reidentified,3 and some antiphons were never added, despite the fact that they should have been. There are six chants for whose omission no explanation is forthcoming, and which can therefore only be considered as curious mistakes, or at best as inconsistencies of treatment.4

---

1 Antiphons which Beckers forgot to add in one or more books but not in all are the second Magnificat antiphons of the eleventh, twenty-second, twenty-third and twenty-fourth Sundays after Pentecost in IV 6; the second Magnificat antiphon for all holy canons regular (5 March) in PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28; the entire office for the patronage of Joseph (third Sunday after Easter) in IV 7; the Magnificat antiphons for the Conversion of Augustine (5 May) in IV 7 (where he does not even mention the feast); the commemoration antiphon for Paul on the feast of Peter in Chains (1 August) in IV 6; the first Magnificat antiphon for the guardian angels (first Sunday in September) in IV 6; the Magnificat antiphon for the first translation of Augustine (11 October) in IV 6—Beckers does not even mention the feast in either IV 6 or IV 7—; and the second Magnificat antiphon for the common of popes in IV 6. He also neglected to add a substantial amount of extra text to the second Magnificat antiphons of the seventh and twenty-first Sundays after Pentecost in IV 6, ff. 53r, 59v. He also forgot to add a rubric for a number of feasts whose antiphons are all present: the Espousal of the Blessed Virgin (23 January) in PBF 6168 Hs (although he and an unidentified hand did add the alternative reading Desponsatio to Conceptio in the antiphons common between the feast of the Espousal and the Conception on 2: ff. 14v-15r, 18r-v); Peter’s Chair at Antioch (22 February) and the commemoration of Paul (30 June) in IV 7; and Our Lady of the Snow (5 August), the Holy Name of Mary (Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin), Our Lady of the Rosary (first Sunday in October) and the patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November) in IV 6.

2 See p. 115.

3 These are the five psalm antiphons of the feast of Agnes (22 January).

4 These are the first Magnificat antiphons of the feasts of the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany of the Lord) and the patronage of Joseph (third Sunday after Easter), the second Magnificat antiphons of the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord (which was also used as the commemoration antiphon for the vigil of the Epiphany on the octave day of the Holy Innocents (4 January)) and the feast of the
EXCURSUS: THE SUPERFLUOUS PSALM ANTIPHONS OF AGNES OF ROME
The instance where Beckers concerns himself with chants that he should by rights have left alone has to do with the double feast of Agnes of Rome (21 January). Its first Vespers concurs with the second of Fabian and Sebastian, another double, and its second with the first of Vincent of Saragossa, a first class double. This means that only Agnes’ first Magnificat antiphon should be used, and that the identification of that chant would have sufficed for Beckers’ purposes. Instead, the rector reidentified the five psalm antiphons in IV 7, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28, and, in case of the latter two manuscripts only, also the second Magnificat antiphon,1 despite the fact that this was unnecessary. The reader may remember that Beckers made a similar but slightly different error in his diurnal IV 58, where he correctly omitted Agnes’ psalm antiphons but superfluously included that of the second Magnificat.2 The Roman Breviary itself already specifies that, unless Agnes’ feast is transferred,3 its concurrence with that of Fabian and Sebastian means that its first Vespers is only celebrated from the chapter onwards. The confusion, then, lies entirely with the unusually high rank that Soeterbeeck’s calendar gives to Vincent’s feast, which is due to the fact that he was the patron saint of Deursen. Beckers was aware of this, but appears not to have fully considered the consequences for the feast of Agnes.

EXCURSUS: THE INEXPLICABLE OMISSIONS IN BECKERS’ RENOVATION OF THE ANTIPHONARIES
There are a small number of antiphons that Beckers did not add to the late medieval antiphonaries despite the fact that he should have done so, and whose absence I cannot very well explain. In the proper of time there is only one instance of this: the rector failed entirely to add the antiphon Puer Jesus proficiebat aetate, that was used both for the second Magnificat on Sunday within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord and in the commemoration of the vigil of the Epiphany on the octave day of the Holy Innocents (4 January). I am at a loss to provide any explanation for this omission.

There are also four inexplicable gaps in the proper of saints. The first two are the Magnificat antiphons of first Vespers of the feasts of the Holy Name of Jesus and the patronage of Joseph. One might perhaps be tempted to seek an explanation for their omission in the fact that the feasts to which they belong are celebrated on Sundays—the second after the Epiphany and the third after Easter, respectively—and that Beckers never concerns himself with first Vespers of the Lord’s day because this was apparently not sung. However, the rector tends to deviate from this line of action when it comes to feasts, for he does provide the Magnificat antiphons for first Vespers of Easter Sunday, Pentecost, Joachim (Sunday in the octave of the Assumption), the guardian angels (first Sunday in September) and the Holy Name (Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin), Rosary (first Sunday in October) and patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November).

The third omission in the proper of saints is that of the second Magnificat antiphon of the Beheading of John the Baptist, which may have something to do with the fact that it is only used as a commemoration antiphon because the office on the evening of 29 August is of Rose of Lima from the chapter onwards. But the same is also true for several other Magnificat antiphons which Beckers did add or (re)identify, such as those of second Vespers of all holy canons regular (5 March) or both Vespers of Cecilia (22 November).

The last peculiarity that remains to be mentioned is Beckers’ failure to reidentify and add the Magnificat antiphons of the feast of Clement I in IV 6 and IV 7. In fact, although he does include these texts in his diurnal IV 58,4 he fails to make any reference at all to Clement’s feast in the antiphonaries. This might have something to do with its transference from its usual date, 23 November, to 12 December, caused by its occurrence on the Windesheim feast of Trudo of Sint-Truiden. When not transferred, the feast of Clement belongs to the summer half of the year, whereas its new date falls in liturgical winter. If Beckers was working from a calendar of

Beheading of John the Baptist (29 August), and both Magnificat antiphons of the feast of Clement I (23 November, but transferred to 12 December at Soeterbeek).
1 IV 7, pp. 181-183; PBF 6168 Hs, 2: ff. 28r-32v; KHS 28, 2: ff. 20r-24v.
2 See pp. 125-126.
3 Cf. IV 65:1, p. 333.
4 IV 58, 2: p. 159.
Soeterbeeck while revising the antiphonaries, he might possibly have thought, while working on the winter half of the year, that he would get to the renovation of Clement’s antiphons at the end of the summer half because that is where the chants occur in the late medieval manuscripts, and then forgotten all about them once he made it there. It is an odd error to make, particularly in an integral antiphonary for the entire year such as IV 7, but I can think of no better explanation for Beckers’ complete disregard of Clement in his renovation of the manuscript antiphonaries.

Other gaps in Beckers’ additions to the late medieval antiphonaries appear to be due to the limitations of the source material that he had at his disposal. To develop this argument, I turn first to the melodies of the antiphons that Beckers did add.\(^1\) Many antiphons that are used at Vespers in the Roman Breviary were already prescribed for Matins, Lauds or one of the minor hours in the pre-Tridentine use of Windesheim. Still, these did not appear in IV 7, which, to repeat, only contains chants for Vespers and Compline. Beckers’ preferred option in such cases was to copy the required chant into IV 7 on the basis of one of the other late medieval antiphonaries, so that they could all continue to be used in conjunction.

In cases where an antiphon did not appear in any of the manuscripts, the rector turned first to the Roman Antiphony. The copies of this book that currently survive from the library of Soeterbeeck are all in the musical tradition of the late sixteenth-century Plantin editions,\(^2\) and many of the antiphons which Beckers added to the medieval books are in line with this. He appears, however, only to have had a seventeenth-century copy of the Roman Antiphony at his disposal, which explains why he failed to add the offices of three universal feasts that were only instituted, universalised or made obligatory in the eighteenth century.\(^3\)

Beckers did manage to add the proper antiphons of some offices that were neither present in the medieval manuscripts nor, presumably, in his hypothetical seventeenth-century Roman Antiphony. These belong to four universal feasts that were instituted after 1694,\(^4\) all three Windesheim feasts that had proper chants that were not already present in one or more of the manuscripts,\(^5\) two feasts for the subjects of the King of Spain,\(^6\) and the feast of Joseph’s patronage of Soeterbeeck. This shows that the rector had found at least some additional sources, possibly in Gaesdonck, although I have not been able to identify these. This extra material was clearly somewhat patchy, however, for besides the three missing universal offices there are also three feasts *pro aliquibus locis* whose proper antiphons Beckers did not add.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) For a survey of the melodies of the antiphons added to Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries, and their possible sources, see Table 3.5.


\(^3\) These are the feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday before Palm Sunday), which was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 22 August 1727 (Schober 1891, 203); the feast of Elizabeth of Portugal (8 July, but transferred to 11 July at Soeterbeeck), which was made obligatory by Innocent XII (1721-1724) (A Carpo 1885, 524, no. 149); and Joseph of Cupertino (18 September), which was instituted by Clement XIV on 8 August 1769 (Schober 1891, 246).

\(^4\) These are the feasts of Thomas of Villanova (22 September, but transferred and accidentally omitted from Soeterbeeck’s calendar in IV 58), which was made obligatory by Innocent XII on 4 September 1694 (Schober 1891, 248); Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March), which was given a proper office by Clement XI on 3 February 1714 (Schober 1891, 201); the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany), which was extended to the universal Church by Innocent XIII on 29 November or 20 December 1721 (Schober 1891, 186); and Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July), which was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726 (Schober 1891, 228).

\(^5\) These are the feasts of the translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October) and all holy canons regular (5 March).

\(^6\) These are the feasts of the archangels Gabriel (18 March) and Raphael (24 October).

\(^7\) These are the feasts of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February, for the subjects of Austria), Mary de Socos (26 September, for the subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor) and the Expectation of the Blessed Virgin (18 December, for all the subjects of the King of Spain).
Still, the omissions in Beckers’ revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries are few, and they did not substantially threaten the success of the entire venture. The result in practice was merely that a dozen offices could not be fully sung, and had to be partly or entirely read instead. This imperfection does not pose a liturgical problem, and considering the fact that the vast majority of necessary chants had been correctly identified, reidentified, added or revised, it will not have greatly affected the functional meaning of the rector’s renovation either. This is confirmed, again, by the fact that none of the remaining gaps have ever been filled in, not even in one case where the convent acquired a source for a missing office relatively shortly after the completion of Beckers’ revision around 1787. This concerns the feast of Elizabeth of Portugal (8 July, but transferred to the 11th at Soeterbeeck), whose proper chants appear in the antiphonary IV 8, which the sisters were given by Van Steenbergen in 1793. The fact that the late medieval manuscripts were not subsequently expanded with this office demonstrates that they were perfectly useful as they were, despite a few small shortcomings.

EXCURSUS: THE OMISSIONS IN BECKERS’ RENOVATION OF THE ANTIPHONARIES THAT ARE DUE TO HIS SOURCES

There are a number of feasts whose proper antiphons were probably not added by Beckers to Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries because he simply could not find a source for them. The first three of these are the universal ones of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday before Palm Sunday), Elizabeth of Portugal (8 July, but transferred to the 11th at Soeterbeeck) and Joseph of Cupertino (18 September). None of the proper antiphons which the Roman Breviary prescribes for these feasts are included in any of Soeterbeeck’s surviving antiphonaries, except for those of Elizabeth in IV 8, a book that the community did not yet own in 1787. That volume also includes an office for the Seven Sorrows, but this is entirely different from that in the Roman Breviary. It has been explained above, that whenever Beckers could not find an antiphon in any of the late medieval manuscripts, his first choice was to copy it from the Roman Antiphony. It is very striking, for this reason, that the most recent chant that the rector took from this source, with reference to the moment when the feast of whose office it is part was extended to the universal Church, is the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers of Joachim (Sunday within the octave of the Assumption). This feast was first approved for universal celebration—not yet on its later date, but on 20 March—by Gregory XV on 18 March 1623. For proper antiphons of feasts added to the general Roman calendar between then and 1787, there are two options. Some have simply not been included by Beckers, and this is what happened to those of Elizabeth (made obligatory by Innocent XII (1721-1724)), the Seven Sorrows (extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 22 August 1727), and Joseph of Cupertino (instituted by Clement XIV on 8 August 1769). For other antiphons, Beckers based himself on one or more other sources. Examples of the latter include the proper antiphons of Thomas of Villanova (22 September, but transferred and accidentally omitted from Soeterbeeck’s calendar in IV 58), whose feast was made obligatory by Innocent XII on 4 September 1694; Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March), who was given a proper

---

1 IV 8, ff. 96r-97r. On IV 8, see p. 144.
2 IV 8, ff. 96r-97r. On IV 8, see p. 144.
3 IV 8, ff. 81r-83r. Cf. IV 65:1, pp. 349-353. The office in IV 8 shares the five psalm antiphons and the Benedictus antiphon with that in the late medieval manuscript IV 78:2, ff. 73r-78v (on which see Kienhorst 2005, 98-99), so the former may be a later but still specifically Windesheim iteration of the office.
4 See pp. 149, 155.
5 IV 6, ff. 113v-114r; IV 7, pp. 261-262. Cf. IV 19, pp. 430-341.
6 Schober 1891, 238.
7 A Carpo 1885, 524, no. 149.
8 Schober 1891, 203.
9 Schober 1891, 246.
10 IV 6, f. 139r; IV 7, p. 289.
11 Schober 1891, 248.
12 IV 7, pp. 201-202; PBF 6168 Hs, pp. i-ii; KHS 28, pp. ii-iii; 2: f. 51r.
office by Clement XI on 3 February 1714;\(^1\) the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany),\(^2\) whose celebration was extended to the universal Church by Innocent XIII on 29 November or 20 December 1721;\(^3\) and Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July),\(^4\) whose feast was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726.\(^5\) The proper antiphons of the first three of these feasts are all present in the Roman Antiphonary IV 18, printed in 1735,\(^6\) but the melodies which Beckers provides in the manuscript antiphonaries are entirely different from those in this book. It seems, then, that Beckers had access only to a Roman Antiphonary printed between 1623 and 1694, and that this is the reason why he did not include antiphons for the Seven Sorrows, John of Capistrano and Elizabeth of Portugal.

One Roman Antiphonary survives from Soeterbeeck that is of the right age: IV 19, published in 1651. This particular edition also has another characteristic that makes it an even more suitable candidate for use by Beckers. In IV 6 and IV 7, the rector added antiphons for the feast of the guardian angels (first Sunday in September),\(^7\) and although this had only been made obligatory by Clement X on 13 September 1670, the universal Church had already been free to celebrate it at will (on 2 October) since 27 September 1608.\(^8\) Although other feasts ad libitum are not present in it, IV 19 does include an office for this one,\(^9\) and, except for some insignificant errors, Beckers’ antiphons have the same melodies as these. Of course, this does not constitute proof that the rector made use of this particular volume; there is not even any evidence that it was already at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century. However, it is clearly representative of the type of book that Beckers must have employed, and that is sufficient for now, as it provides a possible explanation for the omission of some feasts from and the deviant melodies of others in Beckers’ renovation.

The possibility that Beckers used an old Roman Antiphonary as a source does raise the question where he found the melodies for the antiphons that were not included there or in the medieval manuscripts, but which he nonetheless did manage to add. These include, first of all, the four universal feasts just mentioned, of the Holy Name of Jesus, Joseph, Our Lady of Mount Carmel and Thomas of Villanova, instituted between 1694 and 1726. In addition, Beckers also added antiphons for the feast of the patronage of Joseph, the convent’s second patron saint,\(^10\) and for two regional feasts: those of Gabriel (18 March) and Raphael (24 October),\(^11\) both of which already appear for the subjects of the King of Spain in the selection pro aliquibus locis in the diurnal IV 60, which was printed in 1696.\(^12\) By contrast, he did not include the proper antiphons of two other regional feasts, namely those of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February, for the subjects of Austria) and Mary de Socos (26 September, for the subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor). The former was only instituted in 1762,\(^13\) and the latter was not yet present in IV 61, which was printed in 1749, but does appear in IV 65, printed in 1757.\(^14\)

Of course, this long enumeration of miscellaneous feasts does not reveal anything about the actual nature of Beckers’ additional sources besides the antiphonaries that currently survive from Soeterbeeck. However, it does allow us to conclude that he had succeeded reasonably well in

\(1\) Schober 1891, 201.
\(2\) IV 7, pp. 57-59; PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix; KHS 28, p. i.
\(3\) Schober 1891, 186.
\(4\) IV 6, ff. 94v, 109r; IV 7, pp. 236, 243-244.
\(5\) Schober 1891, 228.
\(6\) IV 18, pp. 94-101, 457-463, 575. The antiphon for the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel was later added later between pp. 504-505, but long after Beckers.
\(7\) IV 6, f. 123v-125v; IV 7, pp. 280-281.
\(8\) Schober 1891, 250-251.
\(9\) IV 19, pp. 546-551.
\(10\) IV 6, f. 1r.
\(11\) IV 6, ff. 145v-147r; IV 7, pp. 196-197, 296-297; PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii; KHS 28, p. 4; 2: f. 50v.
\(12\) IV 60, pp. cxix-cxxii, cxxvii-cxxx. Beckers’ notes also include rubrics for the feast of the Espousal of the Blessed Virgin (23 January), but this uses the same antiphons as those of the Nativity (8 September) and the Conception (8 December), except that the words Nativitas or Conceptio are changed into Desponsatio (cf. p. 153 n. 1). The Espousal therefore does not have any truly proper antiphons.
\(13\) IV 65:2, p. 8.
\(14\) IV 65:1, p. cxxii (for 22 September or another date).
finding sources for the antiphons of additional universal and regional feasts that were instituted before 1726, but not for those of later ones. This statement should not be taken absolutely, for it has been argued above that he did not have the means to include antiphons for Elizabeth of Portugal and the Seven Sorrows, despite the fact that the latter was already celebrated by the subjects of the King of Spain before its extension to the Church at large in 1727. So even for the period between 1694 and 1726, Beckers’ additional sources were patchy. Still, it is remarkable that Our Lady of Carmel should be the most recent feast with a proper antiphon that Beckers includes in his renovation. It seems merited, therefore, to infer that the rector simply was not able to find any sources for the offices of later feasts, and that this is the reason why they were not included.

There are two slight additional arguments for the conclusion that Beckers was working with only a limited number of sources for the regional and universal feasts instituted after the printing of his Roman Antiphonary between 1623 and 1694, and that these did not extend far into the eighteenth century. The first of these consists of the fact that, where he adds the Magnificat antiphon for both Vespers of Thomas of Villanova in IV 6 and IV 7, he dates the feast to 18 September. This despite the fact that in Beckers’ days, Thomas’ feast would have been transferred because it occurred on that of Joseph of Cupertino, which had been instituted, as we have seen, in 1769. Beckers’ failure to change the date of Thomas’ feast accordingly may well be a mistake caused by the use of an outdated source. The second argument is based on what may be either an error or a conscious decision on the rector’s part. It has to do with the feast of the Expectation of the Blessed Virgin (18 December, for all the subjects of the King of Spain), which must have been instituted for the subjects of the King of Spain somewhere between 1696 and 1749, because its earliest occurrence, in books that survive from Soeterbeeck, is among the regional feasts in IV 61 and IV 62 (printed in 1749), not in IV 60 (printed in 1696). Most of the antiphons of the Expectation are the same as those of the Annunciation of the Lord (25 March), except for the minor difference that they end with an extra allelulia. However, the fifth psalm antiphon at second Vespers as well as both Magnificat antiphons are different and proper. Still, Beckers’ rubrics for 18 December simply refer to 25 March, and consistently say the offices of both feasts are identical. This could simply be a mistake caused by the fact that so many of the elements are indeed the same, but it might also be a conscious decision on Beckers’ part. It is not inconceivable that he decided, in the absence of a source for the melodies of the Expectation’s proper antiphons, and considering that its office is so like that of the Annunciation, that it was better to sing it with three wrong antiphons than not at all. If it was indeed a pragmatic choice rather than an oversight, the confusion of the feast of the Expectation with that of the Annunciation is another indication of the patchy nature of Beckers’ sources for feasts instituted in the eighteenth century.

While still on the topic of feasts not present in the Roman Antiphonary for which Beckers was nonetheless able to find a source, it should be noted that all Windesheim feasts with proper antiphons are represented in his renovation. The rector added all chants for the translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October) and all holy canons regular (5 March), and for the other feasts of Augustine he was able to mine the late medieval manuscripts themselves. This means that, as far as their antiphons are concerned, the feasts of the order are entirely covered.

Having discussed the most significant textual peculiarities of Beckers’ addition and reidentification of antiphons, I finish this section by addressing a number of oddities in the melodies of his added chants. It has been explained that Beckers followed the Windesheim manuscript tradition when he could, reverted to the late sixteenth-century Antwerp tradition of the Roman Antiphonary when he could not, and only switched to unidentified other sources, possibly from Gaesdonck, when none of these options applied. However, there is one case

---

1 IV 60, pp. cxv-cxix.
2 IV 6, f. 139r; IV 7, p. 289.
3 Cf. IV 61, p. cxii.
4 IV 7, p. 177; PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 18v; KHS 28, 2: f. 17v.
5 Cf. p. 155. The feasts for which Beckers used an unknown source are the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany), the translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October), all holy canons regular (5 March), Gabriel the Archangel (18 March), Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March), the patronage
where Beckers chose a Roman melody over a Windesheim one, and also a significant number of antiphons whose melodies strongly resemble one or the other tradition, but are not entirely identical to either.

The first issue concerns the third psalm antiphon of the common of virgins, *Haec est quae nescivit*. A chant with this text occurs in IV 6 and PBF 6168 Hs as the first psalm antiphon of the third nocturn of Matins,¹ and there Beckers reidentified it with a marginal note. However, in IV 7,² which only includes chants for Vespers and Compline, and KHS 28—whose scribe for some reason only gives the first psalm antiphon of the first nocturn of virgins and then skips almost two folia’s worth of chant to switch immediately to the third responsory of the third nocturn³—the antiphon did not originally appear. Beckers therefore added it in the lower margins, but with the Roman melody, which differs significantly from that in the other two manuscripts. This error on Beckers’ part would have caused great confusion in singing when this antiphon had to be used, and I am unable to explain why it was not ironed out by a later hand. There are a handful of other examples of differences among antiphons added or revised by Beckers,⁴ but these are all minor, whereas those between the two versions of the third psalm antiphon for virgins are such that they would have caused serious discord. An isolated problem like this one is not enough to merit the conclusion that the renovated antiphonaries were not used to sing from during the liturgy at all, but it does raise the serious but unanswerable question what this use consisted of exactly, that this and smaller errors were allowed to stand uncorrected.

Not problematic for the users of the antiphonaries, but as difficult for me to understand, is the considerable number of antiphons whose melodies are very like those in either the manuscripts or the Roman Antiphonary, but display some small deviations. These differences are not just limited to what are very likely just copying errors, such as the absence of flat signs, the use of the wrong clef, and omissions that leave one or more syllables without a note. Nor are they due to Beckers’ habit of reducing double notes on the same syllable to a single. They also include feasible variants, mostly consisting of a different distribution of the same notes across a set of syllables. It would require someone who is more well-versed in musicological matters than I am to judge whether these might be due to eye-skip or similar mistakes, or whether they indicate that Beckers was actually using another source in these cases. What strongly speaks for the second option is that some, though by no means all, of these variant readings also occur in IV 8, the antiphony from Gaesdonck that was donated to Soeterbeeck by Beckers’ confrère Van Steenbergen in 1793.⁵ Even some of the small melodic

---

¹ IV 6, ff. 92v-93r; PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 17.
² IV 7, p. 360.
³ KHS 28, 3: p. 17.
⁴ Examples of antiphons whose melodies were added or revised inconsistently by Beckers include the second psalm antiphon for the octave day of John the Evangelist (3 January) (IV 7, p. 36; PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 64r; KHS 28, 1: f. 63r), the Magnificat antiphon of second Vespers of the first Sunday in Quadragesima (IV 7, p. 69; PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 82r-v; KHS 28, 1: f. 87v) and the fourth psalm antiphon for virgins and women who are neither virgins nor martyrs (IV 6, f. 193v; IV 7, p. 361; PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 21; KHS 28, 3: pp. 18-19).
⁵ The melodies that do not correspond precisely with those in Soeterbeeck’s late medieval manuscripts or Roman Antiphonaries, but do perfectly with those in IV 8, are the fifth psalm antiphon for the octave day of Stephen the First Martyr (2 January); the first and third psalm antiphons at second Vespers of Easter; the Magnificat
additions and adaptations necessitated by minor changes to the text of the antiphons in the late medieval manuscripts correspond with readings in this volume.¹ On the one hand, the rector cannot have used this manuscript in his revision,² as that took place six years before the book came to Soeterbeeck, and, notwithstanding the correspondences, the book also contains many antiphons whose melodies are different from Beckers.³ On the other hand, the coincidences between Beckers’ renovation and IV 8 are so numerous that they might not be entirely coincidental, and point to the possibility that the rector made use of books, perhaps indeed from Gaesdonck, in which his variants also occurred. If this were to be proven, my reconstruction of the rector’s mode of operation as presented above, which casts Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts and Roman Antiphonaries as starting points that were complemented by an unknown number of other sources, would have to be thoroughly reconsidered. As it is, however, I believe this is the interpretation that best fits the evidence, and I do not feel qualified to say more on the topic.

The upshot, then, of the discussion so far is that Beckers was highly succesful at renovating the late medieval antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck with an eye to the Roman Breviary of his days. He makes comparatively few errors, and is almost entirely consistent between manuscripts. This means that the quality of the rector’s revision supports the assumption that it served a practical purpose, or at least does not preclude this.

3.4.3. Other Renovations of the Antiphonaries
With this conclusion, there remains one final aspect of Beckers’ renovation that must be discussed before I can start drawing conclusions concerning the functional meaning of the books which it affected. This is the fact that the rector’s was not the only, nor indeed the first attempt at the revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonal corpus. Of all of Soeterbeeck’s surviving antiphonaries, only four (the second unit of IV 16, IV 131, IV 132 and Manchester, John Rylands Library, Latin 439) do not show any traces of revision at all. Notes in various hands with this intention appear in the four books renovated by Beckers, as well as in eight antiphons at second Vespers of the fifteenth, eighteenth, twenty-first and twenty-fourth Sundays after Pentecost; the second psalm antiphon for Andrew the Apostle (30 November); the first psalm antiphon for the Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany); the fifth psalm antiphon for Philip and James (1 May); the fifth psalm antiphon for the Invention (3 May) and Exaltation of the Cross (14 September); the third psalm antiphon of the Visitatio of the Blessed Virgin (2 July); the second psalm antiphon of all Saints (1 November); the fourth psalm antiphon at second Vespers of Cecilia of Rome (22 November); the fourth psalm antiphon for apostles, evangelists and martyrs in Eastertide; the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers and the fifth psalm antiphon at second Vespers of several martyrs; the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers of bishop-confessors; and the Magnificat antiphon of Doctors of the Church.

¹ The additions and changes to the melodies of the antiphons in Soeterbeeck’s late medieval manuscripts that correspond with those in IV 8 occur in the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers of the Circumcision of the Lord (1 January), the Epiphany (6 January), Septuagesima Sunday, the first Sunday in Quadragesima (in KHS 28 only) and the third Sunday in Quadragesima; the second Magnificat antiphon of the sixth Sunday after Pentecost; the third psalm antiphon of second Vespers of Agatha of Sicily (5 February); the fourth psalm antiphon of Philip and James (1 May); the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers and the second psalm antiphon at second Vespers of Augustine of Hippo (28 August); the third psalm antiphon for one martyr; the first psalm antiphon of a confessor; and the fourth psalm antiphon for virgins and women who are neither virgins nor martyrs (in KHS 28, 3: pp. 18-19 only). In KHS 28, 1: ff. 63v-64r the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of the Epiphany was made to correspond to IV 8, f. 19v.

² That IV 8 might have played some role in Beckers’ revision of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries is suggested by Van Dijk 2000, 67-68. This is only possible, however, if the book was already in existence years before it came to Soeterbeeck and the rector had access to it, or if the renovation of the late medieval books was a project that lasted more than six years. The former cannot be disproven, but the latter seems unlikely, for reasons given above (p. 148). A more feasible alternative seems to be that Beckers made use of one or more books like the one(s) from which IV 8 was copied.

³ Many, though not all, of the melodies in IV 8 that originally differed from Beckers’ antiphons have been brought in line with the rector’s reading, on which see pp. 171-174.
additional manuscripts and in the three printed antiphonaries. The former are the integral eighteenth-century antiphonary IV 8, the winter parts IV 4, IV 22 and The Hague, Royal Library, 130 G 18 (of which Fr. 1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection was once a part), the summer parts IV 15, IV 22 and IV 25, and the diurnal breviary for the entire year of which IV 83 and Fr. 33:3 are the remnants. The latter provides noted versions of many antiphons, particularly for Vespers, and could therefore be used to sing from as well. Various other medieval breviaries from Soeterbeeck are noted too, but none of these were revised, presumably because there were enough antiphonaries that could be used.

It is not possible, within the scope of this chapter, and thankfully not necessary either, to provide a full discussion of all of these revisionary stratigraphic units in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries. However, in order to fill in the context of Beckers’ renovation, I do need to say a few things about their temporal, typological and functional dimensions and their relation to the rector’s notes. This is a challenge not only to the reader’s patience but also to the author’s, because unlike Beckers’ notes, which are in a very distinctive hand of which substantial samples survive, often even with his name attached to them, most of the other ones that appear in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries consist of only a few letters or even a single numeral. Many of them simply do not contain any distinctive characteristics on the basis of which they can be distinguished from others, and their hands must remain unidentified. Other notes are more idiosyncratic, or consist of more substantial amounts of text, sometimes even entire antiphons. In many cases this is still too little evidence to identify the hands with certainty, but an initial attempt must and often can be made.

An overview of the hands I distinguished when studying the revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries, IV 83 and Fr. 33:3—and also the hymnals which are the subject of the next paragraph—illustrated with small script samples, is part of the introduction to Table 3.4. It will be clear at a glance that most of the distinctions and identifications I made there are provisional. Some hands which I chose to distinguish, such as H13, H18 and H33, or H17 and H30, are so similar that they may in fact be the same, whereas some notes which I attributed to the same hand may actually have been written by different persons.

This element of uncertainty is inevitable because of the size of many of the notes and the character of the hands. Once again, a precise and entirely correct identification of these is usually impossible. For the purposes of this chapter, however, it is enough that the survey clearly shows that Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries have been revised by a relatively large number of different people, in different capacities, at different moments in time.

**EXCURSUS: FIVE IDENTIFIED HANDS IN SOETERBEECK’S ANTIPHONARIES**

Of all the hands besides Beckers’ that appear in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries, I have been able to connect five with the name of a person. These are the ones which I gave the sigla H1, H18, H24, H27 and Ho in Table 3.4. The first four can be discussed very summarily, and I therefore begin with these.

H1 appears to have belonged to Antonius Gast, the Mariënhage canon who was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1656 to 1680. This attribution is based on a comparison of various notes in the

---

1 Other noted breviaries from the library of Soeterbeeck besides the diurnal whose remnants are now IV 83 and Fr. 33:3, are the nocturnal IV 79, the diurnal IV 80 and the diurnal of which IV 79A and Fr. 33:1 are the surviving parts. Fr. 33:2, which consists mainly of a bifolium of another nocturnal breviary, also contains a single folium with two noted hymns for Vespers and Lauds (Jesu, corona Virginum) and for Matins (Virginis proles) of the common of one virgin. This fragment probably also belongs with IV 79A and Fr. 33:1, cf. p. 57 n. 4.

2 On Gast, see p. 70 n. 10. The hand that is here attributed to him, also wrote the seventeenth-century statutes (ASP 92, ff. 1r-46v) and the ownership note of Sister Maria van Hout in V 41.
antiphonaries of Soeterbeek with a receipt written and signed by him and dated 10 July 1655.\textsuperscript{1} As far as can be ascertained on the basis of such slender evidence, the hands appear to be identical.\textsuperscript{2}

H18 probably belonged to Henricus Erckens, the confère of Beckers who was rector of Soeterbeek from 1749 until his death on 19 June 1772. The hand that added the antiphons for the feasts of Raphael the Archangel (22 October) and Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July) in PBF 6168 Hs appears to be the same that began Soeterbeeck’s Memorie boeck and one of its registers,\textsuperscript{3} which is the same as that of Erckens’ ownership mark on the pastedown of IV 41 (Figure 3.2).

H24 appears to be that of Prioress Clara Lucia van den Heuvel. It is the same as the hand which added a few contributions to the Memorie boeck immediately after Erckens’, which in turn is the same as that with which Van den Heuvel signed a document that was drawn up by Beckers and dated 14 October 1788 (Figure 3.3).\textsuperscript{4} She was born in ’s-Hertogenbosch on 29 October 1729, entered Soeterbeek as a choir sister in 1748, was professed on 1 July 1749, served as prioress from 1764 to 1776 and died on 9 February 1805.\textsuperscript{5}

H27 identified itself as belonging to a Sr Lusia at the bottom of a piece of paper with chants for funerals—the Dies irae, the Requiem aeternam, the Kyrie, and the In paradisum—that is preserved loosely in IV 15.\textsuperscript{6} There have been many sisters named Lucia over the course of Soeterbeeck’s history, but this hand seems to be from the seventeenth century, and so the most likely candidates are Sisters Lucia Andriessen Hertroy, who was born in 1676 and died on 11 September 1704,\textsuperscript{7} or else Lucia Langens, who was professed between 1702 and 1716 and died on 30 April 1740.\textsuperscript{8}

This leaves only Ho to be considered, which is the same as that of the five ownership notes in the Soeterbeek Collection that bear the name of Sister Anna Hovelmans (Figure 3.5).\textsuperscript{9} She was born in 1610 to Hendrick Hovelmans, esquire and bailiff of Cranendonck and Eindhoven, and Catharina van den Heuvel, entered Soeterbeek as a choir sister in 1623, was professed in 1627 and served as prioress from 1669 until her death in 1679.\textsuperscript{10} The questions arise whether the hand of her ownership notes is Sister Hovelmans’ own, and whether she was indeed at one point involved in the revision of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books. It is worthwhile to try to answer these queries, as they are related to many important issues that provide context for Beckers’ traces.

The main argument for the ascription of Ho to Hovelmans is the fact, already mentioned, that all of the latter’s ownership notes are written in it. The reverse is also true: the hand did not attribute any other books to any other sisters. It is also responsible for various other notes, including, besides marginal (re)identifications and antiphons, the addition of two responsories for Cecilia of Rome and Lucy of Syracuse in the antiphony IV 7,\textsuperscript{11} a versicle and collect against the

\textsuperscript{1} Reproduced in Sloots 1948, 206.

\textsuperscript{2} In all fairness, it should be mentioned here that the notes in the late medieval antiphonaries do contain certain letter forms, such as the initial s in IV 6, f. 45, that do not appear on the receipt.

\textsuperscript{3} PBF 6168 Hs, 3: pp. 40-42; ASP 1: ASP 666.

\textsuperscript{4} ASP 1, document 14 October 1788.

\textsuperscript{5} Sluijters 1982b, 3: pp. 40-42; ASP 1: ASP 666.

\textsuperscript{6} ASP 1, document 14 October 1788.

\textsuperscript{7} Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 37; Van Dijk 1982c, 201, no. 4. Cf. Appendix A.1, no. 20.

\textsuperscript{8} IV 15, between ff. 114-115.

\textsuperscript{9} Frenken 1931/32, 298.

\textsuperscript{10} Sluijters 1982b, 179, no. 6.

\textsuperscript{11} The books that include an ownership note of Sister Hovelmans are III 11 (where it is dated 1627), III 84 (where it is dated 1638), V 23, V 61 (where it is dated 1633) and V 92. An undated document with her name on it was pasted into V 122, on which see p. 167 and Figure 3.6.

\textsuperscript{10} Frenken 1931/32, 297.

\textsuperscript{11} IV 7, pp. 323-333. These are the responsories Beata Cecilia quae duos fratres convertisti and Lucia virgo quid a me petis. The former was the third responsory of the first nocturn of Cecilia (cf. IV 6, ff. 159v-160r). The latter was the first responsory at Matins of Lucy, and H26 reidentified it as het lof van S. Lucia (‘the song of praise to St Lucia’) in 130 G 18, ff. 22v-23r, with a reference to f. 11r of the same manuscript, where H12 added its doxology, together with two others. Similarly, on a loose page between ff. 114-115 of IV 15, an unidentified hand added the responsory O lampas ecclesiae for the feast of Elizabeth of Hungary (19 November, but transferred to the 27th at Soeterbeeck), and H24 wrote the verse and the doxology of the same responsory on a slip of paper between ff. 144-145. The title given by H26 indicates that these responsories had lost their original function in the seventeenth century, but that they still served some (para-)liturgical purpose, possibly during Mass in honour of the saints to whose office they originally belonged.
Figure 3.3: Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Soeterbeeck Priory, no. 1, document 14 October 1788 (detail)

Figure 3.4: Soeterbeeck Collection, Add. 10, front pastedown (detail)
Figure 3.5: Soeterbeeck Collection, III 11, verso front flyleaf
plague in the vespers IV 77, and the Alleluia verse of the common of apostles and evangelists in the gradual IV 135:2. None of these notes are in any way related to the name of another sister, which means that the association between Ho and Hovelmans is not only mutual, but also exclusive. By itself, this is not proof that the hand is Anna’s own, because there are examples of seventeenth-century ownership notes that were not written by the sisters who are mentioned in them. However, a contemporary of hers, Johanna van Cappeval, is known with certainty to have written at least one of her ownership notes herself, because the one on the verso of the front flyleaf in V 5 is in the same hand as her biographical notes in the calendar of the manuscript vespers Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294, which refer to herself in the first person singular. The fact that there is evidence that it was possible for sisters to write their own ownership notes, and that they actually did so too, combined with the close connection between Ho and Hovelmans’ name, makes it eminently probable that they belong to the same person.

In all fairness, I should mention that this conclusion immediately raises a few questions. The first of these is evoked also by H24 and H27, the hands of Prioress Van den Heuvel and Sister Lucia. It will be remembered that I argued above that the seventeenth-century statutes refer to the revision of books as a duty resting primarily with the rector. That sisters should also be involved in it, may seem to contradict this. However, the statutes only forbid them to revise books sonder oorlooff des biechtvaders or bij haer selven, and this statement implies that it was possible for sisters to be permitted or even asked to change their books. It is probably no coincidence, in this respect, that two out of the three hands in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries which I have been able to attribute to women belonged to prioresses. The revision of a liturgical book is not a straightforward task, but if any sister would be permitted or commissioned to undertake it, it would be one with this office, particularly if she had the social status and, presumably, solid education of Hovelmans.

The second question raised by the identification of Ho with Hovelmans has to do with the fact that all of Anna’s ownership notes, except the one in V 92, are accompanied by one or more pious or moralistic doggerels or a biblical quotation. Whereas the Bible verses—Mark 10:47 or Luke 18:38 in IV 61, and 2 Corinthians 7:4 in III 84—are both in the first person singular, and may conceivably have been appropriated by Anna into prayers of her own, two of the rhymed sayings are in the imperative. One of them may simply be a variation on common lore that is quoted in its familiar form, but the other, which occurs in III 11, reads Leset ende believ, and that sounds like a direct and clear command—one that also appears in several contemporary ownership notes in what is probably the hand of Rector Wouter Willems. Seen in light of the fact that the note in III 11 is dated to the year 1627, when Anna was only 17 years old, its contents may cast doubt on its authorship. Would a fully professed, but still very young sister write something like this in her own book? This question is probably anachronistic, however, and certainly unanswerable. It can also be countered by asking what person in authority would have written it for her. The hand is completely

---

1 IV 77, ff. 183v-184r. The same text was also added by Sister Johanna or Jenneken (van) Cappeval to the vespers that is currently Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294, ff. 188v-189r. On Cappeval, see below.

2 IV 135:2, pinned to f. 175r (old foliation).

3 For example, the ownership notes of Sister Maeyken van Hout in III 59 and V 57 (both dated 1644), Rector Wouter Willems in V 3 (dated 1644) and Sister Barbara Peters Cuypers in V 46 (dated 1645) were all written in the same hand, which is highly similar to, and might therefore actually be the same as, that of other notes in many more books. It probably belongs to Rector Willems, on whom see p. 68 n. 4.

4 Cappeval was born ca. 1596, professed in 1613, and served as school mistress from 1627 to 1632 and as subprioress from 1645 until her death in 1660 (Frenken 1931/32, 297).

5 On Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294, ff. 10r, 13r, 14v.

6 See p. 147.

7 ‘Without the confessor’s permission […] of her own accord’ (ASP 92, f. 18r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 230).

8 This is the following verse, dated to 1653: Laet u lijf u ende swijght al stille soo hebt ghij alle dingen naer uwen wille (‘Do not act, endure, be still, then all things will be according to your will’), V 61, front pastedown).

9 ‘Read and live it’ (III 11, verso front flyleaf).

10 The other instances of the phrase leset ende beleve, in various spellings, are a later addition to the ownership note (dated 1637) of Sister Catharina van Oetelaar in V 46 and in the ownership note (dated 1629) of Maria van Aer in V 57. The two hands in these notes are very similar to each other; the one in V 46 is the same as that tentatively attributed to Rector Willems in n. 3 above.
different from the ones that in all probability belong to Rector Willems or Prioress Petronella van Berckel.¹

Here the issue of Ho’s identity would remain if it were not for an additional piece of evidence, consisting of a piece of paper that was slightly trimmed and reused as pastedown in a printed book with shelf mark V 122, to which it was attached upside down (Figure 3.6). On what is currently the front of this document appears Hovelmans’ name in the familiar hand, with one of her customary rhyming couplets, written so near what was originally the bottom of the scrap of paper that the final words had to be written unusually close to those on the line above. When the pastedown was detached from the board in 2015, it was revealed that on its back is a Dutch translation in the same hand of part of the epistle at Mass for the anniversary of the dedication of a church, which consists of Revelation 21:2-5a. An actual liturgical function of this document is out of the question, for not only was the epistle at Mass read or recited by the celebrant himself in Latin, the document, which does not appear ever to have been much larger, does not contain that text in its entirety, but only vv. 2-3. One could, however, very well imagine Sister Hovelmans writing this almost mystical passage down to keep it with her for personal meditation, with her name and one of her sayings on the back to identify its owner. In that case, although no crease is visible anymore, it is possible that the document was folded once to enable it being put away, which would explain the ownership note’s odd position on the lower half of the verso. If this scenario is true, the document in V 122 constitutes clear proof that Ho is Hovelman’s own hand.

There is a complication, however, because directly above Anna’s ownership note—which is unusual not only because of its place on the page but also in its use of the initial rather than the full name—appear two letters: An. This can be one of two things. It may be short for Hovelmans’ first name, but that raises the question why Anna first wrote it down like this, in a form that does not occur in her other ownership notes, and then have it followed by her full name, with the equally uncharacteristic initial. The other option is that an is a colloquial form of aan, meaning ‘for, to’. This would mean that the piece of paper is addressed to Anna and that the hand is not her own. However, the form an, with a short vowel, is not typical for the Brabantian dialect that Anna Hovelmans would have been expected to speak, nor for contemporary written texts from the area of Soeterbeeck.² And who could have given Hovelmans a document like this, with her name and a poem on it as well as a biblical text, and for what purpose?

It is impossible, then, to reach a definitive conclusion concerning the document in V 122, but taking its ephemeral nature, the odd position and wording of the ownership note, the nature of the biblical quotation and Anna’s dialect in consideration, I think the most likely reading of it is the following. The writing on what is currently the front is probably not a dedication or a formal ownership note at all, but a series of doodles by Anna with two unusual attempts on her part at writing her name, on the back of a piece of paper on which she had written a text that was dear to her heart and that she may have borne with her. My conclusion, then, is that it is most probable that Ho is indeed Hovelman’s own hand, and that she was involved in the revision of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript antiphonaries.

The revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries was an ongoing process that spanned at least the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and Beckers’ notes are only a part of it. In order to understand more fully what precise role he played, a distinction must be made between those revisionary activities that took place before his, those that were

---

¹ Sister Van Berckel was born in 1581, probably entered Soeterbeeck as a choir sister in 1602, was appointed subprioress in 1607, which she will was in 1617, and appointed procuratrix on 17 May 1618. She served as prioress from 29 June 1623 until 1659, and again from 1665 until her death in 1669 (Frenken 1931/32, 296-297). Her ownership notes appear in III 11, III 41, V 38, V 41, V 42, V 45 and V 89, and all exept the last one (which is dated 27 August 1605) appear to have been written by the same person, which is probably Petronella herself. It is noteworthy, however, that Van Berckel’s motto, Strijt als dan verblijt (‘Struggle to be happy afterwards’), which accompanies her ownership notes in III 11, III 41, V 38 and V 45, is also adapted as part of the rhyming couplet on the document with Anna Hovelmans’ name that is mentioned below.

² Nicoline van der Sijs, professor of Historical Linguistics of Dutch in the Digital World at Radboud University Nijmegen, personal communication with the author, 1 June 2015.
Figure 3.6: Soeterbeeck Collection, V 122, front pastedown (loosened in 2015)
contemporaneous, and those that followed, dividing the various stratigraphic units across three layers and describing their relationship with each other.

3.4.3.1. Earlier
It seems best to simply deal with the oldest layer first. Hands that belong to it appear in all eleven late medieval manuscripts mentioned above,\(^1\) as well as in the printed antiphonary IV 3, printed in 1627. The people responsible had the same goal as Beckers: to revise these old books in such a way as to enable Vespers to be sung from them in accordance with the text of the Roman Breviary. In order to achieve this, they did many of the things that Beckers would also do, such as identifying, reidentifying and revising antiphons. One remarkable difference, however, is that the oldest hands only rarely add new antiphons directly into the manuscripts themselves, in the right liturgical place, as Beckers does. Instead, if anything is to be found there at all, it is usually only a marginal note informing the user that the antiphon is in schrift or has been gescreven.\(^2\) This is true, of course, for all the contents of these books—that is why they are called ‘manuscripts’—, but the reference is to the fact that the chant in question was written down somewhere else by a modern hand. In most cases the user is supposed to be able to find it without any more information, although occasionally a general description such as agter inden boeck is given.\(^3\) Often, however, the antiphons referred to are nowhere to be found, and that is because they were often written on loose or pinned-down pieces of paper, many of which must have simply been lost. A large number of such slips do still survive, spread throughout the books from the library of Soeterbeeck, but most of these are not referred to by any marginal note. The inconvenience of this system is clear: additional antiphons are hard to find and easily lost, and reference to them has not been made consistently. In fact, the single most important improvement of Beckers’ renovation over the existing revisions is that he provides all antiphons that are necessary on the pages of the books themselves, written in the margins or on slips of paper pasted over the original text, where one would expect them, or at least referred to in that place.

The fact that the old revisions were carried out by so many different people over a long period of time probably explains why they are highly inconsistent. Besides many gaps, there are also many differences of approach, both between hands and among the notes of individual persons. Sometimes antiphons that already had the right function in the manuscripts have been identified, but more often they are not. Antiphons that needed to be reidentified have only received a marginal note to that effect about half the time. The density of revision varies greatly from manuscript to manuscript; the winter part IV 4, for instance, has barely been touched. Sometimes Magnificat antiphons for days of the week or for first Vespers on Sundays have been taken into account in one book, but not in another. The question raised by all of this is, of course, whether these books had been revised carefully enough to actually enable their use before Beckers came along. Certainly not with ease. Of course, the likelihood must be taken into account of a scenario where most antiphons in schrift were thrown away or reused after Beckers’ revision made them superfluous in at least four books, so that there will not have been as many actual gaps in the material as there are now. The general appearance of the notes is haphazard, but that is probably the illusion wrought by time. When taken all together, these isolated activities amount to a great deal of work. So many different persons spent time and energy on the revision of these books for so

---

\(^1\) See pp. 160-161.

\(^2\) ‘Written down.’ Cf. IV 6, f. 64v (H19); IV 7, pp. 182 (Ho), 205 (Ho), 351 (Ho), 357 (Ho), 360 (Ho); IV 15, ff. 67r (H6), 116v (H6), 119r (H26), 124v (H4), 133r (H4) and on the piece of paper between ff. 123-124 (H4); IV 21, ff. 4r (H6), 78r (H28), 96v (H28), 176v (H6); IV 22, ff. 49v (H2), 63r (H8), 246v (H2); IV 25, ff. 3v (H8), 219r (H2); 130 G 18, ff. 16v (H26), 78v (H4), 82r (H4), and PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 37v (Ho).

\(^3\) ‘At the back of the book’ (130 G 18, f. 82r). In this case, the reference is to f. 107v.
many years, that it is difficult to envision them doing so if their work had no practical use and the manuscripts were not used liturgically. Why would so many people write down or (re)identify so many antiphons if these were not sung? It simply cannot be definitively proven on the basis of the available evidence, but the latter strongly suggests that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck did indeed sing Vespers on Sundays and feasts in accordance with the Roman Breviary out of their late medieval manuscripts long before Beckers became rector. Quite possibly, the revision of these books was begun at the moment when the sisters abandoned the pre-Tridentine use of Windesheim for that of Rome.¹

It may very well have been frustration over the unsystematic and not very user-friendly manner of revision of his predecessors that spurred Beckers on to the undertaking of his own renovation. He does make use of the older notes, however. When they were useful, he often simply took their presence for granted, and incorporated them into his own. It was not necessary to add another note for an antiphon that had already been identified or reidentified in another hand. There are also occasions, however, where notes needed to be replaced or expanded. References, for instance, could be made much more precisely with the help of the page numbers that Beckers had added. In IV 7, for instance, most of the psalm antiphons that the Roman Breviary prescribes for use on the octave day of the Holy Innocents (4 January) appear on p. 44 as commemoration antiphons for their octave. The only exception is the second psalm antiphon, A bimatu et infra, which appears on p. 40 as the second psalm antiphon on the feast itself. One of Beckers’ predecessors, who reidentified the commemoration antiphons on p. 44, therefore added a marginal note there referring to the second one, saying simply soeckt hier voor A bimatu.² Beckers largely erased this note and replaced it with the much more precise and helpful direction siet fol. 40.³ Sometimes Beckers even replaced marginal notes whose directions were perfectly clear, perhaps in the interest of uniformity or legibility.

One case of interaction between Beckers and an earlier hand deserves special mention here. On a number of pages that were originally left blank between the proper and the common of saints in the winter antiphonary IV 22, H16 added the antiphons for the feast of Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March), which had been given a proper office by Clement XI on 3 February 1714.⁴ Before this person could quite finish the final antiphon, that of the second Magnificat, he or she reached the end of a page. There the chant was originally abandoned, until Beckers added the rest of it on the verso of the folium.⁵

Beckers’ completion of the antiphon in IV 22 is one of only two instances, besides his abandoned revision of the summer part IV 25, of a revisionary note in his hand in a manuscript that he did not completely renovate. The other example occurs in IV 15, an antiphonary for the summer half of the year, in which he added the fourth psalm antiphon for first Vespers of the common of apostles and evangelists.⁶ In other manuscripts, this antiphon is included as the first of Lauds,⁷ but the scribe of this particular volume apparently forgot about it, and Beckers felt compelled to add it in.

The presence of the two ad hoc notes by Beckers in IV 15 and IV 22, though perfectly understandable in context, raises the question whether these books might have been used in his days without having been thoroughly renovated by him. After all, as explained above,⁸ the four surviving manuscripts that were given the full treatment would not have been sufficient

¹ On the uncertainty of the precise moment when this switch happened, see pp. 104-105.
² See earlier on, A bimatu’ (IV 7, p. 44). This hand is Ho, which belongs to Anna Hovelmans (cf. pp. 162-167).
³ See p. 40’ (IV 7, p. 44).
⁴ Schober 1891, 201.
⁵ IV 22, f. 228r-v.
⁶ IV 15, ff. 216v-217r.
⁷ E.g., IV 6, f. 174v.
⁸ See pp. 145-146.
for the entire community. Perhaps Beckers felt that some of the books had already been revised carefully enough to be usable. This would not only solve the problem of the number of books, but also explain his abandonment of IV 25. However, as they are now, the surviving antiphonaries that were not revised by Beckers almost all lack a number of important offices, such as those of all holy canons regular (5 March) and Gabriel the Archangel (19 March), so they would not have been very useful. What is more, stopping the project of revision before it was complete would rather have defeated its purpose. I believe, therefore, that Beckers added his isolated traces in IV 15 and IV 22 to fill two gaps he just happened to notice during his research for or execution of his renovation of other volumes, and not because these books, or any other ones that he did not revise, were still in use. To think that the rector sometimes even made corrections when this was not strictly necessary is less problematic and easier to reconcile with the care he took with the other volumes than that he would settle for the jumble created by his predecessors.

3.4.3.2. *Contemporary*

Not all hands that are at work in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries predate Beckers. Some of them are clearly later, and to these I turn below, but first I discuss a number of notes that seem to be contemporary. These appear in IV 8, the eighteenth-century antiphory for Vespers throughout the entire year. After its donation to Soeterbeeck by Van Steenbergen in 1793, Beckers himself worked on this book too, most conspicuously by using his set minuscule to add at least the first four tones, out of eight, to which the Magnificat can be recited onto several pages that had originally been left blank at the back.¹ These tones are a topic that is best postponed to the next chapter,² but they are not the only thing that Beckers added to this book, as I will explain shortly. It will be seen that the rector’s traces, and those of other people that are contemporary to them, provide a strong reason to believe that IV 8 was used liturgically at Soeterbeeck in conjunction with the revised medieval manuscripts. This was not possible, however, without some adaptations.

As noted,³ there are many surprising correspondences between Beckers’ minor melodic deviations from Soeterbeeck’s medieval manuscripts and Roman Antiphonaries on the one hand and the antiphons provided in IV 8 on the other. However, there are also a fair number of antiphons among those that were (re)identified or added by the rector whose notes differ in minor as well as substantial ways from those of the corresponding chants in the eighteenth-century book. These differences also occur in the antiphons of feasts for which the rector demonstrably used another source than Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts or Roman Antiphonaries. In other words, Van Steenbergen’s book is not a representative of this source. This is important to keep in mind, because on a textual level, in terms of the antiphons and offices that are included, IV 8 largely corresponds with Beckers’ renovation. It is textually in accordance with the Roman Breviary, and expanded with many of the same regional and congregational feasts that were celebrated at Soeterbeeck. The proper of saints is, in fact, almost the same as the one in which Beckers’ revisions would have resulted in the late medieval antiphonaries. Granted, there are a few differences, but these are very limited in scope.⁴ Taking only its texts into consideration, then, IV 8 could easily be mistaken for a

---

¹ IV 8, ff. 143r-144r.
³ See pp. 159-160.
⁴ IV 8 entirely omits the offices of the translations of Augustine (28 February and 11 October) and the Holy Name (Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin), the Rosary (first Sunday in October) and the patronage (any Sunday in November) of the Blessed Virgin. This looks worse than it is, however, for the antiphons used on these Marian feasts would have been almost the same as those on that of Our Lady of the Snow (5 August), with only minor variations in that of the first Magnificat, so that their absence is not
descendant of Beckers’ model; only a comparison of the melodies lays bare its incompatibility with the rector’s work.

This, however, only refers to the manuscript as it was written. There are many traces of attempts of bringing the melodies in line with those of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries as renovated by Beckers. This makes perfect sense, for once IV 8 had been donated in 1793, the community would have wanted to be able to use the book, and therefore revised it accordingly. Most of the revisions were made by covering the original notes with narrow slips of paper, onto which the right melodies were added, but there are also examples of the scribe’s notes being changed, deleted or added directly on the page. Because these notes are little more than series of small black squares, it is usually not possible to recognise the hand that added them. In the instance of the Magnificat antiphons of Mary Magdalene (22 July), however, the replacement notes are unmistakably Beckers’, as is clear from the shape not only of the notes, but also of the clefs, the flat signs and the custodes.

That Beckers wrote these particular staffs in IV 8 is important not only because it means that it is possible that he was responsible for others as well. More significantly, it proves that the manuscript was indeed being revised during his rectorate, and this means that the other revisionary notes that appear in it, even if they were added by different persons in various stages, may well be more or less contemporary to his. In other words, we could be dealing with a full-fledged extension of the renovation of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval manuscripts in an eighteenth-century book.

On a certain level, there is no doubt that this conclusion is valid. The revisions in IV 8 have the effect of bringing the manuscript in line with Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries as renovated by Beckers and his predecessors. There is also a clear indication that this took place shortly after 1793.

On the pages following the Magnificat tones that have been added by Beckers, there are notes in various other hands. Most of these are in the unidentified H32. The person to whom this hand belonged, added, among other things, several antiphons that were clearly intended as replacements for the corresponding ones in the book’s main body, all of which

---

1 The chants that were brought in line with those of Soeterbeeck’s renovated antiphonaries are the Magnificat antiphons for second Vespers of the third Sunday of Advent, the Magnificat antiphon on second Vespers of John the Evangelist (27 December), the Magnificat antiphon of second Vespers in Quadragesima, the psalm antiphon of first Vespers of Easter, the first and third psalm antiphons of Pentecost, the Magnificat antiphon of second Vespers of the seventh, thirteenth and twenty-third Sundays after Pentecost, the third psalm antiphon and the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of the Conception (8 December), the Espousal (23 January) and the Nativity (8 September) of the Blessed Virgin, all antiphons of the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany) and, with small errors, of all holy canons regular (5 March), and Joseph, the spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March), the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of the Invention of the Cross (3 May), the Magnificat antiphons of the Conversion of Augustine (5 May), the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of John and Paul (26 June), the Magnificat antiphon for second Vespers of Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July), the Magnificat antiphons of Mary Magdalene (22 July), the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of the Transfiguration of the Lord (6 August), the Magnificat antiphon of Joachim (Sunday in the octave of the Assumption), the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of Lawrence of Rome (10 August), the first and fifth psalm antiphons and two Magnificat antiphons for the guardian angels (first Sunday in September), Thomas of Villanova (22 September, but transferred and inadvertently omitted from the calendar of Soeterbeeck in IV 58) and Raphael the Archangel (24 October), the Magnificat antiphon of first Vespers of apostles, evangelists and martyrs in Eastertide, the fourth psalm antiphon of virgins and women who are neither virgins nor martyrs, and the Magnificat antiphon for second Vespers of women who are neither virgins nor martyrs.

2 IV 8, ff. 97v-98r.

3 Cf. IV 8, ff. 147r-[149]r with ff. 67v-70r, 107r-109r. The replacement chants which H32 added at the back of IV 8 are the five psalm antiphons and second Magnificat antiphon of the feast of the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany of the Lord), and the five psalm and two Magnificat antiphons of that of the
were among those that had melodies which differ from Beckers’. There are indications that the relationship between Beckers and H32 was very close. Besides adding the replacement offices, the unidentified hand also used the folia following Beckers’ four Magnificat tones to add at least the sixth, seventh and eighth ones. This is clearly a conclusion to a project that Beckers had for some reason not finished himself. In addition, H32 also added the hymn *Deus tuorum militum* in IV 8, which was in imitation of Beckers’ addition of the same chant to the eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century hymnal Add. 10, which is discussed below. Another example of the same process occurs with reference to Beckers’ addition of a Kyrie to the fifteenth-century gradual Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, ABM h61, discussed in the following chapter. This addition is mirrored by H32 in the manuscript gradual IV 135:2, where this hand added the chant twice in the lower margins of a single opening. It belonged to a person, then, who finished things that the rector had abandoned and imitated his work in different contexts. This merits the name of cooperation, and it is eminently probable that H32 was a contemporary of Beckers’.

Now, it should be granted that the revision method of H32 differs from that of the other hands, which did not add replacement texts at the back of IV 8 but simply changed or replaced the melodies *in situ*. This actually also happened, after some unknown amount of time had elapsed, to the very antiphons that H32 had already replaced, probably to save the user the trouble of leafing through the entire book. However, these circumstances are not problematic, as I am not arguing that the revision of IV 8 was a single, sustained project carried out by one or two people. It clearly was not, and it was not perfect, because even now there are a missing antiphon that has not been added, and two offices whose wildly deviant melodies remain unreplaced and unrevised. My claim is that the revision of IV 8 began during Beckers’ rectorate, and the additions of H32 seem to support this.

How long it took for IV 8 to be revised to its present and ultimate extent, cannot be said, but there is no reason to assume that it was a lengthy project. The question is irrelevant, however, because, despite the differences described above, the contents of IV 8 were originally already so close to what Beckers’ renovation had resulted in, that on most occasions it could be used next to the older manuscripts without any problem. The book is very different, in this respect, from the medieval antiphonaries in their unrevised state, and can, in contrast with them, be expected to have been revised progressively while already in use. In
fact, the gradual realisation of its revision is a strong argument for its use in combination with
the other books discussed so far, and that seems to have started in Beckers’ rectorate.

Besides being an argument in favour of the rather self-evident conclusion that the
sisters actually used the book that they had been given, the scenario sketched above is also
significant because it allows for IV 8 to be added to the corpus of usable antiphonaries, at
least from 1793 onwards. It was argued above that, if they only had the four late medieval
antiphonaries that Beckers revised, the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck would have been at least
one winter and two summer parts short of having enough renovated antiphonaries for the
entire community.1 IV 8 covers the entire liturgical year, and so brings the gap down to one
manuscript. It does not solve the problem of an apparent lack of books for the first six years
after the revision of IV 7 in 1787, but at least it comes close to doing so for the period after
1793.

3.4.3.3. Later
The time during which the antiphonaries from the library of Soeterbeeck can be expected on
the basis of archival sources to have been used liturgically for canonical Vespers and
Compline lasted until about the middle of the nineteenth century. As argued in the previous
chapter, that was the moment when the decision was made for the sisters to restrict their
celebration of the liturgy of the hours entirely to the Little Office of the Virgin. This
development was definitely a fact in 1853, when Joannes Zwijsen, archbishop of Utrecht and
apostolic administrator of ’s-Hertogenbosch, approved the new statutes that describe this state
of affairs, although I connect it with the establishment of the convent of Nazareth in 1845.2 In
this light, it is highly puzzling that IV 8 and, particularly, the three printed copies of the
Roman Antiphonaries from the library of Soeterbeeck (IV 3, IV 18, IV 19) contain a
considerable number of notes in two hands from the latter half of the nineteenth century: H17
and H30. These have nothing to do with Beckers’ stratigraphic unit, and are too few to be
reliably interpreted. The evidence they provide of the use of the books in which they appear
may be an indication that the canonical office or some elements from it were not completely
abandoned at Soeterbeeck even in the second half of the nineteenth century, but it is too
slender to make any definitive statements.

EXCURSUS: THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY NOTES IN SOETERBEEK’S ANTIPHONARIES
The hands that are most strongly associated with the revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries after
Beckers’ rectorate are H17 and H30. It can be firmly concluded that these were active in the second
half of the nineteenth-century. H17 added, among other things, the office of the feast of the Most
Precious Blood of Jesus (first Sunday in July), extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 10
August 1849,3 to IV 3,4 and the antiphons of the new office of the Immaculate Conception,
promulgated in 1863, to IV 8.5 In the case of H30 the evidence for a late date is less direct: formally, it resembles H17 very strongly, and the nature of its notes proves that they are not part of
Beckers’ renovation but of an entirely different project that cannot have been contemporary with it.
The hand appears most prominently in IV 19, to which it added three offices and in which it
replaced one antiphon with a new one and revised the text of many hymns.6 All of these additions
and revisions use Roman melodies. This means that H30 was not considering the use of IV 19 in
conjunction with the late medieval Windesheim manuscripts, but simply updating the book,

1 See p. 146.
2 See pp. 88-89.
3 Schober 1891, 222.
4 IV 3, between pp. 496-497.
5 IV 8, between pp. 65-66. Fragments of this office, also by H17, appear in IV 18, between pp. 4-5.
6 The offices that H30 added to IV 19 are those of the feasts of the Holy Name of Jesus (between pp. 96-97),
Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin and Augustine of Hippo (between pp. 432-433). The replaced chant is the
fourth psalm antiphon of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (p. 425). On the hymns, see p. 184.
perhaps after the example of IV 18, which had been printed 84 years later, in 1735. This is so different from and incompatible with what Beckers and his predecessors and contemporaries had been doing, that H30 must belong to a later time, and it was probably contemporary with H17.

Why were the people to whom these nineteenth-century hands belong working on books for the divine office at a time when this was no longer being prayed? Why was it necessary to update and revise these volumes if they were not used liturgically? The formulation of an answer to these questions is made virtually impossible by two factors. The first is the scarcity of the material with which we are dealing. Most of the added chants in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries that postdate Beckers appear on slips of paper that have been pasted into the books as additional, turnable folia, with only a narrow connecting surface. Many more of such scraps may have and did indeed come loose again; shreds of some of these are preserved in IV 3 and IV 18, and others will have been lost. Such losses mean that it is practically impossible to arrive at an understanding of the larger context of the individual traces that remain. The second complicating factor is that H17 and H30 did not always take consistent action. As indicated, H30 laboured hard to update IV 19 by adding chants with Roman melodies. Conversely, H17 added the psalm antiphons of second Vespers of John and Paul (26 June) to IV 3 with the melodies of the late medieval antiphonaries as lightly revised by Beckers, which differ from those in IV 18 and IV 19.² The purpose of this addition in the oldest and most obsolete Roman Antiphonary that survives from Soeterbeeck, which was printed in 1627, is itself entirely mysterious, but the result is also incompatible with that of other notes.

Still, despite the limited possibilities and uncertainties, a tentative answer to the question why IV 8 and the Roman Antiphonaries were being worked on even in the nineteenth century can be provided, although there are difficulties with it. The majority of the nineteenth-century additions to or revisions of these books have to do with feasts that have the rank of second class double or higher.³ Perhaps the great office was sung on such important feasts at Soeterbeeck, to the melodies of the Roman Antiphonary, even during the second half of the nineteenth century and despite the fact that neither the revised statutes nor any other archival sources mention this.

Sadly, this interpretation does not entirely fit the evidence, for it does not account for all that was done with these books. The revision of the hymns in IV 19 could perhaps be explained by assuming that these chants had a use beyond the divine office. But then there is still the addition of antiphons for the double feast of John and Paul to IV 3 and for many more feasts with a lower rank than second class double in IV 18 and IV 19.¹ The presence of these chants is a mystery that I lack the information to explain, and the same is true, frankly, for all traces left by the use of these antiphonaries at a moment when the latter should not have been in use anymore.

3.4.4. The Antiphonaries’ Functional Meaning
Dwelling on the issue of the nineteenth-century notes in Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries any longer would be an exercise in futility, but thankfully it is not necessary to do so. Beckers⁴

¹ Cf. IV 3, between pp. 486-487 and IV 7, pp. 224-226.
² IV 18, pp. 497-498; IV 19, pp. 452-454.
³ The ranks of the feaststhat have already been mentioned are as follows. The feast of Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin was a first class double at Soeterbeeck because he was its patron, and from 1870 onwards also in the entire Church (Schober 1891, 201). The feast of Augustine was a first class double at Soeterbeeck because it belonged to his order. The feasts of the Holy Name of Jesus, the Purification of the Blessed Virgin and the Precious Blood were second class doubles (Appendix C; Schober 1891, 222). The feast of the Immaculate Conception was also a second class double, until 1879, when it became a first (Schober 1891, 181).
⁴ H17 and H30 added the Magnificat antiphon for the entire octave (semdouble) and the octave day (double) of Peter and Paul (30 June-6 July) to IV 18 (between pp. 504-505) and IV 19 (between pp. 460-461) respectively, incidentally with melodies based on those in the medieval manuscripts. H30 also added the first Magnificat antiphon for the feasts of Our Lady, Help of Christians (24 May), Our Lady of the Snow (a greater double on 5 August), the Holy Name of Mary (a greater double on the Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin) and Mary de Socos (a double on 26 September) to IV 18 (on p. 348 and between pp. 524-525), as did an unidentified hand with the second Magnificat antiphon for Our Lady of Carmel (a greater double on 16 July) (between pp. 504-505). Also, an unidentified hand pinned the specific reading of the antiphon Sancta Maria succurre miseris for the first Magnificat of the feast of Our Lady, Help of Christians to IV 8, f. 138v.
traces have been sufficiently contextualised among their earlier and contemporary counterparts, and this has resulted in two important conclusions. The first of these is that the eighteenth-century rector was not the first to renovate these books, but that he improved upon a project that had been running for at least a century. The other conclusion is that IV 8 was begun to be brought in accordance with the revised late medieval manuscripts very shortly after it came to Soeterbeeck in 1793. Both of these conclusions support the assumption that Beckers’ renovation of the antiphonaries had a practical, liturgical purpose, and therefore that these books had a practical, liturgical use. Together, they add the weight of ages and the power of numbers to the argument that the books’ revision was too much work to be a private pastime.¹ It was not private: many other people worked on it too, over a very long period of time. It was no mere pastime either: in his colophons in IV 6 and IV 7, Beckers signed his many notes in the capacity of rector, and in his obituary he is commended for having particularly displayed his zeal for the community in his writings for the liturgy.² It is clear, then, that the rector’s renovation met a serious, common and sustained liturgical need on the part of the sisters, and given the nature of the books and their revision, this cannot have been anything else than the recitation of part of the divine office.

Against this background, there can be no doubt at all that the revised antiphonaries actually had a functional meaning within the context of the liturgy for the singing of Compline and Vespers according to the divine office in Beckers’ days and many decades before. This conclusion is supported, too, by the presence of very many notes, in nearly every single book, that identify the psalm tones to which certain antiphons in the manuscripts are to be sung,³ evidently to increase the antiphonaries’ ease of use. Granted, there are many gaps, errors and inconsistencies in Beckers’ renovation as well as in the notes of his predecessors and contemporaries, despite the evident care they took, but the community of Soeterbeeck may be expected to have been able to deal pragmatically with minor imperfections. Anyway, such problems do not outweigh the evidence that is constituted by the fact that the revisions were carried out at all and that they were predominantly succesful and adequate.

It would seem, then, that Beckers’ traces in the antiphonaries confirm the tentative conclusion that I drew on the basis of his production of the Dutch diurnal IV 58 that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck did not limit themselves entirely to the Little Office, but also prayed canonical Vespers and Compline on Sundays and (semi)double feasts. They confirm that the rector’s notes in and at the back of the Horae diurnae IV 60 and IV 65 do not mean that the community only said commemorations. To this, they add the insight that the sisters actually sang the office on occasion. Thus, the gap left by the dismissal on the basis of archival sources of the conclusion that only the Little Office was being prayed is partly filled again by evidence from liturgical books. Additional pieces of the puzzle are provided by the third type that Beckers revised: the hymnal.

### 3.5. The Traces of Use in Soeterbeeck’s Hymnals

When canonical Vespers was sung at Soeterbeeck, the only chants besides antiphons whose melodies could be so complicated that the sisters probably needed to have them set out in a book—in contrast to, for instance, the psalm tones, which they must have known by heart—are hymns. In liturgical books such as breviaries and antiphonaries, these can be spread across the various ordinary, proper and common sections, but they also often appear in a self-contained part, or even in a separate volume. This variety of options is the reason why I will not provide as exhaustive an overview of the hymnals from the library of Soeterbeeck as I have of the breviaries and the antiphonaries. Listing only the collections of hymns would not

---

¹ Cf. p. 81.
² See pp. 81, 147.
³ E.g., IV 7, p. 17.
cover all places where these chants are to be found, and if I were to try to discuss all of the latter, the result would be a nearly interminable enumeration of various types of books. Instead, I turn immediately to three hymnals in the Soeterbeeck Collection that contain traces of use in Beckers’ hand, one of which is an eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century stand-alone manuscript, meant for Vespers during the entire liturgical year (Add. 10). The other two each appear as part of another, late medieval book. The first of these is a hymnal for Vespers and Compline during the summer half of the year in the summer antiphonary IV 15 (ff. 262r-296r). The second is a hymnal for Vespers and Compline for the entire year, which begins the liturgical miscellany that is the second unit of the composite manuscript IV 52 (ff. 31r-65r). I discuss the latter two hymnals first and address the first, as well as the relationship of all three to others from the library of Soeterbeeck, in their proper place.

It is likely that Beckers considered his work on IV 15 and IV 52 to be an extension of his renovation of the antiphonaries. One reason for assuming this is that its functional dimension is comparable: the goal was to allow the sisters to sing the hymns for Vespers as included in the Roman Breviary to the tones they have in the convent’s late medieval hymnals. He therefore had to bring the contents of these sections of the old Windesheim books in line with those of the Roman books. He did so by covering part or all of the original text of several hymns with narrow slips of paper that carried revised readings. In one case only did he simply add a hymn on a blank page. An important difference with his work on the antiphons is that he almost never added a marginal note to identify or reidentify a hymn.

Another reason to think that Beckers’ revision of the two hymnals was intended as a supplement to that of the antiphonaries is that he quickly abandoned it, for reasons I discuss below. Therefore, I can be mercifully brief. In the sections that follow, I first outline the typological perimeters of Beckers’ renovation by discussing what it would have had to entail in order to have been complete and thorough. I contrast this ideal to what the rector actually did, and then provide an interpretation of certain peculiarities along the typological dimension of his work in the context of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical practice. The paragraph ends with a short look at later attempts at the revision of the hymns in the convent’s liturgical books.

3.5.1. Hymns in Eighteenth-Century Liturgical Books
If Beckers wished for the hymns in Soeterbeeck’s late medieval manuscripts to be used liturgically in his own days, he needed to revise them thoroughly. There is a double reason for this. First, as with the antiphons, the hymns’ distribution across the offices differed between the late medieval use of Windesheim and the eighteenth-century Roman Breviary, and the repertoire for Vespers was also very different in both. Second, the texts of many hymns had been subjected to, sometimes very extensive, revision under the pontificate of Urban VIII (1623-1644). With the help of a committee of four Jesuits, this pope had undertaken to bring the hymns of the Church into accord with humanist ideals of metre and Latin grammar, and ever since their inclusion in the Roman Breviary in 1632 the revised hymns had been standard, as stipulated in the accompanying bull Divinam Psalmodiam of 25 January 1631. This means that Beckers did not only have to adapt the hymns for Vespers in the Soeterbeeck manuscripts to the Roman Breviary, but also to a seventeenth-century revision of that book.

---

1 For a description of IV 52, see Kienhorst 2005, 86-87.
2 This is the hymn Jesu redemptor omnium in IV 52:1, f. 30v.
3 The exceptions are the hymn Creator alme siderum in IV 52:2, f. 31r, and, of course, the hymn Jesu redemptor omnium in IV 52:1, f. 30v, which Beckers had added himself.
4 See pp. 180-181.
5 On the revision of the breviary under Urban VIII, see Bäumer 1895, 502-510; McGrath 1939.
6 The Dutch translations of the hymns which Beckers included in IV 58 appear to have been made from the pre-Urban version, although this is usually very difficult to say because the differences in sense between the two versions are usually very small and the translations of them very free.
In order to be able to sing Vespers on Sundays throughout the year and on the universal and regional feasts of the Roman liturgy and the proper feasts of Windesheim, the sisters of Soeterbeeck needed to have noted versions of forty-seven different hymns. Most of these were seasonal, while others were proper or common to specific feasts. Each of them had a proper tone to which it could be sung, but not all of these were always used. The reason for this is that the rubrics of the Roman Antiphonary specified that in Advent all hymns for Vespers of the same metre (an iambic dimeter quatrain) should be sung to the tone of the seasonal hymn *Creator alme siderum*.¹ In Nativitytide, understood in its broad sense as lasting until the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (2 February), all hymns of the same metre outside Vespers were sung to the tone of the seasonal hymn at that hour, *Jesu redemptor omnium*, with one exception. This was the seasonal hymn at Lauds, *A solis ortu cardine*,² which in its turn supplied the tone for all hymns at Vespers except *Jesu redemptor omnium*.³ In Eastertide all common hymns of the same metre at Vespers were sung to the tone of *Ad regias Agni dapes*,⁴ and the same was true for all hymns in Ascensiontide and the tone of *Salutis humanae sator*.⁵ Not even the text was entirely constant, for there were seasonal doxologies as well as melodies for hymns in an iambic dimeter quatrain in Nativitytide, the octave of the Epiphany, Eastertide, Ascensiontide and the octave of Pentecost.⁶

3.5.2. Beckers’ Revision of the Hymnals

The hymnal that was most thoroughly renovated by Beckers is the one in the second unit of IV 52. In it, he revised the text of all seasonal and proper hymns for Vespers in the proper of time—insofar as these were in need of revision, for the hymn *Pange lingua gloriosi* for Corpus Christi was not reworked by Urban VIII.⁷ He also added the hymn for Nativitytide, *Jesu redemptor omnium*,⁸ for reasons having to do with its seasonal melody. In the manuscript, the hymn originally given for Vespers on the Nativity of the Lord is *A solis ortu cardine*, and its tone is used for all hymns until the feast of the Purification.⁹ However, as just mentioned, the Roman Antiphonary uses this hymn at Lauds, and though it nevertheless still furnishes most hymns at Vespers during Nativitytide with this melody, it does not do so for *Jesu redemptor*. In order to be true to this distinction, Beckers could not simply replace the words of *A solis* in the manuscript with those of *Jesu redemptor*, but had to add a whole new text, with another melody as well.

In addition to the hymns of the proper of time, Beckers also revised three from the common of saints, namely those for apostles and evangelists in Eastertide, for one martyr in the same season and for (bishop-)confessors. He covered most of the words of the hymn for the dedication of a church, *Urbs beata Jerusalem*, with slips of paper. Presumably, this was in order to replace them with the Urbanian version, *Caelestis Urbs Jerusalem*, but Beckers never wrote anything beyond the first word.¹⁰ It is very well possible that this marks the point where he stopped working on IV 52, never to return to it again.¹¹

---

¹ IV 19, p. 3.
² IV 19, p. 34.
³ IV 19, p. 55.
⁴ There is no rubric that says this, but it is apparent from the tones given in IV 3, ff. clxii-clxxii.
⁵ IV 3, p. clxxvii.
⁶ The texts of these seasonal doxologies are given in the introduction to Table 3.6, which includes a complete survey of all Latin hymns for Vespers revised or added in the liturgical books from the library of Soeterbeeck.
⁷ McGrath 1939, 153, no. 76.
⁸ IV 52:1, f. 30v.
⁹ IV 52:2, ff. 32v-36r.
¹⁰ IV 52:2, ff. 59r-60r.
¹¹ Cf. p. 119 on the possibility that Soeterbeeck’s chapel in Beckers’ days may not have been consecrated. This may have influenced Beckers’ decision to abandon his work on *Urbs beata*. 
In IV 15, Beckers revised only one hymn. This is *Iste confessor Domini sacratus* for Vespers and Lauds of a confessor, which he turned into *Iste confessor Domini, colentes* for Vespers of (bishop-)confessors. Beyond the addition of the fourth psalm antiphon for first Vespers of the common of apostles and evangelists, mentioned above, this is in fact the only trace that he left in this book. Of the hymns for the common of saints that he revised in IV 52:2, *Iste confessor* is the only one that also occurs in IV 15, so in that respect his treatment of both manuscripts corresponds. However, the two volumes also share many hymns for the proper of time, which Beckers did not revise in the antiphonary, whereas he did do so in the miscellany, as we have seen. A possible scenario that would explain this situation would be that Beckers began his revision with the easiest part: the hymns that were already most fully represented in IV 52:2, namely those of the proper of time, followed by those of the common of saints. While he had finished working on the proper and started with the common, he may have realised that IV 15 also contained a significant number of hymns that might suit his purpose, and so he revised the two manuscripts in tandem, probably intending to turn to the proper of time in the antiphonary next. Shortly afterwards, however, he abandoned the entire project without even finishing the common.

In order to find a possible reason why Beckers broke off his revision of these two late medieval manuscripts, it is necessary first to turn to his work on the third hymnal, Add. 10. As mentioned above, this hymnal for Vespers of 23 folia (26.5 x 40 cm.), bound in cardboard boards whose outer edges are reinforced with strips of leather, is written in the same hand as the antiphonary IV 8, which I attribute to an unidentified canon regular who lived at Gaesdonck in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Also in this hand is another hymnal with shelf mark IV 54, of which I will have occasion to speak shortly.

Add. 10 contains noted versions of nearly every single of the forty-seven post-Urbanian hymns for Vespers that the sisters of Soeterbeeck would have needed, except for *Jam nimis terris facinus per omne* for the regional feast of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February) and *Gentis Polonae gloriae* of the universal feast of John Cantius (20 October). This may mean that the book was copied before 1762, when the feast of the Founders was instituted for the subjects of Austria by Clement XIII, but the more likely explanation, given that its scribe was still active in the first decade of the nineteenth century, is that a noted version of the regional hymn was not present among its sources. There are two more gaps, however, for Add. 10 does not contain the seasonal variants for Nativitytide of the hymns *Deus tuorum militum* for one martyr and *Exultet orbis gaudiis* for apostles and evangelists, to the tone of *A solis ortu cardine*. This omission is unexpected, because these particular versions of the two common hymns were used on the feasts of Stephen the First Martyr (26 December) and John the Evangelist (27 December), and the index at the back of the book does list these. The references there, however, are to the common, non-seasonal tones that are included, which means the manuscript is complete in the sense that its index does not refer to chants that are not included, but which is also in contradiction to the rubrics of the Roman Breviary.

Probably in an attempt to remedy this, Beckers used his set minuscule to add the hymn *Deus tuorum militum* for Stephen to the pastedown of the manuscript, with a reference to the seasonal doxology for Nativitytide, *Jesu tibi sit gloria, qui natus es de Virgine*, that is given
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1 IV 15, ff. 293r-294v.
2 IV 15, ff. 216v-217r.
3 See p. 170.
4 See p. 144.
5 IV 65:2, p. 8.
6 See p. 144.
7 Add. 10, pp. 32, 34.
on p. 2 (Figure 3.4). At first sight, the rector seems to have made an error, because the tone he provides is the same as that of Jesu redemptor on the facing page, whereas the Roman Antiphonary dictates that Deus tuorum in Nativitytide should be sung to the tone of A solis ortu. This conundrum can be solved with the help of the other two manuscripts by the same hand in the Soeterbeeck Collection. The antiphonary IV 8 contains hymns as well, and includes both A solis ortu and Jesu redemptor. The two share the same tone in this manuscript, and that means that Beckers was faithful to the Roman rubrics in using the melody of A solis ortu, which just happens to be the same as that of Jesu redemptor in the manuscripts from Gaesdonck. Although the antiphonary does not contain the variant Deus tuorum for Stephen to confirm that Beckers was right, this is included in the hymnal IV 54, once more with the same tone, which clinches the deal.

Both the reason for and the nature of Beckers’ addition to Add. 10 having been explained in this way, the only question that remains concerning his work on this book is why he did not also add the Nativitytide version of Exultet orbis for John. To this I have no satisfying answer. True, it is relatively straightforward, because of their simple metre, to sing the words of a hymn to an alternative tone even without having this transposition spelled out for you. The chief reason for adding Exultet orbis, besides correcting the mistake in the index, would therefore merely have been ease of use; to do so is not absolutely necessary. The same goes, however, for Stephen’s hymn, and that one was added, so this argument does not get us very far. Apparently, the rector simply did not act consistently in this case.

The fact that Beckers added the hymn for Stephen to Add. 10 leads to a possible explanation for his abandonment of the revision of the two late medieval hymnals. The addition means, after all, that it is very likely that the book in which it appears was in liturgical use in his days. This is made even more probable by a note that Beckers made in his set script on the book’s front board, which identifies it as being voor de susters aan den slinker kant de ouwede. This refers to the place in choir where the hymnal was used, for the sisters had fixed places in the stalls according to seniority from the moment of investment, spread across both sides. If this manuscript was used by the old sisters on the left side, this probably means there once were three more like it: one for the young sisters on the same side, and two for either end of the right stall—although the antiphonary IV 5 may also have served this purpose. Besides confirming my contention that Soeterbeeck needed four choir books for its liturgical purposes in Beckers’ days, this conclusion also means that, although Add. 10 is the only up-to-date hymnal to survive, it was part of a larger group that was both theoretically usable and actually used in the liturgy during Beckers’ rectorate.

---

1 Add. 10, pp. 1-2.
2 IV 8, ff. 11r-12r, 13r-v.
3 IV 54, p. 2.
4 For completeness’ sake, it should be mentioned that an unidentified hand interlinearly added the Nativitytide doxology, Jesu tibi sit gloria, qui natus es de Virgine, to the common version of Exultet orbis, thereby providing a seasonal variant of the text, at least. Cf. p. 173 n. 3 on the addition by what may be the same hand of a noted version of the doxology in IV 8, f. [148r]. John’s version of Exultet orbis is included in IV 54, p. 2.
5 ‘For the old sisters on the left side’ (Add. 10, front board).
6 That this is how the phrase should be interpreted, rather than as ‘for the sisters on the left side, i.e. the old ones’, is beyond doubt. Not only does it make no practical sense to have all experienced sisters on one side and all new ones on the other, but an arrangement where old and new sisters appear on both sides is also evident from the statutes, which say that the office of hebdomady sister begint van de outste nedergaande tot elcker weeke van den eenen choor tot den andere, tot den jonxsten toe (‘begins with the oldest, descending every week from one choir to the other, to the youngest’, ASP 92, f. 19v; cf. Fenken 1931/32, 231), and that, if there are no novices to say the versicles, this task should be performed by professed sisters, beginnende vande jonxsten veranderende alle weeke van den eenen choor tot den anderen (‘starting with the youngest, passing every week from one choir to the other’, ASP 92, f. 19v; cf. Fenken 1931/32, 232).
7 See p. 146.
Now, the hymns in Add. 10, as well as in the other two manuscripts in the same hand, IV 8 and IV 54, are textually in line with the Urbanian revisions, but their tones are entirely different from those in the copies of the Roman Antiphonary that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck. They are significantly more similar to those in the late medieval manuscripts IV 15 and IV 52:2, and six of its hymns are entirely the same. But this is not true for all of them, and there are often small differences. This means that, if Beckers had finished his revision of the late medieval hymnals, the result would not have been compatible melodically with the books from Gaesdonck. That at least one of these was already at Soeterbeeck at the unknown moment when Beckers worked on IV 15 and IV 52 is proven by the fact that his addition of the hymn Jesu redemptor in the latter has the same tone as the Gaesdonck manuscripts. Whether or not IV 8, IV 54, and Add. 10 themselves were all already in existence and in use at Soeterbeeck when this hymn was added, it is clearly with an eye to one or more books from Gaesdonck that Beckers abandoned the renovation of the convent’s older hymnals. He appears to have decided that it would not be worth the hassle to revise not only the texts of the late medieval hymns, but also the melodies of the eighteenth-century ones. Interestingly enough, this is exactly opposite to the decision he made for the antiphons, as he did work towards adapting the melodies of those in IV 8 to the ones in the late medieval books, probably because the latter had already been revised before the former came to Soeterbeeck in 1793.

In short, what happened is that Beckers started revising two late medieval manuscripts, realised there were small differences between the tones contained in these books and those in the hymnals from Gaesdonck that he also had at his disposal, and abandoned the project. Whether the sisters already had their four up-to-date hymnals at that point, so that the revision of two late medieval manuscripts was not necessary, or whether they did not but acquired more copies with the Gaesdonck melodies subsequently, cannot be said with certainty due to lack of evidence. On the one hand, it is difficult to see why Beckers would begin renovating two manuscripts if there was no need for it, but on the other hand there must have been at least one book with hymns from Gaesdonck at Soeterbeeck already that he could have used as a source. The uncertainties about the logistics and the date of the rector’s work on the hymnals is of secondary importance, however, compared to what it reveals about Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life.

3.5.3. The Performance of Hymns with the Organ
There is a very curious aspect to the functional dimension of Beckers’ work on the hymns that has not yet been mentioned, but that is very informative about the way in which the divine office was being sung at Soeterbeeck in his days. The rector never revised or added hymns in their entirety, but only considered particular verses. If a chant consisted of an uneven number of couplets, the doxology included, he revised only the odd ones, and if it consisted of an even number, he revised only the even ones. Of the hymns whose text had been revised so heavily by Urban that Beckers had to cover (almost) their entire text with slips of paper, he only wrote down every other verse on these scraps. He made the same selection when he added the hymns Jesu redemptor and Deus tuorum to IV 52 and Add. 10, respectively. The same procedure was also followed for some of the hymns that he included in IV 55, a book of
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1 For a survey of the tones of the hymns in IV 15, IV 19, IV 52:2 and Add. 10, see Table 3.7.
2 The hymns for which Add. 10 provides the same tones as Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries are, to call them by their post-Urbanian incipits, Jam sol recedit igneus (for Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima and Trinity Sunday), Lucis creator optime (for Sundays in ordinary time), Creator alme siderum (for Advent), Chrise, sanctorum decus angelorum (for Gabriel the Archangel), Ut queant laxis resonare fibris (for the Nativity of John the Baptist), Iste confessor Domini, colentes (for bishop-confessors), and Ave maris stella (for the Blessed Virgin).
liturgical chants that he wrote himself whose discussion is reserved for the following chapter.\footnote{See Table 4.2, nos. 8 and 39. On IV 55, see pp. 208-212.}

Initially, it would perhaps seem that the presence of a shortened version of a hymn in Add. 10, a book explicitly ascribed to the left side of the choir, indicates that the verses of these chants were distributed across the two stalls. This is highly unlikely, however, because, as has been said, the verses included are dependent upon the length of the hymn. For this reason, IV 52 as revised contains both odd and even couplets of different hymns, thereby realising the two options in a single book that will not have been intended to switch sides. It is much more probable that Beckers simply gives only those verses that were to be sung. This systematic shortening of hymns at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days can be very suitably explained with the help of the other hymnal from Gaesdonck, IV 54.

This manuscript of 14 folia (24.5 x 18.5 cm.),\footnote{The size of the folia of IV 54 is rather uneven, with differences of up to half a centimeter, and difficult to measure because many of them were pasted together with slips of paper. The size given here is that of the folium of pp. 15-16.} rebound in blue cardboard with a spine of black linen at some point, is much smaller than Add. 10. It contains almost exactly the same hymns, however,\footnote{It is not possible to say with absolute certainty because one folio is missing from IV 54 (pp. 25-26), but the only substantial difference between this book and Add. 10 seems to be that the former contains (on p. 12) \textit{Salve thronus clementiae}, the proper hymn for Vespers on the feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday before Palm Sunday) that is also included in IV 8, ff. 81v-82r, whereas Add. 10 has the hymn \textit{Stabat mater dolorosa} that is prescribed by the Roman Breviary. There are other differences as well, but these are all minor. After the hymnal proper and the index, Add. 10 includes, besides the Stabat mater, also \textit{Sacrıs solemnīs} (pp. [45-47]), which is not present in IV 54. That book has the hymn \textit{Magne doctor, christiani} for feasts of Augustine (p. 14), whereas Add. 10 has \textit{Magne pater Augustine} (see Table 3.3 for a discussion of these hymns and their use), but because both hymns have the same melody and IV 54 was used by the organist (as is argued below), this does not make any difference in practice. IV 54 also includes some seasonal settings of hymns from the common of saints that are not included in Add. 10: \textit{Deus tuorum militum} (for one martyr) and \textit{Exultet orbis gaudios} (for apostles outside of Eastertide) to the tone of \textit{Jesu redemptor omnium} for Nativitytide (p. 2), and \textit{Jesu, corona virginum} (for virgins) and \textit{Fortem virili pectore} (for non-virgins) to the melody of \textit{Ad regias Agni dapes} for Eastertide (pp. 28-29). As has been argued above (p. 180), singing hymns to a different melody is so straightforward that the absence of these specific settings does not preclude the liturgical use of Add. 10.}

It is much more probable that Beckers simply gives only those verses that were to be sung. This systematic shortening of hymns at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days can be very suitably explained with the help of the other hymnal from Gaesdonck, IV 54.

Although it is uncertain if Soeterbeeck had an organ in Nuenen,\footnote{The only mention of an organ in the archival sources known to me on the Nuenen period occurs in the report of a visitation by Bishop Michael Ophovius on 22 October 1627, when the seven sisters who had come to Soeterbeek from Sint-Annemborch in 1613 said they would like to have the organ of their former convent in ‘s-Hertogenbosch, which had been ceded to the Jesuits (Frenken 1931/32, 201 n. 3). This can mean either that there} the convent is said in...
Beckers’ chronicle to have had one at Ravenstein in 1772 or 1773.\textsuperscript{1} That this instrument was used to accompany chant in the nineteenth century is evident from the fact that the Soeterbeeck Collection contains a copy of the plates belonging to J. Wellens’ Handleiding, om het Gregoriaansch met gepaste harmonie te bezetten (Cuijk: J. van Lindert, 1851), an organists’ manual to the accompaniment of Gregorian chant.\textsuperscript{2} The organ being there and its liturgical use being so clearly attested for a later period, it is eminently probable that it was not silent in Beckers’ days at the end of the eighteenth century either. More arguments in favour of this conclusion are provided in the next chapter,\textsuperscript{3} but for now there seem to be enough reasons to conclude that IV 54 was a hymnal for the organist.

The existence of such a book probably provides the key to understanding Beckers’ practice of only providing or revising the alternate verses of each hymn, depending on the number of couplets and selected in such a way that the doxology is always included. I would venture to suggest that hymns were performed alternatim in Beckers’ days. This would mean that the sisters only sang every other verse of each chant, most likely unaccompanied but after a brief prelude to indicate the key, and had the organ play the alternating verses, probably while the hebdomadary sister or the chantress recited these from another book. It would have left intact the number of verses as listed in IV 54, which are always those of the full hymn.\textsuperscript{4}

Not only is this interpretation entirely consistent with the evidence, alternatim was the main way in which the organ was employed during the liturgy in Brabantian convents in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the context of the divine office it was used for the hymns and the Gospel canticles (the Benedictus, Magnificat and Nunc dimittis) in exactly the way I just described.\textsuperscript{5} Additionally, the Caeremoniale episcoporum, the Roman book of episcopal ceremonies first published by Pope Clement VIII in 1600, explicitly forbids the doxology at the end of every hymn to be played by the organ.\textsuperscript{6} This explains why Beckers did not simply add or revise the text of every other verse beginning with the first one, but always the even ones of hymns with an even number of verses and the uneven ones of hymns with an uneven number, so as to make sure that the final verse is always present.

3.5.4. Other Revisions of the Hymnals
With the conclusion that hymns were performed alternatim at Soeterbeeck, the most important questions concerning Beckers’ work on the convent’s hymnals have been answered. Before finishing this chapter, however, I should mention that there are many different hands besides the retor’s that also added and revised hymns in various books from the library of Soeterbeeck.\textsuperscript{7} At least one of these, H30, belonged to a person who lived in the nineteenth century, when the convent no longer prayed the divine office. The revision and addition of hymns in this context is not problematic, however, as these chants can be used very easily outside the specific context of the liturgy of the hours.\textsuperscript{8} This was indeed done during Beckers’

\textsuperscript{1} Both versions of Beckers’ chronicle report that he had the organ moved to another part of the chapel in one of these years (ASP 45, 1: p. 22; ASP 4, p. 5a; cf. Boogaarts 1982, 163). This probably means that the organ had already been at Soeterbeeck for some time. On the organs of Soeterbeeck, see Boogaarts 1982, esp. 163-166 on the first known organ, which continued in use until the twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{2} IV 137.

\textsuperscript{3} See pp. 193, 200.

\textsuperscript{4} E.g., for Stephen’s Deus tuorum militum, IV 54 says there are five verses rather than the three written by Beckers on the pastedown of Add. 10 (p. 2).


\textsuperscript{6} Jespers 1988, 16.

\textsuperscript{7} All additions and revisions of hymns are described in Tables 3.6 and 3.7.

\textsuperscript{8} Cf. p. 175.
rectorate, as is proven by the fact that he included various hymns in his above-mentioned book of chants, IV 55. 1 Sadly, because H30 did not only revise and add hymns but also antiphons, 2 the wider use of the former does not explain his entire stratigraphic unit. Once again I must admit that I am not able to provide a satisfactory interpretation of the nineteenth-century notes in the antiphonaries. They suggest that the Little Office of the Virgin was not quite all that was being celebrated at Soeterbeeck even then, but I cannot draw any specific conclusions from this other than that reality was obviously more complex than can be reconstructed on the basis of prescriptions and descriptions in archival sources such as statutes and chronicles. However, as the issue is not relevant for an understanding of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit, I gladly admit defeat and leave it at that.

EXCURSUS: MORE ON H30’S REVISION OF HYMNS IN SOETERBEECK’S ANTIPHONARIES
The revision and addition of hymns by people other than Beckers do not generally appear to be part of a sustained effort, with one exception that complements my discussion of the post-Beckers revisions of the antiphonaries in the previous paragraph. The Roman Antiphonary IV 19, though printed in 1651, still contains the pre-Urbanian versions of the hymns. The texts of some, though by no means all, of these were revised by the nineteenth-century H30. Sometimes the revision is complete and sometimes it is only partial; usually it took place by means of scraps of paper with replacement texts that have been pasted in over the original words, 3 but sometimes an entirely new hymn was written on a loose sheet that has subsequently been included in the book. 4 I can discover no system to the selection of hymns that have been revised.

Equally puzzling are the melodies that H30 provides for two of the hymns which it added. Following the revision of the texts of the hymns by Urvan VIII, some of their melodies in the Roman Antiphonary were also revised. Another copy of this book in the Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 18, includes both the old and the new hymn tones, if a difference exists between them. A comparison shows that H30 added the hymn Jesu redemptor with its new tone, and the hymn Jam sol recedit igneus for Trinity Sunday with the old one. 5 I cannot explain this inconsistency, although the fact that H30 based himself on the Roman tones rather than on those in any of Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts is consistent with its treatment of most of the antiphons it added. 6

3.6. Conclusion
The previous chapter debated Frenken’s contention that between 1539 and 1906 the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck did not pray the canonical hours at all, but restricted themselves entirely to the Little Office of the Virgin, expanded with commemorations of the saints of the day. Archival sources could only prove this for the period from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, and the evidence for the three centuries before that seemed rather to point in the opposite direction. Beckers’ many traces of production and use in several books for the
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1 See Table 4.2, nos. 4, 7-11, 37-39.
2 Cf. pp. 174-175.
3 This happened in the case of the hymns for the feasts of Stephen the First Martyr (26 December), the Holy Innocents (28 December), the Epiphany of the Lord (6 January), Quadragesima, Passiontide, Ascensiontide, the feast of the Invention of the Cross (3 May), apostles and evangelists in ordinary time and Eastertide, one martyr, several martyrs, bishop-confessors, virgins and women who were neither martyrs nor virgins.
4 This happened in the case of the hymns for Nativitytide (between pp. 32-33), Trinity Sunday, Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March) and Augustine of Hippo (28 August) (all three between pp. 432-433). H21 also added the hymn for the feast of the Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany), with the same tone as IV 18, pp. 95-96.
5 Cf. IV 19, between pp. 32-33, 432-433, and IV 18, pp. 31-32, 259. One or more unidentifiable hands, which are possibly H30, also revised the tones of the hymns for Stephen the First Martyr (pp. 63-65), the Epiphany of the Lord (pp. 84-85) and bishop-confessors (pp. xxxvi-xxxviii). The first was erroneously adapted into the old Roman tone of Jesu redemptor omnium, the second was adapted into the Gaesdonck melody, and the third into the new Roman tone.
6 See p. 174.
great office, as discussed in this and also the following chapter, do as well, for they would make no sense if they had no practical purpose.

I will briefly recapitulate my major findings so far. The earliest traces of use by Beckers that have been discussed in this chapter, which seem to date to the years before 1784, appear to be those in two copies of the *Horae diurnae*, on the pages of IV 60 and in an added binion at the back of IV 65. The immediate functions of these revisions, references and additions are clear, but their meaning in the context of liturgical praxis is uncertain. The added texts are limited to elements that may well have been meant for commemorations to add to the Little Office, but to argue on this basis that to provide these texts was all for which the printed diurnals were used, would be going too far. There is too little evidence to seriously question the straightforward assumption that the *Horae diurnae* were being used exactly in the way they were meant to be: for the recitation of part of the divine office.

What specific part this was, is suggested not only by the significant discolouration of the pages of the *Horae diurnae* that bear the psalms for Sunday Vespers, but also by the contents of Beckers’ own handwritten diurnal, IV 58. This manuscript, produced somewhere before 1787 and intended to function as an aid to the sisters in their celebration of the liturgy of the hours, contains Dutch translations not only of commemorations, but also of everything that was necessary for the full offices of canonical Compline, both Vespers on seasonal Sundays and (semi)double feasts, and second Vespers on ordinary Sundays. The most likely interpretation of the book’s functional meaning leads to the tentative conclusion that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck actually said the canonical hours on these occasions.

Proof that this inference is correct is provided by Beckers’ renovation of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript antiphonaries, which also took place in or around 1787. His notes are the culmination of a project that was geared at revising these books to bring their texts into accordance with the Roman Breviary, and had been running for over a century—perhaps from the moment when Soeterbeeck had abandoned the pre-Tridentine Windesheim liturgy. It enabled the sisters to use them when singing canonical Compline, both Vespers on (semi)double feasts, and second Vespers on Sundays. At one point, Beckers seems also to have begun to revise two late medieval hymnals with the same purpose, but that was soon abandoned in favour of the adoption of contemporary books from his own convent of Gaesdonck.

Together, the printed *Horae diurnae*, the revised antiphonaries and the hymnals from Gaesdoneck provided all that was necessary for the praying of Vespers and Compline of the divine office on Sundays and feasts and during octaves, and there is every reason to believe that this was actually done by the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days. At other hours and on other days, they probably contented themselves with the Little Office of the Virgin.

Of course, this conclusion presupposes many things. Because the number of surviving books that could have been used would not have been enough for all choir sisters during Beckers’ rectorate, it must be assumed that many have been lost. Because the renovations that predate Beckers are not complete or consistent in their present form, many more slips of paper with additional or alternative texts must once have been present in the medieval antiphonaries for them to have been usable before Beckers came along. Because the books and their revision still display many imperfections and inconsistencies even in their final form, the sisters must have had a very high tolerance of having to deal with such infelicities in practice.

Still, all in all, I believe that this is the interpretation that fits the evidence best, and it is confirmed by a comparison of what little is known about the praxis of other convents. The practice of only praying the divine office on Sundays and feasts has its Augustinian parallels, for instance in the agelong habit of various congregations of Hospital Sisters.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Cf. Vissers 1958, 426.
to canonical Vespers seems also to have been present at Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage, as the vast majority of the late medieval books that survive from this convent display a specific focus on this particular hour.\(^1\) This means that Vespers enjoyed a special status at this convent, and may even indicate that it was all it prayed of the divine office in the sixteenth century. If this is true, the coming of seven sisters of Sint-Annenborch, with which Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage had merged in 1543, to Soeterbeeck in 1613 might actually mark the moment when the latter convent also went from saying the full canonical office to only praying Vespers. That such a change must have taken place at Soeterbeeck is evident from the fact that its oldest, late medieval liturgical manuscripts contain chants for all hours, whereas they have only been adapted to the Roman liturgy for Vespers. That the change may have happened in the seventeenth century is because the earliest traces of renovation in these books seem to date from this very period.\(^2\) Of course, this coincidence provides too little evidence for a firm conclusion, especially since there is no additional archival evidence to date Soeterbeeck’s switch to the Roman Breviary.\(^3\) At least the example of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage does confirm that my reconstruction of the liturgical context of Beckers’ traces is a serious possibility.

I do not doubt, therefore, that, in broad strokes, I have correctly interpreted the functional meaning of Beckers’ traces of production and use in Soeterbeeck’s diurnals, antiphonaries and hymnals, and of these books themselves, in the context of the celebration of the liturgy of the hours. The next step is a consideration of any less practical, symbolic aspects that the rector’s work may have had for him, and although this has to wait for the final chapter of this thesis, the preceding pages have already unearthed several important keys to these deeper layers.

Among the hints at the symbolic meaning of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit as discussed so far, his own description of his revision of the antiphonaries as a renovation which he carried out in the capacity of rector takes pride of place. It casts his notes in these books as an attempt, which he felt duty-bound to make, at renewing and restoring something that was on the verge of collapse and disappearance. What else can this apply to than the antiphonaries’ particular melodic tradition, according to which the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck could continue to sing Compline and Vespers of the divine office because he and the earlier revisers had adapted the text to the Roman Breviary? Indeed, so important was this tradition to Beckers, that he rather spent countless hours on the renovation of outdated manuscripts than buy new books. I do not believe that this decision was only motivated by monastic frugality. That may well have played a role when the books began to be revised at least a hundred years earlier, when the convent was suffering from many financial and other troubles.\(^4\) By the 1780s, however, Soeterbeeck was thriving, and, as is discussed in greater detail in Chapters 5 and 8,\(^5\) Beckers and several sisters were able to spend enormous amounts of money on the restoration and embellishment of the convent, and of the chapel in particular. If the funds were there to improve the room in which the liturgy was celebrated, they must also have been available for the books that made this celebration possible. Far from being merely an economy measure, Beckers’ decision to thoroughly renovate Soeterbeeck’s medieval

---

\(^1\) Cf. the list of books attributed to Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage that is provided by Van den Berg 2012, 72 n. 16. It mentions ten books for the divine office, almost all from the sixteenth century, of which one is the integral antiphonary for Vespers IV 7, and seven are vespersals (IV 76; IV 77; IV 84; IV 88; IV 90; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294; RHCe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699). To these has since been added an eighth vesperal (Los Angeles, Richard and Mary Rouse Collection, MS 169).

\(^2\) See pp. 161-171.

\(^3\) See pp. 104-105.

\(^4\) On Soeterbeeck’s difficulties in the seventeenth century, see p. 5.

\(^5\) See pp. 235, 300.
antiphonaries was a conscious choice for the preservation and continued use of the melodies which they contain, and of the books themselves. I would not go so far as to say that he viewed them as material heritage; they were objects of use, not museum pieces. He considered them to be valuable insofar as they could play a role in preserving the liturgical tradition of Windesheim in a new age. That this is what was on the rector’s mind is evident not only from his work on the medieval antiphonaries, but also from his, admittedly short-lived, attempt at the revision of two hymnals. It remains to be seen in the following chapter whether this interpretation also fits Beckers’ other liturgical activities.
Figure 4.1: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 53, f. 108v
Chapter 4: Beckers’ Other Liturgical Activities

4.1. Introduction
As explained in the introduction to the previous chapter, I decided to divide my discussion of the part of Rector Beckers’ stratigraphic unit whose functional dimension is tied to the context of the liturgy into two chapters: one on the traces geared at the revision of books for the divine office and one on the traces having to do with the facilitation of the celebration of the liturgy in other ways. This decision was made for reasons of presentation, with full awareness of the fact that the distinction on which it is based was probably not present in the rector’s mind and cannot even be consistently maintained in my own narrative. Although I doubt if any reader will be inclined to criticise the split after the marathon session of the preceding chapter, the unfortunate side-effect is that this one is less unified. It does have the decency, though, of making up for the inconvenience by being considerably shorter.

Each of the following six paragraphs deals relatively briefly with the functional meaning of Beckers’ traces of use or production in the spatial context of one or at most two books: a gradual, an antiphonary, a book of prefaces, a book of hours, two books with (para)liturgical chants and a book for the liturgical celebration of the golden jubilee of a sister. On the surface, these sections have nothing more to do with each other than that they are all about one man’s traces in the general context of the liturgy. It will appear, however, that several important threads from the previous chapter can be picked up over the course of this one, and that both together contribute to a deeper understanding of the meaning of Beckers’ liturgical work.

4.2. A Kyrie in a Late Medieval Gradual
Chapter 3 dealt with Beckers’ renovation of certain of Soeterbeeck’s books for the divine office. One of the ways in which this was effected was through the addition of texts or chants that for some reason were not yet present. A similar trace in the rector’s hand also appears in a late medieval gradual, a book that is the equivalent of an antiphonary for Mass and contains the chants that are sung by the choir rather than the celebrant.

In the lower margin of f. 112v of Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, ABM h61, a fifteenth-century manuscript donated to the Archiepiscopal Museum in Utrecht by the sisters of Soeterbeeck circa 1870, Beckers used his set minuscule to add a Kyrie. As its direct context consists of proper chants for Mass on the occasion of the funeral and the anniversary of a person’s death, the rector’s addition must be intended for use during Requiem Masses. As is to be expected, the manuscript’s own kyriale—the section that contains the ordinary chants for Mass, that is, primarily the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei—does not indicate a proper Kyrie for Requiem Masses.

Beckers’ addition to ABM h61 strongly resembles the corresponding Kyrie for Masses of the dead in the printed Roman Graduals that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck, as
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1 See p. 109.
2 Kruitwagen 1910, 56. For descriptions of this manuscript, see Kruitwagen 1910, 56-61; Gumbert 2011, 26-27, no. 53.
3 Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, ABM h61, ff. 112v-113v.
4 ABM h61, ff. 114r-120r.
5 E.g., IV 11:1, pp. 542-543. The Roman Graduals from the library of Soeterbeeck are IV 11-IV 14, IV 20, IV 27-IV 30, IV 32-IV 35, IV 45 and IV 120 (and V 193 that belonged to Mariëndaal and came to Soeterbeeck only in 1954). With the exception of IV 14:1, which was printed by Bernardinus Masius in Louvain in 1648, all of them were printed in the Dutch Republic in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, and their melodies go back to the sixteenth-century Plantin editions from Antwerp (Rasch 2000, 334-335).
well as present-day Kyrie XVIII B ad Missam pro defunctis. 1 It is identical to neither, however, and I have not been able to find an exact source. None appears in manuscripts from Gaesdonck, for the Kyries given in the eighteenth-century graduals Goch, Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck, Höv 52 and Höv 53,2 for instance, are all different.

It was already noted in the previous chapter that there is an exact parallel to Beckers’ Kyrie within the Soeterbeeck Collection.3 The same chant was also added twice in the lower margin of one opening in the fifteenth-century manuscript gradual IV 135:2 by H32,4 the nineteenth-century hand that completed Beckers’ Magnificat tonary and added alternative chants at the back of the eighteenth-century antiphonary IV 8.5 Given the fact that this hand follows Beckers’ in the antiphony, the Kyrie in IV 135:2 was probably copied from Beckers’ note in ABM h61 or from Beckers’ source, and will not itself have been the latter.

It is possible that the addition of the Kyrie to ABM h61 and IV 135:2 is part of an attempt at the renovation of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript graduals that is analogous to that of the old antiphonaries as described in the previous chapter. However, whereas the manuscript choir books for the liturgy of the hours survive in relatively large numbers, only three late medieval graduals associated with Soeterbeeck are known to still exist. In addition to the two already mentioned, there is only IV 31, a manuscript from the sixteenth century.6 The paucity of the surviving material means that it is impossible to say much about the nature or the purpose of the renovation of Soeterbeeck’s graduals. Also, because no evidence survives of Beckers having been involved in it besides adding the Kyrie to ABM h61, it is not worthwhile in the context of this book to dwell upon the notes in other hands.

EXCURSUS: THE RENOVATION OF SOETERBEECK’S LATE MEDIEVAL GRADUALS
There are additions, marginal notes and textual emendations in all three of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript graduals that have the effect of bringing them into textual accord with the Roman Gradual. These notes are in various hands, some of which, such as H14, also occur in the antiphonaries. To provide just one representative example: in IV 135:2, a rubric identifies the introit antiphon of the feast of John before the Latin Gate (6 May) as In medio,7 short for In medio ecclesie aperuit os eius et implevit eum Dominus spiritus sapiencie et intellectus, stola glorie induit eum.8 The original reference to this antiphon has been struck through and replaced marginally by a note saying: Protexisti: clxv. This is a reference to f. 165v, where the common of one martyr during Eastertide begins. The first chant of that Mass is indeed Protexisti me Deus a conventui malignancium, alleluia, a multitudine operancium iniquitatem, alleluia, alleluia.9 This text is also given for the feast of John before the Latin Gate in the Roman Gradual,10 and the reason for the change is probably that the antiphon In medio came to be reserved for Doctors of the Church.11 In

1 ‘For the Mass for the dead’ (Graduale 1979, p. 767).
2 CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 52, p. 19; Höv 53, ff. Pv-Qv. On these manuscripts, see Hövelmann 1987e, 69, nos. 52-53.
3 See p. 173.
4 IV 135:2, ff. 193v-194r (old foliation). On the manuscript, see Kienhorst 2009, 120-125. It was alienated from the library of Soeterbeeck, acquired by the NUL as Hs 492 nr. 1 in 2009, and incorporated into the Soeterbeeck Collection with its old shelf mark in 2016.
5 IV 8, ff. 144v-[149]r. On these additions, see pp. 172-173. On the numbering of the hands that revised the antiphonaries, see the introduction to Table 3.4.
6 On IV 31, see Kienhorst 2005, 72-73. Besides the three books there are only fragments, of which the three bifolia that make up IV 135:1 and once belonged to a gradual that was very similar to IV 135:2, are the most substantial. On these fragments, see Kienhorst 2009, 126-127. The fourth unit of the composite manuscript IV 52 also contains Masses for the feasts of Monica of Hippo and Anne (ff. 127r-130r; cf. Kienhorst 2005, 87).
7 IV 135:2, f. 140r (old foliation).
8 Cf. IV 135:2, f. 149r (old foliation).
9 IV 135:2, ff. 165v-166r (old foliation).
10 E.g., IV 11:1, p. 361.
11 Cf. IV 11:1, pp. 480-481.
other words, the replacement of the original antiphon with Protexisti me is a change that brings the manuscript gradual into closer correspondence with the Roman books, although the melody is slightly different from that in the copies of the Roman Gradual that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck. The revision is clearly not complete, however, for the Alleluia verse given for the same Mass in the manuscript, Virgo Iohannes a Domino est preelectus et inter ceteros magis dilectus, is different from those in the Roman Missal (Iustus ut palma and Iustus germinabit). This type of incomplete revision, always disregarding the Alleluia verses, is evident throughout Soeterbeeck’s manuscript graduals.

The questions raised by the possibility that the notes in the manuscript graduals are part of a wholesale renovation of these books are many. When, by whom, for what reason and with what effect was this hypothetical revision carried out? Did the sisters use their old graduals in the same way as their old antiphonaries? Despite the inherent interest of such queries and their possible bearing on our understanding of Soeterbeeck’s treatment of the books for the divine office, I cannot do more at the moment than ask them. There is simply too little evidence to begin to try and provide an answer.

Though I am not able to properly contextualise the rector’s addition of a Kyrie to ABM h61, the chant need not leave us with frustration only. It serves as a reminder that the great and Little Office were not the only forms of liturgy that were being celebrated at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century, and that Beckers also left his traces in other books than diurnals, antiphonaries and hymnals. Furthermore, the fact that the same chant was also added in another gradual by H32 brings to mind again that hand’s additions to the antiphonary IV 8 and in particular its supplements to the four Magnificat tones that Beckers had added to that book. Because I did not have the opportunity to discuss the latter when I mentioned them in the previous chapter, this provides a nice opportunity to do so in the following paragraph.

4.3. A Magnificat Tonary in an Eighteenth-Century Antiphonary

Beckers used a number of pages at the back of IV 8, the manuscript antiphonary that was given to Soeterbeeck by his Gaesdonck confrère Joannes van Seenbergen in 1793, to write down, in his set script, at least the first four tones, out of eight, to which the Magnificat can be recited if Vespers is sung. The two folia onto which Beckers made this addition are the latter half of a binion, the first half of which is occupied by the main text of the antiphonary as copied by its scribe. The lines bounding the outer edges of the staffs on Beckers’ pages are in the same discoloured ink as those bounding the staffs of the manuscript’s main text, but the staffs themselves were added by Beckers in the same blank ink as the text and the notes of the Magnificat tones.

The rector may well have added more than just the four tones that are visible now, but this is impossible to say with certainty because the verso of the folium on whose recto he wrote the fourth tone has been pasted onto the recto of the next folium, so that an entire opening is now hidden. Still, even if Beckers’ addition runs on onto one or both of the pages that are now invisible because they have been pasted together, there can never have been enough space for all remaining four tones. This incompleteness rather defeats the purpose of the entire effort, and one wonders, therefore, what the reason is that Beckers abandoned his project.

That Beckers never finished his Magnificat tonary is proven by the fact that it was continued by H32, as the previous paragraph alluded to. Besides making other additions to the
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1 E.g., IV 9, p. 484.
2 See pp. 171-173.
3 IV 8, ff. 143r-144r. Cf. Figure 1.2.
4 IV 8, ff. 141r-142v.
manuscript that have already been discussed in the previous chapter,¹ this person used the three pages immediately following Beckers’ first four tones to add the sixth, seventh and eighth ones.² This means that the fifth tone is still missing from the book. It may be on one of the hidden sides of the two folia that have been pasted together, but the curious thing is that the glue-pot must already have been used either during or even before H32’s involvement with the antiphony. The page numbers in this section of the book are also in this hand, and they do not skip two numbers, but treat the double folium as one. In other words, the pagination was added after the folia had been pasted together. This means one of two things: either H32 had been glueing during his or her work, or he or she was writing after the folia had been glued together, but in both cases the question is why this person failed to add the fifth Magnificat tone where it is visible. It is a curious error, which, I repeat, takes away from the practical value which the tonary must have had in this antiphony.

On a theoretical level, of course, this value is beyond dispute. Clearly, it would be convenient to have the Magnificat tones in the same book as the antiphons that accompany them, even if only for reference purposes. Perhaps that was all they were ever intended for, given that the canticle of the Blessed Virgin was a fixture whose tones the sisters would have known by heart, even if they did not sing Vespers every day. Another possibility is that IV 8, which is written in a highly legible humanistically-inspired script that resembles type, was meant to be used, liturgically or in practice, by younger sisters who could perhaps still be expected to need a little help with the Magnificat tones in the early stages of their monastic lives. But these are all speculations, which are rendered doubly hypothetical for being concerned with an incomplete set of texts.

Actually, there is yet another reason, in addition to their incompleteness, why the tones’ functional meaning is unclear: they are melodically idiosyncratic. As is to be expected on the basis of Beckers’ treatment of antiphons, a comparison of the rector’s four tones with the ones given in the late medieval antiphonary IV 7, the liturgical miscellany IV 52:2 and the tonaries IV 81:5-6 on the one hand,³ and those in the printed Roman Antiphonary IV 18 (Amsterdam: heirs of the widow of C. Stichter, 1735) on the other,⁴ shows that they are far closer to the former than to the latter. They differ consistently and almost entirely predictably from the tones in the printed book, mostly in the same way and in the same places as the tones in the manuscripts.⁵ However, taking into account several transcription errors and the consistent simplification of identical double notes on the same syllable,⁶ Beckers’ tones also
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¹ See pp. 172-173, where more additions to IV 8 in other hands are also discussed.
² IV 8, ff. 144v-146v. The modern foliation of IV 8 skips 145, either in error or because the person who applied it noticed that f. 144 consists of two folia that have been pasted together.
³ Magnificat tonaries appear in IV 7, pp. 325-341; IV 52:2, ff. 65v-73v and IV 81:5-6, ff. 77r-90v. On the final manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 106-107.
⁴ IV 18, pp. 401-419. This is the only printed Roman Antiphonary from the library of Soeterbeeck to contain a full tonary. IV 3 only has a summary of one on pp. 390-393, which differs in a few respects from that in IV 18.
⁵ The places where Beckers’ tones deviate from those in the printed books in the same way as the manuscripts are the following. In the first tone the median always ends on a clivis and a pes regardless of stress or number of syllables, the tenor of each verse’s second half begins with a so rather than a la (except in the fifth verse, where it is a la), and the termination ends on a so rather than a la. In the second tone, the median ends on a fa rather than a re, the tenor of each verse’s second half begins with a re rather than a fa, and the termination is structured differently. The median of the seventh verse is irregular. In the third tone, the median always ends on a clivis and a pes regardless of stress or number of syllables, the tenor of each verse’s second half begins with a la rather than a do and the termination is structured differently. In the fourth tone, the intonation begins with a la rather than a mi, the pes on the final stressed syllable of the median is la-si rather than la-do, the tenor of each verse’s second half begins with a so rather than a la (except in the doxology, where it does begin with a la), and the termination is structured differently. The median of the seventh verse is irregular.
⁶ Beckers omitted the flat sign before ancilla in the third verse of the first tone (IV 8, f. 143r2), although he did add it in the corresponding place in the other verses; he consistently wrote a do clef where a fa clef should be for the second tone; he wrote a mi for the first syllable of timentibus in the fifth verse of the second tone (IV 8, f.
display several deviations from those in the manuscripts, and these correspond rather with the
tones in the Roman Antiphonary.¹ I am unable to explain this curious mixture of features,
except by concluding that Beckers used another source that does not now survive among the
books from the library of Soeterbeeck.² The result, however, is clear: it is impossible to use
Beckers’ addition in IV 8 in conjunction with any other surviving tonary from Soeterbeeck,
for the melodies he provides correspond with none of these.

The tones’ apparent melodic idiosyncrasy is probably not the reason why Beckers
abandoned them. If that were true, why would he have begun adding them in the first place? It
is also quite possible that they were not divergent at all at the moment of their addition, and
that Soeterbeeck owned several books with this version at that moment. However, even this
partial solution is spoiled by the fact that the melodies of the three tones that have been added
later by H32 correspond with those in the old manuscripts,³ and thereby probably turned the
tonary into a Frankenstein’s monster of incompatible melodic traditions. I simply cannot solve
the riddle posed by this incomplete and very odd set of chants.

However, just like the Kyrie in the late medieval gradual of the previous paragraph,
the tonary in this eighteenth-century antiphonary does not only present an insuperable
challenge. Even if their actual functional meaning is unclear, the Magnificat tones that were
added by Beckers and the person who almost finished his work do display a feature that is
very revealing in relation to what the previous chapter has said about the former’s treatment
of hymns.⁴ This is the fact that only the canticle’s odd verses are provided with a melody, and
the even verses are given in prose without musical notation. The most likely explanation is,
obviously, that the Magnificat was performed alternatim just like the hymns, with the sisters
chanting the odd and the organ playing the even verses, while the latter were being said by the
hebdomadary sister or the chantress. In the entire post-Tridentine Church, an alternatim
performance was as common for the canticle of the Virgin as for hymns,⁵ and, if nothing else,
the Magnificat tones in IV 8 at least allow us to conclude that this procedure was applied to
them at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days as well.

4.4. A Book of Prefaces from a Sixteenth-Century Missal
Now that Beckers’ traces in the antiphonary IV 8 have again brought up the topic of the
liturgical use of the organ, it is time to discuss yet another book which is associated with this
instrument. There is an important difference, however. So far, we have encountered traces of
use whose functional meaning is associated with the alternatim performance of hymns and
canticles in the divine office. The next book to be discussed that displays the traces of

¹Higginbottom 1999, 132 for the practice in a general Roman Catholic context.
²See pp. 181-183.
Beckers’ involvement, however, was meant to enable the accompaniment of the preface at Mass. The rector appears to have contributed to its physical construction as well as to its contents, and I will describe both of these elements before concluding with a consideration of the volume’s intended use.

The book I am talking about has shelf mark IV 53, and it is a slim volume with an extremely layered character. Its core consists of ff. 108-117 (O4-P5), 121-122 (Q1-2) and 126-127 (R2-3) of an edition of the Roman Missal that was published in Paris by Jacques Kerver in 1574.¹ These fourteen folia are all from the section, spanning quires O-R (ff. 105-130), that contains the order of the Mass. They bear noted versions of the preface and of the Lord’s Prayer. The booklet does not contain all interations of these chants that appear in the missal, however, but only a specific selection, consisting of the solemn preface tones for seasonal Sundays and (semi)double feasts without a proper preface, the tone for the common preface on ferias and simple feasts, and the solemn and the ferial tone for the Lord’s Prayer.

The pages bear several notes in Beckers’ cursive script, and it is also possible that he was involved in the booklet’s production as a separate entity, and with a rebinding that it appears to have undergone. However, before I can begin discussing the connections with the rector, and with the organ, I must first consider the current state of the book from which the pages of IV 53 were taken. It is still present in the Zoeterbeek Collection with shelf mark IV 24, and several issues surrounding this volume are relevant to our present purpose, as will quickly become apparent.

In addition to losses at the beginning that are unrelated to the construction of the book of prefaces IV 53,² the Kerver missal IV 24 now lacks the whole of the quaternions O-P (ff. 105-120) and the binion Q (ff. 121-124), as well as the two inner bifolia (ff. 126-129) of quire R (ff. 125-130), a ternion whose outer bifolium (ff. 125^130) is still present. Some of the folia that were taken out of the missal but not selected for inclusion in the book of prefaces were cut up, and their fragments pasted onto the pages that did make it into the smaller booklet, about which more below.³ What happened to the other folia, I cannot say: they may have been reused as binding material in other books, or else they were thrown away.

Because the outer bifolium of quire R is still intact and the removal of quires O-R left no visible traces in IV 24 beyond the fact itself that they are not there anymore, the text block must have been taken out of its binding for the operation, and then put back in. That the missal’s present binding is indeed its original one is borne out by the fact that the sewing supports and the raised bands does not necessarily mean that the binding had not previously contained another text block, as raised bands can be reused when a binding is reapplied

¹ For comparison, I made use of a digital copy of Washington, Library of Congress, Moldenhauer Archives, 3938, which is a more or less complete copy of Kerver’s missal.
² See p. 195.
³ See pp. 195-196.
⁴ Leuridan 1862, 157-160.
⁵ I thank Robert Arpots, curator of the NUL, for pointing out to me that the correspondence between the sewing supports and the raised bands does not necessarily mean that the binding had not previously contained another text block, as raised bands can be reused when a binding is reapplied.
institution by De Werchin,\(^1\) which was replaced with Kerver’s sometime after the promulgation of the Roman Missal by Pope Pius V in 1570. Although its original contents were outdated, the binding was probably deemed too precious to simply throw away, and it could still be put to good use when reapplied to a copy of the revised missal. Another factor may have been that its owner at the time still wanted to have De Werchin commemorated while Mass was being said. Whatever their nature, there must have been sufficient reasons to reuse the binding, despite it being a tight fit for Kerver’s book.

With time, however, even the new missal became obsolete because of liturgical revisions and the gradual addition of saints’ feasts to the calendar. Thankfully, the ordinary had remained largely the same, so part of it could still be of use. The missal was therefore taken out of its binding, or perhaps it had already come loose with use, and the relevant quires were removed. The text block was then pasted back into its binding again, liturgically useless but apparently still deemed worth keeping and binding in a simple way. One of its uses was evidently to provide binding material, for sometime after the book had been rebound several pages from the opening quires were torn out.\(^2\)

Although there are reasons, presented below,\(^3\) to believe that it happened before the removal of the folia for the book of prefaces, it is uncertain when or how the Kerver missal and its transplantation binding from Hainaut ended up at Soeterbeeck. The French priests who sought and temporarily found refuge at Soeterbeeck during the French Revolution may seem a likely source at first.\(^4\) After all, Beckers’ chronicle of the convent says that between 1792 and 1794 it harboured up to 20 of such refugees simultaneously,\(^5\) and some of these will undoubtedly have had books with them to do so. Among them was Abbot Gosse of the abbey of St Callixtus in Cysoing,\(^6\) and since Pierre de Werchin bore the title of that barony and is known to have had connections with the abbey,\(^7\) it is tempting to jump to the conclusion that the abbot was the one to bring the book with his name to Soeterbeeck. The problem with this scenario is that it is difficult to envision a refugee lugging along a missal that had by then become severely outdated except by supposing that this was the only one at hand for some reason, and so, on reflection, it is likelier that IV 24 had come to Soeterbeeck much earlier in an entirely different way. It is impossible to say more, and it is therefore best to finally turn to the book of prefaces.

It will be remembered that IV 53 consists only of those folia from quires O-R of IV 24 that contain the solemn preface tones for seasonal Sundays and (semi)double feasts without a proper preface, the ferial tone for the common preface on ferias and simple feasts and the solemn and the ferial tone for the Lord’s Prayer. All other folia have been purposefully omitted, and most of the other elements that appear on the pages that were included have been meticulously covered with pieces of paper cut to exactly the right size.\(^8\) This was done, for

---

1 That the binding was produced for a missal is very likely because of its general lavishness and the fact that both boards display stamps of the crucifixion.
2 These are ff. ā1-2, ā8 and ē1. They contained the title page, the papal bull *Quo Primum* of Pius V, part of Kerver’s privilege and the calendars of March, April, May and June. That they were torn out of IV 24 after the text block had been rebound is evident from visible remnants that are still present, and from the fact that no identifiable fragments of them appear in IV 53.
3 See p. 196.
4 On these refugee priests, see p. 5.
5 ASP 45, 1: p. 28; ASP 4, p. 6a.
7 De Coussemaker 1883, 619-634, 992-1024.
8 The entire recto of f. 108 and the verso of f. 127 were also covered with pieces of paper, but the purpose of these was probably not to cover anything up but to strengthen the outer pages of the book in an earlier state, as is argued on p. 197. Conversely, ff. 117v, 121r, 122v and 126r were allowed to remain uncovered, although they contain parts of ferial preface tones and the canon and are therefore entirely irrelevant to the purpose of IV 53. F.
instance, with the texts and rubrics preceding the prefaces on f. 108v (Figure 4.1), the opening of the first preface on ferial days on f. 117r and the seasonal Communicantes prayers that are given after some of the prefaces. Most of the pieces of paper used for the covering of such irrelevant texts are blank, whereas others can be identified as being fragments of some of the discarded pages from quires O-R of IV 24.1 The title page, at least, of another Roman Missal, published by Petrus and Joannes Bellerus and Gerard Wolsschaten at Antwerp in 1619 was also used.2 Its decorative engraving of the Last Supper, by Karel van Mallery,3 appears prominently on the first page of IV 53, whereas the rest was cut into pieces that appear upside down, with the blank side up, in various other places.4 It is clear, then, that the person who was responsible for the compilation of the book of prefaces took great pains to produce a fairly handsome booklet with only very specific chants, destroying IV 24 and recycling at least the title page of yet another missal in the process.

The question arises at what point in time IV 53 was taken out of IV 24, and although anything is possible, there hardly seems any reason to doubt that it happened after the missal had come to Soeterbeeck. I am not capable of thinking of any convincing reason why anyone would want to either donate or acquire the Kerver book without the quires O-R, or continue to preserve it unless it had already been theirs to begin with. The smaller booklet’s careful selection of texts also means that it was made with a specific purpose in mind, and that may well have been peculiar to the situation at Soeterbeeck. In fact, the way in which most irrelevant texts and chants are covered by pieces of paper carefully cut to size seems to mirror the method Beckers occasionally used for replacing antiphons in the medieval antiphonaries,5 although the similarity is not close enough to warrant a firm attribution. The only thing that is beyond doubt is that IV 53 was in existence as a separate booklet during Beckers’ rectorate, because there he added a Dutch rubric for every preface in the book, and some of these occur on top of the pieces of paper that had been pasted in to hide irrelevant texts. These notes, then, to whose content I return below,6 postdate the compilation of IV 53, but that is all they reveal about the chronology of its development.

The booklet’s construction does provide additional information of a different nature, for it is absolutely certain that the present binding of blank parchment over cardboard was not originally produced to contain this text block. The parchment has holes for laced-in things that are not present anymore and have nothing to do with the way the book is constructed. Also, the spine is too wide and the boards are too large.

The binding is currently connected to its contents in the following way. The fourteen folia from IV 24 were mostly not conjugate and so they were joined by being pasted onto

---

17v contains the continuation of the ferial preface tone for Lent, the opening of which on f. 117r was covered, whereas f. 121r contains the beginning of the tone for the preface for votive Masses of the apostles, whose continuation on f. 121v is covered. This shows that, apart from those on the two outer pages, only those irrelevant texts were covered that appear on pages which also contain relevant texts and could therefore cause confusion; entire irrelevant pages were allowed to stand because they could be ignored entirely. As explained, irrelevant folia were simply omitted from the booklet altogether.

1 A fragment of f. 118 (P6) was pasted onto f. 109v, and fragments of f. 128 (R4) were pasted onto ff. 112v and 127r. Blank fragments which must also be from IV 24 because they display the same ruling in ink that had been applied to this book after it had been printed, in imitation of a manuscript, were pasted onto ff. 110r and 122r.

2 The title page of this edition exists in two issues: one where the imprint says the book is Ex Officina Petri & Ioannis Belleri (copy: Tilburg, UL, CBM TF D 158), and one where the surname is given as Bellerorum (copies: Antwerp, Hendrik Conscience Heritage Library, F. 26182:1 [C2-572 c]; Utrecht, UL, 325 A 6). The title page that was used in IV 53 is a copy of the issue with Bellerorum.

3 On the engraving, see Hollstein et al. 1949-2010, 11: 159, no. 8.

4 Identifiable fragments from the title page of the missal of 1619 appear on ff. 108v, 109r, 117r and 121v.

5 See p. 149.

6 See pp. 198-200.
paper guards. At least some of these are from a printed book that was probably a missal, although they only display double bounding lines for the text area and no text by which their source can be definitively identified. The guards were sewn onto a parchment fragment of a manuscript antiphonary for the winter half of the year. This manuscript fragment was in turn pasted onto a fragment of a page from the ordinary of Mass of yet another Roman Missal, a folio edition published by the widow and the heirs of Balthasar Moretus at the Plantin Offices in Antwerp in 1677. This second fragment served to cover the sewing threads coming out of the manuscript fragment, as well as to strengthen the spine of the transplantation binding. The parchment fragment from the antiphonary is wider than the paper fragment from the printed missal, and its outer edges were glued to the binding’s cardboard boards on the underside, and subsequently covered with paper pastedowns. The latter have since been removed again, but traces of them still survive, both on the parchment fragment and on the boards. At some point, most of the original guards that connect the folia of the text block to each other were reinforced with additional strips of paper, probably because they had come loose with use.

To make matters even more complicated, it seems that the book of prefaces IV 53 was not originally constructed as it is now. In between the printed folia 115 and 116, which were taken from the Kerver missal IV 24, appears an additional bifolium, on the first three pages of which Beckers has written the solemn tone for a proper preface for feasts of Augustine. This bifolium has been sewn onto the parchment fragment, and the thread passes through the guard which connects ff. 115 and 116, so the bifolium with Beckers’ addition is now an integral part of the book’s construction. However, although all other folia are held together by having been glued to the guards, this bifolium is not; it was not pasted onto anything and is only connected to the rest of the book by way of the sewing thread. This suggests that it was added to a booklet that was already in existence and consisted of folia that were mounted on guards without having been sewn onto anything else. If this is true, it means that the addition of the bifolium with the preface tone for feasts of Augustine, the sewing of the entire booklet onto the parchment fragment, and its pasting into the transplantation binding are all part of a rebinding. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that the text block’s two outer folia have been reinforced, on the outside, with pieces of paper that were pasted on top of them, as if they once formed the outside of a booklet without a cardboard binding.

The question remains whether Beckers’ writing of the preface of Augustine and the sewing and gluing of IV 53 into its present binding took place more or less simultaneously, or if the bifolium that contains the preface was preserved loosely for a period of time before the booklet was rebound. There are two reasons to think that the former option is the most likely. First, the bifolium was added in a logical place, between the solemn prefaces for feasts of the Blessed Virgin and for feasts of the apostles. Since he is venerated as the father of all canonesses regular of his order, this is an appropriate position for Augustine’s preface, because the Virgin exceeds all other saints in personal dignity, whereas a patronal

---

1 Fragments from this book were visibly used as guards on ff. 113r, 114r, 115v and between ff. 126 and 127.
2 This is one of the many surviving fragments of the companion for the winter half of the year of JRL, Latin 439, mentioned on p. 145. It contains chants for Lauds on Holy Saturday.
3 The fragment is part of f. V4 (pp. 235-236). I warmly thank Robert Arpots and Eefje Roodenburg, curators of the NUL, for identifying the edition to which this fragment belongs. Part of f. Aa5 (pp. 285-286) of the same missal, or else another copy of the same edition, has been reused as binding material in V 205.
4 There is one more hint of this type of binding of paper guards sewn onto a manuscript fragment having been used at Soeterbeeck. Fr. 7, a fragment from the same antiphonary as that in IV 53, also shows sewing holes and traces of paper pastedowns (cf. Kienhorst 2009, 27, fig. 7).
5 That the primary purpose of these pieces of paper was reinforcement rather than the covering of irrelevant texts is suggested by the fact that other irrelevant pages within the text block were not covered, cf. pp. 195-196 n. 8.
6 The preface for the Virgin appears on IV 53, f. 115r-v, and that of the apostles on f. 116r-v.
7 RGB XI.2.
feast exceeds those of apostles in rank. First, although, upon their removal from IV 24 and
their initial binding, the printed folia of IV 53 were mounted onto the guards and trimmed in
such a way that the size of the margins and the position of the text area shift up to half a
centimeter from page to page, the lay-out of the first page of Beckers’ bifolium corresponds
exactly with that of the opposite page. The text area is similarly bounded, the margins are
identical, and the staffs are on precisely the same level, as if they run on from one page to the
next. It would appear that Beckers produced his bifolium (which has been cut to the same size
as the rest of the text block) for the very place where it was included when the book was
rebound, opposite the page which it actually faces. This means that the rebinding may well
have happened in his days, and that he was involved in it in some way.

For the purposes of this chapter, the most important things to take away from this
reconstruction of the complicated and eventful history of the book of prefaces IV 53 are the
following. Its pages were taken out of the missal IV 24 to form a booklet with the solemn
preface tones, the ferial tone of the common preface, and the Pater noster. There is no firm
evidence that Rector Beckers was responsible for taking the folia of IV 53 out of IV 24 and
bringing them together for the first time as a separate booklet, and the latter may be predate
his rectorate. However, covering irrelevant sections of books with slips of paper is a method
Beckers occasionally used himself when revising the medieval antiphonaries, so he may have
been involved even in this phase. He certainly added notes and a bifolium with a new preface,
and the booklet’s rebinding, during which the guards onto which the original folia had been
mounted were themselves sewn onto a manuscript fragment and pasted into a transplantation
binding, probably also happened during his rectorate. I therefore think that it is merited to
include at least the rebinding of this very complicated booklet in Beckers’ stratigraphic unit,
in addition to the notes about which there can be no doubt because they are in his hand. I now
discuss these texts, and then address the functional meaning of IV 53, such as it is.

The addition of the solemn tone for the preface of St Augustine, Quia vas electionis
tuae, is Beckers’ most substantial contribution to the book apart from his possible
involvement in its creation and rebinding as a separate entity. The feast of Augustine does not
have a proper preface in the Tridentine Roman Missal, where, having the rank of a double, it
is simply assigned the solemn tone of the common preface. However, a proper preface for
feasts of Augustine was present in many pre-Tridentine missals of the use of Rome, and
continued to be printed, with or without notation, in Augustinian Missae propriae and
supplements to the Roman Missal until the twentieth century. It is likely that Beckers copied
his preface from a printed source like these, and its functional meaning in a convent of
canonesses regular of St Augustine is self-evident.

In addition to the preface, Beckers also added several marginal notes to the book, most
of which are paraphrases in Dutch of the printed rubrics in Latin which identify the printed
prefaces. These paraphrases often omit certain elements, not because of any liturgical change
but apparently because those parts of the rubric were implicitly understood. Frequently

---

1 RGB IX.3.6; DT 1.
2 The folia were trimmed after their removal from IV 24, and probably when they received their present binding, as there is no need to trim a text block before it is put between actual boards. Although the binding is considerably too large, it is possible that the pages were (accidentally) trimmed too much.
3 IV 53, f. 115v.
4 Cf. IV 9, p. 557; IV 24, f. 219v.
5 Menth 1933, 113-119, esp. 114-115.
6 Menth 1933, 115 n. 123. For an (incomplete) bibliography of Augustinian propers for Mass and Office, see Amiet 1990, 438-439, 455-457, 463-465. The Congregation of Windesheim also published its own proper for Mass, see Persoons and Lourdaux 1966, 406. I have not been able to confirm whether this edition contained a noted version of the preface of St Augustine.
7 These more or less faithful paraphrases occur on ff. 108v, 109v, 110r, 111r-v, 112v, 113r, 115r and 116r.
omitted are explicit references to the use of a certain seasonal preface tone on double or semidouble feasts that do not have a proper preface and fall within that season, or to the use of a preface for a specific feast during its entire octave. Always omitted are instructions for the adaptation of the wording of the preface for specific feasts, such as occurs in the rubrics for the solemn preface tones for Eastertide and feasts of Our Lady.  

A representative example of Beckers’ economy in paraphrasing is the rubric for the solemn tone of the preface of the Cross, *Qui salutem humani generis*, which reads in full in its printed version:

> Sequens præfatio cum suo cantu dicitur in Dominica Passionis, in Dominica palmarum, in feria quinta in Cena Domini, & in festis duplicibus, & semiduplicibus eo tempore occurrentibus, nisi in festis propria assignetur. Et in solenmitatibus sanctæ Crucis.

This has simply been paraphrased by Beckers as: *Van Passie sondaagh tot daaghs voor Paeschen.* The fact that the solemn tone for the preface of the Cross should not be used on all days during Passiontide but only on its Sundays and feasts speaks for itself, since those are the days on which solemn tones are sung by definition. The ordinary of Mass also provides a ferial tone for the same preface, for use on weekdays and simple feasts. The omission of the explicit mention of feasts without a proper preface is typical, and the omission of the reference to feasts of the Holy Cross, though it seems more extreme, is really of the same nature, as the preface of the Cross is proper to those occasions and listed in the rubrics.

There are two cases where Beckers did not simply paraphrase a rubric but has actually given a different one. The most straightforward of these occurs on f. 121v, where the ferial tone of the common preface *Per quem maiestatem tuam laudant angeli* begins. Beckers did not translate the rubric assigning this tone to simple feasts and ferias, but instead noted that it is to be used *in de Misse van Requiem*. This does not reflect a liturgical innovation, however, for the preface in question continued to be used on ferias and simple feasts, and Beckers’ decision not to write that down can be explained by simply observing that all other ferial preface tones were omitted from IV 53. Because of this, it is clear that Beckers was not concerned with the tone’s ferial application, but only with its use in Requiem Masses. The latter function was only made explicit in the revision of the rubrics of the Roman Missal promulgated by Clement VIII in 1604. Because it was not reflected in Kerver’s missal yet, Beckers had to add a reference to it in his book of prefaces. Rather than actually replacing the rubric, then, Beckers omitted from it what was irrelevant to his purpose and highlighted what was already implicitly present.

The second occasion on which Beckers deviated from the rubrics as printed in IV 53 is the result of a liturgical change. The use of the solemn tone of the preface of the Trinity, *Qui cum unigenito Filio tuo*, which the printed rubric limits to Trinity Sunday, has been expanded by Beckers to also include *alle sondaghen door ’t jaar daar geen andere præfatie [o]gestelt is*. Conversely, in his paraphrase of the rubric for the solemn tone of the common preface, Beckers omits the reference to its use on Sundays. This reflects a decree issued by Pope Clement XIII on 3 January 1759, which ruled that all Sundays without a proper preface, which until then had been assigned the common preface, should henceforth use the Trinity

---

1 IV 53, ff. 111v, 115r.
2 *The following preface with its chant is said on Passion Sunday, on Palm Sunday, on Maundy Thursday and on double and semidouble feasts that occur in this time, except on feasts which have been assigned a proper preface, and on solemnities of the Holy Cross* (IV 53, f. 111r).
3 *‘From Passion Sunday until the day before Easter’* (IV 53, f. 111r).
4 Cf. IV 9, p. 283.
5 Cf. IV 9, pp. 482, 564.
6 *‘In Requiem Mass’* (IV 53, f. 121v).
7 Cf. IV 9, p. 295.
9 *‘All Sundays in ordinary time which have not been assigned another preface’* (IV 53, f. 114r).
10 IV 53, f. 116v.
preface instead.¹ That the rector should be aware of and implement this change is yet another manifestation, together with the insight with which he compiled the proper of saints in his diurnal IV 58, and the care with which he revised the antiphonaries, of his interest and precision in liturgical matters.

There are two instances where Beckers’ paraphrase of the printed rubrics has been expanded by a later hand. The first of these occurs at the preface Quia per incarnati verbi mysterium, originally attributed both by the printed text and by the rector to Nativity tide, the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (2 February), and the octave of Corpus Christi. To this list was later added a reference to the Transfigurati ons Heere,² an occasion when the proper of saints of IV 24 prescribed the use of this preface,³ but which was simply not represented in the rubric for the preface itself in the order of the Mass. The other expansion of one of Beckers’ paraphrases merely consists of the addition of a reference to feasts of the Holy Cross to Beckers’ summary of the rubric for the preface Qui salutem humani generis.⁴ It is not known when these additions to Beckers’ Dutch rubrics were made, but they are clearly geared at ease of use.

This conclusion brings us to the question what the functional meaning of IV 53 actually was. In its present state, the book consists physically of parts of at least three printed missals and one manuscript, as well as a transplantation binding and various traces of restoration, suggesting that it must have served some real purpose and did indeed see heavy duty. The preface and the Lord’s Prayer are the two most significant elements chanted by the celebrant at a sung Mass,⁵ and IV 53 conveniently combines all of the solemn and one of the ferial tones for the former with both tones for the latter. However, since it is the norm for printed missals to contain noted versions of these texts, it is difficult to envision the celebrant having any practical use for a booklet like this, as he could simply use his missal to sing from. It is more likely, therefore, that IV 53 was not meant for him at all, but for someone else.

The only other candidate at Soeterbeeck is the sister playing the organ, and this seems especially fitting with an eye to the translation of the rubrics which Beckers added, which a priest would not have needed but a sister might. As argued above,⁶ there are reasons to believe that the organ was played when Vespers was sung at Soeterbeeck, and the instrument may well have accompanied the preface and the Lord’s Prayer at Mass too. Organ accompaniment for the preface was widespread in Brabantian parishes in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁷ IV 53 could be used for this purpose on Sundays, double or semidouble feasts without a proper and at Requiem Masses, and it also provided for the Pater noster on all days. This means that the booklet’s construction was a roundabout way in which to salvage part of an ancient and indeed outdated missal for active liturgical use—yet another form of renovation, in other words. By its rebinding and expansion with the preface of Augustine and by the translation and revision of the rubrics, Beckers was able to further facilitate its employment by one of the sisters in his care.

¹ Decreta 1898-1927, 2: 118, no. 2449.
² ‘Transfiguration of Our Lord’ (IV 53, f. 108v).
³ IV 24, f. 213v.
⁴ IV 53, f. 111r.
⁵ Cf. IV 9, f. C2va (Rubricae generales Missalis XVI.3). The celebrant should also sing Dominus vobiscum and Oremus at various points, the collects before the epistle and after communion, the Pax after the rite of fraction (cf. IV 9, p. 311) and the dismissal (cf. IV 9, pp. 313-315), but these are all very brief. Other, longer texts, such as the Gloria and the Creed, were merely intoned by the priest (cf. IV 9, pp. 253, 255). I use the phrase sung Mass in the non-technical sense of a Mass where the celebrant sings those parts which the rubrics indicate are to be sung, whether he is assisted by a deacon and a subdeacon or not.
⁶ See pp. 181-183, 193.
⁷ Jespers 1988, 86.
4.5. The Revision of a Late Medieval Book of Hours

This discussion of Beckers’ work on a book of prefaces for the organist does not exhaust his attempts to facilitate the use of a liturgical book by a sister or the possibilities of his being involved in a rebinding. The same issues are relevant with reference to one of Soeterbeeck’s books with the Little Office of the Virgin in Latin, which according to the seventeenth-century conventual statutes was recited communally in choir every day.1 This time, the volume that rejoices in the rector’s attention is a manuscript with shelf mark IV 47, which is a small (11.6 x 9 cm.) parchment book of hours according to the use of Windesheim in a brown-leather binding. The booklet is dated to the sixteenth century.2 Its contents are as follows:

f. Ir-v: flyleaf with notes in the hand of Prioress Magdalena Verhoeven (1840-1853),3 consisting of full texts of and references to elements of the Little Office of the Virgin, all of which were to be said by the prioress4
f. IIr: flyleaf with an ownership note of Verhoeven in her own hand, dated to 1840, the year in which she became prioress
f. IIV: blank
ff. 1r-12v: calendar
ff. 13r-14v: profession formula of Sister Francisca van der Loo5
ff. 15r-67v: Little Office of the Virgin according to the use of Windesheim6
ff. 68r-82r: penitential psalms with the litany of the saints
f. 82v: blank
ff. 83r-114r: Vigil of the Dead according to the use of Windesheim,7 including the minor lessons8
ff. 114r-v: Commendation of the Dead, incomplete
ff. IIIr-Vv: fyleaves with liturgical texts and instructions, in an unidentified hand of the eighteenth or nineteenth century9

---

1 Frenken 1931/32, 232. See p. 72.
2 For a description of this manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 76-77. On the Latin book of hours within the Congregation of Windesheim, see Gorissen 1968; Korteweg 2013; Marrow 2007 and Ottosen 2007, 280-282, 345.
3 On Verhoeven, see Appendix A.1, no. 31.
4 These are the Confiteor, Misereatur and Indulgentiam for use at Prime and Compline, and the Commemoratio for Prime, which are mentioned but not given in full in the manuscript (ff. 40v, 51r), and which, according to the statutes (Frenken 1931/32, 215, 219), it normally befell to the prioress to recite in choir.
5 Francisca van der Loo was born in 1522 and professed at Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage in Helmond in 1538. She later became prioress of Sint-Aannenborch, which she still was in 1572 (Frenken 1935/36, 236; Schutjes 1870-1881, 4: 455; 5: 606). She was never at Soeterbeeck.
6 On the distinctive features of the Little Office of the Virgin according to the use of Windesheim, see Gorissen 1968, 101-106; Korteweg 2013, 246-250, 260-261; Marrow 2007, 281-285, 290. It may conveniently be noted here that the invitatory in IV 47 is Ave Maria, gratia plena rather than the usual In honore beatae Mariae, a variant whose existence is also noted by Marrow 2007, 284 and Korteweg 2013, 260.
7 On the distinctive features of the Vigil of the Dead according to the use of Windesheim, see Gorissen 1968, 69, 75-76; Korteweg 2013, 241-246, 259-260; Ottosen 2007, 66, 70 n. 42, 143, 174-175, 178, 281-282, 345, 366.
8 The minor lessons were also added later to another late medieval book of hours in the Soeterbeeck Collection: IV 50, ff. Ir-IIV, 36r-v and the back pastedown. The first two minor lessons, with their responsories, are currently lacking there because they were on a folium between ff. 35 and 36 which has largely been torn out.
9 The instructions on ff. IIIr-IIVr provide the versicles before Lauds and the verse of the responsory at Prime in the divine office for various seasons of the liturgical year. It is unclear what the source of the versicles was, as most of these seem not to occur in the Roman Breviary or the liturgical manuscripts of Soeterbeeck. The exception is the versicle on Easter Sunday, which appears in, for instance, IV 6, f. 3v. The verses for Prime correspond with those used in the liturgical manuscripts of Soeterbeeck (e.g., PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 69v; IV 6, ff. 14v, 26r, 30r) but not completely with those in the Roman Breviary. The verse given for the responsory at Prime on Pentecost is Qui misisti Spiritum Paraclitum, not, as in the Roman liturgy, Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, alleluia, alleluia. The notes on ff. IVr-Vv mainly describe the distribution of the four Marian antiphons at Compline, with their versicles and collects, across the seasons of the liturgical year according to the rules of the Roman liturgy. This was necessary because IV 47 does not include most of the versicles and collects, and, according to the use of Windesheim, distributes the antiphons differently and mostly according to the ranks of
Beckers left notes in this book in his cursive script, and the literature associates him with its current binding. I discuss his written traces first and turn to the possibility of his involvement on a material level afterwards.

I have listed the entire contents of IV 47 in order to show that it was clearly still in heavy use even around 1840. This may be surprising with an eye to the book’s age, but it is not in light of the centrality of the Little Office to Soeterbeeck’s liturgical life, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century, when it was the only way in which the choir sisters celebrated the liturgy of the hours. Every one of them must have had a book of hours, although, as noted in the second chapter, only very few of these that include the Hours of the Virgin survive. Most must have been destroyed by the combination of the relatively fragile nature of this type of book and their heavy use, but six of them have survived. Besides IV 47 there are the sixteenth-century manuscripts IV 46 and IV 48,5 and the printed books III 146 (Venice: Joannes Baptista Pasquali, 1740), IV 123 (highly incomplete, but probably printed in Antwerp at the Plantin Offices circa 1700) and IV 136 (Schoonhoven: canons regular of Sint-Michiel in Den Hem, circa 1500).6 Of these, the manuscripts and IV 136 follow the use of Windesheim, and the other two are Roman, but these have both been heavily revised in various hands by means of pieces of paper both loose and pasted-in, to bring them into accordance with the Windesheim texts. As no traces of Beckers survive in these books, I will not discuss this revision in any more detail. Suffice it to say that the sisters of Soeterbeeck continued to say the Little Office according to the use of Windesheim, and to do so from medieval manuscripts, even in the nineteenth century.

Turning now to Beckers’ work on the contents of the book of hours IV 47, I must first determine that it was restricted to the Little Office of the Virgin, and can be divided along its functional dimension into additions and revisions. I begin with the most straightforward notes, which consist of expansions of several texts only given in abbreviated form by the medieval scribe.8 The texts to be thus expanded are the first verses of certain versicles, and the doxology of two responsories. It is unclear to me why Beckers felt it was necessary to expand such a well-known and straightforward text as the latter, Gloria Patri. The usefulness of the expansion of the versicles is more readily apparent, and the fact that it is limited to the first verse of each probably shows that Beckers did it for a sister who had been entrusted with the

---

1 These are the collects for a priest, an anniversary, several men and one man. Those for an anniversary (Deus indulgentiarum) and several men (Inclina, Domine) are identical to those provided in the manuscript itself (ff. 108v, 109v). Those for a priest (Deus, qui inter apostolicos) and one man (Inclina, Domine) are different from those in the manuscript, which has Da nobis, Domine and Omnipotens, sempiterne Deus respectively (f. 109r-v), but identical to those in the Roman Breviary (cf. IV 65, pp. lxxi-lxxii). The same prayers were also added to IV 48, ff. 63v-64r, in a different hand.

2 Translations of Domine, in unione and Beata viscera Mariae Virginis are part of this. The same prayers, though in a slightly different translation and in another hand, have also been added to another late medieval book of hours in the Soeterbeeck Collection: IV 46, ff. Ir-v, IIv-IIIr.

3 Poirters 2013a, 102-103.

4 See p. 55.

5 On these manuscripts, see Kienhorst 2005, 74-75, 78-79.

6 On III 146 and IV 136, see Poirters 2013a, 112, 114-115.

7 A few additional details concerning the revision of III 146 are provided in Poirters 2013a, 103-106.

8 An overview of Beckers’ expansions in IV 47 is provided in Table 4.1.
task of saying or reciting the versicles in choir. She would only be responsible for the first verse, whereas the rest of the community needed to answer with the second verse, so having the full text of the first half of the verse was enough for her but not for anyone else. According to Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century statutes, the office of versicularia circulated weekly among the novices, unless there were none.¹ Beckers’ expansions tie in with this because they indicate that, at the moment of their addition, the manuscript was used by an inexperienced sister who needed help with the versicles.² This conclusion does leave the question why the particular versicles which Beckers expanded where singled out, whereas many others were allowed to stand in their abbreviated form.³ There is really no way to answer this question now, for it may well have been determined simply by the memory of the particular sister who used IV 47 when Beckers added his notes. Perhaps she was able to say the other versicles and only needed help with the ones which the rector expanded.

Compared to the expansions, which are only geared at ease of use, a more substantial addition to this manuscript on Beckers’ part consists of the antiphons and collect of a commemoration to Anthony Abbot (17 January), which read:

[A]d Benedictus.
Ad Magnificat.
Oratio

These texts are not taken from the proper of the feast of Anthony (17 January) in the Roman Breviary of Beckers’ days,⁵ and the collect is the only element which corresponds with the commemoration of Anthony as it is provided in the book of hours IV 46,⁶ which contains a large number of commemorations of saints.⁷ Instead of basing himself on these sources, the rector compiled his version from the fifteenth-century rhyming office for Anthony which appears in many of the convent’s late medieval antiphonaries, especially those attributed to

¹ Frenken 1931/32, 232.
² On the private use and ownership of books at Soeterbeeck, see pp. 232-237. That IV 47 was in possession of an individual sister is particularly likely because its size precludes simultaneous use by more than one person. That the book was in in private possession after Beckers’ rectorate is proven by Verhoeven’s ownership note, dated 1840, on the recto of the second flyleaf, and by the fact that she left notes on the first flyleaf which are all directly related to her use of this book as prioress (see p. 201 n. 4). However, the question remains how private her use of this book actually was, as her ownership note asks the reader to pray for her nu en ook naer mijn doodt (‘now and also after my death’, IV 47, f. 1Ir), which would seem to indicate that other sisters were expected to make use of this book even while it was still in the possession of Verhoeven. For late medieval examples of the common use of books associated with the prioress, see p. 230 n. 1.
³ In the case of the versicles of the suffrages of the Cross and All Saints on ferial days (f. 38r) it is clear why the versicles were not expanded: the texts appear in full on the opposite page, f. 37v, and higher up on f. 38r respectively. Harder to explain is Beckers’ failure to expand, for example, the versicle of the second nocturn at Matins (f. 22v), the first one of the third nocturn (f. 26r-v) or that of Lauds following the hymn (f. 34r), for in these cases the full text is not on the same opening.
⁴ IV 47, ff. 35v-38r (underscore in the original). Certain parts of the text had to be reconstructed, because the pages of IV 47 were trimmed when the booklet was rebound, on which see pp. 206-208.
⁵ Cf. IV 65, pp. 330-331.
⁶ IV 46, f. 48v. Instead of the proper antiphons given by Beckers, this manuscript refers to the common antiphon for double feasts of one confessor, Iste est qui ante Deum (cf. f. 43r), for Anthony Abbot. This is an odd choice, given that there is also a common antiphon for abbots (f. 43v).
⁷ IV 46, ff. 46v-69v.
Mariënhage. The rector does not provide the versicle, but the one appearing after the hymns at Vespers and Lauds in the full office is: VerV. Ora pro nobis beate Anthoni. VerR. Ut digni efficiamur promissionibus Christi. This versicle can be adapted for use for all saints and is also the versicle of the common commemoration of all confessors in IV 47, and for these reasons Beckers probably felt it was not necessary to include it.

It is unclear, however, why he added Anthony’s commemoration in the first place. It appears in the outer margins of the pages bearing the suffrages at Lauds, the set of four commemorations that had to be recited every day, and appears to have been intended to be included among them. But its inclusion does nothing to bring the suffrages of IV 47 into accordance with those of the other books of hours from Soeterbeeck. The manuscript’s original suffrages were to the Cross, Augustine, Gertrude, and all saints. Of the other manuscript books of hours that survive in the Soeterbeeck Collection with the Hours of the Virgin, the first, IV 46, includes suffrages to the Cross, Augustine, Lambert and all saints, and the second, IV 48, daily commemorates the Cross, Augustine, the virgins and all saints. The printed book IV 136 does not have any suffrages at all except for the one to all saints, but that one was added on a slip of paper in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. At about the same time, the suffrage to all saints was also added to III 146, and there, too, it was the only

---

1 The rhyming office for Anthony Abbot is included, with considerable variants in the lessons at Matins where these are present, in the antiphonaries IV 7, pp. 179-180 (where most of the office is concealed because the folia with pp. 180-181 have been pasted together, possibly by Beckers); KHS 28, 2: ff. 24v-31v and PBF 6168 Hs, 2: ff. 21v-28r; the nocturnal breviary IV 74, ff. 184v-187v; and the manual IV 130, ff. Vv-3r, 4r-23r. It was also added at a later stage to the antiphonaries IV 4, ff. 337r-341r; IV 22, ff. 273r-277r and 130 G 18, ff. 68r-75v; but the first two manuscripts omit the chants for Matins. Additions of individual texts occur in the antiphonaries IV 7, pp. 371-372 (the hymn for Lauds and Vespers, Urbs beata Viennensis) and IV 22, f. 272v and IV 25, f. 223r (the second Magnificat antiphon, O lampas ardens). The antiphony that is the second unit of IV 16 only contains six proper lessons for Matins—different once again from those in IV 74 and IV 130—and no other texts (f. 111v-). No proper office for the feast of Anthony Abbot is present in the Windesheim Breviary that was printed in Delft by Henricus Eckert de Homberch in 1499 (cf. IV 51:2, f. 63v). The edition produced by the same printer in Antwerp in 1519 includes a different office, but on folia that are lacking from those that survive in IV 51:1 and Add. 7 in the Soeterbeeck Collection. (I made use of Munich, Bavarian State Library, 4 Liturg. 91, ff. Win O2v-Win O3r for comparison.) The rhyming office was edited from some of Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts by a team of musicologists at Utrecht University, under the title of Het officie van Antonius Eremita (1975). On the office’s date of composition, see p. xvii of this edition.

2 Officie 1975, 4, 22-23.

3 IV 47, f. 67r.

4 The prominence of Gertrude in IV 47 is noteworthy. In addition to the presence of her suffrage in the Little Office of the Virgin, the calendar (ff. 1r-12v) lists the feasts of her translation (10 February, double), her death (17 March, solemnity in hac domo (‘in this house’), a red letter day) and her consecration as abbess (2 December, double) (ff. 2r, 3r, 12r). The fact that all of these feasts are listed is exceptional, as are their high ranks. In addition, the litany of the saints (ff. 75r-82r) lists Gertrude as the first female saint after the confessors, and the first letter of her name has been highlighted (f. 77v). According to Bernardien van den Berg (private communication with the author, 20 February 2014), these anomalies indicate that IV 47 was produced in or for a convent dedicated to Gertrude, possibly Sint-Geertruid in ’s-Hertogenbosch, and not in or for Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage, as is often reported in the literature (e.g., Van Dijk 1984c, 304; Koldeweij 1990, 176, no. 105; Poirters 2013a, 113) on the basis of the inclusion in the manuscript of the profession formula of the Helmond sister Van der Loo. Van den Berg points out that the profession formula is a self-contained codicological unit that need not have been added to the manuscript until long after its production and therefore reveals nothing about its origin but only about its provenance (cf. Poirters 2013a, 101).

5 IV 47, ff. 35r-36r, 55r-56r.

6 IV 46, ff. 18r-19r, 30r-31r.

7 IV 48, ff. 21v-23r, 37v-39r.

8 IV 136, ff. Ir, d3ar-v, e7ar.
one. The same suffrage appeared in IV 123 as it was printed, though with a different collect which was duly replaced, and it was the only one there as well.\(^1\)

The addition of Anthony’s suffrage to IV 47, then, is not reflected in any of the other surviving books of hours from Soeterbeeck’s library. The Egyptian hermit does not feature prominently in any of Beckers’ other liturgical works either, and there are no indications that eighteenth-century Soeterbeeck had a particular devotion for him. As was the case with the commemorations which Beckers wrote on the binion which appears as part of an appendix to the Roman Diurnal IV 65,\(^2\) I am unable to identify the functional meaning of Anthony’s suffrage in IV 47 in the context of the liturgy. Keeping in mind the fact that Soeterbeeck must have owned many more books of hours, which, had they survived, may well have presented a radically different picture, the only explanation I can give of the unique presence of this text in this particular book is that it may have to do with the personal devotion for Anthony of the sister who used it. A proliferation of suffrages cannot be squared with the choral recitation of the Little Office, but this one may not have been part of that.

The last and perhaps most interesting thing that Beckers did with the Little Office of the Virgin in IV 47 comes close to his revisionary work on the medieval antiphonaries: he replaced the blessings before the fifth and seventh lessons at Matins by writing replacement texts in the margin. In another publication I have analysed the significance of these replacements in relation to other textual emendations in the Little Office in other hands;\(^4\) here it suffices to discuss the blessings only. The one before the fifth lesson originally read Maria que peperit Christum pro nobis postulet ipsum, and was marginally replaced by Stella Maria maris succurre piissima nobis.\(^5\) The blessing before the seventh lesson was Christi portatrix sit nobis semper auxiliatrix, which Beckers changed into Iesus Mariae filius sit nobis clemens et propitius.\(^6\)

The same changes were made to the book of hours IV 46 by an unidentified person who wrote the replacement texts on slips of paper which had first been pasted in over the original text.\(^7\) IV 48 already had the Stella Maria maris and Iesus Mariae filius blessings to begin with, and the same goes for IV 94, a fifteenth-century manuscript fragment of a booklet containing the Vigil of the Dead to which the scribe added the fourth to ninth lessons at Matins in the Little Office of the Virgin, with their blessings and responsories.\(^8\) The printed books III 146 and IV 136 did not originally contain these lessons, although they were added to them at the same time as the suffrages, with the ‘new’ blessings.\(^9\) IV 123 is currently too incomplete to be sure, as the pages for Matins have been lost, but this book probably needed to be expanded as well. In other words, the replacement of the original blessings in IV 46 and IV 47 had the function of bringing the text of these books in line with that of the other ones. Although there are many more points where the texts of the Soeterbeeck books of hours differ

---

\(^1\) III 146, verso of a folium added between pp. 52-53.
\(^2\) IV 132, p. 78.
\(^3\) See pp. 135-136.
\(^5\) IV 47, f. 23r.
\(^6\) IV 47, f. 26v.
\(^7\) IV 46, ff. 8r, 11r. The same hand, which is probably H7, also replaced the words una cum Sancto Spiritu in the doxology of the hymn Christe Redemptor omnium for Matins of All Saints (1 November) with cum Spiritu Paraclito in the late fifteenth-century hymnal IV 81:1, f. 46r, also by pasting in a slip of paper with the replacement on top of the original text. In the Roman Breviary, this hymn is given for Vespers, and although McGrath 1939, 170, no. 147 reports that it has the original manuscript reading there, it is possible that the reviser used a copy with the variant reading of the replacement text.
\(^8\) IV 48, ff. 9v, 12v.
\(^9\) IV 94, ff. 16r, 17r. For a description of this manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 130-131.
\(^10\) III 146, recto of the second folium of a bifolium added between pp. 16-17, and recto of the first folium of a bifolium added between pp. 22-23; IV 136, ff. IVr, Vr.
from each other, these blessings are the most conspicuous ones,\(^1\) and bringing all books in line with each other in this respect was probably done with an eye to the communal recital of the Little Office of the Virgin. The question why this had not happened in IV 47 before Beckers did so cannot be answered definitively, but it may have had something do with the fact that the seventeenth-century statutes dictate that, during the liturgy of the hours, the blessing is only recited by the hebdomadary sister and not by more sisters at once.\(^2\) This means that it would have been less important from a practical perspective for all sisters to have the same text.

Incidentally, the fact that two different sets of blessings are found in the manuscript books of hours that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck may be significant for the way in which the Windesheim use of the Hours of the Virgin is defined. James Marrow has noted the existence of variants within this use for the invitatory, the hymn at the minor hours and the position of the hymn in relation to the chapter at Lauds and Compline, and to these can now be added the blessings for the fifth and seventh lessons at Matins. It is not possible here to go into the problems surrounding the identification of the uses of books of hours, but it seems that the situation at Soeterbeeck confirms Marrow’s conclusion that there was no uniform text of the Little Office of the Virgin according to the use of Windesheim, and that it is highly desirable to study the text of this office in greater detail in order to arrive at a better understanding of the various types that existed.\(^3\)

To round off this discussion of Beckers’ work on the Little Office of the Virgin in IV 47, I should point out that it is simultaneously completely in line with all of his other liturgical activities and significantly different from them. Although the circumstances in which they were added are unknown and their precise functional meaning therefore remains uncertain, in general the rector’s notes represent a pattern that is highly familiar by now: he revised the text, added to it and made it easier to use. However, the direction that his revision of the Hours of the Virgin took is entirely different from that of his renovations of the antiphonaries and hymnals: he brought the latter in line with the Roman liturgy, whereas he consolidated the Little Office’s deviation from it by striving towards textual unity among the Windesheim book of hours at least in the case of the blessings at Matins. This was later taken a step further by many other persons, in textual changes both large and small. Most fundamentally, the addition and revision of the suffrage to All Saints in III 146 and IV 132, mentioned above,\(^4\) were but a small part of a largely successful attempt at adapting the Hours of the Virgin in these books, which followed the use of Rome, to the use of Windesheim. Although these and other changes were not carried out consistently in all books of hours or on all points of difference, so that their ultimate effect is not entirely uniform,\(^5\) it is clear that they were intended to produce a unified text of the Little Office according to the use of Windesheim, in explicit deviation from the use of Rome. Apparently, Beckers and the other persons who revised Soeterbeeck’s books of hours felt that, although they had to conform to the Roman liturgy as far as the text of the canonical hours was concerned, it would be appropriate to take the opposite direction for the Little Office. I return to this significant decision in the final chapter.\(^6\)

Having discussed all the notes in Beckers’ hand in the book of hours IV 47, I now turn to its binding. This cannot be the first one the manuscript had, as is evident from the inclusion

\(^{1}\) Apart, of course, from the fact that III 146 and IV 123 reflected an entirely different use and that these and IV 136 originally only included three lessons for Matins. On other, smaller differences, see Poirters 2013a, 103-106.

\(^{2}\) Frenken 1931/32, 234, 237.

\(^{3}\) Marrow 2007, 284-285.

\(^{4}\) See pp. 204-205.

\(^{5}\) Cf. Poirters 2013a, 105-106.

\(^{6}\) See pp. 306, 309.
of the originally separate bifolium with the profession formula of Sister De Loe. I already addressed the topic of the book’s rebinding in an earlier publication, where I claimed that Beckers may have been involved in it. The manuscript’s present binding of brown leather over cardboard cannot itself be dated because it is too plain and only decorated with a blind-tooled frame. However, it was clearly added sometime after Beckers worked on the Hours of the Virgin, because many of his notes in that section have been partly trimmed off. I argued that Prioress Verhoeven, who obtained the book in 1840 according to her ownership note, was also the one to add its pagination, and that she did this in a way that seems to show that the pages had already been trimmed at that moment, some of the numbers being very close to the text and none of them even partially cut off. Given the fact that for Soeterbeeck the three decades between Beckers’ death and Verhoeven’s acquisition of the manuscript were a period of great difficulty, financially and otherwise, because of its dissolution by the Napoleonic government, I considered it improbable that the book was rebound at that time, which means that this had probably already happened before 1810. If, I concluded, the rebinding of IV 47 had indeed taken place during Beckers’ rectorate, it is likely that he was involved with it in some way.

Upon consideration, and having travelled a little further down the hermeneutic spiral of my study of Soeterbeeck’s historical library, I would say that my previously published conclusion, even couched in such cautious terms as it was, is entirely unwarranted. It is true that some of Verhoeven’s page numbers appear unusually close to the text area, and also that none of them have been cut off, but that of p. 18 is on the very edge of the page. It probably was not added deliberately, after the text block was trimmed, and the same can actually be said, to a lesser extent and with less certainty, for many more page numbers, especially those on the versos. The position of Verhoeven’s ownership note on the second flyleaf is also suggestive: it does not appear in the middle of the page, but in the upper right corner. This can be due to a misjudgement on Verhoeven’s part of the space she had at her disposal for the note, but it can also be an effect created by later trimming, and that option is more likely. It seems, then, that Verhoeven’s notes were added before rather than after the text block was trimmed, and on the assumption that she paginated the book when she had it in her possession, this means that the trimming took place in 1840 or later.

Even without considering what the position of Verhoeven’s note and page numbers seems to reveal about the moment when the text block of IV 47 was trimmed, it is difficult to accept my earlier line of argument that the convent’s great poverty in the period between 1810 and 1840 would have prevented the sisters from having the book rebound. Its present binding is so simple that it probably cost the sisters less than a new book of hours would have. True, Rector Henricus de Bruijn (1842-1844) says, in his continuation of the second version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck, that wij hebben ons [...] in alles veel moeten bezuinigen, but rebinding their old books instead of buying new ones would have been a good economy measure. In the case of IV 47 the sisters appear not to have done so themselves, for this

1 IV 47, ff. 13-14.
2 Poirters 2013a, 102-103.
3 IV 47, recto second flyleaf.
4 On Soeterbeeck’s difficulties during the first half of the nineteenth century, see p. 5.
5 E.g., pp. 29 (f. 29r) and 39 (f. 34r).
6 IV 47, f. 23v.
7 E.g., pp. 20 (f. 24v) and 34 (f. 31v).
8 The additions at the back of the book, the first group of which show signs of trimming too because on f. IVr a t has been partly cut off, are of no help in dating the rebinding, because I have not been able to identify or date their hands definitively to the eighteenth or the nineteenth century.
9 ‘We had to cut back a lot on everything then’ (ASP 4, p. 23a; emphasis in the original). On De Bruijn, see p. 279 n. 4.
particular book was bound professionally on sewing supports and between leather-covered cardboard boards, rather than glued into a reused binding or a makeshift construction of cardboard and parchment such as that of the book of prefaces IV 53, as was usual for Soeterbeeck’s in-house rebindings.¹

The final part of my published argument, that Beckers will have been involved in the rebinding of IV 47 because he was rector at the time, does not carry any weight whatsoever. It was not inherent to his function to oversee the rebinding of books, and if he nonetheless did do so, he would probably have prevented his own notes from being trimmed. There are, in other words, no good reasons to believe that IV 47 was rebound under Beckers’ supervision or even during his rectorate, and several valid ones to believe that this was not the case.

4.6. Two Books with Liturgical Chants
Although the rebinding of IV47 is probably not part of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit, his involvement with the contents of the book is evident from his notes in the text block. These were actually the last traces of the revision, expansion and increasing of the user-friendliness of existing liturgical books on his part that I needed consider for this chapter. We are not quite finished, though, for besides traces of the use of books the rector also left several traces of their production in the library of Soeterbeeck. In other words, he wrote several liturgical books of his own. One of these was the Dutch diurnal IV 58 that was probably meant to help the sisters during the preparation for the celebration of canonical Vespers and Compline, and which for narrative reasons was already discussed at the beginning of the previous chapter.² In addition to this substantial volume, the rector also produced two more slender ones, containing collections of liturgical chants in Latin for various occasions. These books, IV 10b and IV 55, are best discussed together, as their contents overlap to a great extent, although the one is markedly more extensive than the other. Because they were produced at least partly by Beckers, I will not only discuss the functional dimension of its contents, but also pay attention to the typological aspect of their outward appearance, as I did with IV 58.

4.6.1. IV 55
The most extensive collection, and, judging from Beckers’ script, probably also the earliest, is IV 55. This book has a binding of brown leather over cardboard (24.5 x 19.3 x 1.1 cm.), without any headbands. The front and back boards are blind-stamped with double fillets forming two concentric frames which are joined at the corners. The spine has seven raised bands; the tail panel is covered with a blue-bordered white label, which reads IV 55 1788 in black ink.³ The same shelf mark is also present in the upper right corner of the recto of the first flyleaf, this time in red ballpoint pen. The roman numeral IV appears upside down in the lower left corner of the verso of the final flyleaf, apparently because the person applying the shelf marks was initially keeping the book upside down. The page edges were once painted red, but the paint has worn off almost entirely.

The manuscript presently consists of 24 folia (24.1 x 19 cm.). It has sewn endpapers at either end which each consist of a bifolium that functions simultaneously as pastedown and flyleaf, and an additional single leaf whose stub has been tucked in underneath the pastedown. The text block consists of six binions, but the fourth folium of the fifth and the first three folia of the sixth quire have been cut away, leaving only the stubs.

¹ See, for example, the bindings of IIII, 228, III 229 and V 53. A discussion of the bindings produced at Soeterbeeck in the nineteenth century will be part of a forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.

² See p. 114.

³ On the date and circumstances of this label’s application, see pp. 6-7.
Beckers identifies himself as the scribe of this book in a colophon that appears on p. 38, and also determines the book’s temporal dimension: Arnoldus Beckers scripsit 1788. That same year, and probably immediately after he had finished writing it, Beckers entrusted the book to Prioress Theresia Heijnen (1783-1822). This is evident from the ownership note which he left on the second flyleaf: Suster Maria Theresia Heijnen mater religieuse in ‘t klooster Nieuw Soeterbeek 1788. A significant context in this case may be that 1788 was the year when Heijnen was re-elected as prioress for the second time; Beckers may have written the book for the occasion.

Beckers used his set minuscule throughout, with the exception of the aforementioned ownership note and colophon, where he employed his cursive script. There are generally eight lines per single-column page, each consisting of a four-line staff with neumes in square notation and a line of text underneath. The only ruling present are two vertical bounding lines in ink, which extend across the full height of the page and bound the staffs; custodes for the chants appear to the outside of the rightmost of the lines. Pricking is present not only for the bounding lines but also for each individual line of the staffs and the text. There are two exceptions to this lay-out: p. 37, which has several lines in prose, and the index on the numberless recto of the first flyleaf at the back of the book, which is in two columns of thirty lines, without any staffs. This page has four bounding lines, two at either end of each column, also with pricking for each line. Page numbers are on the inside of the outer bounding line of each page, except for pp. 9 and 17, which have a page number on the inside of both bounding lines.

The manuscript’s contents seem to have been compiled somewhat haphazardly, which does not seriously impair the book’s usefulness but is noteworthy. The order in which the chants appear, though certainly not random, does not always seem to reflect a preconceived plan but often to derive from gradual expansion over a certain period of time. All but the last chants occur in more or less coherent groups, but no common denominator is apparent, and the order in which the groups are presented seems to be largely arbitrary. The book begins with chants in praise of the Blessed Sacrament (nos. 1-8), and these are followed by three seasonal and proper hymns (nos. 9-11), perhaps because the inclusion in the first group of Pange lingua (no. 7), also a hymn, had made Beckers think of adding them. The hymns are followed by two chants for use in processions (nos. 12-13). The next section contains a selection of Marian chants (nos. 14-20), which are followed by chants for the liturgy of the Holy Week (nos. 21-26), the investment and profession of a sister (nos. 27-31) and various seasonal chants to a single tune (nos. 32-36). The final section of the book (nos. 37-43)...

---

1 ‘Arnoldus Beckers wrote this in 1788’ (IV 55, p. 38). Cf. Figure 1.1.
2 On Heijnen, see Appendix A.1, no. 7.
3 ‘Sister Maria Theresia Heijnen, prioress and sister in the convent of New Soeterbeek, 1788’ (IV 55, recto second front flyleaf).
4 See ASP 3, pp. 1-2; Appendix A.1, no. 7.
5 The exceptions are p. 12, which has seven lines because a new section starts on the next page; p. 37, which has five because there are several lines of prose, and p. 38, which has five because that is where the book originally ended.
6 This may have to do with the fact that pp. 9 and 17 are the first pages of the second and third quire respectively. However, pp. 25 and 33, the first pages of the fourth and fifth quires, do not have double page numbers.
7 For an overview of the book’s contents, see Table 4.2.
8 Beckers gave these chants the header Laudes sanctissimi Sacramenti (‘Chants in praise of the Blessed Sacrament’) in the upper margin of p. 1.
9 Beckers gave these chants the heading Laudes de Beata (‘Chants in praise of the Blessed Virgin’) in the upper margin of p. 13.
10 This tune is referred to in the Dutch Song Database (2016) of the Meertens Institute as Triumpha. Many different texts, for various feasts and various saints, were written to this tune, which appears to have been very
seems to be determined not by theme or function but by needs of the community which are not immediately obvious anymore. Almost all of these final chants could have been included in other groups as well,¹ but seem to have been added as an afterthought.

The index at the back of the book confirms that the contents are the result partly of gradual expansion. It does not simply provide a table of contents, but groups the chants in a different way than the book itself. First the chants are given which belong to a specific liturgical season or feast (no. 40 for Advent, no. 32 for Christmas, no. 33 for Easter, no. 10 for Pentecost and no. 11 for Trinity Sunday), and these are followed first by the chants in honour of the Blessed Sacrament (nos. 1-7,² 39 and 8),³ and then by those for Our Lady (nos. 14-20,⁴ 35 and 38). Next are the chants that belong to the liturgy of the Holy Week (nos. 21-23 for Palm Sunday, no. 7 for Maundy Thursday and nos. 24, 26 and 25 for Good Friday), which are followed by a list of the chants for special occasions (no. 12 in time of need, nos. 27-31 at the investment and profession of a sister, and no. 42 at a jubilee). A small category of three chants (nos. 41, 9 and 43) which were not included elsewhere finishes the index. It is not clear why these stand apart in this way, for each of them could have easily fitted in one of the other categories. The order in which some of the chants are given is odd as well, especially that of those for Good Friday, whose order does not correspond with that in which the chants actually appear in the book and is also wrong liturgically.⁵ Finally, there are some omissions too: nos. 13, 34 and 36-37 are not included in the index at all, and no. 10 should have been included with the chants for the investment of a sister as well. These mistakes were probably merely the result of oversight, but the fact that Beckers felt the need to compile an index which ordered the chants differently than the book itself and subsequently failed to do so correctly suggests that he did not have the book’s contents fully planned when he began writing it. It may even have been something of a rush job, even though it looks very neat.

The melodies correspond mostly with those which the chants have in the manuscripts of Soeterbeeck, admitting once again for the fact that double notes on a single syllable are routinely replaced by one. The hymns usually, though not invariably,⁶ have the same melody as those in the eighteenth-century manuscripts from Gaesdonck, if they appear there. Close parallels with printed liturgical books tend to occur only for chants whose melodies are not identical to those in the manuscripts, or not present there at all. In many instances, however, I have not been able to find any exact parallels at all in the books from Soeterbeeck, neither in the manuscripts, nor in the printed books. I hesitate to write even the minor differences off as transcription errors on Beckers’ part, and in several cases the divergences are so numerous or so fundamental anyway that there can be no doubt at all that the rector used a source which is not part of the collection.

The book’s contents suggest that it its functional contexts were intended to be Mass, the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, processions at various times of the year and special occasions in the lives of sisters, such as their investment, profession, jubilee and death. The

¹ Nos. 32 and 35 appear in appendices to several Roman Graduals in the Soeterbeeck Collection (cf. IV 11:3, pp. 35-6, 37-38, 38-39 and 50 respectively).
² Nos. 38 and 41 could have fit with nos. 14-20; no. 39 with nos. 1-8; no. 40 with nos. 9-11; and nos. 42-43, for the jubilee and death of a sister, could have been included with nos. 27-31.
³ No. 7 is actually listed twice: once, between nos. 2 and 4, as Benedictus, and again, between nos. 39 and 8, as Benedictus Abrahæm.
⁴ No. 14 is listed incorrectly as Haeæ, rather than Haæc, est præclarum vas.
⁵ The order in which the chants for Good Friday are to be sung in the liturgy is simply 24, 25, 26 (cf. IV 11:1, pp. 115-126, with the antiphon Crucem tuam between nos. 25 and 26 (p. 120)).
⁶ No. 8, consisting of the even verses of Verbum supernum, follows the melody given in the fifteenth-century hymnal IV 81:1, ff. 30r-31r, not that in IV 8, pp. 103-104.
attribution to Heijnen probably means that Beckers wrote the book expressly for the prioress’ personal use in preparation for and during the liturgy, although this is not explicitly reflected in its contents. The chants contained in IV 55 are in no way specifically associated with the prioress, and will have been sung by all sisters. Rather, the book’s functional meaning in the context of Heijnen’s office may very well reside in the very fact of its existence. As prioress, she was given this sturdy, beautifully produced book, whereas the other sisters may have had to sing by heart or perhaps from other, less durable copies. Alternatively, Beckers may have given the book to the prioress so that it could be used communally by all sisters, for instance to practice from, although this seems less likely. There is no way of knowing how many companion volumes to IV 55 existed in Beckers’ days, but only one of them survives: IV 10b, about which I say more below.1

EXCURSUS: LATER TRACES OF USE IN IV 55

IV 55 continued to be expanded after its initial completion. The stubs that remain of the cut-away folia of the final quires bear traces of staffs. Although this proves that the folia were not blank, it cannot be ascertained now what chants they contained or by whom these had been added, or even if the staffs were not empty. The fourth folium of the sixth quire was also partly cut off, but instead of bringing it down to a mere stub the person responsible only removed the top half. On the remaining part, a certain G. van den Broek wrote a version of the Salve regina.2 The staffs are in pencil; the text in ink. Van den Broek had forgotten part of the chant, however, and he added the missing words and two staffs in the lower margin of p. 38, which proves that the intervening folia had already been cut away at this point and suggests that Van den Broek was probably not the one to do it. The staffs that he had added to accommodate his correction were still largely empty afterwards, but at some point another hand added Miserere mei Domine, the psalm antiphon for Compline on Sundays and feasts, on them.3 The same hand also wrote Salva nos Domine, the ordinary Nunc dimittis antiphon,4 underneath the Salve regina, using two empty staffs apparently drawn by Van den Broek and adding a third, in pencil, for the remainder of the antiphon. The Salve regina may have been conceived as an alternative to the version which Beckers wrote on pp. 16-17, and the Compline antiphons may have been added because of the chant Lumen ad revelationem gentium (no. 19), which is based on the Nunc dimittis, and because Beckers had not added them in his revision of the late medieval antiphonaries.5 There is also a twentieth-century transcription in black ink of Haec est praecelarum vas (no. 14) on a loose slip of paper which is tucked in between the book’s second flyleaf and first page. All of these later additions show that the manuscript continued to be put to actual liturgical use for a considerable time.

Besides additional texts, IV 55 also contains traces of use of a different kind. Some of the bar lines of Haec est praecelarum vas have been traced with a blue pencil, as have those of nos. 27-30. The latter group of chants are identified in Beckers’ index at the back of the book as antiphons for the investment and profession of a sister.6 They have also been bracketed with black ink, and there is an x in the margin opposite Regnum mundi, the first one. The commas in the text of Veni Sancte

1 See pp. 212-216. There are other manuscript collections of liturgical chants as well, both in the Soeterbeeck Collection (IV 10a, Add. 17) and in the archives (ASP 554, ASP 556-562), but these are either clearly much later or their contents are so dissimilar from those of IV 55 as to be incomparable.

2 Van den Broek also added the same chant to IV 8, f. [150]v, and left an ownership note (dated 1832) in III 20, in which he identifies himself as a Roman Catholic priest. It is tempting to identify this person with Rector Joannes van den Broek (1811-1842), on whom see p. 48 n. 2, although the archival sources signed by the rector (e.g. ASP 781, a letter to W.A.A. Poelman dated 1 July 1832) seem to be in a hand that is similar, but nonetheless different. The use of the initial G. is problematic as well, although the rector was baptised as Joannes Gerardus Arts (ASP 184 and ASP 405) and therefore did have a middle name that started with this letter. I know of no documents which he signed with it, however, so whether G. van den Broek is actually Joannes van den Broek remains uncertain.

3 Cf. IV 18, p. 363. The melody given in IV 55 is slightly different.

4 Cf. IV 52:2, f. 74v. The melody given in IV 55 is identical to this one.

5 See p. 151.

6 Cf. IV 138, pp. 6-8, 12-13, 32.
Spiritus (no. 31) have been traced with a purple pencil; this text is used at the profession of a sister. These traces suggest that the functional meaning of IV 55 eventually came to be focused around investments and professions, although it is impossible to associate it with the role of any particular sister during those rituals.

4.6.2. IV 10b
Very similar to IV 55, in terms of its contents, is IV 10b. Beckers did not sign this book or leave a colophon identifying himself as its scribe, and the set minuscule employed here shows some slight differences with that in IV 55. Most noticeable in IV 10b is the lack of a foot at the right side of the u, the generally slightly more pronounced slant of the a and the slightly crabbed and less straight aspect of the script (Figure 4.2). That the hand is indeed Beckers’ is proven, however, by the fact that it also appears on the pastedown of Add. 10, where it co-occurs with the rector’s unmistakable cursive minuscule (Figure 3.4). It is probable that these two books show Beckers’ hand as it was in the final decade of his life, with slightly less confidence than it had had before.

One important aspect of the typological dimension of Beckers’ traces of production in IV 10b is that the latter’s text block was bound in a transplantation binding. It is one of a set of two wedding bindings in the Soeterbeeck Collection, whose original contents, which probably consisted of wedding poetry, do not survive. The companion piece is attached to IV 10a, and currently includes a collection of chants that is similar to but probably considerably later than Beckers’. I am not able to identify the couple whose marriage was commemorated by these bindings, or to explain how the latter ended up at Soeterbeeck, so I can do little more than briefly describe them. They are of brown leather over cardboard (27.3 x 21.2 x 1.2 cm.), and the edges of the boards are heavily decorated with gilt flower baskets, flowers and crowns. In the centre of each board is an elaborate gilt shield that frames two burning hearts, each of which is pierced by two arrows. On the boards of IV 10a, the hearts are topped by the initials M.J.D.R., and on IV 10b by P.N.D.J. Underneath appears the date 14 July 1767. The spine of IV 10a is almost entirely gone, but that of IV 10b has seven raised bands that are defined by gilt-stamped lines, with dito flowers in the panels between. Each volume currently has a label with a blue border near its tail, which bears the book’s shelf mark in black ballpoint pen.

The original text block of both books had gilded edges, as can still be seen from their brocade endpapers with floral motifs. Those in IV 10a have been almost entirely covered by pastedowns of regular paper added by the sisters of Soeterbeeck when the binding acquired its present contents. The pastedowns and flyleaves of IV 10b were not covered, however, and although the front flyleaf has been largely cut off by the sisters, the one at the rear is still complete and bears the imprint of Johann Wilhelm Meyer, a paper maker who was active in Augsburg circa 1760. Also still present in that particular volume are the book’s original outer flyleaves, consisting of regular paper with gilded edges. After the book’s original text block was removed, Beckers or one of the sisters attached its new contents, consisting of a single quinion with blank edges, to the binding by pasting the outer folia onto these flyleaves and glueing the quire into the empty spine. The back flyleaf has come loose over time, as has the text block’s unnumbered tenth folium that is attached to it. The ninth folium has largely been cut away for some reason, so that only the beginning of the antiphon Pueri Hebraeorum

2 For an overview of the contents of IV 10b, see Table 4.3.
3 Compare Figures 1.1 and 4.2.
4 Cf. p. 27.
5 On the date of these labels and the circumstances of their application, see pp. 6-7.
6 On brocade paper and its producers, see Haemmerle 1977, 77-130.
7 Haemmerle 1997, 126. Meyer was born circa 1713 and died on 3 December 1784.
Figure 4.2: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 10b, p. 1
vestimenta prosternabant (no. 26), which continues on the next page, is retained completely.

IV 10b’s current text block was empty when it was attached to its binding, and Beckers started writing in it afterwards. This is evident from the fact that some of the bounding lines of the staffs on the text block’s two outer folia run on onto the outer edges of the slightly larger flyleaves to which they have been pasted, and also from the pricking of the staffs on these folia, which has also pierced the flyleaves. This means that IV 10b’s original contents were discarded and its binding reused for the express purpose of keeping Beckers’ collection of chants. The extent to which the rector was involved with the material side of this is uncertain; he must at least have ordered the text block to be bound, and he may even have done so himself.

Beckers did not fill the entire quire, but was only responsible for the first three pages and the first staff on the fourth. As already indicated, he used his set minuscule throughout, although in the case of one rubric the l and the h have loops. The rest of the book was written in an unidentified but contemporary hand using a similar script. Beckers’ part has 11 lines per single-column page, each consisting of a four-line staff in ink with square neumes and a line of text. The other hand switches from eleven to ten and eventually nine lines per page. In Beckers’ part, and on almost all other pages as well, every verso has two bounding lines in black ink, and every recto has only one, close to the gutter. The reason for this is probably that Beckers used paper that had already been ruled for a different purpose, so that there were already several lines in now discoloured ink on the pages before he wrote on them, one of which was in the right position to serve as the outer bounding line on the rectos. In addition to this line, there are also three similar ones to the left of the inner bounding line of each verso, and one to the right of the inner bounding line of each recto. These are completely disregarded both by Beckers and his follower. The latter does not provide any custodes for the chants, but Beckers does, to the outside of every bounding line. Pricking is present on all pages, not only for the bounding lines but also for the upper line of each staff and each text line, which are drawn in pencil. Because the pricking uniformly accommodates eleven lines per page, it was probably done by Beckers for the entire book, but since most of the pages in the latter part have less than eleven lines per page and disregard the pricking, he is probably not responsible for the addition of all the staffs. Page numbers and foliation are in the upper corner on the outside of the outer bounding line of each page or folium, except on p. 8, where the page number is on the inside, and on pp. 10-11b, where the numbers are actually on the bounding line. It is likely that the book was paginated by the person who finished it.

The book’s contents correspond very closely to those of IV 55, but because IV 10b is much shorter it includes fewer chants. However, Beckers’ section begins with two groups of chants that are not present in the larger collection: five tones of the first verse of the Benedicamus Domino, which is recited, presumably by the hebdomadary sister, at the end of each service in the liturgy of the hours, and two tones for the responsory In manus tuas and the versicle Custodi nos at canonical Compline. The latter are for within and without Eastertide respectively, and their melodies correspond exactly with those in the printed Roman Antiphonaries that survive from Soeterbeeck’s library. For the Benedicamus tonary, the situation is slightly more complicated. Beckers’ rubrics distribute the tones across first

1 The chants Beckers wrote are nos. 1-7 in Table 4.3.
2 IV 10b, p. 1, line 5.
3 The chants in this unidentified hand are nos. 8-27.
4 Pp. 4-5 and f. 6r have eleven, ff. 6v-7r and pp. 9, 12 have ten, and f. 7v and pp. 8, 10-11b, [14] have nine lines. On the book’s pagination and foliation, see Table 4.3.
5 The only exception is p. 8, which is a recto with two bounding lines.
6 Similar erratic ruling appears in three of Beckers’ historiographical works, cf. pp. 271, 278.
7 E.g., IV 18, pp. 381-382.
class doubles, feasts of the Blessed Virgin, doubles, semidoubles and Eastertide. Soeterbeeck’s Roman Antiphonaries give no tones for doubles, and the melodies that are provided for the other categories are entirely different than Beckers’. The latter are almost identical, however, to those provided in the tonary in the sixteenth-century manuscript liturgical miscellany in IV 92. The categories identified by the rubrics there are In solemnibus et in maioribus, De domina nostra, In duplicibus, and IX lectionum, respectively—the chant for Eastertide does not have a rubric but is recognisable from the triple alleluia. What must have happened, then, is that Beckers followed his usual method by adopting the melodies from an old manuscript source, but changing their rubrics with an eye to the ranks that were current for feasts in his days.

Because Beckers only wrote the first few pages, it is difficult to know what his intentions were for IV 10b. It does not only include fewer and different chants than IV 55, those which the two books have in common are also often arranged in an entirely different order. In fact, the contents of IV 10b appear even more haphazardly, which is not a fatal flaw but still a little awkward. The tones from the ordinary that have been discussed above are given first, and they are followed by a chant for Christmas to the melody of nos. 32-36 of IV 55 (no. 3), then by three chants identified by Beckers in that book as being in honour of the Blessed Sacrament (nos. 4-6) and finally by the hymn O lux, beata Trinitas (no. 7) for the Holy Trinity. The chants are too few to display the system behind their order, if there is any. The pages in the unidentified hand are noticeably more orderly, for after Beckers’ hymn to the Trinity they provide one to the Holy Spirit, Veni, Creator Spiritus (no. 8), followed by two chants against the plague (nos. 9-10), three hymns (nos. 11-13), chants for a sister’s investment, profession, jubilee and burial (nos. 14-18, 20-21)—which are only interrupted by a single antiphon in honour of the Blessed Virgin (no. 19)—, and chants for several processions (nos. 22-27). But even though the person who finished the manuscript brought some systematicity to it, that does not alter the fact that this appears to be absent from Beckers’ part. I cannot explain this situation, especially not in light of the reason probably lies in the book’s purpose, but how it differed from that of the other manuscript is unclear to me. The inclusion of a Benedictamus tonary possibly indicates that the volume was intended for the hebdomadary sister, or for the chantress with an eye to the instruction of inexperienced novices.

EXCURSUS: LATER TRACES OF USE IN IV 10B
Whatever its specific purpose as envisioned by Beckers when he began working on it, the functional meaning of IV 10b, like that of its companion volume IV 55, eventually came to be associated particularly with the investment and profession of sisters. Not only do the chants for these occasions (nos. 14-18) show the same highlights in blue and purple pencil that they do in IV 55, they are also accompanied by several notes that identify the value of individual notes or indicate where the key should be if, as is very often the case, this information was omitted by the person who finished the book. Furthermore, the recto of the second front flyleaf, to whose verso p. 1 has been pasted, bears a note in pencil saying Kleeding en professie, clearly showing that that is

---

1 IV 18, pp. 350-352; IV 19, pp. 351-352.
2 IV 92:2, ff. 106v-107r. On this manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 128-129. A similar Benedictamus tonary was to appear in the sixteenth-century manuscript vesperval IV 77, f. 182r-v, but the rubrics, staves and notes were never filled in.
3 ‘On solemnities and on greater doubles […] Of Our Lady […] On doubles […] 9 lessons […] alleluia’ (IV 92:2, ff. 106v-107r).
4 Cf. pp. 211-212.
5 ‘Investment and profession’ (IV 10b, recto second front flyleaf). The Soeterbeeck Collection contains numerous manuscripts for the investment or profession of a sister. Besides the ones with which Beckers was occupied (IV 10b, IV 55, Mater 5), these are IV 78, ff. 58r-71v; IV 92:2, ff. 64r-74v; IV 138; Mater 1; Mater 3;
what the book’s main context of use had become. This is only confirmed by the presence of a loose sheet, tucked in between pp. 9 and 10 and also headed Kleding en professi,¹ that bears a twentieth-century transcription of nos. 14, 18, 15, 16 and 17, typed with the staffs added in pencil and the notes in black ink.

4.7. A Book for the Jubilee of a Sister’s Investment
The contents of the books of chants IV 55 and IV 10b tie in nicely with the final liturgical book produced by Beckers himself that is to be discussed in this chapter. This is Mater 5 (19 x 12.5 x 0.5 cm.), which contains Latin rubrics, chants and texts for the celebration of a sister’s jubilee, the fiftieth anniversary of her investment.² Beckers follows these with a commemorative section with brief biographies of eight sisters who had reached the fiftieth anniversary of their investment before or during his rectorate,³ leaving nine pages blank for those of later jubilarians. The text block consists of a single quire of ten folia (18.9 x 12 cm.) which are bound in parchment wrappers whose inside is coated with paper. The front cover bears the title In jubileo sororis in black ink in another hand than Beckers’.⁴ He wrote the text in a single column without any pricking or ruling, using his cursive script, except for three lines of chant, which are in his set minuscule (Figure 4.3), and identifies himself as the scribe by reporting that three of the sisters whose biography he includes celebrated their anniversary under me A. Beckers.⁵

Beckers’ work on this book can be dated with some precision thanks to the biographies he provided at the back. These all make a completely unified impression when it comes to the hand and the colour of the ink, except for the final two entries. The one before these describes the jubilee of Sister Elisabeth Verstraeten in 1789, and also her death in 1796. The penultimate entry, which was written with a somewhat more narrow pen, mentions Sister Antonetta Zelands’ jubilee in 1789, but not her death in 1798. The final entry, which displays minor but noticeable changes in Beckers’ hand and in the colour of the ink, only lists the jubilee of Sister Theresia Nouhuijs in 1797, without any mention of her death in 1799. This means that the book was originally written in 1796, and that it was updated twice, probably once in the same year because Beckers had forgotten Zelands, and again in 1797 on the occasion of Nouhuijs’ jubilee.

In addition to Mater 5, there are four other books from the library of Soeterbeeck that describe the liturgical celebration of a sister’s jubilee. In order to enable an interpretation of
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¹ Investment and profession’ (IV 10b, between pp. 9-10).
² Mater 5, ff. 1r-3r.
³ Mater 5, ff. 3v-4r. The sisters whose biography was included by Beckers are Emmerentia van Eijndhoven (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 179, no. 2), Maria van Naussou (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 180, no. 13), Clara van Eijnhoven (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 179, no. 4), Jenneken Panhuijsen (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 180, no. 18, Catharina van Endhoven (cf. Sluijters 1982b, 180, no. 10), Elisabeth Verstraeten (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 33), Antonetta Zelands (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 20) and Theresia Nouhuijs (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 13). Other rectors added more biographies to this list, on which see p. 220.
⁴ ‘At a sister’s jubilee’ (Mater 5, front cover). Two other manuscripts in the Soeterbeeck Collection have similar wrappers with titles in black: IV 138 (Inkleeding Professie Jubilé) and Mater 4 (Inkleeding en professie). Mater 11 (Constitutiën. Directorium. Gebruiken) and ASP 109 (Constitutiën directorium gebruiken) are both kept loosely in parchment wrappers like these. ASP 92 (Statuten ofte ordinantien des cloosters van Soeterbeeck) is bound in parchment over cardboard, but has a similar title on its spine.
⁵ ‘Me, A. Beckers’ (Mater 5, f. 7r).
in Jubileo Sionis.


Portio mea Domine sit in terra viva,

Et evocavit jubilate deo omnis.

terra* servete domino in laetitia

Introitum in conspectu ejus* in exultatione. Scientes quoniam Dominus ipsi est Deus.*

Ipsi fidelis et non, ipse fidelis.

Populus ejus, obra suavis ejus* entusiasticum et portas ejus in confusione, atitia ejus in hymnis: conspecto illi.

Laude, nomen ejus: quoniam Salvus est.

Domus in eternum misericordia ejus* et usque in generationem et generationem.

Veritas ejus.


Pater nostra, et ergo et.

Salvum fac ancillam tuam.

Seu noumin spontem in te.

mitte et auctilium de sancto

et de spone, tuam.
the functional meaning which Beckers’ version of the ritual was intended to have in the occasion of Nouhuijs’ jubilee.

In addition to Mater 5, there are four other books from the library of Soeterbeeck that describe the liturgical celebration of a sister’s jubilee. In order to enable an interpretation of the functional meaning which Beckers’ version of the ritual was intended to have in the context of the liturgy, as well as a reconstruction of the way in which the rector compiled it and how it influenced later ones in its own turn, all of these other books need to be discussed in detail. For reference purposes, however, it is necessary first to provide a description of the ultimate form the ritual would take at Soeterbeeck.

The jubilarian, bearing a decorated candle, is accompanied to the chapel by the community and preceded by two sisters bearing a crown and a staff. Arriving at the door, the jubilarian kneels and is sprinkled with holy water by the priest, who intones the hymn Jesu, corona virginum. The choir continues the chant, while the priest, the deacon and the subdeacon accompany the jubilarian to her seat in the choir. When the hymn is finished, a sermon is preached, after which the priest asks the jubilarian what her desire is. She answers that she wishes to renew her profession, to which the priest responds by inviting everyone to ask for the assistance of the Holy Spirit. He intones the hymn Veni, Creator Spiritus, which is continued by the choir. After the hymn, the versicle Emitte Spiritum tuum and a collect are said, and the priest invites the jubilarian to renew her profession. She then goes to the altar, accompanied by the two sisters who preceded her, and reads her profession formula, which she places on the altar once she is finished. She kneels to receive the priest’s blessing and returns to her seat for Mass, which, if possible, should be the votive Mass of the Holy Trinity.1 During the offertory the jubilarian places her candle on the altar, and when Mass is finished the crown and the staff are also put there, preferably by her two companions. The jubilarian is then brought to the altar again by the prioress and the subprioress or two other sisters. She kneels and intones the antiphon Portio mea,2 which is given in a noted version together with the first verse of the psalm Iubilate Deo.3 After the chantress intones the psalm Ecce quam bonum,4 which is finished by the choir. The chantress then intones the hymn Veni sponsa Christi. The community finishes it and all sisters greet the jubilarian individually with the kiss of peace.

Beckers’ description in Mater 5 provides the full text of everything that should be said and sung, but says very little about the actual ritual. The only indication of who should sing or say what text is a rubric saying that the jubilarian should herself intone the antiphon Portio mea,5 which is given in a noted version together with the first verse of the psalm Iubilate Deo. Nothing is said about the identity of the jubilarian’s companions or her posture, and the jubilarian’s communion, aspersion and coronation,7 as well as the fact that sisters bring her back to her place once the final collect has been said,8 are only mentioned without actually
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1 Its rubrics specify that the votive Mass of the Holy Trinity is one of the preferred options if a Mass is said in thanksgiving (cf. IV 24, 2: f. 20vb).
2 Portio mea is the fifth ferial psalm antiphon at Vespers on Fridays (e.g., IV 82, 1: f. 68v).
3 Psalm 100 (99).
4 Psalm 133 (132).
5 Mater 5, f. 1r.
6 Mater 5, f. 1r.
7 Mater 5, f. 1v.
8 Mater 5, f. 3r.
being described. This brevity clearly shows that Beckers was focusing on the words that were to be said or sung rather than on the liturgical action.

Even more noteworthy is the fact that the rector makes no mention of anything that should be done before Mass, or of the presentation of the staff and the candle or the kiss of peace. This seems to have a different reason than the conciseness of the rubrics, especially because many of the acts before and during Mass would have been accompanied by chant or spoken words. Omission is clearly a step beyond brevity. These final lacunae, then, are probably not just the result of concision, and it seems that the reason why Beckers’ booklet does not refer to a pre-Mass preamble, a staff, a candle or a kiss is simply that the ritual was not as elaborate yet in Beckers’ days as it would become later on.

Beckers had already described the jubilee ritual once before, in his collection of chants IV 55 of 1788, but there it is presented in a highly condensed form. The book starts by giving noted versions of Portio mea and the first verse of Iubilate Deo; the rest of the psalm is entirely omitted. Then follow three of the six versicles and a bare mention of the psalm Ecce quam bonum and the antiphon Veni sponsa Christi. These references suffice, because the second psalm is sung to the same tone as Iubilate Deo—the eighth—, and because the antiphon is included elsewhere in the book. The way, then, in which the ritual is presented in IV 55 is such that it only gives or refers to those texts that were to be sung and said by all, and contains just enough information for a member of the choir to go by, assuming she knew the two psalms and the responses to the remaining three versicles by heart. This makes sense, given that Beckers had written this particular volume for Prioress Heijnen, but it also means that the book contains no extra information on the ritual.

The condensed version in IV 55 is still important, however, because it draws attention to an error in Mater 5. As indicated, the psalm tone to which the psalm Iubilate Deo is set in the condensed version is the eighth office tone, which is the one that is called for by the melody of the accompanying antiphon Portio mea, whose dominant is on do and which ends on a so. The tone to which the psalm is set in Mater 5, however, does not correspond with any of the standard office tones; although the shape of its melody is closest to the sixth, its dominant is on do and it ends on a la. I am unable to explain this curious mistake, which robs the psalm setting of any practical value it may have had. Still, it was not corrected, and that probably means that Mater 5 was used by someone for whom having the correct psalm tone was not necessary.

More information on the book’s functional meaning is provided by a comparison of Beckers’ text with that in a third book containing a description of the jubilee ritual. This is IV 138, a sixteenth-century manual for the investment and the profession of a sister. A Latin account of the celebration of a jubilee was added at the back of this volume by H20, a hand that appears to be from the seventeenth century. Comparing Beckers’ text with this one reveals that the rector may well have based himself on it, because the version in IV 138 similarly limits the ritual to after Mass, and makes no mention of the candle, the staff or the kiss of peace either. Beckers did not simply copy the older text, however, for although the ritual they describe is the same, there are several differences in the way it is presented. On the one hand, the rubrics in IV 138 are far more elaborate than those in Mater 5 and actually do provide information on who should say or sing what, when the jubilarian should kneel and

---

1 IV 55, p. 37.
2 The person who finished IV 10b after Beckers had abandoned it only provides the antiphon Portio mea, followed by the first verse of the psalm Iubilate Deo (pp. 11b-12).
3 IV 55, p. 24.
4 This is also the case in 10b, pp. 11b-12.
5 On this manuscript, see Kienhorst 2005, 140-141. Its text was edited by Frenken 1931/32, 255-267.
6 IV 138, pp. [39]-[44].
who should accompany her. On the other, the seventeenth-century version provides no melodies at all, only indicates that the psalms *Iubilate Deo* and *Ecce quam bonum* should be recited *sub 8 tono* instead of giving their full text, limits itself to the first verse of each of the six versicles, and says that *potest addi in fine collecta de Sanctissima Trinitate* rather than actually providing the collect’s words. So although Beckers probably took his cue from IV 138 for the production of Mater 5, he went out of his way to construct a text which omitted almost all of the action but included all the words.

The only person for whom a book like this would have been of any use was probably the rector himself. IV 55 shows that the general community could get by with only a very short summary of the ritual, whereas the jubilarian herself would have needed more directions. The officiating priest, however, was mostly there to speak, and a text-centered script fits that role particularly well. Granted, he would have had no need of the text or the melody of the psalms, as IV 138 clearly indicates that these were sung by the chantress and the choir, nor would he have to sing the responses to the versicles which he himself intoned, and these are all included in Mater 5. However, as officiant he would benefit from having a complete overview of the ritual, and he definitely would need to know what collect to say at the end. Furthermore, the priest was the only participant in the ritual besides the already discarded jubilarian (and the deacon and the subdeacon) who did not have to sing the psalms, so if he were the intended user of Mater 5 that makes the erroneous psalm tone for *Iubilate Deo* a moot case and explains why it was not revised. I believe, therefore, that Beckers produced this book for himself and his successors, with an eye to use both in the context of the liturgy and for the keeping of a record of all sisters who lived to celebrate their jubilee.

This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that later rectors actually were and continued to be the ones to use Mater 5. Over the years, another 37 jubilarians were added to Beckers’ list of eight, bringing the total number of sisters whose biography is included to 45. The last sister to be added was Josepha Leijten, who died in 1957. With only one exception, the authors of all these additional entries explicitly identify themselves as the rector under whom a sister reached her jubilee by using the phrase *sub me*, followed by their name. Evidence of later use of Mater 5 is not restricted to its administrative function, however, for several corrections and additions were also made to the liturgical text in the twentieth century, many of which have to do with changes to the ritual.

Before I can go on to describe these revisions, however, I must first discuss another version of the jubilee ritual of which I have not yet spoken. This occurs in Mater 3, a book providing Dutch rubrics and Latin texts for the investment and profession of sisters of the convent of Sint-Catharina in Kranenburg. According to its title page, this *Ordo, et modus
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1 ‘On the eighth tone’ (IV 138, pp. [39], [42]).
2 IV 138, p. [39].
3 ‘The collect on the Holy Trinity can be added at the end’ (IV 138, p. [44]). This refers to the collect that Beckers actually gives in Mater 5, f. 3r: *Deus, cuius misericordiae non est numeros*, because that collect is the one that should be used during the votive Mass of the Holy Trinity if it is said in thanksgiving (cf. IV 24, 2: f. 20vb).
4 IV 138, pp. [39], [42].
5 Mater 5, ff. 4v-8r.
6 Mater 5, f. 8r. Leijten was born in Tongelre on 5 May 1875. She entered Soeterbeeck in 1899 as a choir sister, was professed on 26 June 1900 and served as nurse and as a council sister from 1918 to 1934. She died on 14 April 1957 (Sluijters 1982b, 195, no. 179).
7 ‘Under me.’ Nos. 10-11 were added by Antonius van der Heijden (cf. p. 93 n. 7; he left ownership marks in III 143 and III 186), nos. 12-14 by Christianus van Gerwen (cf. p. 6 n. 6), nos. 15-40 by Nicolaas Nuijens (cf. p. 222 n. 1; he also wrote Mater 9 and large parts of Mater 11), and nos. 44-45 by Marius Oomens (cf. Van Dijk 1982d, 204, no. 15). The only entry whose authorship is not absolutely certain is no. 9, but that one was probably written by Joannes van de Laar (cf. p. 88 n. 2), because it provides a biography for Magdalena Verhoeven, who celebrated her jubilee during Van de Laar’s rectorate.
consuetus investiendi aliquam et professionem excipiendi was written for that community by its rector, the Gaesdonck canon Petrus Nabben, in 1711. At a later stage, the scribe expanded his original work by adding a section on a sister’s jubilee. Although Beckers was almost certainly the one to bring the book of his confrère to Soeterbeeck, he appears not to have actually used it as a source for his own text, for the ritual which Nabben describes differs significantly from that in IV 55 and Mater 5.

Most fundamentally, the Kranenburg version describes an elaborate ritual before Mass, during which the acts that happen afterwards in the Soeterbeeck versions, namely the jubilarian’s aspersion and coronation, already take place. There is more to this than a disparity in the moment when the jubilee is commemorated, however, for the ritual is entirely different and includes many additional elements. In Nabben’s version of events, the jubilarian bears a candle to church to place on the altar at the offertory. She is sprinkled with holy water as she enters the chapel, renews her profession, is blessed and receives a staff as well as a crown. After Mass, the priest returns the candle, singing the antiphon Veni sponsa Christi. The jubilarian is then accompanied back to the choir, where she receives the kiss of peace. The Te Deum is sung, followed by a versicle and a collect and the blessing with the Blessed Sacrament, which was also given before Mass. There is no trace of the elaborate structure of psalms, versicles and collects that appears in the books of Soeterbeeck, and it is clear that Nabben’s text, with its strong focus on the renewal of the jubilarian’s profession, describes what is essentially a different ritual.

In time, however, someone decided to turn the rituals of Kranenburg and Soeterbeeck into one. The earliest surviving trace of this appears to be an addition to IV 138, consisting of a text in a twentieth-century hand that has been written in black ink on the originally blank pages between the ritual of the profession and that of the celebration of the jubilee. This text, although it is much later than the original description of the jubilee, now serves as its first half, for it is an adaptation of those rituals which Nabben described as taking place before Mass in his book for the convent in Kranenburg. For this occasion, the text of Mater 3 is revised primarily by omission. Not only is the entire section dealing with the ritual after Mass left out—which makes sense, because that part was already present in IV 138—, the pre-Mass blessing with the Sacrament is also lacking. Most important, however, is the omission of the coronation and the handing over of the staff which belonged with it, clearly necessitated by the fact that the crowning was already described as occurring after Mass in IV 138’s seventeenth-century text. This editorial intervention shows that an attempt was made at producing a single, consistent ritual from two texts, but also introduced a curious incompleteness, because, although the crown and the staff are both mentioned as being brought along by the jubilarian’s two companions, the staff is then forgotten, as is the candle. This twentieth-century addition to IV 138, then, is proof of a first attempt at integrating the Soeterbeeck and the Kranenburg rituals, but it is flawed.

1 Nabben was born in Sevenum on 23 July 1671. He was professed at Gaesdonck on 27 January 1694 and ordained to the priesthood on 24 September 1695. He was rector of Sint-Catharina in Kranenburg from 1710 until 5 March 1716, when he became prior of Mariensand in Stralen. He was the 27th prior of Gaesdonck from 14 August 1721 until his death on 31 December 1750 (Goch, Monastic Library, Höv 38, pp. 34, 59; Hövelmann 1987c, 38-39). Among his writings was a Liber on Gaesdonck (Höv 38, on which see Hövelmann 1987e, 68, no. 38; 1987f, 93).
3 The only other candidate is Beckers’ predecessor Henricus Erckens (1749-1772), who was also from Gaesdonck (cf. p. 100 n. 4). However, given that Beckers wrote a book on the same topic as Mater 3, he is the likelier person to have obtained it, probably for research purposes.
4 IV 183, pp. [34]-[38].
5 IV 183, p. [34].
The process of integration was eventually completed, however, in Beckers’ own book. Nicolaas Nuijens, who was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1913 to 1949 and added many biographies of jubilarians to the rear of Mater 5, also pasted a small slip of paper onto f. 2r with a collect that was to be said by the rector upon handing over the staff between the jubilarian’s aspersion and her coronation. This solved the riddle of what happens to the staff, but it still left the jubilarian’s candle on the altar. That problem was tackled later on, when two typed pages were first joined together and then pasted onto the paper coating on the inside of the cover and f. 1r of the original booklet. These pages bear a transcription of the twentieth-century addition to IV 138, expanded with a note specifying that when the Te Deum has been sung, the priest returns the jubilarian her candle, after which she is escorted back to the choir to receive the kiss of peace. A small slip of paper with the same extra paragraph was also pasted onto f. 3r in its proper place at the end of the ritual. With these final additions, all loose ends had been tied up and the merging of Soeterbeeck’s original ritual for the celebration of a sister’s jubilee with that of Sint-Catharina in Kranenburg was finally complete.

It is also for completeness’ sake that I finish this paragraph by pointing out that a fifth copy of the ritual of a jubilee appears in a brown notebook without a title that is one of a number of similar booklets that are kept in a loose parchment wrapper with shelf mark Mater 11 in the Soeterbeeck Collection. This particular notebook, which probably dates from the second half of the twentieth century, provides the rituals for investment and profession as these had been revised and approved by Arnold Diepen, bishop of ’s-Hertogenbosch, on 23 January 1930. Its final chapter is an adaptation of the liturgical part of Mater 5 and the corresponding section of IV 138, incorporating all later additions and revisions. Besides providing a Dutch translation of the Latin rubrics, the notebook has two noteworthy features. First, its text adds a paragraph saying that the crown and the staff should be placed on the altar after Mass, which explains how the priest is able to give these two items to the jubilarian after they were brought in by her two companions. Second, a narrow slip of paper with the intonation of Jesu, corona virginum in an unidentified hand was pasted opposite the paragraph that says the rector should intone this hymn. A similar piece of paper was also pasted into Mater 5 in the corresponding place, probably at the same time. The addition of this piece of chant is convenient for the rector, and suggests that the books in which it appears were still in liturgical use. It is abundantly clear, then, from the many changes and additions to Mater 5 that, in a sense, Beckers continued to facilitate the liturgy of Soeterbeeck until well into the twentieth century.

4.8. Conclusion
This seems like a good note on which to end this chapter. Despite its fragmented nature, it has significantly expanded our understanding of Beckers’ liturgical activities, not only with reference to their number but also for their nature and scope. Even if many of the traces that have been discussed were either too isolated and devoid of context or too idiosyncratic to allow for a satisfying interpretation of their functional meaning in the context of the liturgy, their very existence is itself meaningful. It shows glimpses of the actual liturgical contexts in which Beckers was active beyond the sisters’ celebration of canonical Compline and Vespers.
on Sundays and feasts, which included not only Mass and the Little Office of the Virgin, but also less central proceedings such as processions, the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and the rituals accompanying the investment, profession, jubilee and death of sisters. In short, it shows us the picture of a rector who facilitates the sisters’ entire liturgical life, even if it is not always possible to understand the way in which he did so.

The most important way in which this chapter supplements the previous one is that it allows us to draw an important conclusion concerning the meaning of Beckers’ traces and the books in which they appear on a general level. If anything has become clear, it is that the rector’s work was not only textual, in the sense that he wished merely to provide the right chants to sing or the proper texts to say, but that it also had a very practical side. The preceding pages have thrown into bold relief the fact that, when revising or expanding an existing book or writing a new one himself, Beckers did not operate in a theoretical vacuum, but always had a particular user or context of use in mind—and that these actually benefited from his labours, sometimes even into the twentieth century.¹

This is particularly clear in the Magnificat tones in the antiphonary IV 8 and the book of prefaces IV 53. These do not merely confirm the liturgical use of the organ and the alternati performance of hymns and canticles at Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate, but above all display his awareness of a liturgical book’s functional meaning. The effect is that the final nail is driven into any possible characterisation of Beckers’ revisions of books for the divine office as a private hobby.² Many of his other traces demonstrate a sensitivity to the practical needs of a specific liturgical actor, such as the organist, the prioress, an inexperienced novice or the rector. This means that his liturgical work as a whole must be understood as an actual contribution to the liturgical practice of the community in his care and therefore as an integral part of the way in which he shaped his rectorate.

The direction that is pointed out by this final conclusion is particularly important within the context of this book, because interpretation cannot limit itself to practicalities. Its added value is that it can go beyond the functional to the symbolic. For this reason, I ended the previous chapter by arguing that the traces of Beckers’ renovation of Soeterbeeck’s books for the divine office can be read as the devotion of part of his rectorate to the preservation of elements from the liturgical tradition of his own Congregation of Windesheim. I asked the question, then, if his other liturgical traces support this interpretation. Some of them do, although not in the same way as his notes in the antiphonaries, which allowed these old Windesheim manuscripts to be kept in use and their melodic tradition to continue to be heard. The addition of the Kyrie to the gradual ABM h61 may have been part of a parallel project, but that cannot be said with certainty, and the melodies of his chants in the other books, though often closer to those in the convent’s old manuscripts than the Roman printed books, are certainly not as consistently identical to the former as his added antiphons are. Instead, the most important specifically Windesheim part of the rector’s work that has been discussed in this chapter is that which was concerned with the Little Office of the Virgin in the manuscript book of hours IV 47. In working on this liturgical text according to the use of Windesheim, Beckers was part of a much larger network of persons who facilitated its continued use, even to the extent of attempting the wholesale revision of the Little Office in Roman books of hours to bring it into accordance with that in Soeterbeeck’s manuscripts. When described like this, the traces in the books of hours are the exact mirror image of those in the antiphonaries, but their ultimate purpose is identical: to preserve part of Windesheim’s liturgical tradition, in the great office on the level of the music, and in the Little Office on the level of the text.

¹ This conclusion is based on later traces of use in IV 53 and Mater 5, but also on those in IV 10b and Mater 5, which are discussed in the excursuses.
² Cf. pp. 81, 176.
Again, a discussion of what it means that Beckers was one of the persons at Soeterbeeck who laboured at this preservation of the Windesheim tradition must wait until the final chapter of this book. Before we can begin to attempt to plumb such symbolic depths, it is necessary first to complete our study of Beckers’ material remains on a functional level. The following chapter, therefore, is concerned with the rector’s non-liturgical traces in the historical library of Soeterbeeck.
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Chapter 5: Beckers’ Management of the Conventual Library

5.1. Introduction
This chapter is concerned with the part of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the historical library of Soeterbeeck whose functional meaning is connected to a non-liturgical context: the traces that show his involvement in the management of the conventual book collection itself. It begins with an analysis of the context of these traces by discussing what can be known from other sources about the way in which books were treated at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century, so that the evidence of Beckers’ treatment of them can be properly understood. It then goes on to interpret the functional meaning of the rector’s traces themselves, divided not according to the spatial context of the types of books in which they appear as in the previous chapters, but along their functional dimension. In turn, the four paragraphs that are at the heart of this chapter treat of the notes which Beckers left to specify the attribution of books to individual sisters and those that indicate communal ownership on the part of the entire convent, the evidence of his involvement in rebindings, and his personal ownership notes. Finally, I summarise what the study of these various traces reveals about Beckers’ interaction with books in ways that would normally be associated with the librarian.

The actual use of books in Dutch women’s convents during the early modern period is a topic about which little is or indeed can be known with certainty. I hope that my discussion of the sources on the situation at Soeterbeeck, besides serving its purpose in the context of this particular study, sheds at least some light on several important issues and serves as a mild incentive to further research in this area.

5.2. The Treatment of Books at Soeterbeeck
The seventeenth-century statutes of Soeterbeeck dictate that one of the sisters should be entrusted with the care of the conventual book collection. It has already been mentioned that she was in charge of the logistics surrounding the refectory readings, and had to inform the sisters when it was their turn to read what text during meals. Her primary duty, however, was to keep an eye on the physical condition and the whereabouts of the convent’s books. She was to lend those that were communal property, and also to ask them back. Although it is unknown who held this office during Beckers’ rectorate, there can be little doubt that someone did. Books were too numerous and too central to everyday life for there not to be a sister who looked after the conventual library.

The reader will remember that I use this last word to refer to Soeterbeeck’s book collection, and not to any specific room where all or some of these volumes may have been stored. It is, in fact, entirely possible that, in Beckers’ days, Soeterbeeck did not have a library room yet for the books that were not in private use. None is ever mentioned in either version of the rector’s conventual chronicle, nor among the rooms listed in an extract of an inventory that was made of the convent’s possessions after its dissolution by the Napoleonic government in 1812. None appears on the map of the ground floor drawn by carpenter Renier van Helmond in 1835. However, accounts of the refurnishing of the old refectory into a library room-cum-chapter house that took place in 1958 as part of structural renovations that had been necessitated by the coming of the sisters of Mariëndaal four years earlier, do speak
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1 See pp. 109, 189.
2 For the chapter on the librarian, see Frenken 1931/32, 230.
3 See p. 75.
4 ASP 442.
5 Reproduced in Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 136, fig. 12.
6 See pp. 6-7.
of an earlier library room that had been on the first floor in the hall of St Joseph.\(^1\) This means that it is also possible that the reason why no library room is mentioned in the two nineteenth-century sources just referred to is not that there was none, but that it was not on the ground floor, in an area of the convent that the map and the inventory do not cover.\(^2\) There is, however, a gap of nearly two centuries between the beginning of Beckers’ rectorate and the renovations of 1958, so the references to the upstairs library room that directly preceded the new one in the old refectory do not actually provide much in the way of evidence. It seems best, therefore, to simply reconcile ourselves to the contemporary sources’ complete silence regarding a possible room for books at Soeterbeeck in the eighteenth century, and accept that, although it is likely that none existed, it is impossible to say so with certainty.

Whether or not there was a specific library room at Soeterbeeck when Beckers was rector, there certainly were accumulations of books throughout the convent. In fact, the still valid seventeenth-century statutes point to three of such places. First, the sisters are forbidden die boecken uut den rifter te draegen sonder weete der suster diese te verwaeren heeft,\(^3\) showing that there must have been a certain number of books that were kept in the refectory to be read from during meals.\(^4\) The statutes indicate that these volumes would have at least contained patristic homilies and the Rule of Augustine.\(^5\)

Second, the nurse should versien boecken voor de getijden te leesen, en de H. lesse for the sisters who had to stay in the infirmary.\(^6\) Some books were probably permanently there, and the Soeterbeeck Collection includes one book, admittedly only from after Beckers’ rectorate, that can be identified as such. This is a copy of T.J. van den Broek’s Godsdienstig handboek voor kranken (Amsterdam: A. Schievenbus, 1818). Although it was owned by a certain F.J. Coplée-Grobbe in 1819,\(^7\) it bears a note on the verso of one of its flyleaves that reveals it eventually passed to the community of Soeterbeeck, voor de zieken en ziekemeesterses.\(^8\)

Third, the chapter in the statutes on the liturgy of the hours refers repeatedly to books that were used in that context,\(^9\) and these will have been kept either in the chapel or very near it.

The threefold division of books for the refectory, the infirmary and the chapel will still have existed in Beckers’ days, and there were also some additional places where books were being kept. The prioress and the rector will have had books in their private rooms,\(^10\) and there

---

1 See the entries for September 1944, March 1956 and January and September 1958 in a chronicle kept by Sister Isidora Goossens from 1939 to 1961 (ASP 6), and the entries for April, May, June and September 1958 in a chronicle kept by Sister Catharina Simonetti from 1954 to 1959 (ASP 10).
2 Rector Henricus de Bruijn’s continuation of Beckers’ second version of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck says that the sisters’ cells were not searched when the inventory was made (ASP 4, p. 20b), so it is likely that the entire first floor was omitted.
3 ‘To take the books out of the refectory without the knowledge of the sister who should keep them’ (ASP 92, f. 18r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 230).
4 For more directions concerning the refectory readings, see Frenken 1931/32, 222-224, 230-231.
5 This conclusion is based on the following stipulation: Inder feesten leesten eerst der HH. vaders homilie, ende in ander dagen die proper hebben; maer saterdaegs leesten altoos den regel, ten waere datmense voorlaesem om eenige feestidach (‘On feasts, and on other days that have a proper, the homily of the sacred Fathers is read first; but on Saturdays the Rule is always read, except if it is omitted because of a feast’, ASP 92, f. 19r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 231). The proper is referred to probably consisted of the homilies assigned that were to particular days in the books that were being used to read from in the refectory.
6 ‘Provide books to read the hours and the Sacred Scriptures’ (ASP 92, f. 12r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 225).
7 Cf. the ownership note on the half-title page. Coplée-Grobbe entered Soeterbeeck as a lay boarder and died there in 1856 (Sluijters 1982a, 127).
8 ‘For the sick and the nurse’ (III 215, verso of half-title page).
10 For instance, IV 23, a book on agriculture, bears a note saying it hoort toe de rector van Soeterbeeck (‘belongs to the rector of Soeterbeeck’, IV 23, title page; cf. Table 5.3, no. 7). On Beckers’ private library, see pp. 241-
is one book in the Soeterbeeck Collection, a Dutch translation of the epistle and Gospel readings at Mass, which bears a note dated 1794 saying that the volume was *tot gebruik van de school van clooster Deurse*, which had been established after the convent’s main wing had been built in 1733.¹ Many more books must have been used at this school which either do not survive or do not bear a note specifying their context of use. Furthermore, after the school had been founded, the convent started taking in lay boarders, who also brought a relatively large number of books with them that ultimately ended up in the conventual collection but which they will at first have kept in their own rooms.²

What this enumeration shows is that books were spread across the convent according to their function, and this means that it is possible that, as Caroline Bowden writes of English convents in exile on the continent in the seventeenth century, Soeterbeeck did not even need a specific library room. The remaining books that did not fit in any of the above-mentioned categories would probably have been so few and so small that they fitted in a single bookcase.³

Where the sisters kept the books which they had in private use is less certain, but it is possible to speculate. They had some things in their cells,⁴ which were on the first floor of the convent’s main wing built in 1733.⁵ Whether books were among these personal belongings is unknown. In any event, personal meditation, which is what most of the non-liturgical books that survive from Soeterbeeck’s library were meant for, very likely did not take place in the dormitory. The statutes mention that place almost exclusively with reference to the period between Compline and Prime,⁶ which was reserved for sleeping.⁷ Insomniac sisters should *gerustelijck bij haer bedde blijve en hen keerent tot Godt ende tot hen selve*,⁸ but reading seems not to be envisioned and would in fact be impossible without a candle. The period between the first and the second bell for Matins should be spent by the sisters, whereas the main wing of 1733 was reserved for the sisters (1982a, 133). This is indeed likely, given that the new wing was also where the boarders’ refectory was, on the ground floor (ibid., 134). The last bell for Compline was tolled at a quarter past 4 a.m., and the last bell for Compline at 7 p.m. between Easter and the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September) and at dusk during the other half of the year (ibid., 229-230).

The statutes also say that between Easter and the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September) the sisters were to go to the dormitory to take a nap of an hour after noon.

¹ ‘In use by the school of the convent in Deursen’ (V 220, verso front flyleaf). On the school at Soeterbeeck, see Peijnenburg 1982a, 42-43.
² No books with ownership notes of the pupils and boarders who are known to have been at Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate are known to survive, but the Soeterbeeck Collection includes many from later boarders such as Antonet van Berkel (III 101, V 148, V 149, V 150, V 151, cf. Slijters 1982a, 126 but also Appendix A.3, no. 25), the above-mentioned F.J. Coplee-Grobbie (III 107, III 215, V 31), Haasje Dobelman (III 14, III 15, III 19, III 91, III 94, III 127, III 193, V 14, V 29, V 67, V 69, V 82, V 173; cf. Slijters 1982a, 128), Joanna Elisabeth Jansen (III 104, cf. Slijters 1982a, 128) and Carolina van Raemsdonck (III 30, cf. Slijters 1982a, 128).
³ Bowden 2015, 351.
⁴ De Bruijn’s continuation of the second version of Beckers’ chronicle says explicitly that *hetwelk de zusters op de cellen hadden* (‘what the sisters had in their cells’) was not included when the convent’s movable goods were inventoried in 1812 (ASP 4, p. 20b).
⁵ Buijks suggests that, once the southern wing was finished in 1746 that was where the lay boarders were housed, whereas the main wing of 1733 was reserved for the sisters (1982, 133-134). This is indeed likely, given that the new wing was also where the boarders’ refectory was, on the ground floor (ibid., 134)
⁶ Frenken 1931/32, 252. The last bell for Matins was tolled at a quarter past 4 a.m., and the last bell for Compline at 7 p.m. between Easter and the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September) and at dusk during the other half of the year (ibid., 229-230).
⁸ ‘Stay quietly near their beds and turn themselves to God and inwards’ (ASP 92, f. 42v; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 252).
⁹ In front of their beds [...] good thoughts and prayers’ (ASP 92, f. 20v; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 233).
describe an ideal that never existed at all, it still seems likely that personal meditation did not take place in the dormitory during Beckers’ rectorate. On the assumption that the individual sisters kept their books where they used them, this suggests that there were no books in the cells.

Instead, it seems rather likely that the sisters repaired to the chapel when they wanted to read, and their personal places in the choir stalls may therefore have been where they kept the books they had in use. Although there is no actual proof that this was the case at eighteenth-century Soeterbeeck, there are clear indications for other convents at other times.¹ The sixteenth-century statutes of Sint-Annencortal, for instance, say: In der tijt dat men die getijden opten choor houdet [...] sal nyemant enighe onlede hebben in anderen boecken te sien of te lesen, die totten getijden nyet en hooren.² Similarly, the statutes generally but erroneously attributed to Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage in Helmond warn: Onder den getijden en salmen geen onlede hebben in anderen boecken ijet te besien.³ These stipulations prove that the sisters of these particular convents could be expected to have non-liturgical books at hand during communal prayer, and that would seem to indicate that it was common

¹ I know of two late medieval examples of semi- or non-liturgical books that were kept in the choir stalls for common use, which, although temporally very far removed from Beckers’ rectorate, may for completeness’ sake be mentioned here. The first is a manuscript that mainly consists of the psalms in Latin and Middle Dutch with the Latin text of Ludolph of Saxony’s commentary on them. It was written between 1490 and 1504 by Sister Lijsbeth Mols of the convent of Jericho in Brussels, and its colophon says that zij heeft begheert dat desen boeck althoes op den choer sal liggen omrunt oft voer die priorinne op dat een yeghelic daer in mach vinden na sijn beliefte (‘she has requested that this book should always lie in choir, before or near the prioress, so that anyone may find in it what he desires’, The Hague, RL, 133 C 1, f. 3r). The other example is a manuscript with a Middle Dutch translation of the Rule of Augustine and the commentary on it by Hugh of Saint Victor, written in 1468 by Sister Katherine Wijgaerts of the convent of Sion in Brussels. Her colophon requests op datter mater geliefft dat dit boexken na mijn doot bleve een der yegheliker mater wie si es ende dat opten choer voer haer laghe om daer in altemet in te studeren een yeghelic diet gelieft (‘that it pleases the prioress that this booklet should, after my death, remain the prioress’, whomever she may be, and that it should lie before her in choir, so that anyone who wishes may occasionally study in it’). Vienna, Austrian National Library, Codex Series nova 12887, f. 117v). The explicit request in both of these books that they be placed near the prioress for common use may have a parallel in Prioress Magdalena Verhoeven’s ownership note of 1840 in the book of hours IV 47, which includes the explicit request to pray for her nu en ook naer mijn doodt (‘now and also after my death’ (IV 47, f. IIr). This suggests that the book was not only used by the prioress herself (see p. 203 n. 2).

² ‘When the hours are said in choir no one will occupy herself with looking or reading in other books which do not pertain to the office’ (Van den Elsen and Hoevenaars 1907, 2: 248-249). On the statutes of Sint-Annencortal, see Van Dijk 1986, 608. The same passage, phrased identically, also occurs in the statutes attributed to Mariaweide in Venlo (Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 11v) and those of Mariagarda in Roermond (RHCL, 14.D051, inv. nr. 95, f. 12r). On these statutes, see p. 73 n. 2.

³ ‘During the hours no one will occupy herself with looking at anything in other books’ (Mater 2, f. 27v; cf. Frenken 1935/36, 231). On these statutes, which have been partially edited by Frenken 1935/36, 212-234, see Van Dijk 1986, 609-610. In imitation of Frenken 1935/36, 202-203, he writes that Mater 2, whose script he dates to the end of the sixteenth century, must be from the convent of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage, despite the fact that this community had already moved to Sint-Annencortal in Rosmalen in 1543 (cf. pp. 4-5). He surmises that the production of these statutes might be connected with hints that there were attempts, later in the sixteenth century, to revive the convent in Helmond. However, the wording of the two profession formulas that are included (cf. Frenken 1935/36, 228-229) does not support an attribution to Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage. Four profession formulas from Helmond say that the convent was founded in honour of the Blessed Virgin and sanctarum omnium (‘all (female) saints’, IV 47, ff. 13v-14r; IV 92:2, f. 74v-; Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, National Print Room, BI-1921-294, f. 185r-v; RHCL, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699, f. 145r). The formulas in Mater 2, however, only mention the Virgin. Another important argument in favour of locating the manuscript in a different convent are the text’s dialectal characteristics, which Frenken 1935/36, 202 identifies as betraying an East-Guelderian rather than a Brabantian dialect. It seems probable, therefore, that these are not the statutes of a second iteration of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage but of another convent.
for them to keep and use their own books in the choir stalls. This appears to be corroborated by the fact that books and remnants of books are occasionally found in these structures.1

In the absence of a similar passage in Soeterbeeck’s statutes, clear-cut evidence for the reading and keeping of non-liturgical books in the church of this convent is lacking, but there is no reason to assume the situation there differed very much. There is one significant divergent factor, however, which is that until the sixth year of Beckers’ rectorate, the new convent in Deursen neither had a proper church nor any choir stalls in it. Van Helmond’s map makes clear that there was only an ordinary room that served as chapel, concerning which the entry for 1777 in the first version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck says:

In ‘tselve jaer naer Pinxsten hebben wij onse kerck verandert, en hebben in deselve de bancken van Ouwt Soeterbeeck laeten stellen en om de devote in de kerck te vermeerderen, en tot meerder gerief der susteren soo hebben wij uijt twee kaemers een guerime werckkaemer laaten maecen, want de religieusen hadden tot hier toe sgh bedient van de kerck soo om te wercchen bidden als den goddelijken dienst te doen.2

This means that, between the move to Deursen in 1732 and the structural renovations in 1777, the chapel room double-functioned as workshop and was therefore the central space where the sisters spent most of their day. When listing the activities that took place there, Beckers distinguishes between prayer and liturgical worship, which means that the former refers to the kind of personal meditation in which books can be expected to have played a part. The passage, therefore, strongly suggests that the chapel was still the appropriate place for the sisters to read and therefore presumably also to keep their books, despite the fact that for years they could not have any proper choir stalls to do so.3

The fact that the sisters were in the chapel so often means that it is possible that it was also home to the common book collection. There is evidence that, in other convents and at other times, books were kept on the nuns’ gallery. This is the case, for example, for The Hague, Royal Library, 75 H 36, a fifteenth-century manuscript that belonged to an unidentified sisters’ convent in the eastern part of the Netherlands and contains the report of an anonymous priest’s pilgrimage to the Holy Land.4 This book has a sixteenth-century note on f. 1r which begins as follows:

Item dit boeck sal wesen opt choer in sunte Iohans cast den susteren int gemeyn, op dat een yegelick sijn devocie daer in mach hebben. Mater gebiet in alsoe voel machten als sij aver ons heeft dat niemant dit boeck voer sijn eygen holden en sal mer altijt opt choer sal bliven inder ewichelt.5

This means that the book was kept on the nuns’ gallery, though not in the stalls by the sisters themselves, but in a bookcase for general use bearing the name of St John, perhaps because it

---

1 For instance, Delétra-Carreras 2005, 168-173 describes booklets and loose leaves, printed and manuscript, that were found in the choir stalls of the Cistercian women’s abbey of Maigrauge in Fribourg.
2 ‘In the same year, after Pentecost [18 May], we renovated our church, and had the stalls of Old Soeterbeeck placed therein, and to increase devotion in church and for the sisters’ greater convenience, we had two chambers made into a spacious workroom, for until now the sisters had used the church to work, to pray and to celebrate the liturgy’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 24). See ASP 4, p. 5a for a more summary description of the chapel’s renovation. Cf. Buijks 1982, 134, 137. On p. 138, Buijks seems to be confused about the position of the chapel and the new workroom in relation to each other, implying that they were both in the main wing built in 1733 by saying that a new sacristy set up in 1790 was probably situated between them. It is clear, however, both from Beckers’ descriptions (ASP 45, 1: pp. 18-19, 24) and from Van Helmond’s map (Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 139, fig. 12), that the new workroom was created out of what had once been two separate rooms in the southern wing that had been finished in 1746. Buijks is probably right that the sacristy was adjacent to the chapel, but in that case it was in between the chapel and the infirmary.
3 According to the sisters’ own tradition, the choir stalls that they had taken from Nuenen to Deursen had originally come from Hoooidonk in Nederwetten, after that convent had been dissolved in 1650 (Frenken 1931/32, 293-294).
4 On this manuscript, see Nijsten 1989.
5 ‘And this book shall be kept on the choir, in the bookcase of St John, for common use by the sisters, so that everyone may practise her devotion therein. The prioress commands with as much power as she wields over us that no one shall keep this book for herself but that it shall always remain on the choir, for all eternity’ (The Hague, RL, 75 H 36, f. 1r).
was situated near his statue. In other convents, books were kept in a room that was adjacent to the gallery, such as that which appears to have been present in the convent of Sint-Agnes in Arnhem.\(^1\) Although Soeterbeeck did not have a nuns’ gallery at the end of the eighteenth century,\(^2\) it is clear that the chapel was not an unprecedented option for storing books in common use if there was no separate room for them.

Wherever the sisters read and kept their books, and wherever those that were in common use were stored, there is evidence that Beckers was concerned with managing the conventual book collection. This is not to say that he was a librarian in any formal sense; there is no evidence that he ever occupied this position at Gaesdonck, and, at Soeterbeeck it was held by a sister. Still, as rector he appears to have been closely involved with the office, as is actually also prescribed by Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century statutes. The reader will remember that the end of the chapter on the librarian stipulates that *geen suster en mach corrigeren de boecken sonder oorlooff des bichtvaders*.\(^3\) In his capacity as the sisters’ ordinary confessor and spiritual director, the rector was apparently responsible for safeguarding the quality of the texts they read. In this light, it only stands to reason that he would also have a say in what books the sisters used for their personal meditation. Although the specifics of the relationship between the rector and the librarian are unclear, it is hardly surprising that Beckers, like his predecessors before him,\(^4\) was involved in entrusting certain books to certain sisters.

### 5.3. Ownership Notes in Books of Sisters

Beckers’ involvement with the management of the books of the convent of Soeterbeeck is most readily apparent from the ownership notes that he wrote in some of them with his cursive script in order to entrust them to individual sisters. These notes refer to four women:\(^5\) Prioress Theresia Heijnen (1783-1822),\(^6\) who received three books from Beckers; the choir sisters Franciska Lips and Constantia van Soelen, who were also given three each;\(^7\) and the converse sister Barbara Teunissen, who got only one.\(^8\) For three of these sisters, the only books that survive with their ownership notes in it are those they were given by Beckers. The exception is Sister Lips, who also had books with ownership notes in her own hand.\(^9\) Needless to say, it is very well possible that all or some of these sisters had more books than the ones referred to in this chapter, but that these either did not bear ownership notes or do not survive. The problem with these notes is that it is impossible to say how consistently they were added

---

\(^1\) Berends 2011, 73, fig. 21.

\(^2\) As discussed on pp. 97-98, a nuns’ gallery was only added in 1912 to the entirely new conventual church that had been built six years before as an extension of the eastern side of the wing of 1733. It was probably removed again during the church’s thorough renovation in 1968 (Buijks 1982, 142, 44; Peijnenburg 1982b, 69-70). Whether Soeterbeeck’s conventual church in Nuenen had a gallery is not known, but this seems likely.

\(^3\) ‘No sister can correct the books without the confessor’s permission’ (ASP 92, f. 18r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 230).

\(^4\) Rector Joannes Verheijden, for instance, entrusted IV 103, a copy of B.J.P.’s *Den Religieusen Staat* (Louvain: Hyeronimus de Gosin, 1692), to Sister Theresia Wagheschot (ASP 267). On Verheijden, see p. 100 n. 2. On Wagheschot, see p. 238 n. 7.

\(^5\) For an overview of these books, transcriptions of the ownership notes by Beckers and those of previous and later owners, see Table 5.1.

\(^6\) The books that Beckers entrusted to Heijnen are IV 40, IV 55 and V 208. On Heijnen herself, see Appendix A.1, no. 7.

\(^7\) The books that Beckers entrusted to Lips are III 114, III 116 and IV 64. On Lips herself, see Appendix A.1, no. 11. The books that Beckers entrusted to Van Soelen are III 110, III 111 and III 135. On Van Soelen herself, see Appendix A.1, no. 30.

\(^8\) The book that Beckers entrusted to Teunissen is III 150. On Teunissen herself, see Appendix A.2, no. 13.

\(^9\) Lips wrote her own ownership notes in III 148:1, III 221:1-2.5, IV 48a, V 234, V 235:1 and V 242:1-4. With the exception of IV 48a, which contains spiritual tracts on the Blessed Virgin, these are all fraternity books, some of which are discussed in greater detail on pp. 258-261.
and phrased, which means that their wording, presence or absence cannot be used to prove much more than they actually say in each case.

The functional dimension of Beckers’ ownership notes is largely a mystery, for instance. What prompted him to write them in the specific books in which he did, and for the specific sisters for which he left them and not for any others? Heijnen was prioress when he entrusted her books to her in 1785, 1788 and 1807, so in this case it might have been a matter of authority, but that still leaves the other three sisters. Because the circumstances surrounding the addition of Beckers’ ownership notes are almost completely unknown, I have no option but to abandon most of the questions which touch upon it and to focus instead on what the notes themselves say.

Along their typological dimension, most of Beckers’ ownership notes are in a recognisable format: the name of the sister, followed by her designation as a sister of (New, that is, post-1732) Soeterbeeck, and a year that presumably indicates the moment when the book was entrusted to her. One of the final two items is occasionally omitted, but only one ownership note deviates from the pattern fundamentally. This is the one with the name of Sister Lips in IV 64, a copy of the edition of the Windesheim Officia propria that was printed by Jacobus Leekens in Maastricht in 1753. The verso of the book’s first flyleaf bears a note saying: Maria Anna Camp, religiues onw., anno 1759. Underneath that is one in Beckers’ hand which says: Nuw bij vereringe van deese bovegenoemde suster als ballink uit ’t klooster Nazareth tot Antwerpen aan suster Joanna Francisca Lips, religiueuse in Soeterbeek tot Deursen, 1784. The reason why Beckers chose to expand upon his usual format in this case probably simply lies in the special circumstances under which the book came to Soeterbeeck. It was evidently brought there by Anna Camp, a sister of the convent of Sint-Jozef-Nazareth in Antwerp, with which the community of Soeterbeeck had a special connection because one of their own sisters, Elisabeth Hurckmans, had been prioress there. The convent had been suppressed in 1782, however, and Sister Camp became what Beckers calls an exile. She was still alive and striving to return to Antwerp in 1787, although her convent was never re-established there. During her stay in Deursen, which will have been short because it is not mentioned at all in the rector’s chronicles, she gave Sister Lips her copy of the Windesheim propers, and Beckers, ever the chronicler, recorded the event.

It is surprising that he did nothing of the kind when he wrote the note entrusting IV 40, a copy of the Officia propria printed by Franciscus Foppens in Antwerp in 1699, to Prioress Heijnen, despite the fact that this book had previously also belonged to a sister from Sint-Jozef-Nazareth, namely Maria Elisabeth de Wit. The reason for this is probably that, although IV 40 almost certainly came to Soeterbeeck on the same occasion as IV 64, the first

---

1 ‘Anna Camp, unworthy religious, in the year 1759’ (IV 64, verso front flyleaf).
2 ‘Now as a gift by the abovementioned sister, who is an exile from the convent of Nazareth in Antwerp, to Sister Joanna Franciscus Lips, religious at Soeterbeeck in Deursen, 1784’ (IV 64, verso front flyleaf).
3 Hurckmans was born on 2 December 1688 and invested at Soeterbeeck in 1710 (IV 78, f. 100v). She became prioress of the community of Sint-Jozef-Nazareth in Waalwijk in 1730, moved along with it to Antwerp, and died on 15 January 1776 (Frenken 1931/32, 299). Her portrait, taken when she was 49 years old, was transferred to Soeterbeeck in 1981 and still hangs there. It is reproduced in Van Loon 1990, 16. Frenken says that Hurckmans was born in 1696 and professed in 1716, but the note in IV 78 is probably more reliable. The year 1710 for her profession is confirmed by an entry by Beckers in Soeterbeeck’s book of benefactors (ASP 267), where he records that, upon her death on 15 January 1776, Hurckmans had been seventien jaeren jubilaria (‘a jubilarian for seventeen years’). This means that, in 1776, it was 67 years since she had been invested. As the noviciate never lasted much more than one or two years, Hurckmans’ profession is more likely to have taken place in 1710 than in 1716.
4 On the history of Sint-Jozef-Nazareth, see Génard 1859, cxxxix-cl.
5 Cf. Réclamations 1787, 184-185.
6 De Wit is known to have been a sister of Nazareth in Waalwijk in 1717 and died in that convent’s new home in Antwerp on 25 January 1740 (Génard 1859, cxl, cxliv, cxlvi n., 443).
book was only given to Heijnen a year after the second one had been given to Lips, that is, in 1785. If I am right in thinking that Sister Camp, accompanied perhaps by Sister De Wit, visited Soeterbeeck only briefly in 1784, IV 40 will already have been at Soeterbeeck for a year when it was given to the prioress, making any overt reference to the book’s Antwerp provenance redundant.

With reference to the spatial dimension of Beckers’ ownership notes it can be said that the ten books in which they were left fall into three categories. The first of these is made up of three liturgical books, which have already discussed in the previous chapters.¹ One of these, the book of chants with shelf mark IV 55, appears to have been written especially for Prioress Heijnen by Beckers, perhaps on the occasion of her third election as prioress.² The others, IV 40 and IV 64, are just copies of the Windesheim *Officia propria* such as all choir sisters will have had for use in the divine office.

The second category consists of two tiny booklets that describe ways to gain indulgences. The first, entitled the *Kleyne geestelycken blaesbalgh* (Antwerp: Alexander Everaerts), is the book of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in the cathedral of Our Lady in Antwerp (III 135). The other is a composite consisting of a *Devotie tot den H. Aloysius Gonzaga van de Societeyt Jesu* (Ravenstein: Gerardus van Olbergen) and a *Wegwzyter tot een zaligen dood en eeuwig leven*, the second of which is the book of the Confraternity of Our Saviour Jesus Christ Dying on the Cross in the church of St Lucia in Ravenstein (III 150). Ecclesiastical fraternities such as these were something with which Beckers was very much concerned, as the next chapter shows.³ For now, it suffices to say that their main attraction were the indulgences that could be earned by their members. Similarly, the booklet on Saint Aloysius is concerned with special graces and indulgences that can be earned by his veneration at the parish church of Ravenstein, whose priests were Jesuits.⁴ The purpose of entrusting these books to the sisters was clearly to contribute to their souls’ repose in a very direct way. All three titles occur numerous times in the Soeterbeeck Collection, the latter mostly in the same combination, as is to be expected.⁵ They all either have ownership notes of sisters who were at Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate or none at all, which suggests that at some point, many or all sisters had been enrolled in the fraternities referred to by these booklets, of which they each received a copy. The devotional exercises described therein were probably best carried out in the chapel, which reinforces the proposition that was advanced above that this was the place where the sisters kept and read their books—although it must be said that the fraternity booklets are small enough to have been carried around.

The third category consists of devotional books with spiritual tracts and devotional exercises. One of these, V 208, is a copy of the *Vertroostingen in lyden en tegenspoed* (Amsterdam: F.J. van Tetroode) by Antonius van Hemert, who was rector of Soeterbeeck in the sixteenth century.⁶ The Soeterbeeck Collection contains one other copy of this text in the

---

¹ On IV 40 and IV 64, see p. 83 n. 6. On IV 55, see pp. 208-212.
² See p. 209.
³ See pp. 257-261.
⁴ Schutjes 1870-1881: 5: 527-530.
⁵ Other copies of the *Blaesbalgh* are III 136 (owned by Antonetta Zelands; cf. Appendix A.2, no. 20), V 232:1, V 233 (owned by a Sister Barbara who may or may not be Barbara Teunissen) and V 234:1 (owned by Francisca Lips). Other copies of the *Devotie* are III 147 (owned by Agatha van der Sande, cf. Appendix A.1, no. 22), III 148:1 (owned by Francisca Lips) and III 149:1. Other copies of the *Wegwzyter* are III 148:2 (probably also owned by Francisca Lips, given her ownership note in III 148:1) and III 149:2.
⁶ Van Hemert was the 10th canon regular to be professed at Mariënhage (Sloots 1943, 102, no. 10; cf. the title pages of many of his works, and the ownership note in his hand in the lower margin of Utrecht, UL, Hs. 116, f. 1r) and became rector of Soeterbeeck at some unknown moment. The title-page of his *Van vrede*, published in Antwerp by Symon Cock in 1553 (V 116:2), identifies him as *Pater tot Zoeterbeeck* (‘rector at Soeterbeeck’), which he still was in 1557 according to an archival document seen by Frenken (1931/32, 301). The dedication of the edition of Van Hemert’s *Paracleseon* that was published in Antwerp by Joannes Bellerus in 1560 is signed
consolatory tradition, as well as of some of Van Hemert’s other works. The other devotional books with ownership notes by Beckers are all copies of the second, third and fourth volumes of Matthias Croonenborch’s four-volume *Gheestelycken leydts-man.* It is noteworthy that Constantia van Soelen and Francisca Lips were each entrusted with two volumes only—the second (III 111) and third (III 110), and the third (III 116) and fourth (III 114) respectively. No copies of the remaining two volumes survive with their names in them. Whether this indicates that these sisters were never in possession of a full set cannot, of course, be said with certainty, but it is possible. The volumes are self-contained, and it is not necessary for a proper understanding to read all four. On the other hand, the Soeterbeeck Collection contains so many copies of individual volumes of this work, that it is clear that the *Gheestelycken leydts-man* was such a popular work that there may well have been more volumes that do not survive. In any case, Van Hemert’s and Croonenborch’s books, which combine instructions with prayers, are clearly also of the kind most easily used for meditation in the chapel.

Before I move on to discuss another type of note from which Beckers’ management of the book collection is evident, a few words must be said about the context of the ownership notes that have been discussed so far. The concept of ownership is not unproblematic in the context of a community of sisters who took a vow of poverty. That these nonetheless had private property is abundantly clear from contemporary sources such as the passages in Beckers’ chronicle where he lists some of the sisters’ financial contributions to the convent’s many structural renovations, and one of his entries in Soeterbeeck’s *Memorie boeck* that specifies what should happen to a sister’s money after her death. However, the rector is very careful to specify for each and every one of the sisters’ contributions that it was made *mit promissie van haer ovrigheit,* and the conventual chapter decided that the half of the sisters’ inheritances that was not spent on Masses for their souls’ repose should simply devolve to the convent, and not to relatives or anyone else. The significance of these facts for understanding the nature of private ownership in a conventual context such as Soeterbeeck is clear: it is technically a loan. Sisters could keep and use their money and some movable goods for a moment. Van Hemert’s date of death is uncertain: the commonly provided year 1560 is based on a misreading of Jean-Noël Paquot’s *Memoires pour servir a l’histoire litteraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas* (1763-1770), which merely says that this was when he could have died *au plûtôt* (‘at the earliest’) (qtd. in Ampe 1980, 8), but the reliability of the year 1570, given on p. 23 of Soeterbeeck’s *Memoriale monialium* (ACRW 1112) and accepted by Ampe 1980, 8-9 without hesitation, is unknown.

On the *Vertroostingen* and its sources, see Verschueren 1933-1935, 9: 341-349.

The other copy of the *Vertroostingen* is V 116:1. Other works are contained in III 193, V 35, V 36:1, V 66, V 94, V 116:2, and V 222. Van Dijk 2012, 243 n. 46 mentions an oral tradition among the sisters of Soeterbeeck that Van Hemert was the author of IV 73, a book of spiritual exercises in Middle Dutch, but this seems unlikely in light of that manuscript’s date of production circa 1500, and its possible association with Onze-Lieve-Vrouw in de Hage (cf. Kienhorst 2005, 90-91; Van den Berg 2012, 72 n. 16). For a comprehensive bibliography of Van Hemert’s writings, see Lourdaux and Persoons 1968, 12-22.

On Croonenborch, see De Troeyer 1986, esp. 149-157 on the *Gheestelycken leydts-man.*

Surviving copies of the first volume are III 112, V 84:1, V 170 and V 171a. One more copy (V 169) came from Mariëndaal in 1954. Copies of the second volume, in addition to III 111 mentioned above, are III 109 (owned by the unidentified Sister Maria van Wijck in 1698, and later by Martina van der Velden, a converse sister who was confessed in 1791 but only entered Soeterbeeck in 1844 (Sluijters 1982b, 189, no. 108)) and V 84:2. Another copy of the third volume, in addition to III 110 and III 116 mentioned above, is III 113 (owned by Maria Colen; cf. Appendix A.2, no. 2). III 114 is the only copy of the fourth volume that survives from the library of Soeterbeeck.

For the profession made by the sisters of Soeterbeeck, see Frenken 1931/32, 186, 243, 263.

E.g., ASP 4, pp. 26-27.

ASP 1, entry 14 October 1788. On this text, see p. 256.

‘With permission of her superior’ (ASp 4, pp. 26-27).
certain time, perhaps all their lives, but they would always need their superiors’ permission for this, and the community as a whole was the true owner and retained the right to claim what it needed. The seventeenth-century statutes condemn property which a sister sonder oorlooff heeft, of met eijgentheijt houdende is, but only because it was withdrawn from the superior’s sphere of influence and appropriated in an absolute sense.

Books are different from money, of course, because they are indispensable tools in the spiritual life, but many of the same mechanisms apply. This is evident from the fact that the fifteenth-century statutes thought to belong to the convent of Mariaweide, the eponymous mother house of the Chapter of Venlo, mention that, although the sisters should once a year yield up everything that they had in use, hanthoeke were among the cleyn dingen which they were allowed to weder nemen with guet duncken der mater. In the books that survive from the library of Soeterbeeck there are many ownership notes that carefully say that the book is in the keeping of or in use by a certain sister rather than in her possession. In one of her own notes, Sister Lips does the same and says the book is in her bewaeringe. Many notes, too, are accompanied by a statement to the effect that the book in question was only in the sister’s possession soe lanck alst haer overste belieft, as Sister De Wit’s ownership note in IV 40 puts it. In practice this was often for a very long period of time or even to the end of the sister’s life, and the highly personal additions made to some of the books show clearly that they were perceived as personal property, but the phrase shows that, in theory at least, their ownership remained conditional and could be temporary. Beckers’ ownership notes do not explicitly refer to this temporality, but that it was nonetheless understood is clear from the fact that IV 40, Heijnen’s copy of the Windesheim propers, passed to Sister Clara Zeelands in 1813, before the previous owner’s death in 1822.

Beckers’ notes do not mention the permission of a superior either, but that would have been unnecessary anyway; the very fact that he, the rector, entrusted a book to a particular sister and personally added a note to that effect, meant that permission had been granted. Conversely, most of the ownership notes that Sister Lips added herself do say that the books are hers soo lang als haer overste blieft, and those that do not were partly trimmed off, left in a book that is not the first in a composite, or added in a place where there simply was not enough space. This is obviously because notes in her own hand needed a superior’s validation, although it must be said that there are several ownership notes of sisters who lived at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days that do not refer to the prioress’ permission, and whose

---

1 ‘Owns, or keeps for herself, without permission’ (ASP 92, f. 4r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 216).
2 The stipulation that geender suster en is geoorloof gelt te hebben, autgenomen die procuratrix (‘no sister is allowed to have money, except the procuratrix’, ASP 92, f. 6v, cf. Frenken 1931/32, 219) should probably be understood as to refer to having money to hand.
3 ‘Handbooks […] small things […] take back […] the prioress’ consent’ (Brussels, RL, IV 1064, f. 64r).
5 ‘Keeping’ (III 221:1, title page).
6 ‘As long as it pleases her prioress’ (IV 40, front flyleaf). Other examples occur in III 125, III 146, III 147, III 176, III 211, IV 10a, IV 12, IV 39, IV 43, IV 44, IV 75, IV 120, V 6, V 12, V 20, V 54, V 57, V 77, V 79, V 144 and V 207.
7 Cf. for example the two ownership notes in V 5. The first indicates the book came into possession of Sister Agnes van Aer in 1606. The second one says that it passed to Rector Wouter Willems nu nae haerder suster Agneten doot in 1644 (‘now after Sister Agnes’ death’, V 5, recto front flyleaf).
8 A discussion of some of the more personal traces of use in books from the library of Soeterbeeck will be part of a forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Pointers.
9 See Sister Zeelands’ ownership note on a slip pasted on top of the front flyleaf that bears the ownership notes of Sisters De Wit and Heijnen. On Zeelands, see Appendix A.1, no. 34.
authorship is unknown and may therefore belong to the sisters themselves.\textsuperscript{1} This circumstance emphasises yet again the point with which this paragraph started, namely that these ownership notes are problematic sources and that it is difficult to draw conclusions from their wording or their presence and absence, even if there are as many as in the Soeterebeck Collection. They refer to a reality that was so self-evident to the people who wrote them down that it often did not need to be explicated, but which is largely impenetrable for us today.

5.4. Library Marks

There is another type of note in Beckers’ hand that does not indicate private possession on the part of individual sisters, but instead refers to the entire convent.\textsuperscript{2} Most of such marks, which the rector left in eight books, consist merely of Soeterebeck’s name, in one case accompanied by its location in Deursen, near Ravenstein.\textsuperscript{3} Similar notes, consisting of the name of the convent and little or nothing else, also occur in other hands from various periods,\textsuperscript{4} but in most cases the person who wrote them cannot be identified with certainty. It is clear that they appear too rarely and too haphazardly to represent a census of Soeterebeck’s complete book collection at any moment in its history, and instead they seem rather to have had several different purposes. In what follows, I will restrict myself to the functional meaning of the notes that were left by Beckers, while occasionally referring to those in other hands if these can provide corroborative evidence.

There are two notes in Beckers’ hand that deviate from the typological norm described above by providing more information, and for this reason their meaning is easiest to understand. These are the notes that appear in the only two liturgical books among the eight with which this paragraph is concerned: the manuscript antiphonary IV 8 and IV 102, a copy of Het Roomsch Martelaren-boeck (Ypres: Martinus de Backer, 1688), a Dutch translation of the Roman Martyrology. As explained in the third chapter,\textsuperscript{5} the antiphonary was given to Soeterebeck in 1793 by Joannes van Steenbergen, canon regular of the convent of Gaesdonck,\textsuperscript{6} on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his investment. These circumstances are carefully described in Beckers’ note on the second flyleaf at the front of the book: Ioannes Ægidius van Steenbergen, canonus regularis et iubilarius in Gaesdonck, conventui nostro Soeterbeek dono dedit 1793 10ma septembri, dum suum solemne celebraret iubileum.\textsuperscript{7} The martyrology has a much briefer note, added on its title page: Dono dedi, Arnoldus Beckers, rector, manu mea propria, 1783.\textsuperscript{8} Although they differ in length, these two notes are clearly very similar as far as their constituents are concerned. They each describe when and in what way the books they appear in became part of the conventual book collection, that is, as gifts. The donation of IV 8 and IV 102 is a benefaction on Van Steenbergen’s and Beckers’ part, for which they deserved to be remembered in the sisters’

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. the ownership notes of Maria Colen in III 113 (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 2), of Lucia Daamen in V 200 (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 3), of Anna Maria Gerome in V 153 (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 5), of Aloysia Verkleij in V 101 and V 144 (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 32), of Clara Zelands in IV 40 (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 34), of Joanna van Haeren in III 5 and III 6 (cf. Appendix A.2, no. 16), and of Antonetta Zelands in III 136 and V 130 (cf. Appendix A.2, no. 20).

\textsuperscript{2} The books in which Beckers left an ownership note referring to the convent of Soeterebeck are III 12, III 13, IV 8, IV 102, IV 103 and V 159 in the Soeterebeck Collection and LCSA, A-0925 and C-0707. For the titles and imprints of these books and transcriptions of Beckers’ ownership notes and older ones, see Table 5.2.

\textsuperscript{3} III 12, recto front flyleaf.

\textsuperscript{4} For a survey of these notes, and identifications of the persons responsible for them if they are known, see Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{5} See p. 144.

\textsuperscript{6} On Van Steenbergen, see Appendix B, no. 16.

\textsuperscript{7} ‘Ioannes Ægidius van Steenbergen, canonus regularis et iubilarius in Gaesdonck, gave this book to our convent Soeterebeck on 10 September 1793, when he celebrated his solemn jubilee’ (IV 8, recto second front flyleaf).

\textsuperscript{8} ‘I, Arnoldus Beckers, rector, have given this book with my own hand’ (IV 102, title page).
prayers, perhaps even as they used these very books. This interpretation of Beckers’ notes appears to be corroborated, for IV 8 at least, by the presence on the binding of that book of Van Steenbergen’s initials, which draw still more attention to the donor in much the same way as Pierre de Werchin’s name does on the missal IV 24.¹ It is clear, then, that the rector’s notes are implicit invitations to prayer, and they have a very specific commemorative function for which liturgical books like the ones in which they appear were more often appropriated. The fact that Beckers left these notes only in these two books does not mean that the community of Soeterbeeck was not given any others during his rectorate, but is probably explained by the fact that in this case the donors were one of his confrères and himself, so that he was particularly well aware of the gifts’ commemorative purpose and keen on its fulfilment.

Van Steenbergen was one of Soeterbeeck’s chief benefactors and may have donated other books as well.² As was mentioned in the third chapter,³ the hymnals IV 54 and Add. 10 are in the same hand as the antiphonary IV 8. These other books, however, do not have any notes in them about how or when they came to Soeterbeeck, probably because they are smaller and have much simpler, cardboard bindings and therefore constitute less substantial gifts, if that is even what they were. The community may also have ordered them from the convent of Gaesdonck, where their scribe resided.

In addition to IV 8 and IV 102, there are six books in which Beckers simply wrote Soeterbeeck’s name and place. The functional meaning of these particular notes is more mysterious than that of the ones previously discussed, but they seem, in some cases at least, to be a sign that the books in which they appear were intended, at the moment of addition, to pass definitively from private ownership into communal use. This is perhaps most likely in the case of three books which contain earlier ownership notes of individual persons: III 12, a copy of Joannes David’s catechetical treatise the Christeliicken waerseggher (Antwerp: Jan Moerentorf, 1603),⁴ which had previously been owned by Rector Verheijden (1705-1744);⁵ IV 103, a copy of Joannes van Bilsen’s Den religieusen staet (Louvain: Hyeronimus de Gosin, 1692),⁶ a defense of religious life which Verheijden had previously entrusted to Sister Theresia Wagheschot in 1711;⁷ and V 159, a copy of the Waerachtighe historie van de martelaers van Gorcom, Willem Hessels van Est’s account of the acts and the death of the Martyrs of Gorcum in Willem Spoelbergh’s Dutch translation (Antwerp: Jan Moerentorf, 1604),⁸ which also bears an ownership note of Maria van Woestenborch.⁹

Before Beckers became rector in 1772 all three of these books had been in private ownership for some time, and although the recorded owners had all died, it is possible that their books had remained part of a circuit of private owners of which no traces survive. III 12 may have been in the rectorate, and IV 103 and V 159 may have been passed on from sister to sister.

---
¹ See pp. 194-195.
² Van Steenbergen donated 33 guilders to Soeterbeeck for the restauration of the refectory windows in 1775 and 150 guilders for the renovation of the church in 1777 (ASP 45, 1: pp. 23-25), which caused him to be entered into the convent’s book of benefactors after his death in January 1797 (ASP 267, January).
³ See pp. 144, 179, 181.
⁴ On David and his works, see Geerts-van Roey and Andriessen 1956.
⁵ On Verheijden, see p. 100 n. 2.
⁶ On Van Bilsen and Den Religieusen Staet, see Meijer 1911.
⁷ Wagheschot was a choir sister; she served as procuratrix and died on 4 January 1714 (ASP 267).
⁸ On Van Est and his Historia Martyrum Gorcomiensium, see Fruytier 1927. The presence of this book in the library of Soeterbeeck can be explained by the fact that one of the Martyrs of Gorcum was John of Oisterwijk, a canon regular of the Chapter of Windesheim. Soeterbeeck celebrated his feast and that of his companions with the rank of double on 9 July (IV 58, 2: p. 83).
⁹ Van Woestenborch was a choir sister; she was procuratrix in 1699 and probably remained so until her death on 1 May 1703 (Frenken 1931/32, 298).
sister, as so many books are known to have done,¹ until Beckers added his note and thereby took it out of circulation. That this mechanism existed is almost certainly proven by IV 26, a Roman Breviary printed in Cologne by Cornelius ab Egmondt in 1630. Its title-page bears a note entrusting the book to Sister Clara van den Bogaert in 1661,² which was later struck through and replaced by Nu Soeterbeek.³ The book had already been at Soeterbeeck since at least the year in which Van den Bogaert received it, so the later note only makes sense if it means that the volume was common property again from now on. It seems likely that Beckers’ notes have a similar meaning, although they lack the temporal adverb.⁴

It is not entirely certain, however, whether the same movement from private to communal ownership is behind all of his notes. The other three appear in books without any traces of private ownership: III 13, a copy of Andreas de Boeye’s Levens vande heylighe patriarchen coninghen propheten ende andere treffelijke persoenen van ‘t Oude Testament (Antwerp: Hendrick Aertssens, 1642), on the lives of Old Testament saints;⁵ LCSA, A-0925, a copy of Frans de Costere’s Viifthien catholiccke sermoonen op de evangelen der sondaghen van den vasten tot de H. Driivyldicheyt (Antwerp: Joachim Trognesius, 1604), a collection of sermons for all Sundays from Lent to Trinity Sunday;⁶ and LCSA, C-0707, a copy of Marcantonio Flaminio’s In librum Psalmorvm brevis explanatio (Lyon: Guillielmus Rouiilius, 1548), a Latin verse translation of and commentary on the psalms.⁷ Of course, the absence of ownership notes in these books does not necessarily mean that they were never in private use. The final two books certainly were, as they are full of annotations, mostly in Latin. However, the hands of these notes have not been identified and might belong to people outside of Soeterbeeck. In that case, Beckers’ notes may mark the acquisition of these books by the convent, an interpretation which seems straightforward enough but which is hard to prove.

For completeness’ sake I should mention that there is also a third option, which is that Beckers added his notes because the books in question were to be loaned to people from outside the community. This is a possibility which is explicitly mentioned in the conventual statutes, which say of the librarian:

Sij sal int schrift tekenen de boecken diemen buinten leent, ende vande ombekte liden sal ij pandt nemen off handteeken, ten waere dat der priorinne anders goet dochte; ende sjij sal oock sorgvuldich weesen die boecken wedr te eijshen, ende te hebben ten gesetten tijden die sjij geleent heeft binnen of buinten.⁸

There is no clear evidence that books were indeed loaned at Soeterbeeck on any significant scale. In fact, the only clear indication of it occurs in III 90, a copy of De H. ioniсте tot Iesvs, Francisce de Smidts translation of Paul de Barry’s Sainte fauve auprés de Jēsus.⁹ On this book’s flyleaf is a note in a seventeenth-century hand saying: Dese boeck daet hoert aan het kloester van Soeterbeek(e) toe dat moete seijen wederom gheven seij(e).¹⁰ This seems to mean that the book was expected to leave the convent and that whoever had it should return it,

---

¹ A discussion of the way in which books passed from sister to sister will be part of a forthcoming study by Kienhorst and Poirters.
² On Van den Bogaert, see p. 6 n. 1.
³ ‘Now Soeterbeek’ (IV 26, title page; cf. Table 5.3, no. 7).
⁴ ‘Alternatively, nu can also be a dialect form of niewe, ‘new’, so that the note indicates that the book was owned by New Soeterbeek, that is, Soeterbeek after its move to Deursen in 1732. In that case it loses some of its force as an argument, but probably still marks the book’s passage from private to communal ownership.
⁵ On De Boeye and his works, see Sommervogel 1890-1960, 2: 1585-1587.
⁶ On De Costere and his works, see Sommervogel 1890-1960, 3: 1510-1534.
⁷ On Flaminio and his works, see Maddison 1965.
⁸ ‘She should make a note in her ledger of the books which are loaned outside the convent, and of strangers she should ask a pledge or a signature, unless the priorress should prefer otherwise; and she should also be careful to ask, and receive back at the appointed time, those books which she loans within or outside the convent’ (ASP 92, f. 18r; cf. Frenken 1931/32, 230).
⁹ On Barry and his works, see Sommervogel 1890-1960, 1: 945-957.
¹⁰ ‘This book belongs to the convent of Soeterbeeck and should be returned’ (III 90, front flyleaf).
which matches the definition of a loan. Beyond this single example there is no evidence that people from outside the community loaned books from Soeterbeeck, and although this does not necessarily indicate that it did not happen, it does mean that it is not a particularly likely interpretation of Beckers’ notes.

Although my understanding of their occasion and precise significance remains sketchy, it is clear that Beckers’ notes in the eight books under discussion here are distinct from his ownership notes in the others not only in form, but also in function. The latter indicated that Beckers entrusted books to individual sisters in the capacity of their spiritual director, the former are indicative of some sort of communal ownership. What this meant for the books’ use or the place where they were kept is uncertain, although it is noteworthy that, with the exception of the manuscript antiphonary IV 8 and Flaminio’s book on the Psalms, all books with notes of communal ownership would have made excellent refectory reading, consisting as they do of catechetical works, collections of sermons and lives of saints.1 The notes themselves, however, do not indicate that the books were meant for the refectory, and it is therefore probably best to simply identify them as library marks, indicating that the volumes had become part of Soeterbeeck’s communal book collection. Why Beckers should have been the one to add them, and only in these books, are yet more questions whose answers are lost in time. The very fact that he did is itself significant enough, because it shows that he was involved in managing the conventual collection of books as something that should be taken care of in its own right, and not only mined for tools of spiritual care.

5.5. Non-Written Traces of the Use of Books

The conclusion that Beckers’ library marks reveal that he was involved in managing the conventual book collection, suggests an awareness on his part of books as material objects rather than just as sources of information. In this light, it is significant that, when discussing the composition of IV 53, the book of prefaces made up of pages from the printed missal IV 24, I explained that, although it is not possible to be certain that the book’s initial compilation took place during Beckers’ rectorate, he was probably involved in its rebinding.2 Similarly, I argued that Beckers was almost certainly also responsible for having the original contents of the wedding binding on IV 10b replaced with empty pages on which wrote a collection of liturgical chants, and that he may even have done so himself.3 With that the matter ended, for I had to admit that there were no good reasons to believe that the book of hours IV 47 was rebound under Beckers’ supervision or even during his rectorate, as I had previously reported.4 Still, the two solid examples provide enough evidence, which need not be repeated here, that the rector’s work on the conventual book collection did not only concern the books’ contents but also had a material side to it that extended at least to their rebinding.

There is one aspect to Beckers’ part in the production of IV 10b and IV 53 that deserves to be singled out for special consideration in the context of this chapter. This is that it involved the partial destruction of other books. In the case of IV 10b the victim was only the wedding poetry that it had originally contained,5 but for the making of IV 53 parts of at least three printed missals and one manuscript antiphonary were reused. If Beckers chose to renovate some of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval liturgical books, as he wrote in two of them,6 he apparently also let, or perhaps even had, one of them be destroyed. These examples show how

---

1 This assumes that IV 102, the copy of the Roman Martyrology, was not actually used liturgically in the chapter house at Prime (cf. Frenken 1931/32, 235) because it is in Dutch rather than in Latin.
2 See pp. 197-198.
3 See pp. 212, 214.
4 See pp. 206-208.
5 See p. 212.
6 See pp. 146-147.
the rector’s dutiful concern for the contents of books and involvement with their material side could interact. He must therefore have played a larger role than can now be reconstructed in the way in which books were treated as material objects.

5.6. Ownership Notes in Beckers’ Own Books

Having discussed what Beckers did with the books of others, I may conveniently round this chapter off by saying a few words about his personal book collection, although but little is known about it. ¹ He probably kept his library in his own rooms in the rectorate, which regional archivist Henk Buijks argues had been built in 1744.² Only one book with his ownership note survives in the Soeterbeeck Collection: IV 63, a copy of the Officia propria sanctorum ordinis (Maastricht: Jacobus Lekens, 1753), on whose title page he wrote: Sum A. Beckers (Figure 5).³ Elaborately discussed above, this is a liturgical book with the offices of the feasts that are proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, and Beckers will have used it when praying the divine office. Sixteen more, non-liturgical volumes that were once in his possession survive outside the Soeterbeeck Collection, in the library of the Crosier convent of Sint Aegten in Sint Agatha.⁴ One of these is a copy of Hugo van Heussen’s Batavia sacra (Brussels: Franciscus Foppens, 1714), a subtly Jansenist history in Latin of the dioceses of Utrecht and Haarlem.⁵ This work had been prohibited by decree of the Sacred Office of the Index on 5 August 1716,⁶ but it is not known if Beckers was unaware of this or whether he had requested and received permission to own the book. The other fifteen volumes contain collected sermons in French of the Benedictine Jacques Biroat (Paris: Edme Couterot)⁷ and the Jesuit Claude Texier (Paris: Estienne Michallet),⁸ both preachers at the royal court of France. All of these volumes have Beckers’ ownership note on their title page, but there is a significant distinction: the notes in the books by Biroat and Texier read: Sum A. Beckers in Gaesdonck,⁹ whereas the note in the Batavia sacra simply says: Sum A. Beckers,¹⁰ like the one in IV 63. This may mean that Beckers had already acquired the works of the French preachers before he became rector of Soeterbeeck, whereas Van Heussen’s book may only have come into his possession afterwards. Whatever their moment of acquisition, however, these books fit Beckers’ role as rector of Soeterbeeck very well, combining his interest in history, about which I will say more in the seventh chapter,¹¹ and his responsibility for the

¹ For an overview of the books known to have Beckers’ ownership notes, and their later owners, see Table 5.4.
³ ‘I belong to A. Beckers’ (IV 63, title page).
⁴ Cf. Poirters 2013a, 101 n. 11.
⁵ LCSA, A-0706. On Van Heussen and his Batavia sacra, see Polman 1968, 1: 238-247. The book was prohibited by decree of the Sacred Office of the Index on 5 August 1716 (De Bujanda 2002, 908). It is not known if Beckers was unaware of this or whether he had requested and received permission to own the book.
⁷ LCSA, B-3361, the composite B-3362 and B-3363, B-3364 (in two volumes), the composite B-3365 and B-3366, the composite B-3367 and B-3368, and B-3369 (in three volumes). On Biroat and his works, see Antoine Albert’s Dictionnaire portatif des prédicateurs français (Lyon: Pierre Bruyet Ponthus, 1757), pp. 35-36. (I made use of NUL, OD 435 c 44.)
⁸ The composite LCSA, B-3399 and B-3400, B-3401 (in two volumes), B-3402 (in two volumes), B-3403 (in two volumes, but the second volume is not present in the LCSA). On Texier and his works, see Sommervogel 1890-1960, 7: 1951-1954. If Beckers ever owned copies of Texier’s sermons for Advent (L’Impie malheureux) and for the octave of Corpus Christi and the Invention of the Cross (Octaves du S. Sacrement et de la croix), these do not survive in the LCSA.
⁹ ‘I belong to A. Beckers in Gaesdonck’ (LCSA, B-3361, B-3362, B-3364 (1), B-3365 (2), B-3365, B-3367, B- 3369 (1), B-3369 (2), B-3369 (3), B-3399, B-3401 (1), B-3401 (2), B-3402 (1), B-3402 (2), B-3403). The fact that there is one ownership note per volume shows that the composites were already bound together in Beckers’ days.
¹⁰ ‘I belong to A. Beckers’ (LCSA, A-0706).
¹¹ See pp. 265-287.
pastoral care of the sisters. That being said, though, the books do not show any other concrete traces of Beckers’ use besides his ownership notes, and I have not found any evidence that he used the *Batavia sacra* in his historiographical works.

The road that Beckers’ books which are not in the Soeterbeeck Collection travelled before they ended up in Sint Agatha cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but there are a few clues. Most importantly, they came to Sint Aegten only in 2009, before which they were in the library of the Crosier convent of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw ter Lind in Uden. This is evident from the fact that all but one of them bear a library stamp of that convent on one of their flyleaves, and the exception is reported to have the same provenance.¹ In addition to these stamps, many books also have one or more handwritten users’ notes featuring names of men who are known to have had connections either with the Crosiers in Uden or with Soeterbeeck.

Beckers’ copy of the *Batavia sacra* has a note on the verso of its fourth flyleaf, saying that in 1810, the year of Beckers’ death, official permission to use this prohibited book was granted to Wilhelms Roefen, the officiant of Boekel. I know of no explicit connection between Roefen and Soeterbeeck, but he certainly had a link with the Crosiers, as he was born in Uden and studied and later taught at the Latin school they ran there.² It seems likely that Roefen’s teaching position is the explanation for the presence of the book in the Crosier library.

The books by Biroat all bear an ownership note of the Uden Crosier Gerardus van Lith on their first flyleaf.³ Although they consist of an amalgam of different editions, they make up a complete collection of the French preacher’s printed works, and, being bound in identical bindings that are probably original,⁴ they are clearly a set. Before it came to Van Lith, this collection was in the possession of Joannes Henricus de Groot,⁵ whose name appears in three volumes.⁶ It is unknown to me whether De Groot had any connection with the Crosiers in Uden, although that is possible given the fact that he was parochial vicar there from 1788 to 1793. During his appointment as parish priest of Dennenburg from 1806 to 1843 he certainly did have connections with Soeterbeeck in general and with Beckers personally. He attended Theresia Heijnen’s re-election and silver jubilee as prioress on 3 February 1807,⁷ and in Beckers’ will of 8 July 1810, he is said to owe the rector three hundred guilders. After Beckers’ death, this sum should be distributed evenly among the poor of Deursen and Dennenburg, in return for which annual Masses should be said in Dennenburg for the repose of Prioress Heijnen and in Deursen for Beckers and his family.⁸ In addition, Sister Joanna de Jong lived at De Groot’s presbytery for four months after Soeterbeeck died there on 30 September 1865 (Schutjes 1870, 4: 657; 5: 944; Verreyaert 1919, 178; Scheerder 1976, 35, 42).

There is no reason to assume the books were ever rebound, and given that Beckers left one ownership note per volume (see p. 241 n. 9 and Table 5:4) the composite books must already have been bound together in his days.

¹ The exception is LCSA, A-0706. The Uden provenance of this book was confirmed by Otto Lankhorst, librarian of the ENK, in private communication with the author on 12 April 2013.
² Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 291-293; Heere 1948, 56. Roefen was officiant of Boekel from 1800 to 1814 and taught the humanities in Uden for twenty-five years. He was responsible for compiling the liturgical directory for the districts and apostolic vicariate of Ravenstein and Megen for 46 years, and was appointed parish priest of Boekel from 1814 onwards. In 1848 he resigned, and he died in Boekel on 8 October 1852.
³ Van Lith was born in Oss on 8 June 1804, ordained in Münster in 1828, appointed parochial vicar of Kaatsheuvel in 1831, and of Woensel in 1834. He became a Crosier and was invested in Uden on 9 October 1844, made his solemn profession in 1845 and died there on 30 September 1865 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 4: 657; 5: 944; Verreyaert 1919, 178; Scheerder 1976, 35, 42).
⁴ There is no reason to assume the books were ever rebound, and given that Beckers left one ownership note per volume (see p. 241 n. 9 and Table 5:4) the composite books must already have been bound together in his days.
⁵ De Groot was born in Herpen. Besides the appointments mentioned here, he served as parochial vicar of Schaijk from 1793 to 1806. He died on 20 December 1844 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 420; 5: 633).
⁶ LCSA, B-3364 (1), B-3364 (2) and B-3369 (1).
⁷ ASP 4, f. 15b.
⁸ CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 8 July 1810.
⁹ ASP 4, p. 21a; ASP 129, p. 13. On De Jong, see Appendix A.1, no. 4.
possible and even likely that the latter personally gave or sold him his set of Biroat, but it is not known how these books subsequently came into possession of Van Lith.

There is one more person to be considered in relation to Beckers’ personal library, although his name appears in none of the books that are known to have belonged to it. This is Joseph van Dongen, parish priest of Deursen from 1793 to 1810, whom Beckers mentioned in his will, where it is written: *Mijne boeken hebbe ik aan den heer pastor van Deursen uit de hand verkogt.* Technically speaking, this sentence could also refer to Laurentius Giebels, who succeeded Van Dongen on an unknown date in the year that Beckers’ will was drawn up, but his predecessor is much the likelier candidate. Van Dongen presided over Heijnen’s re-election as prioress on 3 February 1807, so there were ties between him and Soeterbeeck which Giebels could not yet have formed. Nothing more is known with certainty about the number or nature of the books that Beckers sold the parish priest, or about where they ended up. Van Dongen’s biography provides an interesting coincidence, however. After his resignation, he moved to Uden, where he had obtained the benefice of the chapel of Onze-Lieve-Vrouw ter Linde in 1785. This benefice was produced, and the chapel officiated, by the Crosiers, in whose library the books discussed in this paragraph eventually wound up. This is probably just happenstance, however, for in the absence of ownership notes with Van Dongen’s name, there is no concrete evidence that any of these books were part of the sale referred to in Beckers’ will. Of course, it is possible that Van Dongen bought the works of Texier, in which no ownership notes at all appear besides Beckers’, or that he is the missing link between Beckers and Roeffen. However, there is no evidence at all for the first possibility and the second would mean that the *Batavia sacra* changed hands very shortly after Beckers’ death. It is probably better, therefore, not to identify Beckers’ books in the library of Sint Aegten with those which he sold to the parish priest of Deursen.

Only one more thing remains to be said about Beckers’ private book collection. Among the books in which he added the note *Soeterbeeck* are two that also came to Sint Agatha from Uden in 2009. Given the fact that so many of his personal books followed the same route, it is tempting to suppose that he had also appropriated these two. Copies of *Vijfthien catholicke sermooenen op de evangeliën der sondaghen van den vaster tot de H. Drijvvidicheyt* by the Jesuit Frans de Costere, and of Marcantonio Flamino’s *In librum Psalmorvm brevis explanatio*, these books would seem to fit a rector’s book collection well enough. However, there is no concrete evidence that Beckers ever personally owned them, and there are no traces of use in his hand besides the library marks, so that it is also possible that they came to Uden in an entirely different way than the books that have his name in them.

---

1 Van Dongen was born in Uden. Before his appointment in Deursen, he had served as parochial vicar in Schaijk from 1790 onwards. He died in Uden on 19 May 1833 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 436-437; 5: 633, 760).
2 ‘I sold my books to the parish priest of Deursen by private contract’, CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 8 July 1810. Apart from his books, Beckers also reports that he sold the parish priest of Deursen all the movable goods in his room, with the exception of his clothes, which were to be distributed among his brothers and the poor of Deursen and Dennenburg, and of his watch, which was to go to the oldest son of his brother Godefridus (on whom see Table 8, no. 8). The proceeds from this sale were probably part of the thousand guilders which Beckers directly bequeathed to Soeterbeeck, as Prioress Heijnen says in the *Memorie boeck* that these consisted partly of the revenue of *schoon meubels, het bed met syn toebehooren* (‘beautiful furniture, the bed and its appurtenances’, ASP 1).
3 Giebels was born in Velp, served as parochial vicar of Puijfflijk from 1767 to 1785, as parish priest of Zeeland from 1785 to 1810, and as parish priest of Deursen from 1810 until his death on 26 December 1828 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 437; 5: 501, 997).
4 ASP 4, f. 15b.
5 On the chapel of Our Lady of the Linden Tree and the Crosiers in Uden, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 759-764.
6 LCSA, A-0925 and C-0707. There is no library stamp of the Crosiers in C-0707, but Lankhorst confirmed the Uden provenance of this book as well (cf. p. 242 n. 1). Cf. Table 5.2.
5.7. Conclusion

This chapter portrayed Beckers as a spiritual director who entrusted books to four sisters for them to use in liturgical worship, to meditate on and to pray from, as a benefactor who donated a book to the community and wished to be remembered for it, as an administrator who occasionally acted in management of the general conventual book collection, as a user and producer of books who was occasionally involved in their material side, and as a reader who had books of his own. He was not Soeterbeeck’s librarian, but in his capacity as rector he was nonetheless occupied with the management of its library. In contrast to the activities discussed in the previous chapters, the ownership notes and library marks that were at the heart of this chapter are not concerned with the revision of the books’ contents, but with where they ended up and how they were used, and the extent of his concern deserves to be noted. The question of how it should be understood in light of Beckers’ other occupations belongs to the final chapter,\(^1\) but at present it is enough to simply add the library to the liturgy as another one of his fields of activity.

For although this ends my discussion of Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the historical library of Soeterbeeck, the sources of information which may aid me in my interpretation of it have not yet been depleted. All of the rector’s traces of production and use in books both from the Soeterbeeck Collection and from without it have been considered, but he left traces elsewhere too. In order to provide a broader context in which to better understand Beckers’ personal motivations for his activities in the liturgy and the library, and to arrive at a fuller picture of his active life in general, the next two chapters deal with his work on Soeterbeeck’s conventual archives and in the field of historiography.

\(^1\) See pp. 297-298, 304.
Supplio in obiduo ad electionem et confirmacionem. Nova Matre in conventu de Soelterbeek, prope Ravenstein,
Reverendissime ac Illustissima Domine,
Venerie Generalis!

Exponit humillimo cum Respectu, Solum Deiuis Relecti Conventi de Soelterbeek prope Ravenstein,
Mariae Theodori. Heijen, ante Triennium in Natione.
Dicti conventus electam et confirmatom ad limitatam officio sui terminum, parvisque, quae Religiosa, pro
Dicti Conventus Submissioni. Suppllicant, gratias
Illustissima Dignitati Vestrae. Amplissimum Dominum
Vam de Zinder, hujus Districtus Decanum, de
pro Bedem ulcione, nova. segetum, et simul
facultatem suae nomine. Illustissima Dignитati,
Suae electionem, hanc debito factum conferemann.e concede dignitati,
et interim attenta praedictarum Religiosarum spolia.
Fiscorum annuum bonorum, sanctitatis et immortalitatem
et eorum expansionem, nei non territat praeducta
facultatem, quo hoc calamitatis tempore non sunt
quattuor Illustissima Gratia, ut tua Sur-
ordinaria pro hae stam. Vnit reservare Dignitatem
quam gratiam nobis factam praebatur nostis
feminei confortum, qui nomine omnium Religio-
sarum, de milisimio cum Respectu perpetuit.
Chapter 6: Beckers’ Administrative Work

6.1. Introduction
In addition to the liturgy and the library of Soeterbeeck, Arnoldus Beckers also had another major occupation of which written traces survive: the convent’s current and archival administration. By working in this field, the rector encroached upon the territory of certain sisters in much the same way as he did with the librarian. The first of these was the procuratrix, who was responsible for the convent’s temporary affairs. In Beckers’ days, this office was occupied successively by Sisters Augustina Roefs, Theresia Heijnen, Agatha van Groenland and Aloysia Verkleij.\(^1\) What the precise division of labour was between these women on the one hand and the rector on the other is unclear, but that they worked together in some way is evident from the fact that the latter’s hand can be identified in several financial records, sometimes extensively. The second sister with whose office Beckers associated himself was the archivist. This duty is not defined in the statutes like that of the procuratrix,\(^2\) but that it existed as a recognised position is apparent from an obituary in the rector’s hand, which eulogises Sister Theresia Nouhuijs, who had died in 1799, as archivaria, fidelissima cooperatrix.\(^3\) This indicates that Beckers wished her to be remembered as the keeper of the archives, and, unless she aided him in another way, probably also that he appreciated her specifically for having collaborated with him in this capacity. Again, the exact nature of their cooperation is not clear and I have not been able to identify any concrete examples of it, but some traces certainly do survive of Beckers’ personal recordkeeping. There is more than enough material, then, to allow for this chapter to extend my overview of the rector’s activities beyond the limits of the library, to those whose functional dimension was more directly secretarial.

In contrast with the preceding chapters, this one is not intended to be strictly comprehensive, as exhaustiveness would necessitate an in-depth study of the entire conventual archives. Such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this study, whose primary focus is and remains on Beckers’ occupation with Soeterbeeck’s old books. However, in order to gain a fuller understanding of his rectorate, and because some of the archival sources shed light on his other activities, some attention must nonetheless be paid to Beckers’ administrative work. I therefore searched the inventory of the conventual archives for those pieces that could be expected to have been drawn up or kept up to date during his rectorate and during the years immediately surrounding it.\(^4\) This procedure revealed a considerable number of documents with notes by Beckers or otherwise associated with him, not all of which are considered in depth below. Instead, by discussing the most substantial ones and a certain number of representative examples, I hope to provide a general impression of Beckers’ activities as Soeterbeeck’s administrator.

I divide the traces which the rector left in the conventual archives according to their functional dimension. This results in four largely unrelated paragraphs, which deal in turn with various aspects of his work on certificates of authenticity of the convent’s collection of relics, a book with templates of letters in Latin that would come in handy for his successors, documents that treat of financial matters and various lists of names. As usual, I end this chapter by trying to identify the common denominator of Beckers’ archival activities.

\(^{1}\) On these sisters, see Appendix A.1, nos. 15, 7, 26, 32. All four eventually became prioress.
\(^{2}\) For the chapter on the procuratrix in the seventeenth-century statutes of Soeterbeeck, see Frenken 1931/32, 219-220.
\(^{3}\) ‘Archivist, most faithful coworker’ (ASP 129, p. 12). Nouhuijs also appears on Beckers’ list of sisters celebrating their jubilee in Mater 5, f. 4r as archivaria et fidelissima operatrix (‘archivist and most faithful worker’), which is probably a scribal error for cooperatrix. On Nouhuijs, see Appendix A.1, no. 13.
\(^{4}\) An inventory of the archives of Soeterbeeck was drawn up by Jef van Gils of the diocesan archives of ’s-Hertogenbosch in 2009.
6.2. Certificates of Authenticity, and a Privilege

It seems fitting to begin this chapter by discussing Beckers’ work in an area whose functional dimension touched immediately upon his liturgical interests: the conventual relics. Soeterbeeck owned a large number of these objects, judging from the sizeable pile of certificates of authenticity that is preserved in the archives.  

With one exception that will be discussed in time, the oldest of these documents are a group of fourteen that date from the eighteenth century, twelve of which bear a brief identifying note by Beckers on their back.  

The contents of these notes are almost all the same: they usually only mention the name, though occasionally also the class, of the saint whose relic the certificate pertains to, without identifying that object’s specific nature. Most of the relics were particles of bones, but there is also a certificate that went with several hairs of the Blessed Virgin, and this document is simply said to pertain to geautenticeerde reliquien van de H. maghet Maria, without any further information. The only notes that actually describe the objects referred to are those on the certificates of what are identified as relics of the kleet of Aloysius Gonzaga and the mantel of Joseph. This difference in treatment shows that, in addition to the identity of the saints whose remains are involved, the distinction between primary and secondary relics was also considered relevant by Beckers as he added his notes. Their functional meaning was to enable the general identification of the certificates’ contents when the documents were folded, and the distinction between corporeal and contact relics is obviously of more importance than that between the various kinds of body relics.

Beckers’ identification of the twelve certificates of authenticity seems first of all to have been part of an effort to put a specific section of the convent’s archives in order. That he was concerned with ordering all of the convent’s certificates rather than only with processing those of relics that were newly acquired during his rectorate is beyond doubt. With one exception, the twelve certificates identified in Beckers’ hand originally bore the dates on which the relics were authenticated, and revealed nothing about the moment these objects were acquired by Soeterbeeck. However, there is, in many cases, an additional source of information.

The exception just mentioned is a certificate of relics of Peter and Paul, Aloysius Gonzaga, Alexius of Rome and Hatebrand of Oudenklooster, dated 3 August 1750. This document is atypical because it is in fact not a certificate at all but a letter, in French, by the Jesuit Martin Jacquemin to the diocese of Liège. In it, father recounts how the original certificates of these relics, which dated from 1734, were inadvertently burned. The purpose of his writing is to testify to the relics’ authenticity and to request permission for their public veneration at Soeterbeeck. A note added to this document in the name of Vicar General Edmond-Sébastien-Joseph de Stoupy by Pierre-Louis Jacquet, titular bishop of Hippo and suffragan of Liège, shows that permission was granted on 14 August.

Similar notes by or in the name of the vicar general of Liège that authorise the public veneration of relics at Soeterbeeck, appear on five more certificates, and all of these are dated before 1772. The relics to which these documents pertain, then, were already in the convent’s

---

1 ASP 250.
2 See p. 250.
3 For an overview of the certificates identified by Beckers, see Table 6.
4 ‘Authenticated relics of the Blessed Virgin Mary’ (ASP 250, certificate dated 21 May 1736).
5 ‘Undergarment […] cloak’ (ASP 250, certificates dated 12 June 1743 and 18 March 1750). The words translate the Latin vestis interioris and pallium of the certificates themselves.
6 On De Stoupy, see Poncelet 1939, 52. On Jacquet, see De Blankart 1888/89.
7 These are the certificates of the relics of the Blessed Virgin, authorised for public veneration at Soeterbeeck on 13 May 1748, and those of Paschal Baylon, Catherine of Alexandria, the undergarment of Aloysius Gonzaga and the cloak of Joseph, all four authorised for veneration on 16 November 1751. The vicar general of Liège at the time of both of these occasions was De Stoupy (1747-1764).
possession before Beckers became rector, showing that by adding his notes to them he was putting in order certificates that were already there rather than marking the moment of their acquisition. Of the remaining six documents that have been identified by Beckers, none bear notes on the relics’ veneration at Soeterbeek, and that makes it impossible to be certain that they had been acquired before his rectorate. This is very well possible, however, given the fact that the certificates themselves all date from the 1730s, ‘40s and ’50s, except in one case. This exception is a particle of the bones of Donatus of Münstereifel, whose certificate of authenticity is dated 7 September 1773. Beckers personally requested the authorisation of this relic’s public veneration at Soeterbeek in a letter to Vicar General Marie-Philippe-Alexandre-Charles-Hyacinthe, count of Rougrave, dated 4 March 1778. The request was granted seven days later and a note to this effect was added on the letter, which was returned to the convent and is still preserved among the certificates of authenticity.

Beckers’ letter concerning the relic of Donatus is in fact the latest dated document concerning the relics on which his hand appears, even though the convent may have acquired two more relics during his rectorate. The first of these, a relic of the bones of Louis IX of France, was accompanied by a certificate, dated 25 August 1780, that bears a note by Albert Lejeune, vicar general of the districts of Ravenstein and Megen, approving their public veneration on 3 October 1802. Although Soeterbeek is not mentioned anywhere on this document, it is possible that the convent was already the relic’s owner in 1802 and that Beckers had requested permission for its veneration, in much the same way as he had done with the particle of Donatus. The second relic that does not bear a note by Beckers but which may already have been in Soeterbeek’s possession in his lifetime is of the bones of Eligius of Noyon, whose certificate is dated 6 January 1789. There are no later notes on this document, so it is entirely unknown when the relic was acquired by Soeterbeek, but given the moment of its authentification it is not impossible that this happened during Beckers’ rectorate.

If the relics of Louis and Eligius were indeed acquired before Beckers’ death, the absence of an identifying note on their certificates may be explained by the likelihood that his work on this type of documents was strictly limited along its temporal dimension. The identification of the twelve certificates would only have taken a few minutes if carried out all at once, and it was therefore probably limited to a single occasion.

A hint of what this occasion may have been is provided by a manuscript that is discussed in greater detail below: a collection of templates for letters to the vicar general of Liège entitled Suppliciae ad vicarium generalem Leodiensem, which Beckers probably compiled between 1789 and 1791. The volume’s table of contents does not only list the letters, however, but also a text de nostris reliquis. Sadly, the folium on which this text began and the one after that have been removed at some point and are nowhere to be found. This means that it is impossible to be certain of the exact nature of this part of the book and whether it consisted of anything more than just a list, but it seems fair to suppose that Beckers added his identificatory notes to the certificates in order to inventory the community’s relic collection in conjunction with and perhaps even in preparation for the writing of this text.

Supporting evidence for this conclusion is provided by the fact that the volume with the Suppliciae contains yet another text which is also associated with the certificates of authenticity in another way. Preserved among the latter is a copy of a bull dated 24 April 1789

\[\text{1} \text{On De Rougrave, see Poncelet 1939, 53-55.}\]
\[\text{2} \text{Lejeune was a former Carmelite. He served as vicar general of Ravenstein and Megen from 26 August 1802 to 1806, while living in the convent of Bethlehem in Haren from 1803 to 1804, and died in Sint-Truiden circa 1820 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 109 n. 2; Munier 1978, 77-80).}\]
\[\text{3} \text{ASP 3. For a detailed discussion of this book’s contents and date, see pp. 250-252.}\]
\[\text{4} \text{‘On our relics’ (ASP 3, unnumbered first page).}\]
\[\text{5} \text{ASP 3, pp. 17-20.}\]
by which Pope Pius VI annexed a plenary indulgence to one of the altars in Soeterbeeck’s chapel, in favour of every sister, relative, friend or benefactor for whose repose a Requiem Mass was celebrated at that particular altar. A note added on 30 September of the same year says that Vicar General De Rougrave of Liège assigned this indulgence to the high altar, and Beckers used the back of the document to identify it as pertaining to the *summum altare privilegiatum*, treating it in exactly the same way as the certificates of authenticity among which it is preserved. In this light, it is significant that the book with *Supplicae* in which Beckers wrote his now-lost text on the community’s relics also contains a copy, in his hand, of this bull, prefaced by a note saying that the privilege had been procured, free of charge, by Honorius Voet of Ravenstein, custodian of the Capuchin custody of the Most Holy Trinity. The fact that the certificates and the privilege were given the same type of identifying notes, have been preserved in the same file, and were both used in the book containing the *Supplicae* suggests that they were all processed simultaneously, and inventoried in preparation for the compilation of that volume.

Before going on to discuss the *Supplicae* in more detail, I should round off this section by mentioning that in Beckers’ days, Soeterbeeck owned at least two more sets of relics in addition to the fourteen discussed above. One of these was a reliquary containing particles of the True Cross and the crown of thorns, which is believed to have been brought along by Sister Catharina van Pollaert from the convent of Hooidonk near Nederwetten when she moved to Soeterbeeck in 1650. No certificate of authenticity is extant for this particular shrine, which was acquired by the family Smits van Oyen in the nineteenth century and returned to Soeterbeeck in 1979. Such a document does exist, however, for another set of relics. These consist of bones of Ursula’s virgin companions, and a charter dated 12 February 1589 survives among Soeterbeeck’s certificates of authenticity that says they had been given by the convent of St Maximin in Cologne to the convent of Mariënhage in Woensel. These relics presumably ended up in Soeterbeeck via one of its rectors and were certainly there in Beckers’ days, because the proper of saints in his Dutch diurnal IV 58 lists the feast of Ursula and her companions (21 October) as a lesser double rather than a commemoration, a rank which can only be explained by the presence of these relics. The reason why Beckers did not add an identificatory note to the charter pertaining to these relics—the only surviving certificate of authenticity predating 1772 for which he did not do so—is that it already bore one on its back in a clear hand from the seventeenth century.

### 6.3. *Supplicae ad vicarium generalem Leodiensem*

I now turn, as promised, to the volume that Beckers produced with a collection of templates for letters to the vicar general of the diocese of Liège for various occasions, entitled the *Supplicae ad vicarium generalem Leodiensem* in the table of contents on its unnumbered first page. This table asserts that the compilation was made *pro commodo rectoris*, and its intended function was clearly to save Beckers’ successors the trouble of composing similar

---

1 ‘Privileged high altar’ (ASP 250, certificate dated 24 April 1789).
2 ASP 3, pp. 16-17. As noted, p. 17 has been removed, but the bull’s text breaks off in mid-sentence at the bottom of p. 16 and must therefore have been carried on onto the next page.
3 Voet was born in Ravenstein circa 1737, invested on 12 August 1760 and ordained to the priesthood in Antwerp on 16 June 1764. He served as guardian of the convent in Velp from 1779 to 1782, of that in Geldern from 1783 to 1785, and of that in Hasselt from 1787 to 1788. He was elected custodian of the custody of the Most Holy Trinity in 1788 and again in 1794, and died in Velp on 4 July 1810 (Hildebrand 1945-1956, 5: 398, 410, 444; 6: 569; 7: 358; no. 2498).
4 On the shrine and its history, see ASP 502; Frenken 1931/32, 289; Peijnenburg 1982a, 40-41; Melssen 1994, 157; Koldewey 2011, 39-40.
6 ‘For the rector’s convenience’ (ASP 3, table of contents).
letters for themselves. The templates are contained in a thick volume that is bound in parchment over cardboard, with two pairs of leather ties and red sprinkled edges. The contents of this book are as follows:

pp. 1-2: a letter, dated 28 October 1788 and composed in Latin, in which Beckers requests permission for Joannes Wilhelmus van der Linden, dean of the district of Ravenstein,\(^1\) to preside at the re-election of Prioress Theresia Heijnen (1783-1822). According to the table of contents, this was intended to be a template for the occasion of a prioress’ triennial confirmation in the case of re-election. This is exactly what was going on in the case of Prioress Heijnen, who had first been first elected to the priorate on 9 October 1782 and in 1788 embarked upon her third term. The letter’s own header actually identifies it as being meant for the election and confirmation of a new prioress (Figure 6), because in case a sister was elected who had not been prioress before, it would of course have been possible to simply leave out the phrases referring to Heijnen’s earlier election. The letter is followed by two notes, also in Latin and in Beckers’ hand, on Heijnen’s re-elections in 1788 and 1791.

pp. 3-4: originally blank, except for the page numbers\(^2\)

p. 5: a template, in Latin, for a letter to be sent by the rector, requesting permission for an official, for example Van der Linden, to preside at the election of a new prioress on the occasion of the former’s death

p. 6: blank, except for the page number

p. 7: a template, in Latin, for a letter to be sent by the rector, requesting permission for himself or another official, for example Van der Linden, to preside at the investment of one or more sisters\(^3\)

p. 8: blank, except for the page number

p. 9: a template, in Latin, for a letter to be sent by the rector, requesting permission for an official, for example Van der Linden, to preside at the profession of one or more choir sisters\(^4\)

p. 10: blank, except for the page number

p. 11: a template, in Latin, for a letter to be sent by the rector, requesting permission for an official to preside at the simultaneous investment and profession of a group of sisters

p. 12: blank, except for the page number

p. 13: a template, in Latin, for a letter to be sent by the rector, requesting permission for the triennial renewal of the appointment of an extraordinary confessor, for example Arnoldus Voet,\(^5\) signed also by the prioress, for example Heijnen

p. 14: blank, except for the page number

p. 15: a template, in French, for a letter to be sent by the prioress, for example Heijnen, requesting permission for the triennial renewal of the appointment of the ordinary confessor, that is, the rector, for instance Beckers

pp. 16-17: a copy of a bull of Pope Pius VI, obtained for the convent by Honorius Voet in 1789, granting a plenary indulgence to any sister, relative, friend or benefactor for whom a Requiem

---

\(^1\) Van der Linden was parochial vicar of Boekel from 1734 until he was appointed parish priest of Deursen in 1736. He became dean of Ravenstein in 1772, and remained so until his death on 21 December 1792 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 3: 34, 292, 436). Schutjes actually gives 1762 as the year of his death, but that is obviously a typographical error; Van der Linden was succeeded by Joseph van Dongen (on whom see p. 243) in 1793. A charter confirming the former’s appointment as the person to preside at the election of Soeterbeeck’s prioress and the other officials in 1791 survives as ASP 139.

\(^2\) On the texts which these pages now bear, see pp. 252-253.

\(^3\) The Windesheim constitutions of 1639 (on which see p. 68 n. 7) stipulate on pp. 174-175, par. 5 that rectors of women’s convents may invest sisters if they acquire special permission to do so and if the commissioner is prevented from doing it himself.

\(^4\) Notice that the rector is not mentioned as a possible candidate for this appointment. This is in accordance with the Windesheim constitutions of 1639, which stipulate on p. 175, par. 5 that a rector can never preside at a profession.

\(^5\) Voet was born in Ravenstein, and was professor of the grammar school there from 1762 to 1766, parochial vicar from 1766 to 1772 and parish priest from 1772 until his death in 1811 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 530, 532, 536).
Mass is said by any priest at an altar in the chapel of Soeterbeeck that is to be appointed for this purpose by the ordinary.\footnote{On Voet, the privilege and the document from which this text was copied, see pp. 249-250.}

pp. 17-20: These pages have been removed. According to the table of contents, p. 17 included not only the continuation of the papal bull but also (the beginning of) a text de nostris reliquis.\footnote{On our relics’ (ASP 3, unnumbered first page).} pp. 21-41: originally all blank, except for the page numbers.\footnote{On the texts which these pages now bear, see p. 253.}

The rest of the volume—its majority—is blank, although the remains of at least two cut-out endpapers at the back have writing on them in an unidentified hand, upside down.

That the letters in this book are addressed to the vicar general of Liège, who during most of Beckers’ rectorate was Marie-Philippe-Alexandre-Charles-Hyacinthe de Rougrave (1768-1802), is due to the fact that Soeterbeeck was not exempt. If the convent had been a member of Windesheim, permission for the appointment of the prioress, the rector and the extraordinary confessors and for the investment and profession of sisters would probably have been requested of that congregation’s commissioner for the Netherlands.

The temporal dimension of the traces of Beckers’ production of this book can be determined with a fair degree of precision. The first letter is dated, to 1788. None of the other templates are, but the one asking for renewal of the rector’s appointment does give some other specifics by way of example and says that Beckers had already served the community for 16 years, dating it to the second half of 1788 or the first half of 1789. That last year is also that in which Voet acquired the papal bull whose text is given on p. 16. None of these years actually provide a firm date for the writing of this book, as Beckers may simply have copied documents that he had already prepared at an earlier date, but they do present a terminus post quem. The book will also not have been written after 1791, as that is the year mentioned in Beckers’ second note on Heijnen’s re-election on p. 2, which, judging from the ink and the script, must have been added at a later date. Assuming that, with the single exception of this note, the book was written by Beckers in one go or at least over a limited period of time, it seems likely that this happened somewhere between 1789 and 1791. This is confirmed by the fact that Van der Linden, the dean of Ravenstein who is mentioned in several of the letters, died on 21 December 1792; Beckers would hardly have referred to him even in a book of templates if he were no longer alive.\footnote{The other persons whom Beckers mentions, Heijnen and Voet, both survived him (see Appendix A.1, no. 7 and p. 251 n. 5), and the districts of Ravenstein and Megen continued to be a part of the diocese of Liège until 1801 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 109), so neither of these circumstances narrows the window of time during which Beckers could have compiled ASP 3.}

As was argued above, Beckers compiled this collection of letters for the benefit of later rectors, and there are indications that it was indeed used by his successors. On p. 2, underneath Beckers’ notes on Heijnen’s re-elections, Rector Joannes van den Broek (1811-1842) left similar notes on the election of Aloysia Verkleij as prioress and Magdalena Verhoeven as subprioress in 1822,\footnote{On Van den Broek, see p. 48 n. 2. On Verhoeven, see Appendix A.1, no. 31.} and the election of Verhoeven as prioress and Josepha van den Broek as subprioress in 1840.\footnote{On Van den Broek, see Appendix A.1, no. 19.} An unidentified hand that probably belonged to Rector Johannes van de Laar (1848-1857) filled the page with an entry on the re-election of Prioress Verhoeven in 1843.\footnote{The same hand wrote the entry for Magdalena Verhoeven in Mater 5, f. 4v, on which see p. 220 n. 7. On Van de Laar, see p. 88 n. 2.} On the next page, Rector Van den Broek provided a description, in Latin, of the ritual for the election of a new prioress. On p. 4, he left notes on the appointment...
as extraordinary confessor of Andreas van Wielick, parish priest of Ravenstein,¹ in 1829, and of Antonius Verkuijlen, parish priest of Huisseling,² in 1841. These were followed by entries on the appointment as rector of Henricus de Bruijn in 1842,³ and of Joannes Schraven in 1844,⁴ in the hand that is probably Van Laar’s. At the back of the book, Rector Antonius van der Heijden (1857-1862) used pp. 27-31 and 33 to write down overviews of the convent’s monetary capital and immovable property.⁵ The fact that all of these men used Beckers’ book to write information like this down in shows that they were aware of its existence and probably also indicates that they made use of its contents.

An example of an occasion when Beckers used one of his own templates survives in a letter dated 11 June 1809. At that moment it was already several years since the diocese of Liège had been dissolved,⁶ and so the document is addressed to Arnoldus Borret, who had been commissioner general of the districts of Ravenstein and Megen since 1806.⁷ In it, Beckers asks for permission to invest Sisters Lucia Daamen and Johanna van Iersel,⁸ and Borret granted this request on 14 June. He made a note to this effect on the letter and returned the document, which is currently kept between two unnumbered folia at the back of the volume that contains the first version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck.⁹ Comparing the actual letter with the template, only immaterial differences turn up, most of which can be explained from the fact that Borret was familiar with Soeterbeeck and lived in the neighbourhood.¹⁰

Besides the Supplicae themselves, the book originally also included a copy of the bull on the privileged high altar and a text on the convent’s relics. As the bull dates from the same year as the letter asking for the renewal of Beckers’ appointment as rector, the inclusion of this item and the one on the relics must have taken place during the collection’s initial compilation rather than at a later stage, and was probably an integral part of Beckers’ original plan for the book. The combination of templates for letters with texts on privileges and relics is easily explained from the book’s purpose as a handbook for the rectors, to whom

¹ Van Wielick was born in Ravenstein. He became parochial vicar there in 1801 and parish priest in 1811. In 1841 he relinquished his position, and he died on 3 April 1862 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 5: 530, 532). On the office of extraordinary confessor as described in the seventeenth-century statutes of Soeterbeeck, see Frenken 1931/32, 277, 282.
² Verkuijlen was born in Uden on 3 November 1791. He was parochial vicar of Reek from 1816 until 1824, when he was appointed parish priest of Huisseling. He died on 4 December 1869 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 4: 646; 5: 541).
³ On De Bruijn, see p. 279 n. 4.
⁴ Schraven was born in Sint-Hubert on 13 December 1799, served as rector of Soeterbeeck from 1844 to 1848 and died on 4 October 1861 (Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 7).
⁵ Van der Heijden identifies himself on p. 29, where he writes that he was appointed rector in 1857. For the rest of his biography, see p. 93 n. 7.
⁷ Borret was born in Ravenstein on 26 May 1751. He was parish priest of Haren when he was appointed commissioner general of the districts Ravenstein and Megen on 14 March 1806, and became vicar apostolic of the vicariate of the same name on 12 June 1831. He died on 26 April 1839 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 109-110; 3: 34; 4: 44; 5: 540; Munier 1991, 95-96). He had previously ratified the re-election of Theresia Heijnen as prioress on 3 February 1807 (ASP 4, pp. 10a, 15b). From 1792 to 1830 he kept a diary in which Soeterbeeck is also mentioned (De Stuers 1889, 45-46).
⁸ On Daamen and Van Iersel, see Appendix A.1, nos. 3 and 27.
⁹ ASP 45.
¹⁰ Changes to the template which can be explained by the fact that Borret knew Soeterbeeck are the letter’s omission of the phrase prope Ravenstein (‘near Ravenstein’) to identify the convent’s location, the substitution of habitum nostrum (‘our habit’) for habitum ordinis S.P.N. Augustini (‘the habit of the order of our holy father Augustine’), and the fact that it asks for Borret to in persona examinare (‘personally examine’) the sisters if he does not want to allow Beckers to do so, rather than to send a representative such as Van der Linden (who had died). The only other difference is that the letter never calls Borret illustrissimus (‘most illustrious’), a form of address which the template uses systematically.
information on the privileged altar and on the relics and their authorisation for public veneration would be highly relevant. In fact, the large number of empty pages following the final item suggests that the collection is far from complete, and if that is true it was probably meant to include more information concerning the convent’s privileges and indulgences. For reasons that are unknown, however, Beckers appears to have abandoned the book before these were included, and although the conventual archives include several indulgences, he appears not to have been concerned with a single one of them.

Despite its incompleteness, however, the essentially composite nature of the book with the *Supplicae* is clear enough for the collection’s set-up as a comprehensive handbook for rectors to shine through. It was envisioned to contain not only handy templates of letters, but many more pieces of information that were worth knowing for the sisters’ director. There is, furthermore, a strongly commemorative element to it all that was undoubtedly intentional. A retrospective tendency is inherent in the book’s compilatory nature, and it is made explicit by the overview of various elections and appointments that was continued until the middle of the nineteenth century. Commemoration may even have been one of Beckers’ considerations when he decided to include an actual letter and incorporate several names in some of his templates. These elements serve as examples but also as monuments to Prioress Heijnen, Dean Van der Linden, both Fathers Voet, and, of course, himself. Of course, administration is always about the preservation of information and memory, but it is worth marking that the rector went beyond the purely practical in this case.

### 6.4. Financial Administration

The administrative efforts made by Beckers that I have discussed so far were, restricted to a very specific part of the conventual archives and all related to the compilation of a rectors’ handbook. However, he also worked on other types of files and was involved with the archives in other contexts and at other moments as well. Turning to the purely financial documents, we find that he dealt with many of these also, and in much the same way as with the certificates of authenticity, that is, by writing brief identifying statements on the back so that they could be easily identified when subsequently filed away. I have found no evidence that he attempted to inventory the checks and notarial acts in the same way as the relics; all he seems to have done is to process some of those that came in during his own rectorate. Documents which Beckers identified in this way include the bills for a new shed that had been built in 1784, the receipt of a payment to Sister Francisca Lips in 1785, and the acknowledgement of a debt that the mayors of Deursen and Dennenburg had contracted with Soeterbeeck in 1795 and settled in 1809. Beckers’ identifying notes do not by any means appear on all documents that were filed away during his rectorate, but some appear to have drawn his attention.

In most cases, Beckers’ notes are more than just identifying statements, however. For instance, on the back of a copy of a notarial act signed by Guilhelmus Josephus Leerse on 24

---

1. ASP 199-ASP 202, ASP 204.
2. There is one minor exception: on the back of a document granting an indulgence to the Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, dated 22 February 1766 and preserved in ASP 202, Beckers wrote: *Nro. 6io* (‘No. 6’). See below for a document similarly numbered. I do not know what these numbers refer to; these are the only two instances I have encountered, so they do not seem to be part of an attempt at inventorying the entire archives. On the fraternity and the indulgence, see pp. 259-260.
3. ASP 460. Beckers identified this document as *Nro. 2do* (‘No. 2’). See above for a document that has been similarly numbered. On the shed, see ASP 4, p. 5b; ASP 45, 1: pp. 27-28.
4. ASP 777. On Lips, see Appendix A.1, no. 11.
5. ASP 778.
6. Notes by Beckers are absent, for instance, on ASP 440, 441, 616, 671, 780, 789, 790 and 800.
June 1784, concerning a bond on the ban mills of Brussels for the benefit of Soeterbeeck, the rector wrote:

Deese scrifte sijn van ons capitaal tot Brussel ad 4000 gulden, die hebben gestaan op de bandmeulens derselve stadt, en verkoght aan juffrouw Moreti tot Antwerpen in julio 1785.¹

Rather than simply describing the contents of the act, Beckers also provided an update on what happened to the bond. After it had been settled, the document describing it could be filed away in the archives, and that is what must have occasioned his note.

The archives harbour several more examples of Beckers filing away administrative documents that were no longer relevant. For example, on the back of an act specifying that Petrus van Altvorst of Megen borrowed five hundred guilders of the convent, he wrote a statement, signed by Prioress Heijnen, that the loan had been duly repaid with interest on 1 December 1797.² Similarly, on the back of a document dated 17 February 1803 and specifying that Peter Janse, labourer at Soeterbeeck,³ owed a certain Antoni Tappers six hundred guilders, the rector wrote that the sum had been paid with interest on 22 March 1804.⁴ These notes indicate that he was aware of and actively engaged in the management and settlement of the convent’s financial interests.

That Beckers was involved in the sisters’ finances is even more clearly apparent from the fact that there were also occasions on which he personally drew up documents that had to do with monetary affairs. One of these documents written by the rector himself is the will of Wilhelmina Hendriks, the mother of Sister Barbara Teunissen,⁵ which is dated 6 July 1790 and specifies that her daughter would receive part of her inheritance. The rector expanded upon this on 9 December 1803 by adding a statement on the same document, signed by Barbara’s brother-in-law, Franciscus Teerlingh, to the effect that the latter had agreed to pay her portion to the convent with interest.⁶

Another, similar example of Beckers’ involvement in the sisters’ financial affairs is the copy that he made of a notarial act, dated 29 November 1792, concerning an agreement that had been reached between Prioress Heijnen and a certain Toon Jacobs with reference to a dispute between him and Soeterbeeck over the heritage of one Hendrik Janssen. The copy itself was collated with the original by public notary G.J.D. Peters of Reek on 28 December 1793.⁷

On the same day, this notary also authenticated a copy that Beckers had made of a warrant that had been issued on 21 February 1758 by Charles Theodore, Elector of Bavaria, to the government of Ravenstein, in which these were asked for advice concerning a request made by Soeterbeeck puncto acquisitionis immobilium.⁸ The convent had applied for permission to buy more pieces of land,⁹ and the Elector’s appeal for more information must have been an important step towards getting it. The existence of a copy of his warrant suggests that Charles Theodore eventually gave a favourable answer, although this is not certain. The archives of Soeterbeeck do not contain any more sources on this topic, or any evidence that the convent actually bought any more immovable property before the Elector’s

¹ These writings pertain to our bond of 4000 guilders at Brussels, that was on the ban mills in the same city and sold to Miss Moreti of Antwerp in July 1785 (ASP 669). Nothing more is known about Soeterbeeck’s relationship with Moreti.
² ASP 779.
³ Janse is identified as ons knecht (‘our helper’) in a note on a folder containing more of his bonds (ASP 671).
⁴ ASP 706.
⁵ On Teunissen, see Appendix A.2, no. 13.
⁶ ASP 704.
⁷ ASP 752.
⁸ Concerning the matter of the acquisition of immovable goods (ASP 400). Another copy in another hand, and without a date or an authentification, survives in the same file as Beckers’.
reign of Ravenstein came to an end with the coming of the French in 1794.1 The circumstances which occasioned Beckers to copy the notarial act of 1792 and the Elector’s warrant of 1758 are equally mysterious, but his copies do show that he was actively involved in protecting and trying to improve the community’s material welfare.

A final example on this scale occurs in the convent’s memorial book, which is entitled Memorie boeck sedert het jaer 1716 and was begun by Beckers’ predecessor, Rector Henricus Erckens (1749-1772).2 On one of its unnumbered pages, Beckers left an entry dated 14 October 1788, in which he reports on a decision made in the convent’s chapter the day before about what should happen to a sister’s money after her death. It was decided that, if she left a considerable sum, half of it should be spent on Masses for her soul’s repose, starting with the thirty-three Masses which the sisters had already been accustomed to have said for their deceased. The other half of the sister’s legacy should be devised equally between the procuratrix, who could put it to everyday use, and the safe. A sister who died without leaving any money to speak of would still have her thirty-three Masses. This course of action having been described, Beckers added his signature to the entry and had it signed by Prioress Heijnen, Subprioress Elisabeth Verstraeten,3 Procuratrix Agatha van Groenland and four other sisters, presumably the council sisters (Figure 3.3).4

It will be clear by now that there are many notes and documents which testify to Beckers’ engagement in the convent’s financial administration, but more substantial evidence also exists. The archives of Soeterbeeck contain four eighteenth-century registers of interests received by Soeterbeeck, in three of which I have been able to identify Beckers’ hand.5 The oldest of these is the Register boeck van alle renten,6 which was set up by Rector Franciscus Nolmans (1744-1749) on 20 December 1745.7 Many of its pages have been cut out, but it originally consisted of two sections: one with a number of interests ranked according to place,8 for which Nolmans added a table of contents at the back,9 and one with interests ranked according to date.10 Because the second of these sections had remained largely empty, Beckers used part of it to add a third with the interests which Soeterbeeck had to pay itself.11 This final section was kept up to date in various hands from 1774 to 1812, and although the first one was also updated by various people, including Beckers, into the nineteenth century, the second one, with the chronologically ranked interests, was entirely abandoned in 1782.12 The reason for this was that in that same year Beckers drew up a new version of this part of the register, which he added at the back of the book which also contains the first version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck.13 There it covers more than a hundred pages, and it has its own

---

1 Peijnenburg 1982a, 50.
2 ASP 1. On Erckens, see p. 100 n. 4. On his hand, see p. 162 and Figure 3.2.
3 On Verstraeten, see Appendix A.1, no. 33.
4 The council sisters are Francisca Lips, Beckers’ fellow archivist Theresia Nouhuijs, Anna van den Boogart and Clara van den Heuvel (Appendix A.1, nos. 11, 13, 18 and 20).
5 The fourth register is ASP 662. This document, entitled simply Register des convents van Soeterbeeck, also dates to the eighteenth century, but it does not contain notes by Beckers.
6 ASP 667. The full title, written on the pastedown, is: Register boeck van alle renten, welke ons convent van Soeterbeeck na tot Deursen behooren naar de confiscatie onser huize door de heeren Staten van Holland, en dewelcke wij in Deursen sijnde de novo geacquireert hebben 1732, ende hier opgeschreven ende daer toe bequaam gemaakt anno 1745 20 10bris door mij fr. Franciscus Nolmans rect.
7 Nolmans was a canon regular of the convent of Sint-Elisabethsdal in Nunhem and served as rector of Soeterbeeck from 1744 until his death on 28 August 1749 (Van Dijk 1982d, 203, no. 2).
8 ASP 667, ff. 1r-48r. Of this section, only ff. 1-2 and 47-48 survive.
9 ASP 667, f. 92r.
10 ASP 667, ff. 48v-91v. Of this section, ff. 48 and 63-91 survive, although ff. 64-65 have been largely cut off.
11 ASP 667, ff. 81r-83v.
12 There is a single exception: on f. 48v appears a note for the year 1783.
pagination and table of contents. Curiously enough, however, Beckers appears not to have worked on this section at all anymore after its initial compilation, and the only person who occasionally updated the book was Prioress Heijne. Notes in her hand appear until 1798, but these updates were only incidental; a fact which is probably to be explained by the existence of yet another register. This one, which is also restricted to chronologically ordered interests and is entitled Register boeck van Soeterbeek, had been started by Rector Erckens in 1768, with the explicit purpose of replacing the second section of Nolmans’ register. The two registers were kept simultaneously for some time, however, and only after Beckers had set up his own in 1782 was the corresponding part of Nolmans’ book finally abandoned. For some reason, however, this did not happen with Erckens’ register, which continued to be updated regularly until 1814, also by Beckers.

The situation briefly outlined above poses several riddles that I am not able to solve. That Beckers should draw up a new register to replace that of Nolmans is not surprising, although his precise motivation for doing so, beyond the benefits inherent in a fresh start in a new book, eludes me. What is surprising, is the fact that he immediately abandoned it in favour of an older version. Equally mysterious are the rationale behind and indeed the very presence of Prioress Heijnen’s erratic updates, given that Erckens’ book was kept much more conscientiously and clearly continued to be the main register. These puzzles are less important for our present purpose, however, than the fact that the registers reveal something that was not apparent from the other documents discussed so far. They prove that Beckers regularly spent considerable amounts of time and energy on keeping the community’s books, and that he was occupied with the sisters’ financial administration in a systematic way.

6.5. Lists of Community and Fraternity Members

The systematicity that is displayed by Beckers’ engagement in the convent’s financial administration is also evident from the way in which he kept track of its inhabitants, benefactors and associates. He compiled multiple lists of names and biographical data, each with a specific purpose. One example of this that has already been discussed in the fourth chapter are his biographies of sisters who celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their investment, but the archives of Soeterbeek contain several more. Beckers diligently updated Soeterbeek’s book of benefactors, which had been set up in 1723 by Rector Joannes Verheijden (1705-1744). Beckers’ entries are consistently more elaborate than those of his predecessors, and they do not only consist of the names and dates of death of the benefactors or sisters who died in a given month of his rectorate, but usually also include summary biographical data. Beckers set a trend in this regard, for the biographies continued to expand until they became entire necrologies in the twentieth century.

More ambitiously than simply updating someone else’s surveys, Beckers also compiled a book of his own, consisting of several lists. In addition to a survey of Soeterbeek’s deceased sisters and pensioners, and an overview of the anniversaries that the

---

1 Heijnen’s hand can be identified because she signed Beckers’ entry in the Memorie boeck (ASP 1, entry for 14 October 1788; cf. Figure 3.3).
2 ASP 666. The title page reads: Register boeck van Soeterbeek nu tot Duersen Lande van Ravenstein van alle de renten en pachten, die het convent noch is besittende en gegaquireet hebbende, beginnende van den jaare 1768, sijnde ten eijnde het vorige register boeck beginnende van ’t jaar 1732. That this register was meant to replace Nolmans’ is evident not only from the title, but also from many in-text references to het vorige register boeck (‘the previous register’, e.g., p. 1).
3 Mater 5, ff. 3v-4r. See p. 216.
4 ASP 267. On Verheijden, see p. 100 n. 2.
5 ASP 129, pp. 11-24 (single columns). Beckers only covered pp. 11-13; the other pages have subsequently been covered by other people. Pp. 17-20 have been removed.
convent commemorated each month, this volume also contained lists of members of three fraternities: the Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, the Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity for the Redemption of the Captives, and the Sodality of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour in Munich.

Not much is known about these fraternities, or any others at Soeterbeeck, but what little there is may be outlined here for the light it sheds on what was clearly an important aspect of the convent’s devotional life. According to the definition provided by Joannes Pluijm, fraternities are canonically established communities that are associated with a particular church and subject to the ecclesiastical authorities, and serve to stimulate the devotion and charity of its members. Special privileges and indulgences attached to membership and devotional practices must have been their major attraction. Small fraternities were often affiliated with archconfraternities, as this enabled them to share in the indulgences that had been granted to the more prominent society. Most fraternities were open to faithful of both sexes, and Beckers’ lists have names of both men and women, including not only the sisters and rectors of Soeterbeeck, but also laypeople and religious from other convents.

Beckers’ list of the members of the Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration is headed by a note that the fraternity was founded on 20 January 1766 by Rector Eckens. There is no concrete evidence that there were fraternities at Soeterbeeck before this one. The remnants of the convent’s library include numerous seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century confraternity books, but none of these remarkably small volumes bear ownership marks of sisters from before Beckers’ rectorate. Rather than continuing a fully formed fraternity tradition, then, Beckers seems to have consolidated a nascent one. He was personally familiar with the phenomenon, for in 1761, the year of his profession at Gaesdonck, he had himself been enrolled in that convent’s Confraternity of the Seven Dolours of Mary, and he had kept the list of its members from 1764 up to and including 1771, the year before he moved to Deursen. He apparently decided to make use of and expand upon this experience at Soeterbeeck, and the extension of Beckers’ lists of the members of the original three fraternities show that these continued to thrive after his rectorate. The book in which his lists

---

1 ASP 129, p. 25 (double columns). P. 26 remains blank.
2 ASP 129, pp. 1-10 (single columns). Beckers only covered pp. 1-8; p. 9 has subsequently been covered by other people. P. 10 remains blank.
3 ASP 129, pp. 27-33 (double columns). Beckers only covered pp. 27-30; the other pages have subsequently been covered by other people.
4 ASP 129, pp. 34-38 (double columns). Beckers only covered pp. 34-37; the remaining page has subsequently been covered by other people.
5 On religious fraternities in the nineteenth century in general, see Oepen 2004; Leenders 2008, 917-943; Sluijter 2012. On their institutional aspects, see Beringer 1895, 496-576, 819-820; Pluijm 1911. A survey of the most important nineteenth-century fraternities in the Netherlands can be found in Verheijen 1874.
6 Pluijm 1911, 7.
7 Pluijm 1911, 9.
8 On ASP 129, p. 5, Beckers lists names of members of the convent of St Agatha in Uedem.
9 ASP 129, p. 1.
10 There are books of the Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament in the cathedral of Our Lady in Antwerp (III 135, III 136, V 232:1, V 233, V 234:1), the Holy Wounds of Jesus (V 227:2, V 232:11, V 243:1; cf. p. 112 n. 2), St Joseph in the church of St Saviour in Ghent (III 88:1), St Joseph in the church of the Discalced Carmelites in Antwerp (V 242:3), St Roch (III 221:5), the Son of God (V 132), Our Saviour Jesus Christ Dying on the Cross in the church of St Lucia in Ravenstein (III 148:2, III 149:2, III 150:2) and a blessed death (V 242:2). Also present are three books on the Annunciades (III 108, V 242:4-5). For books of fraternities established at Soeterbeeck in the nineteenth century, see below.
11 CAG, Monastic Archives, A 84, f. 23r-v.
were included was eventually also rebound and expanded with eight more fraternities, most of which were founded by Rector Cornelius van Gennip (1861-1871).

As indicated, the first of the three fraternities at Soeterbeeck with which Beckers was involved, the Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration, was founded by Erckens. A month later, on 22 February 1766, it was confirmed and affiliated with the archconfraternity of the same name in Liège, which had been confirmed by Pope Clement XIII on 4 December of the previous year. As its name suggests, the fraternity’s main activity consisted of adoring Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Members were enrolled by a qualified priest—in this case the rector of Soeterbeeck—and appointed a specific date and time when they were to adore the Sacrament for one hour every year. Beckers’ list records the members’ names per year of enrolment, each followed by the hour the person in question had chosen for the performance of his or her duty. This hour could later be changed, as is evident not only from the fact that several names appear on the list more than once, but also from Beckers’ note saying that den 3den juli 1788 hebben ons religieusen wederom getrooken. This probably indicates that the community of Soeterbeeck was collectively assigned a new hour during which to adore the Sacrament. Although this adoration could take place spiritually anywhere, a church was preferable, and it is likely that this meant going to the chapel of Soeterbeeck for most members of this particular fraternity, except for those who lived too far away. Among the latter were the sisters of the convent of St Agatha in Uedem, who had also been enrolled. In addition to several partial indulgences, members received a plenary indulgence at the moment of enrolment, on specific feasts, after their yearly hour of adoration, once a month on any other occasion when they adored the Sacrament for at least one hour, and at the moment of their death. According to a document in the archives of Soeterbeeck, the members of the fraternity at that convent could also earn a plenary indulgence if they adored the Sacrament on 4 July and 23 September. The Soeterbeeck Collection contains a copy of the Onderwysinge ende gebeden voor de gedurige aenbiddinge van het alderheyligste sacrament des autaers

1 These are the Confraternities of St Peter’s Pence (cf. Verheijen 1874, 50-52), the Sacred Heart of Jesus (cf. Verheijen 1874, 14-20; the Soeterbeeck Collection includes the following books of confraternities of the Sacred Heart: III 155, III 192:3-4, V 242:1), the Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Conversion of Sinners (cf. Verheijen 1874, 59-62), the Most Holy Rosary (cf. Verheijen 1874, 70-76; Soeterbeeck’s books of confraternities of the Rosary are III 221:2-3, V 239), the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, Health of the Sick (whose foundation is documented in ASP 211; cf. Verheijen 1874, 64-70), the Extirpation of Blasphemy (cf. Verheijen 1874, 47-50), the Mass of Reparation (the sisters’ enrolment in the archconfraternity is documented in ASP 213), and the Apostle of Prayer for the Sacred Heart of Jesus (the sisters’ enrolment is documented in ASP 212; cf. Verheijen 1874, 9-14). Also included in ASP 129 are copies of several nineteenth-century papal and episcopal resolutions regarding Soeterbeeck’s fraternities, indulgences and liturgical observances, and a copy of a document describing the installation of Stations of the Cross in the convent’s chapel by Vicar Apostolic Borret on 21 November 1838.

2 Van Gennip was born in Gestel en Blaarthem on 31 Mei 1827 and ordained to the priesthood on 5 June 1852. He was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1862 to 1871, and died on 17 January 1885 (Sluijters 1982b, 203-204, no. 10).

3 The name Beckers uses is Confraternitas Sanctissimi Sacramenti (‘Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament’, ASP 129, p. 1), but in the document which confirms the fraternity’s foundation it is referred to sub titulo Adorationis Perpetue Sanctissimi Sacramenti (‘under the title of the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament’, ASP 202, indulgence dated 22 February 1766).

4 ASP 202, indulgence dated 22 February 1766.

5 On this archconfraternity, see III 176, pp. 5-49; Verheijen 1874, 38-39.

6 On 3 July 1788 our sisters drew lots again (ASP 129, p. 5).

7 For evidence that Soeterbeeck’s chapel was open to people from outside the convent during Beckers’ rectorate, see pp. 96-97.

8 ASP 129, p. 5.

9 ASP 202, indulgence dated 22 February 1766.
The Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity was founded by Beckers in 1772, and confirmed on 21 February 1773. The rector of Soeterbeeck automatically functioned as its director. Beckers notes that he passed on the names of its members as of 23 July 1781 to the archconfraternity of the same name, which had been founded on 10 October 1642 by Gaspar Nemius, bishop of Antwerp. This fraternity originated within the Trinitarian Order, which had been founded in 1198 and combined a special devotion for the mystery of the Trinity with the express mission of freeing Christians who were held captive by non-Christians. The statutes of the archconfraternity reflect this dual charism, and stipulate that, in addition to being enrolled and wearing the fraternity’s scapular, members were to give alms for the release of Christian captives and say a daily prayer of six Our Fathers, six Hail Marys and the lesser doxology Gloria Patri for the intention of the extermination of heresy and the unity of Christendom. The conditions for obtaining indulgences differ from source to source.

The Soeterbeeck Collection contains a copy of ‘t Broederschap van de H. Drievuldigheyt (Antwerp: Gerardus Bloemen, 1724), which is a book containing the statutes of Nemius’ archconfraternity and various devotional texts in honour of the Trinity. The title page bears an ownership note of Sister Lips, but she does not appear on Beckers’ list of members.

---

1 III 176. On its front flyleaf, this book also bears an ownership note of Sister Antonia Peters, on whom see Sluijters 1982b, 186, no. 86. She does not appear on Beckers’ list or its continuations.

2 In 1788, Verstraeten’s turn came on 3 July, from 2 to 3 p.m. (ASP 129, p. 5, no. 109) and in 1789 (and presumably afterwards) on 2 February, from 9.30 to 10.30 a.m. (ASP 129, p. 6, no. 157).

3 Peters was born in Erp on 11 January 1808, entered Soeterbeeck as a choir sister on 18 January 1836, was invested on 4 February 1836 and professed on 10 December 1840, and died on 1 December 1866 (Sluijters 1982b, 186, no. 86).

4 See p. 234. III 135 bears an ownership note, in Beckers’ hand, of Constantia van Soelen, who does not appear on Beckers’ list of members (cf. Appendix A.1, no. 30); III 136 was owned by Antonetta Zelands (ASP 129, p. 6, no. 124; cf. Appendix A.2, no. 20); V 233 was owned by a sister Barbara, who may have been Barbara Teunissen (ASP 129, p. 6, no. 152; cf. Appendix A.2, no. 13); V 234:1 was owned by Francisca Lips (ASP 129, p. 5, no. 13).

5 Beckers uses the designation archiconfraternitas (‘archconfraternity’, ASP 129, p. 27), as does Van den Broek in his table of contents (ASP 129, front), but given the fact that the document in which the fraternity’s foundation is confirmed simply calls it a broederschap (‘fraternity’, ASP 129, between pp. 26 and 27), this is inaccurate. The subordinate status of Soeterbeeck’s fraternity is also evident from the fact that Beckers sent a list of its members to the archconfraternity in Antwerp (ASP 129, p. 28a).

6 ASP 129, document between pp. 26 and 27.

7 ASP 129, p. 27.

8 ASP 129, p. 28a. Apparently the archconfraternity obliged the directors of its branches to pass on the names of their members; a similar requirement was certainly in force for the sodality of Our Lady of Munich (V 243:3, f. A4r).

9 On this archconfraternity, see III 221:1, pp. 3-53; Beringer 1895, 576-581; Verheijen 1874, 109-113. On Nemius, see Fruytier 1930.

10 These are the rules as described in III 221:1, pp. 23-25. Verheijen 1874, 110-111 mentions only the enrolment and the scapular.

11 Cf. III 221:1, pp. 30-49; Verheijen 1874, 111-112.

12 III 221:1.
The Sodality of Fraternity of Our Lady of Munich was affiliated with the Confraternity of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour in Munich, founded in 1683 by Maximilian II, Elector of Bavaria, in honour of the Blessed Virgin’s assistance in breaking the Ottoman siege of Vienna.\(^1\) This archconfraternity was confirmed by Pope Innocent XI on 18 August of the next year.\(^2\) Lay members were enrolled by a qualified priest and said five decades of the rosary, with the Lord’s Prayer and a Hail Mary for deceased members, on feasts of the Blessed Virgin; priests also said a Mass for the dead members’ repose every year. A plenary indulgence was gained on the day of enrolment and at the hour of death. Although there is no documentation on this, Beckers must have founded this fraternity himself, as he lists no members before 8 December 1772. Among the remnants of Soeterbeeck’s library are three books with the statutes and devotional exercises of this fraternity: *Broederschap oft gemeenszaemheyt van devotie tot de H. maghet ende moeder Gods Maria* (Antwerp: widow of Joris Willemsens),\(^3\) and copies of two editions of the *Broederschaps boekjen, ofte uittreddelyk onderwys van de zeer profytyelyke en nutbaare broederschap der H. maget Maria* (Amsterdam: Gerardus van Bloemen and Rotterdam: Anthoni van Zwaamen).\(^4\) The first book is bound together with, among other things, a copy of *De devotie tot het H. Herte van onzen Heere Jesus Christus* (’s-Hertogenbosch: J. Scheffers), on the final page of which Sister Constantia van Oudenhoven wrote that she had been enrolled in the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus on 15 August 1808.\(^5\) If Van Oudenhoven also owned the book on the fraternity of Our Lady, it is noteworthy that her name does not appear on Beckers’ list of members or its continuations.

Beckers must have started collecting data for his book of lists from the moment he became rector, as it goes back to 1772 or, in the case of the Confraternity of Perpetual Adoration, even before. However, there can be no doubt that the lists themselves are fair copies of older documents, made at a later date. Not only is the script of the early parts far too tidy for the book to have been updated yearly from the beginning, but Beckers accidentally omitted an entry in the list of the dead, which he subsequently had to add back in at the bottom of the page.\(^6\) An error like this would not have been possible if he had been adding a name every time someone died. The year in which Beckers produced the copy that survives today cannot be identified with certainty, but it appears to have been 1788. That is the year in which the regularity of Beckers’ script is first interrupted, which would seem a clear sign that what follows is a later addition.\(^7\)

### 6.6. Conclusion

This chapter was an attempt at piecing together the traces which Rector Beckers left in the archives of Soeterbeeck, in order to see what they reveal of his work as one of the sisters’ administrators. The image that arises along their functional dimension is twofold, for his administrative activities concern both the community’s material and its spiritual welfare. The rector did some systematic bookkeeping and was involved in the convent’s financial transactions, but he also kept lists of deceased sisters, relatives and benefactors who needed to be remembered in the community’s prayers, and founded and directed three confraternities in

---

1 Beckers uses the designation *sodalitas* (‘sodality’, ASP 129, 34), whereas Rector Van den Broek uses *confraternitas* (‘confraternity’, ASP 129, front), but the terms are interchangeable.
2 On this confraternity, see Kronenburg 1904–1914, 8: 226-228; Verheijen 1874, 62-65.
3 III 192:1. This book also has a part with a separate title page, called *De Mariaensche weeck* (Antwerp: widow of Joris Willemsens).
4 V 232:3 and V 243:3, respectively. The edition of which V 232:3 is a copy also has a part with a separate title page, called *Weekelyke oeffeninge tot de H. maget Maria* (Amsterdam: Gerardus van Bloemen).
5 III 192:4. On Van Oudenhoven, see Appendix A.1, no. 28.
6 ASP 129, p. 11.
7 ASP 129, pp. 5-6, 12, 35a.
order to help their members earn indulgences. In some cases he began or updated lists and accounts that were and continued to be current, whereas in others he filed documents away into the archives. When it comes to the certificates of the relics and the privileged altar, this was probably done with an eye to preparing an inventory for a handbook for his successors that also had a clear commemorative function. Administrator and archivist, bookkeeper and spiritual director; Beckers’ traces in the archives show that he combined all of these roles.

It is difficult to say much more about the notes and documents that have been discussed in this chapter, let alone about the reality to which they refer. An evaluation of what little they reveal about Beckers’ relation to specific sisters, such as the prioress, the procuratrix and the archivist, must wait until Chapter 8. I lack the expertise to go more deeply into the conventual finances, and it seems impossible to pursue the topic of the relics and the confraternities any further. Just as I eschewed guessing at the devotional preferences or political convictions of the rector or his sisters on the basis of Beckers’ liturgical traces, and tried to explain these solely in the context of the strict mechanism of the liturgy, so, too, am I deeply hesitant about such symbolic interpretations of the archival material. It is tempting to extrapolate, but I do not think the material allows it. Without additional contextual evidence, it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty what the possession of a relic of a particular saint, or the performance of a particular devotion as member of a confraternity, meant to Beckers or to anyone else on more than a functional level. To try to do so would inevitably mean going beyond the point where interpretation becomes little more than speculation.

I will say, though, that it is noteworthy how central to Soeterbeeck’s daily existence this chapter has shown such things as relics, indulgences, adoration, and fraternities with their paraliturgical devotions to have been during Beckers’ rectorate. Although the archival sources do not expose the precise shape or contents of the sisters’ devotional life beyond the liturgy—to the elements just mentioned can only be added the community’s participation in the Forty Hours’ Devotion in 1804—what they do reveal is significant enough. For even in a relatively small and remote women’s convent, holding on to the traditional external forms of religion in the Age of Enlightenment and on the threshold of the liberal revolutions was probably not entirely a given. The Catholic, and especially the monastic, life that such things were part of was coming under severe threat at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. In this historical context, Beckers’ work on the conventual relics and confraternities does acquire an extra layer of meaning beyond the merely practical: that of the preservation of tradition in changing circumstances. This very general conclusion is probably the key to the way in which Beckers’ archival work ties in with all his other activities, and to his ideas about the nature of his rectorate. In order for it to acquire more weight and become more concrete, it is necessary to study both the historical context in which Beckers lived and the way in which he related to it in greater detail. Thankfully, this is possible to some extent with the help of his works of history, which are the topic of the next chapter.

---

1 See pp. 96-97.
Beschrijving der Kloosters en Canonike Regulier.

Door

Arnoldus Bakker
Canonicus Regulier in Gaesdonck en Rector in Nieuwpoortbeek.

1805.
Chapter 7: Beckers’ Historiographical Works

7.1. Introduction

Besides the liturgy, the field in which Arnoldus Beckers seems to have been most active is that of history. Over the course of his rectorate he produced, or at least started working on, four works of history: two versions of a chronicle of Soeterbeeck,\(^1\) the second of which he called Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieu klooster Soeterbeek, a description of his own convent Gaesdonck entitled Canonia Gaesdonckana,\(^2\) and a comprehensive encyclopaedia of the Congregation of Windesheim known as Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden.\(^3\) Beckers is marginally well-known for these texts, which have been referred to several times in the literature, mostly in the context of Windesheim historiography.\(^4\) Acquoy made continuous use of the Beschrijving and the Canonia in his seminal study on the convent and the Congregation of Windesheim,\(^5\) and Schutjes,\(^6\) Frenken,\(^7\) and Peijnenburg used the two versions of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck for their own histories of that convent.\(^8\) Nevertheless, to date the most in-depth study of Beckers’ historiographical works remains a two-page article by Van Dijk on the Beschrijving in the exhibition catalogue Moderne Devotie: Figuren en facetten (1984),\(^9\) which tentatively identifies some of the sources that the rector used.

A more in-depth analysis of Beckers’ works of history is certainly a desideratum. Van Dijk characterises him as Windesheim’s final historian,\(^10\) by which he means that the rector was the last Windesheim canon to write the history of his own congregation. As such, Beckers was the final branch of a once flourishing stem, for the Congregation of Windesheim had an eminent historiographical tradition, going back to its roots in the Modern Devotion.\(^11\) Most numerous are chronicles that describe the history of individual convents, as is to be expected given the fact that the Windesheim constitutions as published in Louvain by Jacobus Zegerus in 1639 explicitly order priors to make sure that such a chronicle was being kept.\(^12\) However, there are also historiographical works that expand considerably into more general territory, such as Thomas a Kempis’ Chronicon canonicorum reguliarum Montis S. Agnetis,\(^13\) Johannes Busch’s Chronicon Windeshemense, especially in its second redaction, and his Liber de viris illustribus and Liber de reformatione monasteriorum,\(^14\) and Petrus Impens’ Chronicon

---

\(^1\) ASP 45, 1 and ASP 4, respectively.
\(^2\) CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 46.
\(^3\) CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 45.
\(^4\) Beckers’ works of history are referred to in, for example, Joosting 1895, 45 n. 4 (qtd. from Acquoy 1984, 3: 42 n. 1, 46); Alberts and Hulshoff 1958, xix; Hövelmann 1977, 155, 159; 1987c, 39; Kohl 1971; 1977, 143; Lesser 2005, 502.
\(^5\) See p. 11.
\(^6\) Schutjes 1870-1881 himself does not acknowledge his use of Beckers’ chronicles, but he almost certainly did use them. As argued on p. 65, the fact that he erroneously says that Soeterbeek suffered two fires in the sixteenth century (5: 216, 219) is probably due to a misreading of Beckers’ account of the only real fire, which took place in 1539 but which the rector treats non-chronologically after the convent’s troubles with field marshal Maarten van Rossum in 1543 (cf. Frenken 1931/32, 197 n. 1).
\(^7\) E.g., Frenken 1931/32, 196-197. He says that the Korte geschiedkundige schets on Soeterbeek in De godsdienstwriend 31 (1833) also made use of Beckers’ chronicles (ibid. 196 n. 4), which is indeed immediately obvious from its contents although the rector is not acknowledged as a source.
\(^8\) E.g., Peijnenburg 1982a, 42 n. 51.
\(^9\) Van Dijk 1984a.
\(^10\) Van Dijk 1984a, 246.
\(^12\) P. 57. Cf. Acquoy 1984, 2: 211. On the constitutions of 1639, see p. 68 n. 7.
\(^13\) Edited by Pohl 1902-1922, 7: 333-525.
\(^14\) All three have been edited by Grube 1886.
Bethleemiticum. Although these works each have one or more convents at their heart on which they focus, they put these in the context of the entire chapter. Other canons wrote histories not of their convent, chapter or congregation, but of the region in which they lived. Beckers’ works cover all of these areas, not only between themselves—consisting as they do both of conventual histories and an encyclopaedia of the congregation—but also internally. As is described in greater detail below, the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck contains a long survey on other convents in the vicinity of Ravenstein as well as an excursion on the installation of King Louis Bonaparte. In a sense, Beckers’ texts combine within themselves all the interests of Windesheim’s earlier historians, and although they do so superficially and derivatively, Van Dijk is right to place them in the same venerable tradition.

Of course, the Congregation of Windesheim was not the only monastic assembly to practise historiography on the level both of the individual convents and of the entire order; this happened on a much more general scale too. Tom Verschaffel reports that histories of orders were often commissioned by general superiors, who would specifically appoint someone for the task, even to the extent of granting this person dispensation of his other duties and allowing him to visit or request help from other convents. Nothing of this applies to Arnoldus Beckers, however. Keeping a chronicle of Soeterbeeck tied in with the sisters’ pastoral care, and there is no sign that his histories of Gaesdonck and Windesheim were commissioned by anyone. Rather, they appear to have been born out of his personal interests, under specific circumstances which are discussed in greater detail below and in the next chapter.

Beckers may have been atypical in attempting to write a history of his order all by himself and without having been commissioned to do so, but in other respects he was entirely a child of his time. Verschaffel describes the historiography of the eighteenth-century Southern Netherlands as ‘essentially compilatory’, that is, as consisting mostly of patchworks of relevant extracts from other sources, with occasional corrections and expansions but very little in the way of an actual, original narrative. This also applies to Beckers’ works of history, especially the Beschrijving, which is an encyclopaedia rather than a narrative and whose title page explicitly says it was bij een vergaderd from various printed and manuscript sources, and the Canonia, which starts with a section consisting entirely of descriptive quotes on Gaesdonck without any context whatsoever. History was also commonly written in annalistic form, with events being arranged and described per year as time went on. This was practised by Beckers in those sections of his chronicles of Soeterbeeck that deal with the period of his own rectorate, where he had no other sources to compile but had to construct his own narrative. Whether they are encyclopaedic or annalistic, however, all of Beckers’ works are characterised by an attempt to simply bring together and present as much data as he could find on the topics he dealt with, including such things as lists of names or expenditures.

1 This text has not been edited in its entirety, but the first book has been published by Van Engen 1992, 41-74.
2 For a survey of these works, see Acquoy 1984, 2: 222-226.
3 See pp. 279-283.
4 The installation of the king covers ASP 4, pp. 8a-10b, the survey of the convents in the areas of Cuijk and Ravenstein appears on pp. 10b-15b.
5 Verschaffel 1998, 30-33 mentions similar ventures among the Premonstratensians, the Cistercians, the Dominicans, the Benedictines, other Augustinians, the Carthusians and the Capuchins in the Southern Netherlands.
8 Essentieel compilerisch (Verschaffel 1998, 239).
9 On this topic, see Verchaffel 1998, 239-241.
10 ‘Compiled’ (Höv 45, title page).
11 Höv 46, pp. 1a-2a.
12 On the genres of annals and chronicles in the eighteenth-century Low Countries, see Janssen 2002.
information-centred way of writing history was entirely characteristic of contemporary monastic historiography.\footnote{1 Cf. Verschaffel 1998, 31-34.}

Although the form of Beckers’ works of history was entirely unexceptional in an eighteenth-century context, the place they occupy in the historiographical tradition of Windesheim would merit closer attention. Beckers was, after all, Windesheim’s final historian, and it would be interesting to know if there is more to this title than just Beckers’ subject matter and date of birth. Regrettably enough, the kind of in-depth study that would be required to answer this question is beyond the scope of this book, which deals with all of Beckers’ activities as rector of Soeterbeeck, especially as these are evident from the traces he left in the conventual book collection. Historiography was just one of his many fields of interest, undoubtedly important and time-consuming, but not closely associated with his traces of use. Because it is not possible to discuss all of Beckers’ works equally exhaustively, and also because a full historiographical analysis would exceed the limits of my own expertise, the discussion of Beckers’ works of history in the present chapter is limited to a description of their contents, composition and sources. This would only be the first step in a more comprehensive study, but it does shed light on the rector’s methodology as a historian, which in turn facilitates an interpretation of his historiographical texts within the context of his personal biography as well as his convictions, motivations and other activities in the next chapter.\footnote{2 See p. 298-308.} Together with my transcription of the two versions of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck,\footnote{3 Transcriptions of both versions of Beckers’ chronicle are given in Appendix D.} this chapter should be viewed as a preliminary attempt at understanding him as a historian.

Before I can turn to Beckers’ works of history, however, a conceptual clarification is in order. Within the plan of this book, the written traces of the rector’s historiographical activities come last of all, together with those of his administrative efforts, because they are not considered to be part of his stratigraphic unit in Soeterbeeck’s historical library. With reference to his notes and writings in archival documents, there can be no doubt about the legitimacy of this distinction, but the works of history occupy a grey area between the library and the archives. True, they are not part of the Soeterbeeck Collection, but I have already explained that the archaeological site which I am excavating is slightly larger than that and conceptually covers the conventual library in all its manifestations, so that alienated books are also included.\footnote{4 See p. 32.} Were Beckers’ chronicles and historiographical sketches never among these? Were they never considered or at least treated as books at Soeterbeeck? This cannot be known with certainty, and so there is no way of satisfactorily answering this question except pragmatically.

Beckers’ works on the history Soeterbeeck are preserved in the conventual archives in the Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven in Sint Agatha, and those on that of Gaesdonck and Windesheim in the monastic library of the Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck in Goch. For the alienated books discussed in the previous chapters, their preservation outside the Soeterbeeck Collection is not itself sufficient ground for their conceptual exclusion from Soeterbeeck’s library, but in this doubtful case it has to be. The two pieces of writing that are currently at Gaesdonck already were there when Acquoy used them in 1876,\footnote{5 Acquoy 1984, 2: 6 n. 1, 22 n. 4.} but the two chronicles were still at Soeterbeeck in 1997 or shortly thereafter, when the sisters moved to a home for elderly religious and their library was dismantled. At that moment, these historiographical works were not included among the books that would later become the Soeterbeeck Collection, but left in the archives. This means that half of the objects under
consideration here were explicitly excluded from the final layer of Soeterbeeck’s library in which the community itself was still involved at least on the level of implicit consent. I follow this example, and on a conceptual level consider Beckers’ works of history as part of the relevant environment of his traces in the library. Just how relevant they are will hopefully quickly become apparent in my discussion of them.

### 7.2. The First Version of the Chronicle of Soeterbeeck

By the time of Beckers’ appointment as rector, the history of Soeterbeeck had already been briefly described in several publications, the most important of which were Jean-Baptiste Gramaye’s *Taxandria* (1610),1 Augustinus Wichmans’ *Brabantia Mariana tripartita* (1632),2 and Jean-François Foppens’ *Historia episcopatûs Silvæducensis* (1721).3 However, I have not been able to find any substantial narrative works of history by members of the community of Soeterbeeck itself in the conventional archives that are older than Beckers’. The only trace that appears to be extant are two pages at the back of the volume that also contains the seventeenth-century statutes, in an unidentified but clearly seventeenth-century hand, and these only describe the convent’s foundation at Nederwetten and its move to Nuenen in 1462.4 Whether Beckers was actually the first person, rector or otherwise, to start keeping a chronicle cannot be said with certainty, but his text is certainly the oldest that survives. Its audience was probably not intended to extend beyond the boundaries of the convent, judging first of all from the use of the first person plural in phrases that refer to Soeterbeeck and its sisters. The chronicle starts by speaking of *ons ouwt klooster Soeterbeeck,*5 and frequently uses the pronouns *wij* and *ons* to refer to the community.6 Also, the chronicle includes several elaborate descriptions of the many structural renovations that took place at Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ rectorate, accompanied by detailed surveys of the costs and the persons by whom these were paid.7 These would have been of little interest to people from outside the community itself, whereas they provided the sisters with a reason for remembering the benefactors in their prayers. Ensuring the survival of certain persons and events in the convent’s collective memory seems to have been Beckers’ main goal in writing the first version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck, as is in line with the genre.

The text does not have a title. It is written in a single column and covers the first thirty pages of a thick volume bound in parchment over cardboard, with three faced-in thongs, two pairs of leather ties and sprinkled page edges.8 The chronicle starts out as a running account of the history of the convent from its origin as a community of Sisters of the Common Life in 1448, but when it reaches Beckers’ election as rector in 1772 it becomes much more detailed and from the year 1773 onwards acquires an annalistic character,9 evolving into a string of mostly self-contained sections that are arranged by date. The year 1784, for instance, is treated as follows: *1784 hebben wij onze nieuwe schuer op de plaats getimmerd; die een goed kapitaal heeft gekost.*10 The final entry before the chronicle’s abandonment concerns the death

---

1 Pp. 79-80. (1 made use of NUL, OD 415 c 155.) On Gramaye and his *Taxandria*, see Stecher 1884/85.
2 Pp. 853-857. (1 made use of NUL, OD 164 c 43.) On Wichmans and his *Brabantia*, see Weyns 1972.
3 Pp. 313-314. (1 made use of NUL, OD 336 c 110.) On Foppens and his *Historia*, see Helbig 1880/83.
4 ASP 92, ff. 62v-63r.
5 ‘Our old convent of Soeterbeeck’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 1).
6 ‘We […] our’ (ASP 45, 1, e.g. pp. 1-2, 5, 9-11, 13-14, 16, 23-28, 30).
7 Esp. ASP 45, 1: pp. 23-27.
8 ASP 45, 1: pp. 1-30. On the other contents of this book, see pp. 256-257. The archives of Soeterbeeck also hold an anonymous copy of this version of Beckers’ chronicle which, based on its script, seems to have been produced in the nineteenth century (ASP 2), as well as a version, dated 1887, that Sister Canisia Broekman (1864-1917) translated into modern Dutch and expanded with a history of the convent of Nazareth in Ravenstein (ASP 5).
9 ASP 45, 1: p. 22.
10 ‘In 1784 we built our new shed in the yard, which cost a small fortune’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 28).
of Prioress Clara van den Heuvel and the placement of three new windows in the schoolroom in 1805.¹

The switch to annalistic form in 1773 does not mean that Beckers began his chronicle when he became rector in 1772 and updated it yearly from that moment onwards. This cannot have been the case, for the narrative section dealing with the period before 1773 contains a reference to the death of Elisabeth Hurckmans on 15 January 1776,² and the entry for the year 1792 refers to 1794 even though there is also an intervening entry for 1793.³ This means that Beckers must have started working on the chronicle after 1776, and that he wrote in chunks rather than year by year, at least on occasion. That the passage on Hurckmans’ death was not inserted later into a hypothetical earlier draft is evident not only from the fact that it is carefully, if clumsily, embedded in the narrative, but also from the paragraphs that immediately follow. There is a clear break there, both visually, as the next lines have clearly been written with a different pen, and with regard to contents. The paragraphs following the one on Hurckmans describe the convent’s foundation and the finding of a miraculous statue of Our Lady during the iconoclasms of the sixteenth century—information which Beckers says ick daer naer heb gevonden,⁴ that is, after having written the preceding paragraphs. Dit hier pro memoria tusschen gestelt sijnde,⁵ the narrative returns to the eighteenth century on the next page. What this reveals is that Beckers was still carrying out his research at this point, somewhere after Hurckmans’ death in 1776. The clumsiness with which he interpolated the new information that he had unearthed strongly suggests that the text under discussion is the first version of his chronicle. This is confirmed by the fact that the second version recounts these events in their proper chronological place.⁶

A terminus ante quem for the chronicle’s commencement is provided by a noticeable change in Beckers’ script between the entries for 1780 and 1782.⁷ The writing of the latter entry, which describes the election of Theresia Heijnen as prioress on 9 October 1782, is clearly smaller and slightly crabbed. It is impossible to say if there were other significant breaks in the composition before this point because the script is very stable throughout, but it is clear that the chronicle was begun before October 1782.

In preparing his text, Beckers was partly dealing with events that he had witnessed himself, but for the period before his rectorate he must have made extensive use of archival sources from the convent. He did not identify many of these, but there are some fortunate exceptions. First, after describing how the convent and its possessions were publicly sold in 1716 and providing a list of the sisters who were alive at the time, Beckers says he took this information uitj ’t memorie boeck van ’t jaer 1716.⁸ This is a clear reference to the first pages of the convent’s memorial book, which is entitled Memorie boeck sedert het jaer 1716 and is still preserved in the archives of Soeterbeeck.⁹ Second, when describing the move from Nuenen to Deursen in 1732, Beckers refers to two documents that demonstrate that the sisters had been given permission for this by Charles Philip, Elector Palatine and lord of Ravenstein,¹

---

² ASP 45, 1: p. 12. On Hurckmans, see p. 233 n. 3.
³ ASP 45, 1: p. 28.
⁴ ‘I found afterwards’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 12).
⁵ ‘This having been interposed here for memory’s sake’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 13).
⁶ ASP 4, pp. 1a-b, 3a.
⁷ ASP 45, 1: p. 27.
⁸ ‘From the memorial book of the year 1716’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 10). When describing Rector Verheijden’s great help around the time of the sale, Beckers mentions een boeck bij mater rustende (‘a book kept by the priorress’, ASP 45, 1: p. 14) as the source of his information. This is probably a reference to the same memorial book, as the latter includes a survey of Verheijden’s benefactions. On the historical circumstances surrounding the sale of Soeterbeeck in 1716, see Peijnenburg 1982a, 38-39.
⁹ ASP 1.
Ravenstein, and Georges-Louis de Berghes, prince-bishop of Liège, and says deese 2 acten zijn in onze archive berustende, which is still the case. These explicit references are exceptional, however. Beckers mostly just provides information without acknowledging any sources, and although it is sometimes possible to make educated guesses about what is behind a certain statement, it seems that most of his sources have not survived. He also made occasional use of oral traditions, for the history of the miraculous statue mentioned above, he says, bevinde ook nogh uijt overleveringe. A tradition like this never had an identifiable source for Beckers to refer to, and the fact that he was aware enough of this fact to refer to it in this way seems to display a concern for historical reliability which is carried even further in his other historiographical works.

7.3. Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden

As mentioned above, the final entry of the first version of Beckers’ chronicle concerns the year 1805. That was also when he finished working on his book on the Congregation of Windesheim, which is entitled, in full, the Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden bij een vergadert uit de navolgende schrijvers, als uijt Joannes Lindenbornius, Joannes Latomus, Joannes Hooijbergius, Thomas a Kempis, Ludovicus Moréri, Joannes Anthonius Zunggo, Franciscus Xaverius Feller, en uit meer andere eijgene handschriften bij een verzameld door Arnoldus Bekkers canonik regulier in Gaasdonk en rector in Nieuw Soeterbeek. The year and the title appear on the title page, not in Beckers’ hand, of the large cardboard-bound volume with green sprinkled edges in which the text is preserved (Figure 7). Rather than being a chronicle in running prose, this work has an encyclopaedic character. It consists of three clearly distinguished main parts:

- pp. 1-24: Van de Vergaderingh van Windeshem, a list of brief historical entries on the convents belonging to the Congregation of Windesheim
- pp. 24-52: Van de andere kloosters en huizen der canonike en canonikersse reguliere, die in Holland of de Nederlanden zijn geweest, noghtans met de Vergaderingh van Windesem niet vereenight, edogh met dezelve groote overeenkomste hebben gehouden, entries on convents in the Low Countries which were or had been under the Congregation’s influence but did not properly belong to it, as well as more information on several monasteries already discussed in the first part
- pp. 1-103: Van de canonike regulieren, die in heiligheid, als ook geleertheid hebben uijtgescheenen, als ook capittels, adijen en kloosters, uijt Morery en De Féller &c., an alphabetically arranged encyclopaedia of holy, learned or otherwise noteworthy canons regular and Augustinian congregations throughout the world

---

1 On Charles Philip, see Schmidt 1977.
2 On De Berghes, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 1: 102-103.
3 ‘These two acts are preserved in our archives’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 17).
4 The Elector’s act is ASP 76 (edited by Hermans 1848-1850, 2: 385-386, no. 280). The prince-bishop’s is ASP 73 (edited by Hermans 1848-1850, 2: 393-394, no. 282).
5 An example is Beckers’ statement that ick […] heb gevonden als dat ons klooster Ouwot Soeterbeek tweemael is bevestig (‘I found […] that our convent, Old Soeterbeek, was founded twice’, ASP 45, 1: p. 12), first by Prince-Bishop John of Heinsberg in 1454 and again by his successor Louis of Bourbon in 1462, after the move to Nuenen. He probably based this on the convent’s founding charters (ASP 60 and 62, both edited by Hermans 1848-1850, 2: 388-392 n. 1), but he does not refer to them. On the circumstances surrounding Soeterbeek’s foundation, see Peijnenburg 1982a, 33.
6 ‘I discovered also from tradition’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 12). In the second version of the chronicle this reference to tradition is omitted (ASP 4, p. 3a).
7 See pp. 268-269.
8 Höv 45. For a description of this manuscript, see Hövelmann 1987e, 68, no. 45. For earlier discussions of its contents, see primarily Van Dijk 1984a and Lesser 2005, 502.
The first two parts are written in single columns and paginated consecutively; part three is written in double columns and has its own pagination. The text area is set off by vertical lines in ink and horizontal lines in pencil, and the two columns of the third part are separated by a vertical line that is also in pencil. The ink bounding lines were all added before the pages’ eventual lay-out became clear, though, for on the right-hand side of every page are two extra lines which are completely disregarded in a way very similar to those in Beckers’ incomplete book of chants IV 10b.¹ It appears, therefore, that only the pencil lines are Beckers’, and that he used a stack of paper that had originally been bounded for a different purpose.

Although he was willing to concede that it is an important source on the final years of the Congregation of Windesheim, Acquoy characterised Beckers’ Beschrijving as almost entirely derivative.² This is true, and as Van Dijk points out,³ Beckers himself informs us of many of the sources he used. The title of the third part refers to Le grand dictionnaire historique by Louis Moréri (first published in 1674), and to François-Xavier de Feller’s Dictionnaire historique et littéraire (first published in 1781).⁴ Both of these authors are also mentioned on the general title page of the Beschrijving, as are many others. The works by the men who are listed there that Beckers can be demonstrated to have used are Jan Lindeborn’s Historia sive notitia episcopatus Daventriensis (1670),⁵ Johannes Hoybergius’ edition and continuation of Johannes Latomus’ Corsendonca (1644),⁶ Thomas a Kempis’ Vita Gerardi Magni and Chronicon canonicorum regularium Montis S. Agnetis,⁷ and Johann Zunggo’s Historiae generalis et specialis de ordine canonicorum regularium S. Augustini prodromus (first published in two volumes in 1742 and 1745).⁸ In the text itself he also acknowledges Foppens’ Historia episcopatûs Silvæducensis (1721),⁹ and Egbert Hopp’s Korte beschrijving van het geheele Land van Cleve (1783).¹⁰ An important source for the first part was also the

¹ See p. 214.
² Acquoy 1984, 2: 222 n. 2.
³ Van Dijk 1984a, 247-248. Van Dijk was wrong, however, in attributing the title page to Beckers, as it is in an entirely different hand.
⁴ I have not been able to determine which editions of these works Beckers used. On Moréri and his Dictionnaire, see Marique 1911. On De Feller and his Dictionnaire, see De Borchgrave 1883.
⁵ Beckers only ever refers to the author’s name (Höv 45, 3: pp. 24a, 34b, 37b, 51a), but the entries in which he does so were translated from Lindeborn’s Historia (pp. 354, 358-359, 349, 337, 328-329 respectively; I made use of NUL, OD 4 c 59 for comparison). On Lindeborn and his Historia, see Brugmans 1930b.
⁶ In Höv 45, 2: p. 38, no. 81 Beckers only mentions the editor’s name, but the preceding pages are about Corsendonck and clearly based on information taken from the Corsendonca (pp. 18-38; I made use of OD 371 c 335 for comparison). Van Dijk 1984a, 247 says that Beckers probably also knew Latomus’ Origo ac progressus Paradisi B. Mariae, but I have found no evidence for this. On Latomus and his Corsendonca, see Juten 1912. On Hoybergius, see Van der Aa 1867.
⁷ In Höv 45, 1: p. 2, no. 6, Beckers mentions what Thomas a Kempis writes in zijnen 3den tom. 1 deel en 15de capittel (‘in his third vol., the first part and the 15th chapter’), and the quotation that follows is translated from the fifteenth chapter of the Vita Gerardi Magni (Pohl 1902-1922, 7: 77-78). The rector apparently used an edition of Thomas’ collected works where this Vita was in the first part of the third volume. In Höv 45, 2: p. 49, no. 7, Beckers again only mentions Thomas’ name, but the quotation that follows is taken from the eighth chapter of his Chronicon (Pohl 1902-1922, 7: 368).
⁸ Beckers only refers to Zunggo’s name (Höv 45, 3: pp. 60a, 74b), but the entries in which he does so were adapted from the latter’s Prodomus (vol. 2, pp. 573-575, 61-62 respectively; I made use of a digital copy of Munich, Bavarian State Library, 2 H.mon. 252-2 for comparison). On Zunggo and his Prodomus, see Lauchert 1900.
⁹ Beckers refers to this book once as de Historie van het bischhsdom van St Hertogenboschs (‘the History of the diocese of ’-Hertogenbosch’, Höv 45, 2: p. 38, no. 81), and the reference is to pp. 260-263. Judging from his reading of pp. 270-272 of the Historia (on which see p. 272), Beckers did not use the Dutch translation by Steven Jan van der Velde, Oudheden, en gestichten van de bisschoppelyke stadt en Meyerye van ’s Hertogenboschs (first published in 1742).
¹⁰ Beckers refers to wat Egbert Hop in zijn Korte Cleefse beschrijvinge meld (‘what Egbert Hopp reports in his Korte Cleefse beschrijvinge’, Höv 45, 1: p. 10, no. 22), and the quotation that follows is taken from p. 144. (I made use of NUL, OD 243 c 78 for comparison.) Beckers did not use the German original, entitled Kurtze
catalogue of convents at the back of the constitutions of the Chapter of Windesheim as published in Utrecht by Harmannus Borculo in 1553.  

This is evident from the fact that the order in which the various communities are listed is the same in both works, and that Beckers explicitly refers to the statutes at various points, once erroneously dating them to 1551.

The list of sources provided here on the basis of Beckers’ own references is probably far from complete. It is likely that he made use of other books without referring to them, or of these books on more occasions than he has explicitly acknowledged. What the eigene handschriften were which he also used according to the title page can only be guessed at. The difficulty of identifying Beckers’ sources, unpublished or otherwise, can be illustrated with one example. In the second part, he provides a list of the priors of Mariënghage, and says that these were uit de archive van hetzelve klooster getrokken, maar zonder aantekeningen van sterf- of verkiedag. At first sight, this would seem to mean that Beckers compiled this list himself from archival sources, whereas in fact the entire passage, including the reference to the archives of Mariënghage, is translated from Foppens’ Historia, without acknowledgement. What this demonstrates is that Beckers was far from consistent when it came to identifying his sources, and that some of the references he did provide are in fact second-hand.

The question arises how and where Beckers accessed the sources he used. The published sources may, of course, simply have been in his personal library, as he is known to have owned at least one work of history. None of them are preserved in the Soeterbeeck Collection, although this does not necessarily mean that they were not in the conventual library in Beckers’ days. Copies of some of these works are present, however, in the monastic library of the Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck in Goch, which inherited many books of the convent of the same name. These are Foppens’ Historia, Hopp’s Korte beschryving, Latomus’ Corsendonca, Lindeborn’s Historia, and Moréri’s Grand dictionnaire in the ninth edition published in four volumes in Amsterdam and the Hague by La Compagnie in 1702. This is a significant part of all of Beckers’ identified sources, and although none of these books contain any traces to prove it, he may have made use of Gaesdonck’s library for his
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Beschreibung dess Landes samt angeheckter Genealogia der Graffen und Hertzogen zu Cleve (1655). On Hopp and his Beschreibung, see p. 252 of vol. 1 of Jean-François Foppens’ Bibliotheca Belgica (Brussels: Petrus Foppens, 1739; I made use of a digital copy of Utrecht, UL, qu 447 dl 2 for comparison.)

1 Regula Beati Avgvstini episcopi cvm constitutionibvs canoniceorum regularium capituli VWindesemensis (Utrecht: Harmannus Borculo, 1553), 2: pp. 14-20. (I made use of a digital copy of Utrecht, UL, F qu 447 dl 2 for comparison.)

2 För 45, 1: pp. 3-5, 8, 10, 13, 22.


4 Private manuscripts (Höv 45, title page).

5 ‘Taken from the archives of the same convent, but without mention of their date of death or election’ (Höv 45, 2: p. 39, no. 82).

6 See pp. 270-272. Beckers translated the phrase ex antiquis ejusdem Domûs Archivis & Necrologiis erati, sed sine notatione electionis aut obitûs (p. 271 n.).

7 On Beckers’ personal library, see pp. 241-243. The historiographical work he owned was a copy of Hugo Franciscus van Heussen’s Batavia sacra that is currently LCSA, A-0706.

8 On the history of the library of Gaesdonck, see Hövelmann 1964, 26-29; 1987d; 1987e.

9 CAG, Monastic Library R 150.

10 CAG, Monastic Library R 184 (olim B 2161).

11 CAG, Monastic Library, R 18.

12 CAG, Monastic Library, R 136.

13 CAG, Monastic Library, R 160.

14 The monastic library of the CAG includes one more book that is referred to by Beckers. In the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck, Beckers mentions Johan Hendrik van Heurn’s four-volume Historie der stad en Meyerve van ’s Hertogenbosch (1776-1778), as is mentioned on p. 280. Copies of the first, third and fourth volumes are present under the shelf mark R 184 (olim B 2162). The library does not include a copy of the 1553 edition of the Rule of Augustine and the constitutions of the Chapter of Windesheim, but a copy of the edition published in Louvain by Jacobus Zegerus in 1639 is present with the shelf mark R 185.
historiographical activities. The logistics of this are not entirely clear to me, however, since the convent had been dissolved in 1802, so that I cannot say how and to what extent Beckers would still have had access to its library. If he did, he must have taken the books he needed with him to Soeterbeeck rather than studying them in Goch. The rector cannot have stayed away from the community he served for such considerable periods of time as would be needed for the research of a work with the scope of the Beschrijving.

Despite the fact that Beckers did not consistently acknowledge his sources, there is evidence that he made some attempt at being a reliable historian. One sign is that he is willing to rectify his own mistakes. The first example of this occurs in the entry for the canonry of Mariënberg, which the 1553 catalogue of the convents of the Chapter of Windesheim says is situated in Aninghen, that is, Anjum in Frisia. At first, Beckers confidently declares that dit is misdrukt; moet weezen Harlingen, but, apparently having mulled it over and done more research while writing the entry, at the end he admits: Geloofe dogh dat het Aningen moet genoemd worden, om dat men het overall onder dezen naam vind. The catalogue was indeed correct, and Beckers’ confusion is probably the result of the fact that there are two places called Anjum, one near Dokkum and one near Harlingen; the latter is currently known as Klooster Anjum in memory of Mariënberg. Another occasion of Beckers correcting himself occurs in the second part of the Beschrijving, when he discusses the convent of Thabor in Sneek. In the first entry, he says the latter’s founder was a rich man called Ulbudus, but later on, when he devotes a second, more elaborate entry to the same canonry, he says: Den eersten stichter van het klooster bij Sneek in Friesland was niet Ulbudus genoemd, gelijk ik reeds pag. 33 nro. 46 heb aangetekent, maar Revenicus. Thabor’s founder was Rienick Bockama, lord of Sneek, but Beckers’ error is easily explained, for Ulbold of Bloemkamp founded the Cistercian women’s convent Nijeklooster or Aula Dei in the same area.

In addition to correcting himself, Beckers also repeatedly indicates that he looked for more information on a certain topic, but was unable to find it. Only a few examples will suffice. In the entry on the convent of Berenberg or Montifagorum, Beckers says: Heb de beschrijvinge van dit klooster zeer wel naargezoght, maar niets konnen vinden. Acquoy confirms that neither Lindeborn nor Zunggo have much to say about the convent, which would have made it difficult for Beckers to say more. The rector also admits that he was

---

1 Although I have not been able to consult it, more information about the library of Gaesdonck around the time when Beckers wrote the Beschrijving can be gleaned from the catalogue made by Johann Bernhard C. von Schönebeck in 1801 (Duisburg, North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive, Rhineland Department, Roerdepartement Prät. IV. Div. 1. Bur. 1 B Nr. 3). This list is reported to also include some books which are not in the monastic library of the CAG anymore (Beßelmann and Hermes 1992, 338; Hövelmann 1987d, 42).

2 Scholten 1906, 62.

3 Cf. Hövelmann 1987d, 42, who argues that Gaesdonck was among the ecclesiastical institutions in the Roer department whose libraries were temporarily sealed by the government in 1801.

4 When Beckers stayed at Gaesdonck, away from Soeterbeeck, for several months in 1774, he was strongly criticised for this, see vol. 2, pp. 97-98 n. 4, 100, 102-104.

5 2: p. 17.

6 ‘This is a misprint; it should be Harlingen’ (Höv 45, 1: p. 16, no. 47).

7 ‘I do believe after all that it should be called Aningen, because it is found everywhere under this name’ (Höv 45, 1: p. 16, no. 47).


9 Höv 45, 2: p. 33, no. 46.

10 ‘The original founder of the convent at Sneek in Friesland was not called Ulbudus, as I wrote on p. 33, no. 46, but Revenicus’ (Höv 45, 2: p. 41, no. 88).


12 Schoengen 1903, 139 n. 2, 155-156 n. 7.

13 ‘I looked very thoroughly for a description of this convent, but was not able to find anything’ (Höv 45, 1: p. 21, no. 84).

14 Acquoy 1984, 3: 181, no. 79.
unable to find the date and place of death of Prior General Marcellus Lentius, despite the fact that Lindeborn says Lentius died in 1603. Finally, returning to Mariënberg—firmly located in Anjum rather than in Harlingen—in the third part, Beckers says that no description of the convent’s origin and development is to be found, probably again because Lindeborn and Zungho have little or nothing to say about it. These examples show that Beckers’ sources were limited, and that he was willing to admit this fact, thereby enhancing his reliability as a historian.

Although the Beschrijving is not a chronicle, Beckers did find occasion to include references to recent developments. Some of this information can be assumed to have been general knowledge, such as the fact that at the time of writing Frenswegen is het eenighste klooster dat van onze vergaderingh nog over is. Other statements are based on what might be called personal communication with the author. One example occurs in Beckers’ description of the convent of Rebdorf in Eichstätt. He justifies his glowing description of this community and its library by saying that den wele. heer Haas prior in het Zand bij Stralen als commissarius en visitator, met den wele. heer prior Koninghs te Udem als secretarius van onze Vergaderingh van Windesem hebben zulkxs ondervonden, toen zij aldaar de visitatie in onzen tijd hebben afgeleid. Both Haas and Coninx were well known to Beckers, as is discussed at length in the next chapter. The Beschrijving makes several similar references to other personal acquaintances, and there is one which deserves closer attention. This is Abbot Auguste-François-Joseph Gosse (1730-1802) of the abbey of St Callixtus in Cysoing, who came to Soeterbeeck while fleeing the troops of the French National Convention.

In his entry on the abbey of Cysoing, Beckers writes the following:

*Ik heb 1794 de eer en geluk gehad, om den Eerwaardighsten Heer Goossen, prestaat van deeze abdije een zeer deftigh man bij mij op Soeterbeek te moghen ontfangen, toen hij, gelijk ballingh uijt zijn land en abdije was, welcke mij voor zekerheit heeft verhaalt, dat in vorige tijden deeze abdije en meer andere verzoght hadden, om in onze Windesemse Vergaderingh ingelieft te moghe worden, maar dat den general en vergaderde vaders tot antwoord hadden gegeeven, dat zij wel prioraten maar geene abdijen aannamen. Wat een groote onderscheid in de laatere tijden?*

---

1 Höv 45, 2: p. 49, no. 6. Lentius was prior of the convent of Marienhof in Amersfoort, and served as prior general of Windsheim from 1573 until his death in 1603 (Acquoy 1984, 3: 318).
2 P. 367.
3 Höv 45, 3: p. 15b.
5 Frenswegen is the only convent of our congregation that is still left (Höv 45, 1: p. 8, no. 17). Also quoted in Van Dijk 1984a, 247.
6 ‘The Reverend Haas, prior of Mariensand near Straelen, commissioner and visitator, and the Reverend Coninx, prior in Uedem and secretary of our Congregation of Windsheim, found this to be the case when they made a visitation there in our days’ (Höv 45, p. 19, no. 67). Hövelmann 1987b, 32 dates this visitation to somewhere between 1783 and 1786, Haas’ period as prior general, assuming that this was when Coninx had become the new secretary. The problem with this is that Beckers explicitly refers to Haas as commissioner, not as prior general, and that Coninx was already secretary in 1775, when he certified the copy of a statement of the general chapter (Duisburg, North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive, Rhineland Department, Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199. f. 138v). It not known, therefore, when exactly this visitation took place. On Haas, see p. 293 n. 3. On Coninx, see Appendix B, no. 3.
7 See pp. 293-296.
8 Beckers refers to Haas again on Höv 45, 1: p. 15, no. 43, and to Arnoldus van Bree (on whom see vol. 2, p. 94 n. 2) on p. 14, no. 40.
9 On Gosse and the abbey of Cysoing, see Bataille 1902, 132-155; Desailly 1865, 264-274.
10 ‘In 1794 I had the honour and the good fortune to be allowed to host at Soeterbeek the Most Reverend Gosse, prelate of this abbey and a very distinguished man, while he was away from his land and his abbey like an exile. He assured me that this abbey and others had tried to be incorporated into our Congregation of Windsheim, but that the Prior General and the chapter fathers had answered that they would accept priories but no abbeys. How different from later times!’ (Höv 45, 2: p. 30, no. 23). On the congregation’s initial refusal of abbeys and their gradual acceptance of them, see Acquoy 1984, 2: 28-30 n. 3.
When describing the state of the Congregation of Windesheim in the sixteenth century, Beckers makes another reference to this meeting, and says the abbot of Cysoing was *mij tonende de scritfen, die deze weigerinh van onze vergaderinh behelsde, en die hij uijt de archive van zijn abdie had gelijkt.*¹ He then goes on to relate that these papers revealed that Windesheim had consented to sending some canons to reform the abbey, and that this had caused the St Callixtus and many other monastic communities in France and Flanders to flourish both in learning and in piety.²

Beckers’ description of his meeting with Abbot Gosse clearly has a function in his narrative, for it is made to illustrate both the fame and the actual conscientiousness and superiority of the Congregation of Windesheim in its earlier days and the tragedy of its deterioration in the eighteenth century. His mention of the archival documents that were brought along by Gosse serves to underscore the reliability of his account.³ However, in relating the anecdote the rector also displays a sense of delight in having had the opportunity of seeing these documents and discussing them with a person who shared an interest in the history of Windesheim. Rather than silently incorporating the information provided by Gosse into his encyclopaedia, Beckers chose to dwell on their meeting at Soeterbeeck, thereby offering an interesting glimpse of the interaction between these two like-minded men and into his own methods as a historian willing to mine his private conversations for information.

**EXCURSUS: THE FLIGHT OF ABBOT GOSSE OF ST CALLIXTUS IN CYSOING**

Beckers and Gosse’s common interest in history allows us not only to know about their meeting, but also to trace its circumstances and its sequel. Just as Beckers incorporated the meeting with the abbot of Cysoing at Soeterbeeck and the story told by the records he carried into his encyclopaedia of the Congregation of Windesheim, Gosse himself would go on to use these elements to document the history of his abbey and his own exile. He produced two books on these topics, in which he incorporated much information from the archival documents that he had shown Beckers and provided transcriptions of many relevant contemporary ones. One of these books, entitled *Rerum Cisoniensium fasciculus,* provides more information on the events of the summer of 1794.⁴

Gosse’s *Fasciculus* consists broadly of two parts: a section dealing with the history of the abbey of St Callixtus, and a section chronicling the events since the dissolution of the monasteries in France by the National Constituent Assembly in 1790.⁵ According to the documents which make up the latter part, the canons of Cysoing were scattered to the winds in 1791 after having been forced to leave their abbey, which was burned down by the troops of the National Convention on 26 October 1793. Gosse and several of his confrères eventually took refuge in Tournai, across the border of the Austrian Netherlands. As the French armies marched north, however, the refugees had to flee again, as the Convention had decreed that all priests who had refused to take an oath of fidelity to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and fled France would be put to death upon discovery. In June 1794, Gosse, accompanied only by his assistant and his oldest confrère, began a long search for a safe haven, which brought them to Ravenstein in July.⁶ The hardships of the last

---

¹ Showing me the records pertaining to this refusal on the part of our Congregation, which he had taken from the archives of his abbey (Höv 45, 1: p. 3, no. 6).
² Höv 45, 1: p. 3, no. 6.
³ That the account of the meeting with Gosse is meant to serve a particular purpose in the Beschrijving is also evident from the fact that Beckers makes no mention of it in his chronicles of Soeterbeeck.
⁴ For descriptions of these manuscripts and transcriptions of some of their contents, see De Coussemaker 1883, 907-910; Desailly 1865, 270-271. The Fasciculus currently has shelf mark 1.M.4 in the patrimonial library of Lille Catholic University. The shelf mark of the other book, which is entitled *Recueil d’opuscles qui peuvent servir à l’histoire de l’abbaye de Cisoyn,* is the same.
⁵ These parts occupy pp. 19-150 and 151-270 of 1.M.4 respectively.
⁶ The events between the suppression in 1790 and Gosse’s flight from Tournai in June 1794 are briefly described in a letter by Gosse to Constantinus Belling, prior general of the Congregation of Windesheim, dated 21 July 1794 and sent from Ravenstein (1.M.4, pp. 199-204). A clearer and more precise account is given by Bataille 1902, 134-139, 144-146.
stage of their journey are described in great detail in a long and very interesting letter by Gosse, dated 18 July 1794 and addressed to Philippus Hippolytus Georgerie, priest of the parish of St George in Antwerp,1 where Gosse and his companions had stayed at the end of June.2 The abbot ends this letter, which was written when he and his companions had just arrived at Ravenstein, by saying that they had met with the parish priest of Ravenstein, Arnoldus Voet,3 and were currently looking for an affordable place to stay.4 Although it is not apparent from Beckers’ description in the Beschrijving if Abbot Gosse stayed at Soeterbeeck for any length of time, it seems likely that the conven was eventually mentioned to him as a convenient location, and that this is how his meeting with Beckers came about.

The Fasciculus allows the story to be continued, for Gosse’s letter to the parish priest in Antwerp is followed by a copy of a letter from Joannes Loyens, prior of Gaesdonck,5 to Arnoldus Beckers. This letter, which is dated 29 July 1794, was written in answer to one by the rector, who appears to have commiserated with Gosse and his two companions and asked his prior if he would be able to provide shelter for them, or at least for the senior canon. Loyens’ answer must have been a disappointment, for he wrote the following:

Plurimum reverendæ domino confrater!

Propter negotia occurrentia hisce temporibus, breviter respondeo litteris honoratissimis tuis. Certè condoleo vices eorum confratrum; ast ipsum jubilarium hic in nostrâ canonï admittere periculosissimum erit ex rationibus sequentibus; primó quia exponerem me et canoniam nostrum, adventientibus Gallis, periculo ruinae; cûm Galli persequantur sacerdotes emigrantes, et ubi inventen, morte plectuntur, ut relations publicæ habent; deinde secundò habemus quatuor confratres emigrantes hic, et si rumor adventûs Gallorum continuatur, sicit fertur et dicitur, illí quatuor hic hospitantes actualiter, discedere debent et volunt. Hinc nobis et jubilario illï erit periculosissimum. His consideratis melius est esse extra periculum, quam cum periculo benefacere. Inter illos quatuor est unus confrater abbatiae Cisoniensis, qui vocatur Sibenbour. Salutem plurimam dicit reverendissimo suo abbati et cæteris confratribus suis, qui praevio amicabili ave ad reverendum abbatem, cæterasque tibi subditas, perenno paterno affectu, meque ad aram recommendans,

Plurimum reverendæ Dignitatis Vestrae

obsequiosior prior tuus.

Signatum J.P. Loijens, prior

Gaesdonck 29 julii 17946

Beckers had done his best to help Gosse, but to no avail.

Several days before Loyens’ disappointing answer, on 21 July, the abbot had himself written a letter to Constantinus Belling, prior general of the Congregation of Windesheim,7 in which he had referred to the historical ties that existed between them, as the abbey of St Callixtus had been

---

1 On Georgerie, see Visschers 1851, 46-49.
2 I.M.4, pp. 185-196. The best part of the letter is translated into French by Bataille 1902, 146-153.
3 On Voet, see p. 251 n. 5.
4 I.M.4, pp. 195-196. Beckers dates his meeting with Gosse to June 1794 (Höv 45, 1: p. 3), but this cannot be correct, as Gosse writes that he and his companions only arrived in Ravenstein on 16 July (I.M.4, pp. 194-195).
5 On Loyens, see Appendix B, no. 7.
6 ‘Most reverend father confrère! Because of the pressing concerns in these times, I respond briefly to your most honoured letter. I certainly deplore the vicissitudes of their confrères, but receiving this jubilarian here in our canonry will be most dangerous for the following reasons: first, because I would expose me and our canonry to the danger of destruction now that the French are coming, because the French pursue fleeing priests, and where they find them, they are punished with death, so that they have public satisfaction; and then second, we already have four fleeing confrères here, and if the rumour of the coming of the French is continued, as is reported and said, those four who are currently being entertained here must and want to depart. Because of this it will be most dangerous for us and for this jubilarian. These things considered, it is better to be out of danger than with danger to do good. Among those four is one confrère of the abbot of Cysoing, who is called Sibenbour. He greets his most reverend abbot and his other confrères most heartily, with which before-mentioned friendly greeting to the reverend abbot, and the others, who are subject to you, I remain with paternal affection, and recommending myself at the altar, Your Most Reverend Dignity’s. Your obsequious prior. Signed J.P. Loyens, prior. Gaesdonck, 29 July 1794’ (I.M.4, pp. 197-198).
7 Belling was prior of the convent of Sankt Georgenberg in Grauhof, near Goslar, and served as prior general of Windesheim from 3 July 1786 until his death on 17 January 1807 (Acquoy 1984, 3: 320).
reformed by Windesheim. Gosse had asked that the kindness that had been shown in the past be repeated in this hour of need, and that Belling order the priors of his congregation to provide shelter for the canons of Cysoing. 1 Belling’s answer, if he ever gave one, has not been included in the Fasciculus, so it is not known what he decided, but it seems to have had no immediate effect for Gosse and his companions. When they left Ravenstein to make for Frenswegen, near Nordhorn, that community dismissed them out of hand by saying that they would not be able to provide even for the old man. 2 It was only in response to a letter of 27 May 1795, written by Gosse from Hildesheim, where the exiles had been sheltered by the baron of Haxtausen, that Prior General Belling finally decided to accommodate them, and in January 1796 Gosse was admitted to the canonry of Grauhof, where he would stay for several years. This aid came too late for the abbot’s senior companion, who apparently was unable to travel any further and died at Hildesheim later that same year. 3 Despite his polite letters, the thought will probably have crossed Gosse’s mind that history was repeating itself in his strained relationship with the Congregation of Windesheim. Centuries earlier, the community of Cysoing had been denied access to the congregation for being an abbey, and its final abbot had great difficulty in finding shelter with them even in the eighteenth century. The fact that Beckers was able to incorporate the meeting with Gosse in the very first pages of the Beschrijving means that he must have started working on it somewhere after 1794. The text itself provides even more information on the writing process. In the second part, Beckers briefly describes the history of Soeterbeeck, and as he discusses the move to Deursen in 1732 he says that the convent tot heeden den 13den julii 1804 floeert, hier van hier naar meer. 4 This statement is important for several reasons: first, because it reveals that, although it is unknown when Beckers began working on his magnum opus, he was still busy writing it in July 1804, and second, because he does not return to the topic of Soeterbeeck at all within the scope of this book. 5 Equally revealing is a reference to the rector’s own convent of Gaesdonck which occurs earlier in the same entry. Beckers says Soeterbeeck’s rectorate had recently been entrusted to Gaesdonck, van welcke geschiedenisse (zoo het den Alderhooghste behaaght) daar naar meer zal schrijven. 6 He had, of course, mentioned the Windesheim convent in the first part of the Beschrijving, but there he had said that alhoewel het mijn professie klooster is, niets weet te zeggen als door geheugen, en om dat het feellbaar is, zoo zal waghten met desselfs beschrijvinge, tot dat wat zekers kan vermelde. 7 Because Beckers

---

1 J.M.4, pp. 199-204.
2 On Frenswegen’s dismissal, see pp. 205-207 of Gosse’s letter of 27 August 1794 to the baron of Fürstenberg (J.M.4, pp. 205-209). It was very likely Beckers himself who asked for refuge for Gosse at Frenswegen, although I have not been able to confirm this. Kohl 1971, 43 mentions Beckers in a list of French religious who sought refuge in that convent in the years following 1793, apparently on the basis of the third volume of Karl von Coth’s Annalen des Gotteshauses Marienwald genannt Frenswegen (Steinfurt, Princely Archives, Library, C 33 c). I have not been able to consult this source, but the most straightforward explanation of the presence of Beckers’ name on this list is that Von Coth misunderstood Beckers’ plea for help, thinking it concerned himself rather than Gosse. It is also possible that Beckers applied for help for yet another French cleric, rather than for Gosse. On the continuation of Gosse’s journey, see J.M.4, pp. 210-216, and the summary in Bataille 1902, 153-154.
4 ‘Is still flourishing today, 13 July 1804, on which more hereafter’ (Hov 45, 2: p. 28, no. 15). The complete entry for Soeterbeeck occurs on pp. 27-28, and is transcribed at the beginning of Appendix D.
5 Soeterbeeck is only mentioned with reference to the meeting with Abbot Gosse (Hov 45, 1: p. 3, no. 6; 2: p. 30, no. 23). Even the entry in the third part on Antonius van Hemert, who was rector of Soeterbeeck in the sixteenth century, and numerous copies of whose works are currently part of the Soeterbeeck Collection (see pp. 234-235), makes no mention of Soeterbeeck (Hov 45, 3: p. 52b).
6 ‘On whose history I will (if it pleases the Almighty) write more hereafter’ (Hov 45, 2: p. 28, no. 15).
7 ‘Although it is the canony where I was professed, I am not able to say anything about it except from memory, and because that is fallible I will wait with its description until I can report anything with certainty’ (Hov 45, 1: p. 10, no. 22).
had nothing reliable to say on the history of the convent of Gaesdonck when he was writing his Beschrijving, he chose to postpone his treatment of it. This statement not only reveals something of Beckers’ method of working and his ambition of being a reliable historian, but together with the promise of more information on Soeterbeeck it provides a connection between the Beschrijving and his other works of history.

There can be no doubt that both the second version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck and his Canonia Gaesdonckana were meant to fulfill the promise he had made in the above-quoted passages of filling the two gaps in the Beschrijving. This is immediately evident from the works’ physical appearance: all three of them were written on folia of the same size, with the same superfluous bounding lines in ink on the right-hand side of every page, and the new chronicle and the Canonia have the same double-column lay-out as the third part of the Beschrijving. It is very likely, moreover, that the chronicle was actually conceived as part of the latter, for the upper margins of its first seven pages still show traces of a header, afterwards erased, identifying it as Het 3de Deel.\footnote{1} This seems to mean that Beckers, as he was working simultaneously on the first version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck and the Beschrijving, decided to abandon the former and rework it to fit into the larger work. This must have happened in 1805, as that is the year of the final entry of the first version of the chronicle. However, he must have abandoned the idea and put the chronicle on hold again before the year was out, as 1805 also appears on the title page of the Beschrijving as the year in which it was finished, with a survey of important canons regular and congregations rather than a chronicle of Soeterbeeck as its third part.

That Beckers abandoned the idea of incorporating the chronicle in the Beschrijving in 1805 is corroborated by a break in the chronicle’s writing which is evident at the bottom of the first column of the final page which originally bore a header identifying it as being the third part of the Beschrijving.\footnote{2} This is where the second version reaches the point where the original chronicle had been abandoned, with the death of Prioress Van den Heuvel on 9 February 1805, although the previous paragraph, which has no equivalent in the earlier version, mentions the summer of 1805. The next paragraph shows a noticeable change in the script and the ink, and suddenly jumps back in time to recount the death of Joannes Adrianus Verseiden van Varick, one of the convent’s principal benefactors, on 2 August 1791.\footnote{3} Saying that ik heb nodigh geaght deez historie hier bij te voegen, om volgens pligt den tol van dankbaarheit daar te stellen,\footnote{4} Beckers then picks up his narrative again with an account of a fire which struck the convent’s neighbours on 7 June 1806. This probably indicates that, over the course of 1805, Beckers must have laid down his work on the revision of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck to instead start working on part three of the Beschrijving, only to resume the chronicle again in 1806.

Before going on to discuss Beckers’ revised chronicle, I should briefly address the question of the audience which the rector had in mind for the Beschrijving. Unlike the conventual chronicle, which was clearly meant for the benefit of the sisters of Soeterbeeck themselves, this is a very general work. It was intended to include detailed sections on Soeterbeeck and Gaesdonck, but that is probably only because these were the two convents with which Beckers was most intimately connected and to whose archives he had the easiest

\footnote{1}{The third part’ (ASP 4, pp. 1-7). The page numbers of the chronicle’s second version have also been changed. The original pagination of what is currently pp. 1-18 cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but seems to have been 9-26, so it did not run on from part 2 of the Beschrijving. The preceding eight pages have been lost. The three parts of the Beschrijving are also identified by headers, but these appear never to have been present in the Canonia.}
\footnote{2}{ASP 4, p. 7a.}
\footnote{3}{Verseiden is duly mentioned as a benefactor in Soeterbeeck’s Memoriale monialium (ACRW 1112, p. 9, no. 5), but not in the book of benefactors (ASP 267, August).}
\footnote{4}{‘I thought it necessary to add this story here in order to to dutifully pay the toll of gratitude’ (ASP 4, p. 8a).}
access, and not because he had either of them in mind as his target audience. The communities of Soeterbeeck or Gaesdonck are not addressed in either of their entries or elsewhere, and although the Beschrijving ended up in Gaesdonck’s library, there is no clear sign that it was specifically written for that convent. Beckers seems instead to have intended the Beschrijving for Dutch-reading members of the Congregation of Windesheim generally, as is evident from his use of the first person plural in phrases such as *onze vergaderingh van Windezem, onze medebroeders* and *onze statuten*, which must include the reader because he refers to himself in the first person singular. There are no passages that explicate his purpose, which is probably best described by what he actually did: providing, in encyclopaedic form, a final survey of the entire history of his congregation at a moment in history when it had become nearly extinct, in pious remembrance of its former glory.

### 7.4. The Second Version of the Chronicle of Soeterbeeck: Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieuw klooster Soeterbeek

The second version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck, entitled, at the head of the first column of its first page, *Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieuw klooster Soeterbeek*, is simultaneously a reworking and an expansion of the earlier version. It survives as the first 18 numbered pages of a large cardboard-bound volume with red sprinkled edges and a general title page that says: *Beschrijving van het oud en nieuw klooster Soeterbeek; van no. 1 tot no. 19 door den weleerw. heer A. Bekkers, rector; van n. 19 tot n. [36] door den weleerw. heer H.J.A. de Bruijn, rector.*

This title is in the hand of Rector Henricus de Bruijn (1842-1844), whose continuation of Beckers’ chronicle covers the period between 1808 and 1844, and is itself continued in an unidentified hand as far as 1906.

The first seven pages of Beckers’ section of the chronicle, written in 1805 to be a part of the Beschrijving as argued above, cover roughly the same ground as the first version, but stylistic infelicities have been ironed out and the new text has a slightly different focus, probably with an eye to the wider audience intended for the Beschrijving. With reference to style, it has already been noted that the descriptions of the foundation of the convent and the finding of a miraculous statue of Our Lady, at first occurring in the midst of the account of the events of 1716, here appear in their proper chronological places. That the new chronicle was intended for a different audience is apparent from the fact that the original version’s overlong descriptions of structural renovations and the costs involved have largely been omitted, and that references to the community in the first person are less common, although they still occur. Significantly, the chronicle now starts by referring simply to *het*, rather than *ons, oud klooster Soeterbeek*.

After giving a reworking of the chronicle’s first version, the new one continues with a surprisingly elaborate description of the installation of Louis Bonaparte as King of Holland in the summer of 1806, followed by an even longer overview of all religious communities that

---

1 ‘Our Congregation of Windesheim […] our confrères […] our statutes’ (Höv 45, 1: p. 3, no. 6; p. 5, no. 9; p. 6, no. 13; p. 8, no. 17; p. 13, no. 35; 2: p. 27, no. 15; 3: p. 71b).
2 E.g., Höv 45, 1: p. 6, no. 13; p. 21, no. 84; p. 22; 2: p. 38, no. 81; p. 41, no. 88; p. 49 no. 6.
3 ASP 4. Rector De Bruijn left a gap for the last page number of his own part, obviously because he could not tell how far he would be able to continue Beckers’ chronicle.
4 De Bruijn was born in Grave on 20 July 1811 and ordained to the priesthood on 22 December 1838. He was rector from 1842 to 1844, and died on 14 April 1862 (Van Dijk 1982b, 203, no. 6).
5 ASP 4, pp. 19-36.
6 ASP 4, pp. 36-37.
8 ASP 4, pp. 1a-b, 3a.
9 E.g., ASP 4, pp. 1a, 5a-7b.
were still living in the area of Ravenstein, Cuijk and Boxmeer.1 Only after this survey, which also includes a description of the state and the inhabitants of the convent of Soeterbeeck tot nu toe in september 1806,2 does the chronicle properly resume again with the events of dit aangevangene jaar 1807.3 The chronicle continues in Beckers’ hand until 1808, and is then taken over, in mid-sentence and from one page to the next, by Rector De Bruijn. Judging from the stub which is still present between the two pages and the fact that Beckers’ final sentence is carried on in De Bruijn’s hand, it seems that De Bruijn cut out a page on which Beckers had begun to write and subsequently copied what Beckers had already written onto the next. It cannot be said with certainty, therefore, where Beckers’ original text ends and De Bruijn’s begins.

Continuing the habit that he had developed during the writing of the Beschrijving, Beckers made extensive use of published sources in the new part of the chronicle. His account of the miraculous circumstances of the foundation of the Bridgettine abbey of Coudewater in Rosmalen is an acknowledged paraphrase of a passage in Dionysius Mutsaerts’ Generale kerckelieke historie (1624).4 Also, when describing how, after the city of ’s-Hertogenbosch was taken by William of Orange in 1629, Roman Catholic priests living in the Meijerij had been heavily persecuted and, when arrested, were lucky to get off with only a fine, he mentions that dit getuigen gereformeerde schrijvers gelijk Joannes Henricus van Heurn, Van Oudenhofen en meer andere zelfs.5 This is a reference to Johan Hendrik van Heurn’s four-volume Historie der stad en Meyerey van ’s Hertogenbosch (1776-1778),6 and to Jacob van Oudenhoven’s Beschryvinge der stad ende Meyerey van ’s Hertogen-bossche (1649).7 After mentioning these authors, however, Beckers quickly goes on to say: 

Ik behoeft deze schrijvers niet bij te halen, want heb zelfs zinter ik hier rector van Nieu Zoeterbeek ben, priesters gekent, die 600 gulden Hollands boeten hebben moeten betaalen, dat zij den Meijereizen bodem dooreisden en in de hande der papevangers, wiens afstammelinge nogh leefen, ongelukkigh vervielen.8

This passage is a good example of the way in which Beckers was able to combine information from written sources with tradition, hearsay and personal experience.

It is also interesting for another reason, however. The rector’s description of the virulent anti-Catholicism of the Dutch Republic and his claim that it still had its living inheritors acquire a note when they are read in their context. They are part of very

---

1 The installation of the king covers pp. 8a-10b, and the survey of the convents in the area of Boxmeer, Cuijk and Ravenstein appears on pp. 10b-15b.
2 'This year 1806 which has just begun' (ASP 4, p. 15b). Cf. similar statements elsewhere: dit lopent jaar 1806 ('this current year 1806', ASP 4, p. 14a); tot 1807 in januario in welcke maund dit schriijve ('until January 1807, in which month I am writing this', ASP 4, p. 14a); het vorige jaar 1806 ('the last year, 1806', ASP 4, p. 16a).
3 The installation of the king covers pp. 8a-10b, and the survey of the convents in the area of Boxmeer, Cuijk and Ravenstein appears on pp. 10b-15b.
4 This year 1806 which has just begun’ (ASP 4, p. 15b). Cf. similar statements elsewhere: dit lopent jaar 1806 ('this current year 1806', ASP 4, p. 14a); tot 1807 in januario in welcke maund dit schriijve ('until January 1807, in which month I am writing this’, ASP 4, p. 14a); het vorige jaar 1806 (‘the last year, 1806’, ASP 4, p. 16a).
5 ASP 4, pp. 14b-15a. The passage is based on pp. 188b-189a of the Oorsprongh, begin ende vervolgh van het ghelof, ende de kerckelycke geschiedenissen in onse Nederlanden in Mutsaerts’ Generale kerckelieke historie. (I made use of vol. 2 of NUL, OD 49 a 6 for comparison.) On Mutsaerts and his Historie, see Van der Aa 1869.
6 'Reformed authors like Johan Hendrik van Heurn, Van Oudenhoven and others testify to this themselves’ (ASP 4, p. 17b).
7 Judging from his mention of a fine below, Beckers probably refers to Van Heurn’s passage on the resolution of the States General, dated 23 January 1638, to impose a fine of 600 guilders on priests who were caught while performing their religious duties in the Meijerij, which occurs in vol. 2, pp. 498-499. (I made use of NUL, OD 13 c 39 for comparison.) As discussed on p. 272 n. 14, Beckers may have made use of the copy in the monastic library of Gaesdonck (R 184 (olim B 2162)), although precisely the second volume is currently missing there. On Van Heurn and his Historie, see Brugmans 1930a.
8 I do not need to quote these authors, for, since I became rector here of New Soeterbeeck, I have personally become acquainted with priests who regrettably fell into the hands of papist-hunters, whose descendants are still alive, and have to pay fines of 600 Holland guilders because they travelled across the Meijerij’ (ASP 4, p. 17b).
elaborate descriptions of the recent establishment of the Kingdom of Holland and serve to illustrate and underscore the many improvements this development had brought for the Roman Catholic minority. At present, priests could travel freely without any fear of fines, and never mind the descendants of papist hunters. Louis Bonaparte was a member of the Church which they had persecuted, and his advent must have filled Beckers with hope that things had finally taken a definitive turn for the better for all who shared their new king’s religion, including the community of Soeterbeeck. This is probably why the rector’s account of Louis’ installation and reception is so long, and why it exudes such optimism. It may actually be what made Beckers decide to pick up and continue the second version of his chronicle as an independent work in 1806 after having finished his *Beschrijving* the year before, as I intend to show now.

In order to support my argument, it is helpful to establish that the rector’s private conversations did not only furnish him with information, but also influenced his writing process on a fundamental level. This becomes evident from a close inspection of one of the extensive quotes which Beckers extracted from various speeches that had been given around Louis Bonaparte’s installation, as these were reported on in various editions of the *Koninglyke staats-courant*. With reference to the audience that the king had granted to a number of high ecclesiastical authorities on 17 July 1806, the rector suddenly adopts a critical attitude towards his source. The *Staats-courant* says that the spokesman on the ecclesiastical side was Antonius van Alphen, vicar apostolic of ’s-Hertogenbosch, but Beckers changes this to Anthonius van Gilis, president of the seminary of that vicariate in Herlaar. He also corrects the initial of Arnoldus Borret, commissioner general of the districts Ravenstein and Megen, from N. to A, and omits the newspaper’s reference to Adrianus Oomen, president of the seminary of Breda. After having quoted Van Gils’ speech and the king’s answer as reported in the newspaper, Beckers adds a description of a brief bit of informal conversation which ensued when the meeting’s official part had ended, during which the king expressed his intention of paying the clergymen a visit. Concerning this piece of information, Beckers says:

---

1 It may conveniently be mentioned here that Peijnenburg 1982b, 50 argues that Beckers had considered the Batavian Republic to be a continuation of the Dutch Republic because he occasionally referred to the former as the *Hollanderse Republiek* (‘Republic of Holland’, ASP 45, 1: p. 30; ASP 4, p. 7a). It is probably not merited to draw such a far-reaching conclusion solely on the basis of this evidence. According to Bart Verheijen, who is writing a PhD thesis at Radboud University Nijmegen on resistance to the French annexation of the Netherlands, the epithets ‘Batavian’ and ‘Holland’ were used without much distinction in Beckers’ days (personal communication with the author). However, perhaps the rector’s statement that the descendants of papist-hunters were still alive even in the Kingdom of Holland in 1808 can be seen as significant additional support for Peijnenburg’s argument.

2 ASP 4, pp. 8a-10b. Beckers quotes, without acknowledgement, from the *Koninglyke staats-courant* of 16 June 1806 (no. 81, p. 2b) on pp. 8a-b and that of 22 July (no. 24 (113), p. 2a) on pp. 10a-b, and, with acknowledgement, from that of 24 June (no. 89, pp. 1b-2a) on pp. 8b-9b. On p. 17a, he acknowledges quoting the *Rotterdamsche courant* of 22 December 1807 (no. 153, p. 3a) to describe the ordination of several clergymen by the bishop of Roermond.

3 Cf. the *Koninglyke staats-courant* of 22 July 1806 (no. 24 (113), p. 2a) and ASP 4, p. 10a. Beckers does not transcribe the report completely literally, but beyond the changes mentioned here there are only very minor paraphrases.

4 Van Alphen was born in Boxtel on 16 May 1748 and served as vicar apostolic of ’s-Hertogenbosch from 1790 until his death on 1 May 1831 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 158-162; 3: 351; 5: 644, 648).

5 Van Gils was born in Tilburg on 29 July 1758 and served as president of the seminary from 1 January 1798 until his death on 10 June 1834 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 189-193; 3: 352, 562; 4: 295, 354; cf. the sources mentioned by Harix 1965/66, 22).

6 On Borret, see p. 253 n. 7.

7 Oomen was born in Teteringen on 9 December 1758, and served as president of the seminary of Breda from 1798 until his death in 1817 (Van Duinkerken 1941, 15-48).
Dit laaste is in gene couranten bekent gemaakt, maar heb het van de heeren zelfs vernomen.\(^1\)

It cannot be said with certainty on what occasion Beckers was given the information for his corrections and expansion of the newspaper report, but a possibility is offered by the diary of Anthonius van Gils.

The president of the seminary kept the journal in question, entitled *Ephemerides*, from 1 February 1806 to 19 May 1812.\(^2\) Concerning his meeting with the king, Van Gils writes: *Hora prima audientia apud regem, me eloquente. Responsio humanissima.*\(^3\) This confirms Beckers’ account, which features Van Gils rather than Van Alphen as the speaker on the ecclesiastical side and reports on some pleasant conversation, but does not provide any additional information. In his entry for Tuesday 2 September 1806, however, Van Gils mentions that he went to Ravenstein and Megen with Joannes Hoogaerts, the dean of the city of ’s-Hertogenbosch and administrator of its cathedral,\(^4\) and Martinus van Hooff, vicar of the parish of St Catharine in the same city,\(^5\) and that they visited the convent of Soeterbeeck.\(^6\) Hoogaerts had also been present at the audience with the king, and it is very likely that he and Van Gils told Beckers about their experiences, shortly enough after the meeting for it to easily present itself as a topic of conversation.\(^7\) Beckers, who, as has been argued above,\(^8\) had temporarily set aside his work on the revised version of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck in 1805 and can first be traced working on it again in September 1806 with the elaborate description of the installation of the king and the survey of religious institutions which follows it, may well have been inspired to do so by stories that he had heard from Hoogaerts and Van Gils at this very meeting.

If there is indeed a connection between the visit of 2 September and Beckers’ continuation of the second version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck, that makes his meeting with Van Gils and Hoogaerts very important. It was not simply another occasion on which he was able to use his private conversations as a source of information, but actually provided the incentive to start writing again. Taking this possibility into consideration, the presence in the chronicle of the excursuses on the king’s installation and the surviving monasteries in Ravenstein, which initially feel out of place because of their length, begin to make more sense.

Van Gils and Hoogaerts’ eyewitness account supported the newspaper reports in demonstrating the Louis Bonaparte’s good character and his willingness to improve the position of those who professed his own faith. Beckers must have been delighted with this, and it appears to have been delight at chronicling a joyous turn in history which induced him to start writing again. First he spends several pages celebrating the monarch who was going to be responsible for the improvement. Having done so, he describes at great length the state of monastic life in the originally independent and Catholic Land of Ravenstein,\(^9\) and justifies this long survey of religious institutions in a way that confirms the mood of exultation: *Heb deeze*

1 ‘This last bit was not reported in any newspaper, but I learned it from the gentlemen themselves’ (ASP 4, p. 10b).
2 It has been edited by Harkx 1965/66.
3 ‘At one o’clock audience with the king, me doing the talking. A most humane response’ (Harkx 1965/66, 20).
4 Hoogaerts was born in Someren, and served as administrator of the cathedral from 1797 to 1814 and as dean of the city from 1803 until his death on 30 August 1840 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 210; 3: 22; 4: 318, 320, 343; 5: 789; Harkx 1965/66, 228 n. 18).
5 Van Hooff was born in ’s-Hertogenbosch and was parochial vicar of St Catherine from 1803 until 1810. He died on 13 April 1811 (Schutjes 1870-1881, 4: 354; 5: 868; Harkx 1965/66, 228 n. 33).
6 Harkx 1965/66, 21.
7 On Hoogaerts’ presence at the audience, see ASP 4, p. 10a and the *Koninglyke staats-courant* of 22 July 1806 (no. 24 (113), p. 2a). Beckers might also have learned the details of the audience from Arnoldus Borret, as he maintained contact with Soeterbeeck as well (see p. 253 n. 7).
8 See pp. 277-278.
9 Van der Ree-Scholtens 1993, 79-80.
kloosters en vergaderinge beschreven, om met rede te toonen, datze veele voordeelen in en aan het land doen, en dat het niet te bedencken is of zullen wel in haaren staat verblijfen. Beckers had had to describe year after year of anti-Catholic measures denying the value these institutions had for society, and had personally witnessed the dissolution of many for the very same reason by Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II in 1783 and again by the French in 1796. Now that their future seemed safe he was finally able to vindicate them, and thereby also himself and the sisters in his care. From this vindication onwards, Beckers’ part of the chronicle consists mostly of ever more triumphant stories about rewon religious freedom in the period from 1806 to 1808. Even if Van Gils and Hoegaerts had nothing to do with it, it is clear that Beckers’ return to work on his chronicle was brought about by enthusiasm for the current political situation and by optimism about the future. After having documented all the crises in the history of Soeterbeeck and the larger religious community of which it was part, it now seemed he would finally be able to describe their revival.

I must admit that this may not be all that there is to it. In retrospect, Beckers’ final words, overflowing with optimism, and indeed the entire continuation of his chronicle, in particular the final clause of the justification just quoted, are almost too triumphant. He seems to be laying his optimism on just a little too thick for it to be taken entirely at face value, and perhaps he was actually trying to convince himself while on some level still silently fearing that, although the present king was well-disposed towards the Roman Catholic religion, its position was still precarious. The descendants of papist-hunters were still alive, after all. If Beckers did indeed have these doubts, history would prove him right, although he did not live to see the bitter end.

7.5. Canonia Gaesdonckana

The final entry in the second version of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck that was begun by Beckers rather than by De Bruijn was for the year 1808. That is also the year which is associated with the Canonia Gaesdonckana, Beckers’ description of the canonry of Gaesdonck. This work, occupying, in double columns, the first 14 pages of a large cardboard-bound volume, starts out with a brief review of existing literature on the canonry of Gaesdonck, which is followed by a long list of its priors and canons, mostly in the order of their profession. Near the end of this list, Beckers writes of Joannes Bosch that he was nogh in het leefen 1808, and of himself that he was schryver deezes, den 9den october 1808. The list of canons is followed by a narrative description of the canonry’s location and outward appearance, which is entitled Beschrijvingh van klooster and ends in mid-sentence, unfinished, after less than two pages. — Judging from what little Beckers actually wrote of this

1 I have described these convents and congregations to establish with reason that they are of great profit in and for the country, and that it cannot be conceived but that they would remain in their current state’ (ASP 4, p. 15b).
3 On the development under the Napoleonic government of the area that would later make up the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch, see Schutjes 1870-1881, 2: 71-76.
4 Höv 46. For a description of this manuscript, see Hövelmann 1987e, 68, no. 46. Between two empty pages at the back of the book is a piece of paper on which Beckers wrote a list of the names of several convents of the Congregation of Windesheim, with references to the relevant pages and entries in the second part of his Beschrijving. The list consists of most of the convents discussed on Höv 46, pp. 32-41, but it is unclear what its purpose was or why these convents were singled out in this way. They were all full members of the congregation, rather than merely being associated with it, and so did not really belong in the second part of the Beschrijving at all, but the convents listed by Beckers are by no means the only Windesheim ones that have entries in the second part.
5 The review occupies pp. 1a-2a; the list of priors and canons covers pp. 2b-13a.
6 ‘Still alive in 1808’ (Höv 46, p. 12a). On Bosch, see Appendix B, no. 2.
7 The author of this work, on 9 October 1808 (Höv 46, p. 12b).
8 The description covers pp. 13a-14b.
section, it seems to have been intended to cover the entire history of Gaesdonck, from its foundation to its dissolution and beyond, on the same scale as that of the history of Soeterbeeck in the chronicles. Had it been finished, it would undoubtedly have served as a heartfelt in memoriam for a convent that had been dissolved six years earlier, but many of whose members were still alive.

Although the Canonia fulfills the promise of more information on Gaesdonck that Beckers made in the first part of his Beschrijving,¹ it seems that it was not actually written to be a part of that work. First of all, because the text on Gaesdonck is brief and because its hand does not display any conspicuous breaks, it is likely that it was written during a limited period of time and subsequently abandoned. This will have happened in 1808, three years after the Beschrijving had been finished. Second, whereas the latter work appears to have been intended for a general audience within the Congregation of Windesheim, the Canonia was clearly meant for Gaesdonck itself. It contains many references, mostly describing the place where a given canon was professed, to that convent being hier,² and although these are often merely translations of hic in Beckers’ sources and therefore do not say anything about where the rector was when he wrote this book, it probably does mean that it was intended to be read at Gaesdonck. It seems, then, that although it was originally conceived as part of a greater work, the Canonia was actually begun as a standalone description of Beckers’ own convent, for the benefit of his own confrères.

The published sources which Beckers used for writing the Canonia are largely the same as those he had previously also acknowledged using for the Beschrijving. Most of the sources he quotes in his review of the literature on Gaesdonck are already familiar: the Windesheim constitutions printed in 1553—although Beckers erroneously gives the year 1551—⁴ Hopp’s Korte Beschrywing,⁵ Lindeborn’s Historia,⁶ and Zunggo’s Prodomus.⁷ There is only one new source: Henricus Gualter Eskes’ Historie van het Land van Cleve (1789).⁸ Unpublished sources whose use Beckers acknowledges include Gaesdonck’s book of anniversaries,⁹ and de tabellen die voor de vernietingh in den ganck of pandt langhs de kerck waren geplaatst, en thans zijn berustende bij den weleerwaarde heer Van Haeren, pastor te Goch, en op welcke de naamen der weleerwaarde heeren priorum, confratrum onder ieder prior van welcke zij aangenomen waren, waren gedrukt.¹⁰ There are two of these tables, both of which are now back at Gaesdonck and grace the wall outside the library room. Beckers’ description only matches the first one; the second lists all canons regular professed at Gaesdonck in the order in which they died, with the year and the place of their death.

Rather than basing himself on a single source for the list of priors and canons that makes up the bulk of his Canonia, Beckers seems to have combined information from multiple sources, supplementing it with personal knowledge. An example of his occurs in the

---

¹ Höv 45, 1: p. 10, no. 22.
² ‘Here’ (Höv 46, pp. 2b-14b).
³ Gaesdonck is listed on p. 15 of the second part, following the constitutions themselves.
⁴ As noted on p. 272, Beckers had also done so in Höv 45, 1: p. 8, no. 17.
⁵ Beckers quotes p. 144 (Höv 46, p. 1a), just as he had done in Höv 45, 1: p. 10, no. 22.
⁶ Beckers translates a passage from pp. 328-329 (Höv 46, p. 1a-b); he had already translated the same passage once before, and slightly differently, in Höv 45, 3: p. 51a.
⁸ Beckers quotes a passage from p. 15a (Höv 46, p. 1b). (I made use of LCSA, B-3474 for comparison.) On Eskes and his Historie, see Tervooren 2011, 31-36.
⁹ Höv 46, pp. 13a, 14a. This is A 89 in the archives of Gaesdonck (cf. Hövelmann 1987e, 67, no. 24).
¹⁰ ‘The tables which, before the dissolution [of Gaesdonck in 1802], used to hang in the cloister next to the church and are now kept by the reverend [Johannes] van Haeren, parish priest of Goch, and onto which the names were applied of the reverend priors and confrères, underneath the priors by whom they were admitted’ (Höv 46, p. 1b).
entry for Johannes Zeller,\footnote{Zeller was born in Nijmegen and died in Gaesdonck on 26 June 1567 (Scholten 1906, 124).} of whom Beckers says the following: \textit{Staat niet geschreven wanneer hij is gestorven, edogh daar naar bevonden dit geschiet te zijn 1567}.\footnote{\textit{It does not say when he died, but I found later that this happened in 1567} (Höv 46, p. 8a).} The year of Zeller’s death is indeed absent from the first table of names, but it appears on the second, as well as in the book of anniversaries,\footnote{CAG, Monastic Archives, A 89, p. 87.} and in Gaesdonck’s \textit{Liber}, a chronicle begun by Prior Petrus Nabben (1721-1750) in 1724 and continued by several of his successors until 1853.\footnote{CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 38, p. 47. On Nabben and this manuscript, see p. 221 n. 1.} Beckers may have used any or all of these sources. Similarly, when speaking of Theodorus Metzmecher,\footnote{Metzmecher was born in Kranenburg and served as prior of Gaesdonck from 1623 until his death on 5 October 1670 (Höv 38, pp. 34, 49-50; Scholten 1906, 113-114, no. 22). He was the one to begin the \textit{Gaesdonckx chronicxken} (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 29, on which see Hövelmann 1987e, 67, no. 29; 1987f, 94). An edition of this text is currently in preparation by Joseph Böhmer of the CAG, for publication in \textit{Gaesdoncker Blätter}.} he writes: \textit{Hij moet zeer in achtning zijn geweest, want vinde dat boeken aan hem zijn opgedragen}.\footnote{He must have been very highly esteemed, for I find that books have been dedicated to him} It is likely that Beckers had seen some of these books in the library of Gaesdonck, and used the experience to flesh out his own work.

The \textit{Canonia} displays clear signs of having been written with the same care as Beckers’ other works of history. The critical attitude that induced him to question the location of Mariënberg in Anjum and to correct the newspaper accounts of the installation of Louis Bonaparte, resurfaces when he quotes Egbert Hopp a second time concerning the etymology of the name \textit{Gaesdonck}:

Als wanneer men het wel betracht moet men wel gewaar worden, dat het voor dezen niets anders is geweest, als een broek of donck, waarvan den naam ook zekerlijk ontsproten is, van de ligging, Gaesdonck te noemen, en aldus van gans en donck heerkomt. Het is waar dat Egbertus Hop in zijne Beschrijvingh van het geheele Land van Cleve zegt: Gaesdunk, quasi Gadesdunk (habitatio divinae). Hij staattter wel meer nenen, darom is dit hem ook light toe te geefen.\footnote{Thinking about it, one must reach the conclusion that before this it was nothing but a broek [‘marsh’] or donck [‘swamp’], and this, its location, was certainly the origin of its name, Gaesdonck, which therefore derives from gans [‘entire’] and donck [‘dune’]. It is true that Egbert Hopp, in his Beschrijvingh van het geheele Land van Cleve, says: Gaesdunk, quasi Gadesdunk (habitatio divinae) [‘Gaesdunk, that is, Gadesdunk (habitation of a goddess’), but he is more often mistaken, so this can easily be forgiven him as well} Beckers clearly disagreed with Hopp’s derivation and posited his own, although it turns out that he was also wrong himself. Peter Bergrath argues persuasively that the name of Gaesdonck derives in fact from \textit{gans}, ‘brook’, and \textit{donck}, ‘dune’, and refers to the dune by the river Kendel on which the convent was eventually built.\footnote{‘It does not say when he died, but I found later that this happened in 1567’ (Höv 46, p. 8a). The critical attitude induced him to question the location fact and surmise. He diligently describes how, on the feast of the apostles Simon and Jude (28 October) in 1634, Caspar Münster, titular bishop of Aureliopolis and suffragan of Osnabrück,\footnote{On Münster, see Möller 1887, 132-150, no. 20.} reconciled the monastic church and fixed the date for the annual celebration of the church’s dedication on the same date. He then immediately goes on to admit: \textit{Warom dat de kerk is verzoent kan ik niet vinden, edogh dencke door de vervolgers van ons geloof ontheilig zal zijn geweest, want het waren bedoefde tijden, die onze medebroeders eenigen}.

As was the case in the \textit{Beschrijving}, Beckers is quite frank about the gaps in his knowledge in the \textit{Canonia}.\footnote{Statements where Beckers professes ignorance occur in Höv 46, pp. 13b and 14a.} A single example suffices to show how carefully he distinguishes between fact and surmise. He diligently describes how, on the feast of the apostles Simon and Jude (28 October) in 1634, Caspar Münster, titular bishop of Aureliopolis and suffragan of Osnabrück, reconciled the monastic church and fixed the date for the annual celebration of the church’s dedication on the same date. He then immediately goes on to admit: \textit{Warom dat de kerk is verzoent kan ik niet vinden, edogh dencke door de vervolgers van ons geloof ontheilig zal zijn geweest, want het waren bedoefde tijden, die onze medebroeders eenigen}.
tijd van te voren hadden beleeft.¹ In fact the church had been profaned by the Croatian army of the Imperial general Ottavio Piccolomini, which was fighting the States’ troops in the vicinity of Goch during the hostilities of the Thirty Years’ War.² Beckers’ assumption is wrong, therefore, but the fact that he is careful to present it as a surmise, and that he was willing to record the event of the reconciliation even though the cause was unknown to him, is testimony to his fairness.

It is not known what caused Beckers to abandon the Canonia as suddenly as he did, but a hint of what Beckers had intended the unwritten part to contain appears in his biography of Prior Hermannus Eynraad (1558-1561).³ He writes: Deeen heeft van het capittel general verkregen, dat alle jaaren het feest van de Moeder Godts van 7 Weijen zoude gevierd worden, gelijk in het hartogdom Gelder; wij zullen van dit feest hier naar meer handelen.⁴ The feast of the Seven Sorrows or Compassion of the Blessed Virgin Mary had been established in the diocese of Utrecht at the instigation of Charles II, duke of Guelders, in 1514,⁵ and was adopted by several monasteries of the Chapter of Windesheim, for celebration on Friday after the second Sunday after Easter, in 1516.⁶ Beckers’ words seem to mean that Eynraad obtained permission for Gaesdonck to also celebrate this feast, but, regrettably enough, he never redeemed his promise of saying more about this matter.

7.6. Conclusion

Beckers’ works of history emerge from this chapter as a cluster of tightly interconnected texts. In 1805, the first version of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck was abandoned in favour of a revision that was originally intended to be part of his encyclopaedic survey of the Congregation of Windesheim, but which eventually became a standalone work which Beckers carried on until at least 1808, the year in which he also worked on a description of Gaesdonck which the encyclopaedia had promised. The entire conglomerate is impressive in scope and for the combination of personal involvement and scholarly rigour with which it was written, which is equal to the care with which Beckers revised Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books, but it presents a rather sad picture, on two levels.

The Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier was given a title page and presented as finished in 1805, but it is actually incomplete without the Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieu klooster Soeterbeeck and the Canonia Gaesdonckana, the latter of which was

¹ ‘I cannot find the reason why the church was reconciled, but I think it was desecrated by the persecutors of our faith, for the times which our confrères had lived through a while before had been hard’ (Höv 46, p. 14a).
² Scholten 1906, 35, 46.
³ Eynraad, also known as Daems, was born in Nijmegen. He was elected as the 17th prior of Gaesdonck in 1558 and died there on 29 November 1561 (Höv 38, pp. 32, 46-47; Scholten 1906, 112, no. 17).
⁴ He obtained from the general chapter that the feast of the Mother of God of Seven Sorrows be celebrated annually as in the Duchy of Guelders. We will return to this feast hereafter’ (Höv 46, p. 7a). This is translated literally from Gaesdonck’s book of anniversaries, which says of Eynraad: Hic à capitulo generali impetravit, ut celebraretur quotannis festum Compassionis B.M.V. sicut in ducatu Gelriensi, and adds that in eodem festo fratribus fiet pittance vini ‘on the same feast a pittance of wine is given to the brothers’, A 89, p. 136; cf. a reference to this passage in Höv 38, p. 47). Beckers was enrolled in Gaesdonck’s Confraternity of the Seven Dolours of Mary in 1761, and kept its list of members from 1764 up to and including 1771 (CAG, Monastic Archives, A 84, f. 23r-v); cf. p. 258.
⁵ Kronenburg 1904-1914, 2: 223-224. On the general history of the feast, see A Carpo 1885, 485-5486, nos. 59-61; Kronenburg 1904-1914, 2: 238-241; Huf 1916, 7-13. It was eventually extended to the universal Church in 1727, for celebration on Friday after Passion Sunday. It should not be confused with another feast of the Seven Sorrows, which arose within the Servite Order in the seventeenth century and was extended to the universal Church in 1814, to be celebrated as a greater double on the third Sunday of September (A Carpo 1885, 547-548, nos. 187-189; Huf 1916, 13-22).
⁶ Van der Woude 1953, 114. In the Soeterbeeck Collection, the office of the feast which Beckers refers to occurs as a self-contained codicological unit in IV 78, ff. 73r-78v.
hardly even begun before it was abandoned. The fragmentary state of these texts is a harsh reminder of the partial failure of Beckers’ ambitious project.

Also, the congregation and convents whose memory the rector clearly wanted to keep alive by describing their history, were at that moment in a fatal decline. Beckers must have been aware of this, for although he did not live to see the dissolution of Windesheim in 1811 or that of Soeterbeeck in 1812,1 at the moment of his death in 1810 he had experienced the closure of his own convent, Gaesdonck, in 1802, and that of the last Windesheim convent, Frenswegen in Nordhorn, in 1809.2 His historiographical works, then, testify to a venerable monastic tradition that had once been vigorous and strong but was now almost entirely gone, and which would survive only obliquely, in a few convents associated with but not fully part of it. It is against this background of decline and fall that the next chapter tries to understand not only Beckers’ works of history, but all of his activities as rector of Soeterbeeck, one of those last, indirect heirs of the Windesheim tradition.

---

1 Peijnenburg 1982b, 52; Acquoy 1984, 2: 64, 176.
Figure 8: Soeterbeeck Collection, IV 63, back board
Chapter 8: An Interpretation of Beckers’ Works in the Context of his Life

8.1. Introduction
The preceding chapters discussed practically all known traces left by Rector Arnoldus Beckers, both those within the library of Soeterbeeck, and, by extension, also the ones that survive elsewhere. These have been dated and related to each other as precisely as possible, and an interpretation of their functional meanings in the contexts of the liturgy, the library, the conventual administration and historiography has also been provided. In archaeological terms, the stratigraphic unit determined by Beckers’ identity has been laid bare and described, and an elementary form of contextual analysis has been carried out. In terms of my research process itself, I was driven by the rector’s notes in the books in the Soeterbeeck Collection to attempt to provide an answer to the question what it is exactly that he has done with them. The realisation that there is evidence beyond the collection, and indeed beyond the library, in archival sources, of more activities on Beckers’ part that might in some way shed light on this issue enticed me to study these sources as well. The result is that the foregoing pages have not been limited to a discussion of his revision of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books and his involvement in the management of its library. They have also considered his administrative duties and his histories of Soeterbeeck, Gaesdonck, and the Congregation of Windesheim, thereby providing a full overview of Beckers’ entire active life as it can be reconstructed from the writings and the traces he left behind over its course.

Because the preceding pages shed light on various aspects of life at Soeterbeeck at the end of the eighteenth century, and on the works of the final historian of the Congregation of Windesheim, they have at least some value in themselves. I have been able to qualify the contention that the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck limited their celebration of the liturgy of the hours entirely to the Little Office of the Virgin, arguing that it is likely that they prayed Vespers and Compline according to the divine office on Sundays and feasts.1 I have demonstrated the liturgical use of the organ,2 the likelihood of private books being kept in the choir stalls,3 the role of fraternities in the sisters’ devotional lives,4 and the interconnectedness of Beckers’ works of history.5 As life at Soeterbeeck helped me understand the traces in its books, so have the traces given me a better understanding of life at Soeterbeeck. Each of the preceding chapters has highlighted an important aspect of monastic life as it was lived by specific people in a specific convent at a specific time. I hope that what little light I was thereby able to shine on a particular manifestation of such general phenomena as eighteenth-century liturgy and devotion and the use of books in women’s convents may prove to be of help to students of these topics in other contexts.

Still, the reader will remember that the ultimate object of my archaeological approach is the meaning of material culture for its users, that is, in the present case, of books from the library of Soeterbeeck for Arnoldus Beckers. However, because of the way in which the scope of this study has gradually but inexorably broadened to include archival sources, and thereby moved beyond the rector’s interaction with books, its goal has also shifted. The issue at hand has become simultaneously more general and more straightforward. At present, the question is, simply: why did Beckers do what he did? What were his motivations for doing the things that left the traces that have been discussed? Of course, various books in Soeterbeeck’s library played a role in his actions and therefore had meaning for him, but they are only a part of the

1 See pp. 184-185.
3 See pp. 229-232.
4 See pp. 257-261.
5 See pp. 277-278.
equation, and the direction that my research process has taken means that it is no longer feasible for me to limit myself to them.

To reiterate, the question that remains to be answered now is what motivated Beckers to revise Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books, to manage its library, to take care of its administration and to write its history as well as that of Gaesdonck and Windesheim. So far, however, I have exclusively focused on the practical uses of Beckers’ notes and writings, and that means that only the functional meanings of the books he wrote or worked on have been covered, leaving other, less tangible aspects unexplored. What is more, the rector’s works have only been studied in the general context of the convents and the congregation with which he was associated, most prominently that of Soeterbeeck. The context of Beckers’ own life has not yet been considered, so that the personal dimension of his activities that is essential to understanding his motivations is still missing. To arrive at a more intimate and well-rounded understanding of his actions, it is necessary to try to find out what made him tick.

This is what the present and final chapter seeks to do, as far as the sources allow it. The reader will understand by now that, on the one hand, this is not a very great distance. Beckers’ stratigraphic unit does not include any highly personal or deeply reflective statements, but mostly dry liturgical revisions and businesslike ownership notes. Only rarely, even in his narrative works, does he say anything about his motivations for doing something, and such statements are always brief and limited to the functional dimension. Not even after hundreds of pages’ worth of painstaking analysis can this kind of material be made to yield very spectacular results on a personal, symbolic level. Seen from that angle, this book cannot but end with a whimper rather than a bang. On the other hand, if a whimper is all that my interaction with the sources is able to produce, it is all the more important that we listen well. I did not set out to test an explosive hypothesis, but to arrive at a fitting interpretation of the evidence I have at my disposal. If studying all of the issues that have been addressed in the preceding chapters was necessary to arrive at only a relatively simple conclusion, than that is simply the nature of my approach, subject matter and scholarly abilities. Modest as they may be, the interpretations that I am able to give of the motives behind Beckers’ actions whose traces I have studied, are the result of the meeting of my mind with his. I gladly leave it to others to judge their merit from other perspectives, but since they are what my hermeneutic spiral has led me to within the limits that have been set for it, they suffice on a conceptual level.

The first step towards understanding Beckers’ motivations is to study his biography. Not much is known about this, except for a comparatively early episode that is very thoroughly documented. Fortunately enough, this event was also revealing of the rector’s character and singularly influential on the course of his life and his goals in it. The interpretation of its meaning in Beckers’ life in the following paragraph provides the background against which the remainder of this chapter will reinterpret his activities.

Before going on to provide the necessary biographical sketch, I should note that I am aware of the potential for circular reasoning that is involved in the procedure just outlined. It entails studying Beckers’ life with an eye to understanding the written traces he left, and interpreting these traces in light of those aspects of his life that seem relevant. My answer to this insoluble methodological problem is Hodder’s: the hermeneutic circle will turn out to be a spiral if it is propelled by a continuous dialogue with the sources.¹ If my interpretation of the meaning of certain events in Beckers’ life is in line both with the facts of these particular incidents and with the rest of his biography, I believe it may safely inform my reading of his work on Soeterbeeck’s liturgy, library and administration, and on historiography. I therefore proceed by describing certain events that played out during the very first years of Beckers’

¹ On Hodder’s understanding of the hermeneutic spiral, see pp. 41-42.
rectorate, but which were almost certainly of decisive importance for the course of the rest of his life and what he decided to do with it, including the activities whose material traces are the topic of this study.

8.2. Beckers as Conspirator

One of the most important aspects of Beckers’ biography is that his election as rector of Soeterbeeck in 1772 must have come unexpectedly, at that point in his life. Arnoldus, who had been born twenty-nine years before on 8 July 1742, to the farmer Segerus Beckers and his wife Margaretha Brux in Uedem, a town in the duchy of Cleves, was just making a very promising career in the Windesheim canonry of Gaesdonck, near Goch. Prior Petrus van Kempen (1760-1775) had invested him there when he was eighteen years old, on 30 September 1760.2 He had been professed on 4 or 5 October of the next year, and ordained in October 1765.3 Only six years later, he had been elected subprior. In a conventual chronicle commenced by Prior Petrus Nabben (1721-1750), Van Kempen summarily describes this election as follows:

Anno 1771. 17 augusit D. Schell spontè et quidem per instantes preces resignavit officium subprioris et ipso die 11 9bris in festo S. Martini Dominus Arnoldus Udemiensis Beckers factus et electus in subpriorum cum singulariter esset recommendatus per nostrum reverendissimum Dominum Generalem Schamallen.4

Although it must be stressed that the circumstances under which this happened are entirely unclear, the fact that Beckers was personally nominated by Prior General Schmallen is noteworthy in and of itself. A subprior was normally elected by the prior of the convent, following the advice of his council brothers or the majority of the conventual chapter.5 On the one hand, the fact that the prior general personally recommended him must mean that Beckers was perceived to possess considerable talent. On the other, Van Kempen’s strong emphasis on this circumstance might be an attempt at justification of Schmallen’s decision in light of later developments to be discussed shortly. However this may be, the prior general’s explicit

---

1 Beckers’ date of birth is mentioned on p. 61 of a chronicle of the convent of Gaesdonck, begun in 1724 by Prior Petrus Nabben (1721-1750) and continued by several of his successors until 1853 (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 38). Nabben simply entitled his chronicle Liber, which is how it is referred to henceforth in order to distinguish it from another relevant chronicle, the Gaesdoncks cronicxken (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 29), about which more below. On Nabben and the Liber, see p. 221 n. 1. Beckers was baptised on the day of his birth (cf. p. 96 of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century register of the parish of St Lawrence in Uedem (Duisburg, North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive, Rhineland Department, Rhineland Civil Archives, BA 2598), edited by Bartels et al. 2010). His godparents were his paternal uncle Godefridus Beckers, parish priest of Well from 1736 to 1763 (cf. Habets 1875-1927, 3: 195-196; Janssen 1907, 74), and his maternal grandmother Sibilla Tack (cf. BA 2597, p. 196). He appears to have been named after his paternal grandmother, Arnolda Hoeck (cf. Driessen op ten Bulten 2006-2016, year 1704; Janssen 1907, 74). For a survey of Beckers’ immediate family, see Table 8.

2 On Van Kempen, see Appendix B, no. 12. His portrait and his autograph are reproduced in Hövelmann 1965, 31.

3 Höv 29, p. 113; Höv 38, p. 61. As indicated above, Höv 29 is a chronicle of Gaesdonck, entitled Gaesdoncks cronicxken. It was begun by Prior Theodorus Metzmecher (1623-1670), and extends from 1610 to 1794, having been continued by several of his successors, Van Kempen among them. On Metzmecher and the Cronicxken, see p. 285 n. 5. The confusion regarding the exact date of Beckers’ profession is caused by the fact that Van Kempen says it was on 5 October in the Cronicxken (Höv 29, p. 113), whereas he says it was on 4 October in the Liber (Höv 38, p. 61). Hövelmann 1987c, 39 and Van Dijk 1984a, 246; 1984b, 249 accept the Liber’s date in favour of that in the Cronicxken, but present no corroborative evidence. The fourth is indeed most likely, because it was a Sunday.

4 On 17 August of the year 1771, Rev Schelle voluntarily, and indeed with urgent prayers, resigned the office of subprior, and on the very day of 11 November, on the feast of St Martin, the Reverend Arnoldus Beckers of Uedem was made and elected subprior, because he had been particularly recommended by our Most Reverend Prior General Schmallen’ (Höv 38, p. 61). On Stephanus Schelle, see Appendix B, no. 10. Joannes Schmallen was professed in the convent of Ewig, near Attendorn, and served as prior general of Windesheim from 1766 to 1783 (Acquoy 1984, 2: 174; 3: 87-88, 320).

5 This is stipulated on p. 62, par. 1 of the Windesheim constitutions of 1639 (on which see p. 68 n. 7).
involvement in Beckers’ election as subprior means that it is all the more surprising that the young canon should subsequently, in less than a year’s time, be elected to the rectorate of Soeterbeeck.

Given the circumstances, one cannot help but suspect that Beckers was being kicked upstairs, even though it should be noted straightaway that the written accounts of his election as rector provide no evidence for this conclusion. Van Kempen continues his report merely by stating that Beckers anno 1772 16 junii Deurser in convenitu Soeterbeck factus est rector monialium ordinis nostri. The victim’s own account in his two versions of Soeterbeeck’s chronicle, though more informative when it comes to the circumstances, does not go into the background of the election either. The oldest and most expansive draft says:

Dit jaer [1771] voor bij sijnde ben ick Arnoldus Beckers geprofest van de Gaesdonck alhier [in Soeterbeeck] gekomen den 17den junij 1772: alswanneer ick voor Pinxten met eenpaerige stemmen tot rector verkoren was, naer dien de heer Henricus Erckens jaers te voren met een beroerte besoght was, en onbequaem om den autaer te bedienen, soo wordt ick als meede rector ingesteld, maer het hadt geen lange duer, want ’t behaeghde den almogenden Godt van de heer Henricus Erckens uijt de elende deeses weerelts over over te haelen naar sijn euwigh duerende glorie door een nieuwe beroerte den 19den junij 1772. This report is somewhat garbled, and flatly contradicts Van Kempen’s, but what appears to have happened is this. Somewhere over the course of 1771, Henricus Erckens, a Gaesdonck canon who had become rector of Soeterbeeck upon the death of Franciscus Nolmans in 1749, suffered a stroke. After this, his need of assistance became increasingly apparent. Shortly before Pentecost in 1772, which in this year fell on 7 June, Beckers was chosen by the general chapter of Windesheim to become Erckens’ assistant and, eventually, his successor. Van Kempen’s curious statement that Beckers was made rector on the sixteenth may be explained by assuming that this was the date when he left Gaesdonck, for by the subject’s own account he arrived at Soeterbeeck the next day. Erckens died only two days later of a second stroke, which, according to Beckers’ note in the conventual death register, took place around five

---

1 That it was a promotion is clear from the fact that the Windesheim statutes of 1639 say on p. 175, par. 6 that rectors come immediately after priors in the hierarchy, that is, before subpriors.
2 On 16 June of the year 1772 he was made rector of the nuns of our order, in the convent of Soeterbeeck in Deurser’ (Höv 38, p. 62). Judging from its shape, the number 16 in the date appears to be a correction of 15.
3 This year [1771] having ended, I, Arnoldus Beckers, professed at Gaesdonck, arrived here [at Soeterbeeck] on 17 June 1772; since I had been elected as rector with a unanimous vote before Whitsunday, after the Reverend Henricus Erckens had been hit by a stroke the year before, and rendered incapable to minister at the altar, I was appointed as his assistant rector, but this did not last long, for it pleased Almighty God to transport the Reverend Henricus Erckens from the misery of this world to his everlasting glory by another stroke on 19 June 1772 (ASP 45, 1: pp. 21-22). The second version of Beckers’ chronicle contains a more summary account, which agrees with this one in all particulars, the only addition being the biographical qualification that Beckers was van Udem in het Land van Cleve gebornigh (‘born in Uedem in the Land of Cleves’, ASP 4, p. 5a).
4 On Erckens, see p. 100 n. 4. On Nolmans, see p. 256 n. 7.
5 The Windesheim constitutions of 1639 say on p. 172, pars. 1, 3 that the rectors of Windesheim women’s convents are delegated by the general chapter, the prior general alone, or a commissioner, whereas it only mentions the prior general or a commissioner with reference to the rectors of women’s convents outside the congregation. Although Soeterbeeck belongs to the latter category, the fact that Beckers says he was elected into his office by voting precludes that it was done by an individual rather than by a body such as the general chapter. His account also suggests that Erckens did not have an assistant priest yet, despite the fact that the same constitutions explicitly prescribe this (p. 173, par. 2). Historically, Soeterbeeck’s rectors had always been assisted by such socii, as well as by lay brothers (Frenken 1931/32, 181-182, 251, 254), and a list of them appears at the back of the volume with the seventeenth-century statutes (ASP 92, ff. 18v, 52v). It is not known if Beckers himself had a socius during the majority of his rectorate, although he was assisted, during his final illness, by a certain Van der Ven, who remained at Soeterbeeck until Beckers’ successor, Joannes van den Broek (1811-1842), was appointed (ASP 4, p. 20). On Van der Ven, see p. 308 n. 7.
6 The distance between Goch and Deurser is about fifty kilometres, and it is not unlikely that Beckers took two days to cross it.
o’clock in the evening. The deceased was buried in Soeterbeek’s cemetery on 21 June, and his funerary rites were performed the next day.

The only thing that Beckers says about his election, besides the fact that it took place before Pentecost of 1772, is that it happened mit eenpaerige stemmen. 2 Apparently the chapter was unanimous in its opinion that the subprior of Gaesdonck should become rector of Soeterbeek. Like Schmollen’s recommendation earlier on, this agreement is probably a testimony to Beckers’ pastoral talents, but it does not shed light on any possible politics behind his candidacy.

The narrative sources on Beckers’ sudden career change, then, do not definitively confirm my suspicion that it was not entirely voluntary or benevolent. However, that all was not well between the former subprior and his convent is made perfectly clear by events that began to unfold two years later, in 1774. On 15 March of that year, six Gaesdonck canons, Beckers among them, wrote a letter to the commissioner general of the Congregation of Windesheim in Upper Germany—probably at that time Joannes Haas—3—in which they accused Prior Van Kempen of serious mismanagement. The authors also asked that their superior be subjected to a visitation, 4 threatening obliquely with the involvement of the secular government if this request was not honoured. The letter is the first piece of evidence of what would go on to become a long and tedious affair, whose course has been admirably reconstructed by Gregor Hövelmann, teacher at the Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck and later archivist of the districts of Guelders and Cleves. 5 He named the case after its principal initiator, Wilhelmus Coninx, who appears to have attempted to blacken Van Kempen’s character, force a visitation and have him removed from office. In 1760, both men had stood themselves up for the priorate of Gaesdonck, and Coninx, besides failing to obtain the desired position, also had to witness how one of his victorious rival’s first acts was to undo some of the decisions he had himself made as procurator. 6 Hövelmann believes that these events are at the roots of the Coninx Affair, and suggests that its eponym was motivated by a mixture of vindictiveness at having lost the election and having been second-guessed as procurator, and possibly by a desire to obtain the priorate of Gaesdonck for himself. 7 What the motivations of his fellow conspirators were I cannot say, but it is entirely plausible that Beckers, who would be the only one of the original letter writers to continue to support Coninx’s incendiary activities until the desired visitation finally took place in September 1775, was driven by similar considerations. Unknown circumstances surrounding his precipitous removal from the office of subprior in 1772 may well have played a part in inspiring his sedition, and he may have expected to regain his position once Coninx had attained the highest office.

Certainly, personal grudges are the only motivations for which there is any kind of evidence, for throughout the long and dreary affair Coninx and Beckers are not reported as having provided a single legitimate piece of criticism of Van Kempen. In a letter of 8 January 1775, 8 the spiritual and temporal misconduct that is only vaguely alluded to in that of 15

1 ASP 129, p. 11.
2 ‘With a unanimous vote’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 21). The second version of the chronicle merely states that Beckers was tot rector verkoren (‘elected as rector’, ASP 4, p. 5a).
3 Haas became prior of the convent of Mariensand, near Straelen, in 1754. He is known to have been Windesheim’s commissioner general of Upper Germany in the latter half of 1774. He became prior general in 1783, only to die two years later (Brimmers 1977, 464-465).
4 On the rules that govern visitations within the Congregation of Windesheim, see pp. 18-33 of the constitutions of 1639.
5 Hövelmann 1987b. The main source for this article are Duisburg, North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive, Rhineland Department, Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199, ff. 22-154. My own reading of these documents, which is greatly indebted to Hövelmann’s in its general outline and in almost every particular, is found in Appendix E.
6 On Coninx and Van Kempen’s strained relationship, see vol. 2, pp. 92-93.
7 Hövelmann 1987b, 15, 19, 22.
8 See vol. 2, p. 105. The letter consists of Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199, ff. 75-83.
March 1774 is specified as meaning that he wasted many thousands of rix-dollars, frequently acted without the consent of the council brothers, and was unable to maintain discipline. Although there may be a kernel of truth in the last accusation, given the way in which the Coninx Affair would eventually escalate, none of these charges are ever corroborated by documentary evidence or the witness of others. Dealing improperly with large amounts of money and being remiss in living out the constitutions could be sufficient reason for a prior to be removed from office by his visitators, if these should have been invested with that power,\(^1\) so it is clear what Coninx and Beckers were aiming for, but the most likely conclusion is that their allegations were little more than hot air and slander.

Still, even though there is no evidence for it, the possibility that Coninx and Beckers were also at least partly driven by nobler motives cannot be entirely discarded. Van Kempen was an old man, and perhaps they really did feel that they could do a better job than he at the management of Gaesdonck. Perhaps originally they had wished for a stricter maintenance of discipline, for although they actually worked against it, this might have been the result of having been carried away by circumstances. Perhaps they wanted Gaesdonck to be reformed rather than just be at its head. Perhaps they were frustrated at the slow but steady and soon to be accelerated decline of the Congregation of Windesheim,\(^2\) and felt that they must do something to counteract it. Perhaps, but in the absence of any concrete evidence in this direction, it is best to stay close to what can be known with certainty, which is Coninx and Beckers’ actual behaviour. This quickly became conspirational and inflammatory, no matter what its motivations.

Even without a clear understanding of the background of Beckers’ involvement in the Coninx Affair, it is absolutely clear that it was a watershed moment in his life, though not in a positive sense. Granted, a year and a half of bullying ended up being enough to have Schmallen undertake a visitation. Van Kempen decided to resign his office at the end of it, but only because the tensions had been too much for him, and not as a punishment or even an admission of guilt. In fact, the behaviour of the two conspirators had caused them to lose whatever support they originally may have had within the convent, to the extent that not one of the canons had a negative thing to say about their superior. Not even Beckers, who was the only one of the pair to be present at the visitation, dared to do so, probably because he realised that he and Coninx had overplayed their hands and that there would be no manipulating the prior general. Indeed, for him the end of the matter was that he did penance.\(^3\) Coninx definitively distanced himself from Gaesdonck by changing his profession to the convent of the Holy Spirit in Uedem, whose prior he had become earlier on.\(^4\) So although the letter writers’ ostensible demands for a visitation of the convent and the resignation of its prior had been met, their personal interests had not been served in the process. Still, even ending in failure, the entire business must have been of great importance for the young rector of Soeterbeeck, for various reasons.

First is its sheer scale. The affair lasted from March 1774 to September 1775 and involved many different people both within Gaesdonck and without. It was not just an incident that Beckers happened to be involved in, but a sustained effort with which he consciously decided to go along for a considerable amount of time in the face of much resistance. A second reason for assuming the affair’s importance is the serious nature of the rector’s involvement in it. This entailed the grave violation of one of the foundations of his religious life: the vow of obedience to his superior, who in 1774-1775 was still, incidentally,

\(^{1}\) Cf. pp. 27-28, pars. 25-30 of the Windesheim constitutions of 1639.

\(^{2}\) On the decline of the Congregation of Windesheim over the entire course of the eighteenth century, see Acquoy 1984, 2: 172-176.

\(^{3}\) Höv 29, p. 118.

\(^{4}\) On these and later events in Coninx’ life, see Appendix B, no. 3; vol. 2, p. 110-111.
the very person to whom Beckers had made his profession. In fact, as part of his connivance with Coninx against Prior Van Kempen, he also committed at least two more severe errors. For six weeks near the end of 1774 and the beginning of 1775, the pair of conspirators continuously resided at Gaesdonck, simultaneously profiting from and disturbing the peace within their own community and neglecting those entrusted to their own pastoral care. This behaviour, too, gnawed at the very roots of Beckers’ life as a religious and a rector. The gravity of his missteps points to the third reason for their significance, which resides in the consequences. Even though he did penance after all was said and done, his active and long-term involvement in the whole affair positively ruined any chances the rector might still have had of ever climbing to a higher position at Gaesdonck or within the Windesheim Congregation in general. Traditionally, the penalty for conspiracy against one’s superiors was the deprivation of one’s office and one’s voice in the conventual chapter, which could only be reconferred by the prior general or his visitators. Beckers was probably rehabilitated after he had finished his penance, but advancement was almost certainly out of the question for him.

Given that the scale, nature and consequences of the Coninx Affair all underscore its significance in Beckers’ life, it seems merited to assume that it influenced his subsequent actions and therefore is a relevant context for the operational meaning of the activities that have been discussed in the previous chapters. The extent to and the way in which this is the case, however, are difficult to assess, as no statement by Beckers or those who knew him survives on this topic. It is impossible, then, to be absolutely sure of the role which the affair should play in our understanding of the rector’s written traces within and without the library of Soeterbeeck. Still, it is certainly far from meaningless. A person’s behaviour during an occurrence of this magnitude must, to some extent, be revealing of his personality. The reader will already have gathered that Beckers was ambitious. Furthermore, the fact that he was the only one, in the face of much opposition, to stand by Coninx until the very moment when Prior General Schmallen finally made further disobedience impossible by carrying out the requested visitation, shows that he was also persistent, committed and loyal. His pertinacity was relieved, however, by the ability to recognise when to admit defeat and accept the status quo, and his willingness to make amends for his wrongdoing. This is evident from the fact that Beckers, as Joannes Loyens, Gaesdonck’s second prior after Van Kempen, puts it in one of Gaesdonck’s chronicles, *poenitentiam suam peregit et optime*. The qualification, added interlinearly and therefore purposefully, testifies to the sincerity with which Loyens believed Beckers to have carried out his penance. In line with this, the prior’s account refers to Coninx and Commissioner General Haas as the two true conspirators, and merely characterises Soeterbeeck’s rector as a repentant associate. Loyens’ testimony is highly valuable, because it indicates that Beckers radically distanced himself from his earlier behaviour.

In light of the importance of the Coninx Affair itself, the rector’s decisive turning away from it is at least as significant. It obviously will not do to view the remaining thirty-five years of Beckers’ life as an extension of his admirable penance, which after all could be described as optimus only because it had been completed at some point. Predictably enough, its subject does not refer to the matter in any of his surviving writings, and his continued association with Gaesdonck suggests things eventually went back to normal. Be that as it may, it stands to reason that Beckers’ conversion greatly influenced the way in which he viewed and lived his religious and rectoral duties. Given how strongly his previous behaviour had violated the very foundations of his life as a religious and a rector, his sincere repentance must have entailed a fundamental reappraisal of this basis. Once again the details are

---

1 On the penalty for conspiracy within the Congregation of Windesheim, see vol. 2, p. 111.
2 On Loyens, see Appendix B, no. 7.
3 ‘Did his penance, and very well’ (Höv 29, p. 118).
4 On Beckers’ dealings with Gaesdonck after the Coninx Affair, see vol. 2, pp. 111-112.
lacking, but if the rector’s errors had entailed the rejection of his duties as a canon of Gaesdonck and as a rector, his rejection of these errors necessarily means the acception of these duties. This is perhaps the most significant conclusion which the Coninx Affair allows us to reach: that by the end of it, Beckers had decided to say ‘yes’ to a life as a rector of Soeterbeeck in the spirit of Windesheim as it was lived at Gaesdonck, and to place the ambition and the tenacity that were such an evident part of his personality at its service.

8.3. Beckers as Rector

Beckers’ fundamental acceptance of his office and the institutional framework of which he was part at the end of the Coninx Affair suggests that each of these two aspects of his life are a particularly meaningful context in which to try to understand his motivations for the activities whose traces have been discussed in the previous chapters. These were mostly undertaken in the service of the community of Soeterbeeck, and for this reason I first focus on Beckers’ views on and discharge of his rectoral duties and the way these find expression in his actions as these can be reconstructed from their written traces. After this I will conclude by interpreting the same activities against the rector’s Windesheim background.

The way in which Beckers understood and lived his rectorate of Soeterbeeck should be central to our understanding of his works. In this context it is important to note that, when Beckers succeeded Henricus Erckens on 19 June 1772, he had acquired a very particular function within a particular community at a particular time and place. Therefore, the question that is to be addressed if we are to properly contextualise Beckers’ activities is what it meant to be rector of Soeterbeeck at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. The present paragraph discusses, in turn, the rectorate as it is described in Soeterbeeck’s statutes, what Beckers’ own views on it were, and what his contemporaries say about the way in which he actually exercised the office in practice.

8.3.1. The Rectorate at Soeterbeeck According to its Statutes

Before it is possible to consider the specific way in which Beckers chose to discharge his duties as rector, it may be good to consider briefly what these consisted of in a general sense. The most informative source on this topic are the statutes that were in force during Beckers’ days, which, as has been reported, survive in a seventeenth-century manuscript and were only replaced by a new version around the middle of the nineteenth century. Rather than describing the actual situation in Soeterbeeck at any given moment, this text outlines the ideal which the community sought to attain. It therefore provides information on how the rectoral office was ideally perceived, and must have been of great constitutive meaning in Beckers’ interpretation of his office.

The statutes make clear that the rector had a somewhat precarious position. On the one hand, he was emphatically not the convent’s superior. Upon their profession, sisters vowed obedience to the prioress, not to him, and when they elected a new subprioress he played an advisory role only. He was to be informed when anything of value was loaned to the community, but he was not among the persons who were ordinarily given a key to the safe where the financial documents and the inheritance money were kept. On the other hand, because he was a priest his authority in spiritual matters far exceeded that of the prioress, and since he was also the sisters’ ordinary confessor, he also had unique insight into their inner lives. For these reasons, the prioress was to inform, consult and obey him whenever she was

---

1 On Soeterbeeck’s seventeenth-century statutes, see pp. 70-71.
3 Frenken 1931/32, 218.
4 Frenken 1931/32, 217.
making important decisions regarding the sisters’ offices,¹ the relaxation or tightening of discipline such as general dispensations from fasting,² and the administration of severe punishments.³ Within this field of tension, the rector essentially had two tasks: to attend to the sisters’ pastoral care and to mediate between them and the outside world.⁴

When it comes to the rector’s pastoral care, the statutes strongly emphasise his liturgical duties. They stipulate that he should celebrate Mass and administer the sacraments of penance and extreme unction,⁵ that he should officiate at the sisters’ Vespers on feasts with the rank of greater double and up,⁶ and that he was the one to grant sisters permission to confess more or receive communion less often than usual.⁷ His role is not presented as being entirely restricted to the liturgy, however, for he is also said to occasionally preside over the penitential chapter,⁸ and to instruct the sisters about the contents of the statutes.⁹ Although the librarian took care of the physical condition of the convent’s books, the statutes warn that their contents could not be corrected or changed without the rector’s consent.¹⁰ He was, in short, the convent’s highest authority in spiritual matters.

The rector is also presented as the sisters’ link with the outside world. If the community received an external benefaction, he was to be told, ostensibly in order to be able to pray for the donor but obviously also to keep track of their worldly contacts.¹¹ Any letters or gifts which the sisters or the prioress wanted to send or receive were to be given to him first and read for approval, and his consent was needed if the sisters wanted to produce anything for any layperson.¹² Workmen could only enter the monastic enclosure after his and the prioress’ consent, and if it was time for the sisters to be bled, he and a mature assistant should accompany the surgeon wherever he went.¹³ His mediative role is strongly related to the fact that the rector’s residence was envisioned to be outside of the enclosure. He was to be given his food through a serving-hatch,¹⁴ and although he could enter the enclosure to administer the sacraments or to bury a sister, on such occasions he always had to be properly vested and accompanied by two sisters.¹⁵ During confession, he and the penitent should always remain in view of a third party.¹⁶

---

¹ On the requirement of obedience to the rector, see Frenken 1931/32, 214, 216. The prioress and the council sisters had to inform the rector of the state of the community (ibid., 218), and the prioress had to consult him when she needed to speak after Compline (ibid., 214), when a sister’s office was to be changed (ibid., 216, 219), and when a sister did not make amends after she had reproved her (ibid., 214, 218).

² The prioress had to consult the rector when she wanted the community as a whole to be granted dispensation from fasting (Frenken 1931/32, 223) and when a sister wanted to impose additional discipline on herself or needed a softer shirt instead (ibid., 224, 227)

³ Frenken 1931/32, 245.

⁴ Romijn 1986, 84 also identifies pastoral care and mediation as the rector’s most important tasks according to the statutes, but she makes an erroneous distinction between the rector and the sisters’ ordinary confessor. These were, in fact, one and the same person (cf. Frenken 1931/32, 181).

⁵ Frenken 1931/32, 23, 252-253. The rector also was to take care of the liturgical vestments, the sacred vessels and the linen that came into contact with the latter (ibid., 228-229).

⁶ Frenken 193/31, 237.

⁷ Frenken 1931/32, 252. The prioress is also mentioned as having influence on the frequency of confession, but not on that of communion.

⁸ Frenken 1931/32, 244 n. 2.

⁹ Frenken 1931/32, 214.

¹⁰ Frenken 1931/32, 230.

¹¹ Frenken 1931/32, 217.

¹² Frenken 1931/32, 216, 248.

¹³ Frenken 1931/32, 251.

¹⁴ Frenken 1931/32, 221.

¹⁵ Frenken 1931/32, 250-251. This stipulation is also present in the Windesheim constitutions of 1639, which say on p. 177, par. 11 that one of these sisters should be the prioress.

¹⁶ Frenken 1931/32, 251.
These final stipulations regarding the sisters’ radical separation from the outside world illustrate the urgency of the question how accurately the description of the rector’s duties in the statutes reflect the actual situation at Soeterbeek in Beckers’ days. The text’s earliest extant copy was written in the seventeenth century, when the convent was still situated in Nuenen. There it had indeed been enclosed, but after the sisters had moved to Deursen in 1732 it was not until 1844 that the enclosure was formally re-established. To what extent it was actually lived in the intervening century is highly uncertain, especially in view of the sisters’ decision to begin a school and a boarding house in 1733. It is equally doubtful, therefore, precisely how relevant the rector’s mediative role was for Beckers. That it did still exist is evident from such archival sources as the documents that show his involvement in the sisters’ financial affairs, and the collection of templates for letters to the vicar general of the diocese of Liège on the election of a prioress and the investment and profession of sisters which Beckers compiled for his successors between 1789 and 1791. Information on this topic is relatively scarce, however, as mediative activities are only responsible for a small part of all of Beckers’ written traces.

It is most profitable, therefore, in the context of this study, to focus on the rector’s duties towards the sisters’ souls. Predictably enough, Beckers’ day-to-day pastoral care cannot be reconstructed, as it did not leave any traces in writing. No homilies or other edifying texts he may have written survive, and a study of the collected sermons of Jacques Biroat and Claude Texier which were part of his personal library would obviously not suffice to fill this gap. Still, the four main areas of Beckers’ activities as identified in the previous chapters—liturgy, library care, administration and historiography—can all be understood as being part of his pastoral care in a general sense.

The rector’s involvement in the sisters’ liturgical and sacramental life is explicitly mentioned in the statutes, where it is indeed presented as his core business. Beckers’ restoration, revision and production of the sisters’ liturgical books is as much a part of this responsibility as saying Mass or hearing confessions, one that is even referred to in the passage that mentions the rector’s responsibility for the text of the community’s books. That this stipulation appears in the chapter on the librarian shows that this sister was not the only one responsible for the conventual book collection, and indeed it is obvious that entrusting books to (or withholding them from) sisters has an element of spiritual direction belonging to the rector. There is also a pastoral side to Beckers’ administrative duties. This may not be very evident when it comes to actual bookkeeping, but it certainly is a prominent aspect of his care for the convent’s relics and privileges, his foundation of and presiding over the confraternities, and his keeping of lists of deceased sisters, family members and benefactors. By fostering their devotion to saints and certain mysteries of the faith, and by reminding them of their responsibility for the dead, the rector aided the sisters in two important areas in their spiritual lives as they lived it on a daily basis, and, through the indulgences and remissions associated with these matters, also extended his care beyond the grave. Even Beckers’ work on the conventual chronicle had a pastoral side to it, not only because it was yet another opportunity to list benefactions for which prayers were in order, but also because reminding the community of their origins and history was a way of confirming their identity and providing support or suggesting a course of action in times of
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1 On the circumstances surrounding the re-establishment of Soeterbeek’s enclosure, see p. 97.
2 On Beckers’ role in the sisters’ financial affairs, see pp. 247, 254-257.
3 On this collection of letters, see pp. 250-254.
4 On the pastoral side of Beckers’ involvement with the management of the conventual book collection, see pp. 232, 234-235.
5 On Beckers’ involvement with the conventual relics, see pp. 248-250.
6 On Beckers’ presiding over and founding of the conventual fraternities, see pp. 257-261.
7 On Beckers’ lists of deceased sisters, see pp. 257.
difficulty and insecurity. In short, even though only Beckers’ liturgical work can be connected to specific passages in Soeterbeeck’s statutes, the latter’s emphasis on the rector’s duties as a pastor actually constitutes a useful lens through which to consider all of his pursuits. To put it differently, the statutes confirm that the activities whose written traces we have studied can be safely understood as an integral part of the rectorate which Beckers had thrust upon him in 1772 and finally came to accept in 1775. This raises the question, of course, whether there is any reason to suppose that this was also in fact how Beckers himself thought of these activities, and in order to answer it, it is necessary now to consider his view of the office he held.

8.3.2. The Rectorate at Soeterbeeck According to Beckers

To be sure whether it is merited to consider Beckers’ work on Soeterbeeck’s liturgy, library and administration, and in the field of historiography, as an integral part of his rectoral duties, we must study what is known about his opinion on the latter. In addition to the traces he left in the execution of his work, Beckers’ understanding of the rectorate is also evident from three other sources: his own remarks on the topic, the portrait he had made of himself as rector of Soeterbeeck, and the accounts of his contemporaries concerning his reign.

8.3.2.1. In Writing

Regrettably enough, Beckers left no explicit statement concerning his views on the rectorate, apparently preferring to let his actions speak for him. As usual, a case must be built from the smallest scraps. I already referred to one of these before, where I pointed out that Beckers justified his revision of the antiphonaries IV 6 and IV 7 by adding a colophon in both manuscripts which he explicitly signed as rector. This clearly shows, among other things, that he considered the care for the contents of the books that enabled the sisters’ liturgical worship to be an integral part of the office.

Another piece of evidence that I have not yet mentioned can be found in the earliest version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck. This contains a brief but revealing passage on his predecessor. After describing Erckens’ death, he continues as follows:

Sijnwe. saeliger memorie heeft ons klooster Nieuwsoeterbeeck mit grooten iever en sorgh 22 jaeren en eenige maenden bedient, en aen ons convent vermaeckt mit toelaetinge van zijn tijdelijke ovrigheit de weleerwaerden heer Petrus van Kempen als prior van ‘t klooster Gaesdonck de somma van 300 gulden, en heeft daer en boven naer meer andere weldeaden en almoesen aen ons convent, gegeeven aen ieder religieus een ducaton ieder uitmaeckende 3 gulden 3 stuijver: en is eenen bijsonderen ieveraer geweest van uijtsetten der capitaelen, jaerlijcke renten, en ’t doen der reekeninge.

The new rector here paints a portrait of the old in which he praises him for three things: general devotion to his duties, personal generosity and care for the convent’s finances. That Beckers singles out these aspects for special mention in Erckens’ obituary suggests that he considered them to be particularly important for the position they consecutively occupied.

It comes as no surprise, then, that each of the three dimensions also features prominently in Beckers’ rectorate. First, there is zeal. Of itself, the fact that the new rector testifies that his predecessor was faithful to his office is not particularly meaningful. After all, there is not much else that he could have written than this cliché. However, in light of

---

1 On the commemorative aspect of Beckers’ chronicles of Soeterbeeck, see pp. 268-269, 282-283. Cf. the comparable function of his volume of sample letters for the vicar general (ASP 3), on p. 254.
2 On Beckers’ colophon for his renovation of the antiphonaries IV 6 and IV 7, see pp. 146-148.
3 ‘His Reverence, of blessed memory, served our convent New Soeterbeeck with great zeal and care for 22 years and several months, and, with the approval of his temporary superior, the reverend Petrus van Kempen, in the capacity of prior of the convent of Gaesdonck, left our convent the sum of 300 guilders, and above that, after several other benefactions and alms to our convent, gave each religious a ducaton, each worth 3 guilders and 3 stivers, and he was especially committed to putting out capital, the annual interests and bookkeeping’ (ASP 45, 1: p. 22).
Beckers’ own initial struggles to be faithful to and come to terms with his responsibilities towards the sisters of Soeterbeek, the worn-out phrase does acquire some significance. To be a diligent rector must have been an important ideal for a person who had repented of, among other things, the neglect of his rectoral duties during the Coninx Affair. What is more, Beckers’ own traces clearly testify to the zeal which he praised in Erckens. Despite the errors and omissions he made in the process, the way in which he acquitted himself of the laborious task of renovating the convent’s liturgical manuscripts stands out as remarkably more careful and methodical than the approach of his predecessors.\(^1\) The same devotion and willingness to do the best possible job are also evident from the care with which he selected and employed sources for his historiographical works.\(^2\) It may be thought that Beckers’ aspirations towards scholarship and comprehensiveness are simply symptomatic of a general eighteenth-century encyclopaedic spirit, but it seems to be something more. It is clear that, for the man who stuck with Coninx until the bitter end, dedication and ambition were an integral part of his character and among the most important values in life, and therefore also in the rectorate.

The second aspect of Erckens’ reign that Beckers praises is his generosity as a benefactor to the convent. This, too, is something that the new rector also practised himself. It has been pointed out that the first version of the chronicle of Soeterbeek contains many elaborate descriptions of structural renovations carried out during Beckers’ rectorate, including lists of the amounts of money contributed by various benefactors.\(^3\) The rector himself is almost always among these, and he personally estimated the total amount he had donated in this way to be about eighty guilders.\(^4\) In addition, his wills reveal that upon his death he left the convent his liturgical objects and vestments, his bottles of wine in the cellar, and a thousand guilders. He also stipulated that his servant, Sister Johanna Hoeben, should receive two hundred guilders as well as the interest of the thousand guilders which were owed to him by one Arnoldus Mosk.\(^5\) After Hoeben’s death, the complete sum should be paid to the community, or, if it had been dissolved, distributed among the sisters, or, if no sisters were left alive, given to the poor.\(^6\)

The third and final dimension of Erckens’ interpretation of the rectorate that Beckers praised is his talent as an investor and a bookkeeper. As has been briefly discussed, the conventual finances are an area in which the new rector was also active himself. This is in line with the spirit if not the letter of the statutes, which envision the procuratrix as the convent’s bookkeeper,\(^7\) but which also stipulate that the rector should be informed in the case of external donations, thereby anticipating at least some involvement in financial matters on his part.\(^8\) It is evident that Beckers and the sisters who held the office of procuratrix during his rectorate worked together in some way, and a comparable division of labour existed between him and Sister Theresia Nouhuijs, whom he describes of his _fidelissima cooperatrix_ as archivist.\(^9\)
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1. On the relationship of Beckers’ revision of the antiphonaries to earlier attempts, see pp. 169-171.
3. On this aspect of the first version of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeek, see p. 268.
4. ASP 45, 1: p. 25. I cannot satisfactorily answer the question how Beckers had come by this much money. His father was a farmer (Perau and Siskens 2009, 11), and may have been wealthy.
5. On Hoeben, see Appendix A.2, no. 7. Mosk had several ties with Soeterbeek. His ownership note appears in III 153, so it is likely that he gave this book to the community. On 30 April 1822 he testified to the death of boarder Geertruda Dashorst in 1806 (’s-Hertogenbosch, BHIC, 21.1598, no. 43), and he stood as witness at some financial transactions involving Peter Jansen, a labourer at Soeterbeek (ASP 671 and 706).
6. Beckers’ bequest to Soeterbeek and its sisters is described in his wills of 30 October 1806 and 8 July 1810 (CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21), as well as in a note, discussed on p. 303, by Theresia Heijnen in the _Memorie boeck_ (ASP 1) and in a nineteenth century donation register (Mater 10). On Beckers’ wills, see pp. 242-243.
The image that Beckers presents of his predecessor Erckens is that of a rector who takes diligent care not only of the sisters’ spiritual but also of their temporal prosperity. His praise is equally applicable to himself, but its particulars only cover administrative efforts. These were clearly at the very heart of Beckers’ idea of the rectorate. It does not appear from his writings that the same was true for the activities which stand out most clearly today: his liturgical and historiographical work. To arrive at a better understanding of whether and how Beckers felt that this related to duties as rector, we need to turn to the two remaining sources on Beckers’ views of the rectorate: his portrait and the testimony of his contemporaries.

8.3.2.2. In Paint
Beckers’ portrait is an unremarkable painting of indifferent quality, but despite its traditional design, it does provide some insight in the way Beckers wanted himself to be seen and remembered. It shows his likeness, clothed as a canon regular of the Congregation of Windesheim, seated at a table near a window which offers a view on the building of Soeterbeeck. This is identical to the way his predecessors have been portrayed, namely as a Windesheim canon and a rector of Soeterbeeck. It is, in this regard, the visual representation of Beckers’ acceptance of this way of life and everything it entailed. Still, it is not merely a collection of topoi, for the table at which the rector sits is real and still in existence, showing that the portrait is also very close to everyday reality.

There are two additional elements in the picture. One of these is a crucifix on the wall, which, when taken by itself, is such a general symbol that its precise meaning is impossible to identify with certainty. It is also a fixture of the portraits of earlier rectors, but in Beckers’ case becomes somewhat more specific in the context of another element in the painting. Beckers’ right hand is resting on a book with conspicuous red edges and gold stamping on the spine. Instead of a title, there are merely a name and a year: Thomas a Kempis and 1787. The combination of this name with the crucifix reminds one of the imitation of Christ. However, where the table is an element of concrete reality, the book is not, for Van Dijk notes that no edition of De imitatione Christi is known to have appeared in the year that is mentioned. This is significant, for two reasons. First, if the date on the spine is not a year of publication, this probably means that it indicates the moment when the portrait was taken. This would mean that Beckers is depicted at 45 years of age, in the year he completed his renovation of the antiphonary IV 7. Second, if the book is an unrealistic element in a setting which does contain some other elements that are true to life, it is almost certainly symbolic of something. It now remains to be seen what this is.

Beckers mentions Thomas a Kempis several times in his Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, although he does not dwell on him to any notable degree. He lists Thomas’ writings as a source on the title page, quotes from his Vita Gerardi Magni and Chronicon canonicorum regularium Montis S. Agnetis, and refers in general terms to his Vita Florentii.7
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1 For a reproduction of the portrait, see this study’s frontispiece. The painting itself has been described by Van Dijk 1984b, 248-249.
2 For a description of the Windesheim habit, see Acquoy 1984, 1: 100-105.
3 The predecessors of Beckers whose portraits have been identified are Joannes van Breda and Joannes Verheijden. The paintings are reproduced in Weiler and Geirnaert 1980, 225-226.
4 At present, the portrait graces the wall above the very table which it depicts, in a room on the first floor of Vergader- en Conferentiecentrum Soeterbeeck in Ravenstein.
5 Van Dijk 1984b, 248.
6 This is the interpretation of Van Dijk 1984b, 248. On the date of Beckers’ work on the antiphonary IV 7, see p. 146-147.
He also says that the French librarian and scholar Gabriel Naudé (1600-1653) deserves a place in his encyclopaedia despite the fact that he is not a canon regular, precisely because he defended Thomas as the writer of De imitatione Christi. However, the actual description of Thomas’ own life is rather brief, providing little more than the barest biographical data and a reference to the controversy surrounding the authorship of his most famous work. The only other mention of him occurs in the biographical sketch of the canon regular Franciscus Tolensis, whom Beckers credits with improving Thomas’ Latin. Of course, the rector’s sources had considerable influence on the length at and way in which any topic is treated in the encyclopaedia, but even if that is the explanation of the situation here, it is still worthy of note that Beckers did not go out of his way to do more for the man whose name appears on his own portrait. The Beschrijving describes Thomas a Kempis as a saintly figure and a spiritual author, but more often refers to him as a historian whose works are an important source of information.

The Beschrijving’s historiographical emphasis is only fitting in a work of history, but it is questionable if it gets to the heart of the reasons why Beckers chose to have Thomas’ name appear in the rectoral portrait he had commissioned. In 1787 all of his own historiographical works except the first version of Soeterbeeck’s chronicle were still several years in the future. At the time the portrait was made, he had liturgy rather than history on his mind, as most of his major liturgical enterprises date from around this period. For this reason, and because of the importance of De imitatione, it does not seem likely that Beckers wished to refer to Thomas primarily as a historian, or that his inclusion of the latter’s name in his portrait is an early indication that he considered historiography to be central to a rector’s duties. However, in the absence of any more information on Beckers’ personal spirituality, it is impossible to determine what Thomas’ particular influence on him was in this area. The only conclusion that seems safe to draw is the very general one that the mention of the author of De imitatione Christi is a reference to an important part of both the intellectual and the spiritual tradition of the Congregation of Windesheim of which Beckers still considered himself to be a part, and of which he evidently wished to partake. The fact that he had himself portrayed as having Thomas’ works ready to hand may represent his willingness to be inspired by his congregation’s valuable heritage in his execution of the rectoral office at Soeterbeeck. I will return to this important topic, and endeavour an interpretation of Beckers’ activities in the context of his link with Windesheim, after first discussing the third and final source of Beckers’ views of the rectorate: other people’s testimonies of the way in which he had actually lived it.

8.3.2.3. In Memory
There are two more or less contemporary appraisals of Beckers’ reign as rector. Both of them were written shortly after he had died, the first being Prioress Magdalena Verhoeven’s obituary notice in the book that also contains the seventeenth-century statutes, already repeatedly referred to:
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1 Höv 45, 3: p. 72a. On Naudé, see Rice 1939, esp. 40-41 on his defense of Thomas a Kempis.
2 Höv 45, 3: pp. 95b-96a.
3 Höv 45, 3: p. 96a. On Tolensis, see Mulder 1927.
4 On the date of Beckers’ historiographical works, see pp. 269, 277-280, 283.
5 On the date of Beckers’ liturgical activities, see pp. 112-113, 132-134, 136-137, 146-148, 177, 209, 216.
6 See pp. 81, 147, 176. On Verhoeven, see Appendix A.1, no. 31.
De eud. heer Arnoldus Beckers naar de bestierig van 38 jaere met veel iver voor de gemeent onse gemeente bediend heeft besonde door zijne schifte voor de koor. Ook een besondere weloeinder van ons klooster. Stierf de 23 juli 1810.¹

A second necrology occurs in Rector Henricus de Bruijn’s continuation of the second version of Beckers’ chronicle:

De weleerw. heer A. Bekkers […] heeft onze gemeente vele geschreven nagelaten, en was daarin onvermoeij werkzaam. Is 38 jaren rector van ons klooster Nieuwsoeterbeek geweest; zijn eerw. was een waardige religieus en ijvrige rector, zijne nagedachtenis blijft steeds in gezeegend aandenken. R.I.P.²

Both texts emphasise their subject’s rectoral zeal. The prioress also mentions his benefactions, and the rector his memory; these two things are obviously closely related. After determining the large amount of money that should be left to the sisters after his death, Beckers’ will stipulates rather drily that this bequest means that the sisters *verpligt zullen zijn om voor mij te bidden*,³ without going into any detail about the exact nature of this prayer. According to a note by Prioress Theresia Heijnen (1783-1822) in the *Memorie boeck*, one of the convent’s memorial books of the dead, it entailed that every year on Beckers’ day of death, 23 July, the community would abstain from work, read the Vigil of the Dead with nine lessons at Matins and the collect for a priest, celebrate a sung Mass and pray the penitential psalm *Miserere mei Deus*,⁴ also with the collect for a priest, explicitly for Beckers’ repose. In return, part of the latter’s estate would be used for providing the sisters with extra fine food at their midday and evening meals.⁵ With such a legacy and measures like these, it would have been rather difficult for Beckers to be forgotten.

Zeal and benefactions are familiar by now as part of a rector’s image. They already featured prominently in Beckers’ necrology of his predecessor. Verhoeven and De Bruijn also add a new element, however. This addition is important, because it reveals in what ways Beckers’ rectorate was perceived to have stood out. It consists of Beckers’ writings, which are presented as a service and a gift to the community. The prioress singles out his liturgical work for special mention, whereas De Bruijn uses a more general phrase which, given its appearance in a chronicle, undoubtedly refers to his historiographical works. Clearly, then, although Beckers did not make this explicit in his own writings or include it in his portrait, he did consider liturgy and history to be among the defining elements of his office. If the way in which the execution of Beckers’ rectorate had been perceived by those who had known him or, in the case of De Bruijn, knew people who had, can be depended on, it is impossible to interpret his liturgical and historiographical work as anything other than part of his core business as rector of Soeterbeeck.

8.3.3. In Conclusion

Having now considered the sources on Beckers’ view of the rectorate of Soeterbeeck beyond the written traces he left during it, I cannot but conclude that at least three of the four main areas of interest represented by these traces—liturgy, administration and historiography—were indeed considered by him to be integral and important elements of his rectoral duties. In
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¹ Rev Arnoldus Beckers, after the government of 38 years, with great zeal for our community served our community, especially by his writings for the choral prayer services. He was also a special benefactor of our convent. He died on 23 July 1810’ (ASP 92, f. 51v).

² ‘Rev A. Beckers […] left our community many writings, and was tirelessly occupied with these. He was rector of our convent New Soeterbeeck for 38 years; His Reverence was a worthy religious and a zealous rector; his memory will always be blessed. May he rest in peace’ (ASP 4, pp. 19b-20a).

³ ‘Will be obliged to pray for me’ (CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 8 July 1810).

⁴ Psalm 51 (50).

⁵ ASP 1. The same stipulations appear in the *Memoriale monialium* (ACRW 1112, p. 80), in yet another memorial book (Mater 7), and in a nineteenth-century donation register (Mater 10). As one of the convent’s special benefactors, Beckers would also be remembered at the daily and monthly prayers, Vigils and sung Masses celebrated for their repose (ASP 267; ASP 268).
his predecessor, Rector Erckens, he singled out for praise not only the latter’s zeal and generosity, but also his administrative activities. The colophons in the antiphonaries IV 6 and IV 7 prove that he viewed his liturgical work as part of his office, and Prioress Verhoeven confirms that it was indeed a defining one. Rector De Bruijn seems to add the writing of history as another essential piece of the puzzle.

The only major activity that is not specifically associated by Beckers or his contemporaries with his rectorate, is the care he took of the sisters’ book collection. However, it was pointed out above how easily the distribution of books among sisters can be interpreted as one of his pastoral duties, and his writings do contain at least a small indication of the importance he attached to libraries. The third part of Beckers’ Beschrijving consists of an encyclopaedia of important canons regular, but it actually also contains the biographies of four men who were not members of the Augustinian order. In three out of these four cases, the reason for the person’s inclusion is said by the rector to have to do with books. The exception is François Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld (1558-1645), whose biography is included because he reformed the abbey of Saint Genevieve in Paris. The others are the above-mentioned librarian Gabriel Naudé, who defended Thomas a Kempis’ authorship of De imitatione Christi, and Henri du Bouchet, Lord of Bouronville (1593-1654), and the translator Louis Cousin (1627-1707), both of whom were included because they had generously left their personal book collections to the library of the abbey of St Victor in Paris. The fact that Beckers included the biographies of two people explicitly because they had served his order by significantly expanding an Augustinian semi-public library is noteworthy, and testifies to his awareness of the value of book collections. Granted, that of Soeterbeeck was of an entirely different scale and nature than that of St Victor, and occasionally writing a sister’s name in a particular book is very different from donating hundreds of volumes, but a library is a library regardless of size. Beckers must have seen the value of Soeterbeeck’s book collection, and he will also have done so in his capacity of rector.

The realisation that there are solid reasons to suppose that Beckers considered the activities whose written traces are the subject of this study to be important elements of his rectorate confirms that it is merited to interpret them in this context, as was already tentatively concluded on the basis of Soeterbeeck’s statutes. This means that part of the reason that he renovated the sisters’ liturgy, was occasionally involved in distributing their books, kept some of their administration and wrote their history, is simply that he believed that this was the substance of his duties as rector, which he had definitively accepted after the Coninx Affair. It was all part of his core business, and not something which he did on the side.

This is a significant conclusion, for two reasons. First of all, it eliminates the possibility that Beckers’ liturgical work and historiography were simply private pastimes. Second, it allows the central question of this study—at what motivated Beckers to do the things which his written traces show he did?—to be taken to a higher level. If the answer is that he did them because he felt that they were all part of his rectoral duties, we can ask ourselves why that should be the case. Along the functional dimension, the answer is self-evident, for the liturgy is at the heart of a choir sister’s life, library care and administration are simply indispensable for a monastic community on a practical level, and an awareness of their history provides the convent with a firm identity. In some ways, however, Beckers goes beyond the immediately obvious. How come, for instance, that he felt it was his duty to enable the sisters
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1 Höv 45, 3: p. 84a. On De La Rochefoucauld, see Bergin 1987.
2 Höv 45, 3: p. 72a.
4 Cf. pp. 81, 147, 176.
in his care to sing Vespers to the old melodies,\(^1\) to contribute to their continued use of the late medieval books of hours,\(^2\) and to write the history not only of their convent but of the entire Congregation of Windesheim? The answer to these questions lies in the fact that, as his portrait clearly shows, he was not rector of Soeterbeek in a vacuum, but in a particular tradition. This was the second major dimension of his life to which he had consented after the Coninx Affair, namely that he was a canon of Gaesdonck, a canon of Windesheim. It is to this aspect of Beckers’ biography that I now turn.

### 8.4. Beckers as a Canon Regular of Windesheim

The contexts that were apparently considered by Beckers’ contemporaries to have exerted the most defining influence on the way in which he lived his rectorate—liturgy and historiography—can only be properly understood within the context of his choice to live his life in the tradition of Windesheim. Granted, none of his activities were unique either to himself or to his congregation. The revision of liturgical books takes place wherever these are used; it is endemic to the genre because of the liturgy’s constant state of flux. Kat assures us that the continued use of liturgical manuscripts for centuries after their production was a common occurrence, of which he provides several examples.\(^3\) Monastic historiography was also very common,\(^4\) to the extent that it would have been surprising if Soeterbeek and Windesheim had not had accounts of their own history. Even the form of Beckers’ main work, the *Beschrijving*, is entirely unremarkable in the age of the great encyclopaedias. But all of this is besides the point, which is merely that the liturgical and historiographical tradition of the congregation with which he identified himself in his portrait decisively influenced his attitude towards these issues.

Beckers’ work has many precedents within the Congregation of Windesheim, whose strong historiographical tradition has already been sketched.\(^5\) In this context, Acquoy, who made extensive use of the *Beschrijving* and the *Canonia Gaesdonckana*, describes the rector of Soeterbeek as a man in whom *iets van den oude geest* of the congregation was still alive.\(^6\) By this he means that Beckers had the sense of history which had characterised many of its older members, including Thomas a Kempis.

Equally characteristic was the rector’s preoccupation with the liturgy. Busch’s well-known description of Windesheim’s late medieval liturgical reforms in his *Chronicon Windeshemense* pays great attention to the care with which the commission entrusted with the compilation of the chapter’s proper *usus* acquitted itself of its task, and emphasises the importance that was attached to textual unity.\(^7\) The chronicler famously concludes:

> *Cuncta enim missalia evangelizarii epistolaria lectionaria capitularia et collectaria nostra usque ad unam iotam bene sunt correcta punctata et ordinata debiteque accentuata, ut talis librorum correctio et consonancie conformitas in nullo mundi ordine usquam reperiatur.*\(^8\)
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1. On the melodic tradition of Soeterbeek’s late medieval antiphonaries as the main motivation for Beckers’ renovation of them, see pp. 148-160, 186-187.

2. On Beckers’ involvement with a book of hours, see pp. 201-206.

3. Kat 1939, 65. His most important example, referred to on pp. 54, 74, 97, 106, is the Windesheim gradual *Haaren hs. 34* (described in *Van de Ven 1990*, 74-76, no. 27), but he also mentions several other books (pp. 67, 78, 83).

4. Verschaffel 1998, 30-33 discusses several examples of historiography on the part of convents, orders and congregations in the Southern Netherlands in the eighteenth century.

5. On historiography within the Congregation of Windesheim, see pp. 265-266.


7. Grube 1886, 308-313. For an analysis of Windesheim’s liturgical reforms as reported on by Busch, see Franke 1981, 11-19.

8. ‘All our missals, gospel books, epistolaries, psalters, lectionaries, capitularies and collectaries, then, have been well corrected, punctuated and arranged to the last iota and duly accentuated, so that such a correction of books and uniformity of consonance are not to be found anywhere in any order in the world’ (Grube 1886, 311).
In order to safeguard this unity of worship, the Windesheim constitutions dictated that no liturgical book may be revised without the general chapter’s consent, unless the prior (or the rector) and the council brothers should detect an unequivocal error.\footnote{This stipulation is present on p. 82 in the edition of 1553 (on which see p. 272) and in the women’s constitutions before 1559 (Van Dijk 1986, 366, 773-774). The constitutions of 1639, published after the Congregation of Windesheim had relinquished its own liturgical books for those of Rome, say on p. 103, par. 4 only that [libros […]] cum quibus divina celebrantur officia, non nisi castigatione Romanâ emendatos, quis retinere præsumat (‘only those books […] with which the divine offices are celebrated that have been corrected according to Roman reproof shall anyone presume to maintain’).} Despite these precautions, it is highly doubtful whether absolute uniformity ever truly existed within the congregation, but attempts to achieve it continued to be made. As late as the eighteenth century, Prior General August Schepers explicitly prescribed a new edition of the Windesheim proper of saints in an effort to restore unity.\footnote{On Schepers and the edition of the Windesheim proper prescribed by him, see pp. 86-87.} The meticulousness, then, with which Beckers revised both the text and the music of many of Soeterbeeck’s liturgical books, bringing them in accordance with the latest iteration of the Roman books and with each other, is entirely in line with Windesheim’s consistent effort to achieve textual and musical perfection in its liturgy.

So although an interest in liturgy and history is by no means unique to the Congregation of Windesheim, it is typical of it in the sense that it is part of its character, and Beckers clearly shared it. He even manages to combine the two areas on occasion. The reader may remember how, in his chronicle of Soeterbeeck, he seized the opportunity provided by the fact that his sources said the community’s breviaries had perished in the flames of the fire of 1539, to draw his own conclusions concerning the sisters’ liturgical practice at the time.\footnote{ASP 45, 1: p. 5; ASP 4, p. 2b. On Beckers’ treatment of the fire of 1539, see pp. 62-65.} Also, in his book on Gaesdonck, the mention in his sources of Prior Hermannus Eynraad’s involvement in procuring the celebration of the feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday after the second Sunday after Easter) at Gaesdonck extracted a promise from him to return to the background of this liturgical curiosity later on.\footnote{CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 46, p. 7a. On this passage in Beckers’ \textit{Canonia}, see p. 286.} Although he never redeemed this pledge because he abandoned the \textit{Canonia} very soon after its inception, the fact that he made it is itself significant. Both passages display an interest in the history of the liturgical tradition of which he is part, and that is one that is shared by the congregation to which he belongs.

There is also an even more obvious reason for concluding that Beckers had his congregation in mind during his liturgical and historiographical work. This is the fact that most of what he did was not only for the benefit of the sisters of Soeterbeeck, but also for that of Windesheim. After all, his largest work of history is an encyclopaedia of the congregation, and even the revision of his chronicle of Soeterbeeck and his unfinished description of Gaesdonck were originally conceived as part of this text.\footnote{On the relationships between Beckers’ historical texts, see pp. 277-278.} Among the most conspicuous of his liturgical activities was the revision of at least four and probably more late medieval antiphonaries according to the use of Windesheim, with an eye to allowing the sisters to sing Vespers according to the text of the Roman books while using the old melodies of the congregation. He also contributed to the continuing celebration at Soeterbeeck of the Little Office of the Virgin according to the use of Windesheim by leaving notes in a book of hours that made it easier to use during choral prayer.\footnote{It may be mentioned here that the Windesheim constitutions of 1639 on p. 135, par. 21 explicitly instruct the recital of the Little Office \textit{secundum Breuiarium Romanum} (‘according to the Roman Breviary’), making the continued use at Soeterbeeck of the use of Windesheim all the more remarkable.} In this way he renovated Windesheim’s liturgical tradition, renewing it so that it could survive in a new age.
The personal background of Beckers’ decision to serve his congregation has already been discussed above.¹ His involvement in the Coninx Affair, though it was possibly motivated to some extent by the good of Gaesdonck, primarily served to damage the latter, and Beckers eventually repented and purposefully accepted his position as a canon of this convent. This decision necessarily entailed putting his talents and ambition at the service of Windesheim, and to join his confrères in building up what he had previously acted to break down. His liturgical and historiographical activities can apparently be interpreted as part of his way of doing so.

It should be stressed, however, that there is obviously also a wider context to Beckers’ actions than just the story of his own life. He lived in an age when the very existence of the Windesheim tradition of which he was a part, and indeed all monastic life in his general vicinity, was under severe threat. An acute awareness of this on Beckers’ part may be assumed from the fact that Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II and the French government closed down large numbers of convents in 1783 and 1796 respectively.² That Soeterbeeck harboured many refugee priests from France and that his own convent Gaesdonck was dissolved in 1802. It is also evident from the mention, referred to above, of the possibility of the suppression of Soeterbeeck in one of his wills,³ and it permeates most of his historiographical works. Beckers began to write the Canonia Gaesdonckana several years after its subject’s dissolution, giving the work the character of a monument to his own vanishing past.⁴ His Beschrijving of the Windesheim Congregation sounds a particularly heavy note of doom when he mentions that Frenswegen is het eenigste klooster dat van onze vergaderingh nog over is.⁵ The chronicles of Soeterbeeck, finally, consist for the most part of a description of a string of calamities threatening the community’s survival that extends to Beckers’ own days. He writes that the sisters had prospered under the leadership of Charles Theodore, the Count Palatine of Sulzbach, but that their happiness had begun to diminish after 1792, when they began to be troubled by the armies of the French Republic. He records that Soeterbeeck barely escaped being looted during the French occupation in September 1794.⁶ He also describes increasingly invasive government measures such as the billeting of troops and the registration of all of the convent’s inhabitants and possessions.⁷ He was probably well aware that the last time when the latter had happened was in 1716, when Soeterbeeck had been disowned by the States General of the Dutch Republic. His revision of the conventual chronicle may end on a jubilant note with the advent of the Catholic Louis Bonaparte as King of Holland, but even in these pages Beckers’ sense of security is not absolute. After all, he includes a long excursus on the other convents in the Land of the Ravenstein, which he says is meant to demonstrate that they are indispensable to society and dat het niet te bedencken is of zullen wel in haaren staat verblijven.⁸ But the fact that he writes it down proves that he did indeed think it, and that he argues for the survival of these communities shows that their suppression was not felt to be entirely beyond the realms of possibility.

In conclusion, there can be no doubt that the grave danger that was threatening his way of life and its background was on Beckers’ mind. It seems justified, therefore, to consider his entire rectorate as an effort towards the preservation of monasticism, including its external features such as the liturgy, meditation, the veneration of relics, and all sorts of devotions. In particular, his historical descriptions of the Congregation of Windesheim and two convents

¹ See pp. 291-296.
³ CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 8 July 1810.
⁴ On the commemorative aspect of the Canonia, see pp. 283-284.
⁵ ‘Frenswegen is the only convent of our congregation that is still left’ (Höv 45, 1: p. 8, no. 17).
⁶ ASP 45, 1: pp. 28-29; ASP 4, p. 6a-b.
⁷ ASP 45, 1: pp. 29-30; ASP 4, p. 7a.
⁸ ‘That it cannot be conceived but that they would remain in their current state’ (ASP 4, p. 15b).
associated with it both formally and informally, as well as his revision of several of its ancient liturgical books, appear to have been attempts at saving whatever could be saved of this specific tradition within the walls of the convent of Soeterbeeck. The very word the rector himself uses for his work on the liturgy, ‘renovation’, supports this conclusion. It suggests taking something that is almost lost and renewing it for use by a new generation. All around him, he saw the Congregation of Windesheim and the tradition which it represented being torn down. He witnessed the death of the last prior general, Constantinus Belling, in 1807, as well as the dissolution of Frensweeney, the congregation’s last remaining convent, in 1809. Although the final canon, Clemens Leeder, would live until 4 November 1865, and several convents influenced by but not formally associated with the congregation still existed after the latter’s formal dissolution in 1811, it would be no exaggeration to say that Beckers lived to see Windesheim die. This destruction happened on a national and international level by hostile governments, although Beckers may have felt that his personal involvement in the Coninx Affair had also contributed to it in a smaller and different but no less real way. He had repented of his destructive behaviour, however, and during most of his life tried to renovate within his own limited sphere of influence the religious tradition of which he was a part. I believe that this is one of the most important symbolic meanings of the rector’s work.

8.5. Conclusion
Having studied what Beckers did, and gone as far towards answering the complicated question why he did it as I believe the evidence and my abilities as a scholar allow me to go, I think the only remaining question that needs to be addressed is what the result of his actions were. The man may have redeemed himself and devoted himself to a life as a rector of Soeterbeeck in the spirit of Windesheim, but how successful were his attempts at keeping alive certain aspects of his congregation’s tradition at Soeterbeeck actually? In the short run, not at all. After a rectorate of 38 years, Beckers himself died in Deuren on Monday 23 July 1810, at the age of 68, and was buried in the cemetery of Soeterbeeck. During his final illness, he had been assisted by a certain Rev Van der Ven, who continued to look over the convent until 6 August 1811. That was when Beckers’ successor was appointed, who was not a

---

1 On Belling, see p. 276 n. 7.
3 Leeder was from the convent of Sankt Georgenberg in Grauhof, near Goslar, and died as lector of the cathedral at Hildesheim (Van Dijk 1978, 2-3).
4 Acquoy 1984, 2: 176.
5 ASP 4, pp. 19b-20a; ASP 129, p. 13; Höv 38, p. 62.
6 Gaesdonck’s book of anniversaries is the only contemporary source to explicitly mention where Beckers was buried, saying that he was rector in Deursen prope Ravenstenium [...] et ibi sepultus (‘in Deursen near Ravenstein [...] and buried there’, CAG, Monastic Archives, A 89, p. 92). Beckers’ will confirms this implicitly, leaving the execution of his burial to the goeddanken van de maters of Soeterbeeck (‘prioresses’ discretion’, CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 8 July 1810).
7 Van der Ven is only mentioned in Rector De Bruijn’s continuation of the second version of Beckers’ chronicle (APS 4, p. 20a). Van Dijk 1982d, 202 does not refer to him in his list of Soeterbeeck’s rectors, but in his brief discussion of the gap between Beckers’ and Van den Broek’s rectorates, does say that it is likely that the sisters were helped out by either the Franciscans in Megen or the Capuchins in Velp during this period. As far as the Franciscans are concerned, this statement may be based on the fact that the guardian of the convent in Megen was asked in 1737 to be the extraordinary confessor for the sisters of Soeterbeeck for another three years, and to send another friar to assist Rector Verheijden at Christmas (Verbeek and Heijer 1946, 81; De Kok 1951/53, 186, no. 127). However, the only extraordinary confessor in Beckers’ days for whom concrete evidence exists, is Arnoldus Voet, the parish priest of Ravenstein, who is mentioned in Beckers’ Suppliciae ad vicarium generalem Leodiensem (ASP 3, p. 13). In other words, it is not certain if the Franciscans were still closely associated with Soeterbeeck during the first decade of the nineteenth century. Be that as it may, no Friar Van der Ven of the right age is listed by De Boer 1979. If Van der Ven was a Capuchin of Velp, a possible candidate is Willem v.d. Ven (1769-1827) (Hildebrand 1945-1956, 7: 102, no. 600).
Windesheim canon but Joannes van den Broek, the first diocesan priest to be rector of Soeterbeeck since the community had adopted the Rule of Augustine.\(^1\)

Even more serious breaks with tradition were just around the corner. Only a few days after Beckers’ death, Prioress Heijnen had received a letter from the government.\(^2\) Dated to 26 July, it was from the bailiff of Megen and the Land of Ravenstein, Henricus Kleinefeldt, a good acquaintance and significant benefactor of the convent.\(^3\) It is not surprising, therefore, that his letter is full of commiseration for the community’s recent loss, but no amount of sympathy could change the fact that he was bringing bad news. The reason for Kleinefeldt’s letter was that he had been authorised by Sub-Prefect Louis Gaston de Bonnechose of the district of Nijmegen to investigate the situation in the monasteries and convents in the area.\(^4\) The precise nature of his errand is not apparent from his letter, but it is probably justified to read it as an illustration of how the Napoleonic government was set on increasing its interference with the remaining religious institutions. Less than two years later, on 3 January 1812, the Emperor of the French dissolved all monasteries in Megen and the Land of Ravenstein, including Soeterbeeck.\(^5\)

In another example of its extraordinary resilience, the community survived. It did change, however, and for a time moved rather far beyond its origins as a convent of canonesses regular under the influence of Windesheim by setting up a daughter house with a more or less professional school in Ravenstein and limiting its celebration of the liturgy of the hours to the recital of the Little Office of the Virgin. Still, thanks partly to Beckers’ involvement, the books of hours that were used contained or were adapted to the use of Windesheim, and this will have been at least one of the factors that prevented Soeterbeeck’s links with its origins to be completely severed. Over the course of the nineteenth and particularly the twentieth century, the sisters reacquired an awareness of their foundations, which resulted in the readoption of traditional customs such as the use of a nuns’ gallery and particularly the use of the Roman Breviary with the Windesheim proper of saints. The development culminated in Soeterbeeck’s pioneering role in the resurrection of the female branch of the Congregation of Windesheim in 1971.\(^6\)

Whether and in what ways Beckers’ work played a role in the final flowering at Soeterbeeck of an awareness of the convent’s indebtedness to the Windesheim tradition is of course uncertain. Equally doubtful is the extent to which the resurrected Windesheim of the second half of the twentieth century was actually a continuation of the original congregation. Whatever its character, it did not last long in Soeterbeeck anyway, as the convent closed its doors in 1997. It will not do, therefore, to conclude that Beckers’ work had success in the long run.

Still, if the vagaries of history are such that it is impossible to claim any degree of victory for the eighteenth-century rector, there are also some solid reasons for denying the final collapse of his efforts. If Beckers can be said to have faithfully served Soeterbeeck as its

---

\(^{1}\) On Van den Broek, see p. 48 n. 2. There is some uncertainty about the date of his appointment: De Bruijn says it happened in August (ASP 4, p. 20a), whereas Van Dijk 1982d, 202-203 consistently speaks of July. I follow the oldest source.

\(^{2}\) ASP 801.

\(^{3}\) Kleinefeldt had contributed financially to the building of a new sacristy in 1790, a fact that is mentioned by Beckers in the first version of his chronicle (ASP 45, 1: p. 28). He was also involved in some financial transactions with Peter Jansen in 1802 (ASP 671). Rector De Bruijn’s continuation of the revised chronicle records that King Louis Bonaparte spent the night at Kleinefeldt’s house when he visited Ravenstein on 22 and 23 April 1809 (ASP 4, p. 19b).

\(^{4}\) De Bonnechose was sub-prefect of Nijmegen from April 1810 to 1813. He was married to Sara Maria Schas (Hendriks, Steenkamer and Mustert 1971, 63; Bos-Rops 2002, 35).

\(^{5}\) Peijnenburg 1982b, 52.

\(^{6}\) On Soeterbeeck’s spiritual development during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with special reference to its liturgy, see pp. 88-104.
rector for the time that was given to him, he would probably have considered that to be a measure of success. If during this period he managed to preserve at least something of the spirit of Windesheim, that would undoubtedly have pleased him. Even if he could not speak to later generations of sisters, he had at least been heard by those who had been in his care, and in that sense he is by definition an important link in the community’s connection with its origins.

What is more, he is not definitively silenced even now. By studying the traces he left in books from the library of Soeterbeeck, as well as his other written works, I have attempted to give the rector back his voice by making the books and archival records speak of what he did and what his motivations were. They tell the story of a man whom I have personally gotten to know as a tragic figure. Driven by disappointment in and frustration with certain aspects of his personal life and the political developments of his days, and trapped in a system which forced him to rein in his ambitions, he eventually decided to make the best of his position as rector. Part of this resolve was to use his intellectual capacities in a small-scale but uncompromising attempt to apply liturgy, administration and historiography to salvage what could be saved of the gradually disappearing tradition to which he had devoted his life. Throwing scholarly discretion to the wind, I must confess that I have come both to pity and admire him, and that his sense of the centrality of liturgical worship to the identity of those who are involved in it is a source of inspiration in my personal life.

I wish to end by emphasising that this statement is not merely pathetic. It is also not the sign of a scholar breaking down after having spent hundreds of pages writing about obscure liturgical revisions and barely comprehensible traces of use. Far from it. This kind of appreciation is an expression of the personal, subjective understanding of another person’s meaning that, more than the mere accumulation of knowledge, is the justification of the humanities. It is also what my archaeological approach to the historical library of Soeterbeeck was ultimately about. To the extent to which it has been successful, I hope that it may testify to the importance of the study according to hermeneutic principles of books and their production and use.
Glossary of Liturgical Terms

The definitions provided below are not intended to be comprehensive or universally applicable, but to aid the understanding of the way in which the terms are used in the context of this book.

Agnus Dei

a text that is prayed after the Pax* at Mass,* beginning with Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi, ‘Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world’

Alleluia verse

a verse that is prayed after the gradual* but before the Gospel reading at Mass,* accompanied by the expression Alleluia both before and afterwards

Alma redemptoris mater

one of the Marian antiphons,* beginning with Alma redemptoris mater, quae pervia caeli porta manes, ‘Loving mother of the Redeemer, who remains the open gate of heaven’

altar

the sacrificial table at which Mass* is offered

Angelus

a prayer in honour of the Incarnation, traditionally said at 6 a.m., noon, and 6 p.m., and beginning with Angelus Domini nuntiavit Mariae, ‘The angel of the Lord declared unto Mary’

antiphon

a verse that in the liturgy of the hours* is usually prayed (before and) after (a) psalm(s)* or (a) canticle(s),* to which it serves as a frame, or as the first part of a commemoration*

antiphonary

a choir* book with antiphons,* responsories* (and hymns)* for the divine office*

Athenasian Creed

the Quicumque vult*

Ave regina caelorum

one of the Marian antiphons,* beginning with Ave regina caelorum, ave domina angelorum, ‘Hail, O queen of heaven. Hail, O lady of angels’

Benedicamus Domino

a versicle* in the liturgy of the hours,* whose first verse is Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, ‘Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel’

Benedicamus tonary

a tonary* for the Benedicamus Domino*

Benedictus

the canticle* of Zachary (Luke 1:68-79) that is prayed at Lauds* and begins with Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, ‘Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel’

blessing

1) a text invoking the blessing of God before a lesson;* 2) the consecration of a church or chapel with less solemnity* than a dedication*

book of hours

a book with texts for liturgical devotions such as the Little Office of the Virgin,* the penitential psalms* with the litany of the saints,* and the Vigil of the Dead,* rather than the divine office*

breviary

a book with all texts for the divine office*

canon

the Eucharistic consecration prayer of the Mass*

canonical

of hours:* according to the divine office*

canonical hours

the divine office*

canonical office

the divine office*

canticle

a biblical chant that is not a psalm*

celebrant

the priest* who offers Mass*

chantress

1) the sister who is in charge of the preparation and the performance of the liturgical services, and determines who
should read and sing what; 2) a sister who leads the singing of a particular choir* half
chapter

a biblical reading in the divine office* that is not preceded by a blessing* and is concluded by the expression Deo gratias, ‘Thanks be to God’
choir

1) the part of the church where the choir stalls* are; 2) the persons who occupy these
choir stall

the (structure with the) seat(s) of the clergy or the sisters
collect

a prayer, usually introduced by Oremus, ‘Let us pray’
commemoration

a condensed office,* consisting of an antiphon,* a versicle* and a collect,* prayed at the end of Lauds* or Vespers* within the liturgy of the hours*
commemorative office

a votive* office*
Commendation of the Dead

a liturgical devotion for the deceased
common, adj.

of texts: used on feasts* of saints in particular classes
common of saints

the part of liturgical books that contains texts that are shared by particular classes of saints, such as apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins
Communicantes prayer

part of the canon* of the Mass,* beginning with Communantes, ‘In communion with’
Compline

the hour* celebrated at the close of the day
concur

of feasts: coincide in their respective second* and first Vespers*
concurrence

when second Vespers* of one feast* coincides with first Vespers* of another
Confiteor

a confession of sins that is used at Mass,* Prime* and Compline,* beginning with Confiteor Deo omnipotenti (or: caeli), ‘I confess to almighty God (or: the God of heaven)’
conventual Mass

a Mass* that is attended by all those in the convent who are held to choral prayer, usually corresponding to the divine office*¹
Credo

the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed that is prayed at Mass,* beginning with Credo in unum Deum, ‘I believe in one God’
Daytime Prayer

the hour* that replaces the minor hours* in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI
deacon

a man who has received the second of the major orders,* or serves in this capacity at Mass*
dedication

of a church or chapel: its solemn and irrevocable consecration
dignity

of a saint: his personal importance in relation to others
Dies irae

the sequence* of the Requiem Mass*
diurnal, adj.

of breviaries:* for the diurnal* hours;* of hours:* not nocturnal*
diurnal, n.

a breviary for the diurnal* hours*
divine office

the chief celebration of the liturgy of the hours,* whose texts are contained in the breviary*
double, adj.

of feasts:* with two Vespers,* usually three nocturns* at Matins,* and antiphons* prayed in their entirety both before and after psalms* and canticles* at Matins,* Lauds* and Vespers*
double, n.

da double* feast*
doxology

a verse or a stanza of a text, or an entire text, in praise of God

¹ On a different use of the term, see p. 101.
ember days

Wednesday, Fridays and Saturdays after the feast of Lucy of Syracuse (13 December), Ash Wednesday, Pentecost and the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September), observed as days of fasting and abstinence.

epistle

a reading at Mass,* properly from one of the New Testament epistles, but also from any other part of the Bible apart from the Gospels.

evangelistary

the book of the Gospels that is used during Mass.

Evening Prayer

Vespers* in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI.

exposition

the displaying of the Blessed Sacrament for adoration.

feast

1) a holy day on which a certain saint, sacred event or mystery is liturgically commemorated; 2) the second highest rank of celebrations of saints, events or mysteries in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI.

feria

a weekday, not a Sunday* or a feast*

ferial

of days: not a feast;* of texts: 1) not seasonal or proper; 2) not solemn;* of preface tones:* used on ferias* and simple* feasts;* of psalters:* with the psalms distributed across the hours*.

first class double

a double* feast* with the highest liturgical rank.

first Compline

Compline* on the eve of a feast*

first Vespers

Vespers* on the eve of a feast*.

Forty Hours’ Devotion

a paraliturgical devotion in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed and adored for forty hours.

Gloria

the greater doxology* that is prayed at Mass,* beginning with "Gloria in excelsis Deo," ‘Glory to God in the highest’.

gradual

1) a chant, consisting of a refrain and a verse, that is sung after the epistle* at Mass;* 2) a choir* book for Mass* with all chants that are not sung by the celebrant*.

gradual psalms

Psalms* 120-134 (119-133)

greater double

a double* feast* with a higher liturgical rank than a lesser double*.

great office

the divine office*.

hebdomadary sister

the sister who presides at the liturgy of the hours* during a particular week.

high Mass

a solemn Mass*.

hour

a part of the liturgy of the hours* that is celebrated at a fixed time of the day.

Hours of Eternal Wisdom

a liturgical devotion in honour of the wisdom of God as personified in Jesus Christ.

Hours of the Holy Spirit

a liturgical devotion in honour of the Holy Spirit.

Hours of the Virgin

the Little Office of the Virgin*.

hymn

a metrical text that is prayed in the divine office*.

hymnal

a (section of a) book with hymns* for the divine office*.

hymn tone

a tone* to which a hymn* can be sung.

Indulgentiam

a prayer that follows the Misereatur,* beginning with "Indulgentiam, absolutionem et remissionem peccatorum nostrorum" , ‘Pardon, absolution and remission of our sins’.

1 On a different use of the term, see p. 79.
In paradisum  an antiphon* in the liturgy of a funeral
introit  an antiphon* and a psalm* prayed as the celebrant* approaches the altar* at Mass*
invitatory  the first antiphon* of Matins,* which accompanies Psalm* 95 (94)
kyriale  a (section of a) book with chants from the ordinary of the Mass*
Kyrie  a text that is prayed near the beginning of the Mass,* beginning with Kyrie eleison, 'Lord, have mercy'
Lauds  the morning hour*
lesser double  a double* feast*
lesser doxology  the doxology* that is appended to all psalms* and canticles* in the liturgy of the hours,* beginning with Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, ‘Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit’
lesson  a reading in the divine office* that is preceded by a blessing* and concluded by a versicle* that begins with Tu autem, Domine, miserere nobis, ‘But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us’

Litany of Loreto  a litany to the Blessed Virgin, whose origin is traditionally associated with the Holy House in Loreto
litany of the saints  a prayer invoking the intercession of all the saints
Little Office of the Virgin  a liturgical devotion in honour of the Blessed Virgin that is shaped after the divine office* and includes all hours*
liturgy of the hours  the cycle of prayer services that are celebrated at fixed times of the day, distinct from the Mass*
Long Hours of the Cross  a liturgical devotion in honour of the Passion of Jesus Christ
low Mass  a Mass* that is said rather than sung and celebrated without a deacon* or a subdeacon*
Magnificat  the canticle* of the Blessed Virgin (Luke 1:46-55) that is prayed at Vespers* and begins with Magnificat anima mea Dominum, ‘My soul magnifies the Lord’
Magnificat tonary  a tonary* for the Magnificat*
Magnificat tone  a tone* to which the Magnificat* can be sung
major antiphon  one of the seven Magnificat* antiphons* beginning with O on the days leading up to Christmas
major orders  the subdiaconate, diaconate and presbyterate
manual  a book with instructions for various liturgical events
Marian antiphons  four antiphons* in honour of the Blessed Virgin, one of which is prayed at the end of Compline* every day
martyrology  a catalogue of saints arranged according to the liturgical calendar that is used at Prime*

Mass  the Eucharistic sacrifice
Matins  the nocturnal* hour*
memorial  the lowest rank of celebrations of saints, events or mysteries in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI
minor hours  Prime,* Terce,* Sext* and None*
minor lessons  short lessons* for Matins* of the Vigil of the Dead* for use on less solemn occasions than the long ones, such as days without an anniversary
Misereatur a prayer that follows the Confiteor,* beginning with Misereatur nostrī (or: vestri, or: tuī) omnipotens Deus, ‘May almighty God have mercy on us (or: you)’

missal a book with all texts for the Mass*

Morning Prayer Lauds* in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI

Night Prayer Compline* in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI

nocturn a section of Matins, of which there are either one or three, depending on the liturgical rank of the day¹

nocturnal of breviaries: for Matins; of an hour:* Matins*

None the hour* that is traditionally celebrated towards noon

Nunc dimitiss the canticle* of Simeon (Luke 2:29-32) that is prayed at Compline* and begins with Nunc dimitiss servum tuum, Domine, ‘Now dost thou let thy servant go, O Lord’

nuns’ gallery an elevated space in church where the choir stalls* are

occur of feasts: fall on the same day

occurrence when two feasts* fall on the same day

octave the eight days during which certain feasts* are celebrated, including the day of the feast* itself

octave day the eighth and last day of an octave*

office 1) the celebration of an hour;* 2) the texts used for this

Office of Readings Matins* in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI

order of the Mass the ordinary* of the Mass*

ordinary, adj. 1) the fixed, nearly unchanging elements of hours* or Mass;* 2) the part of a liturgical book which contains these

ordinary, n. 1) the fixed, nearly unchanging elements of hours* or Mass;* 2) the part of a liturgical book which contains these

Pax a liturgical salutation of peace after the rite of fraction* at Mass,* in full: Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum, ‘The peace of the Lord be with you always’

penitential psalms Psalms* 6 (6), 32 (31), 38 (37), 51 (50), 102 (101), 130 (129), and 143 (142)

preface the first part of the canon* of the Mass,* before the Sanctus*

preface tone a tone* to which preface* s can be sung

priest a man who has received the highest of the major orders,* or serves in this capacity at Mass*

Prime the hour* that is traditionally celebrated towards 6 a.m.

private Mass 1) a low Mass;* 2) a Mass* celebrated without a congregation

processional a book with chants for processions

proper, adj. 1) the part of liturgical books that contains texts that are proper* to particular saints’ feasts;* 2) a book with proper* texts of a certain diocese or congregation

proper of saints 1) the part of liturgical books that contains texts that are proper* to particular saints’ feasts;* 2) a book with proper* texts of a certain diocese or congregation

proper of time the part of liturgical books that contain texts that are proper* to feasts* of Our Lord, or seasonal*

propriety the degree to which a feast* is proper*

¹ On a different use of the term, see p. 74 n. 2.
psalm | one of the 150 chants in the biblical book of Psalms
psalm tonary | a tonary* for psalms*
psalm tone | a tone* to which psalms* can be sung
psalter | a (section of a) book with psalms*
Quicumque vult | a creed traditionally attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria, prayed at Prime* and beginning with *Quicumque vult salvus esse*, ‘Whosoever wants to be saved’
Requiem aeternam | the introit* of the Requiem Mass*
Requiem Mass | a Mass* that is celebrated for the deceased
responsory | a text that is said or chanted in dialogue, usually consisting of a refrain, one or more verses, and the lesser doxology*
rite | a manner of celebrating the liturgy, e.g. the Roman rite
rite of fraction | the part of Mass* where the celebrant* breaks the host
rogation days | the feast of Mark the Evangelist (25 April), known as the Major Rogation, and the three days before the Ascension of the Lord, known as the Minor Rogation, observed as days of prayer and fasting
Roman Breviary | a breviary* whose first edition was promulgated by Pope Pius V in 1568
Roman Missal | a missal* whose first edition was promulgated by Pope Pius V in 1570
Roman Ritual | a book with texts for rituals that do not appear in the Roman Breviary* or the Roman Missal,* such as the dedication* and blessing* of a church, whose first edition was promulgated by Pope Paul V in 1614
rubric | a text that regulates (part of) a liturgical celebration, or identifies a liturgical text
Salve regina | one of the Marian antiphons,* beginning with *Salve regina, mater misericordiae*, ‘Hail queen, mother of mercy’
Sanctus | a text that is prayed after the preface* at Mass,* beginning with *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus*, ‘Holy, holy, holy’
seasonal | of Sundays: belonging to a particular liturgical season, such as Advent or Eastertide; of texts: used only during such seasons
second class double | a double* feast* with a higher liturgical rank than a greater double*
second Compline | Compline* on a (semi)double* feast*
second Vespers | Vespers* on a (semi)double* feast*
secular use | a use* that does not belong to a monastic order
semidouble, adj. | of feasts:* with two Vespers,* usually three nocturns* at Matins,* and antiphons* prayed in their entirety only after psalms* and canticles* at Matins,* Lauds* and Vespers*
semidouble, n. | a semidouble* feast*
sequence | a chant sung between the Alleluia verse* and the reading from the Gospel at Mass*
Sext | the minor hour* that is traditionally celebrated towards 3 p.m.
Short Hours of the Cross | a liturgical devotion in honour of the Passion of Jesus Christ of feasts:* with first Vespers* only, one nocturn* at Matins,* and antiphons* prayed in their entirety only after psalms* and canticles* at Matins,* Lauds* and Vespers*
solemn of preface tones:* for use on Sundays* and (semi)double* feasts;* of texts: for use on days of a high liturgical rank

solemn Mass a Mass* that is sung rather than said and celebrated with a deacon* and a subdeacon*

solemnity 1) a feast* with the highest liturgical rank; 2) the external ceremony with which a feast* or a liturgical service is celebrated; 3) the highest rank of celebrations of saints, events or mysteries in the breviary* that was promulgated by Pope Paul VI

Stabat mater a hymn, beginning with Stabat mater dolorosa, iuxta crucem lacrimosa, ‘At the cross her station keeping, stood the mournful mother weeping’

subdeacon a man who has received the lowest of the major orders,* or serves in this capacity at Mass*

suffrage, n. a daily commemoration*¹

Sunday the first day of the liturgical week

Te Deum a text traditionally attributed to Ambrose of Milan, prayed at the end of Matins* and beginning with Te Deum laudamus, ‘We praise thee, O God’

Terce the hour* that is traditionally celebrated towards 9 a.m.

tonary a collection of tones*

tone a melody to which certain texts can be sung

Trisagion a text that is prayed on Good Friday, beginning with Hagios o Theos, ‘Holy God’

universal of feasts:* not proper*

use a variant of a rite*

versicle a verse with a response

vesperal a breviary* for Vespers* that generally also includes additional texts and chants for specific rituals or processions that would otherwise be more at home in a manual* or a processional*

Vespers the evening hour*

vigil the day before certain feasts*

Vigil of the Dead a liturgical devotion for the deceased that is shaped after the divine office* and includes first Vespers,* Matins* and Lauds*

votive of Masses:* celebrated for a special intention and not corresponding to the divine office:* of offices:* not on the calendar, but celebrated for a special devotion

¹ For clarity’s sake, I follow Harper 1991, 131 in reserving the word ‘suffrage’ for ‘memorials recited on a daily basis in a fixed order’, and distinguishing these from other commemorations that are only said during specific seasons or on specific feasts.
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The Hague, RL
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**Leeuwarden, Tresoar**

PBF 6168 Hs

Manuscript antiphonary for the winter half of the year. Ca. 1520.

**Lille, Catholic University, Patrimonial Library**
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‘Recueil d’opuscules qui peuvent servir à l’histoire de l’abbaye de Cisoin.’ 18th century.
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‘Rerum Cisoniensium fasciculus, sive collectio aliquot documentorum pertinentium ad historiam abbatiæ Sancti Callisti de Cisonio, prope insulas Flandrorum, ordinis canonicerum regularium Divi Augustini, dioecesis Cameracensis.’ 18th century.
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Psalter of Henry VI. 15th century.
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3. Manuscript collectary, with a list of versicles and the rituals to be observed when a sister is ill or dead. 16th century. Ff. 145-218.
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4 Liturg. 91 Breuiarium consuetudinem ad canoniconum regularium instituti diui patris Augustini episcopi. congregationis Windesimensis. Antwerp: Henricus Eckertanus de Homberch, 1519.

Liturg. 905 h Officia propria sanctorum ex speciali S.D.N. Pii papa V. concessione a canoniciis regularibus Lateranensibus recitanda. Munich: Joannes Jacobus Vötter, 1748.
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OD 141 d 15 nr. 1 W.K. *De getyden of bedestonden*. Utrecht: Theodorus van den Eynden, 1723.
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**Oxford, Bodleian Library**

13841 d.5  
*Breviarium Leodiense*. Summer part. Liège: typographical offices of Everardus Kints and Clemens Plomteux. 1766.
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Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699  
Manuscript vesperal. 16th century.

**RHCL**

14.D051, inv. nr. 95  

**Steinfurt, Princely Archives, Library**

C 33 a-c  

**Tilburg, UL**

CBM TF D 158  

Haaren hs. 23  
Manuscript ferial psalter with the penitential psalms, the litany of the saints, the Vigil of the Dead, the common of saints of the breviary, and a hymnal. 15th century.

Haaren hs. 30  
Manuscript antiphonary for the winter half of the year. 15th century.

Haaren hs. 31  
Manuscript antiphonary for the winter half of the year. 15th century.

Haaren hs. 34  
Manuscript gradual. 15th century.
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Manuscript antiphonary for the winter half of the year. 16th century.
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Manuscript gradual. 1485.

BMH h23  
Manuscript gradual and vesperal. 1563.

**Utrecht, UL**

325 A 6 dl 1  

F qu 447 dl 2  

Hs. 116 *(olim Hs. 2 D 18)*  
Manuscript. John Chrysostom. ‘De compunctione cordis libri II.’ 15th or 16th century.

Hs. 406 *(olim Hs. 3 J 7)*  
Manuscript antiphonary. 12th century, with additions until the 15th century.
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Summary

Since 2014, Nijmegen University Library has had the loan of what was left of the historical library of the canonesses regular of the convent of Soeterbeeck in Deursen (the Netherlands) when the last remaining sisters left for a nursing home for elderly religious in 1997. These books—45 late medieval manuscripts, 33 loose manuscript fragments and about 600 early printed books and post-medieval manuscripts—are known as the Soeterbeeck Collection, and for the past decade they have been the subject of extensive study at Radboud University Nijmegen. This has resulted in the development of an approach to historical libraries that is theoretically rooted in archaeology.

The archaeology of a book collection is based on the metaphor of a library as a deposit of material traces of human activity in the past. It has two pillars: stratigraphy and interpretive archaeology. The former is the study of layering, which in books is only present conceptually. Their production is stratified because it takes place in various phases, and at each instance of use after the books’ completion yet another layer is added. The stratification of individual books and entire libraries can be visible from traces of production and use, which in collections can often be combined into larger stratigraphic units that cover multiple volumes. When studied and contextualised according to the principles of interpretive archaeology, these reveal how books were produced and used, and therefore what meaning these had for the people who did so, both on a functional and on a symbolic level.

This book provides an interpretation of the stratigraphic unit in the historical library of Soeterbeeck of Arnoldus Beckers, a canon regular of the Windesheim convent of Gaesdonck, near Goch (Germany), who was the sisters’ rector from 1772 to 1810. It studies the functional meaning of the traces of his production and use of books and contextualises these with the help of additional sources on Soeterbeeck and a consideration of his traces in the conventual archives and of his historiographical works. With an eye to the abundance of contextual information, the goal is not merely to understand the meaning that the books he made and used had for him, but to grasp the motivations for all of his activities of which there still is evidence. What do Beckers’ traces both within and without the library of Soeterbeeck reveal about what he did as rector of this convent and why he did it?

Along its functional dimension, Beckers’ stratigraphic unit in the library of Soeterbeeck can be divided into two categories: those traces that have to do with the liturgy and those that have to do with the library. The liturgical ones are most numerous, and must be contextualised very carefully. The reason for this is that Adrianus Frenken, one of Soeterbeeck’s most eminent historians, has stated that the convent did not celebrate the divine office at all for most of its existence, but limited itself to the Little Office of the Virgin between 1539 and 1906. An analysis of the surviving archival evidence shows, however, that it only supports this assertion from circa 1850 onwards. With reference to Beckers’ traces in books for the canonical hours, this means that there is no a priori reason to to interpret them as referring to anything else than actual liturgical use.

The rector wrote and revised several books for the divine office, among which diurnal breviaries, hymnals and antiphonaries. His traces in the latter are most prominent. Beckers renovated some of the convent’s late medieval antiphonaries in such a way as to bring their text into accordance with the Roman liturgy of his days, while allowing their old melodies to stand as much as possible. He did so only for Vespers on Sundays and feasts, and these were probably the only occasions when the choir sisters of Soeterbeeck prayed the divine office during his rectorate.

There is also one manuscript book of hours whose text of the Little Office he helped to bring into accordance with that in other ones in the library of Soeterbeeck, so that they could
all continue to be used in choir. This example and that of the antiphonaries show that Beckers was part of a long line of people in the convent who were concerned with the revision of its old liturgical books according to the use of Windesheim. Such activities were probably not merely driven by frugality or private pleasure, but by a desire to preserve something of the liturgical tradition which the books represent by allowing them to continue to be used in a different context.

Beckers’ other liturgical work, which ranged from the expansion and possibly also the production and rebinding of a book of prefaces for use by the organist at Mass, to the writing of two books of liturgical chants and one for the celebration of a sister’s jubilee, did not have any explicit ties with the Congregation of Windesheim. Rather, it exemplifies the rector’s involvement with the sisters’ liturgy in every form and at every level.

The traces of the rector’s involvement with the conventual book collection paint a similarly multifaceted picture. From them, he emerges as a spiritual director who entrusted books to four sisters for them to use in liturgical worship, to meditate on and to pray from, as a benefactor who donated a book to the community and wished to be remembered for it, as an administrator who occasionally acted in management of the general conventual book collection, as a user and producer of books who was occasionally involved in their material side, and as a reader who had books of his own. He was not Soeterbeeck’s librarian, but in his capacity as rector he was nonetheless occupied with the management of its library.

Beckers’ traces outside the library can also be divided in two groups along their functional dimension: they are administrative and historiographical. The former concern both the community’s material and its spiritual welfare. The rector did some bookkeeping and clearly aided the sisters in their financial transactions; he kept lists of deceased sisters, relatives and benefactors who needed to be remembered in the community’s prayers, and founded and directed three confraternities in order to help their members earn indulgences. In some cases he began or updated lists and accounts that were and continued to be current, whereas in others he filed documents away into the archives. Administrator and archivist, bookkeeper and spiritual director; Beckers’ traces in the archives show that he combined all of these roles.

Over the course of his rectorate, Beckers also produced, or at least started working on, four works of history: two versions of a chronicle of Soeterbeeck, the second of which he called the Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieuw klooster Soeterbeek, a description of his own convent Gaesdonck, entitled Canonia Gaesdonckana, and a comprehensive encyclopaedia of the Congregation of Windesheim known as Beschrijving der kloosters en canonie regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden. They are a cluster of tightly interconnected texts, impressive in scope and for the scholarly rigour and personal involvement with which they were written. Beckers’ historiographical works testify to the venerability of the Windesheim tradition, which had once been vigorous and strong but had almost entirely vanished by the beginning of the nineteenth century.

It is against this background of decline and fall, and against that of Beckers’ personal biography, that the symbolic meaning of his activities becomes apparent. In 1771, Beckers had become subprior of Gaesdonck at the personal recommendation of the prior general of Windesheim, only to be removed to Soeterbeeck several months later. It was probably at least partly out of disappointment with this development that the new rector went along with his confrère Wilhelmus Coninx in a plot to depose their prior, Petrus van Kempen. The affair ended in failure for everyone involved, and after having completed the penance that had been
imposed on him, Beckers seems to have accepted his rectorate of Soeterbeeck and his membership of the Windesheim convent of Gaesdonck with renewed zeal.

Each of the four fields in which Beckers has been shown to have been active—the liturgy, the library, administration and historiography—is known from sources such as Soeterbeeck’s statutes, Beckers’ portrait, and other people’s testimonies to have been of central importance to him as rector. In the context of an age that was becoming increasingly hostile towards traditional expressions of religion, his work can be seen as an attempt at saving whatever could be saved of the monastic way of life in general and the Windesheim tradition in particular within the walls of the convent of Soeterbeeck. The very word which the rector used for his work on the liturgy, ‘renovation’, supports this conclusion. It suggests taking something that is almost lost and renewing it for use by a new generation. In the eighteenth century, the destruction the Congregation of Windesheim and other representations of monastic life happened on a national and international level by hostile governments, although Beckers may have felt that his personal involvement in the Coninx Affair had also contributed to it in a smaller and different but no less real way. He had repented of his destructive behaviour, however, and during most of his life worked to preserve within his own limited sphere of influence the spirit of the religious tradition of which he was a part.
Samenvatting

Sinds 2014 heeft de Universiteitsbibliotheek Nijmegen in bruikleen wat er nog over was van de historische bibliotheek van de reguliere kanunnikessen van het klooster Soeterbeeck in Deursen toen de laatste zusters in 1997 naar een verzorgingstehuis voor religieuzen gingen. Deze boeken—45 laatmiddeleeuwse handschriften, 33 losse handschriftfragmenten en ongeveer 600 vroege drukken en postmiddeleeuwse handschriften—staan bekend als de Collectie Soeterbeeck, en zijn aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen de laatste jaren het onderwerp geweest van uitgebreid onderzoek. Dit heeft geresulteerd in de ontwikkeling van een benadering van historische bibliotheken die haar theoretische wortels heeft in de archeologie.

De archeologie van een collectie is gebaseerd op de metafoor van een bibliotheek als vindplaats van materiële sporen van menselijke activiteit in het verleden. Zij heeft twee fundamenten: stratigrafie en de interpretatieve archeologie. Dat eerste is de studie van gelaagdheid, die in boeken slechts op conceptueel niveau aanwezig is. Hun productie is gelaagd omdat zij in verschillende fasen heeft plaatsgevonden, en iedere keer dat een boek gebruikt wordt nadat het voltooid is, wordt daar weer een nieuwe laag aan toegevoegd. De gelaagdheid van individuele boeken en hele bibliotheken kan zichtbaar zijn in sporen van productie en gebruik, die in collecties vaak gecombineerd kunnen worden tot grotere stratigrafische eenheden die meerdere banden beslaan. Als zij bestudeerd en gecontextualiseerd worden vanuit de principes van de interpretatieve archeologie, kunnen dergelijke eenheden laten zien hoe boeken gemaakt en gebruikt werden, en dus welke betekenis zij hadden voor de mensen die dat deden, zowel op functioneel als op symbolisch niveau.

Dit boek biedt een interpretatie van de stratigrafische eenheid in de historische bibliotheek van Soeterbeeck van Arnoldus Beckers, een reguliere kanunnik van het Windesheimse klooster Gaesdonck, bij Goch (Duitsland), die rector van de zusters was van 1772 tot 1810. Het bespreekt de functionele betekenis van de sporen van zijn productie en gebruik van boeken en contextualiseert deze met behulp van andere bronnen over Soeterbeeck en een studie van zijn sporen in het kloosterarchief en van zijn historische werken. Met het oog op de overvloed aan contextuele informatie is het doel niet alleen het begrijpen van de betekenis die de boeken die hij gemaakt en gebruikt heeft voor hem hadden, maar om te begrijpen wat hem dreef bij al zijn activiteiten waar nog bewijs van over is. Wat laten Beckers’ sporen in de bibliotheek van Soeterbeeck en daarbuiten zien over wat hij als rector van dit klooster zoal gedaan heeft, en over het waarom daarvan?

In haar functionele dimensie kan Beckers’ stratigrafische eenheid in de bibliotheek van Soeterbeeck verdeeld worden in twee delen: de sporen die te maken hebben met de liturgie, en zij die te maken hebben met de bibliotheek. De liturgische sporen zijn het talrijkst, en moeten zorgvuldig gecontextualiseerd worden. De reden hiervoor is dat Adrianus Frenken, een van Soeterbeeks belangrijkste geschiedschrijvers, beweerde dat de kloostergemeenschap voor het grootste deel van haar bestaan in het getijdengebed niet het canoniek officie gebeden heeft, maar zich tussen 1539 en 1906 beperkt heeft tot het Maria-officie. Uit onderzoek van de overgebleven archiefstukken blijkt echter dat deze Frenkens conclusie slechts ondersteunen voor de periode vanaf circa 1850. Met betrekking tot Beckers’ sporen in boeken voor het canoniek officie betekent dit dat er geen reden is om a priori aan te nemen dat zij naar iets anders verwijzen dan naar liturgisch gebruik.

De rector heeft verschillende boeken voor het canoniek officie geschreven en herzien, waaronder diurnales, hymnales en antifonaria. Zijn sporen zijn in die laatste categorie het meest prominent. Beckers heeft enkele van de laatmiddeleeuwse antifonaria van het klooster
zodanig gerenoveerd dat hun tekst in overeenstemming is gebracht met de Romeinse liturgie van zijn dagen, terwijl de oude melodieën zoveel mogelijk behouden zijn. Hij deed dit alleen voor de vespers op zondagen en feesten, en dit waren tijdens zijn rectoraat waarschijnlijk ook de enige gelegenheden waarbij de koorzusters van Soeterbeeck het canoniek office baden.

Er is ook een handgeschreven getijdenboek waarin hij eraan heeft bijgedragen om de tekst van het Maria-officie in overeenstemming te brengen met die in andere getijdenboeken in de bibliotheek van Soeterbeeck, zodat zij allemaal gebruik konden blijven worden in het koorgebied. Zowel dit voorbeeld als dat van de antifonaria laat zien dat Beckers deel uitmaakte van een lange reeks mensen in het klooster die zich bezighielden met de revisie van de oude liturgische boeken volgens de usus van Windesheim. Zulke activiteiten waren waarschijnlijk niet slechts gemotiveerd door zuinigheid of hobbyisme, maar ook door een verlangen om iets te bewaren van de liturgische traditie die de boeken representeerden door het mogelijk te maken hen te blijven gebruiken in een andere context.

Beckers’ andere liturgische werkzaamheden, die variëren van de uitbreiding en mogelijk ook de productie en herbinding van een boek met prefaties voor de organist in de Mis, tot het schrijven van twee boeken met liturgische gezangen en een voor de viering van het jubileum van een zuster, houden niet expliciet verband met de Congregatie van Windesheim. Zij zijn wel voorbeelden van de betrokkenheid van de rector bij de liturgie van de zusters in elke vorm en op elk niveau.

De sporen van de betrokkenheid van de rector bij de boekencollectie van het klooster geven een even veelzijdig beeld. Daaruit komt hij naar voren als een geestelijk leidsman die boeken toevertrouwde aan vier zusters zodat zij ze konden gebruiken in de eredienst, of om over te mediteren of uit te bidden, als een weldoener die een boek doneerde aan de gemeenschap en daarvoor herdacht wilde worden, als een administrator die af en toe de algemene kloosterbibliotheek beheerde, als een gebruiker en maker van boeken die nu en dan ook bij hun materiële kant betrokken was, en als een lezer die zelf ook boeken had. Hij was niet de bibliothecaris van Soeterbeeck, maar in zijn hoedanigheid als rector was hij toch betrokken bij het beheer van de bibliotheek.


Gedurende zijn rectoraat heeft Beckers ook vier historische werken geschreven, of in ieder geval opgezet: twee versies van een kroniek van Soeterbeeck, waarvan hij de tweede Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieu klooster Soeterbeek genoemd heeft, een beschrijving van zijn eigen klooster Gaesdonck, getiteld Canonia Gaesdonckana, en een uitgebreide encyclopedie van de Congregatie van Windesheim die bekendstaat als Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden. Zij vormen een cluster van nauw met elkaar verbonden teksten, indrukwekkend van opzet en vanwege de persoonlijke betrokkenheid en wetenschappelijke nauwkeurigheid waarmee zij geschreven zijn. Beckers’ historische werken getuigen van de
eerbiedwaardigheid van de Windesheimse traditie, die ooit levendig en sterk was maar tegen het begin van de negentiende eeuw bijna helemaal was verdwenen.

Het is tegen deze achtergrond van verval en ondergang, en tegen die van Beckers’ persoonlijke levensloop, dat de symbolische betekenis van zijn activiteiten naar voren komt. In 1771 werd Beckers op de persoonlijke voorspraak van de prior generaal van Windesheim subprior van Gaesdonck, maar hij werd al binnen enkele maanden naar Soeterbeeck overgeplaatst. Het was waarschijnlijk tenminste gedeeltelijk vanwege teleurstelling om deze ontwikkeling dat de kersverse rector zich aansloot bij zijn medebroeder Wilhelmus Coninx in een samenzwering die als doel had hun prior, Petrus van Kempen, af te zetten. De affaire liep voor alle betrokkenen uit op een fiasco en nadat hij de opgelegde boete gedaan had, lijkt Beckers zijn rectoraat van Soeterbeeck en zijn lidmaatschap van het Windesheimse klooster Gaesdonck met hernieuwde ijver aanvaard te hebben.

Elk van de vier velden waarin Beckers actief is gebleken—liturgie, de bibliotheek, administratie en geschiedschrijving—komt ook uit bronnen zoals de statuten van Soeterbeeck, Beckers’ portret en de getuigenissen van andere mensen naar voren als van cruciaal belang voor hem als rector. In de context van een tijd die steeds vijandiger kwam te staan tegenover traditionele vormen van religie, kan zijn werk gezien worden als een poging om binnen de muren van klooster Soeterbeeck te redden wat er nog te redden viel van de monastieke manier van leven in het algemeen en de Windesheimse traditie in het bijzonder. Het specifieke woord dat de rector gebruikte om zijn werkzaamheden op liturgisch gebied te beschrijven, ‘renovatie’, onderschrijft deze conclusie. Het suggereert dat iets dat bijna verloren is gegaan wordt vernieuwd met het oog op gebruik door een nieuwe generatie. De vernietiging van de Congregatie van Windesheim en andere vertegenwoordigingen van monastiek leven vond in de achttiende eeuw plaats op nationaal en internationaal niveau door vijandig gezinde overheden, hoewel ook Beckers zijn persoonlijke betrokkenheid in de Coninx-affaire ervaren heeft als een kleinere en hele andere maar niet minder reële bijdrage daaraan. Hij heeft zich echter van zijn destructieve gedrag bekeerd, en gedurende het grootste deel van zijn leven heeft hij geprobeerd in zijn eigen invloedssfeer de geest van de religieuze traditie waar hij onderdeel van uitmaakte te helpen bewaren.
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Since 2014, Nijmegen University Library has had the loan of what was left of the historical library of the canonesses regular of the convent of Soeterbeeck in Deursen (the Netherlands) when the last remaining sisters left for a nursing home for elderly religious in 1997. These books—45 late medieval manuscripts, 33 loose manuscript fragments and about 600 early printed books and post-medieval manuscripts—are known as the Soeterbeeck Collection, and for the past decade they have been the subject of extensive study at Radboud University Nijmegen.

This book focuses on Arnoldus Beckers, a canon regular of the Windesheim convent of Gaesdonck, near Goch (Germany), who was rector of Soeterbeeck from 1772 to 1810. It studies the traces he left in the sisters’ books and contextualises these with the help of archival sources. The goal is not merely to understand the meaning that the books he made and used had for him, but to grasp the motivations for all of his activities of which there is still evidence.

Each of the four fields in which Beckers is known to have been active—the liturgy, the library, administration and historiography—was of central importance to him as rector. In the context of an age that was becoming increasingly hostile towards traditional expressions of religion, his work can be seen as an attempt at preserving, within the walls of Soeterbeeck, something of the spirit of the Congregation of Windesheim.
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List of Abbreviations

The following lists only include abbreviations that are used throughout the entire study. Those whose use is restricted to Tables 3.1, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7 are explained in the introductions to these tables.

1. General Abbreviations
The following abbreviations are used for the titles of texts and journals and with reference to libraries and archives:

- **AAS** *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*
- **ACRW** Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Canonesses Regular of the Congregation of Windesheim
- **ASP** Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Archives Soeterbeeck Priory
- **BHIC** Brabants Historisch Informatie Centrum
- **CAG** Goch, Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck
- **DT** *Duae tabellae ex superioribus rubricis excerptae* (addendum to RGB; I refer to the first table (on occurring feasts) and the second (on concurring feasts) as DT I and DT II respectively, and to the list giving the ranks of feasts as DT)
- **ENK** Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven
- **JRL** Manchester, John Rylands Library
- **LCSA** Sint Agatha, Erfgoedcentrum Nederlands Kloosterleven, Library Convent Sint Aegten
- **NUL** Nijmegen University Library
- **RGB** *Rubricae generales breviarii*
- **RHCe** Eindhoven, Regionaal Historisch Centrum Eindhoven
- **RHCL** Maastricht, Regionaal Historisch Centrum Limburg
- **RL** Royal Library
- **UL** University Library

2. Abbreviations Used for Liturgical Texts and Chants
In tables, and occasionally also in the main text, the function of liturgical texts and chants is described by means of a string of abbreviations. These are as follows:

- 1Mar one martyr
- 1Vir one virgin
- 2Mar several martyrs
- 2Vir several virgins
- A antiphon
- Adv Advent
- ApEv apostle(s) and/or evangelist
- Asc Ascension of the Lord
- AT Ascensiontide (from the Ascension of the Lord to Pentecost)
- Aug August
- B Benedictus antiphon
- BV Blessed Virgin
- C(#) Compline
- CC Corpus Christi
- Col collect
- Com(#) commemoration antiphon
- Conf confessor
- ConfBis bishop-confessor
- Ded dedication of a church
- Doc Doctor of the Church
- Eas Easter
- Ep Epiphany of the Lord (6 January)
- ET Eastertide (from Easter Sunday to the Ascension of the Lord)
- F(#) feria(s)
In addition to these abbreviations, the names of saints are used, in abbreviated form, to refer to their feasts, e.g. AugustineHippo for the feast of Augustine of Hippo (28 August).

The abbreviations are stringed together to go from the general to the specific. For example:

Adv.S1.V1.M the Magnificat antiphon at first Vespers of the first Sunday in Advent
Asc.OS.V.P1 the first psalm antiphon at either Vespers of the Sunday within the octave of the Ascension of the Lord
InventionCross.V2.Com.MonicaHippo the commemoration antiphon for the feast of Monica of Hippo at second Vespers of the feast of the Invention of the Cross
Appendix A: The Community of Soeterbeeck during Beckers’ Rectorate (1772-1810)

The main sources for these tables, which do not aim at absolute completeness, are the following archival records: Beckers’ chronicles of Soeterbeeck (ASP 4, pp. 1-19 and ASP 45, 1), his death register (ASP 129, pp. 11-13), his entries in the conventual book of benefactors (ASP 267), his list of sisters who celebrated their jubilee (Mater 5, ff. 3v-4r), his Supplicae ad vicarium generalem Leodiensem (ASP 3) and the records pertaining to him in the monastic archives of the CAG (A 21). Brief quotations from these sources are included when they yield extra information. Additional information has been taken from three files at the BHIC in Grave (7618.110 and 7618.118) and in ’s-Hertogenbosch (21.1598), and from lists by Sluijters and Van Dijk.

As far as possible, the spelling of names has been based on that of Sluijters, and names between brackets are the names which he gives as the sisters’ baptismal names. The lists also include books known to have been in use by particular sisters because of ownership notes with their names, although only those books where identification is certain have been included; the years between brackets are the years mentioned in the ownership notes. Shelf marks in bold indicate books which have ownership notes in the hand of Arnoldus Beckers.

1. Choir Sisters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Cleijn/Kersjens, Dorothea | Birth: Wijchen  
Profession: 24 July 1746  
Nurse: for 29 years  
Death: Deursen, 10 November 1786  
Burial: 13 November 1786 | ASP 129, p. 12  
ASP 267, November  
Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 33 |
| 2   | Colen, Maria (Magdalena) | Birth: Udenhout, 1731  
Entrance: 1758  
Profession: 9 January 1759  
Sacristan  
Death: Deursen, 2 July 1800  
Burial: 4 July 1800  
Book: III 113 | ASP 45, 1: pp. 24-25  
fidelissima sacrista, sed fere per 6 annos innocens (ASP 129, p. 13)  
ASP 267, July  
Sluijters 1982b, 183, no. 49 |
| 3   | Daamen, Lucia (Henrica) | Birth: Beugen, 20 March 1784  
Investment: 19 June 1809  
Profession: 16 July 1810  
Death: Deursen, 19 June 1865  
Book: V 200 | ASP 4, p. 19b  
ASP 45, letter 11 June 1809  
Sluijters 1982b, 186, no. 81 |
| 4   | De Jong, Joanna Gertrudis (Joanna Maria) | Birth: Berghem, 1749  
Entrance: 1768  
Profession: 9 May 1769  
Nurse: in September 1806  
Death: Dennenburg, 23 February 1813  
Book: V 153 | ASP 4, p. 12a  
Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 58 |
| 5   | Gerome, Anna Maria | Birth: Amsterdam, 1744  
Entrance: 1765  
Profession: 21 April 1767  
Death: Deursen, 20 November 1790  
Burial: 28 November 1790  
Book: V 153 | ASP 129, p. 12  
ASP 267, November  
Sluijters 1982b, 183-184, no. 56 |

1 A copy of the original book of benefactors (ACRW 1105) was produced in 1880 for the benefit of the convent of Nazareth in Ravenstein and kept in use until 2007. However, it does not provide any extra information on the community in Beckers’ days and has not been considered.

2 Sluijters 1982a; 1982b; Van Dijk 1982c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grobbie, Antonia  (Joanna Theresia)</td>
<td>Amsterdam, 27 November 1771</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Deursen, 21 January 1828</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heijnen, Theresia (Hendrina)</td>
<td>Nederasselt, 1739</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Deursen, 12 March 1822</td>
<td>Books: IV 40 (1785), IV 55 (1788), V 208 (1807)</td>
<td>ASP 3, pp. 1-2 ASP 4, pp. 5a-b, 12a, 15b, 16a-b ASP 45, 1: pp. 23-24, 27 Van de 300 gulden hollands ten lasten van den heer pastor tot Dennenborgh zullen de armen van Deursen, en Dennenborgh ieder de halfscheit genieten, met lasten, om 's jaars hiervoor een leezende misse voor de ziel van mater Maria Theresia Heijnen te Dennenborgh […] te laten lezen (A 21, will of 8 July 1810). Sluijters 1982b, 183, no. 50 Van Dijk 1982c, 201, no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hermens/Ariens, Catrina</td>
<td>Neerbosch, 22 May 1763</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Deursen, 30 November 1848</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a Sluijters 1982b, 184-185, no. 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hogervorst, Joseph</td>
<td>Sassenheim</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Deursen, 28 April 1778</td>
<td>ASP 129, p. 11 ASP 267, April Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jansen, Joanna (Joanna Caecilia)</td>
<td>Neerbosch, 18 January 1768</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Deursen, 22 January 1842</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maas, Elisabeth (Elisabeth)</td>
<td>Ravenstein</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Deursen, 11 September 1776</td>
<td>ASP 129, p. 11 ASP 267, September Sluijters 1982b, 183, no. 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nouhuijs, Theresia (Agnes)</td>
<td>Lith, 1724</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Deursen, 26 March 1799</td>
<td>archivaria, piissima cooperatrix (ASP 129, p. 12) ASP 267, March clanculo inter nos […] propter incertitudinem temporum, archivaria et fidelissima operatrix (Mater 5, f. 4r) Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pelt, Joseph</td>
<td>Purmerend, 1755</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Deursen, 26 August 1806</td>
<td>ASP 129, p. 13 ASP 267, August Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Roefs, Augustina</td>
<td>Oijen</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Deursen, 24 August 1776</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 4b-5a ASP 45, 1: p. 20, 23 ASP 129, p. 11 ASP 267, August Sluijters 1982b, 181, no. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Dijk 1982c, 201, no. 5</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>16</td>
<td>Schelvisch, Theresia (Maria)</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, 30 January 1761</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 1803</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 26 June 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Van Asten, Augustina</td>
<td>Birth: Herpen, 1748</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 20 April 1804</td>
<td>Per longum tempus cancro laboraverat, et ut martyr obiit (ASP 129, p. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cook: in September 1806</td>
<td>ASP 267, November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 13 November 1809</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 14 November 1809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funerary rites: 16 November 1809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Van den Boogart, Anna</td>
<td>Birth: Megen, 1733</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1753</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 30 April 1754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 26 June 1811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Van den Broek, Josepha (Johanna Maria)</td>
<td>Birth: Deursen, 16 April 1806</td>
<td>ASP 3, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 19 April 1806</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 16b, 19b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 12 February 1805</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Van den Heuvel, Clara (Lucia)</td>
<td>Birth: ’s Hertogenbosch, 29 October 1729</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 4b-5a, 7b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1748</td>
<td>ASP 45, 1: pp. 20, 22, 26, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 1 July 1749</td>
<td>ASP 129, p. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prioresse: 1764-1776</td>
<td>ASP 267, February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 9 February 1805</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 12 February 1805</td>
<td>Van Dijk 1982c, 201, no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Van den Heuvel, Maria Antonia</td>
<td>Birth: 1717</td>
<td>suppressa in conventu Oostrum prope Venrai (ASP 129, p. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 16 April 1806</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982a, 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 19 April 1806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Van der Sande, Agatha (Anna Maria)</td>
<td>Birth: Best, 1 March 1776</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 16b, 19a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investment: 10 August 1807</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 185-186, no. 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 23 August 1808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 20 April 1862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book: III 147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Van Dueren, Agnes (Helena Cecilia)</td>
<td>Birth: Ravenstein, 15 September 1748</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 12a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1766</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 2 June 1767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 22 June 1839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book: V 12 (1767)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Van Dueren, Henrica (Maria Petronella)</td>
<td>Birth: Uden, 1740</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 6b, 12a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1761</td>
<td>ASP 45, 1: p. 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 20 April 1762</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 183, no. 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subprioress: from 3 March 1796 onwards, still in September 1806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Deursen, 2 October 1813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Van Endhoven, Catharina</td>
<td>Birth: Sint-Michielsgestel</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1727</td>
<td>ASP 45, 1: p. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subprioress: 1765-1782</td>
<td>ex veteri conventu exul, ultima ad chorum professa (ASP 129, p. 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee: 2 September 1777</td>
<td>de laaste van Ouwdt Soeterbeek (ASP 267, May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: 16 May 1782</td>
<td>Hæc erat ultima exul ex derelicto conventu Soeterbeek prope Endhoviam (Mater 5, f. 4r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book: III 47</td>
<td>Sluijters 1982b, 180, no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Van Groenland, Agatha (Maria Catharina)</td>
<td>Birth: Geffen, 1739</td>
<td>ASP 4, pp. 5a-b, 7a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance: 1760</td>
<td>ASP 45, 1: pp. 27, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 10 November 1761</td>
<td>ASP 129, p. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Van Iersel, Johanna</td>
<td>Tilburg, 20 July</td>
<td>19 June 1809</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Deursen, 21 October 1844</td>
<td>14 April 1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Van Oudenhoven, Constantia</td>
<td>Oirschot, 25 November 1766</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Deursen, 1 May 1838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Van Raaij, Allegundis</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>18 September 1757</td>
<td>Deursen, 4 March 1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Van Soelen, Constantia</td>
<td>Deest</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>5 October 1756</td>
<td>Deursen, 25 January 1788</td>
<td>26 January 1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Verhoeven, Magdalena</td>
<td>Udenhout, 6 April</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>27 September 1802</td>
<td>Deursen, 6 December 1853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Verkleij, Aloysia</td>
<td>Gouda, 15 September 1756</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>1822-1840</td>
<td>Deursen, 16 February 1840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Verstraeten, Elisabeth</td>
<td>Mill, 1721</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Deursen, 3 March 1796</td>
<td>5 March 1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Zeelands, Clara</td>
<td>Volkel, 1740</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>20 April 1762</td>
<td>Deursen, 3 January 1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | Boers, Benedicta (Hendrica)   | Birth: Haren, 29 July 1777  
                                   | Profession: 1802  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 21 May 1841                      | ASP 4, p. 12b  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 76             |
| 2   | Claessens, Petronella        | Profession: before 1732  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 18 October 1773               | ASP 4, p. 4b  
                                   | ASP 45, 1: p. 16  
                                   | exul ex derelicto conventu prope Endhoviam (ASP 129, p. 11)  
                                   | ASP 267, October  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 180-181, no. 21         |
| 3   | Elemans, Maria               | Birth: Huisseling  
                                   | Profession: 17 February 1778                 | ASP 129, p. 12  
                                   | ASP 267, February  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 61             |
| 4   | Fransen/Tijse, Elisabeth (Anna Maria) | Birth: Neerloorn, 21 October 1764  
                                          | Entrance: 1786  
                                          | Death: Deursen, 14 October 1834               | Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 66             |
| 5   | Hendriks, Maria Elisabeth    | Birth: Neerloorn  
                                   | Profession: before September 1806             | ASP 4, p. 12b             |
| 6   | Hendrix/Van Wichem/Janssen, Joanna | Birth: Wijchen, 1715  
                                          | Profession: 13 July 1745  
                                          | Death: Deursen, 20 July 1793                   | ASP 129, p. 12  
                                          | ASP 267, July  
                                          | Sluijters 1982b, 181-182, no. 32         |
| 7   | Hoeben, Johanna (Maria)      | Birth: Hamont, 22 September 1762  
                                          | Profession: 1801  
                                          | Servant of the rector: in 1806  
                                          | Death: Deursen, 21 November 1848            | ASP 4, p. 12b  
                                          | Zoo is edogh mijnen uijtdrukkelyken wil, [...] dat binnen een maand naar  
                                          |                     | mijn afisteren aan de suster Joanna Maria Hoeben, die mij dient, twee  
                                          |                     | hondert gulden hollands moeten en zullen uijtbetaalt worden (A 21, will  
                                          |                     | of 30 October 1806).  
                                          |                     | De intressen van 1000 gulden capital  
                                          |                     | ten lasten van mijn heer Mosk te  
                                          |                     | Ravenstein zal suster Joanna Maria  
                                          |                     | Houben levenslang genieten (A 21,  
                                          |                     | will of 8 July 1810).  
                                          |                     | Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 74         |
| 8   | Schaijmans, Helena           | Birth: Cleves  
                                   | Entrance: 1769  
                                   | Profession: 29 May 1770  
                                   | Death: Deursen                         | ASP 4, p. 12a  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 59             |
| 9   | Slook, Henrica               | Birth: Deventer, 1719  
                                   | Entrance: 1749  
                                   | Profession: June 1750  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 10 January 1793         | ASP 129, p. 12  
                                   | ASP 267, January  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 182, no. 40            |
| 10  | Slots, Joanna (Johanna)      | Birth: Udenhout, 1764  
                                   | Profession: 1784  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 26 February 1813           | ASP 4, p. 12b  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 64             |
| 11  | Smits, Dorothea (Petronella) | Birth: Weert, 1788  
                                   | Investment: 29 September 1809  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 7 November 1820            | ASP 4, p. 19b  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 186, no. 82             |
| 12  | Sonnenberg, Petronella (Petronella) | Birth: Deursen, 21 January 1759  
                                          | Profession: 1786  
                                          | Death: Deursen, 28 March 1830              | ASP 4, p. 12b  
                                          | Sluijters 1982b, 184, no. 65             |
| 13  | Teunissen, Barbara           | Birth: Mook, 4 August 1757  
                                   | Profession: 1789  
                                   | Death: Deursen, 25 August 1831             | ASP 4, p. 12b  
                                   | Sluijters 1982b, 185, no. 72             |
### 3. Boarders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blanken, C.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam Present in September 1806</td>
<td>pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brandlight, A.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam Present in September 1806</td>
<td>pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clercx, C.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam Present in September 1806</td>
<td>pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two sisters Cloetée</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam Present in September 1806</td>
<td>pupils (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>De Goeij, F.</td>
<td>Birth: Grave Present in September 1806</td>
<td>pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birthplace and Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>De Greef-Klijn, Elisabeth</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, Death: 10 November 1773, domina (ASP 129, p. 11), wife of Bartholomeus, mother of Cecilia Van Crakenburgh-De Greef (Sluijters 1982a, 124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dubbeldemuts, Catharina</td>
<td>Birth: Rotterdam, Entrance: ca. 1751, domicella [...] que hic habitavit circa 34 annis (ASP 129, p. 12), Sluijters 1982a, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Esser-Ballegoy, Euphemia</td>
<td>Death: 22 November 1775, domina (ASP 129, p. 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evers, A.</td>
<td>Birth: Batenburg, Present in September 1806, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>two sisters Friesekolk</td>
<td>Birth: Kessel, Present in September 1806, pupils (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gallenkamp, A.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, Present in September 1806, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Henriette, Maria Claudia</td>
<td>Birth: France, Schoolmistress: in 1805, mademoiselle (ASP 4, p. 12b), mademoiselle [...] meestersse van de school (ASP 45, 1: p. 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Keijsteren, A. van</td>
<td>Birth: Sint Agatha, Present in September 1806, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Landman-Scheen, Catharina</td>
<td>Present on 30 May 1786, Juffrow Cat. Scheen wed. dhr. Landman tans woonende int cl. der s. H. ch. r. vant cl. Soet. in Deurse Land van Ravestijn gelegen (Grave, BHIC 7618.118, p. 148, no. 57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Minbergen, Gertrudis</td>
<td>Birth: Rotterdam, Present in September 1806, juffrouw (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Peerenboom, Agnes</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, Death: 16 January 1780, Subitania morte obiit domicella (ASP 129, p. 11), sister to Maria (Sluijters 1982a, 124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Peerenboom, Maria</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, Death: 19 July 1773, domicella (ASP 129, p. 11), sister to Agnes (Sluijters 1982a, 124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Planssen-Schwartz, Margaretha</td>
<td>Present on 28 October 1777 and still on 8 March 1779, Juffr. Swaerts wde. Plantz woonende opt clooster tot Deurse (Grave, BHIC 7618.110, p. 329), Sluijters 1982a, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ruwerts, C.</td>
<td>Birth: Sloten, Present in September 1806, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Schenck, Beatrix</td>
<td>Birth: ’s-Hertogenbosch, Death: 1 April 1784, domicella (ASP 129, p. 12), Sluijters 1982a, 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Schraven, M.</td>
<td>Birth: Uedem, Present in September 1806, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sonnemans, Maria</td>
<td>Birth: Rotterdam, Present in September 1806, juffrouw (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Van Baele, Catharina Elisabeth</td>
<td>Birth: The Hague, before 1733, Entrance: ca. 1787, domicella [...] etatis ultra 67 annos, pater illius fuit Henricus van Baele et mater Elisabeth Muniks [...] hic habitavit circiter 13 annis (ASP 129, p. 13), Sluijters 1982a, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Two sisters Van Berckel</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam, Present in September 1806, pupils (ASP 4, p. 12b), Sluijters 1982a, 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Van Coenen, J.</td>
<td>Birth: ’s-Hertogenbosch, pupil (ASP 4, p. 12b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth Location</td>
<td>Death Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Van Cranenburgh-De Greef, Cecilia</td>
<td>Entrance: 1780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Van Crimen, A.</td>
<td>Birth: Amersfoort</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Van Crimen-Dashorst, Geertruda</td>
<td>Birth: Amersfoort</td>
<td>Death: 10 March 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 14 March 1806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Van den Heuvel, M.A.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Van der Horst, Joanna Maria</td>
<td>Birth: Nijmegen</td>
<td>Death: 8 September 1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Van der Linden, M.</td>
<td>Birth: Rotterdam</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Van der Lught</td>
<td>Birth: Rotterdam</td>
<td>Entrance: probably ca. 1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: 26 March 1775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Van de Ven, D.</td>
<td>Birth: 's-Hertogenbosch</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly the Aloysia van der Ven from 's-Hertogenbosch who died on 23 March 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Van de Voort, B.</td>
<td>Birth: Uden</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Van de Voort, J.</td>
<td>Birth: Beers</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Van Gammeren, P.</td>
<td>Birth: Vlijmen</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Van Gorp, Catharina</td>
<td>Birth: Breda</td>
<td>Death: 7 April 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Van Grinsven, A.</td>
<td>Birth: 's-Hertogenbosch</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must be a duplicate entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Van Ingen, Elisabeth</td>
<td>Birth: Utrecht</td>
<td>Death: 2 November 1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Van Lammeren, A.</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Van Maaren, G.</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Van Selst, J.</td>
<td>Birth: Ammerzoden</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Van Vught, M.</td>
<td>Birth: 's-Hertogenbosch</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Van Willigen, Antonet</td>
<td>Birth: Ravenstein, 1720</td>
<td>Death: between 13 and 14 September 1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burial: 16 September 1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Verhoeven, M.</td>
<td>Birth: Veghel</td>
<td>Present in September 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Viskorf, Margaretha</td>
<td>Birth: Amsterdam</td>
<td>Death: 19 December 1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Zuijlen, Maria van</td>
<td>Birth: 's-Hertogenbosch</td>
<td>Death: 1 October 1779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: The Community of Gaesdonck in 1774-1775

This table contains biographical information on the canons who made up the community of Gaesdonck during the years of the Coninx Affair (1774-1775).\(^1\) The main sources on which it is based are Theodorus Metzmecher’s *Gaesdonckx cronicxken* (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 29, pp. 112-128), Petrus Nabben’s *Liber* (Höv 38, pp. 59-61) and Beckers’ *Canonia Gaesdonckana* (Höv 46, pp. 11-12), with occasional reference to the two versions of Beckers’ chronicle of Soeterbeeck (ASP 4 and 45), the convent’s book of benefactors (ASP 267) and the file Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199 at the Rhineland Department of the of the North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive in Duisburg. The list provided by Scholten is not reliable and has only been used when it provides additional information.\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beckers, Arnoldus</td>
<td>Birth and baptism: Uedem, 8 July 1742&lt;br&gt;Investment: 30 September 1760&lt;br&gt;Profession: 4/5 October 1761&lt;br&gt;Ordination: October 1765&lt;br&gt;Subprior: 11 November 1771 to before 7 June 1772&lt;br&gt;Rector of Soeterbeeck: 19 June 1772 to 23 July 1810&lt;br&gt;Death: Deursen, 23 July 1810</td>
<td>ASP 4, p. 5a&lt;br&gt;ASP 45, 1: pp. 21-22&lt;br&gt;Höv 29, p. 113, 118&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, pp. 61-62&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bosch, Joannes Matthias</td>
<td>Birth: Kempen, 5 April 1723&lt;br&gt;Profession: 23 December 1743&lt;br&gt;Ordination: 17 December 1746&lt;br&gt;Death: Kempen, 21 July 1809</td>
<td>Höv 29, p. 117&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, p. 60&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coninx, Wilhelmus Joannes Lambertus</td>
<td>Birth and baptism: Well, 8 February 1731&lt;br&gt;Investment: 7 April 1750&lt;br&gt;Procurator: before 5 February 1760 to 30 March 1760&lt;br&gt;Rector of St Catherina in Kranenburg: 30 March 1760 to 21 June 1774&lt;br&gt;Prior of the Holy Spirit in Uedem: 21 June 1774 to 1802&lt;br&gt;Secretary of the Congregation of Windesheim: July 1783 to July 1786&lt;br&gt;Death: Uedem, between 1802 and 1808</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113-114, 116, 118&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, p. 60&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12a&lt;br&gt;Hövelmann 1987b, 20-22, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De Langh, Petrus (converse brother)</td>
<td>Birth: The Hague, 5 May 1720&lt;br&gt;Investment: 22 September 1750&lt;br&gt;Profession: Death: 26 March 1785</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113, 118&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, p. 60&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dijckman, Cornelius</td>
<td>Birth: Arcen, 22 September 1731&lt;br&gt;Investment: 16 September 1750&lt;br&gt;Profession: 20 October 1755&lt;br&gt;Death: 22 May 1775</td>
<td>Höv 29, p. 113&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, p. 60&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Koppers, Joannes Theodorus</td>
<td>Birth: Uedem, 25 November 1740&lt;br&gt;Investment: 19 May 1760&lt;br&gt;Profession: 2 June 1761&lt;br&gt;Ordination: 13 October 1764&lt;br&gt;Death: 23 June 1796</td>
<td>Höv 29, p. 113-114, 117&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, p. 61&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, p. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Loyens, Joannes Petrus</td>
<td>Birth: Kempen, 22 February 1725&lt;br&gt;Investment: 23 November 1749&lt;br&gt;Profession: 23 November 1750&lt;br&gt;Procurator: 2 May 1760 to 26 February 1768&lt;br&gt;Rector at Goch: 26 February 1768-17 June 1777</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113-114, 117-128&lt;br&gt;Höv 38, pp. 35, 57, 60&lt;br&gt;Höv 46, pp. 12a-b, 13b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 On the Coninx Affair, see Appendix E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Profession Date</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
<th>Parish priest of Goch</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ruyss, Petrus Wolterus</td>
<td>Goch</td>
<td>15 September 1721</td>
<td>11 November 1742</td>
<td>September 1744</td>
<td>1748-1782</td>
<td>11 June 1782</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113, 118, 123-124, Höv 38, p. 60, Höv 46, p. 12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Schadden, Joannes Casimir</td>
<td>Sonsbeck</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>18 August 1771</td>
<td>24 August 1772</td>
<td>one of the September Ember Days of 1776</td>
<td>7 June 1782 and still on 3 July 1782</td>
<td>A 21, will of 30 October 1806, will of 23 September 1808, will of 8 July 1810, declaration of 16 August 1810 Höv 29, pp. 117, 123-124 Höv 38, p. 62 Höv 46, p. 12b Scholten 1906, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Schelle, Stephanus Arnoldus</td>
<td>Rheinberg</td>
<td>2 June 1728</td>
<td>13 January 1750</td>
<td>24/26 January 1779</td>
<td>3 July 1782-9 November 1811</td>
<td>9 November 1811</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 111, 117, 121 Höv 38, pp. 60-61, 63 Höv 46, p. 12a Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199, f. 146-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Van Kempen, Petrus</td>
<td>Goch</td>
<td>11 February 1704</td>
<td>18 April 1730</td>
<td>17 February 1731</td>
<td>18 March 1738 to 29 August 1778</td>
<td>29 August 1778</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113-118, 121, 127 Höv 38, pp. 35, 59, 61, 63 Höv 46, pp. 11b, 12b Hövelmann 1987b, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Van Kölcken, Joannes Wilhelmus</td>
<td>Kempen</td>
<td>8 January 1712</td>
<td>7 November 1736</td>
<td>15 June 1737</td>
<td>26 February/27 September 1775</td>
<td>29 August 1778</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113, 117 Höv 38, p. 59 Höv 46, p. 12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Van Oeyen, Oswaldus Theodorus Godefridus</td>
<td>Mulbracht</td>
<td>14 April 1706</td>
<td>7 November 1728</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>22 August 1730</td>
<td>31 December 1785</td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113, 117, 127 Höv 38, p. 59 Höv 46, p. 11b Scholten 1906, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Van Zedlits, Oswaldus (converse brother)</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>16 October 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Höv 29, pp. 113, 118 Höv 38, p. 61 Höv 46, p. 12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investment: 18 August 1771</td>
<td>Höv 38, p. 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 24 August 1772</td>
<td>Höv 46, p.12b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordination: 16 April 1776</td>
<td>Scholten 1906, 131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subprior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: 21 November 1809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wooningh, Petrus Bernardus Alexander</th>
<th>Birth: Xanten, 21 October 1736</th>
<th>Höv 29, pp. 113-114, 117-119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investment: 15 April 1760</td>
<td>Höv 38, pp. 35, 61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Profession: 21 April 1761</td>
<td>Höv 46, p.12b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordination: 1761</td>
<td>Scholten 1906, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurator: 1768-26/27 September 1775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior: 26/27 September 1775-27 May 1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: 27 May 1777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Soeterbeeck’s Liturgical Calendar

The table below presents a comparison between Soeterbeeck’s calendar as it can be reconstructed from the proper of saints in IV 58 on the one hand and the Roman and Windesheim calendars in IV 69 and IV 63 on the other. IV 69 is a copy of the winter part of a two-volume edition of the Roman Breviary (Liège: office of Clementus Plomteux, 1782), and is closest of any book for the divine office from the library of Soeterbeeck to having been printed during the period between 1785 and 1787 when Beckers probably wrote IV 58.¹ The rector appears not to have used this particular book when preparing his diurnal, however, because there are errors in it that he does not copy. IV 63 is Beckers’ personal copy of the Officia propria sanctorum ordinis of the Congregation of Windesheim (Maastricht: Jacobus Lekens, 1753), and it has been expanded with the offices of five feasts that were instituted at a later date (IV 63).² In the column for IV 69, the table below only gives those feasts and commemorations that are actually listed in the universal calendar at the front of IV 69. For instance, the commemoration of the vigil of Stephen the First Martyr on the feast of the Nativity of the Lord (25 December) is not included, because it is not listed in the calendar. To the feasts in the calendar are added those ad libitum and pro aliquibus locis for the winter part of the year at the back of IV 69. For the corresponding feasts of the summer part of the year, reference was made to IV 65 (Antwerp: office of Plantin, 1757), the most recent surviving copy of the Horae diurnae for the entire year from the library of Soeterbeeck. Information gleaned from this source was added in the comments column, as is the case for information from other sources. Information in the latter category, and inferences by the editor, are between square brackets.

If a feast is listed in IV 58 on the same date and with the same rank as in IV 69 or IV 63, this is indicated with the following sign: =. Most differences are entirely regular, and can be explained on the basis of the rules governing the insertion of proper feasts and feasts ad libitum and pro aliquibus locis into the universal calendar. These general rules are taken primarily from the Rubricae generales of the Roman Breviary as promulgated by Urban VIII in 1631 and the Duae tabellae which summarise them. If another explanation is available, this is indicated in the comments column; these comments always apply to the feast given in IV 58, not to those in IV 69 or IV 63. There are a few errors, merely typographical, concerning the rank of several feasts in the calendar of IV 69; these have been corrected in the comments column.³

In the proper of saints in IV 58, Beckers marked the ranks of certain feasts with an asterisk (*). I have not been able to determine the significance of this, but for completeness’ sake I have included the mark in the table below.

¹ See vol. 1, p. 112.
² These are the offices of Israel of Dorat (8 February), Theobald of Dorat (10 February), Faucher of Aureil (10 April) and Bertrand of Comminges (16 October)—whose feasts, proper to Windesheim, were instituted, extended to the congregation or raised to the rank of double after IV 63 was printed in 1753,—and of William of Vercelli, whose feast was extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1785 (Schober 1891, 220).
³ The feasts for which an erroneous rank is given in the calendar of IV 69 are those of Pius V (5 May), Venantius of Camerino (18 May), Juliana Falconieri (19 June), Camillus de Lellis (18 July) and the Invention of Stephen the First Martyr (3 August). With the exception of the latter, all of these feasts were either extended to the universal Church or raised to a higher rank after 1762.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Circumcision of the Lord (octave day of the Nativity of the Lord)</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[second class double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>octave day of Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day within the octave of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day within the octave of the Holy Innocents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>octave day of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day within the octave of the Holy Innocents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>octave day of the Holy Innocents</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>vigil of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[semidouble]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[first class double with an octave]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>within the octave of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>octave day of the Epiphany of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second Sunday after the Epiphany</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holy Name of Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[second class double]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers</td>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felix of Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
2 Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
|   | Paul the Confessor **double** | Paul the Confessor **double**  
Maurus of North Africa **commemoration** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marcellus I <strong>semidouble</strong> =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anthony Abbot <strong>double</strong> =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17 | Peter’s Chair at Rome **greater double**  
Peter’s Chair at Rome **greater double**  
Prisca of Rome |
| 18 | Melaine of Rennes **double*** (order)  
Maris, Martha, Audifax and Abachum **simple**  
Canute IV **semidouble ad libitum**¹ |
| 19 | Melaine of Rennes **double with nine lessons**  
Maris, Martha, Audifax and Abachum **commemoration** |
| 20 | Fabian and Sebastian **double** = |
| 21 | Agnes of Rome **double** = |
| 22 | Vincent of Saragossa **first class double**  
Vincent and Anastasius **semidouble**  
[cf. 19 February]  
Gaudentius of Novara **double**  
[cf. 3 February]  
patron saint of parish church and the village of Deursen,² [and because the sisters of Soeterbeeck were members of a religious order, this feast was celebrated as a **first class double without an octave**³] |
| 23 | Espousal of the Blessed Virgin **greater double**  
Espousal of the Blessed Virgin **greater double** (for all subjects of the King of Spain and the Holy Roman Emperor)⁴ |
| 24 | Timothy **semidouble** = |
| 25 | Conversion of Paul **greater double** = |
| 26 | Polycarp of Smyrna **semidouble** = |
| 27 | John Chrysostom **double*** = |

¹ IV 69, p. ccxxi.  
³ A Carpo 1885, 273, no. 170.  
⁴ IV 69, p. ccxxxii.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ildephonsus of Toledo</th>
<th>Second Feast of Agnes</th>
<th>Ildephonsus of Toledo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>double* (order)</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>double with nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julian of Cuenca</td>
<td>lessons (for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semidouble ad libitum</td>
<td>subjects of the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Aquilinus of Milan</td>
<td>Francis de Sales</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>double</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[cf. 12 February]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Martina of Rome</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Peter Nolasco</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IV 69, p. ccxxxvii.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bridget of Kildare</td>
<td>Ignatius of Antioch</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>semidouble [cf. 21 February]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purification of the</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blessed Virgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second class double</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gaudentius of Novara</td>
<td>Blaise of Sebastea</td>
<td></td>
<td>transferred from 22 January because Vincent of Saragossa is celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double* (order)</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td>as patron saint\textsuperscript{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gilbert of Sempringham</td>
<td>Andrew Corsini</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>double [cf. 14 February]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agatha of Sicily</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guarinus of Palestrina</td>
<td>Dorothea of Caeserea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guarinus of Palestrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>double with nine lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorothea of Caeserea commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Romuald of Ravenna</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Juvence of Pavia</td>
<td>John of Matha</td>
<td></td>
<td>[The feasts of Juvence and Israel are proper to the order and therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>double [cf. 16 February]</td>
<td></td>
<td>take precedence over the universal feast of John.\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel of Dorat double [cf. 15 February]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juvence was a bishop-confessor; Israel was only a confessor. Being of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lesser importance, the feast of Israel is transferred,\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and because it is proper it is celebrated earlier than that of John.\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vedast of Arras</td>
<td>Apollonia of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double* (order)</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vedast of Arras double with nine lessons Apollonia of Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Theobald of Dorat</td>
<td>Scholastica of Nursia</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>double</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Seven Founders of the</td>
<td>for the subjects of Austria\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Servite Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Francis de Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[transferred from 29 January]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gregory II</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Andrew Corsini</td>
<td>Valentine of Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td>[transferred from 4 February]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>double*</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} IV 58, 2: p. 15.
\textsuperscript{2} A Carpo 1885, 254, no. 148.V.
\textsuperscript{3} A Carpo 1885, 255, no. 148.VII.
\textsuperscript{4} A Carpo 1885, 256, no. 149.
\textsuperscript{5} IV 69, p. ccxl. This feast was extended to the universal Church as a lesser double by Leo XIII on 20 December 1888 (Schober 1891, 197).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Transferred From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Israel of Dorat</td>
<td>double* (order)</td>
<td>8 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>John of Matha</td>
<td>double*</td>
<td>8 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Scholastica of Nursia</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>10 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Theotonius of Coimbra</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>10 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Anastasius of Persia</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>transferred from 22 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Raymond of Penyafort</td>
<td>semidouble*</td>
<td>23 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ignatius of Antioch</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>1 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Peter’s Chair at Antioch</td>
<td>greater double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Abilius of Alexandria</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>vigil of Matthias the Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Matthias the Apostle</td>
<td>second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Felix III</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Leander of Seville</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>second translation of Augustine</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 IV 58, 2: p. 23.  
2 IV 58, 2: p. 23.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Albinus of Angers double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hirculanus of Perugia double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Casimir of Poland semidouble</td>
<td>Casimir of Poland semidouble Lucas I commemoration</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All Holy Canons Regular of Augustine double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Olegarius Bonestruga double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thomas Aquinas double</td>
<td>Thomas Aquinas double Perpetua and Felicity commemoration</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John of God double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frances of Rome double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Forty Martyrs of Sebaste semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gregory the Great double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ansovinus of Camarino double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zachary, pope double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Patrick of Ireland double (order)</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gabriel the Archangel greater double</td>
<td>for all subjects of the King of Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin first class double</td>
<td>second class double patron saint is first class double with an octave²</td>
<td>[second patron saint of Soeterbeeck,³ and because the feast is in the period between Ash Wednesday and Low Sunday there is no octave]⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gertrude of Nivelles double (order)</td>
<td>date is for the subjects of the King of Spain⁵</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Benedict of Nursia double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 65:1, p. cxvii.
² RGB VII.1; IX.5; DT I.
³ ASP 4, p. 16a.
⁴ RGB VII.1; DT I.
⁵ ‘In the domains of the Spaniards’ (IV 63, p. 81).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annunciation of the Lord first class double</th>
<th>second class double patron saint is first class double with an octave¹</th>
<th>patron saint of Soeterbeeck,² [and because the feast is in the period between Ash Wednesday and Low Sunday there is no octave]³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ludger of Münster double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>William of Poitiers double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ *RGB* VII.1; IX.5; *DT* I.
² IV 58, 2: p. 39.
³ *RGB* VII.1; *DT* I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apr.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday before Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin [greater double]</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third Sunday after Easter</td>
<td>Patronage of Joseph</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>[celebrated at Soeterbeeck because Joseph was the convent’s second patron saint]¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Francis of Paola double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vincent Ferrer double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>William of Paris double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Albert of Jerusalem double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gaucher of Aureil double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faucher of Aureil double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leo the Great double (order) universal</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hermenegild of Spain semidouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Tiburtius, Valerian and Maximus simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Anicetus, pope simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Anselm of Canterbury double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Caius and Soter semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>George of Lydda semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fidelis of Sigmaringen double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mark the Evangelist second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cletus and Marcellinus semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Vitalis of Milan simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Peter the Martyr double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ ASP 4, p. 16a. Chants for this feast were added by Beckers to IV 6, f. 1r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>Catherine of Siena\n\textit{double}</th>
<th>=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>IV 58</td>
<td>IV 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philip and James second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Athanasius of Alexandria double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Invention of the Cross second class double</td>
<td>Invention of the Cross second class double Alexander, Eventius and Theodulus commemoration Juvenal of Narni commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monica of Hippo double (order)</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conversion of Augustine greater double (order)</td>
<td>Pius V semidouble [cf. 13 May]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John before the Latin Gate greater double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Benedict II double (order)</td>
<td>Stanislaus the Martyr double [cf. 14 May]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Apparition of Michael the Archangel greater double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aldebrand of Fossombrone double (order)</td>
<td>Antoninus of Florence semidouble [cf. 15 May] Gordianus and Epimachus commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Walter of Lesterps double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nereus and Achilleus semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pius V double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stanislaus the Martyr double</td>
<td>Boniface of Tarsus simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Antoninus of Florence semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ubaldus of Gubbio double (order)</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) IV 58, 2: p. 58.
\(^3\) IV 58, 2: p. 59.
\(^4\) IV 58, 2: p. 59.
\(^5\) IV 65:1, p. cxx.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Order</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Possidius of Calama <strong>double</strong> (order)</td>
<td>= Paschal Baylon <strong>double</strong> extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1784, before IV 69 was printed cf. 22 May¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Venantius of Camerino <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>semidouble <strong>extended to the universal Church by Clement XIV on 23 July 1774; error in IV 69</strong>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dunstan of Canterbury <strong>double</strong> (order)</td>
<td>Celestine V <strong>double</strong> [cf. 23 May] Pudentiana of Rome <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ivo of Chartres <strong>double</strong> (order)</td>
<td>Bernardino of Siena <strong>semidouble</strong> [cf. 24 May]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>John Nepomucene <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>transferred from 16 May³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paschal Baylon <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>transferred from 17 May⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Celestine V <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>transferred from 19 May⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bernardino of Siena <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>transferred from 20 May⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gregory VII <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>Mary Magdalene of Pazzi <strong>semidouble</strong> [cf. 27 May] Urban I <strong>commemoration</strong> [suppressed in the Austrian Netherlands, where IV 69 was printed, since 1750]⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Philip Neri <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>Philip Neri <strong>double</strong> Eleutherius, pope <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mary Magdalene of Pazzi <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>John I <strong>simple</strong> transferred from 25 May⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>Felix I <strong>simple</strong> Ferdinand III [instituted by Clement X on 12 August 1673 as a <strong>double de praecipuis</strong>⁹ (for all subjects of the King of Spain)]¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>Petronilla of Rome <strong>simple</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Schober 1891, 212.
² Schober 1891, 212.
³ IV 58, 2: p. 62.
⁴ IV 58, 2: p. 63.
⁵ IV 58, 2: p. 63.
⁶ IV 58, 2: p. 64.
⁷ Roegiers 1976, 437.
⁸ IV 58, 2: p. 65.
⁹ Analecta 1866, 1181, no. 1977.
¹⁰ IV 65:1, p. cxxi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jun.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcellinus, Peter and Erasmus simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Norbert of Xanten double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primus and Felician simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Margaret of Scotland semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barnabas the Apostle greater double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Odulphus of Utrecht double (order)</td>
<td>John of Sahagún double [cf. 17 June] Basilidus, Cyrilus, Nabor and Nazarius commemoration</td>
<td>Odulphus of Utrecht double with nine lessons Basilidus, Cyrilus, Nabor and Nazarius commemoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Anthony of Padua double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Basil the Great double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bernard of Menthon double (order)</td>
<td>Vitus, Modetus and Crescentia simple</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Benno of Meissen double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>John of Sahagún double</td>
<td>transferred from 12 June¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark and Marcellian simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Juliana Falconieri double</td>
<td>Juliana Falconieri semidouble Gervasius and Protasius commemoration</td>
<td>[raised to the rank of double by Clement XIII on 11 December 1762; error in IV 69]²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silverius, pope simple</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Raymond of Barbastro double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Aloysius Gonzaga double (for all subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor, the King of Spain and Italy and its islands) [cf. 22 June]¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Aloysius Gonzaga double</td>
<td>Paulinus of Nola simple</td>
<td>transferred from 21 June¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 70.
² Schober 1891, 219.
³ IV 65:1, p. cxxi. The feast was extended to the universal Church by Gregory XVI in 1842 (A Carpo 1885, 517-518, no. 138).
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>vigil of the Nativity of John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nativity of John the Baptist&lt;br&gt;<strong>first class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>William of Vercelli&lt;br&gt;<strong>double</strong></td>
<td>within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist&lt;br&gt;[extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1785, after IV 69 was printed]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>John and Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>double</strong></td>
<td>John and Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>double</strong>&lt;br&gt;within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist&lt;br&gt;<strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Leo II&lt;br&gt;<strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>Leo II&lt;br&gt;<strong>semidouble</strong>&lt;br&gt;within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist&lt;br&gt;<strong>commemoration</strong>&lt;br&gt;vigil of Peter and Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>commemoration</strong>&lt;br&gt;=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Peter and Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>first class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Commemoration of Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>double</strong></td>
<td>Commemoration of Paul&lt;br&gt;<strong>double</strong>&lt;br&gt;within the octave of the Nativity of John the Baptist&lt;br&gt;<strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 71.
² Schober 1891, 220. A loose office for William’s feast is included in the back of IV 63.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jul.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>octave day of the Nativity of John the Baptist <strong>double</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td>octave day of the Nativity of John the Baptist <strong>double</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visitation of the Blessed Virgin <strong>greater double</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td>Visitation of the Blessed Virgin <strong>greater double</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td>Processus and Martinian commemoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rumbold of Mechelen <strong>double (order)</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td>within the octave of Peter and Paul</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Theodoric of Reims <strong>double (order)</strong> ([within the octave of Peter and Paul commemoration])</td>
<td>within the octave of Peter and Paul</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>within the octave of Peter and Paul</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>octave day of Peter and Paul <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter Fourier <strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raymond of Toulouse <strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>Elizabeth of Portugal <strong>semidouble</strong> [cf. 11 July]</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>John of Oisterwijk and companions (Martyrs of Gorcum) <strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>Seven Holy Brothers, and Rufina and Secunda <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>= Martyrs of Gorcum <strong>double (for all secular clergy in the Netherlands)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seven Holy Brothers, [and Rufina and Secunda] <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>transferred from 8 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elizabeth of Portugal <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>Pius I <strong>simple</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Gualbert <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>John Gualbert <strong>double</strong> Nabor and Felix commemoration</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Anacletus I <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marcellinus of Deventer <strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>Bonaventure of Bagnoregio <strong>double</strong> [cf. 21 July]</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dispersion of the Apostles <strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td>Henry II <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 78.
2 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 78.
3 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 78.
4 Cf. IV 58, 2: p. 78.
5 But cf. IV 58, 2: p. 78, where a commemoration for the days within the octave of Peter and Paul is listed.
6 IV 65:1, p. cxxi.
7 IV 58, 2: p. 84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Name/Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Our Lady of Mount Carmel</td>
<td>greater double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Leo IV</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Camillus de Lellis</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vincent de Paul</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jerome Emilian</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bonaventure of Bagnoregio</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mary Magdalene</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Apollinaris of Ravenna</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>James the Greater</td>
<td>second class double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>greater double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alexius of Rome</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nazarius, Celsus, Victor I and Innocent I</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>Abdon and Sennen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Schober 1891, 229.
² IV 58, 2: p. 89.
³ IV 58, 2: p. 91.
⁴ Analecta 1866, 1138, no. 1771. It should be noted that this is not evident from the section pro aliquibus locis in any book from the library of Soeterbeeck.
⁵ A Carpo 1885, 525, no. 150.
⁶ IV 58, 2: p. 92.
<p>| 31 | Ignatius of Loyola double | = |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Peter in Chains  
*greater double* | Peter in Chains  
*greater double* | Seven Holy Maccabees  
*commemoration* |          |
| 2    | no feast | Stephen I  
*simple* |          |          |
| 3    | Invention of Stephen the First Martyr  
*semidouble* | simple | [error in IV 69]¹ |          |
| 4    | Dominic de Guzmán  
*double* | = | order |          |
| 5    | Our Lady of the Snow  
*greater double* | = |          |          |
| 6    | Transfiguration of the Lord  
*greater double* | Transfiguration of the Lord  
*greater double* | Sixtus II, Felicissimus and companions  
*commemoration* |          |
| 7    | Cajetan of Thiene  
*double* | Cajetan of Thiene  
*double* | Donatus of Arezzo  
*commemoration* |          |
| 8    | Cyriacus and companions  
*semidouble* | = |          |          |
| 9    | vigil of Lawrence of Rome | vigil of Lawrence of Rome  
Romanus Ostiarius  
*commemoration* |          |          |
| 10   | Lawrence of Rome  
*second class double with an octave* | = |          |          |
| 11   | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome  
Tiburtius and Susana  
*commemoration* |          |          |
| 12   | Clare of Assisi  
*double* | Clare of Assisi  
*double* | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome  
*commemoration* |          |
| 13   | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome  
Hippolytus and Cassian  
*commemoration* |          |          |
| 14   | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome  
vigil of the Assumption  
*[commemoration]* | within the octave of Lawrence of Rome  
vigil of the Assumption  
*commemoration* | Eusebius of Rome  
*commemoration* |          |
| 15   | Assumption of the Blessed Virgin  
*first class double with an octave* | = |          |          |
|      | Sunday within the octave of | Joachim  
*greater double* | Joachim  
*greater double* | Sunday |

¹ A Carpo 1885, 456.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Commemoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hyacinth of Poland</td>
<td>double within the octave of the Assumption commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>octave day of Lawrence of Rome</td>
<td>double within the octave of the Assumption commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Alipius of Tagaste</td>
<td>double (order) within the octave of the Assumption Agapitus of Palestrina commemoration =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>within the octave of the Assumption</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bernard of Clairveaux</td>
<td>double within the octave of the Assumption commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jane Frances de Chantal</td>
<td>double [within the octave of the Assumption commemoration]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>octave day of the Assumption [double]</td>
<td>octave day of the Assumption [double] Timothy, Hippolytus and Symphorian commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Philip Benitius</td>
<td>double Philip Benitius double vigil of Bartholomew the Apostle commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bartholomew the Apostle second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gregory of Utrecht</td>
<td>double (order) Louis IX semidouble [cf. 26 August] =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Louis IX</td>
<td>semidouble Zephirinus, pope simple transferred from 25 August¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joseph of Calasanz</td>
<td>double =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Augustine of Hippo</td>
<td>first class double with an octave Augustine of Hippo double Hermes of Rome commemoration order [patron saint of the canons and canonesses regular of Augustine]²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 108.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event 1</th>
<th>Event 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beheading of John the Baptist <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>Beheading of John the Baptist <strong>double</strong> Sabina of Rome <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rose of Lima <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>Rose of Lima <strong>double</strong> Felix and Adauctus <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Raymond Nonnatus <strong>double</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>=</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>IV 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first Sunday in September</td>
<td>Guardian Angels second class double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen I semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>no feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>octave day of Augustine double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Giustiniani double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laetus, Donatian and companions double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evortius of Orléans double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nativity of the Blessed Virgin second class double with an octave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holy Name of Mary greater double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sergius I double (order)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) IV 65:1, p. cxxvi.
\(^2\) A Carpo 1885, 457, 550, no. 194.
\(^3\) Windesheim calendar for the diocese of Utrecht in 1488 (Van der Woude 1949, 469).
\(^4\) IV 126, f. **4v. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>Peter of Pibrac <strong>double (order)</strong></th>
<th>within the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin <strong>commemoration</strong></th>
<th>Peter of Pibrac <strong>double with nine lessons</strong> Protus and Hyacinth <strong>commemoration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rosalia of Sicily <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>within the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td>transferred from 4 September¹ for all subjects of the King of Spain²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>within the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Exaltation of the Cross <strong>greater double</strong></td>
<td>Exaltation of the Cross <strong>greater double</strong> within the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>octave day of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin <strong>double</strong></td>
<td>octave day of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin <strong>double</strong> Nicomedes of Rome <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cornelius and Cyprian <strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td>Cornelius and Cyprian <strong>semidouble</strong> Euphemia, Lucy and Geminian <strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lambert of Maastricht <strong>first class double</strong></td>
<td>Stigmata ofFrancis of Assisi <strong>semidouble</strong> [cf. 5 October]</td>
<td>Peter of Arbués <strong>double</strong> [cf. 22 September] patron saint of the diocese of Liège¹ [and also titular patron of the cathedral of Liège.² Soeterbeeck belonged to this diocese from 1732 until its dissolution in 1801.³ and Lambert continued to be the patron of the districts (and later apostolic vicariate) of Ravenstein and Megen from 1801 onwards.⁴ Because the sisters of Soeterbeeck were members of a religious order this feast was celebrated as a <strong>first class double without an octave.</strong>]⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 120.
² IV 65:1, p. cxxi.
³ IV 58, 2: p. 121-122.
⁴ Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 1); 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 3).
⁵ Frenken 1965, 231.
⁶ Coppens 1840-1844, 1: 22
⁷ A Carpo 1885, 273, no. 170.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Commemoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Joseph of Cupertino</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Januarius and companions</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Eustace and companions</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>Eustace and companions double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vigil of Matthew the Evangelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Matthew the Evangelist</td>
<td>second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Peter of Arbués</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>Thomas of Villanova semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(order)</td>
<td>Maurice of Agaunum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Linus, pope</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Our Lady of Ransom</td>
<td>greater double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fermin of Amiens</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mary de Socos</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>Cyprian and Justina simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 September or another day for all subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cosmas and Damian</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wenceslaus I</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dedication of Michael the Archangel</td>
<td>second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jerome of Stridon</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 124.
² Schober 1891, 248. A chant for the feast was added by Beckers to IV 6, f. 139r and IV 7, p. 289.
³ IV 65:1, p. cxxii.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first Sunday in October</td>
<td>Rosary of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Remigius of Reims (order)</td>
<td>simple de praecepto</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beregisius of Saint-Hubert (order)</td>
<td>Guardian Angels double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas of Hereford (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Francis of Assisi (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stigmata of Francis of Assisi (double)</td>
<td>Placidus of Messina and companions simple</td>
<td>transferred from 17 September [raised to the rank of double by Clement XIV on 11 August 1770]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bruno of Cologne (double)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td>Mark, pope simple</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bridget of Sweden (double)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Denis of Paris and companions (semdouble)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Francis Borgia (second class double)</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>John of Bridlington double [cf. 22 October]</td>
<td>Francis Borgia second class double (for all Jesuits and subjects of the King of Spain) [cf. 23 October]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>first translation of Augustine (double (order))</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cerbonius of Populonia (double (order))</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edward the Confessor (semdouble)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gaudentius of Rimini (double (order))</td>
<td>Callixtus I semidouble [cf. 25 October]</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teresa of Avila (double)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bertrand of Comminges (double (order))</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IV 58, 2: p. 129.
2 Schober 1891, 246.
3 IV 65:1, p. cxxii.
4 IV 65:1, p. cxxii.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hedwig of Silesia</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Luke the Evangelist</td>
<td>second class double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Peter of Alcantara</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>John Cantius</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ursula and companions</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilarion of Gaza</td>
<td>simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ursula and companions</td>
<td>commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Ubi insignis reliquia asservatur vel unius tantum ex Ss. Virginibus et Martyribus Sociis S. Ursulae, earum omnium conjunctim Officium persolvendum est ritu duplci minori (decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 11 January 1749).]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soeterbeeck owned noteworthy relics of Ursula’s virgin companions. A certificate of authenticity preserved in its archives and dated 12 February 1589 says quattuor ossa magna, quorum unum ex parte fractum: scapulas duas non plane integras, et membrum supremum ex spina dorsi were given by the convent of St Maximin in Cologne to the convent of Mariënghagen in Woensel. Scapulam unam minus integram et supremam partem, which were given to Gijsbert Coeverincx, administrator of the cathedral of St John in ’s-Hertogenbosch and bishop of Deventer, according to a note dated 7 August 1598 on the back of the document. The other relics ended up in Soeterbeeck, presumably via one of its Mariënghagen rectors.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>John of Bridlington</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transferred from 10 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Louis Bertrand</td>
<td>double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transferred from 10 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ‘Where a notable relic is preserved, even only of one of the virgin and martyr companions of Saint Ursula, their collective office should be celebrated with the rite of lesser double’ (A Carpo 1885, 563, no. 222).
2 Frenken 1931/32, 294. On what constitutes a notable relic, see A Carpo 1885, 285-286, no. 185.
3 ‘Four large bones, one of which partly broken, two not entirely complete shoulders, and the uppermost portion of the dorsal spine’ (ASP 250, certificate of authenticity 12 February 1589).
4 ‘One less complete shoulder and the uppermost part of the dorsal spine’ (ASP 250, certificate of authenticity 12 February 1589).
5 On Coeverincx, see Gasman 1914.
6 IV 58, 2: p. 136.
7 IV 58, 2: p. 137.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Saint/Feast</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Date/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Raphael the Archangel</td>
<td>greater double</td>
<td>[instituted by Innocent XI on 22 May 1683 with the rank of] double (for all subjects of the King of Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Callixtus I</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>transferred from 14 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[not present]</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>Evaristus, pope Fulco of Plaisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>vigil of Simon and Jude</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Simon and Jude</td>
<td>second class double</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no feast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wolfgang of Regensburg</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>vigil of All Saints Wolfgang of Regensburg for all of Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 *Analecta* 1866, 1255, no. 2238.
2 IV 65:1, p. cxxiii.
3 IV 58, 2: p. 138.
4 IV 65:1, p. cxxv.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov.</th>
<th>IV 58</th>
<th>IV 69</th>
<th>IV 63</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patronage of the Blessed Virgin [instituted by Innocent XI on 6 May 1679 as a](^3) double (for all subjects of the King of Spain)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first class double with an octave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All Souls</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[double] within the octave of All Saints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hubert of Liège</td>
<td>within the octave of All Saints</td>
<td>Malachy of Armagh double [cf. 6 November]</td>
<td>[patron saint of the city of Liège,(^3) which is why Soeterbeeck, which belonged to the diocese of Liège from 1732 to 1801,(^4) should celebrate it as a greater double without an octave](^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first class double</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Charles Borromeo double</td>
<td>Charles Borromeo double within the octave of All Saints commemoration Vitalis and Agricola commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guiraud of Béziers double (order)</td>
<td>within the octave of All Saints</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malachy of Armagh double (order)</td>
<td>within the octave of All Saints</td>
<td>transferred from 3 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>within the octave of All Saints</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>octave day of All Saints double</td>
<td>octave day of All Saints double Four Crowned Martyrs commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dedication of the Basilica of the Lateran double</td>
<td>Dedication of the Basilica of the Lateran double Theodore of Amasea commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andrew Avellino semidouble</td>
<td>Andrew Avellino semidouble Tryphon, Respicius and Nympha commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Martin of Tours double</td>
<td>Martin of Tours double Menas of Egypt commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) *Analecta* 1866, 1221, no. 2095.
\(^2\) IV 65:1, p. cxvi. A reference to this feast was added by Beckers to IV 7, p. 307.
\(^3\) Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 3), 53-55, no. 3614 (esp. no. 8).
\(^4\) Frenken 1965, 231.
\(^5\) *Decreta* 1898-1927, 1: 225 (no. 1095).
\(^6\) IV 58, 2: p. 143.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Date (If applicable)</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rufus of Avignon</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>Martin I</td>
<td>semidouble [cf. 9 December]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Floridus of Tifernum Tiberinum</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>Didacus of Alcalá</td>
<td>semidouble [cf. 10 December]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Laurence O’Toole</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gertrude the Great</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eucherius of Lyon</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>semidouble</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dedication of the Basilicas of Peter and Paul</td>
<td>[double]</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fridian of Lucca</td>
<td>double* (order)</td>
<td>Elizabeth of Hungary</td>
<td>double [cf. 27 November] Pontian, pope commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Felix of Valois</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Presentation of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cecilia of Rome</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Trudo of Sint-Truiden</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>Clement I</td>
<td>semidouble [cf. 12 December] Felicitas of Rome commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Prosper of Reggio</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>John of the Cross</td>
<td>double [cf. 5 December] Chrysogonus of Aquileia commemoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Catherine of Alexandria</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Peter of Alexandria</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Elisabeth of Hungary</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>transferred from 19 November¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Papinianus of North Africa and companions</td>
<td>double (order)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Romanus of Caesarea</td>
<td>vigil of Andrew the Apostle</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 151.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>double (order)</th>
<th>Saturnin of Toulouse commemoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Andrew the Apostle second class double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>IV 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | Gelasius I  
**double (order)** | = | = | |
| 2    | Anianus of Alexandria  
**double (order)** | Bibiana of Rome  
**semidouble**  
[cf. 14 December] | = | |
| 3    | Francis Xavier  
**double** | = | = | |
| 4    | Peter Chrysologus  
**double** | Peter Chrysologus  
**double**  
Barbara of Nicomedia  
**commemoration** | order | |
| 5    | John of the Cross  
**double** | Sabbas the Sanctified  
**commemoration** | transferred from 24 November⁵ | |
| 6    | Nicholas of Myra  
**double** | = | = | |
| 7    | Ambrose of Milan  
**double** | = | = | |
| 8    | Conception of the Blessed Virgin²  
**second class double with an octave** | = | = | |
| 9    | Martin I  
**semidouble** | within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin | transferred from 12 November³ | |
| 10   | Didacus of Alcalá  
**semidouble** | within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin  
Melchiades, pope  
**commemoration** | transferred from 13 November⁴ | |
| 11   | Damasus I  
**semidouble** | Damasus I  
**semidouble**  
within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin  
**commemoration** | = | |
| 12   | Clement I  
**semidouble** | within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin | transferred from 23 November⁵ | |
| 13   | Lucy of Syracuse  
**double** | Lucy of Syracuse  
**double**  
within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin  
**commemoration** | = | |
| 14   | Bibiana of Rome  
**semidouble** | within the octave of the  
Conception of the Blessed Virgin | transferred from 2 December⁶ | |

¹ IV 58, 2: p. 156.  
² Beckers speaks of the Blessed Virgin’s *onbevlekte* (*‘immaculate’) conception (IV 58, 2: pp. 157, 160), although most liturgical books would not do so before the declaration of this dogma on 8 December 1854 (Schober 1891, 181). This may be due to the fact that IV 63 explicitly identifies the commemorative office for the conception, which Benedict XIII had, on 15 December 1717, allowed the subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor to recite on Saturdays *per annum*, as an office for the immaculate conception (IV 63, f. *7r, pp. 307-332). In contrast, the same office appears in IV 69 simply as one for the conception (pp. ccLIX), and the word *immaculata* is not used within the office itself at all.  
³ IV 58, 2: p. 157.  
⁴ IV 58, 2: p. 158.  
⁵ IV 58, 2: p. 158.  
⁶ IV 58, 2: p. 160.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Class/Qualifier</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>octave day of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>double</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eusebius of Vercelli</td>
<td><strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Expectation of the Blessed Virgin</td>
<td></td>
<td>for all subjects of the King of Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>greater double</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vigil of Thomas the Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thomas the Apostle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>second class double</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>vigil of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>first class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>second class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>second class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Holy Innocents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>second class double with an octave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Thomas of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>double (order)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>semidouble</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within the octave of John the Evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IV 69, p. ccxxiv.
2 IV 58, 1: p. 22.
3 IV 58, 1: p. 23.
4 Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Within the octave of the Holy Innocents commemoration</th>
<th>Within the octave of the Holy Innocents commemoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sunday [or a feria] within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; semidouble [within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord commemoration] within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr commemoration within the octave of John the Evangelist commemoration within the octave of the Holy Innocents commemoration&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sylvester I double [within the octave of the Nativity of the Lord commemoration] within the octave of Stephen the First Martyr commemoration within the octave of John the Evangelist commemoration within the octave of the Holy Innocents commemoration&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
<sup>2</sup> Cf. IV 69, pp. 188-189, 192-193.
<sup>3</sup> Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
<sup>4</sup> Cf. IV 58, 1: p. 23.
Appendix D: The Two Versions of Arnoldus Beckers’ Chronicle of Soeterbeeck

The texts below have been transcribed from Beckers’ Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, bijzonder van de Vergaderingh van Wendeszem, in de Nederlanden (CAG, Monastic Library Höv 45), and the two versions of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck (ASP 4 and 45, 1). First is given the entry on Soeterbeeck in the Beschrijving, which serves as an introduction. The first version of the chronicle of Soeterbeeck is then given in its entirety. Of the second version, entitled Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieu klooster Soeterbeek, only the part which Beckers wrote himself is given in full, followed by only a short section of the continuation by Rector Henricus de Bruijn (1842-1844). The latter continues until the convent’s temporary dissolution in 1812, in order to include the part describing Beckers’ death and to finish the narrative thread which he began. The remainder of ASP 4, which describes events from 1812 to 1906, is omitted.

The part of ASP 4 that corresponds with ASP 45 is given parallel to the text of the chronicle’s first version, whereas the rest simply follows. Page numbers are given in the margin. The precise location of page breaks is indicated in-text by //, and that of a transition to a new column in ASP 4 (which is written in double columns) by /.

De Bruijn uses page catchwords, but these are ignored in the transcription. Corrections or (marginal) additions in other hands are given in the notes. The point of transition between the part written by Beckers and that of De Bruijn in ASP 4 is also marked by a note. Explanatory notes are only given very occasionally, in the case of a small number of obscure words.

1 On the relationship between the second version of Beckers’ chronicle and this passage in the Beschrijving, see vol. 1, pp. 277-278.
genoemd, en tot heeden den 13den julij 1804 floreert,¹ hier van hier naar meer.

[ASP 45, 1]

1 Ons ouwt klooster Soeterbeek was gelegen aan de rivier genaamd de Dommel, welcke rivier haeren aen vanck neemt in eenen moerassigen grondt Den Donderslagh genoemt in ’t Landt van Luijck, en komt in de Majorie van St. Hartogen Boschs een weinigh onder Borkel, waer bij sij neemende de rivier genoemt den Tongelreep en nogh een ander klein rivierke vloeijt nevens Endhoven, waer sij vergrootert wordt door de Gender, vloeijt nevens ’t klooster Soeterbeek, onder welck sij de Aa onfanght en meer andere rivierkens tot sij neemende gelijck de Beerser onder Boxstel, de Runne onder Vught, komt in Den Boschs, alwaer veroehgt sijnde mit de Groote Aa, haeren naam verliest, en dien van Diese eenneemt, sij begeeft in de Maas bij ’t slot Crévecœur genoemt.

Bij deesen rivier dan is ons klooster Soeterbeek geplaets bij Endhoven onder ’t dorp Nuenen, 1448. En den grondt is hier toe gegeeven van eenen seecker heer mit naeme Hendrick pastor in ’t bijgelegen dorp Wetten, welcken hier toe gaf sijn woninge mit enighe goederen tot Wetten, alwaer ’t klooster eerst is begonnen.

Deesen bovengenoemden heer pastor wordt genoemt Henricus Sanders van Soomer, en heeft ons klooster laeten bouwen bij een beeksken, Soetebeek genoemt, waer van ons klooster van ouwts den naam heeft gevoert, en tot heeden toe; dien heer heeft tot fondatie

¹ [Pencilled note in the inner margin:] 13 juli 1804.

[ASP 4]

Beschrijvinge van het oud en nieuw 1a klooster Soeterbeek

Het oud klooster Soeterbeek was gelegen aan de rivier genaamd de Dommel, welcke rivier haeren aan vanck of begin neemt in eenen moerassigen grondt Den Donderslagh genoemt, in het Land van Luijck, en vloeit in de Meijerei van St. Hartogenboschs, een weinigh onder Borckel, waer omtrent bij zigh nemende de rivier den Tongelreep genoemt, en nogh een ander klein rivierken, vloeit nevens Eijndhofen, alwaer zij vergrootet zijnde door den rivier Gender, vloeit nevens het oud klooster Soeterbeek, onder welck zij den rivier Aa onfanght, en meer andere rivierkens tot zigh nemende, gelijck de Beerser onder Boxstel, de Runne onder Vught, komt in de stad St. Hartogenboschs, alwaer veroehgt sijnde met de Groote Aa, haeren naam verliest, en die van Diese aannoemt, zigh begeeft in de Maas, bij het slot Crévecœur genoemt.

Bij deesen rivier de Dommel was het klooster Soeterbeek geplaets bij Endhoven, onder het dorp Nuenen, in het jaar 1448. Den grond, om het klooster te bouwen is gegeeven van eenen seecker heer genaamd Hendrik pastor in het bijgelegen dorp Wetten, welcken hier toe gaf zijne woningh met enighe goederen gelegen in het dorp Wetten, alwaer het klooster eerst is begonnen.

Deesen bovengenoemden heer pastor wordt genoemt Henricus Sanders van Soomer, heeft ons klooster laten bouwen bij een beekske Soetebeek genoemt, waar van het klooster van ouds den naam heeft gevoert, en tot heeden toe behout. Deesen heer heeft
van 't klooster gegeeven eene hoeve // welcke jaerlijckxs uitjdooft of opbragt bij de 20 malders koren. Daer bij heeft hij nogh gegeeven twee huijzen en een hoeve hun velden en wijwassen gelegen onder de selve parochie jaerlijckxs opbrengende vijf malders roggen, en daer bij nogh eene hoeve met haer ackers en weiland, jaerlijckxs opbrengende 12 mudden coren.

Alduijs dan gefondeert sijnde en tot volmaecktheit gebraght alles mit voorweeten van den hooghwaerdigsten heer prins bischop van Luijck, en desselfs goetvinden en goetkeuringe, soo is tot eerste mater verkoren de eeuwarme suster Elisabeth Trijsenaerts uijt 't klooster Aerschot en heeft geregeert tot het jaar 1456. En den eersten rector is verkoren Joannes Rijckwijns canonick regulier uijt 't klooster de H. Maria ten Haeghe of op de Haeghe geleegen tusschen de Dommel ende Ravensdonck bij Endhoven gestight 1419. Afgebrant en verwoest in de Neederlantse troebelen 1581. De tweede mater is geweest suster Elisabeth Trijesnaerts, geprofest in het klooster te Aerschot, heeft geregeert tot het jaar 1456. Tot den eersten rector is verkoren Joannes Rijckwijns canonik regulier van het klooster St. Maria ten Hage, gelegen tussen de Dommel, en Ravensdonck bij Endhofen, gestight in het jaar 1419, desezen eerwaarden heer rector is gestorfen 1470.

De tweede mater is geweest sr. Hedwigis Evaarts en de 3de mater is geweest sr. Margarita Kemps gestorfen 1494. Ons klooster Soeterbeek sterck aengewassen sijnde is onder de tweede mater en Joannes Rijckwijns als rector tot een slot bevestight 1457. Door den weleerwaerden heer Art prior der canonicken regulieren in Ons Lieve Vrouwe tot St. Haeghe visiteerder van 't klooster namens de // bischop van Luijck, onder weckers bisdom doen ter tijdjt de stadt Hertogenbos mit de Mejorie nogh was, en door den weleerwaerden heer Jacob prior der canonieke reguliere in 't klooster Korsendonck hier toe bijsonderlijck van den bovenbenoemden tot fondatie van het klooster gegeeven eene hoeve, welcke toen ter tijdjt opbragt 20 malder koren. Daar en bofen heeft hij gegeeven twee huijzen, en nogh eene boere hoeve met hunne velden, en weijen onder de zelve parochie gelegen, jaerlijcks uitdoende 5 maar\(^1\) of malder roggen. Heeft nogh aan aan het klooster gegeeven en afgestaan een ander hoeve met bouw en weiland, jaerlijcks opbrengende 12 mudden koren.

Het klooster werd alduis gefondeert, en tot volmaaktheid gebragt, / met 1b goedkeurige van den hooghwaardighsten heere bischop van Luijck, onder weckers geestelijke bestieringe toen ter tijdjt de Meijerie van St. Hartogenboshcs nogh was. Tot de eerste mater van Soeterbeek is verkoren de eeuwarme suster Elisabeth Trijesnaerts, geprofest in het klooster te Aerschot, heeft geregeert tot het jaar 1456. Tot den eersten rector is verkoren Joannes Rijckwijns canon regiulier van het klooster St. Maria ten Hage, gelegen tussen de Dommel, en Ravensdonck bij Endhofen, gestight in het jaar 1419, desezen eerwaarden heer rector is gestorfen 1470. De tweede mater is geweest suster Hedwigis Evaarts. De 3de mater is geweest suster Margaritha Kemps, gestorfen in het jaar 1494. Naar dat het klooster Soeterbeek nuw sterk, zoo in susteren, als ook goederen had toegenomen, zoo is het onder de tweede mater Hedwigis Evaarts en den eerwaarden heer rector Joannes Rijckwijns tot een slot bevestight in het jaar 1457, en dit is volbragt door den weleerwaerden heer Art prior der canonike regulieren van Onze Lieve Vrouwe te St. Haage, aangestelde visiteerder van het klooster Soeterbeek door en namens den bischop van Luijk,
visiteerder versocht: en op denselven
daghe te weeten sondaags in de octave
van onsen H. vaeder Augustinus hebben
de mater mit 18 gewielde susters ’t slot
vrijwillig belooft. Daer was doen ter
tijde nogh maer een witte suster.

’t Slot bestont hier in dat niemand van de
susters op straffe van den kerckelijcken
ban, hetzelve derfde te buijten gaan,
uitgenomen in cas van brandt, of dat
eene suster wilde gaan woonen of wirdt
verplaets in een ander klooster, dit moest
noghtans geschieden mit bijsonder
consent des visiteerders, en de
toestemmige van de eerwaerde mater en
alle meedesusters.

De susters konden ’t slot wel houden,
want hadden ruijmte genoegh om door
het wandelen sigh te verlustigen, want
konden mit toelatinge van mater alle
daeghen een uer in den bogaert gaan
wandelen; buijten deesen noghtans
derfde niemant te gaan, dat is langhs de
Dommel over ’t schoone weilandt of
nevens ’t bebouwt veldt, ten sij mit
bijzonder consent // van den tijdelijke
heer rector, en dit geschiede op
bijzondere daeghen dat de religieusen
soo ver als haer bijsittinge waeren sigh
gingen verlustigen mit wandelen selfs
over de Dommel jae wel een uer in ’t
ronde.

’t Klooster Soeterbeeck is bevestigt van
Julius ten tweeden paus van Romen,
1507 den 5den april in ’t vierde jaer van
sijn pausdom onder de weleerwaerde
mater sr. Elisabeth Heijmans en de heer
Joan van Beest als rector.

Anno 1543 is hier ten lande gekomen
eenen seeckeren generael genoemt
en door den weleerwaarde heere Jacob
prior der canonnicke regulieren van het
klooster Corsendonck bij Turnhout,

denwelcken bijzonder van den
bovenbenoemde visiteerder hier toe was
verzocht: en op denzelven daghe te
weeten ’sondaaghs onder de Octave van
den heiligen vader Augustinus, heeft de
eerw. mater met 18 gewielde susters het
slot vrijwillig belooft, onder alle dezen
susters was nogh maar eene witte suster,
die alleen ten den arbeid aangename
was. Het slot bestont hier in, dat
niemand van de susters op straffe van
den kerckelijken ban, hetzelve derfde te
buijten gaan, uitgenomen in voorval
van brand, of dat eene suster wilde gaan
woonen, of wird verplaats in een ander
klooster; dit moest noghtans geschieden
met bezonder toestemminge des
visiteerders, en de eerw. mater // met
alle medesusters.

De susters konden het slot wel houden,
want bezaten ruijmte genoegh, om door
het wandelen zigh te verlustigen, want
konden met toelatinge van mater alle
daagh een uer in den ver uijtgestrekten
bogard wandelen, buijten deesen derfde
noghtans niemant te gaan, dat is langhs
de Dommel over het schoone weiland,
or nefvens het gebout land, ten zij mit
bezondere toestemminge van den
eerwaarde heere rector, en dit geschiede
ook wel op bezondere daghen in het
jaar, dat de susters zigh gingen
verlustigen met wandelen zoo ver als
haare bezittinge waren, zelfs over de
Dommel, jaa wel een uer in de ronde,
waar uijt men zekerlijk kan besluijten,
dat het klooster eene alderaanenmaamste
liggingh moet hebben gehad.

Het klooster Soeterbeek wordt bevestigt
door den paus van Romen Julius den
tweeden den 5den april 1507, in het
vierde jaar van zijn pausdom, onder de
eerwaarde mater Elisabeth Heijmans, en
den eerwaarden heer rector Joannes van
Beest.

Tot dus verre floreerde Soeterbeek zoo
in het geestelijke als tijdelijke; maar
Marten van Rossem, dien alles door vier en swaert verdiilgde, heeft 't klooster der religieusen geleegen bij Helmont af doen branden, die sigh hebben begeeven mit de susters van Driel, welcke alle van denselven order waeren bij de susters van 't klooster Annenborgh tot Rosmaelen gestight 1505. Die haer convent door overval van den oorlogh hebben moeten verlaeten en sigh begeeven tot St. Hartogenboschs, alwaer sigh hebb en begeeven mit de susters van Driel, alle canonikersse reguliere, die hetzelve lotgeval hadden onderstaan, bij de susters van het klooster Anneburgh in het dorp Rosmalen bij de stad St. Hartogenboschs, hetwelck was gestight in het jaar 1505. Maar de susters van het klooster Annenburgh moesten haare woningh ook om den oorlogh verlaten, en hebben zigh naar rijpen raad begeefen naar St. Hertogen Boschs, alwaar zij met toelatinge van den paus van Romen het klooster der bogaarden hebben aangekoght; en om dat het eene bij het / andere quam, en deeez religieusen zigh bij malckanderen veroeoghten, zoo hebben zij aldaar zeer treffelijck kunnen leeven, en dit klooster hebben zij in Den Bos beginne te bewoonen van 1584 tot 1609 alswanneer de jesuiten binnen de stad gekomen, en haer 't klooster hebben afgekoght mit een pensioen voor haer leeven: hier toe noghtans waeren velee der religieusen ten onvreeden, en deeez zijn met haer priorinne 1609 getrocken naer 't klooster Soeterbeeck: onder sr. Margarita van Grevenbroeick als mater, en de heer Wouwter Smolders als rector.

Ons klooster Soeterbeeck alduis gefondeert en begifhtig sijnde, is door sorghloosheit van een suster afgebrandt, wordt naar dien tijdt in veele ongunstigheeden verdompelt; want in het jaar 1543 is alhier ter lande gekomen eenen zekeren general Marten van Rossem genoemd, die alles ten platte lande door vuer en swaard verdiilghde, waardoor de religieuse van Soeterbeek veele wederwaardigheden hebben uitgestaan, en zij niet alleen, maar ook de religieusen van de andere kloosters; want den bovengenoemde general heeft het klooster der religieusen bij Helmont gelegen af doen branden, welckers susters zigh hebben veroeoght mit de religieuse van Driel, alle canonikersse reguliere, die hetzelve lotgeval hadden onderstaan, bij de susters van het klooster Anneburgh in het dorp Rosmalen bij de stad St. Hartogenboschs, hetwelck was gestight in het jaar 1505. Maar de susters van het klooster Annenburgh moesten haare woningh ook om den oorlogh verlaten, en hebben zigh naar rijpen raad begeefen naar St. Hertogen Boschs, alwaar zij met toelatinge van den paus van Romen het klooster der bogaarden hebben aangekoght; en om dat het eene bij het / andere quam, en deeez religieusen zigh bij malckanderen veroeoghten, zoo hebben zij aldaar zeer treffelijck kunnen leeven, en dit klooster hebben zij bewoont van het jaar 1584 tot het jaar 1609. Toen quamen de patres van de Societijt Jesu binnen de stad St. Hertogenboschs; en deeez hebben hetzelve klooster van haar gekoght, ieder religieuse een pensioen voor haar leeven jaarlijks te betalen toelanginge, over dit contract waren nogh veele der religieusen niet te vreeden, en deeez zijn met haare priorinne naar Soeterbeek vertrocken in het jaar 1609, toen mater was suster Margaritha van Grevenbroeick, en den eerwaarden heer Wouter Smolders rector.

In deeezen alderdroevighsten en alderelendighsten tijdt is het eene ongeval bij het andere gevoeght, want
en bijnaer door ’t vier geheel vernielt, in welckers brandt buijten den onnomelijken schaeden des kloosters, de religieusen haere brevieren zwarte mantels etc. hebben verlooren, waer uijt blijckt dat sij voor eerst de getijden van ’t Rooms officie hebben geleesen, en op ’t choor sijn verscheenen volgens de fondatie van onsen orders eerste instellinge, in deesen tijdt is ’t ook geschiet dat den weleerwaerden heer rector van deure tot deure heeft gegaen om een almoes voor zijn klooster te vraegen, om daer meede sijne religieusen, die overvallen waren mit brandt oorloogh en sterfte bij te staen en om ’t klooster weederom gelijck ’t behoore in order te brengen: want ’t was doen eenen bedroefden tijdt, hongersnoot en pest waeren de jaerlickxse quellinge; den bedroefden en alles verslindende oorloogh bijnaer jaerlijckxse ontstaende, stelden ’t klooster onder schattinge en contributien en ’t was in de elende van ’t ganse landt verdompelt. //

6 Alduis door veele miserien en elenden haeren tijdt doorgebraght hebbende, is in Calvin en Luters tijden de bedroefde Reformatie van ’t geloof aengevangen, en ook de beeldstormerie in de kercken, dat is ’t woedent verstoorren van de overblijfselen der beelden en reliquien van alle Gods lieve heiligen begonnen, en dit geschiede door deese occasie. Den maghtigen koningh van Spaenjen de het klooster Soeterbeek alduis begiftight en gestight zijnde, is door de zorghloosheit van eene der medesusteren afgebrand, en bijnaer of geheel door de vlam vernielt; in welcken brand de religieuse buijten onnomelijken schaden des kloosters haare Roomse Bevrieren en zwarte mantels, als ook andere kerckelijke cieraden hebben verloren; waar uijt klaarljck blijckt, dat zij voor eerst voor deezen brand de Romeinse getijden hebben geleesen, als ook dat zij op het choor volgens de instellinge van onzen order der canonike reguliere in gekleed geweest. Door deezen ongelukkigen toeval was het klooster en de religieuse tot zulcke groote aermoede en benodighheit vervallen, dat den rector genootzaakt was om haar de nodige hulp bij te brengen, met een schelle van de eene deur tot de andere te gaan, om aldus het brood voor zijne kloosterlinge te bidden, en om bijstant voor haar te verkrijgen, die door des Heere toelatinge mit brand, pest, en oorloogh bezoght wierden, en ook om het verbranle klooster wederom enigsints in staat te stellen. //

Dan het was toen eenen 3a aldereelendighsten en bedroefsten tijdt, pest hongersnoot, en oorloogh waren de dagelijckse straffen, die het klooster met ’t geheele land in den uijtersten noot verdompelde, daar bij de swaare contributien en brand schattinge, die ieder een uijtputte. Tot hier toe hadden de religieusen in Soeterbeek bezonder in de laaste jaaren haaren tijdt mit vrees en elende doorgebraght, maar nuw begunen zij nogh vreeselijker tijden te beleefen, want ziet Luther en Calvin begunnen haare leerlinge te verspreide, waar uijt de beeldstormerei in de kercke begon, dat is het woedent verstoren vernielen en verbranden der heiligenbeeld, en

1 [Note in blue ballpoint pen in the inner margin:] Op 20 maart 1539 brak de brand uit.
bedorfgene seeden van zijn ondersaeten aensiende en alle daeghen meer en meer gewaeren wordende, heeft sigh hier teegen willen stellen, en heeft hierom eenige nieuwe bisdommen in de Neederlande gefondeert waer onder ook een is geworden dat van St. Hartogenboschs onder wiens dioeces en begrijpt 't klooster Soeterbeek vervolgens ook is geraeckt in leeven sijnde als mater Anna van Acht en rector Antonius van Hemert.

Den eersten bisschop van Den Bos is geweest, Franciscus Sonnius doctor van de godtsgeleertheit ende canonicus tot Utrecht wirtt ingeleit den 18 9ber 1562. En deesen is alhier bisschop geweest 7 jaeren en 5 maenden, en in 't jaer 1570 wordt hij bischop tot Antwerpen. Hier op quam Laurentius Metzius deecken van St. Goedelen tot Brussel ingeleit den 7 mej 1570. Hij weec om de inlandse beroerten naer Naemen, en is aldaer overleeden den 18 7ber 1580. //

Den daerden bisschop was en wierdt naer dat den bisschopelijken stoel vier jaeren hadt laegh gestaan Clemens Crabeels ingeleit 1585. En den 22 8ber des jaers 1592 overleeden. Den stoel van haare overblijfzelen, en deee te schenden, gelijk in het klooster Nieuwsoeterbeek nogh beelden worden gevonden, die deee woedende vervolgingh hebben onderstaan. Te Driel hadden de beeltstormers een houteren beeltje in den Dommel geworpen, onze susters te Soeterbeek just aan het linnen te bleeken bezigh zijnde, wierden dit ziende, en wel dat het van de Moeder Godts was, en tegens den stroom opwarts quam drijven, hebben hetzelve met groote blijdschap opgevist en in haar kerck geplaatst, waar uijt zij hetzelve naar Deursen in Nieuw Soeterbeek hebben meede gebracht alwaar het nogh Moederke van Driel word genoemt, en in de kerck te vinden is.

Deze schromelijke beeldstormerei is hier uijt ontstaan. Den koningh van Spanjen de bedorfgene zeden van zijne onderdanen betraghtende, heeft zigh hier tegen willen stellen, en heeft eenige nieuwe bischsdommen in de Nederlanden, die toen nogh aan hem onderworpen waren, gestight, waar onder ook was dat van St. Hartogenboschs, onder hetwelcke het klooster Soeterbeek ook gestelt werd, toen Anna van Acht mater, en Antonius van Hemert rector was.

Den eersten bisschop van St. Hartogenboschs is geweest, Franciscus Sonnius doctor van de godtsgeleertheit, en canonicus te Utrecht, wordt ingeweit den 18den 9ber 1562, is bisschop geweest 7 jaeren en 5 maenden. Hij wordt bisschop van Antwerpen 1570. Den tweeden bisschop was Laurentius Metzius deeken van St. Goudula te Brussel, ingeweit den 7den mej 1570. Hij week om de inlandse beroerten naar Namen, en is aldaer overleeden den 18den september 1580. //

Den daerden bisschop was Clemens Crabeels, en wordt ingeweit, naar dat den bisschopelijken stoel 4 jaeren hadt leegh gestaan, in het jaar 1585, hij stierf den 22ten october 1592.
weederom 2 jaeren laeghstaende is tot vierden bisschop ingestelt Gisbertus Masius geboren van Bommel, plebaen sijnde in Den Bos in St. Joans kercke wordt gewijd 1594 en stierf den 11den julij 1614.


Naer dien dan dat deese bovenstaende bisschoppen nefvens de andere aengestelde nieuwen seer oplettende waeren om de plight van de waere religie te doen inboesemen en te onderhouwden, en naer dien desselfs weten als een Spaense Inquisitie of ondersoeck of bedwanck van gewisse wordt beschouwt, en naer dien ook de gemoederen van ’t gemeene volck door de verkondinge van ’t nieuwe geloof waeren vervalst // soo is ’t dat de verdoemelijcke beldstormerije heeft aengevangen waer van seecker Soeterbeek zijn deel heeft gehad.

Want anno 1566 den 26ten august hebben de eerste soo genoemde reformeerders de Sijns Joans kerck in Den Bos aenvangen te plunderen en berooven alle overblijfzel van religie vernietende, autaeren, schildereien, bancken, stoelen, beelden, of wat maer iets daer op geleeeck in stucken slaende, hier hebben zij niet bij gebleeven maer als woedende honden buijten en binnen de stad op de kloosters en kercken vallende, hebben al ’t geloof achtergestelt, de priesters veracht, de religieusen verdreeven en in alles sigh opgevoert als de woedende Turckens langs de straeten roepende:


Den 5den bisschop was Nicolaus Zoes geboren van Amersfort, wordt ingeweit den 10den mej 1615. Hij stierf den 22ten augustus 1625.

Den 6den bisschop was Michael van Ophoven van de preeckheeren order, deeszen is geweest den laatsten bisschop van St. Hartogenboschs: want 1629 is de stad, en de Meijerie aan den Prins van Oranje, en de Staaten General overgegaan.

Deeze bischoppen, als ook de andere nieuwe ingeweide in de Nederlanden, volbraghten haare pligt, om door besondere kerkvergaderinge, als ook weten en beveelen het rooms catholijk geloof ten sterksten voor te staan, hetgeene van het volck gelijk eene Spaanse Inquisitie wordt aangesien, warom de beeltstormerei is aangefangen, waar van Soeterbeek zijn deel heeft gehad. Toen Den Boschts wordt ingenomen was Wouter Smolders rector en Elisabeth van Oorschot mater.
Nogh liever Turckxs als paeps, gelijk eenen in Den Bos quam gereeden, en derfde uijt te roepen: Langh leeven de Geusen, maer wordt ook mit eenen kogel gestraft. Soo dat men wel kan dencken dat Soeterbeeck niet is vrij gebleeven, 'tgeene uijt de verbroockene nuw vermaeckte beelde kan gesien worden. Deesen schromelijcken tijdt van vervolginge omtrent 't geloof wordt somtijts wel eenigsints belet door de starcke placaten der koninge in Spaeinje, maer dan weederom aengevangen dan weederom vernieuwt, tot dat ten laesten de stad van St. Hartogenboschs mit desselfs Majorie is ingenomen 1629 door den Prins van Orangien, en aen onse vijanden gel/gelefert. En dit is geschiet onder Wouter Smolders als rector en Elisabeth van Oorschot als mater. Hier konde ons religieusen vreesen, want 't eene klooster voor 't andere wordt ingetrocken de religieusen verjaeght sijnde moesten zien om een goede uijtkomste: gelijk men ook kan seggen van 't klooster Hoijdonck gelegen onder Neerwetten 'twelck van religieusen van aedelijcke stam geboren wordt bewoont begonnen 1146, onder den order van onsen H. vaeder Augustinus, alhoewel een swart habijt draegende, noghtans waeren sij van diegeene, welcke den H. Petrus Forerius in 't landt van Franckerijck heeft ingestelt als canonickersse reguliere, van deese adelijcke religieusen is ons eene overgebleven mit naemen Catharina Pollart, welcke aen ons klooster veele goederen heeft vermaeckt, en die wij ook hebben verkreegen soo in de kerck als keucken gelijck blijckt uijt den sijn1 in de keusterie berustende.

Alhoewel dat dan deese voornoemde religieusen mit meer andere stad en landt hebben moeten verlaeten soo hebben noghtans ons religieusen verbleeven, mit toestemminge van de heeren en dit niet zonder klein Als nuw begon den aldergevarelijksten tijdt voor de religieusen van Soeterbeek te ontstaan, want het eene klooster naar het andere wierd vernietight, en de religieusen moesten, om een goed heerkomen zien; edogh de religieuse

---

1 [Probably a schrijn, 'casket', kept in the sacristy which contained the paperwork pertaining to Sister Van Pollaert’s benefaction.]
præsenten, gelijck als van 't aldervinste linne en andere saecken tot 't jaer 1715. Want alswanneer den eersten april 1716 ons meedesuster Josijntje van // Bogaert in den Heere was ontslaepen, soo zijn altants1 naer haere, doot alle goedere soo roerende als onroerende aengeslaegen, gelijck blijckt uijt 't overgeeven der rentbriefen die onbenoemelijck waeren, en meer andere goederen welcke geweldigh wierden ontnomen.


In 't jaar 1716 is sr. Josijna van den Bogaert gestorfen, ende in 'tselfe jaar is ons klooster van de heere Staaten aengeslaegen, en in Den Bos voor alle man verkoght, en wij religieusen hebben ons klooster door de heer Van Minten laeten koopen en wij moesten geeven 3250 gulden en mit alles quam 't wel te staan 4000 gulden, op den koopdagh hebben // alle religieusen haer devotie gehouwden, en Godt den gansen dagh ieverigh gebidt, dat den Allesbestierende togh moght schicken dat de aerm religieusen bij malckanderen moghten blijven in 'tselfe klooster om sijnen lof van Soeterbeek zijn met toestemminge der heere tot het jaar 1715 verbliene; want toen den eersten april 1716 suster Josina van den Bogaerd gestorfen was, zoo zijn aanstonts naar haaren doot alle goederen zoo roerende als onroerende aangeslagen, die haar alle wierde ontnomen. Dit geschiecht onder Verheijden rector en onder de mater Maria van Endhofen.

Het klooster wierd toen ook aangeslagen en voor alle man verkoght, en wierd voor de religieuse wederom aangekoght door Van Minten voor 4000 gulden. //

---

1 [From altehants, 'directly, immediately'.]
te verkondigen, en in ’tselve jaer hebben wij aan de heere Staeten moeten overgeven alle onse renten van ’t jaer 1648 incluijs, doen de geestelijke goederen altemael aan de heere Staete quaemen, soo dat wij doen mit ons klooster ook alle onse schoone renten soo groote als kleine en 2 pagthhoeven hebben moeten verliesen soo dat wij doen meer als 30000 guldens zijn quijdt geraeckt, want een vol opgepackt kisken bestaende alleen maer in renten moest naer Den Bos gesonden worden. Onse religieuze sloegen haer ogen naer den heemel: en vronge haere hande te saemen, sij troosten sigh malckandere, seggende: Godt sal de sijne niet verlaeten, sij waeren seer verblijdt dat sij haer woonplaets maer moghten behouwden; niets hebbende om een ander klooster te timmeren waeren de susters seer nerstigh om den kost te winnen de eene op ’t spinnen en de andere op ’t bleijcken, soo dat sij heel reedelijck waeren, sij veranderde sigh bij de helfte in consumptie, Godt heeft sindert meer de eendraghtigheid gegeeven, de susters waeren onder malckanderen gelijk engelen seer wel te vreeden: seggende hebben wij ’t niet vet wij hebben ’t dan maeger, alles van de handt Godts opneemende, sigh vertrouwende op de barmhartigheit Godts en den bijstandt van de aldersuiverste // maeghet Maria: alhoewel sij ook boven haere naeberuen in ’t opbrengen wierden geschat.

Onder deese bovestaende meedestaets wirdt suster Elisabeth Hurckmans verkoren tot mater in ’t convent van ons meedereeliegen tot Waalwijck. (Dit klooster in ’t voorseide dorp werd Nazareth genoemt. En is begonnen in ’t jaer 1454 en haer kerck is gewijd 1510.) Alsdan daer mater sijnde heeft mit haar religieuze sigh moeten begeeven naer Antwerpen alwaer sij haer ampt loffelijck heeft bedient 47 jaeren is gestorfen den 15 jan. 1776 ouut sijnde 88 jaere. Van ’t klooster van Waalwijck
sij ook enige Religieusen getrocken mit
den rector naer Franckerijck, alwaer sij
aengenomen sijn mits conditie, dat
altoos een van de religieusen moet
bidden dagh en naght voor het alder
heilighste sacrament des autoaers.
Hier moet nogh bijgevoeght worden dat
ick daer naer heb gevonden als dat ons
klooster Ouwt Soeterbeeck tweemael is
bevestight of dat sij te weeten de
religieusen tweemael permissie hebben
verkregen om 't klooster te bouwen van
den bischop van Luijck te weeten anno
1454 den 16 febr., soo dat sij 'tselve
hebben aenvangen te bouwen bij een
revierke Sueterbeeck genoemt, maer
aldaer te benouwt of te wateraghtigh
liggende, soo is 't dat de religieusen op
nieuws permissie hebben versoght om te
timeren op een hooghte bij de Dommel
dit is haer toegestaan door Ludovicus
de Buorbon 1462 den 16 junij als
bischop van Luijck.
Bevinde ook nogh uijt overleeveringe
'tgeene men stellen moet bij de
belstormerie, dat onse religieusen in
dien // tijd een beeldeken van Ons lieve
Vrouw nogh genoemt 't Moederken van
Driel teegens den stroom van de
Dommel opdrievende hebben opgevist,
'tgeene wij als een wonderwerck nogh
bewaeren in onse kerck nefvens den
hoogh autaer.
Dit hier pro memoria tusschen gestelt
sijnde, soo is 't dat wij weederom komen
tot 't jaer 15 van deese eeuwe,
alswanneer de goederen van ons klooster
mit de uijtstaaende renten, welckers
intresse bevinde sigh belopen te hebben
volgens rekeningh des tijdelijcken
rentmeesters van de Staaten hier toe
aengestelt: 799 guldens 18 stuijvers 9
duijten.
Alhoewel dan dat de religieusen alles in
deesen tijd quijt waeren geraeckt, soo is
't dat de susters naer 't inkoopen van 't
klooster weederom mit den
weelerwaerden heer rector Verheijden
moet hebben gevat, om daer haere
verblijfplaats te behouwen, alhoewel
De religieusen kreegen diensvolgens 4a
wederom goeden moet, om haare
verblijfplaats te behouden, alhoewel alle
cloosterlinge uijt haare woninge
moesten vertrecken, de canonike
regulieren van St. Haeye naar de stad
Weert, de clarisse van Boxtel naar
dat de geestelijkheid van alle kante bijzonder de religieusen uit de Meijerie moesten vertreken. Ons confratres van St. Haeghe naer Weert, de clarissen onder Boxtel naer Meegem, alwaer ook de minderbroers uit Den Boschs zijn geretireert, de capucijnen uit Den Boschs tot Vellep, de cruijsheeren uit Den Boschs tot Uden, alwaer ook de religieusen uit Kouwaeter bij St. Hartogenboschs haer woningh hebben gestelt, de religieusen van Waelwijk ten deelen naer Antwerpen ten deelen naer Franckerijck, eenige moesten uijtsterfen gelijck de religieusen van Hoijdonck hier vooren benoemt, en noghtans waeren onse religieusen goeden // moedt houwonde, en den welleerwaerden heer rector was haer in alles bijstaende soo mit almoesen als goeden raedt, gelijck blijckt uijt een boeck bij mater rustende, sij repareerden alles buijten en binnen 't klooster, herbouwden eenen omgewaeid en hoef, naemen goederen in erfpaght aen, selfs naemen sij ook aen nieuwe religieusen tegens 't verbod van de heere Staeten, en alswanneer van de gedeputeerde iemant in 't klooster quam, soo moesten sigh deese jonge susters ofwel boven op den toren of ievers anders verbergen, op dat sij niet souwden gewaer worden deese neue aenneeminge.

Maer al haer doen was voor iedel, daer baeten geen agterhouwdinge, geen gifte en gaeven aen de false broeders, geen raedt van goede vrienden, geen voorspraak, den tijd die quam de religieusen moesten vertreken, men sagh uijt naer Geemert, maer 't was tegens 't plaet 1662 den 8 junij, waer in dat wel stippeijck wordt overeengekomen dat geen religieusen aldaer bij malckanderen als ook tot Handel mogen woonen, men sagh uijt naer Boxsmeer, alwaer wij volmaght om te wonen hebben verkregen, maer dit behaeghde niet; alduij vondt men dan goet, om 't goet Den Boogarta genoemt liggende even buijten Ravenstein Megen, alwaar ook de minder broeders uijt Den Boschs zigh hebben gehuijsvest, de patres capucinen te Velp bij de stad Grave, de cruijs heeren ook uijt Den Boschs te Uden, alwaer ook de religieuse uijt Kouwater zigh hebben neergeslagen, ende zoo ginck het verders met de andere kloosters

De religieuse van Soeterbeek hadden dit niet tegenstaande goeden moet, zij reparererde het ingekoghte klooster en haare hoefen, en namen selfs nieuwe religieusen aan, dit noghtans alles niet tegenstaande kreegen zij het bevel 1731 van te vertreken, en dit wel binnen den tijd van 3 maanden, maar verkregen door verzoek nogh 3 andere maanden uijtstel, en eindelijk verhuijdsen zij van Oud naar Nieusoeoterbeek bij Ravestein in Deursen op mei avond 1732 naar dat zij het oud klooster bewoont hadden van het jaar 1448 tot het jaar 1732, zijnde den tijd van 300 min 16 jaaren.
toebehorende aen de weduwe van den advocaat Van den Broeick te koopen. En dit goetjen sijnde een ouwdt huijs gebouwdt 1649 mit boogaert hof en bijlegent landt hebben wij moetem betaelen mit 7000 gulden. //

In ’t jaar 1731 kreegen dan de religieusen beveel van te vertrecken, en dit wel binnen den tijdt van 3 maenden, maer daer werdt een request opgestelt, soo dat sij nogh 3 maenden uijtstel verkreegen, en eindelijck verhuijsden sij van Ouwt Soeterbeeck naer Nieuw Soeterbeeck bij Ravenstein op mei avont 1732 naer dat sij ’t ouwt klooster Soeterbeeck bewoont hadden van ’t jaar 1448 tot ’t jaar 1732 sijnden den tijdt van 300 min 16 jaeren.

De volgende religieusen hebben als dan onder den weelerwaarden heer Verheijden, Nieuwsoeterbeek aanvangen te bewonen.
De Choorsusters waeren 13. Te weeten:
Sr. Clara van Endhoven mater
Sr. Maria Antonetta van Vlierden suppriorinne
Sr. Emerentiana van Endhoven
Sr. Anna Maria van Keverenbergh
Sr. Joanna van Haerpert
Sr. Barbara de Groot
Sr. Lucia Langens
Sr. Monica Mutzarts
Sr. Christina Bockhoven
Sr. Constantia de Vries
Sr. Catharina van Endhoven
Sr. Theresia van Meuwen
Sr. Agatha Vromans //

De zeerwaarden heer Verheijden, Nieuwsoeterbeek aanvangen te bewonen:
Deeze waren alle 13 choorsusters, hier volgen de namen der werksusters.

De werksusters volgens haeren sterfdagh waeren de naestvolgende:
Gertrudis Gubels
Catlijn van Avendonck
Maijke Thielens
Helena Heijkants
Elisabeth Vercampen
Meh tidalis Creemers
Anna de Groot
Jenneke Panckhuijse
Maria Janse
Petronella Claessens

Heb deese bijsander hier aengeteekeent soo choor als werksusters, naer dien sij
wel verdienen, dat haar naemen ten euwigen daeghen onderhouwden worden.

’t Privilegie om hier te bouwen hebben zij verkregen van Carel Philip mit deese conditie en vrijheid, om een school te houwden, de vrijheid van heere en gemeene dienste, inquartieringe, personeele lasten, en imposten, voor haar persoonen en naervolgers, mits conditie dat wij de jaerlijcke dörps lasten moeten opbrengen, en deese privilegien zijn aen ons gegeeven mit voorweeten van de officieren der stad en Lande Ravenstein door Carl Philip onsen aldergenadighsten cuervorst en heer den 9 febr. 1732.

Deeze susters hadden reets de volmaght den 9den februarij 1732 van Carl Philip cuervorst van de Pals als heere / van het Land van Ravestein verkregen om een klooster op een goed genoemt Den Bogaert in de parochie Deursen te timmeren, daar benefvens verkregen zij vrijheid van denzelven cuervorst om schoole te houden, vrijheid van ’s heere gemeene diensten, inquartieringe personele lasten en imposten, voor haare personen en naervolgers, mets jaarlijks de dorpslasten te betalen.

De confirmatie of bevestinge hier van is toegesonde van Luijck door den hooghwaerdigsten heer Georgius Ludovicus mit deese conditie dat hij in alles ons nieuw gebouwt convent in zijn geheel aen zijn gesagh en visitatie onderwerpt. Dit is ons gegeeven 1732. En deese 2 acten zijn in onze archive berustende: zij hadden boven deese 2 acten nogh oorlof of permissie door den pauwselijcken vicarius om uijt de Meijerie te vertrecken: en dit geschiede ook altemael mit voorweeten en consent van de weleerwaerden heer Arnoldus Zeelands als landdeecken en de eerwaerden heer Crebben, onder wiens gesagh als pastor tot Deursen sijnde, zij quaemen woonen: nochtans hadden deese twee laastbenoemde heeren in ’t minste nogh geestelijck nogh in ’t waerelttlijck over ’t klooster te seggen, want dit in alles sigh den hooghwaerdigsten heer bishop van Luijck voorbehieldt en nogh voorbehouwt: gelijck blijckt als boven in onse archive.

Onse religieusen alduijs dan gewaepent sijnde, mit haere geestelijcke privilegien, sijn van Ouwt Soeterbeeck naer Den Bogaert bij Ravenstein, ’tgeene sij Nieuwsoeterbeek benoemt hebben en nogh alduijs benoemt wordt vertrocken. Op meij avondt 1732 gelijck is geseit.

Den bishop van Luijck Georgius Ludovicus heeft dit alles bevestigt in het jaar 1732, mets deeze conditie dat hij het nieuwe klooster geheel en al aan zijn gezagh onderwierp.
Sij hebben alles meedegebraght door hulp van de nieuwe en ouwde nabuere, wat maer te vervoeren was, gelijck men nogh kan sien uijt de grafsteen, palmbomen etc. //

En alduijs in ’t huijs aen ’t woonen sijnde, hebben sij in ’t eerste jaar ’t broowhuijs gebouwt.

In ’t tweede jaar 1733 hebben sij aengefangen den bouw te setten waer in dat teegenswoordigh ons kerck, sieckenhuijs en refenter is, de heer Joannes Verheijden rector heeft hier aen den ersten steen geleit en daer voor gegeeven 60 gulden: en deesen bouw is mit sulcken spoet bearbeit dat denselven reets in november onder ’t dack was, tot deesen bouw sijn over de 12000 rente gelight en daerbij nogh opgenomen 7900 gulden, soo dat den eersten bouw bij de 20000 gulden heeft gekost: deesen bouw alduijs staende hebben de religieusen mit grooten vlijt de schoole begonnen, sij hebben kostjuffrouwen aangenomen, en verders haeren kost gewonnen mit haeren arbeid: den weleerwaerden heer rector was voor ’t klooster gedienstelijck schonck sijn jaerlijxke inkomsten en heeft daer boven aen ’t convent meer als 1000 gulden gegeeven: en naer dat sijn weleerwaerden soo naer geestelijck aen waereltlijck 38 jaeren mit den grootsten iever en liefde had voorgestaen, soo is ’t dat hij is overleeden den 7den januarij 1744. Hier op is als rector verkoren uijt het klooster van St. Elisabeth bij Ruremonde, den wele. heer Franciscus Nolmans, onder deesen en de eer. mater Clara van Endhofen is den tweeden bouw gezet, waar in den refenter der pensionairen, de werkkamer der religieusen, en het nieuwaschs huijs¹ is, en deesen is volbraght 1746.

¹ The *nieuw waschhuijs*, ‘new wash-house, laundry room’.
klooster St. Elisabeth, om aldaer eenen rector te versoecken, en hier toe is verkoren den weleerwaerden heer Franciscus Nolmans, en dit geschiede daerom, omdijswil dat de religieusen eenigh verschil hadden gekreegen met de confratres van Weert over de naelaeutenschaap van de heer Joannes Verheijden saeliger memorie ’tgeene noghtans is bijgeleit. Alswanneer dan de heer Franciscus Nolmans hier gekomen was 1744 soo heeft zijn eerwaerde onder mater Clara van Endhoven den 2den bouw begonnen, waer in nuw is de boldelerie,¹ de refter der pensioneeren, de werckkaemer der religieusen daer van doen nogh 2 kaemers waeren, en het nieuwe washujs en deesen bouw heeft seekerlijck over de 16000 guldens belopen, hetgeene door losse van capitaelen, kostgeld van juffrouwen en pensioneeren bij malckandere is gewerckt, en den bouw is voleindt 1746. En naer dat de heer Franciscus Nolmans de gemeinte vijf jaer hadt voorgestaen mit grooten iever soo is sijn eerwaerden overleeden, naer een lange uijtgestaene sweeringe in sijn rechter been, den 28 augustus 1749.

Naer desselfs doot is als rector verkosen de heer Henricus Erckens, dien de doot heeft bijgewoont of het afsterfen van de eerwaerde mater Clara van Endhoven, welcke de laetste mater was van ’t ouwt en de eerste van Nieuwsoeterbeeck want haere. heeft ’t ouwtd klooster 2 jaeren voorgestaan // en naar dat haere. ’t nieuw convent als mater nogh 25 jaeren hadt geregeert, soo is haere. in den Heere ontslaepen den 10 febr. 1757. Hier is gevolght sr. Christina van Bockhoven, welcke 3 jaeren mater is geweest en is gestorfen 1760. Naer deese is verkoren sr. Cornelia van Eck, en is 4 jaeren mater geweest en in den Heere Den eew. heer Franciscus Nolmans is overleden den 28ten augustus 1749. Naar deszelfs afsterfen is als rector verkoren den wele. heer Henricus Erckens canonik regulier in de Gaesdonck. De wele. mater Clara van Endhoven is overleden den 10den febr. 1757. Deeze had het oud klooster 2 jaaren en het nieuwe 25 jaaren als mater geregeert.

¹ [Buijks 1982, 134 is probably right to emend this to botdelery, i.e. bottelarij, ‘buttery, scullery’. The map produced by carpenter Renier van Helmond in 1835 (reproduced in Van Dijk 1982a, facing p. 136, fig. 12) identifies this room as de keuken, ‘the kitchen’, and the adjacent one, which Beckers calls the boarders’ refectory, as a klein zaal, ‘drawing room’.]

Hier is gevolght sr. Christina van Bockhoven, welcke 3 jaeren mater is geweest en is gestorfen 1760: naar deese is verkoren sr. Cornelia van Eck, die 4 jaeren mater is geweest, en is in
ontslaepen 1764.
Naer deese is tot mater verkosen sr. Clara Lucia van den Heuvel, deese mater sijnde en sr. Augustina Roefs als procuratersse, en rector de heer Henricus Erckens soo is ter een proces geaccordeert mit de heer rector tot Handel, en dit proces was ontstaen over 700 guldens, die op de rectoraet voornoemt waeren uitgeset, en waer van ons convent jaerlijkckx moest trecken 35 gulden welcke de heer Bresser aldaer rector ons weigerde te betaelen, 'tgeene hem noghtans is teegengewezen door 4 doctors tot Loven in 't jaer 1764 in julie; maer de rector revisie versoght hebbende soo heeft 't geduert tot 't jaer 1771 alswanneer men tot accoort is gekomen, en dien heer heeft betaelt aen ons convent 950 gulden dewelcke de bovenvernoemde hebben ontfangen door de heer hofraet en landschrijver Leonardus van Duren op sijn buijte plaats tot Velp genoemt Vennesteijn den 26 juni 1771.
In dit selve jaer heeft ons convent ook eenen hoef mit landt huys en hof verkoght geleegen // in de Meijerie, en deese hoef werd genoemt Ter Stratum was opgedraegen aen de heer Francisc van Orsouw tot Oschs wonende en aen sijne. susters en broeders tot Ravenstein, en alhoewel 't goedt aen deese familie was opgedraegen, en wel geen gevaer scheen bij te weesen, 't was nochtans bekent dat deese hoef in eigendom toequam aen ons klooster soo is 't dat ons religieusen denselven hebben verkoght aen Francis van de Vijf Eijcken desselfs inwoonder voor de somme van 4100 segge vier duisent een hondert gulden en sijn ons overgetelt 1771 den 21 november; en deese penninge sijn 1771 en 1772 in den winter geschooten op 't dorp Herpen.
Onder deese bovestaende oversten sijn geleit in ons pant en refenter de schone Nameurse steenen en dit is geschiet 1768, en onsen refenter is onder deselve geplafoneert 1770 door liberale gifte
van juffrouw Antonetta van Willigen, van welcke hier naerder sal schrijven.
Dit jaer voor bij sijnde ben ick Arnoldus Beckers geprofest van de Gaesdonck alhier gekomen den 17den junij 1772: alswanneer ick voor Pinxsten mit eenpaerige stemmen tot rector verkoren was, naer dien de heer Henricus Erckens jaers te voren mit een beroerte besoght was, en onbequaem om den autaer te bedienen, soo ick als meede rector ingestelt, maer het hadt geen lange duer, want ’t behaeghde den almogenden Godt van de heer Henricus Erckens uijt de elende deeses weerelts over // over te haelen naer sijn eeuwig dierende glorie door een nieuw beroerte den 19den junij 1772. Sijnwe. saeliger memorie heeft ons klooster Nieuwsoeterbeek mit grooten iever en sorgh 22 jaeren en eenige maenden bedient, en een ons convent vermaect mit toelaetinge van sijn tijdelijcke ovrigheit de weleerwaerdens heer Petrus van Kempen als prior van ’t klooster Gaesdonck de somma van 300 gulden, en heeft daer en boven naer meer andere weldeaden en almoesen aen ons convent, gegeeven aen ieder religieus een ducaton ieder uijtmaeckende 3 gulden 3 stuijver: en is eenen bijsonderen ieveraer geweest van uijtsetten der capitaelen, jaerlijckxse renten, en ’t doen der reekeninge.
Naer sijn weleerwaerdens afsterfen 1772 heb ick voor eerst den orgel laeten versetten in d den hoeck aghter de deur op ’t choor alwaer hij nogh staet, hij stont eerst reght voor den hooghen autaer naer den kant waer nuw Ons L. Vrouwen autaer is, en dit is geschiet mit goetvinden van mater Clara Lucia van den Heuvel, en verdere religieusen.
In ’t jaer 1773 naer dat juffrouw Antonetta van Willigen onsen refenter hadt laaten stockedöuren en in dit selve jaer hadt laeten in sijn geheel vernieuwen, item onse kerck mit schoone nieuwbe ornamenten en ook ons convent mit groote gaevne en weldaeden hadt voorsien is haere. in den Heere

1772 wird ik Arnoldus Beckers van Udem in het Land van Cleve gebortigh en in de Gaesdonck bij Goch geprofest tot rector verkoren, en ben den 17de junij in hetzelve jaar in Soeterbeek aagekomen; den wele. Heer Henricus Erckens was reets jaers te voren met een beroerte overvallen, en is den 19de junij 1772 in den Heere overlede. 1773 is onzen orgel in de kerck verplaats, daar hij nogh staat. 1774 was alhier de sterfte onder het runtvee, het klooster heeft 5 schone beesten verloren en 3 kalver. 1775 zijn nieuwe glazen gemaakt, zoo in de kerck als refenter.
ontslaepen tusschen den 13den en 14den
september 'snaghts omtrent 12 ueren. //

Godt geeft haere. siel de euwige rust.
Haere. lijghaem is ter aerdens bestaet1 op
't choor teegensoever Moeder Godts
autaer.

1774 zijn ons afgestorfen in de maenden
van augustus en september vijf schoone
melckende koeibeesten item 2 kolven en
een vullen, soo dat wij dit jaer door
goddelijcker toelaetinge meer als 1000
gulden schaeden hebben gehadt,
bijsonders aenmerckende mit weederom
andere aen te koopen.

1775 heeft ons den weleerwaerdens heer
Egidius Joannes van Steenberghen
canonicus regularis in Gaesdonck de
glaesen in den refenter vereert en daer
voor gegeeven 33 gulden, in dit selve
jaer is ook den solder in onse kerck als
choor geverft waer toe ick heb gegeeven
15 gulden 15 stuijver, en de heer
Theodorus Brouwer van Amsterdam
heeft in dit selve jaer aen ons vereert de
nieuwe glaesen soo in ons kerck als
choor.

1776 den daertighsten maij is tot ons
mater verkoren de eerwaerde suster
Augustina Roefs gebortigh van Oijen, en
naer dat haere. omtrent de 3 maenden
overighet was geweest, is haere. in den
Heere ontslaepen den 24ten augusti:
deese eerwaerde suster heeft ons convent
als procuratersse 18 naesteenvolgende
jaeren voorgestaen mit groote
sorghvuldigheit en iever soo in 't
tijdelijk als geestelijck: waerom haere.
siel den Allesbestierende magh
belooven; in dit selve jaer is tot mater
verkoren den tweeentwintigste
september de eerwaerde suster Agatha
van Groenland en tot procuratersse sr.
Maria Theresia Heijnen. //

1777 hebben wij aengevangen mit 't
bouwen van eenen nieuwen vercken stal
in den bogart, deels uijt de boemen en
plancken van ons eigen gewas, deels uijt
aengekoghte, en noghtans heeft dit

1 [Probably from besteden, bestaden, ‘bring, take, place’.]
bouwtjen al veel geld gekost, en alles hier voor betaald door de ordineere inkomste van de procuratorie, sonder weldoeners.

In 'tselve jaer naer Pinxsten hebben wij onse kerck verandert, en hebben in deselve de bancken van Ouw Soeterbeeck laten stellen en om de devotie in de kerck te vermeerderen, en tot meerder gerief der susteren soo hebben wij uijt twee kaemers een geruime werckkaemer laaten maecken, want de religieusen hadden tot hier toe sigh bedient van de kerck soo om te wercken bidden als den goddelijchen dienst te doen; de muer ruemende₁ tusschen de 2 kaemers hebben wij eenen nuwen balck moeten leggen, wij hebben ook nieuwe raemen mit glaesen laeten maecken, de helft van de werckkaemer laeten pleisteren, en de ondere helft mit plafuisen laaten beleggen, en de kerck mit de nieuwe werckkaemer heeft in sijn geheel gekost 309 guldens en 18 stuiver, waer toe hebben gegeeven den weleerwaerden heer Steenbergen 150-“.“

Arnoldus Beckers 42-“.“
Sr. M. Magdalena uijt de kusterie 49-18-“

Sr. M. Theresia uijt de ordineere inkomsten 68

--------------
facit 309-18-“

--------------

Soo dat den weleerwaerden heer Van Steenbergen aen ons klooster vereert heeft 183 guldens waer voor sijn new, versoght heeft om naer sijn doot op ’t sielboet² geplaets te worden, hetwelcke pro memoria // moet in agh genomen worden.

Ick sal voor mijn rekeningh omtrent de 80 gulden in sijn geheel so aen ’t eene als ander aen ’t convent of kerck hebbe gegeeven, waer voor soo in mijn leeven als naer mijnen doot mijn recommandeere in de gebeede van ons

1 [Form of ruimen, ‘remove.’]
2 [An error for sielboek, ‘obituary, necrology.’]
meedesusters en algemeine goede wercken van dit godshuys.

1778 den 28ten februarij hebben wij alhier 'savonts tusschen acht en neegen ueren eene schromelijke overstroming van waeter gehad, hetgeene voortquam door een stercke opstoppinge van 't ijs in de Maes, en het drongh ver over 't sommerdamke aghter ons klooster, wij waeren 'sanderen daeghs liggende gelijk in een baere zee, niets kon van of op ons klooster komen als mit schuijt, daer waeren selfs twee familien hier gevliught, die sigh om het waeters wille in haer huijsen niet konde verhouwen, van alle kante was allarm, 't waeter stont in ons turf1 maer nogh niet in onse groote schuer op de plaats, en in den hof tot 't middelpat, ick heb gehoorht dat 't waeter dit jaer alhier nogh hooger is geweest, als anno vertigh van deese euwe, 7 duim, maer soo ras als het is gekomen is het weederom vertrokken, want 't heeft maer 4 daeghen gestaen. Onse procuratersse heeft in dit jaer alle vensters en deuren en ook de raemen laete ren verfen, item onse schuere op de plaats langhs den kant van den bogaert en gemeenen wegh laaten vernieuwen, soo omtrent de steene muere als ook van binne, dat nootsaeckelijck de reparatie van nooden had. //

Wij hebben in dit jaer 1778 ook vortgevaeren in onse kerck / laten vernieuwen en den refenter met pleisteren laten vernieuwen als ook de groote poort aan het klooster laten opbouwen. En
pant 27.-"."
tot versiersel van de kleedere van Ons
Lieve Vrouwe beelden 39-18.-".
nogh drie cronen aan de selve 8.-".
Haere. heeft daerenboven vereert aan de
kerck 2 groene Lieve Vrouwe rokken en
aen den refenter
twee groote taefellaeckens 32.-".
aen tijn te verwisselen 22.-".
-------------------
facit 168-18.-"
-------------------
Ick heb gegeven voor de schilderie van
de geboorte hangende boven de deur van
’t choor 4.-"."
voor ’t opmaecken van de schildereien
van den gecruisten Christus en Ons
Lieve Vrouw hangende aan weerskanten
van den hoogen autaer 5-10.-".
Voor de andere verscheidene beelden
hebben diverse religieuze gegeven om
deselve op te maencken 12-14.-".
Den soldier van ’t pantje van de kerck
heeft laeten verfen Clara Lucia van den
Heuvel en daer voor gegeven met
promissie van haer ovrigheit 7.-". //

1779 hebben wij onsen refenter laeten
renoveeren en daer voor betaelt een
ducaet, hetgeene onse religieuze niet
konden zelfs doen, want ’t moet door gips
geschieden.
Wij hebben in dit selve jaer mit witte en
swarte steentjes onsen schouw in de
keucken laeten bekleeden, en ook onse
grafe1 roont oom ’t klooster laeten
opgraeven door onze knechten en twee
gestaedige arbeiders hetwelck ons heeft
gekost 13 gulden voor ieder 8 stuivers
daeghs. Wij hebben ook van dit jaer onse
groote klooster poort laaten bouwen naer
dien wij vreesden dat de ouwde door
swackheit souwde invallen, en deese
nieuwe heeft ons over de 200 gulden
sonder ’t verfen gekost: en den
steenwegh hebben wij aengevagen
laeten leggen tot neeven ons eerste deur.
1780 heeft sr. Maria Theresia Heijnen de
schilderien van den Salvator Mundi en
1780 zijn wij met eene zoo als met het
andere te vernieuwen voortgevaren.

1 [A moat.]
de twaelf apostelen mit de schilderie van onsen Salighmaecker in ’t graf en den H. Joannes van Oosterwijk laeten opmaecken mit promissie van haer ovrigheit en daer voor gegeeven 14 gulden.

1780\(^1\) den 9den october is de eerwaarde suster Maria Theresia Heijnen geboren te Neerasselt, 6 jaaren procuratersse geweest zijnde, tot mater verkoren, en in deszelfs plaats als procuratersse is aangestelt suster Agatha van Groenland, naar dat zij 6 jaaren mater was geweest.

1783 heeft hier rontom den rooden loop sterk geregereert waar van veele zijn gestorfen, edogh ons klooster is hier van vrij geblefen. //

1782 den 9den october is de waarde suster Maria Theresia Heijnen geboren te Neerasselt, 6 jaaren procuratersse geweest zijnde tot mater verkoren, en in deszelfs plaats als procuratersse is aangestelt suster Agatha van Groenland naar dat zij 6 jaaren mater was geweest.

1783 heeft alhier ten platte landen ook in de stad Ravestein den rooden loop de overhand genomen, waar door veele inwoonders zijn gestorfen, edogh Godt danck, wij zijn alhier in het klooster vrij geblefen, zoo dat wij niemand door deeze ziekte hebben verloren, alhoewel veele rontom het klooster zijn gestorfen.

1784 hebben wij in de maand junij onze nieuwe schuer in de 80 voeten langh en in de 40 voeten breed aanvangen te timmeren, en in hetzelve jaar volbout.

In hetzelve jaar als ook de naarvolgende tot 1787 heeft den patriotisme in Holland sterk de overhand genomen, edogh hier door heeft het vaderland nogh ons klooster geen schaden geleeden.

1782

---

1 \(^{1}\)[Later changed in a different hand to:] 1782.
1790 hebben wij ons sacristei gebout, waar over wij veele weldoenders hebben gehad, te weeten: den heere Henricus Kleinefeld advocaat te Ravestein en daar naar rentmeester heeft ons den glasraam en 2 deuren vereert. Hebben ook bezondere vrinden in Amsterdam hier toe almoesen vereert, te weeten den heer Rits kleermakers baas aldaar, de heer Oldenkot koopman in toebak op Den Kolk aldaar, de heer Prola en meer andere, wat het mij gekost heeft, weet ik niet, want heb benefvens veele uijtgafe de schilderie in den hoogen autaar laten maken, en den preedikstoel de Nijmegen door mij gekocht, in de kerck laten plaatzen.

Edogh nuw begonnen de geluckige tijden, die wij dus verre onder Carl Theodor curvorst van Pals Beijeren als heere van deeze lande hadden beleeft, geheel te veranderen, want groote omwentelingh in Frankrijk begon volbracht te worden, en de priesters zoo zij het leefen wilde behouden moesten uijt het rijk vlugten, waar van 1792 in november 3 geestelijke alhier in het klooster zijn aangekomen, die wij huijsvestingh kost drank en meer andere liefde daaden toevoeghde, en niet alleen aan deeze 3 waarde mannen, maar ook aan andere, van welcke somtijts 17 tot 20 alhier misse leesden en dit heeft geduert tot de komste der Fransen den 17den september 1794.

Edogh nuw begonnen de gelukkige tijden, die wij dus verre beleeft hadden te veranderen, want de algemene omwentelingh in Frankrijk begon zijnen aanvanck te neemen, dat de bepalingh stelde aan ons gerust en vreedzaam leefen, want het scheen of men de geheele religie en welbezonder de rooms catholijke wilde verniele, en wederom tot het heidendom overgaen, dit geschiede bezonderlijk onder eene Roberspiere die ontelbaare duizenden, bezonder priesters heeft laten vermoorden, hier door de priesters zoo werelds als ordens geestelijke vreezende dat haar zulcks zouden overkomen, hebben bij de 80.000, haar vaderland Frankrijk verlaten, en hebben naar elders geweeken, die wij alhier ten weinighsten veelen hebben gezien, want 1792 in november zijnder alhier in het klooster 3 geestelijken aangekomen, die wij benefvens nogh 3 a 4 andere den kost en huijsvest met andere liefde daaden hebben gegeefen tot het jaar 1794 omtrent den 17den september. Het
1793 in mart hebben wij alhier inquartieringh der Pruijssisse cavalerie of paarde volk gehad, // die naar Braband en Frans Flanderen marcheerde.

1794 in september quamen alhier de Franse troepen aan, het hoofdquartier was in Ravestein geleit, zoo dat het geheele land overstroomt was, en alle inwoonders vol schrik en vreese, van deeze troepen wierden somtijts naar de Maas gezonden, om op den vijand te schieten, van dit geveght wederkeerende, waren zij gelijk aan ommenschen, ons klooster zouw zeker geplondert zijn geweest, zoo den wele. heer Arnoldus Ignatius van Berckel, die tot dienst van het klooster was, geen kennis met den officier had gehad. Ons klooster had 40 man voor inquartieringh, die men alles moest geefen, den refenter wird voor eenige daghen voor een brood magazijn gebruikt, maar dit wordt haastelijk verandert, want het brood beschuimelde, wordt weghgebraght, als den commissarius, die hier van schuld was door de husaren.

1793 heeft de Nationale Conventie het doodvonnis den 21ste januarij tegens Ludovicus den 16de koningh van Frankrijk ten uitvoer gebracht, en den 16en oktober van hetzelve jaar is Maria Antonetta aartshartoginne van Oostenrijk en koniginne van Frankrijk vrouwe van Ludovicus den 16den te Paris onthooft. Robespierre had tot het jaar 1794 in de Nationale Conventie met de zijnige de overhand gehad, maar wordt den 28te julij van hetzelve jaar met 20 van zijn leden gegoulutineert of ter doot gebracht. Alhoewel dat deezen bloethond onthooft was, noghtans houwde de vervolging der geestelijke niet op, maar wordt ten sterksten voortgezet, warom de Franse geestelijke gelukkigh waren, dat zij dit land den 16den september 1794 hadden verlaten en zigh over Maas, Waal en Rhijn hadden begeeven, om aldaar het leeven te behouden; want de voorposten der Franse troepen quamen den 17den van hetzelve jaar naar middagh binnen Ravestein; het klooster heeft de behoudenisse van de plunderingh te danken aan den wele. heer Arnoldus Ignatius van Berckel, die tot dienst van het klooster was, en juist / kennis had met den commanderenden officier der troepen, die zonder dat in deeze daghen het convent zouden uijtgeplundert hebben.

Eenige ooghen hier naar werd het geheele Land Ravestein met Franse troepen bedekt, den general van deeze was Pichegru, die het hoofdquatter te Ravestein plaatste, wij hadden alhier somtijts 40 jaa meer in het klooster, die men kost en drank moest geefen buijten
Geluckigh dat Maas Rhijn en Waal bevroren waar door zij den 17den december vertrokken, edogh waaren noijt zonder inquarteringe of door marschen.

1794. Gelukkigh voor dit land, dat Maas, Waal en Rhijn met ijs bedekt wierden, want toen trok het hoofquatier den 17de december over het ijs naar Holland, dat ons groote blijschap veroorzaakte, want aldus wierden wij de troepen quiijd, dat edogh wel voor die tijd zoude geschiet zijn, zoo de stad Grave was ingenome geweest; den 10den oktober was St. Hertogenboschs, en den 8ten november de stad Nijmegen reets overgegaan, maar de stad Grave hiel het uijt tot den 31te december van ditzelve jaar, zoo dat de Franse daar in trokken den 1ten jan. 1795, den 18de van hetzelve jaar neemt den Prins van Orange de vlught naar Engeland, en de Franse troepen komen aldaar den 22ste jan., gelijk ook in andere plaatzen. Dit heb ik bezonder hier bij gevoeght om te besluijten, hoe stercke inquartieringe het klooster in de jaaren 1795, 96, en 97 heeft gehad, die van de armée quamen en daar naar toe trokken, gelijk wij ook in de vorige jaaren niet wierden gespaart bezonder 1793 door de Pruisisse paarde volckeren, die in de maand mart hier door quamen, en met welcke wij voor eenen dagh en naght wel voorzien wierden.

1796 den 3den mart omtrent 3 ueren ’s morgens is overleeden de eerw. suster Maria Elisabeth van Straten geboren van Mill oud 74 jaaren, van professie 56. Jubilaria 6. In wiens plaats als superriorinne verkoren is de eerwaarde suster Maria Henrica van Duren gebortigh van Uden.

1798 is dit land den 4den februarij door de Fransen georganiseert, dat is het Franse gebied ingelief, toen wierden de namen der religieusen als ook haaren hetgeene zij somtijts hadden gerequireert, den refenter wierd ook eens tot een brood magazijn gebruikt, edogh dit duerde geen langhen tijd, want het brood beschuemelde, werd weghgebrght als ook den commissarius door de husaren.
ouderdom &c. opgeschreven, dit geschiede door eenen zeekeren Cranenburgh &c. en den revolutioneeren secretarius De Vreem, alle beide niet veel nuts. // De vaste goederen, capitalen, intresse, schildereijen stoelen bancken, potten en bannen, ten laasten alles wat het klooster zoo binnen als buiten bezat dit wordt alles aangetekent.

1798 den 12den april is overleeden de eerwaarde suster Agatha van Groenland, geboren van Geffen in de Meijerie naar dat zij 6 jaaren mater en 16 jaaren procuratersse was geweest, en in haar plaats als procuratersse is verkoren de eerwaarde suster Maria Aloysia Verkleij, geboren te Haasreght bij Tergouw of Gouda.

1800 den 13den maert zijn wij in de Hollandse Republiyk ingelieft.

In ditzelve jaar 1798 den 12den april is overleden de eerwaarde suster Agatha van Groenland gebore van Geffen, naar dat zij 6 jaaren mater en 16 jaaren procuratersse was geweest; in haar plaats als procuratersse is verkoren suster Maria Aloysia Verkleij geboren te Haastrecht bij Gouda.

1800 is het land Ravestein gelijk ook Gemert, Boksmeer en Megen van de Fransen aan de Hollandse Republik afgestaan, van welcke den 13de mart 1800 de Hollanders bezittingh hebben genomen. Onder welckers bestieringh deeze landen gelukkigh waren, want alhoewel wij wat meer moesten opbrengen, noghtans leefden de kloosterlinge gerust, die reets in de andere landen uijt haare wonigen wierden of waren verbannen, en alle haare bezittinge geconfiskeert; deeze gerustigheid onder de Bataafse regieringh duerde tot 1805 den 20sten septem. toen des ’s morgens een quartier naar 4 ueren alhier in het klooster aanquamen den fungerende drossard Van Wielik en den secretarius De Jongh van Ravestein, waar bij mater en alle religieusen moeste compareren, en deeze hebben van ieder gevraaght: hoe oud zij waren, hoe langh in het klooster geweest, en waar zij zigh opgehouden hadden eer zij in het klooster waren gekomen? Naar dat zij dit opgeschreven hadden, en dit gescrift van de eerw. mater ondertekent was, zijn zij vertrokken. Deeze daad veroorzaakte een groote vrees, want het quam de religieuse zeer nugteren en onverwaght voor, edogh wij leefen...
1803 hebben wij in het voorjaar en door den geheele zomer sterke inquatering der Franse gehad, en het formde zigh tot een armée van 25000 man, die Hanoer innamen.

1803 hebben wij in het voorjaar, en door den geheelen zomer groote en stercke inquatering der Franse gehad, die met eene armée van 25000 man naar Hanover moeste trekken, om hetzelve land, gelijk zij ook zon/der slagh of stoot gedaan hebben in te nemen. Wij hadden dikwils alle officieren, daar bij 35 en 40 gemeene soldaten, eers het hoofdquartier van het 23te Regiment jagers te paard, wiens colonel was St. Germain, die alhier bij de 7 daghen hebben gelegen, hier op volgden den geheelen zomer door de depoots, quamen vandezelve ad 60 man zoo voet als paerde volck alhier in Deursen en Dennenborgh, verkregen wij in het klooster van dezelve 8 of meer, want de tijdelijcke borgemeesters waren ons zeer genegen, en aan deeze soldaten moesten wij kost en drank en alles wat zij van noden hadden geefen.

1804 den 27te maij is den eersten consul van Franckrijk Napoleon Bonaparte als erffelijken keijser geproclameert, en in den advent van hetzelve jaar door paus Pius VII gezalft. 1804 is den dam te Huisselingh aangeleght, en om dat hij in den winter veel had geleeden om het hoogh water, zoo is hij in den zomer 1805 verhooght en verbetert, en is in hetzelve jaar gebracht of volmaakt over den Hoghen Vrouwenbergh tot aan de Groote Wetteringh, hier bij moet noteren, als dat de groote dijkken langhs de Maas reets geleit zijn in de 12 eeuw, om dat in de 13de eeuw de dijkgraf en himraden zijn aangestelt, waar over men veele bevelen in de oude historien vind.

1805 den 9den februarij is overleeden de eew. suster Clara Lucia van den Heuvel geboren in St. Hartogenboschs, oud 76 jaren, als religieus alhier geprofest 56, en 6 jaren jubilaria, voor deesen 12 jaren mater.
mater geweest, haare. stierf omtrent aght ueren ’savonts, wiens geheugen in zegen is.

In dit zelve jaar heeft mademoiselle Maria Claudia Henriette meestersse van de school 2 nieuwe glasrame en Suster Cecilia Wilms eenen glasaam op de schoolkamer laten maaken.

[ASP 4]

7b 1791 den 2den augustus is tot Leiden overleden den hooghweledel geboren heer Joannes Adrianus Verseiden van Varick heer tot Zeil, welcken tot zijnen sterfdagh alle jaaren eenen bijzonderen weldoender zoo wel van Oud als Nieu Soeterbeek, als ook van de heeren rectores is geweest, het geene hier door gekomen is: den vader van den voorbnoemdene heer met zijne moeder waren op reijs, om // geheel in den avond Endhofen nogh te bereiken, zigh voorstellende om des anderen daghs verders naar Braband te reizjen. Joannes Adrianus en zijnen broeder, die bij laaten tijdt nogh geheim raad van den keijzer is geweest, quamen bij laaten avond te voet onzen rector Verheijden bij het klooster Oud Soeterbeek te gemoet, & dezen waarden man vroegh haar, waar zij naar toe wilden? Naar Endhoven, was de antwoord, en ons ouders zijn reets met de koets voor af gereist; den rector niet zonder reeden vreezende om het hoogh water dat zij een ongeluk soude krijgen, nam de twa jonghe heeren met zigh naar het klooster, en zond terstond den kneght te paard, om de ouders over het gevaar te waarschouwen, deeze wierden alsdan ook overgehaalt, om naar Soeterbeek te komen, alwaar zij met de kinderen zeer vreugd waren, deftigh onthaalt wierden en vernaghten, van die tijdt heeft ons deeze familie zeer veele welbeken bewezen en wel bevonden ban voorgenoemden Joannes Adrianus Verseijden van Varick heer tot Zeijl, ik heb nodigh geacht deeze historie hier bij te voegen, om volgens plight den tol van dankbaarheit daar te stellen.

8a 1806 den 7den junij naar den middagh omtrent drie ueren zijn onze naaste nabueren met name Petrus la Garde en Petrus van Eck haare huijzen, schueren, stallingen en schoppen1 geheel verbrand, den eersten was zeer ongelukkigh, want heeft niets uit den brand geredt, daar benefvens zijn hem nogh 2 verckens en 6 keuwen door den brandt vernielt, met alles wat in het huijs te vinden was. Het klooster was in het aldergrootste gevaar, maar den in alles goedertierentsten Godt heeft ons geliefen te sparen, om dat den wind alzijt westenlik verbleef waeijen, waar door wij het gevaar te bofen zijn gekomen, en Godt niet genoegh konnen dancken.

1806 in junio is Ludovicus Napoleon Bonaparte prins en conetable van Frankrijk als koningh van Holland onder het luijden der klocken, &c. uitgeroepen. Van deezen prins scrijt men uijt Parijs den 11den junij 1806: Zijne Majesteit den koningh van Holland, zal morgen van hier naar zijn rijk vertreken. De konigin is haar gemaal reeds gisteren vooruitgereisd.

Sedert de broeder onzes keizers, prins Louis, de kroon van Holland aangenomen heeft, herinnert men zigh met vergenoegen, al het geen, omtrent het bijzonder karakter van dien prins, bekent geworden is, en noemt men de Hollanders gelukkigh, door zulk eenen vorst geregeert te zullen worden. Men beschouwt Zijne Majesteit algemeen als begaavt met alle hoedanigheeden, geschikt om de harten der volken te winnen, en zijn eigen geluk te vinden, in het bewercken van dat zijner onderdanen. Menigvuldig zijn de

1 [Sheds for storing tools.]
trekken van goedhartigheid en weldadigheid, welke / men van den jongen koningh verhaalt, zijn geheel gelaat draagt den indruk van welwillentheid; en men moet zich gedurig zijne waardigheid herinneren, om bij zijn gedragh, waarin geen zweem van trotsheid gevonden word, niet ganschelijk te vergeten, wie hij is. Of schoon de gezondheid Zijner Majestiet geene te sterke inspanning zijner krachten gedooght, is hij onvermoeid werkzaam, en heeft zeer veel smaak voor de litter oeffeningen. Voor het overige is hij de beste huis vader, en bemint zijne gade en kinders hartelijk. De koniginne van haare zijde, wedijvert met haaren gemaal in weldadigheid, en wordt alomme geprezen als een voorbeeld van goedheid, bevalligheid, en zagtvaardigheid. 1806 den 17den juniis. Naar dat Zijne Konighlijke Majestiet van Holland Ludovicus met de koniginne en deszelfs 2 jonge princes op de grenzen waaren aangekomen, zijn zij door eene deftige afzendinge gecomplimenteert, en verwillekomen, die haar ook tot Breda geleiden, alwaar zij konighlijk wierden ingehaald, en ook de gelukweisinge van de roomze geestelijkenheid in haar plughtgewaad met den Te Deum Laudamus zeer genadigh aannamen.

Den 18den juniis arriveerde den koningh koniginne en deszelfs kinderen naar den middagh te Rotterdam, wierden verwillekomen en ingehaald door eene bijzondere commissie, ook wierden Zijne Majestiet, door den weleu. heer Thomas van Beekom rooms chatolijk pastor te Schiedam aan het hoofd der roomsch chatolijke pastoors deezer stad, gecomplimenteert. Den 19den quam Zijne Majestiet op hoogh deszelfs paleijs In het Boschs aan omtrent 8 uuren ’s avonts. De aanspraak te Rotterdam is niet gedaan door den wele. heer Van Beekom pastor van Schiedam, maar door den wele. heer J.H. Vredeveld pastor en landdeeken van Schieland; de aanspraak was heel kort en wierd om het slechte weer bij gescritt afgegeefen.

Den 23ten juniis 1806 heeft Zijne Majestiet van Holland op de plechtighste wijze van Den Haagh bezit genomen, en op den troon geplaats zijnde heeft de volgende aanspraak gedaan.

Mijne heeren!

Toen de afgevaardigden der natie mij den troon quamen aanbieden, dien ik thans bestijgh, nam ik dien aan, uit overtuing, dat zulks de wensch der geheele natie was; dat het vertrouwen en de behoefte // van alle mij daar toe riepen. Bouwende op de bekwaamheden, den ijver en de vaderlands liefde der voornaamste amptenaren, en voor al op de uwen, mijne heeren de afgevaardigde, heb ik, zonder schroom, de geheele diepte van de qualen der natie gepeild. Bezielt door het levendig verlangen, om voor het geluk van dat goede volk te zorgen, en de hoop opvattende, om daarin eenmaal te slagen, onderdrukte ik de gevoelens, die tot nogh toe het onafgebrokken doel, en geluk mijns levens uitgevocht hadden. Ik heb besluiten kunnen te bewilligen, om van vaderland te veranderen, om op te houden eeniglijk en ganselij Franschman te zijn, naa mijn geheel leeven doorgebragt te hebben met het vervullen, zoo veel in mij was, der pligten, welken die naem oplegt aan allen, die de eer hebben hem te dragen.

Ik heb besluiten kunnen, voor om de eerste maal van dien geen te scheiden, die van mijne kindsheid af aan mijn liefde en bewondering aan zich geboeid hield; om de rust en onafhankelijkheid te verliezen, onmogelijk te bezitten voor hem, dien de hemel roept om te regeeren, om, eindelijk, dien geenen te verlaten, wiens afzijn, zelfs in de rustigste tijden, mij schrik aanjoegh, en wiens tegenwoordigheid de gevaren vernietigt.

Ik heb hier in bewilligt, mijn heere, en ik zou er nogh in bewilligen, wanneer ik het niet reeds gedaan had, nu, door den toevloed, de vreugd, het vertrouwen der ingezetenen, wier grondgebied ik doorreisd heb, zij mij bewezen hebben, dat gij de waarachtige tolken der natie geweest zijt; nu vooral, nu ik zekerheid heb, van op uwen ijver, uwe
verknochtheid aan de belange van uw vaderland, op uw vertrouwen, en uwe getrouwheid jegens mij te kunnen rekenen.

Mijne heeren! van dezen dag af aan begint eerst de waare onafhankelijkheid der Vereenigde Provincien. Een eenige blik op de verloopen eeuwen is genoeg, om de overtuinging te geeven, dat die Provincien nimmer, een vast gouvernement, een verzekerd lot, en eene wezentelijke onafhankelijkheid bezaten. Onder dat vermaarde volk, hetwelk zij beurtelings bestreden en dienden, even als onder de Franken en het Wester Keizerijk, waren zij nimmer onafhankelijk noch gerust. Niet onafhankelijker noch geruster waren zij naderhand, en onde de heerschappij van Spanjen.

Haere oorlogen, en hare lange worstelingen tot op het tijdperk der Unie, vermeenderden den roem der natie, bevestigden hare hoedanigheden, trouw, onverschrokkenheid en eer, door welken zij altoos beroemd geweest is, door haare pogingen verschaften haar noch rust, noch onafhankelijkheid; zelfs niet onder het gezag der Princen van Orange, die, allen goede veldheeren, en bekwame staatkundigen, nuttig voor haar land werden, maar het onophoudelijk aan onlusten ten prooi gaven, door eene magt zigh aan te matigen, of naar dezelve te traghten, welke de natie hun weigerde.

Holland heeft almede noch gerust, noch onafhankelijk zijn kunnen in deze laatste tijden, waar in de verhitting der denkbeelden, en de algemeene schokking van Europa zoo langen tijd de ruste der volkeren hebben opgeschort. Naar zoo veele wisselvalligheden, kon dit land geene wezentlijke veiligheid vinden, dan in eene gematigde monarchie; noghtans was de alleenheersching ontoreikent voor een land, zoo het niet met eenen aldergrootsten monarch van Europa verbonden was, zonder immer inbreuk te doen op deszelfs onafhankelijkheid. Dit is, hetgeen de natie gedaan heeft; dit is het eenig doel der constitutioneele wetten, en mij met een zoo roemrijk aampt belastende, mij in het midden van een volk bevindende, 't welk door mijne genegentheid en zorgh, het mijne is, en altoos zijn zal, zie ik met fierheit, dat het mij twee groote middelen van het bestuur van vertrouwen aanbied, namelijk zijner inwoneren eer en deugden. Jaa dit zullen de waare steunen van dezen troon zijn, ik wil geen anderen leidraat hebben, voor mij bestaat er geen verschil van godsdienst noch van partijen. Deugd, bekwaamheid en diensten alleen zullen de onderscheiding uijtmaken. Mijn doel zal zijn de qualen te herstellen, door welke het land geleeden heeft, hoe langer en hoe moeijelijker zij te genezen zullen zijn, des te grooter zal mijn roem zijn, daar in geslaagd te hebben. Om dit te bereiken, heb ik het geheel vertrouwen der natie, het doorzigt der voortreffelijkste mannen, en voor al van uw noodig. Ik roep in uwe tegenswoordigheid, alle de goede Hollanders op. Dat zij aan hunne medeburgers de verzekering van ik zij voor den koningh de koniginne en de konighlijke familie te bidden, hier toe de gelofte te vermanen, en alle daghen in het H. sacrificie van de misse de collecte voor den koning te houden, hetgeene op volgende zondagh den 6den julij in alle kercken als ook bij de reformeerde te Ravestein zijnen aanvanck heeft genomen met het gebed te doen.

Aldus of daar omtrent was de aanspraak des konings, die ik bijnaar litterlijk uijt de Staats courant no. 89 den 24ten junij mets eenige veranderinge heb getrokken. //

In ditzelve jaar 1806 den 4den juli hebben alle pastores en kloosters bevel gekregen van den weleerwaarden heer Arnoldus Borret commissarius generalis in het geestelijke en pastor te Haaren, om voor den koningh de koniginne en de konighlijke familie te bidden, hier toe de gelofte te vermanen, en alle daghen in het H. sacrificie van de misses de collecte voor den koning te houden, hetgeene op volgende zondagh den 6den julij in alle kercken als ook bij de reformeerde te Ravestein zijnen aanvanck heeft genomen met het gebed te doen.

Den 17den juli 1806 zijn bij Zijne Majestie in ’s Gravenhage ter audientie toegelaten de heeren A. van Alphen vicarius generalis van Den Bosch; A. van Dongen vicarius
generalis van Breda; A. Borret vicarius generalis van het Land van Ravestein en Megen; A. van Gilst president van het Boscher seminarium; en J. Hoogaerts pleban en deeken van Den Bosch, in wier aller naam A. van Gils op de navolgende wijs aangesproken heeft.

Sire! De apostolische vicarissen van Den Bosch en Breda, nog doordrongen van de gunst, welke zij onder de eersten hebben mogen genieten, om aan Uwe Majesteit, tijdens haaren intoght in hare staten, te Breda hunnen eerbied te betuigen, komen, gezamenlijk met den vicarius van Ravestein, met de presidenten hunner seminarien, en met het hoofd der geestelijkheid van Den Bosch, insgelijks, in het middenpunt des vaderlands in uwe konighlijke residentie, aan de algemeene vreugden deel neemen, door aldaar de hulde van hunnen diepen eerbiet, van hunne liefde, van hunnen trouw, en van hunne gehoorzaamheid te hernieuwen. Ter zelfder tijd, sire, en met de volste vertrouwen, bieden wij u de harten aan van uwe katholijke onderdanen, van bijna driemaal honderd duizend inwoners der zuidelijke grensstrook van uw konighrijk, en welker geestelijke besturing ons toebetreuwd is. In de eenvoudigheid en braafheid hunner harten vereenigen zij zigh met ons, om hune verknoogheid, hunne gehoorzaamheid, hunne getrouwheid aan uw koninglijk gezag te betuigen, om onafgebroken wenschen uit te storten, en de goddelijke bescherming over uwe regeering, ’s hemels overvloedigste zegeningen over uwe geheiligde perzoon, over uwe doorluchtige gemalinne, onze koniginne, en over uw geheel doorluchtigh huisgezin af te smeken. Wat ons betreft, sire, wij erkennen en koesteren al ons heilighe en strelende plicht, deze gevoelens in de harten uwer aan onze zorgen opgedragene onderdanen aan te kweken, en te verstercken, door hun de grondbeginzels van onzen heiligen godts dienst, welken die gevoelens inboezemt, uit al ons vermogen in te scherpen, eenen godts dienst, dien wij het geluk hebben gemeenschappelijk met Uwe Majesteit te belijden, en die (wij / durven zulks met zekerheid hopen) onder uw zagt bestuur niet anders vinden kan dan bescherming, vreede en voorspoed.

Den koningh antwoorde: Mijne heeren! Ik heb achtingh voor de gevoelens der inwoonderen van uw departement, en ik weet naar waarde het gewigt uwer bedieningen te schatten, niet alleen met betrekking tot het geestelijck heil, maar ook wat aangaat den vreeden en voorspoed van den staat: gij zult, vertrouw ik, uwen arbeid zoodanigh inrigten, dat dit geluk daar van het gevolg zij.

Naar dat dit den koningh had uijtgesproken, zoo heeft het Zijne Majesteit belijft aan ieder van haar te vragen wie zij waren? Of zij ook klocken en geluijt in de torenren op haare kercken hadden? Waar op geantwoord zijnde, dat zij nogh het meesten, kercke huijzen, en vervolgens geene torens noch klocken hadden, heeft den koningh geantwoord; Zeer wel ik zal uw komen bezoeken. Dit laaste is in geene couranten bekend gemaakt, maar heb het van de heeren zelfs vernomen.

In de maand augustus van ditzelve jaar heeft Joannes Baptista Robertus baron van Velde de Melroij, voorheen bisschop van Ruremonde, thans apostolisen administrateur voor het Hollandse aandeel van het voorgenoemde bisschdom, een aldergrootste eer gehad, naar dat hij den koningh op de Hollandse grensen zeer pleughtigh had ingehaald, en hooghst denzelven naar het konighrijk paleijs In den Boschs bij Den Haagh had verzeld, en naar dat hij dikwils de eer had gehad, om bij Zijne Majesteit ter gehoor geweest te zijn, is hij wederom naar den Grave vertrokken, aldaar eenen korten tijdt geweest zijnde, wijd hij van den koningh door eenen bijzonderen courier met eene goede snijjdooos met brilante zeer rijkelijk bezet, en daar en boven met eenen eeigenhandigen brief van Zijne Majesteit vereert, over welcke hij zigh bij zijne goede
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1 [Objects producing sound.]
vrieden uitdrukte: dat de doos zeer kostbaar was, edogh den konighlijken brief kostbaarder, en niet genoeghzaam te waderen was.
Het was niet langh hier naar in dezelfe maand, wird deezee kerkherder als eersten als eenen almosenier door den koningh naar Den Haagh beroepen, alwaar hij zigh ook naar toe begaf, om dit ampt te bekleeden, en aante vangen. Over het beroep van deezee allerwaardighsten kerk vooght voeijen de welmeenende roomse chatolijken de aldergrootste hoop, dat dit zal dienen tot handhafing van staat, geloof en kloosters, eer

dat wij edogh verders hier in voort#gaan, zullen wij de kloosters en geestelijke gemeentens, die hier ter lande nogh gevonden worden, in het kort zoo veel mij mogelijk beschrijven.

1. Voor eerst noem ik den aanvanck van Boxsmeer, alhier bevinden zigh twee kloosters het eene van patres carmeliten, en het andere der religieuze carmelitersse: eene van de patres is pastor, als ook onder pastor en capellaan, is een tamelijke gemeente, en hebben van dit jaar 1806 nogh 5 nieuwe ingekleet, bedienen de parochie kerk, en hebben professores of magisters om de vijf kleindere scholen te leeren. Alduis is deze gemeente tot nut van staat en land zoo in het geestelysche als tijdelijke.

2. De susters carmelitersse aldaar wonende bezitten ook een schoon klooster, waar in zij den Heere dagh en naght zeer ieverigh dienen, want beginnen alle naghten, om twaalf ueren haare getijden, bezitten ook een kostschool voor de jonghe juffrouwen, om haar in de plighten des geloofs, hand arbeiden, en Franse spraak onderwijzinge te geeven, alduis ook zeer nuttelyk.

3. Het 3de klooster is bij en in het Land van Kuijk aan de heilige maaght en martelaresse Agatha toegeweit, is eene zeer oude woningh der cruys heeren; deeze heeren hebben zigh in hetzelve in alle vervolginge zeer deftigh als waare religieuzen gehouden; men heeft al voor veele jaaren gehoord als dat zij moesten uijtsterfen, edogh toelatingh krijgende om nieuwe medebroeders aan te neemen, hebben zij haar huys tot nuw toe behouden, alhoewel zij alle jaaren voor veel geld het huys en landereien moeten paghten. Thans zijnder wederom eenige jonghe heeren aangenomen, die met grooten lof, en eenige wereldlycke heeren de studie in de godtsgeleerheit onder eeen bequamen lector voortzetten. Het leefen der cruysheeren is zeer stighthig, volbrengen de plighten van haeren staat, zijn zeer gastvrye, en liefdadigh tot den armen, alduis zeer nuttigh voor staat en land.

4. Het 4de klooster is der eewr. patres capucijnen te Velp. Voor het jaar 1645, was die plaats, waar het capucijnen klooster, zich thans vertoond, voor het grootste gedeelte onvruchbaar en moerassigh, staande aldaar alleen eenen kleine en eenzame hut, genaamd Emmaus, zijnde het laatst bewond geweest, door Hermannus Jacobs en Waleria Slipenbeek. Pater Basilius wel eer canonik van St. Salvator te Brugge, edog bij het innemen van Den Bosch 1629 was hij guardian aldaar, want had den order der capucinen reets aangenomen. Hij was eenen man zeer beroemd. / Toen hij Den Bosch met zijne medebroeders moest verlaten, wird hij van eenen bevelhebber der Staatssse troeopen ondervraagt: Pater wanneer komt gij terugh? Waar op hij oetmoedigh antwoorde: Als uwe zonden de onze zullen overtreffen. Hij wird naar dit vertrek uijt Den Bosch van de regeringh en burgerij te Ravestein verzoght, om de pastorele functies, mets den pastor niet meer in staat was, waar te nemen, hetgeene hij ook 18 maanden volbragt, tot dat eindelijc de vaders jesuiten hem in den post opvolgden. De roomse burgerij der stad Grave, was zedert het jaar 1602 van zielzorgers berooft (om dat toen die plaats door den prins Maurits van Orange was ingenomen) deeze verzocht P. Basilius als zielzorger, hij komt te Velp, en aanvaard de herderlijke bedieninge, naar
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1 [A form of voeden, ‘cherish’.]

[11a]

[11b]
dat hij alvorens hier toe de nodige briefen van apostolische zending, van den bisschop van Ruremonde Andreas Creusen had ontfangen op verzoek van 2 afgezondene uit de burgerij Antonius Diemers en Arnoldus Verheijen beide der rechten licentiaten. De vrije uittoefening van roomsen godsdienst was voor de Graafse gestremt; edogh Basilius wist door zijn beleid het zoo ver te brengen, dat hij vreijen toegangh tot de stad verkreegh, hij hiel zigh op in het huys van den licentiaat Diemers, hij oeffende in stilte den godsdienst, en bediend de zieken en sterfende; edogh deezen iever wierd wederom belet, Basilius kon zigh niet gestadigh in de stad Grave ophouden, warom hij gebruijk maakte van het huijs te Velp toebehorende aan den heere landscholtus Beijers, tot dat hij 1645 het huisje genaamd Emmaus met de daar bij liggende gronden tot een verblijf bekwam. 1648 wierd den vreden getekent, Basilius verkreegh meer godsdienstige vrijheid, had dus hulp nodigh, en deezen wierd hem verleend door zijne medebroeders, welcke hij verzamelde in de eenzame cluijs Emmaus, alwaar 1662 den choordienst is begonnen door den eerw. guardiaan Van Landen. Pater Basilius stierf in de stad Grave ten huize van juffrouw Elisabeth van Ewik, en zijn ligham wierd met groote eerbiedigheid te Velp begraven. De Grave wierd door de Staate troepen uijt de handen der Franse troepen, die daar van 2 jaaren meester waren geweest, 1674 ingenomen, den roomsen catholijken godsdienst wierd diensvolgens wederom belet, en moest wederom te Velp verright worden, warom de kerk der capucijnen aldaar door den bisschop van Ruremonde tot parochie kerck // voor de Graafse burgers wierd benoemd; edogh kort daar naar wierd den roomsen godsdienst in de stad Grave wederom toegestaan, de patres capucijnen van Velp verkregen de zendingh, en men teld tot het jaar 1741 vijftien opvolgende missionarissen uit het klooster te Velp, hier op zijn de wereldde gevolght. Het eerste klooster kerkje werd 1664 voltoeit, en is 1734 geheel op nieu gebout, het klooster was reeds aangeleght (gelijk men het nu nogh ziet) 1718. De kerck is met eenen orgel voorzien tegens de gewoonte der patres capucinen, edogh deeze is daar gestelt om dat het eene parochiale kerk is geweest. De eerw. patres zijn zeer gastvrei, en tot dienst van ieder parochie niet alleen voor de stad Grave, het district Ravestein, maar ook voor het Land van Cuijk en Boxsmeer, zijn ook zeer edelmoedigh omtrent den armen en van ieder bemind, warom het te wenschen is dat den goedertierenden Godt hetzelve voor altoos zal bescherme. Men heeft nogh een klooster der susters religieuze in de stad Grave gehad, maar dit is voor enige jaaren reets vernietight, hier van leefen thans nogh 2 religieuzeen, en woonen te Grave.

Sde. Het 5de klooster is ons Nieusoeterbeek te Deursen bij Ravestein van welk ik de beschrijvinge heb aangevangen, het floreert tot nu toe in september 1806, en bestaat in de naervolgende religieuzeen

Choor susters
De eeuwaaerde suster Maria Theresia Heijnen in haare. 25te jaar mater, geboren te Neerassel
Sr. Maria Henrica van Dueren, supriorinne, geboren te Uden
Sr. Maria Anna van den Bogart, jubilaria geboren te Megen
Sr. Maria Clara Zelands, geboren te Uden
Sr. Maria Agnes van Duren geboren te Ravestein
Sr. Joanna Gertrudis de Jongh, ziekemeestersse geboren te Bergen
Sr. Augusta van Asten refectorsse geboren te Herpen
Sr. Maria Catharina Ariens köstersse gebore te Neerbosch
Sr. Maria Aloysia Verkleij procuratersse, geboren te Haasreght
Sr. Joanna Cæcilia Wilhms schoolmeestersse gebore te Neerbosch
Sr. Joanna Antonia Grobbie gebore te Amsterdam
Sr. Constantia van Oudenhofen gebore te Oorschot
Sr. Maria Theresia Schelvis geboren te Amsterdam
Sr. Maria Magdalena Verhoeven geboren te Udenhout
Werk susters
Sr. Helena Schaijmans geboren te Cleve
Sr Monica Tiessen geboren te Wijgen /
12b Sr. Maria Elisabeth Hendriks geboren te Neerloon
Sr. Petronella Sonnenbergh gebore alhier te Deursen
Sr. Barbara Tönisen geboren te Mook
Sr. Joanna Slots geboren te Udenhout
Sr. Joanna Maria Hoeben geboren te Hamont
Sr. Anna Vloet geboren te St. Hubert bij Mill
Sr. Benedicta Boer geboren te Haaren
School en kostjuffrouwen
Juffrouw Gertrudis Minbergen van Rotterdam
Juffrouw Maria Sonnemans van Rotterdam
Kostschool
Maria Claudia Henriet uijt Frankrijk mademoiselle
A. van Keijsteren van St. Agatha
C. Ruwerts van Slooten in Friesland
de twee gesusters Van Berckel van Amsterdam
A. van Grinsven van ’s Bosch
C. Clercx van Amsterdam
A. van Crimpen van Amersfoort
M. van Vught van ’s Bosch
de twee gesusters Cloetée van Amsterdam
A. Gallenkamp van Amsterdam
H. van Lammeren van Amsterdam
J. van de Voort van Beers
B. van de Voort van Uden
P. van Gammeren van Vlijmen
G. van Maaren van Schansen Dries
D. van de Ven van St. Bosch
M. Schraven van Udem
F. de Goeij van Grave
de twee gesusters Friesekolk van Kessel
J. van Coenen van ’s Bosch
C. Blanken van Amsterdam
A. Evers van Batenburgh
A. Brandligt van Amsterdam
J. van Selst van Amelroij
M. Verhoeven van Vegchel
M.A. van den Heuvel van Amsterdam
M. van der Linden van Rotterdam
Alduis 29 te zamen,
Hier uijt kan men besluijten hoe voordeligh dat het klooster voor het land is, dit alleen
is genoegh dat men magh wenschen, dat het nogh veele jaren mets Godts hulp in
zijnen toestant magh verblijfen. //
13a 6. Het 6de klooster is te Haaren een dorp in grafschap Megen gelegen genoemd
Betlehem, de susters of religieuzen zijn geprofest op den 3den regel van den heiligen
Franciscus, wiens kerk met 3 autaren den 28ten augustus 1696 geweit is van den
hooghwaardighsten heer Reginaldus Cools bishop van Ruremonde, en daar naar bisschop van Antwerpen. De waarde religieuze leeven alhier stillekens, en zeer gestichtig van haare alm inkomsten; den behoeften hier van bijstaande, zoo dat zij niet tot last, maar wel tot proftij van het land zijn.


9. De kloosters langhs de Maase opgenomen hebbende, wandele ik nuw naar den Heijkant, en wel naar het vermaaft dorp Uden, alhier bevind ik voor eerst de cruijsheeren. Deeze eervaarde heeren hebben eertijts in Den Bosch gewoont. Den oorspronk van haar klooster aldaar waren de broeders bogaarden, van welcke 5 clerken en 7 broeders, naar een strenger leeven willende overgaan 1470 een klooster hebben gebout, en wel met voornemen om den order der cruijs heeren aante nemen, waar toe zij reets verlof hadden; tot dien einde is den eervaaridighen heer Van Campen prior van Huij en general der cruijsheeren met 4 priores van denzelven order in Den Bosch gekomen, omse tot de professie aan te nemen, met toestemmingh van de Boscher magistraat, en heeft den eew. heer Albert van Hamont tot eersten prior aangenomen. Edogh de andere Bogarden wilden hier in niet toestemmen, en hierom zijn velee verschillen en processe ontstaan, als ook de scheidings van hujs en woning, en de bogarden verblefen in het eerste huys, te weeten die, welcke niet tot den cruijs heeren order wilde overgaan, deze zijn den 7den december 1469 vertrokken en hebben zighe begeeven in een borgre huys omtrent de Mortel, en zijn daar in tot den zomer toe verbleven, als toen hebben zij met hulp van Jean Moninex, agter de St. Joris straat een plaats gekoght voor 1614 goud Reijngulden, alwaar zij een nieuw klooster hebben gebout als ook eene kerk, die aan Godt, nefvens aan de heilige maaght en martelaresse Catharina wird toegeweit, edogh deze is verandert in eene parochie kerk 1569 door Franciscus Sonnius, den eersten bisschop van Den Bosch, den pastor deszelfs was altijt eenen canonik van de cathedrale kerk. In de volgende beroertens is deze kerk dikwils onteert en berooft, ten laaisten is zij 1629, toen de Hollanders de stad hadden ingenomen, tot een wanhuys of arsenaal verandert, en het klooster werd gestelt tot eenen kerker der quaaddoende soldaten. De cruijs heeren vertrokken alsdan naar ‘t dorp Uden, alhier in het Ravesteinse gelegen,
alwaar zij thans alleen magh men zeggen, door de goddelijke voorzienigheid wonen. //

De cruijsheeren aldaar toven zigh waare en opreghte religieuzen te zijn, want zijn dagh en naght bezigh om haare geestelijke pligthen te volbrengen, en om altijt haaren evenmensch bij te staan, zij bezitten een klooster ordentelijk van gebou, als ook eene kerk of capel, waar in een wonderdagh Moeder Gods beld te vinden is, dat door het geheele jaar wonderlijk van veele pelgrims word bezoght, als ook een H. Cruijs. De heeren hebben de vijf kleindere scholen, en de philosophie en theologie, en deeze studie staan zij voor met aldergrootsten iever en lof, zoo dat men van dit lopent jaar 1806, hondert en vijftien studenten getelt heeft.


The Uden in het Land Ravestein is nogh een klooster der susters van de heilige Brigitta, deeze hebben eerst gewoond in Rosmalen in een klooster Kouwater genoemd, en hetzelve heeft zijn begin gehad 1434, op deeze wijze gelijk het Dionisius Mudzaert verhaalt.

In Holland woonde een godtvrughtige weduwe met name Milla de Kampen van adel en zeer rijk, die dikwils werd vermaand, om een klooster te bouwen van den order van de H. Brigitta; het geschiede, dat eenen landman, bezitter van Kouwater met naame Petrus de Gorter veele bijje karren had, deeze bezoght hij dikwils, en ook eens des 's nachts daar bij komende, heeft eenen hemelsen zank gehoord, waar over hij niet konde verzadighet worden, en op deeze plaats heeft daar naar den hoghen aultaar gestaan. Hij heeft den bijenkar omgeschud, om te zien, wat aldaar was schuijlende, en heeft in den kerp van den korf gezien een kercsken, en twee kloosterkits, zeer wonderlijk van het alderwitste was te zamen gestelt. Den landman hier over verslagen verhaalde dit aan zijnen pastoor, en aan meer anderen, die daar naar toe gingen, en het ook aldus bevonden hebben, gelijk het was verhaalt.

Dit wonderwerk heeft onder veele anderen de godtvrughtige weduwte Milla de Kampen verstaan, en vervoeghde zigh zeer haastigh naar Kouwater, handelde met den
landman, die zijnen acker verleende, om aldaar een klooster van de heilige Brigitta te stichten. Milla de Kampen had eerst veel te doen met de canoniken van Den Boschs, die deeze stichtinge zoghtte te beletten, edogh de weduwe overwon alles, en het klooster werd door pauzelijke toelatingh gebout en door haar gesticht.

De eerste Religieuzen zoo patres als susters wierden van Besanzon uijt Frankryk beroepen, die in het nieuwe klooster naar den regel van de heilige Brigitta zoude leefen, deeze aankomende gaf Godt den wasdom en wonige.

De weduwe Milla nam het habijt aan, en wierd daar naar abdisse. Petrus Krom deeken van het capittel van St. Jean in Ben Boschs // berouw gekregen hebbende over den tegenstant, die hij om het klooster op te bouwen had betoont, heeft het habijt de Kouwater aangenomen, is religieus geworden, naar dat hij alle zijne waardigheeden had verlaten, en is daar naar tot prior verkoren. In dit klooster waren mannen en vrouwen, edogh de wonigen waaren met of door eene groote muur gescheiden; de patres hadden eenen prior, en de susters eene abdisse, bij welcke het oppergezagh van het klooster was, en was voor beijde een besloten klooster, gelijk was te Marienboom bij Zanten in het Land van Cleeve als ook aldaar Marienbloem in de stad Kalckar.

Naar dat het klooster Kouwater alduis door veele jaren had gefloreert, zoo heeft hetzelve het droevigh geval van alle andere klooster moeten ondergaen, want is in het jaar 1566 geheel afgebrand, en de religieuzen begafen zigh na Marienboom bij Zanten in de stad Kalckar.

Hier ter lände heeft men nogh eene vergaderingh, te weeten de broeders van den darden regel van den H. Franciscus, deeze wonen in het dorp Boekel bij Handel in het Gemertze, haar huijs word Padua genoemd, en is gebout bij manier van een klooster. Zij houden publicke school voor de kinderen, zijn tot dienst van de capelle te Handel, alwaar een wondadigh Moeder Godts beelt is, zij onderhouden zigh met poten en planten van alderhande zoorten van houd, en door kostgangers. De broeders zijn in het bruijn gekleet / gelijk de minderbroeders te Megen, edogh dragen geen capuijs, maar wel een scapulier, gelijk gehoorht heb zal deeze vergaderingh zigh weer opheffen met eene Franse school aan te leggen voor jonghe heeren gelijk zij voor deezen hebben gehad, en hier toe eenen geestelijke heer tot schoolmester nemen, die alsdan voor de vergaderingh alle daghen in eene bij het huijs geboude capel zal misse leeez, bidde dat den Alles bestierende haaren iever tot beste van het land magh opwecken, en hier toe zijnen bijzonderen zegen geeven.
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Hier ter lände heeft men nogh eene vergaderingh, te weeten de broeders van den darden regel van den H. Franciscus, deeze wonen in het dorp Boekel bij Handel in het Gemertze, haar huijs word Padua genoemd, en is gebout bij manier van een klooster. Zij houden publicke school voor de kinderen, zijn tot dienst van de capelle te Handel, alwaar een wondadigh Moeder Godts beelt is, zij onderhouden zigh met poten en planten van alderhande zoorten van houd, en door kostgangers. De broeders zijn in het bruijn gekleet / gelijk de minderbroeders te Megen, edogh dragen geen capuijs, maar wel een scapulier, gelijk gehoorht heb zal deeze vergaderingh zigh weer opheffen met eene Franse school aan te leggen voor jonghe heeren gelijk zij voor deezen hebben gehad, en hier toe eenen geestelijke heer tot schoolmester nemen, die alsdan voor de vergaderingh alle daghen in eene bij het huijs geboude capel zal misse leeez, bidde dat den Alles bestierende haaren iever tot beste van het land magh opwecken, en hier toe zijnen bijzonderen zegen geeven.

15b

Heb deeze klostiers en vergaderinge beschreven, om met rede te toonen, datze veele voordeelen in en aan het land doen, en dat het niet te bedencken is of zullen wel in haaren staat verblijfen. Vare diensvolgens voort, om het eene zoo als het andere hier en
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1 [A capuchon, ‘cowl, hood’.]
elders voorgevallen te beschrijven.
Onze wele. mater Maria Theresia Heijnen is in dit aangevangene jaar 1807 den 3den februarij wederom met alle stemmen der sunters tot mater ingekoren, over deezen keus hebben gepreesterde de eeuwarme heeren Josephus van Dongen pastor allhier te Deursen, en Petrus van Vechel pastor te Demen, Dieten en Neerlange, welcke de religieuze bij deeze plechtigkeit met eene toepaszelijke aanspraak heeft vereert, den algemeenen keus wordt ook op dienzelven dagh bevestigt door den eeuwagdigste heer Arnoldus Borret pastor te Haaren als aangestelten commissarius generalis in het geestelijke over het Land van Ravestein en de graafschap Megen, zoo dat de wele. mater Maria Theresia Heijnen nuw in het 25te jaar deeze gemeente bestiert. Godt magh haare, nogh veele jaaren in gezontheit verleenen, dat in opreghtigheit den wenschs is van alle kloosterlinge.

Dit heugelijk feest hebben ook met haare tegenswoordigheid vereert den wele. heer Joannes Henricus de Groot pastor te Dennenboergh en pater Benedictus capucin te Velp, onder Uden te Volckel geboren, met name Colen. //

16a In dit zelfe jaar 1807 den eersten februarij, vallende juist op zondagh Sexagesima daaghs voor Onze Lieve Vrouwe Lightmisse hebben wij allhier in het klooster als ook door het geheele konighrijk Holland in alle kercken een plughtigh dank en bid feest gehouden, voor dat den Allesbestierende de wapens der Fransen, tegen die van Pruissen, Brunswick, Hesse-Cassel en Ruissen in het vorige jaar 1806, bijzonder bij Jena tegen de Pruisen had gezegend. Edogh dien dagh was niet alleen een dagh van dankzegginge, maar ook van de vurigste smeking, dat het den almagtigen Godt moght behagen, spoedig eenen algemeenen en duurzamen vrede te schenken, eenen vrede, waar naar het menschdom reeds zoo langh rijkhalzend heeft uitgezien, en welcke alleen een einde kan maken, aan alle die rampen, waer onder een zoo groot gedeelte van Europa, als nogh is zuigtende, jaa ook den zegen des hemels over de konighijke familie, en deszelfs onderhorigh rijk Holland af te smeeken. &c.

Omtrent deezen tijdte te weeten den 27te januarij heeft het klooster, en ik voor mijn perzoon eene groote liefde gaaf ontfangen van de h. Wilhelmus van Zuijlen gebortigh uijt ‘s Hertogenboschs edogh nuw en al voor langh koopman in de stad Rotterdam op de Zuidblaak, ter gelegenheit dat zijne. met deszelfs beminde geboren Alida Heijmans op den zelven dagh haare. zilveren bruiloft vierde, omdatze 25 jaaren met den huwelijks band vereenigd waren geweest; en dat juist op dien dagh zijne ouwde doghter M.E. van Zuijlen met den heere P.A.J. d’Aquin het huwelijk besloot. Op dit zelfs feest heb ik allhier eenen solemnelen dienst gedaan, en 8 daghen voor dien heer of deszelfs intentie gelezen, en de eeuwarme mater heeft alle kloosterlinge en pensionaire op wijf en een goede maaltij onthaalt. Godt geeft haare. zegen zoo in het geestelijke als tijdelijke.

Den 19den mart zijnde het feest van den H. Joseph, hetgeene wij allhier in het convent solemnelijk vieren als onzen tweeden patroon, hebben wij wederom inquateringh gehad, 9 personen en 8 paarden, waren Hollanders, cuissiers of cavalerie en zijn zanderen daghs vertrocken den 20te op Vught, zij hebben zigh zeer wel gedragen. /

16b Wij hebben in deezen zomer beonders in de maanden julius, en augustus overgrote heette beleeft zonder regen, zoo dat bijnaar alles verderde, edogh het winterkoren, rogh en tarf, 1 was zeer wel gegroet.

Onze eeuwarme mater Maria Theresia Heijnen heeft den 10de van de maand october haare. half jubilei gehouden, zijnde op die dagh voor 25 jaaren als mater verkoren. Dat mijns dunckens wel moet aangemerkt worden, om dat haare. van drie tot drie jaren altijd ingekoren is, hetgeene gelofe aan weinige is wedervaren.

---

1 [A form of tarwe, ‘wheat’.]
In dit jaar is ook een groot geluk aan geheel Europa wedervaren, naar dat den grooten Napoleon keijser van Frankrijk en koningh van Italien voorleeden jaar den keijser van Oostenrijk Franciscus den 2den zoo in Italien als ook in Duijtsland had verslagen, heeft hij in dit jaar 1807 over de Ruissen en Pruissen getriumpheert bijzonder in den slagh van Friedland; waar naar hij een zamekomst heeft gehad met den keijser der Ruissen en den konigh van Pruissen in Tilsit, eene stad in het konighrijk Pruissen bij Niemen, eene hoftstad van een groot drostamt 20 ueren van Konings bergen, alwaar den vreden den 18den julij tusschen deeze 3 momarchen is getekent: alles is ook verders vereffent tusschen Frankrijk en Oostenrijk, zoo dat men verhoopt ten laasten eenen algemeenen en duerzamen vreeden door geheel Europa te verkrijgen, hetgeene voor ons klooster niet alleen; maar ook voor alle geestelijken en de geheele roomse catholijke kerk te verhopen is.

Den 10den augustus op St. Laurentius feestdag hebben wij ingekleet de jonge doghters sr. Maria Joseph van den Broek geboren van Tilborgh, en sr. Agatha van Best in de Meijerie, benoemd Van der Zande, Godt geeftze voortganc in hieaar deugtzaam leefe, en dat gelijk zij zigh betonen ieverigh te zijn in haaren novitiaat alduis ook moghen volherden.

Tusschen den 2den en 3den december toen wij om het groot water, en omlopende Beerze Maas, daghten vrij te zullen zijn van marschere ende troepen, hebben wij wederom van over de hondert soldaten, die in Deurzen en Denenborgh ingequarteert waren, tien in het naght quartier gehad, waren te voet en // Fransen van de laaste requisitie, zeer goed volk, moesten den 3den 10ber naar Den Bosch, en verders naar Antwerpen.

In ditzelve jaar heeft den koningh van Holland, een zeer groote en langhe reijs naar Frankrijk gedaan, om zijne gezontheit te herstellen, wederom te rugh gekomen zijnde, en zigh in Den Hagh eenen korten tijd opgehouden hebbende, heeft hij deeze residentie of verblijfplaats verlaten, om iu in Utrecht, en het nieu geboude paleijs zijn verblijf te nemen, alhier wordt zijne koniglijke majesteit van alle standen verwillekomt, ook onder andere van den jansenisten aarts bischop Van Rhijn, die naar zijne complimenten gemaakt te hebbe, deeze klaghten voorbraght: dat zijne gelofiger te weten de jansenisten van de roomsgezinden veele vervolginge moesten uijtstaan, waarop den koningh geliefde te antwoorden: Onderwerpt uw aan den paus te Romen, en alsdan zullen deeze vervolginge wel eindigen. Het is zeeker te dencken, dat deezen koniglijke antwoord aan den gewaarden aartbischop der jansenisten in het geheel niet zal behaagd hebben, veel minder het naarvolgende ook in Utrecht voorgevallen, en getroken uit de Rotterdamse courant van 1807. Nro. 153, dingsdagh den 22te december.

Laastleden dingsdag, en heden werd alhier binnen Utrecht, in de rooms catholijke kerk, van den weleerwaarden heer pastoor Van Bennekom, onder een groot getal, en wel de aanzienlijkste roomsch-catholijken, dezer stad, met groote plechtigheid uitgeoeffend de wijding der bedienaren van den rooms-catholijken godtsdienst van dit konigrijk; waar van sestien, door zijne doorlughtige hoogwaardigheid den bischop, voor deezen van Roeremonde, en nuw eersten almoesenier van den koningh, tot de drie groote ordens zijn verheven.

Deeze daad en uijtoeffening van bischoppelijke maght moet zekelijk niet behaagd hebben, aan den bischop der jansenisten met name Van Rhijn, om dat van den tijdt der groote omwenteling zulcke uijtoeffeninge niet voorgevallen is, als door de kerckschendende handen der jansenistisse bischoppen, die in haare ongehoorzaamheyt omtrent den Apostolisen Stoel volharden.

1808. In aanvanck van dit jaar, heeft Zijne Konighlijke Majesteit van Holland wederom eene resolutie genomen waar voor hem de roomse catholijke geenen danck genoegh
konnen betuigen; deeze resolutie bestont hier in, dat in de meeste hoofdsteden van geheel het konighrijk uijt de rooms catholijken zoo wel tot de regiering als burgemester, wethouders en vroedschappen zijn aangesteld als uijt de andere gezindens, en wel bijzonder in de alhier bijleggende hoofdplaatsen St. Hartogen Bosch en Nijmegen, deeze twee steeden moet het bijzonder vreemd voorkomen.

Want naar dat de stad St. Hartogenboschs 1629 door de State troepen onder het bevel van den Prins van Orangen was overgaan en ingenomen, was het schromelijk om te zien hoe het rooms catholijk geloof en deszelfs belijders werd vervolght en gehoont, geenen roomsen godsdienst werd in de stad toegelaten, die in heimelijke plaatzen den godsdienst hadden bijgewoont of bijwoonde, stelde zigh aan de aldergrootste gevaren bloot, en wierden op het aldersterkste vervolght, en achterhaalt zijnde warenne gelukkigh, zooze met geldboeten afquamen, dit getuigten gereformeerde schrijvers gelijk Joannes Henricus van Heurn, Van Oudenhofen en meer andere zelfs. Ik behoef deeze schrijvers niet bij te halen, want heb zelfs zinter ik hier rector van Nieu Zoeterbeek ben, priesters gekent, die 600 gulden Hollands boeten hebben moeten betaalen, dat zij den Meijereizen bodem dooreijsden en in de hande der papevangers, wiens afstammelinge nogh leeven, ongelukkigh vervielen. De pастoors op de dorpen hadden alleenkens huïjs of om beter te zeggen schuerkerken gebout, zij konde nogh moghten hier in iets verbeteren of moesten dit met groote moeiten of steekpennigen bewercken, andere onnoemelijke swarigheeden en vervolginge zal ik overslaan; want anders zou geen einde van schrijven konnen vinden. Maar nuw heeft het een ander aanzien omtrent Den Bosch en deszelfs Meijerie; voor eenige jaaren hebben de gegoedste burgers van Den Boschs een schoon en wel // doortimmert huïjs met eenen schoonen tuijn aangekogh, en dit verandert tot een weeshuïjs der kinderen zoo voor jongens als ook voor meisjes van de roomse catholijke burgers, dat niet alleen in het gebouw, maar ook in onderwijzinge der kinderen zeer wel onderhouden word.

De roomze hebben aldaar een kerk op de Hintemmerstraat gebout en gestigh, die ver met het dak boven de andere huïzen pronkt en uijtschijnt, is van een zeer moderne boukunde, en door den iever der roomze daar gestelt. De inkomste der aarme moeten thans door konighlijk beveel, zoo wel aan de behoeftige der rooms catholijken, als aan die der andere gezindens uijtbetaalt worden. En het hoofdzakelijkieste is, dat thans de geheele regiering, uitgenome drie, rooms catholijk is.

Als men nuw het platte land beschout, wat eene groote veranderingh vind men aldaar, de pastoors vernieuwen haar kercke huïzen, gelijk het haar behaaght, neme zelfs op veele plaatzen de oude kerken in, die van haare voorouders aldaar gebout zijn, doen haaren godsdienst ongestoor, de geestelijke herders behoefen geene toestemminge bij de wereldlijke ovrigheid bij aanneminghe van haar geestelijk ampt te vragen, nogh bij haar gelijk voor deezen den eed af te leggen, het is genoegh dat zij door haare geestelijk ovrigheid daar toe gezonden worden.

Beziet men de geestelijke queekschool onder de parochie van St. Michiels Geestel, wil zeggen het seminarium, alwaar thans zigh bij de 60 quekelinge bevinden, die in de philosophie, theologie, Heilige Scriftuer en andere wetenschappen worden onderweezen, door drie zeer geleerde mannen, te weeten de heeren Van Gilst als president, de heeren Moser en Smits als professoren, zoo moet men zigh zekerlijk verwonderen, en uijtroepen: Dit alles is door de toelatingh des Alderhoogsten in zoo korte jaaren geschiet, en het is in onze ogen zeer veronderlijk.

Nijmegen is ingenomen en overgegaan door de Staate troepen onder het bevel van prins Maurits in het jaar 1591 den 21ten october: het is alleenigh maar aante mercken, dat altoos de vervolgingh der rooms catholijke gelofigen op het hooghste moet zijn
geweest, en dit is hier uijt te besluijten, dat niemand der roomsgezinden, rijk of arm, van wat voor eenen staat of beroep hij ook was, konde burger van de stad worden, als wel bij deeze tijde, nuw zigh de stad, en burgers door eenen rooms catholijken burgemeester den wel edel en aghbaren heer Joannes Sanders / van Well, en de meeste van de regering als roomsgezinden, word regeert en bestiert, nuw zal het aan de getuigen van de roomz religie niet meer geweigert worden, om de burgerlijke rechten te genieten, ampten te verkrijgen, dat anderzints aan andere gezintens van wat voor staat of conditie zij waren voorbehouden was. Ik kan de stad Grave ook niet overslaan, deeze wordt door de Staate troepen ingenomen 1577. Weder ingenomen door den prins van Parma in het jaar 1586 wird zij ook weder veroverd door prins Maurits 1602. Zij wird veroverd door de Fransen 1672. Maar den Prins van Oranje Wilhelms von III heeftze weder veroverd 1674. De stad is onder Staten gebied verbleeven tot datze 1794 in december door de Franzen herovert is. Wat heeft men naar deeze laaste inneminge voor de roomse catholijke een groote veranderingh aldaar bespeurt. De roomsche catholijke priessters hebben thans tot of in deeze stad Haaren vreijen toeganck, onder de vorige regiering, en dat in mijnen tijdt nogh is geschiet, moesten dezelve zooze zaaken in de plaats te verrichten hadden, voor eerst aanvraagh bij den commendant laaten doen of het haar toegelaten wird om in de stad met deeze toelatinge te konnen komen, en moesten alsdan tot dat het antwoord quam, in het eerste waghthuijs bij de gemeene soldaten verblijfen, dit is nuw geheel opgehefen, en hier aan denkt men thans niet meer. Allhier in de stad Grave was een slechte kerkheuijzinge onder die tijdt te vinden, deeze wird daar naar edogh verbeterd, en tot een tamelijke huys kerk geschickt, maar de catholijke hebben, dit niet tegenstaande, naar de groot kerck genadert en ingenomen, deeze was met het laaste bombardement ijzelijk geteistert, edogh is thans zooy vernieut en verbeterd, dat ieder een daar over zigh moet verwonderen: den goddelijken dienst word alhier plughtelijk verricht, en den eerwaardighesten heer bischop voor deeze van Ruremonde, houd alhier ter steede zijne residentie, zoo hij het konighlijk hoff niet moet volgen, doet in deeze kerck zijne amptenverrightinge, in priessters te wijden en het H. sacrament des vormzels aan de gelofige meede te deele; thans worden hier ook de ampten door rooms catholijken bedient. Waar op niemand voor deeze derfd... to denken. Ziet // hierover naar het clooster van den Ruremonde... te Velp, bladz. 19.

1808 den 23ste augustus zijn alhier geprofest zuster Maria Joseph van den Broek geboren te Tilburg, door den koning nu tot eene stad verheven; en zuster Agatha van der Zande, geboren te Best, in de Meijerie gelegen.

1809 is tuschen den 28ste en 29ste jann. een grooten storm met groot water ontstaan, door dat geheel Holland in dien akeligen nagt schroomlijk heeft geleden; en vele beesten en menschen zijn verdrongen: waar bij onze koning zijn best gedaan heeft om alles te redden wat gered kon worden, bijna overal tegenwoordig zijnde met gevaar zijn levens, heeft de stad Gorcum zeker geredt, die anders zoude vergaan zijn, gelijk ook vele andere plaatsen. Zijne Majesteijt heeft zich daardoor zeer beminnelijk gemaakt. Rond om het clooster stond ook het water, in den binnen en buijten hof, boomgaart enz. wel 3 voeten hoog, als ook de wegen naar Ravensteijn, Deursen enz. waren met water bedekt, edogh alles is zonder ongelukken afgeloopen. De koning de dorpen en plaatsen, naar Paschen in dit loopende jaar bezoekende, is ook in het Ravensteinze geweest, en

---

1 [Here the part in Beckers’ hand ends. As explained in vol. 1, p. 280, the folium that originally followed pp. 17-18 has been removed, and Rector De Bruijn began his continuation of Beckers’ chronicle by copying the contents of the original folium. It is of course uncertain how far these originally extended into the narrative.]
kwam te Herpen den 22ste naar middag aan, alwaar hij een overgrote liefde aan de inwoonders betoonde in het vergeven van eene overtreding die ze tegen zijn persoon hadden begaan. Van daar reisde men door Overangel, alwaar Zijne Majesteijt over de f. 1400 gulden aan de capel beloofde, en ook uitbetaalde, gelijk ook te Neerloon voor een nieuwe kerk f. 2000, en te Huisseling voor den orgel f. 500.-

Zijne Majesteijt is ’s avonds te Ravensteinj aangekomen, en heeft / des ’s nags tuschen den 22ste en 23ste zijn verblijf genomen bij den heer Henricus Kleinefeld, land rentmeester, of der domeinen van Ravenstein en Megen, heeft des avonds en ’s morgens aan verscheijde heeren gehoor verleent, heeft f. 500 aan de roomsche kerk vereert, en f. 500 aan den armen. Nadat Zijne Majesteijt zondags ’s morgens had mis gehoord, heeft hij het kasteel, en gevangenis wezen bezien, en is op Megen vertrokken, waar hij ook groote weldaden heeft uitgeoefend. Wij hadden alhier in ons klooster ook alles voorbereid, om Zijne Majesteijt te ontvangen, doch deeze eér hebben wij niet mogen genieten.

Wij hebben in dit jaar den 19de junij ingekleedt, de zusters Henrica Lucia Damen en Johanna Francisca van Iersel, de eerste geboren te Beugen bij Boxmeer, en de tweede te Oosterwijk in de Meijerij, en den 29sten sept. hebben wij nog ingekleedt sr. Dorothea Smits te Weert geboren en te Neer Bosch gedoopt.

Anno 1810 juli den 23ste overleed alhier onze waardige rector, de weleerw. heer Arnoldus Bekkers, cannunik regulier van het order van den H. Augustinus, van het clooster de Gaasdonk gelegen in Pruissen, alwaar hun klooster was, en thans nog in wezen is, doch eene andere bestemming heeft; jammer is het dat ook dit klooster, hetwelk zeer groot en schoon was, te niet is moeten gaan, door het uitsterven dier waardige religieusen. De weleerw. heer A. Bekkers was de laaste rector van voornoemd klooster, welke onze gemeente bedient heeft. Zijn eeuw. heeft onze gemeente vele geschriften nagelaten, en was daarin onvermoejd werkzaam. Is 38 jaren rector van ons klooster Nieuw//soeterbeek geweest; zijn eeuw. was een waardige religieus en ijvrige rector, zijne nagedachtenis blijft steeds in gezegend aandenken. R.I.P.

De wel eeuw. heer Van der Ven is tot assistentie geweest van den weleerw. heer Bekkers, zoo in zijne ziekte, als na zijn overlijden, totdat wij eenen nieuwen rector kregen, zijn eeuw. heeft insgelijks onze gemeente, gedurende zijn verblijf alhier, met veel ijver bedient.

1811 augustus de 6de is de wel eeuw. heer J. van den Broek, geboortig van Boekel tot rector over ons klooster aangesteld; zijn eeuw. is geweest kapellaan te Zeeland, (Lande Ravensteinj,) later in dezelfde betrekking te Heijthuisen (Limburgs), doch mogt niet lang het genoegen smaken in de eenzaamheid God te dienen, en in rust onze religieuze gemeente te bestuuren.

Reeds het jaar daaropvolgende kwam de suppressie onder Napoleon, en hebben toen zijn eeuw. als alle waardige religieusen met vele wederwaardigheden te kampen gehad. In 1812 wierd ons klooster gesuprimeert, aangeslagen zoome de landerijen enz.

Wij kregen aanzegging om ons habijt uittrekkken, en in wereldsche klederen te gaan; men kan wel denken, in welk eene droevige toestand wij ons bevonden, echter vol betrouwen op God, wachtenden wij diep bedroefd de toekomst af.

Onze kerk wierd toegezegd, wij konden dus die plaats van heiligheid, zoö dierbaar, zoö onmisbaar voor ons, zoo troostrijk voor ons hart, waar zoö menige zucht ons ontging tot Hem, die daar altijd ruste in het H. sacrament niet meer naderen: hiervan wierden wij verstoken, en daar men ons nog in het klooster dulde, moesten wij dus eene noodkark hebben, en hiervoor wierdt bestemd van ouds genaamd de greefs-kamer.¹ en

¹ [Probably a form of gerfkamer, ‘vestry.’]
eenigen tijd / daarna de werkkamer, en aldaar las onze wel eew. heer rector de H. mis. Ons kerkegoed, en andere zaken (men had echter veel verborgen) werd opgeschreven, doch niet datgene, hetwelk de zusters op de cellen hadden. Hoe of men toen gesteld was, behoef men hier niet te schrijven, dat de leezer dezes, zich die tijden en ogenblikken voor den geest brenghe, en hij zal met ons bekennen, dat, zoo de goede God ons in deze droevige tijden geene sterkte en troost verleende, wij onder dezelve van droefheid zouden hebben moeten wegwijzien. Eindelijk brak het onweder los, hetwelk wij reeds een geruimen tijd voorzien hadden, de dag brak aan, dat wij ons klooster moesten verlaten, die eënzame plaats vaarwel zeggen, waar wij zoo in gerustheid des harten, van het gewoel der wereld afgezondert, God in stilte dienden. Het was de 5de october ’s morgens omtrent negen uur, toen men ons kwam aanzeggen, dat wij het klooster moesten ruijmen. Ik ben niet in staat, die hartroerende scheijding afdemalen, welke hier moest plaats hebben, dit laat zich beter gevoelen dan beschrijven. De wel eew. heer J. van den Broek rector en de eew. mater Heijnen hadden zorg zorg gedragen, dat de zusters eenigen tijd konden blijven bij goede lieden, die ons zeer genegen waren. Eenigen tijd daarna vertrokken zij naar hunne familien, en bij andere brave menschen. De wel eew. heer Rector, en de eew. mater bleven met zuster Magdalena bij den wel eew. heer Giebels pastoor van deze gemeente. De eew. zuster Johanna Slots van Udenhout is niet een nagt uit het klooster geweest, zij huisveste bij de boden in de schuur, des ’s nags sliep zij in de nieuwe kamer van het rectoraat, alwaar zij ziek geworden // zijnde, den 26ste februiarij 1813 tot groote droefheid van alle zusters overleed. Deeze was de enigste zuster, welke in wereldsche kleding bij de boden het klooster niet heeft verlaten, zij was ons zeer dierbaar, en is begraven op het kerkhof te Deursen. De eew. zuster Johanna Girtrudis de Jong te Dennenburg bij den wel eew. heer De Groot zijnde, is aldaar gestorven den 24ste februiarij 1813 en begraven op het kerkhof aldaar.

Voor dat wij het klooster verlieten, hebben wij te Ravensteijn eenige dagen erfhuiz gehouden (wij hadden echter nog veel behouden, en in bewaring gesteld bij goede menschen, zoomede de boerderij aangehouden), omdat de eew. mater altijd nog goede moed had, dat de tijden wel eens zouden veranderen, zoo als het na eenigen tijd ook gebeurde, want men kon wel denken, dat de regeering van Napoleon, van genen langen duur zoude wezen, en met deszelfs val hoopten wij een betere toekomst.
Appendix E: The Coninx Affair (1774-1775)

This appendix provides a detailed account of Coninx and Beckers’ attempt at provoking a visitation at Gaesdonck, based on the documents preserved as ff. 22-154 of the file Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199 at the Rhineland Department of the North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive in Duisburg.¹ The events recorded in these pages were first described by Gregor Hövelmann, teacher at the Collegium Augustinianum Gaesdonck in Goch and later archivist of the districts of Guelders and Cleves.² My account, though based on a fresh examination of the evidence, remains greatly indebted to his interpretation both in its general outline and in almost all of its particulars. However, whereas Hövelmann was not particularly interested in the role which the rector of Soeterbeeck played in what he called, after its leading figure, the Coninx-Affäre, that is the case’s main interest in the context of this book. Indeed, the affair has been documented so thoroughly that it is one of the most important sources on Beckers’ biography. For these reasons it seems merited to discuss it here at some length.

On 15 March 1774, six Gaesdonck canons addressed the following letter to the Upper German commissioner general of the Congregation of Windesheim—probably Joannes Josephus Haas, prior of the convent of Mariensand, near Straelen,³ who will be shown to have held this office half a year later:

> Tam justitiæ et Regularis disciplinæ zelo quam conscientiæ motu, ne canonia nostra justæ Dei vindictæ diutius exponatur, et imminentem coram sæculo et maxime coram acatholicis in hisce partibus confusionem subire cogatur, nos infrascripti ad Reverendissimam Dignitatem Vestram omni, qua par est veneratione recurrimus, non tantum qua commissarium generalem, verum etiam tamquam subditum regis nostri procul dubio ad visitationem de consensu regiminis admittendum, eidem denuntiantes quod amplissimus prior nostri jam a longo tempore tam in spiritualibus quam temporalibus ita se gesserit, ut intra breve tempus eundem coram acatholicis convenientium merito timeamus, proinde Reverendissimam Dignitatem Vestram enixè rogamus, ut sine ullâ interpositâ morâ causam hanc debite excutere, et remedium opportunum gratiosissime adhibere dignetur.⁴

The note is signed by Arnoldus Beckers and his confrères Wilhelmus Coninx, Joannes Loyens, Petrus Ruys, Oswaldus van Oeyen and Joannes van Steenbergen.⁵ This text, though tantalisingly vague, is also very revealing, for several reasons. First, although it is not at all clear what complaints they have in mind exactly, the six canons are clearly accusing their prior, Petrus van Kempen,⁶ of spiritual and temporal mismanagement. This was a very serious accusation to make, especially since it was aimed at the person to whose office the accusers had vowed obedience. The gravity of this situation must have been most strongly felt by Beckers, as Van Kempen was the very man by whom he had been invested and professed.

¹ The references in this appendix are to this file, unless indicated otherwise.
² Hövelmann 1987b.
³ On Haas, see vol. 1, p. 293 n. 3.
⁴ ‘Driven by our zeal for justice and the instruction of our Rule and by the stirring of our conscience, in order that our canonry may not be exposed to God’s just punishment any longer, or forced to experience, before the world, and especially before the non-Catholics in these parts, the disorder which threatens it, we, the undersigned, turn with all due respect to Your Most Reverend Highness, not only as our general commissioner, but also as our king’s subject, who will undoubtedly be given leave, by the government’s consent, for a visitation, when we announce to you that our most august prior has for a long time now been behaving himself in such a way, both in spiritual and temporal matters, that we fear, with some justification, that he will, in a short while, be summoned before the non-Catholics. We therefore urgently request Your Most Reverend Highness that you may most graciously vouchsafe to appropriately examine this case without any more delay and prescribe the proper remedy’ (f. 90r). The quotation is taken from a certified copy of the original letter (ff. 90-91), which is part of a letter to the Prussian government at Cleves by Haas of 11 January 1775 (ff. 84-95), on which see p. 106.
⁵ On Beckers, Coninx, Loyens, Ruys, Van Oeyen and Van Steenbergen, see Appendix B, nos. 1, 3, 7-8, 15-16.
⁶ On Van Kempen, see Appendix B, no. 12.
Second, although the allegations are a highly sensitive issue, the note stresses that it is not merely internal to the convent of Gaesdonck or even the Congregation of Windesheim as a whole, but concerns secular society as well. The letter writers twice express concern—or threats—that whatever Van Kempen was doing wrong might lead to the involvement of non-Catholic authorities. Presumably, that is why they make sure to mention his shortcomings in temporal matters, as these would be particularly likely to draw the government’s attention. They also strongly emphasise that their own general commissioner is subject to the authority of the King of Prussia, on whose consent his ability to make a visitation in the duchy of Cleves, where Gaesdonck was situated, depended. This condition of governmental consent had been laid down in two treaties that had been entered upon by Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia (1640-1688), and Philip William, Count Palatine of Neuburg (1653-1690), in 1666 and 1672 in order to settle some of the long-standing differences between them, partly by officially incorporating Cleves in the inheritance of Brandenburg-Prussia.\(^1\) The religious agreements that had been part of these settlements stipulated that Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities would be allowed to make visitations in the Protestant duchy of Cleves. However, they should notify the government whenever a visitation was about to take place, and a governmental commissioner should be present to observe whether the proceedings were in accordance with secular law.\(^2\) The letter’s references to these laws and to the opinion of the Protestants were probably intended to make it seem all the more urgent that the situation be treated speedily and properly by Windesheim’s commissioner general.

Third, it was clearly easier for a canon to criticise his prior if he was not actually living in the convent where he had made his profession. Of all six subscribers, only Van Oeyen and Van Steenbergen actually resided at Gaesdonck when this letter was written. Beckers had, of course, moved to Soeterbeeck less than two years before and Ruyss was parish priest in Goch, where Loyens was rector of a women’s convent. Coninx was rector of the convent of St Catherine in Kranenburg, and the accusations made in the letter must have gained weight when he was elected as prior of the convent of the Holy Spirit in Uedem on 21 June. As Hövelmann points out, this meant that Van Kempen was being challenged by someone of his own rank.\(^3\) In fact, it will become clear from the course which events would take that Coninx was the driving force behind the request for a visitation, and that Beckers was his closest associate.

Coninx and Van Kempen had already been at odds with each other on two previous occasions. The first of these had occurred in 1760, when Coninx and Van Kempen had both stood themselves up for the priorate of Gaesdonck.\(^4\) On 5 February, Van Kempen was elected prior, and on 30 March, Coninx was given the rectorate of Kranenburg instead.\(^5\) His defeat may have caused Coninx to bear ill will towards Van Kempen, and there is every appearance that he was simply being put out of the way.\(^6\) The second clash followed soon after, when the

\(^1\) On Frederick William, see Oestreich 1961. On Philip William, see Fuchs 2001.
\(^2\) See art. 4, par. 2 of the additional treaty regarding religious matters of 9 September 1666 and art. 5, par. 4 of the religious agreement of 26 April 1672. (I made use of digital scans of Düsseldorf, University and State Library, DGV 888:2, pp. 9-11 and DGV 888:3, pp. 21-22 respectively, which are copies of editions published in Düsseldorf by Tilman Liborius Stahl in 1735.) The documents concerning the Coninx Affair continuously allude to these treaties with reference to the visitation at Gaesdonck. The most explicit references occur in a letter by the lawyer Van Oven to the Prussian government at Cleves of 27 December 1774 (ff. 32v-33r) and in a letter to the government by Commissioner Haas of 8 January 1775 (f. 70v), on which see pp. 104-105.
\(^3\) Hövelmann 1987b, 6.
\(^4\) Hövelmann 1987b, 4-5, 22.
\(^5\) For Van Kempen’s account of this election in the Gaesdonckx cronicxken, see CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 29, pp. 113-114.
\(^6\) Van Kempen himself clearly believed that envy at his own election was one of the reasons for Coninx’ request for a visitation on 15 March 1774. In a diary kept by Heijden, the dean of the collegiate church at Cleves, during
newly elected Van Kempen overruled some of Coninx’ earlier decisions as procurator.\(^1\) This case is described by Van Kempen himself in the *Gaesdonckx chronicxken*:

In het jaer 1759 is onsen hoft huïjs en schur te Well afgebrant. Of het aengestockt is of door onversightigheit geschiet is en weet men niet, en hebben wederom laeten opbouwen 1760. Met groote onkosten soo in de reckening daervan te sien is, antie electionem meam waer het door den heer prior et procurator Coninx, daer alles toe gestelt en verandert met eenen arckenteck en het holt daer toe gehouwen en ten deelen gesaegt, soo dat ick het niet konde veranderen, als dat ick de schur in het huïjs liet maecken, en een gemein boere schuir en schaepstael. Hadde groote onkoste konen gespart worden, maer van aevanck niet wel ingericht, en dewil wij beneficiens veele anxten en swarigheeden oek groote exactiones en contributiones aen de Fransen moesten geeven, hebbe gedwongen gewest daer geelt toe te negotiere. Want den heele voeraet van geeft waer alleen 63 rixd.\(^2\)

This passage on the prior’s anguish over his former procurator’s disastrously expensive decisions regarding the rebuilding of one of the convent’s farmhouses in Well is revealing for two reasons. First, and most obviously, it seems probable that Coninx and Van Kempen’s difference of opinion will have been a second source of conflict between them. Second, the prominence with which Van Kempen distances himself from the entire project is remarkable. He emphasises that Coninx’ over-ambitious plans had already been made before his own election as prior, and that in 1760 they had already advanced too far to be abandoned entirely. In connection with this, it should be noted that Coninx is called prior, which means that this account must have been written after 21 June 1774, at least several months after the writing of the letter in which Coninx *cum suis* had asked for Van Kempen to be visited. That document had accused the prior of Gaesdonck of (among other things) financial mismanagement, and, as will become evident,\(^3\) this aspect would continue to play an important role over the course of the next few months. It would seem, then, that Van Kempen’s account in the *Cronicxken* was at least partly meant as a defense to his confrères against the accusations that had been leveled against him.

It is not known what happened immediately after 15 March. Ruyss and Loyens would later report to have written a letter of their own on 5 April, presumably also to the commissioner general, in which they declared not to want to have anything to do anymore with the request for a visitation.\(^4\) Although this document does not survive, there is no reason to question the two canons’ testimony, and it is likely that this withdrawal damaged the credibility of the others’ demand.

---

\(^1\) Hövelmann 1987b, 22.

\(^2\) In the year 1759 our farmhouse and barn in Well burned down. It is not known whether it was arson or if it happened by accident, and we had them rebuilt in 1760. At great expense, as is evident from the bill, everything to that end had been prepared by the Rev Prior and Procurator Coninx before my election; the buildings had been modified with the help of an architect, and the wood that was necessary had already been chopped and partly sawn, so that I could not change anything except that I had the barn built inside the farmhouse, and just an ordinary barn and a sheep house besides. Expenses could have been greatly reduced, but from the beginning, matters had not been handled in the right way, and because, in addition to suffering many fears and difficulties, we had to pay many taxes and contributions to the French, we were forced to borrow money for this, as our entire supply of money consisted of only 63 rix-dollars’ (Höv 29, p. 116). On the *Cronicxken*, see vol. 1, pp. 285 n. 5, 291 n. 3.

\(^3\) See p. 105.

\(^4\) Ff. 114v-115r. This is reported in a letter to the government at Cleves by the Dean Heijden, of 22 January 1775 (ff. 114-115), on which see pp. 107-108.
None of this is evident, however, from the letter that Joannes Schmallen, prior general of the Congregation of Windesheim, wrote on 3 September to Joannes Haas, by then certainly in the capacity of commissioner general of Upper Germany, and Arnoldus van Bree, prior of the convent of Mariënange in Weert and commissioner general of the Netherlands. The superior writes that Haas, or his predecessor, informed him of serious complaints harboured against their prior by the greater part of the community of Gaesdonck, and he instructs both addressees to make a visitation there.

Rogato et obtento regii regiminis Cliviensis clementissimo placito ad canoniam in Gasdonck sepositis tantisper privatis negotiis se se recipiant, eámque juxta constitutiones nostras visitant tam in capite, quàm in membris, in delatas ad nos querelas inquirant et si quid reformandum, corrigendum, et emendandum invenièrent, reforment, corrigan, emendent, eáque faciant que nos, si presentes essemus, faceré possemus, ac deberemus.

Schmallen evidently took the complaints that had been lodged by Coninx and his associates very seriously, to judge from the fact that he eventually complied with their wish for a visitation.

The two commissioners seem not to have acted upon Schmallen’s orders straightaway, for Haas was still at Straelen a month later. At that time, two Franciscan friars of the convent of Mariënwater in Weeze, by name of Cremer and Schmits, passed through there while on their way home from Aachen. They were told that Haas had been ordered by Schmallen to go to Gaesdonck um den Prior, Procurator, und Subprior daselbsten abzusetzen, as well as that their own guardian, Raphael te Koock, was to inform Van Kempen of the commissioner’s mission and imminent arrival. When Cremers and Schmits arrived in Weeze on 10 November, they told Te Koock about what they had heard, and he, acting upon their instructions in good faith, contacted Van Kempen. This will not have been the first hint that the prior of Gaesdonck received of the accusations leveled against him by Coninx cum suis or their request for a visitation. However, by his own account, it was because of Haas’ ill-considered words to the Franciscans that he first began to consider the whole affair as a personal threat and to mistrust the commissioner’s impartiality even before he had arrived. It is noteworthy that both Te Koock and Van Kempen report Haas’ intention to be to depose not only Van Kempen himself, but also his subprior, Joannes Koppers, and his procurator, Petrus Wooningh, who had not been involved before.

---

1 On Schmallen, see vol. 1, p. 291 n. 4.
2 Van Bree was rector in Venray in 1754–1765, prior of Mariënange in Weert from 1765 to 1782, and rector in Venray again from 1782 to 1786. He died in 1787 (Weiler and Geirnaert 1980, 240).
3 ‘When the most graceful decree of the royal government of Cleves has been asked for and obtained, they should return to the canonry of Gaesdonck for these exceptional, by now confidential, matters, and visit it according to our constitutions, both in its head and in its members, look into to the quarrels which have been reported to us, and reform, correct and emend whatever they find in need of reforming, correcting and emending, and do there those things which we would have been able and obliged to do, if we had been present’ (f. 23r).
4 This is taken from a copy of the original letter (ff. 23-24) which is part of a letter to the government at Cleves by Commissioner Haas of 26 November 1774 (ff. 22-25), on which see p. 95.
5 ‘To depose its prior, procurator and subprior’ (f. 134v).
6 Ff. 134r-135r. This incident is reported by Te Koock in a letter to the Prussian government of 9 September 1775 (ff. 133-137, 140), written because Haas had accused him of setting Van Kempen up against him at both the Franciscan provincial chapter on 25 April and the Windesheim general chapter on 12 and 13 July of the same year (ff. 133r-137v). It is evident from a statement by the general chapter, a certified copy of which is enclosed in Te Koock’s letter (ff. 138-139), that they had backed Haas up and decided to reprimand Te Koock and let his provincial know about his misconduct (ff. 138r-138v). Te Koock would, in his turn, complain to the Prussian government, which advised him, according to a copy of their response written on the front of his letter dated to 11 September, not to become involved with the Windesheim chapter, as that would mean that he subjected himself to its authority (f. 133r). The outcome of this affair does not appear from the papers in the file Kleve-Mark, Akten Nr. 1199.
7 Ff. 39v and 44r. Van Kempen’s testimony is recorded in Heijden’s diary (ff. 37-51).
8 On Koppers and Wooningh, see Appendix B, nos. 6 and 19.
On 26 November, Haas and his servants arrived at Gaesdonck, without even having properly announced their coming. On the same day, the commissioner informed the Prussian government at Cleves of his and Van Bree’s task, and in accordance with secular law he requested that they appoint Ernst Wilhelm Bonrath, the official of the archdeaconry of Xanten, as governmental commissioner. The latter would later testify that he had met with Haas and Van Kempen on 28 November, and that during this meeting the former had told the prior of Gaesdonck about the visitation with which he and Van Bree had been entrusted by Schmallen. Van Kempen had responded that he would not cooperate, as he was convinced that Haas was prejudiced, and that he had already asked the Prior General three times if he would not make the visitation himself, without receiving an answer. Haas, apparently unimpressed by Van Kempen’s objections, had only responded that Van Bree had written him to say that he intended to travel to Gaesdonck on 27 or 28 November, and would be awaiting a coach in which to do so at Venray. Van Kempen subsequently agreed to host Van Bree for three days, but only pro salutatone fraterna, et pro concilio dando, and not as a visitation. It is not known if Van Bree was indeed picked up that same day, but he was certainly at Gaesdonck by 14 December.

Despite the fact that Bonrath had already been involved, the government at Cleves chose to appoint the judge of Kalkar, Theodorus Joannes Messmecker, as their delegate instead. On the day of the meeting between Haas, Van Kempen and Bonrath, Messmecker was sent a message in which he was ordered to be present at the visitation, to observe the course of events and to make sure that everything would happen in accordance with the sovereign, territorial and episcopal laws.

On 1 December, Haas called together the ordained canons residing at Gaesdonck, and asked them if they would be willing to submit to the visitation to which the government had consented, and if they would accept the visitators to whom the task had been assigned. Five of them—among whom not only Subprior Koppers but also Van Steenbergen and Van Oeyen, two of the original letter writers—replied affirmatively to these questions and signed a declaration to confirm it. Procurator Wooningh responded that ad suam personam contra visitatores per generalem designatos nullam habeat exceptionem, but he did not answer the other question or sign a declaration. Only Joannes Wilhelmus van Kölcken and Cornelius Dijckman refused to submit: the former said se debere prius cum suo priore loqui, whereas the latter responded that toti negotio se nolit immiscere, teneaturque suo superiori obedire. Neither of them signed a declaration.

In an account dated to 3 December, Messmecker recounts that he had arrived at Gaesdonck to assist Haas and Van Bree on the day before. He had intended to begin the visitation the next day, but when morning came, Prior Van Kempen refused to cooperate. He explained that he would be willing to accept Van Bree as visitator, but that he believed Haas

---

1 Ff. 39v-40r. This is said to have been reported by Van Kempen in Heijden’s diary (ff. 37-51).
2 F. 22r-v. Haas’ letter itself (ff. 22, 25) was accompanied by a copy of Schmallen’s letter of 3 September (ff. 23-24).
3 ‘As a fraternal visit and for the giving of council’ (f. 88r). This is taken from a certified copy of Bonrath’s testimony (ff. 88-89), which is part of Haas’ letter of 11 January 1775 (ff. 84-95). Cf. the account by Theodorus Messmecker, judge at Kalkar, dated 3 December 1774 (f. 87r-v), on which see pp. 95-96.
4 Cf. f. 37r. This is reported in Heijden’s diary (ff. 37-51).
5 This appears from a copy of the government’s message to Messmecker written on the back of Haas’ letter of 26 November (f. 25v).
6 ‘Personally, he does not have any objection against the visitators which had been appointed by the prior general’ (f. 92r). This is taken from a certified copy of a transcript of Haas’ interrogation (ff. 92-93), which is part of Haas’ letter of 11 January 1775 (ff. 84-95).
7 ‘That he has to speak with this prior first. […] He does not want to take part in the entire business, and he is held to obey his superior’ (f. 92r). On Dijckman and Van Kölcken, see Appendix B, nos. 5 and 13.
to be prejudiced and unreliable.\(^1\) He therefore could not agree to a visitation, and he 
*protestirte gegen alle des Ends der Canonie causirte köste.*\(^2\) This was a new argument, but 
providing accommodation for all the people involved, including Haas’ servants, would indeed 
have been onerous for a convent whose entire property had consistes of only 63 rix-dollars 
several years before. Van Kempen proved immovable, and Messmecker left the next day 
without having accomplished his mission, only to report his failure to the government in a 
letter of 6 December.\(^3\)

On Monday 12 December, the government at Cleves received a letter signed (only) by 
Coninx and Beckers, in which they responded to the recent developments.

Ewer Königlichen Majestät ist ohnlängst allunterthanigst angezeigt worden, daß die beijden Canonici 
Regulares Haas und van Bree Priores zu Sand und zu Werth, von dem Superiori Generali der 
Windesheimischen Congregation als Commissarii, um in dem Closter dem Canonicoium Regularium zu 
Gaesdonck eine Visitation vorzunehmen, benennt wären, worauf sie auch nicht allein Ewer Königlichen 
Majestät allernächstigstest Placitum, sondern auch die Beijfügung des Calkarschen Richters Messenmaecker 
as Commissarii erhalten haben.

Kaum aber sollte diese visitation der Anfang nehmen, so hat der van Kempen Prior zu Gaesdonck ad 
Protocollum dictirt, daß er den Haas Prioren zu Sand perhorrescrire, ohne doch den gringsten Grund seiner 
Perhorrescentz dabei anzuführen, und hat sich demnächst vom 4ten bis 8ten M.c. vom Closter Gaesdonck 
abewesend gemacht.

Wir finden uns also in Gewissen verpflichtt Ewer Königlichen Majestät allunterthanigst 
vorzustellen, daß eine so wilde und ungereimte Perhorrescentz, welche so gar vom 1ten auf den 2ten, 3ten, ja 
4ten fallen könnte, den Statutis omnium Ordinum, und sonderlich den Constitutionibus Canonicoium 
Regularium durchaus zuwider seij, und daß:

1mo Auf solche weise eine jede in geistlichen Disciplin und closterlichen Oeconomie hochstnötige 
Visitation Monathe ja Jahre verzögert werden könnte.

2do Daß in diesen Umständen eine Perhorrescentz von sich selbst gantz grundlos verdächtig und das 
Liecht scheuend seij, da Ewere Königliche Majestät den beijden a Superiore Generali verordneten 
Commissariis allernächstigst einen weltlichen Concommissarium getrieben haben, 
3o Daß die gantz unbestimte ad Protocollum ausgegofene Perhorrescentz auf nichts anders ziele, als nur 
immer weitere Unkosten zu verursachen, und den dreijen Commissariis ins gesamt die Sache beij diese[n] 
rauen Winterzeit verdrieβlich zu machen,

4to Um auch die Priester des Clostergaesdonck welche doch alle nur zwener ausgenommen lauth 
eigenhändiger Unterschrifff auf die Visitation gedrungen haben, in Verwirrung zu bringen,

5to Der van Kempen Prior zu Gaesdonck den Prioren Haas lauth Protocols in dem Falle, wenn nur der 
General selbst beij der Visitation gegenwärtig wäre nicht perhorrescrire, welches lächerlich, unwiβt, und 
widersprechend ist, indem die Gegenwart des Generals unotheil und die benannten Visitatores das nemliche 
verrichten.

Wir bitten also Ewer Königlichen Majestät allerdemüthigst, allerhochst dieselbe geruhen dem van 
Kempen Prioren zu Gaesdonck allernächstigst zu befehlen, daß er in Continenti und ohne den geringsten 
Anstand seine angebliche Perhorrescentz des Prioren Haas mit hinnlänglichen Gründen rechtferntige, und in 
Ermanglung die Visitation allergehorsamst annehme, damit ein unter Ewer Königlichen Majestät 
ohnmittelbare Schutz und Schirm stehendes Closter seiner uralten Stiftung und Regeln gemäß so wohl in 
Spiritualibus als Temporalibus behalten bleiben möge.\(^4\)

---

1 F. 87r-v. This account (ff. 87 and 94) was sent to the government along with Haas’ letter of 11 January 1775 
(ff. 84-95).
2 ‘Protested against all the expenses to which the canony would be put for that purpose’ (f. 87v).
4 ‘It has recently been most humbly reported to Your Royal Majesty that the two canons regular Haas and Van 
Bree, priors at Mariensand and at Weert, have been appointed commisioners by the general superior of the 
Windesheim Congregation to undertake a visitation at the convent of the canons regular of Gaesdonck, for which 
they received not only Your Royal Majesty’s most gracious consent, but also the additional help of the Kalkar 
judge Messmecker as fellow commisioner. Hardly, however, was the visitation to commence, or Van Kempen, 
prior at Gaesdonck, went on record as rejecting Haas, prior of Mariensand, without, however, putting forward 
the least motive for his rejection, and subsequently left the convent of Gaesdonck from the 4th until the 8th of 
the present month. We are therefore obliged in all conscience to most humbly propose to Your Royal Majesty 
that such a wild and absurd rejection, which could fall on one after the other, completely goes against the 
statutes of all orders and particularly the constitutions of the canons regular, and that: 1) in this way each and every
In short, they argue that the reasons given by Van Kempen for his rejection of Haas were so imprecise that they could be applied to any visitator. His accusations served only to delay the actual visitation, to inconvenience the visitators and to confuse the ordained religious, only two of whom had not insisted on a visitation. They are right, of course, that only Van Kölcken and Dijckman had refused to cooperate when asked by Haas on 1 December, but the other canons had only submitted to a visitation, and not insisted on it. After this exaggeration, Coninx and Beckers go on to argue that, to guarantee impartiality, the government had appointed Messmecker as independent commissioner, and the three commissioners together would have managed just fine, so that Van Kempen’s request for a visitation by the prior general himself was as baseless as his rejection of Haas. For these reasons, Beckers and Coninx ask the government to command Van Kempen to vindicate Haas and to submit to the visitation.

The government responded that same day by letting Coninx and Beckers know that they had entrusted the settlement of the discord at Gaesdonck to the dean of the collegiate church of St Mary at Cleves, Heijden. The task entrusted to him was sothane Differentien unter ihnen in der Güte beizulegen und zu vergleichen, which is a much more pro-active mission than the one with which Messmecker had been entrusted, probably indicating that the government wanted to end the difficulties as soon as possible. Whereas his predecessor had been ordered to attend the visitation and make sure that no laws were violated, Heijden was to make an active attempt at reconciliation. The dean received this order on 13 December, and arrived at Gaesdonck the next day. He described his experiences there with great accuracy in a lengthy diary covering 14-21 December.

When Heijden arrived at Gaesdonck, he was welcomed by Coninx, who had arrived there together with Beckers sometime after Haas. It is likely that Coninx had hoped for a visitation, so necessary for spiritual discipline and monastic economics, could be delayed for months, even years; 2) that a rejection is by itself entirely baseless and suspect under these circumstances, and that its perpetrator shuns the light of day, as Your Royal Majesty most graciously added a secular commissioner to the commissioners who had been appointed by the general superior; 3) that the entirely vague rejection which is on record is aimed at nothing else than to cause ever more expenses, and to make the case unpleasant for all three commissioners in this harsh time of winter; 4) to confuse also the priests of the convent of Gaesdonck, all of whom, with two exceptions, insisted on the visitation according to subscriptions they wrote in their own hands; 5) Van Kempen, prior at Gaesdonck, is on record as not rejecting Prior Haas if only the prior general would himself be present at the visitation, which is laughable, stupid and inconsistent, as the prior general’s presence is unnecessary and the appointed commissioners do exactly the same. We therefore most humbly pray Your Royal Majesty to vouchsafe to most graciously order Van Kempen, prior at Gaesdonck, that he immediately and without the least delay corroborate his reported rejection of Prior Haas with adequate arguments, and for lack of these most obediently accept the visitation, so that a convent which exists under Your Royal Majesty’s ceaseless protection and shelter might continue to survive according to its ancient foundation and Rule both in spiritual and temporal things’ (ff. 30r-31r).

1 According to a copy of their response written on the back of Coninx and Beckers’ letter of 12 December (f. 31v).
2 ‘Settle amicably and resolve any such disagreements among them.’ This is taken from a copy of the government’s message to Heijden, dated 12 December, written on the back of Messmecker’s letter of 6 December (f. 29v).
3 Ff. 37-51. Heijden sent this diary to the government with a letter of 28 December (ff. 34-36), on which see p. 104.
4 Coninx and Beckers’ arrival at Gaesdonck was reported to Heijden by Prior Van Kempen, but without any mention of a date (f. 40r). In his continuation of the Gaesdonck chronixken, Joannes Loyens writes: Haes et Coninx per sex hebdomadas hic permanerunt sumptibus canonie. Quibus etiam associatus fuerit D. confrater Beckers rector in Düersen (‘Haas and Coninx stayed here for six weeks at the canony’s expense. Associated with them was the rev. confrère Beckers, rector in Deursen’, Höv 29, p. 118). The fact that they are all mentioned together like this would seem to indicate that Coninx and Beckers joined Haas very shortly after his arrival on 26 November 1774. The precise date of their departure is not known either, but in his letter to the government of 22 January 1775, Heijden would report that Haas, Coninx and Beckers had no longer been at Gaesdonck when he arrived there on 12 January (f. 114r). The period between 26 November and 12 January is
private interview with the dean, but the duo was immediately intercepted by Prior Van Kempen, who brought Heijden to Commissioners Haas and Van Bree. The dean informed them of his own commission, and subsequently asked Van Kempen to convok the canons to enable him to announce his governmental appointment. When all the religious of Gaesdonck, including Coninx and Beckers, were gathered in the refectory, Heijden read them the government’s commission and requested Van Kempen to instruct the community to cooperate if he needed any information. Thereupon Coninx said that he needed to read Heijden something as well, and produced the letter which he and Beckers had received from the government, in which they had been informed of Heijden’s task. He proceeded to read this document, although it is difficult to see what he sought to achieve with this, as the description of Heijden’s mission in his own letter was practically the same as that in the dean’s. It is clear, in any case, that Coninx considered Heijden to be a threat, but the dean interrupted him by saying that the letter concerned only Coninx and Beckers, and that he should not read it out.

Heijden then went back to Haas and Van Bree, but the trio was immediately joined by Coninx, who tried once more to read his letter, this time to the two commissioners. Heijden urged Coninx to leave off and show him some respect, whereupon Coninx answered: *dat dient u niet.* As a result of this treatment, Heijden asked Haas and Van Bree to make sure that Coninx would not bother him any longer, and said that he wanted to have another room, or else he would have to spend the night outside of Gaesdonck. Haas and Van Bree assented, and that evening Heijden shared his meal not only with the two commissioners, but also with Van Kempen, Coninx and Beckers in a tense but composed atmosphere.

The next day, Thursday 15 December, Van Bree came to Heijden to tell him that he intended to leave, first because he had obligations in Weert and in Brabant which he could not neglect any longer, and second because he gathered that no visitation would take place before Van Kempen’s accusations against Haas were withdrawn. He did promise to return as soon as Haas’ position had been sorted out and everything was ready for the visitation to be made. After Van Bree’s departure, Heijden went to Haas, who was in the presence of Coninx and Beckers. After the latter had left, Haas and Heijden talked about the accusations leveled against the commissioner by Van Kempen and how to resolve the disagreements which had arisen between them. The dean left feeling confident about Haas’ willingness to cooperate.

Coninx, Beckers and Van Kempen were present again at the midday meal, and afterwards Heijden invited Haas to walk with him and discuss the situation yet again. The latter insisted that Van Kempen first had to retract his accusations of partiality, and when Heijden asked him to make some suggestions for the improvement of the situation, Haas merely answered by saying that he expected the suggestions to come from the dean instead.

1 Ff. 29v and 31v. The only material difference between the two letters is that Heijden is given a reason for his appointment: *da […] verschiedene Irrungen, besonders auch wegen der daseblst vorzunehmenden Ordens Visitation entstanden sind, welche zu vielen weitere Irrungen Anlaß geben können* (‘because […] many errors have arisen, especially because of the visitation which is intended to be made there by the order, which could give cause for many more errors’, f. 29v). There is no equivalent to this passage in the letter addressed to Coninx and Beckers, which is simply framed as a reply to theirs.

2 F. 37v-v.

3 ‘You are not entitled to that’ (f. 38r, emphasis in the original).

4 F. 37v-38v.

5 F. 38v. According to Haas’ letter of 11 January 1775, Van Bree had to attend an election (f. 86r-v), probably of a prior.

6 F. 38v-39r.

7 F. 39r.
It had become clear to Heijden that he needed more information on the source of the troubles at Gaesdonck, and so he turned to Van Kempen. He found the prior ganz niedergeschlagen but willing to talk.\(^1\) Van Kempen gave an elaborate account of the events of the past few weeks, starting with his reasons for mistrusting Haas. Not only had the commissioner blazoned about that he was going to depose Gaesdonck’s prior, subprior and procurator, überdehme legte der beständige Umgang welchen der Haas mit dem Konings Prioren zu Uedem und dem Nonnen Rectoren Beckers hätte, deutlich gnug an Tage, daß er praecoccupiret und partialis wäre.\(^2\) He then goes on to relate Haas’ unexpected arrival at Gaesdonck, and reports that die H. Konings und Beckers wären nachhero auch gekommen, um daselbst es ihnen auf des Closters kosten wohl seijn zu laβen und gleichfals den meister zu spielen.\(^3\) Coninx had evidently tried to persuade Van Kempen to accept Haas as commissioner, but Van Kempen had answered that, Coninx being prior in Uedem, they had no authority over or responsibility towards each other anymore.\(^4\)

Heijden advised Van Kempen, for the love of God and with an eye to his old age, to resign and to spend the rest of his days as ex-prior at Gaesdonck or in Hülm, where he had been parish priest before becoming prior. If he chose the latter option, Heijden would try to make sure that he would receive a pension. Van Kempen was willing to take this course, but only if he could resign honourably and without loss of face.\(^5\)

Van Kempen then proceeded to tell Heijden about his relationship with Coninx, Beckers and the other canons of Gaesdonck. He told the dean about the unsuccessful attempt on Coninx’ part at becoming prior of Gaesdonck in 1760 and his subsequent moves to Kranenburg and Uedem. Dem Beckers hätte er van Kempen erlaubnüs gegegeben das Rectorat zu Doersden anzunehmen, mithin wüsste er nicht, wie beijde H. anjetzo so sehr wieder ihme aufgebracht wären, da er ihnen doch niemahls böses wohl aber viel gutes gethan hätte.\(^6\) Among the other canons there were some, both young and old, who were not as well-behaved as he might wish, although there were also others who were very good.\(^7\)

The prior then turned the conversation to Gaesdonck’s financial situation, and to Procurator Wooningh, whom Haas had said he was also going to depose. Van Kempen reported that Wooningh had been very ill and that his recovery had cost a lot of money, but that his relatives had paid most of the expenses. The procurator had already begun working, against the advice of his doctor, and although he was somewhat behind in his bookkeeping, this did not worry Van Kempen overmuch. Wooningh had continued to be actively involved in Gaesdonck’s financial situation during his sickness, and although the political instability had cost the convent a lot of money, they had managed to pay off many of their debts.\(^8\)

---

1 ‘Deeply depressed’ (f. 39v).
2 ‘Haas’ continuous association with Coninx, the prior in Uedem, and Beckers, the nuns’ rector, also brought to light clearly enough that he was biased and partial’ (f. 39v). It is probably as a result of this conversation with Heijden, and certainly before the drawing up of Heijden’s pro memoria the day after, that Van Kempen wrote a statement, an undated copy of which (ff. 52-53) is included in Heijden’s letter of 28 December (ff. 34-60), in which he declared that he suspected Haas of being partial, that he would be willing to provide reasons for this suspicion before a competent judge, and that he would accept Van Bree as commissioner, but only after Haas had left Gaesdonck (f. 52r).
3 ‘The Rev Coninx and Beckers afterwards also came, in order to live the good life there at the convent’s expense and boss around as well’ (f. 40r).
4 Ff. 39v-40r.
5 F. 40r-v.
6 ‘He, Van Kempen, had given Beckers permission to become rector in Deursen, so he did not know how both gentlemen had been stirred up against him so much, as he had never done them any wrong but rather much good’ (f. 41r).
7 F. 41r-v.
8 Ff. 41v-42v.
Van Kempen concluded their conversation by saying that he was unaware of having done anything wrong, although he knew that it was impossible to manage the convent in such a way as to please everyone—it would be counter-effective to be too strict, however. He also expressed his willingness to submit to a visitation, if only he could trust the visitators to be impartial.¹

The next day, Friday 16 December, Heijden again spoke with Commissioner Haas and asked him if he had changed his mind. Haas persisted, however, in demanding that Van Kempen should first deny the accusations that he had leveled against him, and declared that he would stay at Gaesdonck until this had happened. He added that die Canonici des Closters bestünden auf die Visitation, solche wäre auch sehr nötig, weilen keine Disciplin mehr aufm Closter wäre.² This was the same exaggeration that Coninx and Beckers had presented; the fact that almost all canons had consented to a visitation taking place did not mean that they had insisted on one. Heijden tried to persuade the commissioner to reconcile himself with Van Kempen, but Haas would not budge.³

The dean subsequently turned to Prior Van Kempen again, and urged him to try and restore peace in his convent, to his own disadvantage if necessary. This caused the prior to break down emotionally; he assented and asked Heijden to take some measures for improvement. Heijden drew up a pro memoria, stating, first, that Van Kempen accepted Haas as a rightfully appointed and fair-minded visitator, second, that Van Kempen would make known four weeks in advance of the next meeting of the general chapter, scheduled for 12-13 July 1775, that he accepted the visitation and whether he chose to step down as prior. In case of the latter, if he decided to stay at Gaesdonck, he would enjoy all the privileges of a former prior, but if he chose to go to Hülz instead, he would receive a pension and always have a room reserved for him at Gaesdonck.⁴ Van Kempen accepted these stipulations, although he also asked if Heijden could make sure that Haas, Coninx and Beckers would leave as soon as possible.⁵

Following the afternoon meal, where nothing could be discussed because of the presence of Coninx and Beckers, Heijden again went for a walk with Haas and discussed the pro memoria with him. Haas accepted it as well, and requested Heijden to make sure that the visitation would take place before the meeting of the general chapter. Heijden suggested that it should be possible to make the visitation on 1 May, and asked Haas to make an arrangement on the basis of his pro memoria, which should be drawn up in threefold—one copy for the government, one for Van Kempen and one for himself—and which he would be free to discuss with two other canons of Gaesdonck.⁶

Believing that everything was now under control, and in order to improve the relationship between the commissioner and the prior, Heijden also told Haas that Van Kempen had accused him of partiality primarily because he had been told that Haas had always intended to depose him. Haas denied everything, but conceded that Van Kempen was right in accusing him if that was what he had heard.⁷

---

¹ F. 42v.
² ‘The canons of the convent insisted on a visitation, and this was indeed urgently needed, as there was no discipline in the convent anymore’ (f. 43r).
³ Ff. 42v-43r.
⁴ Ff. 54r. Heijden sent this pro memoria (ff. 54-55) to the government with his letter of 28 December (ff. 34-36).
⁵ F. 43r-v.
⁶ Ff. 43v-44r.
⁷ F. 44r. In order to corroborate his report, Heijden says that he showed Haas two letters which apparently contained information regarding these circumstances, but which seem not to be part of the surviving documents. Heijden asked Haas to return these letters to him on 17 December (f. 48r) and again on 21 December (f. 51r), but on both occasions, Haas refused and said that he wanted to have copies made of them. It is likely that Haas would go on to use these letters against Guardian Te Koock at the general chapter on 12-13 July 1775.
About nine o’clock in the evening, Heijden went to Haas again to inquire if he had finished his arrangement yet. He found the commissioner writing busily, *und die beijde Konings und Beckers gewöhnlicher maßen beij ihme.*¹ After they had left, Haas read Heijden his arrangement, which stipulated, first, that Van Kempen should very contritely retract his accusations, second, that he should make known his decisions regarding his possible withdrawal and move to Hülm by 2 February, and third, that henceforth he could not make any important decisions anymore without consulting Haas first and subsequently being assisted by Coninx or one of his representatives. Should Van Kempen decide to move to Hülm, he would not receive a pension.² Hövelmann interprets this turn of events as an indication that Haas was merely a pawn used by Coninx in order to make sure that he would become prior of Gaesdonck. It would appear that he is right, especially given that the commissioner is suggesting a merely advisory role for himself and an executive role for Coninx.³

Heijden responded to this unexpected development, which was clearly instigated by Coninx and Beckers, by asking Haas to hand him his draft papers and retiring to his room again to draw up his own version of the arrangement. This draft was based on Heijden’s own *pro memoria,* but incorporated two changes that are clearly based on Haas’ suggestions: first, that Van Kempen is now said to apologise for his accusations, and second, that he will not make any important decisions without Haas’ approval and assistance. It is noteworthy that no mention is made of Coninx.

After about two hours, Heijden let Haas, who by this time was once more accompanied by Coninx and Beckers, know that he had finished. Half an hour later, the commissioner came to him and, after having been read Heijden’s draft and having it explained to him, he refused all cooperation, saying that the community would not accept this proposal. Heijden responded by asking him why he had accepted the *pro memoria* if that were the case, but Haas did not answer. The dean then told him that this meant that he could not accomplish anything anymore and that he would leave for Cleves the next morning. He had to admit, however, that Haas’ intimate association with Coninx and Beckers made him question his impartiality. Haas answered that *alles dies von ihme nicht dependire, der Konings und Beckers speisten mit ihme an einer Tafel Er könnte diese nicht heischen weg gehen, der Konings wäre auch Prior, sie kämen beijde zu ihme.*⁵ Heijden responded by saying that Haas should have at least realised that his behaviour, and Beckers and Coninx’ insistence to stay even at Gaesdonck at the convent’s expense, would make a suspicious impression on Van Kempen, and with that his report of this conversation ends.

The next day, Saturday 17 December, Heijden went to Haas’ room, this time to find him alone with his servants. The commissioner was immediately called away, however, and when he returned, he told Heijden that a canon had come to him to say that, if peace and order were not restored and no visitation were made, he would be forced to move to Uedem or Straelen—not coincidentally the places where Coninx and Haas were prior. The dean answered that Haas should simply assert his authority as commissioner, and try to restore peace. He also announced that he had to go to Cleves on other business, but that he intended

---

¹ ‘And both Coninx and Beckers in his presence, as usual’ (f. 44v).
² F. 44v.
³ Hövelmann 1987b, 16.
⁴ Ff. 56r-58v. Heijden sent this draft arrangement (ff. 56-59) to the government with his letter of 28 December (ff. 34-36).
⁵ ‘All this did not depend on him. Coninx and Beckers ate with him at the same table, and he could not demand them to leave. Coninx was prior as well, and they both came to him’ (f. 47r).
⁶ Ff. 44v-47r.
to return the next day. As it turned out, circumstances prevented Heijden from returning until Tuesday 20 December, although he did contact Haas by letter in the meantime.\(^1\)

The dean reports that, as he was nearing Gaesdonck again around noon, he saw *den P. Haas mit dem Konings und Beckers wieder im Garthen spatzieren*, and *vermuthete nicht ohne Grund, daß auch diese Reijse abermahlen fruchtlos ablaufen dorffe. Wie sie mich erblickten separirten sie sich von einander, der Haas kame auf den Vorhof mir entgegen.*\(^2\) The commissioner wanted to bring Heijden to Prior Van Kempen, but Heijden said he would rather speak with Haas himself. He revealed that, during his stay in Cleves, he had discussed the situation at Gaesdonck with the head of the district, who had said that the differences between Heijden’s *pro memoria* and Haas’ were so small as to be negligible, and that Haas should simply assert his authority as commissioner to restore peace and quiet. Haas responded that he was not able to do anything, but that Heijden was free to turn to Coninx. Heijden refused, because Coninx had treated him very disrespectfully and would probably continue to do so. When Haas answered that he would be willing to be present at their meeting, Heijden responded by saying that he would talk to him, and him alone, as he was the only one who could end this situation. If the problems were not solved very soon, he would have to report on them.\(^3\) He proceeded then to give a candid account of his assessment of the situation.

Ein jeder ohnpartheijischer würde die beständige Conversation, welche er Haas mit dem P. Konings und Beckers hätte als aufgebracht und partiæ bemercken. Der Konings und Beckers müsten billig nach ihren Closteren gehen da alsdenn die Aufhetzereijen unter denen anderen Geistlichen cessiren, und Hoffnung seijn würde die Gemüther zu besanfftigen. Er müste mir nicht verdencken, wenn ich hiemit declarirte wie ich seit meines Aufenthalts dahier sehr misvergnügt und zuverläßig bemercket hätte, daß die beijde Konings und Beckers nicht allein ihme P. Haas eingenommen, sondern auch andere Geistliche mit in Unruhe zu bringen und die Verwirrungen beijm Glaβ Wein vehementer zu machen sich angelegen seijn ließen. Ich müste die Conduitte jener dem Konings und Beckers beijgetretern sein sovllenden Geistlichen des P. Haas eigenem Urthel überlaßen, und ob diese wohl so viel Talenten hätten, daß man mit ihnen in Friede und Ruhe leben könnte. Ich wäre versichert, daß wenn ein unpartheijischer Richter diese vorforderte er darüber gar keine favorable Zeugnüsse würde abgeben können.\(^4\)

Haas had nothing to say to this, but instead revealed that the canon who had told him that he was planning on moving had been Stephanus Schelle, Beckers’ predecessor as subprior of Gaesdonck. Heijden responded that this surprised him, as he knew Schelle to be an honest man.\(^5\)

After dinner, Heijden had Schelle brought to him to ask if the latter was satisfied with his prior. The man assented, and said that, although he had submitted to the visitation that had been ordered by Prior General Schmallen, he had not requested it. He merely wished that all disagreement in the convent would cease. Van Kempen had requested him to become subprior again, but he had refused. Heijden asked Schelle to do whatever he could to restore the peace,\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Ff. 47r-48r.

\(^2\) ‘Prior Haas walking with Coninx and Beckers in the garden again, and I suspected, not without reason, that this journey would prove fruitless once again. When they saw me they separated from one another, and Haas came to meet me at the forecourt’ (f. 48v).

\(^3\) Ff. 48v-49v.

\(^4\) ‘Any impartial person would judge the continuous conversations which Haas had with Prior Coninx and Beckers to be inflammatory and partial. Coninx and Beckers should in all fairness go to their own convents, for then the provocations among the other religious would cease and there could be hope of calming people’s feelings. He should not take it ill of me if I at once also declared that, during my stay here, I had learned, reliably and with great displeasure, that both Coninx and Beckers were not only favourably disposed towards Prior Haas, but also allowed themselves to cause unrest among other religious and to make the confusion even greater over a glass of wine. I had to leave to Prior Haas’ own judgement the behaviour of the religious who had associated themselves with Coninx and Beckers, and the question whether these were at all capable enough to be lived with in peace and quiet. I was sure, however, that if any impartial judge would summon them, he would not be able to give a positive testimony regarding this matter’ (ff. 49v-50r).

\(^5\) F. 50r-v. On Schelle, see Appendix B, no. 10.
and then sent him away.\footnote{Ff. 50v-50ar.} There were no signs that Haas’ report of Schelle’s intentions to move was true.

During the evening meal, Heijden did not have the opportunity to speak with Haas, as Coninx was also present. He retired to his own rooms, where his servant told him that one of the other canons, Joannes Bosch, whom Heijden believed to be one of Coninx’ supporters, had talked with him.\footnote{On Bosch, see Appendix B, no. 2. There is no evidence regarding Bosch’ sympathies apart from Heijden’s statement here and the fact that he had assented to a visitation when asked about it by Haas on 1 December (f. 92r).} He had told the servant that Heijden should leave and stop bossing around here, but when the servant had answered that he would tell his master about this, Bosch pretended not to have said anything and merely to want to help him feed the horses. Heijden did not attach much importance to this occurrence.\footnote{Ff. 50ar-v.}

The next day, Wednesday 21 December, the dean wanted to speak with Haas, but did not succeed, weil\en die beijde Klägere Konings und Beckers mit dem P. Haas im Garthen spatzierten. Ich wartete eine halbe Stunde, weil\en aber erwehnte mit ihrer Promenade continuirten, so verfügte ich mich zum beklägten Prioren.\footnote{‘Because both complainants, Coninx and Beckers, were walking with Prior Haas in the garden. I waited for half an hour, but because the above-mentioned continued their walk, I betook myself to the accused prior’ (f. 50av).} Van Kempen told Heijden that, now that Haas had dismissed the stipulations which they had agreed upon, he did not consider himself bound by them anymore either. He merely wanted to await the decisions of his superiors, but asked Heijden to make sure that Haas, Coninx and Beckers would leave, so that peace and quiet could once more return to the convent and the community could save a little bit of money after the expenses that had been incurred.\footnote{F. 50av.}

Heijden then went in search of Haas, Coninx and Beckers, who were still walking in the garden. They accompanied the dean to the cloister, where Coninx and Beckers withdrew to let Haas and Heijden have a word in private. Heijden said that he regretted that his efforts had not accomplished anything, and he told Haas once again that Friede Ruhe und Einigkeit nicht erfolgen würde als lang der P. Konings und Beckers auf der Canonie wären.\footnote{‘Peace, quiet and unity could not be accomplished as long as Prior Coninx and Beckers were at the canonry’ (f. 51r).} Haas merely responded by asking what Schelle had told Heijden at their meeting on the evening before, and Heijden told him. He then proceeded to take his leave of Van Kempen and of the commissioner, who told him that he intended to go to Cleves the next day, as he wished to speak to the head of the district. After requesting Haas to call on him as well, Heijden left Gaesdonck.

This is where Heijden’s diary ends. Later that same day, the other two remaining canons out of the six who had originally signed the letter of 15 March, Van Oeyen and Van Steenbergen, as well as Schelle and Bosch, signed a warrant authorising Coninx and Beckers to request the government at Cleves to allow Haas to go on with the visitation and to receive the help of a lawyer in this matter if necessary.\footnote{F. 103r. This warrant (f. 103) is part of a letter to the government by the lawyer Caspar Sethe of 11 January 1775 (ff. 98-106), on which see pp. 106-107. Schelle’s involvement in the warrant seems to be in contradiction with his testimony to Heijden on the day before, and indeed, by his own account, he had been tricked into signing it by Coninx and Beckers, see f. 125r and p. 107.} This appears to indicate that Coninx and Beckers, unsuccessful at winning Heijden for their cause, wanted to make another attempt at forcing a visitation with the help of a lay government official, rather than an ecclesiastic. It is likely that Coninx and Beckers made immediate use of their authorisation.
On Tuesday 27 December, the government at Cleves received a letter from a certain Van Oven, a lawyer specialised in criminal law. This letter accuses Haas of having made a visitation at Gaesdonck three years earlier without having obtained the government’s consent or the assistance of a governmental commissioner, which was punishable by law. He is also said to have caused the convent great unrest, and Van Oven suggests to have him arrested and taken into custody in Goch. It is not known who is responsible for involving Van Oven.

The next day, Heijden sent his diary to the government, accompanied by a letter in which he explained his position. He explicitly states that Haas called *den grösten Verdacht eines aufgebrachten partheijischen Mannes* upon himself, and that Conings und Beckers durch ihre Conversicula viele Verwirrungen rege machen, besonders beij ein oder anderem Geistlichen, deme nach Beschaffenheit seines Cörpers eine besondere Mäßigkeit allerdings nötig ist. The latter probably refers to Procurator Wooningh. Heijden wonders why Coninx and Beckers chose to stay at Gaesdonck, away from their duties and at the convent’s expense, even after Van Kempen had requested them to leave. Given the fact that their presence was not necessary for the visitation, it would seem that it had other reasons, evidently unrelated to the improvement of the convent’s economy. Heijden expresses concern about Coninx, Beckers and Haas’ partiality, and requests that the government order them to leave and appoint a reliable commissioner to make the visitation.

On the same day, the government also received a letter from a lawyer named Caspar Sethe, who had been warranted by Coninx and Beckers to take up their cause. On behalf of Coninx, Beckers, Van Oeyen, Bosch, Van Steenbergen and Schelle, Sethe explained the circumstances leading up to Heijden’s departure. He argued that it was not surprising that the dean had failed in his task to restore peace and quiet, as that would only have been possible after a visitation had laid bare the precise nature of the situation. Also, being a secular priest, he was not in a position to deal with matters which properly belonged to a congregation. Van Kempen’s objections against Haas were baseless, and the government should therefore make sure that he submitted to the visitation and paid the commissioner’s expenses.

In answer to these three letters, the government decided, on Thursday 29 December, to dismiss Haas, partly because of the accusations recently leveled against him, but principally because of the unlawful visitation in 1771, at least until the accusations were rejected. Heijden, on the other hand, was to complete his assignment. This message was sent to all parties involved—Van Oven, Haas, Heijden and the canons of Gaesdonck—in January 1775.

---

1 Ff. 32-33. For Van Oven’s occupation, see the salutation of the copy of the government’s response on the back of his letter (f. 33v).
2 Ff. 32r-33r.
3 Ff. 35r-36v. The letter itself (ff. 35-36) was sent in a folder (ff. 34v60) and accompanied by Heijden’s diary (ff. 37-51), the statement by Van Kempen regarding Haas (ff. 52-53), the *pro memoria* of 16 December (ff. 54-55) and Heijden’s draft arrangement (ff. 56-59).
4 ‘The gravest suspicion of being an inflammatory, partial man’ (f. 35v).
5 ‘Coninx and Beckers, by means of their meetings, cause much confusion to flare up, especially in a certain religious, who, due to his bodily condition, is nevertheless in need of particular moderation’ (f. 35v).
6 Ff. 35v-36v.
7 Ff. 61-68. Sethe’s warrant (ff. 104-105) is part of his letter of 11 January (ff. 98-106). The warrant is dated 3 January, which is odd, given that Sethe’s first letter on behalf of Coninx *cum suis* is dated 28 December. On Sethe himself, see Hövelmann 1987b, 23.
8 Ff. 62r-65r.
9 Ff. 65r-66v.
10 This is evident from copies of the government’s messages written on the back of Van Oven’s letter of 27 December (f. 33v), on the back of Heijden’s letter of 28 December (f. 60v) and on the front of Sethe’s letter of the same date (f. 61r).
On Saturday 7 January 1775, however, Haas, who was apparently still at Gaesdonck despite his dismissal, convened with Van Kempen, Van Oeyen, Schelle, Bosch and Joannes Schadden and interrogated the prior about the visitation of 1771. Van Kempen testified that he remembered that Schmallen and Haas had indeed intended to make a visitation and that this would have happened with his consent. However, the plan had been abandoned as soon as they learned that it would be against the law to make a visitation without explicit governmental consent and supervision. The next day, Haas wrote the government a letter in which he included a transcription of this interview and objected to his dismissal as commissioner, introducing various arguments. With regard to his accusation, he argued that Van Kempen should have complained about him to Prior General Schmallen and not to the government. With regard to the visitation in 1771, Haas argued that, not only did this not have any bearing on the current situation, there also had not actually been an unlawful visitation at all, as Van Kempen himself had testified the day before.

In addition to Haas’ letter, the government also received a second letter by Sethe in which he objects to Haas’ dismissal on behalf of Coninx cum suis. They made the same points as Haas had, adding that Heijden, being a secular priest, completely misunderstood and underestimated the situation. In explaining this, they finally shed more light on the nature of the supposed mismanagement on the part of the prior, subprior and procurator of Gaesdonck, as alluded to in the original letter of 15 March 1774.

Given that Heijden was ignorant enough to consider this to be simply a matter of fraternal discord, Coninx and his associates asked the government to make sure that the dean would not have anything more to do with Gaesdonck. In the meantime they requested a transcript of Heijden’s diary, so that they could prepare a response. As they had feared, rumour of the unfortunate situation was already getting around.

The government responded the next day, Monday 9 January, that they would not reverse their decision. The reasons they gave to Haas were, first, that Messmecker and Heijden had raised some important objections against him, and second, that his fellow

---

1 A certified copy of a transcript of this interrogation is included in Haas’ letter of 8 January (f. 72r). On Schadden, see Appendix B, no. 9.
2 Ff. 69-74. The letter covers ff. 69r-71v, and the copy of the transcript of the interview covers f. 72r.
3 Hövelmann 1987b, 25 notes that Van Kempen had not actually, at this point, turned to the government at all, but this is not certain. It is possible that the prior wrote a letter which does not survive, or that he was behind the letter written by Van Oven (ff. 32r-33r). On top of this, there is the copy of Van Kempen’s undated testimony against Haas (ff. 52-53) in Heijden’s letter of 28 December 1774 (ff. 34-60), and Heijden later testifies, in his letter of 22 January 1775 (ff. 113-130) that Van Kempen had contacted Schmallen (f. 115r).
4 The letter consists of ff. 75-83.
5 Ff. 78v-80v.
6 ‘What things are like here with us both spiritually and temporally, we will leave aside for now, for it could easily happen all over the world that a monastery’s best shrubs should be cut down, that the application of many thousands of rix-dollars should be unknown, that for nine years no accounts should be kept, although the statutes most strongly command this to be done every year, that matters of the greatest importance, in which the council brothers’ agreement would be most necessary, were handled haphazardly and recklessly, yes even illicitly, and so forth; that the monastery’s spiritual discipline has been entirely undermined and that the convent’s spiritual and temporal ruin is near’ (ff. 80v-81v).
7 Ff. 81v-82v. The attestation that rumours about the troubles at Gaesdonck were indeed spreading is confirmed by the transcript of Van Nuys’ answers in the report of the visitation of 19-22 September (f. 151v).
commissioner, Van Bree, had withdrawn entirely from the visitation.¹ The canons of Gaesdonck were given other reasons, however: first, that it appeared from Messmecker and Heijden’s reports that they were themselves the cause of the discord among the canons, and second, that the rest of the community did not desire a visitation at all.² It would seem that the government intended to put all parties involved in their places.

The next day saw the renewed involvement of Prior General Schmallen himself. Among the archival records is an incomplete copy of a letter by him, in which he writes that he intends to go to Gaesdonck and see to the situation there himself. In the meantime, he asks the addressee, who is not identified, to leave the matter to Heijden, unless the government should arrange otherwise.³ Hövelmann thinks this letter could have been addressed to both Haas or Van Kempen,⁴ but it seems Haas is the likelier candidate. Not only is Gaesdonck identified as canoniam istam, ‘that canonry’, rather than canoniam vestram, ‘your canonry’, but Haas would also seem to be the one who most needed to be told to commit the state of affairs to Heijden.

Schmallen’s letter did not change Haas’ and Coninx’ tactics, however. On Wednesday 11 January, the government again received a letter from Haas, in which he argued that his dismissal was undeserved.⁵ He had been properly authorised by the government, so if he was to be dismissed at all, that course of action should at least have been properly substantiated. Instead, he writes, Van Kempen’s accusations were simply being taken at face value, even though he had not provided any evidence whatsoever, and had simply been trying to delay the visitation.⁶ Haas also added that Van Bree had not actually withdrawn, but that he had been called away only temporarily because he had to attend an election, probably of a prior.⁷ On top of this, he argued that all ordained canons of Gaesdonck, except for the prior, the subprior and the procurator, had expressed themselves in favour of a visitation, with but two exceptions.⁸ He therefore requested that his dismissal be reverted, and that Van Kempen be given a deadline before which he must provide support for the accusations he had leveled against Haas.⁹

On the same day, the government also received a third letter from the lawyer Sethe, this time said to be on behalf of Bosch, Schelle and all six original letter writers, including,

¹ This appears from a copy of the government’s answer written on the back of Haas’ letter of 8 January (f. 74v). As reported in Heijden’s diary (f. 38v), Van Bree had intended to return (at least initially), but only after the accusations leveled against Haas had been sorted out.
² According to a copy of the government’s answer written on the back of Sethe’s letter of 8 January (f. 83v).
³ F. 127r. This partial copy (ff. 127-128) is part of Heijden’s letter of 22 January (ff. 113-130).
⁴ Hövelmann 1987b, 26.
⁵ Ff. 84-95. The actual letter covers ff. 84r-86v and 95r-v. It was accompanied by Messmecker’s account of 3 December 1774 (ff. 87, 94) and certified transcriptions of Bonrath’s testimony of what happened on 28 November (ff. 88-89), the letter of 15 March (ff. 90-91) and a transcript of Haas’ interrogation of 1 December (ff. 92-93).
⁶ Ff. 84v-86r.
⁷ F. 86r-v. It appears from Van Bree’s own testimony, as related in Heijden’s diary (f. 38v) that he had indeed originally intended to return to Gaesdonck, but only after the accusations leveled against Haas had been sorted out (f. 38v).
⁸ Ff. 86v and 95r. This is indeed what is evident from two of the documents which Haas append to his letter as corroborative evidence: copies of the letter of 15 March 1774 (f. 90r) and of a transcript of his interrogation of 1 December (f. 92r). Heijden’s diary (f. 37v) reveals that the community of Gaesdonck consisted of six more religious at the time, i.e. two converse brothers (Petrus de Langh and Oswaldus van Zedlits) and four canons who had not yet been ordained at this point (Schadden, Antonius Weegman, Arnoldus van Nuys and Joannes van Haaren), but these had no vote in the chapter and their opinion was therefore considered irrelevant. Heijden would later conclude that only Van Oeyen, Van Steenbergen and Bosch actually supported Coninx and Beckers (f. 115r), on which see p. 107. For biographical information on De Langh, Van Haaren, Van Nuys, Van Zedlits and Weegman, see Appendix B, nos. 4, 11, 14, 17 and 18.
⁹ F. 95r-v.
surprisingly enough, Loyens and Ruyss. They presented the same arguments and asked for the same things as Haas himself, although they highlighted the unreliability of Heijden’s report and added the threat that if their letter were not taken into serious consideration, they would take their appeal higher up.

The government proved inexorable. The next day, Thursday 12 January, they told Haas that he was only making himself more suspect by his incessant complaining, and that they stood by his dismissal in favour of Heijden. Coninx and associates received an answer that was largely the same.

That same day, Heijden, who had been instructed on 29 December 1774 to continue his reconciliatory efforts, was engaged at Gaesdonck once again. Haas, Coninx and Beckers had finally left by then, and Heijden was asking the inhabitants of the convent what their opinions were on their prior and procurator, and if they desired a visitation. Over the course of three days, Heijden managed to speak with Subprior Koppers, Procurator Wooningh, converse brothers De Langh and Van Zedlits and canons Van Haaren, Weegman, Van Nuys, Schadden, Van Kölcken and Schelle. None of them complained about Van Kempen or Wooningh, and none of them were particularly desirous of a visitation. Heijden had already been in contact with Dijckman, who was travelling but had expressed similar opinions at an earlier stage, and with Loyens and Ruys. The latter had complained about the fact that, even though they had already distanced themselves from the whole affair on 15 April 1774, they had still been mentioned by Coninx and Beckers as one of their companions in their letter to the government of 11 January. A similar story was told by Schelle, whom Heijden interviewed on 13 January. After Van Kempen had accused Haas of being partial, Coninx and Beckers, wanting to enforce a visitation, had sought to involve Schelle in their cause and given him a document to sign, which he had done without thinking. This document had turned out to be the warrant to write the government in request of Haas’ continued involvement and to seek the aid of a lawyer, which is why Schelle’s name appears on Sethe’s letters, even though he had not wished to be involved. Indeed, he intended to let Coninx know by first delivery that he did not want to have anything to do with any of his letters, or with any of the expenses that he had made.

On Tuesday 17 January, Sethe wrote the government a fourth and final letter on behalf of Coninx, Beckers and associates, probably in an attempt to intercept the report of Heijden’s interviews. They claim to have sufficiently refuted the charged which the dean had made against them, and repeat their threat to go higher up as well as their request to receive copies of Heijden’s diary.

On Sunday 22 January, Heijden sent the government a letter to describe the results of his efforts, enclosing also the signed declarations of the canons at Gaesdonck. He concludes that only Coninx, Beckers, Van Oeyen, Van Steenbergen and Bosch truly opposed their prior and reports that Van Kempen had provided Prior General Schmallen with arguments for Haas’ partiality. As Schmallen intended to make a visitation at Gaesdonck himself, Heijden

---

1 Ff. 98-106. The actual letter (ff. 99-102) was sent in a cover (ff. 98^106). It was accompanied by Coninx’ and Beckers’ warrant of 21 December (f. 103) and Sethe’s warrant of 3 January (ff. 104-105).
2 F. 101v. Hövelmann 1987b, 27 makes a reasonable case for them referring to the Elector of the Palatinate.
3 According to a copy of the government’s answer (f. 96r). The copy consists of ff. 96-97.
4 According to a copy of the government’s answer written on the back of Sethe’s letter of 11 January (f. 106v).
5 The following information is taken from Heijden’s letter of 22 January (ff. 113-130).
6 Ff. 99r, 114v-115r.
7 F. 125r-v, cf. ff. 62r, 99r, 103r.
8 Ff. 108r-110v. The letter itself (ff. 108-111) was sent in a cover (ff. 107^112).
9 Ff. 113-130. The actual letter (ff. 114-115) was sent in a cover (ff. 113^130), and is accompanied by the canons’ declarations (ff. 116-126, 129) and a partial copy of Schmallen’s letter of 10 January (ff. 127-128).
10 F. 115r.
requests permission from the government to partake in this visitation as commissioner, and to order Coninx and Beckers to keep quiet and not to put Gaesdonck to any more expense with their unnecessary presence.¹

The day after, the government responded both to Coninx *cum suis* and to Heijden, and their response left no doubt about their position. The canons regular of Gaesdonck were told that, as they had no right to carry out a visitation themselves or to make one happen, they should just keep quiet.² There is no sign that their repeated request for a copy of Heijden’s diary was complied with. The dean himself, instead, was requested to let the government know when the visitation by the Prior General would take place, and that they would appoint him as commissioner.³

Many months later, on 9 September 1775, Heijden responded that Schmallen intended to make the visitation at Gaesdonck around the middle of that month, and to take as second visitorator the prior of the convent of Frenswegen, Christoph Bernhard Kersenbrock.⁴ He requested the government’s permission for this visitation, and to be appointed as governmental commissioner.⁵ The government answered on 11 September that, if Schmallen and Kersenbrock would contact them, they would provide the necessary authorisations.⁶ On 15 September, Schmallen and Kersenbrock wrote the government to report that on 12-13 July the general chapter had given them permission for a visitation at Gaesdonck, and that they now requested the government’s authorisation as well as the aid of a commissioner.⁷ Three days later, the government communicated its consent both to the two visitorators and to Heijden.⁸ Heijden’s instructions were very similar to the ones Messmecker had received on 28 November 1774: he was to be present and make sure that the visitation was carried out in accordance with the law. In addition, if any of the canons caused any difficulties, he would have to settle the matter.

On 20 October, Heijden wrote the government a letter in which he gave an account of the visitation and enclosed a formal report.⁹ It is evident from this report that Heijden, Schmallen and Kersenbrock had arrived at Gaesdonck on Monday 18 September, and that they had received the government’s consent for a visitation later that same day.¹⁰

The day after, the community of Gaesdonck had met with the two visitorators and the commissioner in the chapter-house. Prior General Schmallen had addressed the congregation with a spiritual exhortation and read them the government’s consent, after which Heijden had read his appointment.¹¹ The interrogation of the individual religious had started after the midday meal on the same day, and had lasted until Friday 22 September.

All resident religious had been interviewed, with the exception of the converse brothers and Dijckman, who had died on 22 May, and the addition of none other than Beckers, who had apparently come to Gaesdonck for the occasion. Everyone had been asked all or most of six questions which reflected the accusations made in Sethe’s letter of 8

---

¹ F. 115r-v. Heijden corroborates his claim concerning Schmallen’s intention to make the visitation himself by including a partial transcription of the prior general’s letter of 10 January (ff. 127-128).
² According to a copy of the government’s answer written on the front of Sethe’s letter of 17 January (f. 107r).
³ According to a copy of the government’s answer written on the front of Heijden’s letter of 22 January (f. 113r).
⁴ Kersenbrock was prior of Frenswegen from 1773 to 1792 (Kohl 1977, 152).
⁵ F. 131r-v. The letter consists of ff. 131-132.
⁶ According to a copy of their answer on the back of Heijden’s letter of 9 September (f. 132v).
⁷ Ff. 141r-142r. The letter consists of ff. 141-144.
⁸ According to copies of their messages on the back of Schmallen and Kersenbrock’s letter of 15 September (f. 144v).
¹⁰ F. 145r-v.
¹¹ F. 145v.
January.¹ These questions had been, first, whether they were satisfied with Prior Van Kempen; second, if Van Kempen was able to maintain discipline; third, if they knew of any debts having been incurred and if they had been partially paid off; fourth, if the interest on the remaining debts was being paid properly; fifth, if an inordinate amount of wood had been cut and for what reason; and sixth, if they were satisfied with the way Procurator Wooningh carried out his office. Some canons had also been asked if they thought Van Kempen was wasteful or if they had any indications that he had used the convent’s revenues for private purposes.² Every single religious, including Beckers, Van Oeyen, Van Steenbergen and Bosch, had answered these questions in such a way as to take away any doubt about Van Kempen and Wooningh’s good standing. Everyone was satisfied with the way they carried out their offices, despite the procurator’s illness. The French War had caused the canonry to incur a debt of three thousand rix-dollars, but this debt had been partly settled, and the interest on the remaining amount was regularly being paid.³ No unnecessary wood had been cut, not even according to Bosch, a longtime forester.⁴ The answers of the rector of Soeterbeeck may stand for the whole.

Only the answer to the final question contains a hint of criticism, but it is harmlessly presented as hearsay.

After the visitation, the community had convened again, and Prior General Schmallen had exhorted them henceforth to be obedient to their prior. At this moment, Van Kempen had

---

¹ Ff. 80v-81v.
² No mention is made of any questions having been asked with reference to the subprior, despite the fact that Haas was reported as intending to depose him as well (ff. 39v, 134v) and that he was still being denounced by Haas (ff. 86v-87r) and Sethe (f. 100r) in their letters of 11 January. It is likely that this is because Schelle had replaced Koppers as subprior, probably somewhere between January and September 1775, for the visitation report refers to him as subprior (f. 146r-v).
³ The circumstances surrounding the debts are described most elaborately by Procurator Wooningh (f. 149r).
⁴ F. 148r.
⁵ ‘At Gaesdonck on 22 September 1775 the canon regular Beckers, rector of the nuns’ convent in Deursen, was brought up and questioned about the following matters. 1) If he had lived with Prior Van Kempen in peace, quiet and unity; 2) If the prior also kept good discipline, and punished transgressions; 3) If the prior was wasteful or even if he had put the convent’s revenues to his own private uses; 4) If he was aware that the canonry had incurred debts, and why this had happened; 5) If he, Beckers, had also heard that the interest on this claimed capital was not being duly paid; 6) If he was aware that the shrubs had been cut down and ruined; 7) If he knew that a small amount of money had been laid by again. He answered to 1) Yes; 2) Quite well; 3) He could not say so; 4) The debts had been incurred during the latest war; 5) No; 6) He could not say that the shrubs had been cut down and ruined; 7) He had heard that some amount of money had been laid by’ (f. 152r).
Wilhelmus Joannes Coninx had to this failure, however. He was parish priest at Hülm for 40 years, and having been prior here for some years, he died on 29 August 1778. Upon his death, he left us a great benefaction', Höv 46, pp. 11b, 12b).

Reporting briefly on the entire affair in his continuation of the Gaesdonckx Cronicxken, Joannes Loyens, who succeeded Wooningh as prior of Gaesdonck in 1777, writes the following:

Anterioribus annis fuit hic procurator Joannes Wilhelmus Coninx, qui factus est rector monialium in Cranenborgh 1760 et postea prior in Údem, et factus prior mutavit suam professionem ex Gaesdonck in Údem quia Gaesdonckani noluerunt ipsum in priorem eligere. Hic prior Udemiensis Coninx et D. commissarius Haes prior Arenanus voluerunt habere hic anno 1774 visitationem sub priore Petro van Kempen, sed prior Petrus van Kempen except contra dominum Haes commissarium postulans illustrissimum dominum generalem Adolphum Schmallen priorem Ewicanum, qui etiam visitationem instituit cum priore Frenswegiano 24 septembris 1775. Illi duo prænominati Haes et Coninx per sex hebdomadas hic permanserunt summibus canonicis. Quibus etiam associatus fuerit D. confrater Beckers rector in Düersen sed ille poenitentiam suam peregit et optime. Que prætensa visitatio illorum duorum hisce temporibus non erit obliviscenda. Sufficit de hoc negotio et imprudenti processu. Factâ ergo resignatione Petri van Kempen elegerunt in priorem D. Wooning per quinquennium ægrotum.5

1 F. 153r-v. The date is mentioned in CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 38, pp. 35, 62, although p. 61 seems to say 26 September.


3 This is reported both by Beckers in his Canonia Gaesdonckana (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 46, p. 12a), and by Loyens in his continuation of the Cronicxken (Höv 29, p. 118) and in a footnote in the Liber (Höv 38, p. 60). That Coninx changed his profession during or after the events leading up to the visitation of 1775 and not directly after his electoral defeat in 1760, as is implied by Loyens’ account in the Cronicxken, appears from the fact that Coninx still mentioned Gaesdonck as the place where he had made his profession when he signed Sethe’s warrant of 3 January 1775 (f. 104r). He does not appear in the list of canons that make up the community of Gaesdonck at the moment of Loyens’ election on 17 June 1777, as given by the latter in the Cronicxken (Höv 29, pp. 117-118), which means that the change had taken place by that time.

4 As Hövelmann 1987b, 31 notes, Beckers’ testimony about Van Kempen in the Canonia Gaesdonckana is entirely favourable. He writes that Van Kempen had been 40 jaarren pastor zeer lievrijhe te Hûlm […], en alhier eenige jaaren prior, stierf den 29en augustus 1778. Heeft ons naar zijnen dood een groote weldaad naargelaten (‘a very diligent parish priest at Hûlm for 40 years, and having been prior here for some years, he died on 29 August 1778. Upon his death, he left us a great benefaction’, Höv 46, pp. 11b, 12b).

5 ‘In the previous years [before Loyens’ period as procurator from 1760 to 1765] Wilhelmus Joannes Coninx had been procurator here, who was made rector of the nuns in Cranenburg in 1760 and afterwards prior in Údem, and having been made prior changed his profession from Gaesdonck to Údem because those of Gaesdonck had not wanted to elect him as prior. This Údem prior Coninx and the Rev Commissioner Haas, prior of Mariensand, wanted to have a visitation here in the year 1774, under Prior Petrus van Kempen, but Prior Petrus van Kempen took exception to the Reverend Haas, requesting as commissioner the illustrious Prior General Adolph Schmallen, prior in Ewig, who indeed held a visitation with the prior of Frenswegen on 24 September 1775. The aforementioned pair, Haas and Coninx, stayed here for six weeks at the canonry’s expense. Associated with them was the rev. confrère Beckers, rector in Deersen, but he did his penance, and very well. The pretense visitation of those two should not be forgotten in these times. This is enough concerning this affair
It is not known what Beckers’ penance was precisely, but the Windesheim constitutions of 1639 list acts of insubordination, conspiracy and defamation among the graver crimes:

Grauior est culpa; cum quis [...] turpiter, & proteruè cum [Prælatu suo] contenderit. [...] Si qui per conspirationem, coniurationem vel malitiosam concordiam aduersus aliquem (præsertim Prælatum) manifestè se erexerint. Si qui falsum testimonium dixerint: aut crimen quod probare non possint, aliucui imposuerint: tales tanquam infame (secundum Canones) puniantur. Si quis Priorem suum [...] euidenter diffamauerit. [...] Qui in huiusmodi repertus fuerit reus; ter in Capitulo vapulabit, & toties ad terram comedet, officium si habuerit, amittet, vocemque in tractatibus capitolariibus carebit; nec poterit ei vox restitui, aut aliquod officium committi sine Prioris Generalis, aut Visitorum consenso.¹

These stipulations give an idea of what the nature of Beckers’ punishment for his involvement in the Coninx affair might have been, although it is of course impossible to say to what degree the constitutions were actually carried out in his particular case.

Whatever Beckers’ penance consisted of, however, it was enough to normalise his relationship with the convent were he was professed. This is apparent from the fact that he maintained contact with Gaesdonck for the rest of his life. When in 1794 Abbot Gosse of Cysoing visited Soeterbeeck and explained that he was in need of refuge, Beckers wrote a letter to Loyens with a request for help.² After Gaesdonck’s suppression in 1802, Beckers was assigned 3000 guilders, which he indeed received in 1808.³ He also made Joannes Schadden and another confrère, Arnoldus van Eijck, his heirs.⁴ References that occur in various places in his writings show that he kept in touch with Coninx.⁵ Finally, Van

---

¹ It is a graver crime, when any should [...] contend with his superior in an ugly and violent manner. [...] If any should openly raise themselves against anyone (especially a superior) by conspiracy, a plot or malicious concord. If any should give false testimony, or accuse anyone of a crime that cannot be proven: such highly infamous things are to be punished (according to the canons). If anyone should manifestly defame his prior [...] . He who should be found guilty of something of this kind shall be flogged thrice in the chapter, and eat on the ground as often; he shall lose his office, if he should have one, and he shall be deprived of his voice in the acts of the chapter; nor can he be given back his voice, or entrusted with any office, without the consent of the prior general or the visitors’ (pp. 150–151, par. 3).

² See vol. 1, p. 276.

³ CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, declarations 18 July 1805 and 17 September 1808. Beckers intended, after his death, to give one half of this sum to the poor, and the other half to the parish of Uedem, where his brother Jacobus was desservant at the time (Heinrich 1993, 81). In return he expected four Low Masses to be read there for the repose of his soul around the Ember Days for five years on end (A 21, letter 29 August 1805, will of 8 July 1810, letter 19 August 1811).

⁴ CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, will of 30 October 1806, will of 23 September 1808, will of 8 July 1810, declaration of 16 August 1810. Van Eijck was born in Asperden on 24 December 1758 and invested in 5 October 1779. He made his profession on 15 July 1781 and was ordained to the priesthood on 5 April 1783, though he only celebrated his first Mass on 11 May. He died at Gaesdonck on 24 April 1816 (Höv 38, p. 63; cf. Höv 46, p. 12b).

⁵ In his Beschrijving der kloosters en canonike regulier, Beckers reports that Coninx renovated the convent in Uedem circa 1789 (CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 45, 1: 18). In the same book, Beckers also describes a visitation at the convent of Rebdorf, near Eichstädt, which Coninx, in the capacity of secretary of the Congregation of Windesheim, made together with Commissioner Haas (Höv 45, 1: p. 19), Hövelmann 1987b, 32 dates this visitation to somewhere between 1783 and 1786, but as explained in vol. 1, p. 274 n. 6, it is not known if this is merited, and Beckers’ report of the event does not prove that he maintained contact with Haas. The same can be said of his report of Haas’ visitation of Richenberg near Goslar, which took place around 1770 (Höv 45, 1: 15). Beckers does refer to one of the future activities of Van Bree, whom he reports to have been still alive around 1778, about which time he became prior in partibus of the convent of Wittenburg, near Hildesheim, after his term as prior of Mariënhage had ended (Höv 45, 1: p. 14). Van Bree must have been given this honorary title after 1782, for that was when his priorate of Mariënhage ended (Weiler and Geirnaert 1980, 240). The inaccuracy of Beckers’ account is probably the result of an imprecise memory, but it might also indicate that he had not actually been in contact with Van Bree anymore after 1774.
Steenbergen, one of the original six letter writers, would go on to become one of Soeterbeeck’s principal benefactors.¹

¹ On Van Steenbergen’s benefactions, see vol. 1, p. 238.
Table 2: Differences between the Antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck and the Utrecht Breviary

This table lists differences between the texts of the proper of saints of four winter antiphonaries in the Soeterbeeck Collection (IV 7, IV 22, IV 131 and IV 132) and of the edition of the Utrecht Breviary that was printed in Gouda by the collation brethren in 1497. It is based on the list of differences between the Soeterbeeck manuscripts and Utrecht, UL, Hs. 406 that is provided by Van Zitteren. I did not, therefore, systematically compare the books from Soeterbeeck with the Utrecht Breviary, but only checked the places where Van Zitteren has noticed a difference.

In all of the instances listed below, where the Soeterbeeck manuscripts differ from the Utrecht Breviary, they correspond instead with the edition of the Windesheim Breviary that was printed in Delft by Henricus Eckert de Homberch in 1499.

The texts representing the Soeterbeeck manuscripts are taken from IV 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Soeterbeeck</th>
<th>Utrecht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ConceptionBV.C.ND</td>
<td>Regali ex progenie Maria orta refulget cuius precibus nos adiuvari mente et spiritu devotissime poscimus.</td>
<td>Adest namque festivitas sacratissime virginis que ex regali progenie edita genuit Christum regem omnium ipsa intercedat pro peccatis nostris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConceptionBV.V2.P1-5</td>
<td>1. Conception est hodie sancte Marie virginis cuius vita inclita cunctas illustrat ecclesias. 2. Cum iocunditate conceptionem beate Marie celebramus ut ipsa pro nobis intercedat ad Dominum Ihesum Christum. 3. Regali ex progenie Maria orta refulget cuius precibus nos adiuvari mente et spiritu devotissime poscimus. 4. Corde et animo Christo canamus gloriam in hac sacra solemnitate precelse genitricis Dei Maria. 5. Conception glorioso virginis Marie ex semine Abrahe orta de tribu Iuda clara ex stirpe David.</td>
<td>1. Beatissime virginis Marie conceptionem devotissime celebramens ut ipsa pro nobis intercedat ad Dominum Ihesum Christum. 2. Quando concepta est virgo sacratissima tunc illuminatus est mundus stirps beata radix sancta et benedictus fructus eius. 3. Adest namque festivitas sacratissime virginis que ex regali progenie edita genuit Christum regem omnium ipsa intercedat pro peccatis nostris. 4. Regali ex progenie Maria orta refulget cuius precibus nos adiuvari mente et spiritu devotissime poscimus. 5. Conception glorioso virginis Marie ex semine Abrahe orta de tribu Iuda clara ext stirpe David.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I made use of a digital copy of The Hague, RL, 170 E 32 for comparison.
2 Van Zitteren 2006, app. 18-2.
3 I made use of a digital copy of The Hague, RL, 170 E 14 for comparison.
| ChairAntioch.V1.P(1-5) | Solve iubente Deo terrarum Petre catenas qui facis ut pateant celestia regna beatis. | 1. In plateis ponebantur infirmi in lectulis ut veniente Petro saltem umbra illius obumbraret quemquam illorum et liberarentur ab infirmitatibus suis.  
2. Ait Petrus principibus sacerdotum Ihesum quem vos interemistis suspendentes in ligno hunc Deus suscitavit et principem ac salvatorem exaltavit ad dandum penitentiam in remissionem peccatorum.  
3. Petrus apostolus dixit paralitico Enea sanet te Dominus Ihesus Christus surge et sterne tibi qui continuo surrexit et omnes qui videbant conversi sunt ad Dominum.  
4. Factum est ut quaedam discipula nomine Tabita plena operibus bonis et elemosinis infirma moreretur miserunt autem discipuli ad Petrum rogantes ne pigriteris venire usque ad nos.  
5. Adveniente Petro circumsteterunt eum omnes vidue flentes et ostendentes tunicas et vestes quas faciebat illis Dorcas. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnnunciationLord.V2.M</td>
<td>Hec est dies quam fecit Dominus hodie Dominus affliccionem populi sui respeexit et redemptionem misit Hodie mortem quam femina intuit femina fugavit Hodie Deus homo factus id quod fuit permansit et quod non erat assumptit ergo exordium nostre redemptionis devote recolamus et exuilemus dicentes gloria tibi Domine.</td>
<td>Magnum hereditatis mysterium templum Dei factus est uterus nesciens virum non est pollutants ex ea carnem assumens omnes gentes venient dicentes gloria tibi Domine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1: Hymns and Other Texts in IV 58 that Appear in Printed Books in the Same Translation

This table provides a survey of all hymns in Beckers’ diurnal IV 58 to whose text I have been able to find a parallel in printed sources. The abbreviations in the final column refer to the following books:

- **COG**: J.C. van Eckel and Ignatius Walvis. *Christelyke onderwyzingen en gebeden*. Made use of the large 643-page fifteenth edition published by Jan Meyer in Ghent in 1761.¹ This edition has the benefit of being contemporary with Beckers and representing what Theo Clemens identifies as the ‘mainstream’ of editions.²

- **CRG**: Andreas van der Schuur. *Christelijke rijmdigten en gezangen*. Made use of the edition published in Utrecht by Theodorus van den Einde in 1709.³

- **Getyden**: Willibrord Kemp. *De getyden of bedestonden*. Made use of the edition published in Utrecht by Theodorus van den Eynden in 1723.⁴


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pp. in IV 58</th>
<th>Dutch Incipit</th>
<th>Latin Original</th>
<th>Parallel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: 1</td>
<td>H. O Schepper van het helder light</td>
<td>H. Lucis creator optime</td>
<td>COG, pp. 555-556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 2</td>
<td>H. Godt, Schepper, ziet den dagh verdwijnt</td>
<td>H. Te lucis ante terminum</td>
<td>COG, pp. 585-586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 5</td>
<td>A. Ik groet uw hemels kopingin Ver. Gewaardight uw o heilige maagt, dat ik uw love</td>
<td>A. Ave regina caelorum Ver. Dignare me laudare te, virgo sacrata</td>
<td>COG, p. 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 5-6</td>
<td>A. Des hemels koniginne verblijt uw alleluia</td>
<td>A. Regina caeli</td>
<td>CRG, p. 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 6</td>
<td>A. Weest gegroet o koninginne</td>
<td>A. Salve regina</td>
<td>CRG, p. 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 67-68</td>
<td>H. Kom, Schepper, Heil’ge Geest, ei kom!</td>
<td>H. Veni, Creator Spiritus</td>
<td>COG, pp. 405-406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 72-73</td>
<td>H. Loof, tong, het heerlijk goed</td>
<td>H. Pange lingua gloriosi</td>
<td>CRG, pp. 153-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 2</td>
<td>H. Hoe [zoet] is uw gedagtenis</td>
<td>H. Jesu dulcis memoria</td>
<td>COG, p. 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 35</td>
<td>H. O Christe die de engels croont</td>
<td>H. Christe, sancتورum decus angelorum</td>
<td>Palm-hof, pp. 234-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 37</td>
<td>H. Dat heel het hemels hoff en choor der engelen</td>
<td>H. Te, Joseph, celebrent agmina caelitum</td>
<td>COG, pp. 431-431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ I made use of NUL, OD 727 c 55 for comparison.
² Clemens 1985, 234-235.
³ I made use of a digital copy of NUL, OD 421 c 244 for comparison.
⁴ I made use of NUL, OD 141 d 15 nr. 1 for comparison.
⁵ This page is erroneously numbered 23 by Beckers (cf. vol. 1, p. 112 n. 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Wij vieren de engelen, die ons bewaarders zijn</td>
<td>H. Custodes hominum psallimus Angelos</td>
<td>H. Dat ’s hemels burgerij</td>
<td>H. Laat met vreugden gaan beginnen</td>
<td>H. Deezen dienaar Gods roemwaardigh</td>
<td>H. O ster die door den luister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Exultet orbis gaudiis</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Sanctorum meritum inclita gaudia</td>
<td>H. Ave maris stella</td>
<td>H. O Jesu soet, der maagden croon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In Meyer’s editions of the COG, this particular translation was replaced by a different one beginning *Zeesterre, ik u groete* from the seventeenth edition of 1772 onwards. (I made use of NUL, OD 749 d 11, a copy of the large edition, for comparison.) I do not know how the two translations are distributed across the various editions of COG, or what the reasons for the replacement were, but if Beckers made use of one of Meyer’s mainstream editions of COG for compiling IV 58, it is likely that he used an edition that had been published before 1772.
Table 3.2: Beckers’ References in the Proper of Saints of IV 60

The first table (3.2.1) lists those references by Beckers in the proper of saints in IV 60 which are to feasts included elsewhere in the book, either because they are *ad libitum* or *pro aliquibus locis*, or because they had been transferred to another date after the printing of the book in 1696. The leftmost column provides the page number on which the reference occurs; the rightmost column gives the page referred to.

Table 3.2.1: References to Feasts Included Elsewhere in IV 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Espousal of the Blessed Virgin (23 January)</td>
<td>instituted for all subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor by Innocent XI on 6 April 1680 and for all subjects of the King of Spain on 27 February 1680&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxiii (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Andrew Corsini (4 February)</td>
<td>made obligatory by Innocent XII on 31 August 1697&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxi (<em>ad libitum</em>)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (Friday after Passion Sunday)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 22 August 1727&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxvi (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Gabriel the Archangel (18 March)</td>
<td>instituted for all subjects of the King of Spain by Innocent XI on 17 June 1684&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxix (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Vincent Ferrer (5 April)</td>
<td>made obligatory by Clement XI (1700-1721)&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxii (<em>ad libitum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Pius V (5 May)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church on 28 January or 17 February 1713 by Clement XI&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxxii (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Antoninus of Florence (10 May)</td>
<td>made obligatory by Clement XI on 2 or 16 April 1707&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxii (<em>ad libitum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxxiii (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Joachim (Sunday in the octave of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (15 August))</td>
<td>transferred from 20 March to Sunday in the octave of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin by Clement XII on 3 October 1738&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>354 (20 March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Rose of Lima (30 August)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII in 1727&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxxvi (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Our Lady of Ransom (24 September)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church for 24 September by Innocent XII (1691-1700)&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxxv (<em>Sunday closest to 1 August</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Wenceslaus I (28 September)</td>
<td>made obligatory by Benedict XIII on 14 March 1729&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxii (<em>ad libitum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Raphael the Archangel (24 October)</td>
<td>instituted for all subjects of the King of Spain by Innocent XI on 22 May 1683&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>cxxviii (<em>pro aliquibus locis</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> *Analecta* 1866, 1227-1228, nos. 2130, 2135.
<sup>2</sup> Schober 1891, 196.
<sup>3</sup> The page reference actually says *ci*, because due to a typographical error that is how IV 60, p. cxi is paginated.
<sup>4</sup> Schober 1891, 203.
<sup>5</sup> The office actually starts on IV 60, p. cxv.
<sup>6</sup> *Analecta* 1866, 1263, no. 2264.
<sup>7</sup> A Carpo 1885, 493, no. 81.
<sup>8</sup> Schober 1891, 209-210.
<sup>9</sup> Schober 1891, 211.
<sup>10</sup> Schober 1891, 228.
<sup>11</sup> Schober 1891, 238.
<sup>12</sup> A Carpo 1885, 543, no. 179.
<sup>13</sup> A Carpo 1885, 549, no. 190.
<sup>14</sup> Schober 1891, 248.
<sup>15</sup> *Analecta* 1866, 1255, no. 2238.
The next table (3.2.2) lists those feasts to which Beckers refers in the proper of saints, but which are not present in IV 60 at all. The rightmost column gives the number of the page where the reference occurs, and the leftmost column that of the page referred to. In this way, the table provides a reconstruction of the hypothetical appendix which Beckers is assumed to have referred to.4

Table 3.2.2: References to Feasts not Present in IV 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after Epiphany)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Innocent XIII on 29 November or 20 December 17215</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Joseph, spouse of the Blessed Virgin (19 March)</td>
<td>given a new office by Clement XI on 3 February 17146</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville (4 April)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Innocent XIII on 25 April 17227</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fidelis of Sigmaringen (24 April)8</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIV on 16 February 17719</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gregory VII (25 May)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 25 September 172810, but suppressed in the Holy Roman Empire and the Dutch Republic since 1730, and in the Austrian Netherlands since 175011</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Camillus de Lellis (18 July)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Clement XIII on 16 September 176712</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vincent de Paul (19 July)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIII on 11 December 173713</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jerome Emilian (20 July)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIV in 176914</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Analecta 1866, 1221, no. 2095.
2 On IV 60, p. 404 the office of the feast of Our Lady of the Snow (5 August) is given. An office for the feast of the Patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November) is given for all subjects of the King of Spain on p. cxxxi, but the rubrics there say everything is to be said according to the office of Our Lady of the Snow. The only difference is that Vespers of 5 August is the first Vespers of the Transguration of the Lord (6 August), so that the second Vespers of Our Lady of the Snow is only commemorated, whereas these specific circumstances do not apply for the feast of the Patronage. The rubrics on p. cxxxi specify that for second Vespers everything should be taken from first Vespers except for the Magnificat antiphon Beatam me dicent, which is also used as the commemoration antiphon for Our Lady of the Snow at first Vespers of the Transfiguration. This is all strictly logical, and no reference to p. cxxxi is necessary.
3 Schober 1891, 185-186.
4 See vol. 1, pp. 133-134.
5 Schober 1891, 186.
6 Schober 1891, 201.
7 Schober 1891, 204.
8 For the date of Fidelis’ feast, Beckers actually wrote xvi aprilis (‘16 April’), forgetting a second x. To remedy this, another hand wrote the note 24 Fidelis a Sigmaringa (hart) getijdeboek (‘24 Fidelis of Sigmaringen (heart?) book of hours’) in the lower margin of p. 358.
9 Schober 1891, 205.
10 Schober 1891, 213.
11 Huijbregts 1968, v, 174; Roegiers 1976, 437. The office appears not to have been suppressed in the independent Land of Ravenstein where Soeterbeeck was situated, or else Beckers ignored the suppression. Cf. vol. 1, pp. 134, 120; p. 24 above.
12 Schober 1891, 229.
13 Schober 1891, 230.
14 This page is wrongly numbered as 295.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution Details</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jane Frances de Chantal (21 August)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XVI on 2 September 1769</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joseph of Calasanz (27 August)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIV on 19 August 1769</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mary de Socos (22 September)</td>
<td>instituted for the subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor between 1749 and 1757</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Joseph of Cupertino (27 September)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church for 18 September by Clement XIV on 8 August 1769</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rosary of the Blessed Virgin (first Sunday in October)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Clement XI on 3 October 1716</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>John Cantius (20 October)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIV on 8 September 1770</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gertrude the Great (15 November)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XII (1730-1740)</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scholastica of Nursia (10 February)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII (1724-1730)</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John of God (8 March)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XI on 21 April 1714</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John of the Cross (24 November)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XII on 5 October 1738</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Peter Chrysologus (4 December)</td>
<td>instituted by Benedict XIII on 10 February 1729</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Seven Founders of the Servite Order (11 February)</td>
<td>instituted for the subjects of Austria by Clement XIII on 27 February 1762</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expectation of the Blessed Virgin (18 December)</td>
<td>instituted for all subjects of the King of Spain between 1696 and 1749 (cf. A Carpo 1885, 554, no. 205)</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aloysius Gonzaga (21 June)</td>
<td>instituted for all subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor, the King of Spain and Italy and its islands between 1696 and 1749</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feasts on pp. 1-7 are in chronological order, but from then on there appear to be three groups (pp. 8, 9-10 and 11). I have not been able to determine what the rationale behind this order is.

Beckers also added references to the offices of the feasts of John of Sahagún (12 June), which had been extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII in 1729, and

---

1 Schober 1891, 230.
2 Schober 1891, 239.
3 Schober 1891, 240.
4 IV 65:1, p. cxxii. IV 65:1 was printed in 1757, and the feast does not appear in IV 61, which was printed in 1749.
5 It is not clear to me what this date is based on, as the feast of John of Cupertino was included on the universal Roman calendar with the rank of double on 18 September in 1769 (Schober 1891, 246), causing the feast of Thomas of Villanova, which had occupied that date with the rank of semidouble since 4 September 1694, to be transferred to the nearest available date, 22 September (Schober 1891, 248). On 27 September the feast of Cosmas and Damian is celebrated (cf. A Carpo 1885, 554, no. 205). The feast of John of Cupertino is on 18 September in IV 58, 2: p. 122 as well.
6 Schober 1891, 246.
7 An office for the feast of the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin for all subjects of the King of Spain is present at the back of IV 60, p. cxxvi-cxxvii, but Beckers could not refer to it because the feast had acquired a different collect when it had been extended to the universal Church (see vol. 1, p. 131).
8 Schober 1891, 250.
9 Schober 1891, 255.
10 A Carpo 1885, 573, no. 238.
11 Another hand wrote x febr. S. Scholasticae virg. folio 8 (‘10 Febr. St Scholastica virg. folium 8’) on p. 349, but it is not clear why.
12 A Carpo 1885, 477, no. 43.
13 Schober 1891, 199.
14 Schober 1891, 260.
15 Schober 1891, 179.
16 IV 65:2, p. 8. The feast was extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 20 December 1888 (Schober 1891, 197).
18 IV 61, p. cxxi. IV 61 was printed in 1749. The feast was extended to the universal Church by Gregory XVI in 1842 (A Carpo 1885, 517-518, no. 138).
Juliana Falconieri (19 June),\(^3\) which had been instituted by Clement XII on 8 March 1738.\(^4\) However, in these cases the references’ page numbers have been almost entirely trimmed off, making it impossible to see on what page of the appendix they would have appeared.

---

\(^1\) IV 60, p. 373.
\(^2\) A Carpo 1885, 516, no. 133.
\(^3\) IV 60, p. 374.
\(^4\) Schober 1891, 219.
The appendix added at the back of IV 65 (IV 65:3) is not paginated; any pagination that may once have been present has been trimmed off. For this reason, I have numbered the offices rather than the pages. Nos. 5-18 were written by Beckers, no. 19 by H42.¹

For a description of the hands and the physical construction of this appendix, see vol. 1, pp. 134-135, 140-141.

Feasts that are proper to the Congregation of Windesheim can be found in Beckers’ own copy of the Officia propria (IV 63), which was printed in 1753.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Israel of Dorat (8 February)²</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeeck’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theobald of Dorat (10 February)</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeeck’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faucher of Aareil (10 April)</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeeck’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bertrand of Comminges (16 October)</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeeck’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patronage of Joseph (third Sunday after Easter)⁴</td>
<td>celebrated at Soeterbeeck because Joseph was the convent’s second patron saint⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fidelis of Sigmaringen (24 April)</td>
<td>instituted by Clement XIV on 16 February 1771⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gregory VII (25 May)</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 25 September 1728,⁷ but suppressed in the Holy Roman Empire and the Dutch Republic since 1730, and in the Austrian Netherlands since 1750⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ On this hand and its number, see the introduction to Table 3.4.
² In IV 58, 2: p. 21 this feast was transferred to 15 February because it occurred on the feast of Juvence of Pavia, who, being a bishop-confessor, took precedence over Israel, who was merely a confessor (cf. A Carpo 1885, 255, no. 148.VII.).
³ In contemporary Officia propria of the canons regular of the Lateran, for instance the edition printed in Munich by Joannes Jacobus Vötter in 1748 (I used a digital copy of Munich, Bavarian State Library, Liturg. 905 h for comparison), the feasts of Israel, Theobald, Faucher, Bertrand and also Lawrence Giustiniani (5 September) are given as doubles ad libitum. The unsignified preface to this edition says that plurimi in Germania abstinent a 5. Officiis cum nota ad libitum huic libello insertis, ob copiam aliorum Festorum non ubique receptis (‘many in Germany refrain from the five offices that were added to this book with the note ‘at will’, and were not everywhere received among the number of the other feasts’, f. )2r). Apparently this was the case within the Congregation of Windesheim too, for their offices are omitted from every single copy of the Windesheim Officia propria from the library of Soeterbeeck. IV 63, IV 64, ASP 252 and 253, which were all printed in 1753, only include the feast of Lawrence, as a double de praecepto (p. 203), so apparently the rank of that feast had changed for the Congregations of Windesheim and the Lateran between 1748 and 1753. At some point in time, printed copies of the offices for the other four saints were included between pp. 370 and 381 of IV 63, Beckers’ copy of the Windesheim Officia Propria, but these do not have any indication of rank, so I am not sure whether they were still ad libitum or had become de praecepto. It is clear from the proper of saints in IV 58 that Beckers considered them to be de praecepto, and that means they probably were when he wrote that book between 1785 and 1787. In ASP 254, a copy of the Lateran Officia propria printed in 1893, only the feasts of Israel (11 February) and Lawrence (5 September) are still included, both as doubles de praecepto.
⁴ Cf. IV 6, f. 1r; IV 8, f. 120r-v. The feast was extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 10 September 1847 (Schober 1891, 208).
⁵ ASP 4, p. 16a.
⁶ Schober 1891, 205.
⁷ Schober 1891, 213.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feast/Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jerome Emilian (20 July)</td>
<td>Instituted by Clement XIV in 1769¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jane Frances de Chantal (21 August)</td>
<td>Instituted by Clement XVI on 2 September 1769²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Joseph of Calasanz (27 August)</td>
<td>Instituted by Clement XIV on 19 August 1769³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Suffrage for Augustine of Hippo⁴</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Second translation of Augustine (28 February)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>All Holy Canons Regular of Augustine (5 March)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Conversion of Augustine (5 May)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Augustine of Hippo (28 August)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>First translation of Augustine (11 October)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>John Cantius (20 October)</td>
<td>Instituted by Clement XIV on 8 September 1770⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Joseph of Cupertino (18 September)</td>
<td>Extended to the universal Church by Clement XIV on 8 August 1769⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Proper hymn of Augustine at Vespers (Magne pater Augustine)</td>
<td>Proper to the Congregation of Windesheim⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Francis Caracciolo (4 June)</td>
<td>Extended to the universal Church by Pius VII on 5 August 1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>William of Vercelli (25 June)</td>
<td>Extended to the universal Church by Pius VI in 1785⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Camillus de Lellis (18 July)</td>
<td>Extended to the universal Church with the rank of a double by Clement XIII on 16 September 1767¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Jerome Emilian (20 July)</td>
<td>Instituted by Clement XIV in 1769¹¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Schober 1891, 230.
² Schober 1891, 239.
³ Schober 1891, 240.
⁴ Beckers identified these texts as belonging to the feast of Augustine’s second translation (28 February), but that is clearly an error; cf. no. 12.
⁵ IV 63, p. 306.
⁶ Schober 1891, 255.
⁷ Schober 1891, 246.
⁸ E.g., IV 63, pp. 44-45. The hymn Magne pater Augustine is given for Vespers (and Matins) of all feasts of Augustine (his conversion, his death and his translations), though not for his monthly commemorative office (when the hymn Iste confessor is given), in all surviving copies of the Officia propria from the library of Soeterbeeck, except for the two printed in 1731 (IV 42 and IV 68). There the hymn given is Magne doctor, christiani. Similarly, the hymn which the other books give for Lauds, Coeli cives applaudite, is replaced in these two with Regalaris clericorum. Chevalier 1897, 67, 462 notes that these different hymns were also present in an edition of the Windesheim Officia propria that was printed in 1701. They seem to be a variant which was temporarily adopted but later abandoned again. The preface to the Lateran Officia propria mentioned on p. 121 n. 3 confirms this. It says that the Lateran canons in Germany used to have different hymns, but that editions published in Venice and Milan in the seventeenth and eighteenth century used Magne pater and Coeli cives. Liberum proinde erit Canonicius Regularibus Lateranensibus per Germaniam, aut antiquam morem in retinendis Hymnis continuare, aut servatis duobus Magne Pater, & Coeli cives, caeteros cum Italis dimittere (“The Lateran canons regular throughout Germany are free, therefore, either to continue the old custom of retaining the hymns, or, having kept the two Magne Pater and Coeli cives, to dismiss the others with the Italians’, Munich, Bavarian State Library, Liturg. 905 h, f. ) (2r). It seems that the Congregation of Windesheim temporarily wavered between using the Italian or the German hymns. In IV 63, Beckers’ copy of the Propria, and in IV 64, a copy of the same edition, an unidentified hand marginally added the first lines of the alternative hymns in most places where Magne pater and Coeli cives occur (IV 63, pp. 50, 104, 113, 189; IV 64, pp. 50, 104). The same hand also changed some of the dates of feasts in these books to bring them into accordance with the dates given in IV 42 and IV 68 (cf. p. 121 n. 3). This person appears, therefore, to have attempted, for some reason, to bring the later editions of the Officia propria in line with the earlier ones. Another hand added the hymns Magne doctor and Regularis clericorum at the back of IV 41, and also added references to them in the appropriate places as well as erroneously for the commemorative office of Augustine (IV 41, pp. 82, 269, 390). However, this was probably done prior to rather than after the publication of the editions of 1753, as shown by the nature of other revisions which the same hand carried out in this book.
⁹ Schober 1891, 220. A loose office for William’s feast is included in the back of IV 63.
¹⁰ Schober 1891, 229.
¹¹ Schober 1891, 230.
| 24 | Mary de Socos (22 September)\(^1\) | for all subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor\(^2\) |
| 25 | Alphons Liguori (2 August) | extended to the universal Church by Gregory XVI on 18 September 1839\(^3\) |
| 26 | Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin (third Sunday of September) | extended to the universal Church by Pius VII on 18 September 1814\(^4\) |
| 27 | Leo IV (17 July)\(^5\) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 28 | Marcellinus of Deventer (18 July)\(^6\) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 29 | Rumbold of Mechelen (3 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 30 | Theodoric of Reims (4 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 31 | Peter Fourier (7 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 32 | Raymond of Toulouse (8 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 33 | John of Oisterwijk and companions (9 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 34 | Dispersion of the Apostles (15 July) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 35 | Dominic de Guzmán (4 August) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank |
| 36 | Alipius of Tagaste (18 August) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 37 | Gregory of Utrecht (25 August) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 38 | Laetus, Donation and companions (6 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 39 | Evortius of Orléans (7 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 40 | Sergius I (9 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 41 | Nicholas of Tolentino (10 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank |
| 42 | Peter of Pibrac (11 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 43 | Peter of Arbués (17 September)\(^7\) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 44 | Fermin of Amiens (25 September) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 45 | Remigius of Reims (1 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim with the rank of double |
| 46 | Beregisius of Saint-Hubert (2 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 47 | Thomas of Hereford (3 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 48 | John of Bridlington (10 October)\(^8\) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 49 | Bruno of Cologne (6 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank |
| 50 | Cerbonius of Populonia (12 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 51 | Gaudentius of Rimini (14 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 52 | Bertrand of Comminges (16 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeeck’s eighteenth-century *Officia propria*; added after 1753 |
| 53 | Fulco of Plaisance (26 October) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |
| 54 | Malachy of Armagh (3 November)\(^1\) | proper to the Congregation of Windesheim |

---

1. In IV 58, 2: p. 125 this feast is transferred to 26 September because the feast of Peter of Arbués takes precedence, being proper to the Congregation of Windesheim (cf. A Carpo 1885, 254, no. 148.V).
2. IV 65:1, p. cxxii.
3. Schober 1891, 234. Alphonsus is identified in IV 65:3 as bishop-confessor, but not yet as a Doctor of the Church, which he was declared to be by Pius IX on 7 July 1871.
5. IV 65:3 erroneously has 16 July.
6. This is the feast’s date in IV 42 and IV 68, two copies of the edition of the *Officia propria* printed in 1731. IV 58 and in the *Officia propria* printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64, the date is 14 July, although in the latter two books the date was changed by hand to the 18th.
7. In IV 58, 2: p. 124 this feast is transferred to 22 September because it occurs on the feast of Lambert of Maastricht, the titular patron of the cathedral of Liège (Gardellini 1824–1849, 4: 41–43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 1)), which is a first class double (A Carpo 1885, 273, no. 170) because Soeterbeeck belonged to that diocese from 1731 to 1801 (Frenken 1965, 231).
8. IV 65:3 erroneously has 6 October. In IV 58, 2: p. 136 this feast is transferred to 22 October because it occurs on the feast of Francis Borgia, which is celebrated as a second class double by all subjects of the King of Spain (IV 65:1, p. cxxii).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feast Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Guiraud of Béziers</td>
<td>5 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rufus of Avignon</td>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Floridus of Tfiernum Tiberinum</td>
<td>13 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Eucherius of Lyon</td>
<td>16 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Fridian of Lucca</td>
<td>19 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Trudo of Sint-Triviaen</td>
<td>23 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Prosper of Reggio</td>
<td>24 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Peter of Alexandria</td>
<td>26 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Fridian of Lucca</td>
<td>27 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Papinianus of North Africa and companions</td>
<td>28 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Romanus of Caesarea</td>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Gelasius I</td>
<td>1 December</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Anianus of Alexandria</td>
<td>2 December</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Peter Chrysologus</td>
<td>4 December</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Eusebius of Vercelli</td>
<td>16 December</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Thomas of Canterbury</td>
<td>29 December</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim with the rank of double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Melaine of Rennes</td>
<td>19 January</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Gaudentius of Novara</td>
<td>22 January</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ildephonsus of Toledo</td>
<td>28 January</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Aquilinus of Milan</td>
<td>29 January</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Bridget of Kildare</td>
<td>1 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Gilbert of Sempringham</td>
<td>4 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Guarinus of Palestrina</td>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Israel of Dorat</td>
<td>8 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeek’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Vedast of Arras</td>
<td>9 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Theobald of Dorat</td>
<td>10 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim but not originally present in any of Soeterbeek’s eighteenth-century Officia propria; added after 1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Juvence of Pavia</td>
<td>11 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 In IV 58, 2: p. 143 this feast is transferred to 6 November because it occurs on the feast of Hubert of Liège, the patron saint of the city of Liège (Gardellini 1824-1849, 4: 41-43, no. 3600 (esp. no. 3)), which is a first class double (even though it should be a greater double; cf. Decreta 1898-1927, 1: 225 (no. 1095)) since Soeterbeek belonged to that diocese from 1731 to 1801 (Frenken 1965, 231).
2 IV 65:3 erroneously has 17 November, which is a change from 15 November.
3 The feast of Laurence O’Toole (14 November) was omitted here, probably accidentally.
4 This is the feast’s date in IV 58, 2: pp. 147-148 and in the Officia propria printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64. In the latter two books the date was changed to the 27th, its date in IV 42 and IV 68, the books printed in 1732. In IV 65:3 there is a reference to that date, cf. below.
5 Cf. vol. 1, pp. 84-85.
6 IV 65:3 erroneously has 20 December here.
7 In IV 58, 2: p. 15 this feast is transferred to 3 February, because it occurs on the feast of Vincent of Saragossa, patron saint of the village of Deursen (IV 58, 2, p. 8), which was a first class double (cf. A Carpo 1885, 273, no. 170).
8 This is the feast’s date in IV 58, 2: p. 12 and in the Officia propria printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64. It is changed there to 3 February, which is the date in the books printed in 1732, IV 42 and IV 68. It is curious that IV 65:3 here follows the later rather than the earlier calendar, as it is normally the other way around.
9 In IV 58, 2: p. 21 this feast was transferred to 15 February because it occurred on the feast of Juvence of Pavia, who, being a bishop-confessor, took precedence over Israel, who was merely a confessor (cf. A Carpo 1885, 255, no. 148. VII.).
10 This is the feast’s date in IV 42 and IV 68, two copies of the edition of the Officia propria printed in 1731. In IV 58, 2: p. 18 and in the books printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64, the date is 8 February, although in the latter two books the date was changed by hand to the 11th. Cf. p. 121 n. 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proper To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gregory II</td>
<td>13 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Theotonius of Coimbra</td>
<td>18 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Abilius of Alexandria</td>
<td>23 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Felix III</td>
<td>25 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Leander of Seville</td>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Albinus of Angers</td>
<td>1 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Herculanus of Perugia</td>
<td>2 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ollecgarius Bonestruga</td>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Ansovinus of Camarino</td>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Zachary, pope</td>
<td>15 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Patrick of Ireland</td>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim with the rank of double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Gertrude of Nivelles</td>
<td>18 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ludger of Münster</td>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>William of Poitiers</td>
<td>27 March</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville</td>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>William of Paris</td>
<td>6 April</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Albert of Jerusalem</td>
<td>8 April</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Gaucher of Aureil</td>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Leo the Great</td>
<td>11 April</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Monica of Hippo</td>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Benedict II</td>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Aldebrand of Fossombrone</td>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Walter of Lesteps</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ubaldus of Gubbio</td>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Possidius of Calama</td>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Ivo of Chartres</td>
<td>20 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Dunstan of Canterbury</td>
<td>26 May</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Norbert of Xanten</td>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, but also universal with the same rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Bernard of Menthon</td>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Benno of Meissen</td>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Odulphus of Utrecht</td>
<td>17 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Raymond of Barbastro</td>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Leo II</td>
<td>28 June</td>
<td>proper to the Congregation of Windesheim with the rank of double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Most Precious Blood of Jesus (first Sunday of July)</td>
<td></td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 10 August 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Titus (10 January)</td>
<td></td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 18 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IV 65:3 erroneously has 26 February here.
2 According to IV 63, this feast is transferred to 20 March for the subjects of the King of Spain (p. 81) because for them it occurs with the feast of Gabriel the Archangel, which is a greater double (IV 65:1, p. cxvii). This transferrance is carried out in IV 58 (2, p. 28).
3 IV 65:3 erroneously has 10 February here, but that is the feast of Faucher of Aureil (IV 63).
4 IV 65:3 erroneously identifies this as the office for Ivo of Chartres, cf. no. 107.
5 This is the feast’s date in IV 42 and IV 68, two copies of the edition of the Officia propria printed in 1731. In IV 58, 2: pp. 61-62 and in the books printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64, the date is 19 May, although in the latter two books the date was changed by hand to the 26th.
6 The feast of Anthony of Padua (13 June) is omitted here, probably accidentally.
7 This is the feast’s date in IV 42 and IV 68, two copies of the edition of the Officia propria printed in 1731. In IV 58, 2: p. 68 and in the books printed in 1753, IV 63 and IV 64, the date is 12 June, although in the latter two books the date was changed by hand to the 17th.
8 Schober 1891, 222.
9 The feast of Titus was assigned to 6 February, with the understanding that if it occurred on another feast it should be transferred to the next available date (A Carpo 1885, 476, no. 41). Within the Congregation of Windesheim it occurred on the feast of Guaranus of Palestrina, so it had to be transferred. The Sacred
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Extension</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Peter Canisius (27 April)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>extended to the diocese of ’s-Hertogenbosch on 20 October 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Angela Merici (31 May)</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 11 July 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Paul of the Cross (28 April)</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 14 January 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Boniface of Mainz (5 June)</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 11 June 1874; the office was approved on 26 August of the same year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Cyril of Alexandria (9 February)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Cyril of Jerusalem (18 March)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Justin Martyr (14 April)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Augustine of Canterbury (28 May)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Josaphat of Polotsk (14 November)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 28 July 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Cyril and Methodius (5 July)</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>extended to the universal Church on 25 October 1880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congregation of Rites decreed on 6 February 1858 that the feast of Titus should, in cases such as these, not be transferred to the next available date after 6 February, but rather to the first available date after 4 January (Decreta 1898-1927, 2: 409-410, no. 3064 (esp. no. I)). 10 January is the fifth day within the octave of the Epiphany, and within that octave no feasts except those of patron saints and the dedication of the church may be observed (RGB VII.3), so this date seems to be an error based on the assumption that the Congregation had meant the fourth ides rather than the fourth day of January.

1 Schober 1891, 197.  
2 Collectio 1914, 325-326, no. 72.II.  
3 Schober 1891, 214.  
4 Schober 1891, 207.  
5 Schober 1891, 218.  
6 Schober 1891, 197.  
7 Schober 1891, 200.  
8 Schober 1891, 205.  
9 Schober 1891, 214.  
10 Schober 1891, 258.  
11 Schober 1891, 227.
Table 3.4: The Revision of the Late Medieval Antiphonaries from the Library of Soeterbeeck, Including IV 83:3

Each of the following tables provides the function and the text of antiphons that are used in the divine office, followed by a description of the way in which these antiphons are treated in the revisions of Soeterbeeck’s manuscript antiphonaries. Other texts, such as hymns, responsories and versicles, are not included.

Except where indicated otherwise, the antiphons’ texts are not taken from IV 69, a copy of the winter part of a two-volume edition of the Roman Breviary (Liège: Clemens Plomteux, 1782) whose calendar was used as the basis of Appendix C, but which is not complete enough for the present purpose. Instead, the texts are taken from IV 65, the most recent surviving copy of the Horae diurnae Breviarii Romani (Antwerp: Plantin Offices, 1757) from the library of Soeterbeeck with Beckers’ notes in them, and IV 63, Beckers’ personal copy of the Windesheim Officia propria (Maastricht: Jacobus Lekens, 1753).

Because Beckers was only interested in Vespers and Compline, the identification of the antiphons as they appear in IV 63 and IV 65 only refers to their function at these hours. Even though many psalm antiphons, such as those at second Vespers on the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (2 February), are used at Lauds as well, this is ignored in view of the specific function of these tables. This is not to provide an overview of all antiphons in the Roman Breviary and their uses, but to describe the way in which the manuscript antiphonaries of Soeterbeeck were renovated to enable them to be used at Vespers and Compline even in the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

The selection and identification of the antiphons in the proper of saints was based on the liturgical calendar of Soeterbeeck as reconstructed from the proper of saints in IV 58 and explained in Appendix C. The presence there of feasts that do not appear in the proper of saints of IV 65, as well as the transference and different ranks of others that do, mean that there are several occasions when different antiphons would actually have been needed at Soeterbeeck than those that are provided by the printed Horae diurnae. In these cases, taking into account the rules governing the occurrence and concurrence of feasts, I silently provide the right antiphons, and not the typical ones. A particularly spectacular example of this occurs in the case of the feast of Clement I. This normally fell on 23 November, but because the proper feast of Trudo of Sint-Truiden occurred on that same date, that of Clement was transferred to 12 December at Soeterbeeck. Because of this transference, the feast of Clement concurred, at first Vespers, with that of Damasus I, and, at second, with that of Lucy of Syracuse. Since the feasts of Damasus and Clement were both semidoubles, the latter’s proper texts were only used from the chapter onwards; before the chapter, Damasus’ texts were used. Lucy’s feast was a double, however, and that meant that at second Vespers on the feast of Clement only his second Magnificat antiphon would be used, as a commemoration, whereas everything else would be taken from Lucy’s office. In cases such as this, I provide only those antiphons that were actually needed at Soeterbeeck.

The ferial antiphons for Vespers on Saturdays and Sundays, as given in the psalter of IV 65, are given only once, in the table covering the period after Pentecost, even though they are also used on other occasions. The reason for this is that these antiphons do not occur in any of Soeterbeeck’s late medieval antiphonaries for the winter half of the year, making it unnecessary to treat of them there. The Roman antiphons for the psalms and the Nunc dimittis at Compline outside Eastertide, Miserere mihi Domine, & exaudi orationem meam and Salva nos Domine vigilantes, custodi nos dormientes: ut vigilemus cum Christo, & requiescamus in pace, are not included anywhere in the medieval antiphonaries, and they have not been added by Beckers. For this reason, they are not included in the tables below. Presumably, the sisters knew these ordinary chants by heart.
Beckers and the persons to which other hands belonged were only interested in antiphons for Sundays and feasts, not in those for ferias even if these had one or more proper antiphons that could be sung, as was the case with, for instance, the weekdays in Advent. Proper antiphons for ferias are therefore ignored, except in those cases where at least one hand in one antiphonary is occupied with them, as is the case with Monday and Thursday after the fourth Sunday in Quadragesima. Also ignored are days within octaves and octave days, because these generally only repeat the antiphons of the feast itself. The only exceptions are the second day within the octaves of Easter and Pentecost, because Beckers and the other hands occupied themselves with their antiphons, and the octave days of the feasts of Stephen the First Martyr (2 January), John the Evangelist (3 January), the Holy Innocents (4 January) and Peter and Paul (6 July), because these used other antiphons than the feasts. The antiphons for Vespers on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday are not given, because neither Beckers nor any of his coworkers provide any of them.1

Antiphons that cannot be identified with certainty are not given. For instance, at first Vespers on the Sunday within the octave of the Epiphany, there should be a commemoration of the day within the octave with which the Sunday concurs, using the Magnificat antiphon of that particular day.2 Because the choice of the antiphon depends entirely on the date of the Sunday, it is not possible to provide one in the table, and it is therefore ignored.

The following description of the revision of Soeterbeeck’s antiphonaries is not exhaustive. Only those books are included that have been revised substantially. This excludes the printed antiphonaries IV 3, IV 18 and IV 19, and the manuscripts IV 8, IV 16, IV 17, IV 131, IV 132 and JRL, Latin 439, to which some antiphons have been added and some of whose melodies have been replaced, but which otherwise remain largely unaffected. Also excluded from the survey are other books for the divine office which also include antiphons, such as breviaries and vespersals, except for IV 83 (and the fragment Fr. 33:3, which once belonged to it), as that manuscript was also heavily revised in the same way as the antiphonaries.

The addition or (re)identification of antiphons for feasts that were not celebrated at Soeterbeeck in Beckers’ days, or with entirely different chants, is ignored. This means, for instance, that the tables below do not refer to the antiphons for the feast of the Most Precious Blood of the Lord (first Sunday in July) that have been added to IV 3,3 because that feast was only extended to the universal Church by Pius IX on 10 August 1849,4 or to the identification of the antiphons for the feast of Anthony Abbot (17 January) in The Hague, RL, 130 G 18,5 because the Roman Breviary prescribes an entirely different office.6 These notes are beyond the scope of these tables.

The description of each antiphon covers a maximum of four elements: presence, function, text and location. The first of these elements merely addresses the question whether a particular antiphon is present in a manuscript. This is indicated by the following signs and abbreviations:

- the antiphon is present in the manuscript
- the antiphon is not present in the manuscript
- add the antiphon has been added to the manuscript in a post-medieval hand
- fnp the antiphon cannot be discussed because the folium/folia on which it could have been expected to appear is/are no longer present in the manuscript

---

1 On the reason for this, see vol. 1, p. 151.
2 Cf. IV 65:1, p. 205.
3 IV 3, between pp. 496 and 497.
4 Schober 1895, 222.
5 The Hague, RL, 130 G 18, ff. 73v-74r, 75r.
6 IV 65:1, pp. 330-331.
If an antiphon is present, but with another function than the one which it has in the Roman Breviary, that function is described next. The function described is strictly the one which the antiphon has where it is given in full, and any other functions the antiphon might have elsewhere are ignored. For instance, if psalm antiphons are given in full for Lauds, whereas a rubric indicates that they should also be used at second Vespers, reference is only made to their use at Lauds.

The text of some antiphons, though substantially the same as that given in IV 63 or IV 65, differs from it in one or more ways. Such variant readings are the third element provided, and if there are more than one in a single antiphon, they are separated from each other by a comma (,). Spelling variants and obvious scribal errors are ignored.

The number of the page or folium on which each antiphon can be found in a particular manuscript is provided last of all. Places where an antiphon is merely referred to and not given in full are ignored. The acronym *evovae*, which accompanies the termination of the tone on which the psalm accompanying a particular antiphon should be sung, is not considered to be a part of the antiphon and is consequently ignored. If an antiphon occurs in one of the two unfoliated fragments (Fr. 1 that belongs with 130 G 18, or Fr. 33:3 that belongs with IV 83), reference is necessarily only made to the fragment as a whole.

There are three manuscripts whose foliation needs some explanation. The first of these is IV 83. As described by Kienhorst,¹ in preparation for the exhibition *Rijkdom in eenvoud* in 2005, several breviaries whose folia had been mixed together over time were reassembled to better represent the original manuscripts. This meant that the first three folia of the book which the sisters had numbered IV 80 had to be placed before the manuscript numbered IV 83, because that was the bulk of the manuscript of which these folia had originally been part. As a result, there are two folia numbered 1, 2 and 3 in IV 83. It is necessary, therefore, to refer the first three as IV 83:1, and to the rest of the manuscript as IV 83:2.

Another problem is provided by Leeuwarden, Tresoar, PBF 6168 Hs and Tilburg, UL, KHS 28, neither of which have modern foliation but both of which have been foliated by Beckers in a special way. In both manuscripts, the proper of time and the proper of saints have been foliated separately, whereas the common of saints has been given its own pagination. For clarity’s sake, I provide each of these sections within the manuscript with its own number: the proper of time is 1, the proper of saints is 2, and the common of saints is 3. In order to determine which section an antiphon appears in, I preface each reference to a folium with one of these three numbers. In some cases, Beckers did not number a folium but an opening, so that both the left and the right page have the same number. Because this system is not carried through consistently, I ignore the number on the left-hand page, referring, for instance, to opening 11 in the proper of saints as 2: ff. 10v-11r.

In addition to describing each antiphon as it appears in the manuscripts, the tables below also record whatever has been done to it by Beckers and other people. To do so, the following sign and abbreviations are used:

- **head**: an antiphon is (re)identified by a header in a certain hand on the same opening
- **id**: an antiphon is identified by a marginal note in a certain hand on the same page
- **ref**: the page on which an antiphon appears is referred to by a marginal note in a certain hand
- **ri**: an antiphon is reidentified by a marginal note in a certain hand on the same page
- **>**: the function or the text of an antiphon is changed by a certain hand

The abbreviations *head* and *id* are not used for additions, because it is a matter of course that these are identified.

If a feast cannot be celebrated with a full office but only with a commemoration, the antiphon that is used on such occasions is usually a Magnificat antiphon. For this reason,

---

¹ Kienhorst 2005, 105, 111.
whenever Beckers or any of the other revisers identify an antiphon that is actually a commemoration antiphon as a Magnificat antiphon, I do not consider this to be wrong.

There are three cases, namely the psalm antiphons for second Vespers of the feasts of Agnes of Rome (21 January) and Clement I (12 December), and first Vespers for the Commemoration of Paul (30 June), where the specificities of Soeterbeeck’s calendar were not taken into account by Beckers and/or the other people who revised the manuscripts. For various reasons, the proper antiphons which the manuscripts provide for these occasions, and which at least one of the revisers (re)identified in at least one of these books, could not in fact be used. In the case of the feast of Agnes this is because of the high rank of the feast of Vincent of Saragossa, in the case of that of Clement it is due to its transference, and in the case of that of Paul it is because the chapel of Soeterbeeck was not dedicated to the apostle.\(^1\) Several revisers did not think of these circumstances and reidentified antiphons that were not actually needed, and in these cases I provide descriptions also of these erroneous reidentifications.

The description of antiphons which are present in a manuscript without having been (re)identified are printed in grey.

The notes that (re)identify antiphons often consist of only an arabic numeral or the abbreviation mag for ‘Magnificat’. In such cases it is often not possible to identify the hand in which they have been written with certainty, and the abbreviation Un, for ‘unidentified’, is used. In cases where the hand can be identified, it is given one of the following sigla. The hands are numbered entirely arbitrarily, in the order in which I encountered them while studying the books in which they appear.

With exceptions mentioned in the main text,\(^2\) I have only tried to identify and number the hands of antiphons and hymns, for the purposes of Chapter 3. This means that I have not considered the hands of the other texts added to IV 65 and listed in Table 3.3, or referred to in the notes to Table 4.2. I have neither numbered these, nor attempted to identify them with any of the numbered hands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B    | ![Sample Image](image1.png) | Rector Arnoldus Beckers (1772-1810)  
IV 7, p. 50  
vol. 1, pp. 25-32 |
| Ho   | ![Sample Image](image2.png) | Sister Anna Hovelmans (1623-1679)  
IV 7, p. 323  
vol. 1, pp. 162-167 |

\(^1\) Cf. IV 65:1, p. 388  
| H1          | probably Rector Antonius Gast (1656-1680)  
|            | IV 7, p. 366  
<p>|            | vol. 1, pp. 161-162 |
| H2          | IV 22, f. 5r |
| H3          | IV 83:2, f. 3v |
| H4          | Fr. 1 |
| H5          | Fr. 1 |
| H6          | IV 22, f. 63v |
| H13 | 130 G 18, f. 93br |
| H14 | IV 6, f. 146v |
| H15 | KHS 28, 2: f. 17v |
| H16 | IV 22, f. 227r |
| H17 | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 |
| H18 | probably Rector Henricus Erckens (1749-1772) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 41 vol. 1, p. 162 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H19</th>
<th>IV 6, f. 64v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 189v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21</td>
<td>IV 15, f. 300v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22</td>
<td>IV 15, between ff. 137a-138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23</td>
<td>IV 15, back pastedown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>probably Sister Clara Lucia van den Heuvel (1748-1805) IV 15, loose piece of paper at the back vol. 1, p. 162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
probably either Sister Lucia Andriessen Hertroy (d. 1704) or Lucia Langens (d. 1740)

IV 15, between ff. 114 and 115
vol. 1, p. 162
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H31</th>
<th>IV 6, f. 204v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H32</td>
<td>IV 8, f. 147r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H33</td>
<td>IV 92:2, f. 136v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H34</td>
<td>IV 17, between ff. 139-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H35</td>
<td>IV 90, f. 16v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H36</td>
<td>RHCe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarismr. 699, f. 12r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H37</td>
<td>RHCE, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisch. 699, verso loosened pastedown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H38</td>
<td>IV 52, f. 152v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H39</td>
<td>IV 76, f. 198r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H40</td>
<td>Add. 10, between pp. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H41</td>
<td>IV 15, between ff. 180-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H42</td>
<td>IV 65:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.1: Advent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 4</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 22</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
<th>Fr. 1 + 130 G 18</th>
<th>PBF 6168 Hs</th>
<th>KHS 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S1.V2.P1</td>
<td>In illa die stillabunt montes dulcedinem, &amp; colles fluent lac &amp; mel, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ f. 11v-v</td>
<td>+ (B.id) p. 3</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 5v</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S1.V2.P3</td>
<td>Ecce Dominus veniet, &amp; omnes sancti ejus cum eo: &amp; erit in die illa lux magna, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ f. 11v</td>
<td>+ (B.id) p. 3</td>
<td>+ f. 4r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 5v-6r</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S1.V2.P4</td>
<td>Omnes stientes venite ad aquas: quaerite Dominum, dum inveniri potest, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ f. 11v</td>
<td>+ (B.id) pp. 3-4</td>
<td>+ f. 4r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S1.V2.P5</td>
<td>Ecce veniet Propheta magnus, &amp; ipse renovabit Jerusalem, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ ff. 11v-12r</td>
<td>+ (B.id) p. 4</td>
<td>+ f. 4r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 6r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S1.V2.M</td>
<td>Ne timeas Maria, invenisti enim gratiam apud Dominum: ecce concipies, &amp; paries filium, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ invenisti gracion f. 12v</td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) invenisti gracion p. 4</td>
<td>+ (H2.id) invenisti gracion f. 5r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ (B.id) invenisti gracion 1: f. 6v</td>
<td>+ (H1.id, B.id) invenisti gracion 1: f. 7r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P1</td>
<td>Ecce in nubibus coeli Dominus veniet cum</td>
<td>+ f. 18v</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) p. 7</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ (Un.id) 1: f. 1r</td>
<td>+ (H4.id) Fr. 1</td>
<td>+ (B.head) 1: f. 11r</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 10r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P2</td>
<td>Urbs fortitudinis nostrae</td>
<td>+ f. 18v</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) p. 7</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P5</td>
<td>Ecce Dominus noster cum virtute veniet, &amp; illuminabit oculos servorum suorum, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ f. 19r-v</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) p. 8</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V1.M</td>
<td>Ante me non est formatus Deus, &amp; post me non erit: quia mihi curvabitur omne genu, &amp; confitebitur omnis lingua.</td>
<td>+ ff. 23v-24r</td>
<td>+ 2: f. 3v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Incipit</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.P1</td>
<td>Veniet Dominus, &amp; non tardabit, &amp; illuminabit abscondita tenebrarum, &amp; manifestabit se ad omnes gentes, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ [fnp] f. 27v-28r + (H3.id) 2: ff. 3v-4r [fnp] + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 16v</td>
<td>+ f. 9r + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r + (H4.id) Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.P2</td>
<td>Jerusalem gaude gaudio magno, quia veniet tibi Salvator, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ [fnp] f. 28r + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td>+ f. 9r + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.P3</td>
<td>Dabo in Sion salutem, &amp; in Jerusalem gloriam meam, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ [fnp] f. 28r + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td>+ f. 9r-v + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r-v Fr. 1 + 1: ff. 17v-18r + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.P4</td>
<td>Montes &amp; omnes colles humiliabantur: &amp; erunt prava in directa, &amp; aspera in vias planas: veni Domine, &amp; noli tardare, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ [fnp] f. 28r + (H3.id) 2: f. 4v Fr. 1 + 1: f. 18r + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td>+ f. 9v + (H3.id) 2: f. 4r-v Fr. 1 + 1: ff. 17v-18r + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.P5</td>
<td>Juste &amp; pie vivamus, expectantes beatam spem, &amp; adventum Domini.</td>
<td>+ [fnp] pp. [fnp]-17 + (H3.id) 2: f. 4v Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17v + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td>+ f. 28r-v + (H3.id) 2: f. 4v Fr. 1 + 1: f. 17r + (H3.id) 1: f. 17r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The seven major antiphons are reidentified in the sense that the rubrics of the Roman Breviary assign them to specific dates from 17 to 23 December (e.g. IV 65:1, pp. 165-166), which was made explicit by H1 in KHS 28, 1: ff. 12r-13r but was implicitly intended by B as well. The rubrics of the manuscripts, however, distribute the major antiphons across the days between the feast of Lucy of Syracuse (13 December) and the vigil of Christmas (24 December) (e.g. KHS 28, 1: f. 12r). These are ten days rather
### Adv.MA2

O Adonai, & dux domus Israel, qui Moysi in igne flammae rubi apparuisti, & ei in Sina legem dedisti: veni ad redimendum nos in brachio extendo.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 21v</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) pp. 11-12</td>
<td>+ f. 7v</td>
<td>+ 2: f. 1r-v</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) 1: f. 13v-14r</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ff. 21v-22r</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) p. 12</td>
<td>+ ff. 7v-[fnp]</td>
<td>+ 2: ff. 1v-2r</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) 1: f. 13v</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adv.MA3

O radix Jesse, qui stas in signum populorum, super quem continebunt reges os suum, quem Gentes deprecabuntur: veni ad liberandum nos: jam noli tardare.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (B.ri)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (B.ri)</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (B.ri)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (B.ri)</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adv.MA4

O clavis David, & sceptrum domus Israel; qui aperis, & nemo claudit; claudis, & nemo aperit: veni, & educ vincum de domo carceris, sedentem in tenebris, & umbra mortis.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 22r</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) p. 12-[fnp]</td>
<td>+ f. 2r</td>
<td>+ f. 2r</td>
<td>+ (B.ri) 1: f. 13v</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 22r-v</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adv.MA5

O oriens splendor lucis aeternae, & sol justitiae: veni, & illumina sedentes in tenebris, & umbra mortis.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 22r-v</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than seven, but at both Vespers of the feast of Thomas the Apostle (21 December) the antiphon *O Thoma Didime* was prayed (cf. KHS 28, 1: f. 13r-v), and at first Vespers of the fourth Sunday of Advent the antiphon *O virgo virginum* was prayed (cf. KHS 28, 1: ff. 13v, 24r), bringing the total number of antiphons to ten.
| Adv.MA6 | O Rex Gentium, & desideratus earum, lapisque angularis, qui facis utraque unum: veni, & salva hominem, quem de limo formasti. | + | f. 22v | [fnp] | [fnp] | + | 2: f. 2v | [fnp] | + (B.ri) | 1: f. 14r | + (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) | 1: f. 13r |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adv.MA7 | O Emmanuel Rex & legifer noster, expectatio Gentium, & Salvator earum: veni ad salvandum nos, Domine Deus noster. | + | ff. 22v-23r | [fnp] | [fnp] | + | 2: ff. 2v-3r | + | [fnp]-Fr. 1 | + (B.ri) | 1: f. 14r | + (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) | 1: f. 13r |
| Adv.S4.V2.P1 | Canite tuba in Sion, quia prope est dies Domini: ecce veniet ad salvandum nos, alleluia. | + | nos alleluia f. 42r | + | (B.id) nos alleluia pp. 18-19 | + | nos alleluia f. 20r | + | nos alleluia 2: ff. 6v-7r | [fnp] | + | nos alleluia 1: f. 27v | + | nos alleluia 1: ff. 26v-27r |
| Adv.S4.V2.P4 | Dominus veniet, occurrere illi, dicentes: Magnum principium, & regni ejus non erit finis: Deus fortis, dominator, princeps pacis, alleluia. | + | f. 42v | + | (B.id) pp. 19-20 | + | f. 20r-v | + | 2: f. 7r-v | + | [fnp]-Fr. 1 | + | 1: ff. 27v-28r | + | 1: f. 27r |
| Adv.S4.V2.P5 | Omnipotens sermo tuus Domine a regalibus sedibus veniet, alleluia. | + | f. 42v | + | (B.id) p. 20 | + | f. 20v | + | 2: f. 7v | [H4.ri] Fr. 1 | + | 1: f. 28r | + | 1: f. 27r |
### Table 3.4.2: From Nativitytide to after the Epiphany of the Lord

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 4</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 22</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
<th>Fr. 1 + 130 G 18</th>
<th>PBF 6168 Hs</th>
<th>KHS 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.P1</td>
<td>Rex pacificus magnificatus est, cujus vultum desiderat universa terra.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VigNat.V1.P4 &gt; Nat.V1.P1 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 22r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.P2</td>
<td>Magnificatus est rex pacificus super omnes reges universae terrae.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VigNat.V1.P5 &gt; Nat.V1.P2 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 22r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.P3</td>
<td>Compleni sunt dies Mariae, ut pareret filium suum primogenitum.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.C1.P &gt; Nat.V1.P3 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 26r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.P4</td>
<td>Scitote quia prope est regnum Dei: amen dico vobis, quia non tardabit.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VigNat.V1.P1 &gt; Nat.V1.P4 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 44r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VigNat.V1.P2 &gt; Nat.V1.P5 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropinquat f. 44v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.M</td>
<td>Cum ortus fuerit sol de coelo,</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.V1.P4 &gt; Nat.V1.P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The scribe of PBF 6168 Hs conflated VigNat.V1.P4 and P5 at the word *magnificatus*, and B added P4, reidentified as Nat.V1.P1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.P1</strong></td>
<td>Videbitis Regem regum procedentem a Patre, tamquam sponsum de thalamo suo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (Ho.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum ff. 48r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (Ho.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum &gt; Cum (B) p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (Ho.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum f. 25r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (H10.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum Fr. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (B.ref on 1: f. 29v, Un.ri, B.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum &gt; Cum (B) 1: f. 31v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V1.M (H1.ref and B.ref on 1: f. 28v, H1.ri)</strong></td>
<td>Dum &gt; Cum (B) 1: f. 31r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V2.P1</strong></td>
<td>Tecum principium in die virtutis tuae in splendoribus sanctorum: ex utero ante luciferum genui te.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>ff. 56r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H3.id) f. 32r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2: ff. 12v-13r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id)</td>
<td>1: f. 37r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>f. 56v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H3.id) f. 32r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2: ff. 13r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id)</td>
<td>1: f. 37r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V2.P3</strong></td>
<td>Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis corde: misericors, &amp; miserator, &amp; justus Dominus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>f. 56v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H3.id) f. 32r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2: f. 13r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id)</td>
<td>1: f. 37r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>f. 56v-57r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) pp. 28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H3.id) f. 32v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2: f. 13r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id)</td>
<td>1: f. 37r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V2.P5</strong></td>
<td>De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>f. 57r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) p. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H3.id) f. 32v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2: f. 13v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id)</td>
<td>1: f. 37r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nat.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Hodie Christus natus est: Hodie Salvator apparuit: Hodie in terra canunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>in celo canunt f. 57r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (B) p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(H2.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (H2) f. 32v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>in celo canunt 2: f. 14r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fnp</em></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (B) 1: f. 38r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (Un) 1: f. 37v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis corde: misericors, &amp; miserator, &amp; justus Dominus.</td>
<td>Nat.O.V.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Martyr.V2.M</td>
<td>Sepelierunt Stephanum viri timorati, &amp; fecerunt planctum magnum super eum. + f. 69r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V2.M</td>
<td>Exiiit sermo inter fratres, quod discipulus ille non moritur, &amp; non dixit Jesus, non moritur: sed, Sic eum volo x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.OS.V</td>
<td>Dum medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. M silentium teneunt omnia, &amp; nox in suo cursu medium iter perageret, omnipotens sermo tuus Domine a regalis sedibus venit, alleluia.</td>
<td>Nat.O5.L.B cursu iter ff. 88v-89r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.O5.L.B cursu iter f. 60r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.O5.L.B cursu iter 2: f. 26r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.O5.L.B cursu iter Fr. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat.O5.L.B cursu iter 1: f. 60r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) Nat.O5.L.B (H1) cursu iter 1: f. 59r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.O5.V. Com.Thomas Cantuariensis Qui vult venire post me, abneget semetipsum, &amp; tollat crucem suam, &amp; sequatur me.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) 1Mar.V2.M p. 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) 1Mar.V2.M 3: p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) 1Mar.V2.M 3: p. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Nat.V2.M (B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (B) p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Nat.V2.M (H2.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (H2) f. 32v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Nat.V2.M in celo canunt 2: f. 14r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Nat.V2.M (B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (B) 1: f. 38r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Nat.V2.M (B.head.id) in celo canunt &gt; in terra canunt (Un) 1: f. 37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ StephenMartyr.V 2.M (H6.id, H7.id) f. 43r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ StephenMartyr.V 2.M (Ho.id) 2: f. 21r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ StephenMartyr.V 2.M (H9.id, B.id) 1: f. 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ StephenMartyr.V 2.M (B.id) 1: f. 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) StephenMartyr.V 2.M (H9.id, B.id) 1: f. 46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) StephenMartyr.V 2.M (B.id) 1: f. 46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) JohnEvangelist.V 2.M 1: f. 51r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) JohnEvangelist.V 2.M 1: f. 50v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.OS.V 2.M</td>
<td>Puer Jesus proficiebat aetate &amp; sapientia coram Deo et hominibus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.P1</td>
<td>O admirabile commercium! Creator generis humani, animatum corpus sumens, de Virgine nasci dignatus est: &amp; procedens homo sine semine, largitus est nobis suam Deitatem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.P2</td>
<td>Quando natus es ineffabiliter ex Virgine, tunc impletae sunt Scripturae: sicut pluvia in vellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.P3</td>
<td>Rubum, quem viderat Moyses incombustum, conservatam agnovimus tuam laudabilem virginitatem: Dei genitrix intercede pro nobis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.P4</td>
<td>Germinavit radix Jesse, orta est stella ex Jacob, Virgo peperit Salvatorem: te laudamus Deus noster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.P5</td>
<td>Ecce Maria genuit nobis Salvatorem, quem Joannes videns exclamavit, dicens: Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V1.M</td>
<td>Propter nimiam charitatem suam, qua dilexit nos Deus, Filium suum misit in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
2 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon, reading *dextris Dei*, on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.</td>
<td>A bimatu et</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8.V.P2</td>
<td>infra, occidit multos pueros Herodes propter Dominum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V.P2</td>
<td>Innocents.V.P2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (Ho.ri, B.ri) p. 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V.P2</td>
<td>Innocents.V.P2 ff. 55v-56r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V.P2</td>
<td>Innocents.V.P2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (H3.ri) f. 25r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V.P2</td>
<td>Innocents.V.P2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (B.ri) f. 56v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V.P2</td>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (Un.ri, B.ri) f. 56v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.L.P2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (Ho.ri, B.ri) f. 83r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 3 (B.ri) f. 55r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com2 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 3 (H3.ri) f. 23v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (B.ri) f. 56v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.P3</td>
<td>Vox in Rama audita est, ploratus et ululatus, Rachel plorans filios suos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.L.P3 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (Ho.ri, B.ri) f. 83r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com3 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 4 (B.ri) f. 55r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com3 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 4 (H3.ri) f. 23v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (B.ri) f. 56v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.L.P4 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (Ho.ri, B.ri) f. 83r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com4 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 5 (B.ri) f. 55r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.Com4 &gt; Innocents.O8.V.P 5 (H3.ri) f. 24r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.P 2 (B.ri) f. 56v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V .Com.Innocents ipsum collaudant Agnum f. 78r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V .Com.Innocents ipsum collaudant Agnum f. 50v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V .Com.Innocents ipsum collaudant Agnum f. 23r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V .Com.Innocents ipsum collaudant Agnum f. 52r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.O8.V.Com</td>
<td>Puer Jesus proficiebat aetate x x x x [fnp] x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vig.Ep</td>
<td>&amp; sapientia coram Deo et hominibus.</td>
<td>1Mar.V1.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ mirram</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) mirram &gt; mirram f. 65r-v</td>
<td>+ (H8.id) mirram f. 65r-v</td>
<td>+ mirram 2: f. 28v</td>
<td>+ (H4.id) mirram Fr. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V2.M</td>
<td>Tribus miraculis ornatum diem sanctum colimus: hodie stella Magos duxit ad praesperium: hodie vinum ex aqua factum est ad nuptias: hodie in Jordane a Joanne Christus baptizari voluit, ut salvaret nos, alleluia.</td>
<td>Fr. 1</td>
<td>1: f. 69r-v</td>
<td>1: f. 68r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Hodie a</td>
<td>+ (B.id) Hodie a &gt; Hodie in Jordane a (B) p. 52</td>
<td>+ (H8.id) Hodie a f. 71r</td>
<td>+ Hodie a 2: ff. 30v-31r</td>
<td>+ (H4.id) Hodie a Fr. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.OS.V.P 1</td>
<td>Ante luciferum genitus, &amp; ante saecula, Dominus Salvator noster hodie mundo apparuit.</td>
<td>Fr. 1</td>
<td>1: f. 69r-v</td>
<td>1: f. 68r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.OS.V.P</td>
<td>Venit lumen</td>
<td>Fr. 1</td>
<td>1: f. 69r-v</td>
<td>1: f. 68r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.S6.V2.M¹</td>
<td>Simile est regnum coelorum fermento, quod acceptum mulier abscondit in farinae satis tribus, donec fermentatum est totum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x H4.ref on f. 78v <em>in schrift</em></td>
<td>add (B) 1: 76r</td>
<td>add (B) 1: f. 74r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H11 also wrote this antiphon on a loose slip of paper preserved at the back of IV 15, as did H16 in IV 25, f. 103v.
### Table 3.4.3: From Septuagesima Sunday to the Holy Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 4</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 22</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
<th>Fr. 1 + 130 G 18</th>
<th>PBF 6168 Hs</th>
<th>KHS 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>Dixit Dominus ad Adam: De ligno quod est in medio paradisi necomedas: in qua hora comederas, mortem moreris.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>Dixit Dominus ad Noe: Finis universae carnis venit coram me: fac tibi arcam de lignis laevigatis, ut salvetur universum semen in ea.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (H13) f. 93br</td>
<td>add (H11) f. 106v</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Vobis datum est nosse mysterium regni Dei, ceteris autem in parabolis, dixit Jesus discipulis suis.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>add (H12) f. 107v&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quin.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>Pater fidei nostrae Abraham summus obtulit holocaustum super altare pro filio.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quin.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Stans autem Jesus jussit caecum adduci ad se, &amp; ait illi: Quid vis ut faciam tibi? Domine, ut videam. Et Jesus ait illi: Respicie, fides tua te salvum fecit. Et</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>add (B) 1: ff. 80v-81r</td>
<td>add (B) 1: ff. 82v-83r</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> H12 erroneously identified this antiphon as Sep.V2.M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quad.S1.V1.M</th>
<th>Tunc invocabis, &amp; Dominus exaudiet: clamabis, &amp; dicet: Ecce adsum.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>[fnp]</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quad.S2.V1.M</td>
<td>Visionem, quam vidistis, nemini dixeritis, donec a mortuis resurgent Filius hominis.</td>
<td>+ ff. 149v-150r</td>
<td>+ p. 72</td>
<td>+ f. 107v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ f. 89v</td>
<td>+ 1: f. 89r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad.S3.V1.M¹</td>
<td>Dixit autem pater ad servos suos: Cito proferte stolam primam, &amp; induite illum, &amp; dare annulum in manu ejus, &amp; calceamenta in pedibus ejus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose slip of paper preserved at the back of IV 15, with a header by H1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pas.V1.M</td>
<td>Ego sum qui testimonium perhibeo de meipso: &amp; testimonium perhibet de me, qui misit me Pater.</td>
<td>Pas.V1.M Ego sum qui testimonium perhibeo de meipso: &amp; testimonium perhibet de me, qui misit me Pater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The rubricator of 130 G 18 erroneously identified this antiphon as Quad.S5.V2.M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[meum: vidit, &amp; gavisus est.]</th>
<th>f. 183r</th>
<th>[Pas.V2.M (H6.ri) f. 138r]</th>
<th>2: f. 46r</th>
<th>f. 94v</th>
<th>[Pas.V2.M (B.ri) 1: f. 114r]</th>
<th>[Pas.V2.M (H1.ri, B.ri) 1: f. 118r]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Pater juste, mundus te non cognovit: ego autem novi te, quia tu me misisti.]</td>
<td>+ autem cognovi te f. 186v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ f. 95v-[fnp]</td>
<td>+ autem cognovi te 1: f. 116v</td>
<td>+ autem cognovi te 1: f. 120v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Scriptum est enim: Percutiam pastorem, &amp; dispergentur oves gregis; postquam autem resurrexero, praeecedam vos in Galilaeam: ibi me videbitis, dicit Dominus.]</td>
<td>+ surrexero f. 193r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ (H2.id) surrexero f. 143r</td>
<td>+ (H3.id) surrexero 2: ff. 49v-50r</td>
<td>+ (H4.id) surrexero f. 96r-v</td>
<td>+ (B.id) surrexero 1: f. 121v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>IV 6</td>
<td>IV 7</td>
<td>IV 15</td>
<td>IV 21</td>
<td>IV 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V1.P</td>
<td>Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>+ (H11.id)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alleluia &gt; alleluia alleluia (B) f. 2r</td>
<td>alleluia alleluia (B) p. 94</td>
<td>alleluia f. 1r</td>
<td>alleluia f. 1r</td>
<td>alleluia &gt; alleluia alleluia (B) f. 1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V1.M</td>
<td>Vespere autem Sabbati, quae lucescit in prima Sabbati, venit Maria Magdalene, &amp; altera Maria videre sepulchrum, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>+ (H11.id)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eas.V1.M &gt; Eas.V1.M/C1.ND (B.ri) Magdalena p. 94</td>
<td>Magdalena f. 1r</td>
<td>Magdalena f. 1r</td>
<td>Magdalena f. 1r</td>
<td>Magdalena f. 1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.C1.ND</td>
<td>Vespere autem Sabbati, quae lucescit in prima Sabbati, venit Maria Magdalene, &amp; altera Maria videre sepulchrum, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P1</td>
<td>Angelus autem Domini descendit de coelo, &amp; accedens revolvit lapidem, &amp; sedebat super eum, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eas.L.P1 &gt; Eas.V2.P1 (B.ri) f. 3v</td>
<td>Eas.L.P1 &gt; Eas.V2.P1 (Un.ri) ff. 4v-5r</td>
<td>Eas.L.P1 &gt; Eas.V2.P1 (H6.ri) f. 3v</td>
<td>Eas.L.P1 &gt; Eas.V2.P1 (H8.ri, B.ri) f. 3r</td>
<td>Eas.L.P1 &gt; Eas.V2.P1 (H8.ri, B.ri) f. 3r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P2</td>
<td>Et ecce terraemotus factus est magnus: Angelus enim Domini descendit de coelo, alleluia.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (B.ri) autem &gt; enim (B) ff. 3v-4r</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (Un.ri) autem f. 5r</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (H6.ri) autem f. 3v</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (H8.ri, B.ri) autem f. 3r-v</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (H8.ri, B.ri) autem f. 3r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>Erat autem aspectus ejus sicut fulgur,</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt;</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt;</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt;</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt;</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
2 Ho also wrote this antiphon, reading *autem*, on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
3 Ho also wrote this antiphon, reading *eius candida* and *alleluia*, on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>vestimenta autem ejus sicut nix, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>f. 3v</td>
<td>eius candida, alleluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>f. 5r-v</td>
<td>allemuya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>f. 3v</td>
<td>allemuya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3</td>
<td>f. 3v</td>
<td>allemuya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.V2.P4**

Prae timore autem ejus exterriti sunt custodes, & facti sunt velut mortui, alleluia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.L.P4</td>
<td>p. 93</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P4</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>+ Eas.L.P4 &gt; Eas.V2.P4 (B.ri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.V2.P5**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.L.P5</td>
<td>p. 93</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P5</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>+ Eas.L.P5 &gt; Eas.V2.P5 (B.ri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.O.V.A**

Haec dies quam fecit Dominus: exultemus, & laetemur in ea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr</td>
<td>f. 96</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr (B.ri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.V2.M**

Et respicientes viderunt revolutum lapidem: erat quippe magnus valde, alleluia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2</td>
<td>p. 93-94</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>+ Eas.V2.Gr (B.ri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ET.C.P**

Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET.C.P</td>
<td>f. 1r</td>
<td>+ Eas.V2.Gr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.O.C.ND**

Haec dies quam fecit Dominus: exultemus, & laetemur in ea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr</td>
<td>f. 96</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>Eas.V2.Gr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eas.O2-6.V.P1**

Angelus autem Domini descendit de cerkono

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.L.P1</td>
<td>p. 93</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P1</td>
<td>f. 4r</td>
<td>Eas.V2.P1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
2 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coelo, &amp; accedens revolvit lapidem, &amp; sedebat super eum, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>Eas.V2.P1 (B.ri) f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 93</td>
<td>Eas.V2.P1 (Un.ri) ff. 4v-5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P1 (H6.ri) f. 3v</td>
<td>Eas.V2.P1 (H8.ri, B.ri) f. 3r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: f. 72v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et ecce terraemotus factus est magnus: Angelus enim Domini descendit de coelo, alleluia.</td>
<td>Eas.O2-6.V.P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (B.ri) autem &gt; enim (B) ff. 3v-4r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) Eas.V2.P2 p. 93</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (H6.ri) autem f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P2 &gt; Eas.V2.P2 (H8.ri, B.ri) autem f. 3r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O2-6.V.P3</td>
<td>Erat autem aspectus ejus sicut fulgur, vestimenta autem ejus sicut nix, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt; Eas.V2.P3 (B.ri) eius candida &gt; autem ejus (B), alleluia &gt; alleluia alleluia (B) f. 4r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) Eas.V2.P3 p. 93</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt; Eas.V2.P3 (H6.ri) eius candida, alleluia f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P3 &gt; Eas.V2.P3 (H8.ri, B.ri) eius candida &gt; autem ejus (B), alleluia f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.3 eius candida, alleluia f. 2: f. 72v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O2-6.V.P4</td>
<td>Prae timore autem ejus exterriti sunt custodes, &amp; facti sunt velut mortui, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P4 &gt; Eas.V2.P4 (B.ri) f. 4r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) Eas.V2.P4 p. 93</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P4 &gt; Eas.V2.P4 (H6.ri) f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P4 &gt; Eas.V2.P4 (H8.ri, B.ri) f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P4 f. 2: f. 72v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P5 &gt; Eas.V2.P5 (B.ri) f. 4r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) Eas.V2.P5 p. 93</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P5 &gt; Eas.V2.P5 (H6.ri) ff. 3v-4r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P5 &gt; Eas.V2.P5 (H8.ri, B.ri) f. 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eas.L.P5 2: ff. 72v-73r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O2.V.M</td>
<td>Qui sunt hi sermones, quos confertis ad invicem ambulantes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id, B.ref on f. 94) tristes alleluia</td>
<td>+ (H4.id) tristes alleluia alleluia et respondens unus cui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (H6.id) tristes alleluia alleluia et</td>
<td>+ (H6.id) tristes alleluia alleluia et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (H8.id, B.id) tristes alleluia alleluia et</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
2 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
3 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
4 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
5 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
& estis tristes, alleluia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ p. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H4.id) ff. 15v-16r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H6.id) f. 10r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H8.id) f. 8r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 77v-[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O8.V.P</td>
<td>Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (B.id) p. 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Eas.V2.P &gt; ET.S.V.P (H4.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 15r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ f. 17r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET.S.V.P</td>
<td>Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET.S.V.Com.Cross</td>
<td>Crucem sanctam subit, qui infernum confregit: accinctus est potentia, surrexit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The scribe of IV 7, p. 107 erroneously provided the Benedictus antiphon Post dies as the Magnificat antiphon for first Vespers.
| Eas.S5.V2. M | Petite, & accipietis, ut gaudium vestrum sit plenum: ipse enim Pater amat vos, quia | | + (H1.id) plenum sit > sit plenum (B) f. 21r-v | + (Ho.id) plenum sit > sit plenum (B) p. 107 | + (H6.id) plenum sit f. 39r-v | + (H28.id) plenum sit f. 22v | + (Ho.id) plenum sit f. 31r-v |

¹ The scribe of IV 25 erroneously identified this antiphon as the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers.
² The scribe of IV 21 erroneously omitted this antiphon.
<p>| Asc.V.P1 | Viri Galilaei, quid aspicitis in coelum? Hic Jesus, qui assumptus est a vobis in coelum, sic veniet, alleluia. |
| Asc.V.P2 | Cumque intuerentur in coelum eum illum, dixerunt, Alleluia. |
| Asc.V.P3 | Elevatis manibus benedixit eis, &amp; ferebatur in coelum, alleluia. |
| Asc.V.P4 | Exaltate Regem regum, &amp; hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia. |
| Asc.V.P5 | Videntibus illis elevatus est, &amp; nubes suscepit eum in coelo, alleluia. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asc.V1.M</th>
<th>Pater, manifestavi nomen tuum hominibus quos dedisti mihi; nunc autem pro eis rogo, non pro mundo, quia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (H1.id, B.id) f. 26r</td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) p. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.Os.V.P 1</td>
<td>Viri Galilaei, quid aspicitis in coelum? Hic Jesus, qui assumptus est a vobis in coelum, sic veniet, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Asc.L.P3 &gt; Asc.V.P1 (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 25v</td>
<td>+ Asc.V2.P3 &gt; Asc.V.P1 (Ho.ri) p. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.Os.V.P 2</td>
<td>Cumque intuerentur in coelum euntem illum, dixerunt, Alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Asc.L.P2 &gt; Asc.V.P2 (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 25v</td>
<td>+ Asc.V2.P2 &gt; Asc.V.P2 (Ho.ri) p. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.Os.V.P 3</td>
<td>Elevatis manibus benedixit eis, &amp; ferebatur in coelum, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Asc.L.P5 &gt; Asc.V.P3 (H1.ri, B.ri) ferebatur in celem et benedixit eis, et ferebatur in caelum (B) ff. 25v-26r</td>
<td>+ Asc.V2.P5 &gt; Asc.V.P3 (Ho.ri) ferebatur in celem et benedixit eis &gt; benedixit eis, et ferebatur, in caelum (B) p. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.Os.V.P 4</td>
<td>Exaltate Regem regum, &amp; hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Asc.L.P4 &gt; Asc.V.P4 (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 25v</td>
<td>+ Asc.V2.P4 &gt; Asc.V.P4 (Ho.ri) pp. 119-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.Os.V.P 5</td>
<td>Videntibus illis elevatus est, &amp; nubes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Asc.L.P1 &gt;</td>
<td>+ Asc.V2.P1 &gt; Asc.V.P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.OS.V1. M</td>
<td>Cum venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis Spiritum veritatis, qui a Patre procedit, ille testimonium perhibebit de me, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.OS.V2. M</td>
<td>Haece locutus sum vobis, ut cum venerit hora eorum, reminiscamini quia ego dixi vobis, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V3</td>
<td>Repleti sunt omnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Pen.L.P3 &gt; Pen.V.P3 (B.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v-30r</td>
<td>Pen.V2.P3 &gt; Pen.V.P3 (Ho.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51v</td>
<td>Pen.L.P3 &gt; Pen.V.P3 (H6.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v</td>
<td>Pen.L.P3 &gt; Pen.V.P3 (H28.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v</td>
<td>Pen.L.P3 &gt; Pen.V.P3 (H2.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) p. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pen.L.P4 &gt; Pen.V.P4 (H6.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pen.L.P4 &gt; Pen.V.P4 (H2.ri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B.id, B.ref on f. 30r) f. 28r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) pp. 124-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H6.id) ff. 47v-48r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H28.id) f. 30v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) f. 40r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>Pen.L.P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Pen.L.P1 &gt; Pen.V.P1 (B.ri) Dum &gt; Cum (B), dicentes &gt; in eodem loco (B) f. 29v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Pen.V2.P1 &gt; Pen.V.P1 (Ho.ri) Dum &gt; Cum (B), dicentes &gt; in eodem loco (B) p. 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Pen.L.P1 &gt; Pen.V.P1 (H6.ri) Dum, dicentes f. 51v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Pen.L.P1 &gt; Pen.V.P1 (H28.ri) Dum, dicentes f. 32v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Pen.L.P1 &gt; Pen.V.P1 (H2.ri) Dum, dicentes f. 42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>Pen.O2.V.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>Pen.O2.V.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4.5: After Pentecost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 6</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 15</th>
<th>IV 21</th>
<th>IV 25</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tri.V.M</td>
<td>Gratias tibi Deus, gratias tibi vera &amp; una Trinitas, una &amp; summa Deitas, sancta &amp; una Unitas.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
2 Un also replaced the original text of this antiphon with the typical one in IV 8, f. 47v.
3 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC.V1.M</td>
<td>O quam suavis est Domine spiritus tuus, qui ut dulcedinem tuam in filios monstrares, pane suavissimo de coelo praestito, esurientes reples bonis, fastidiosos divites dimittens inanes.</td>
<td>+ (B.id) replens f. 35v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ (H6.id) replens f. 62v-63r</td>
<td>+ (H28.id) replens ff. 39v-40r</td>
<td>+ replens [fnp]-2: f. 78r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC.V2.M</td>
<td>O sacrum convivium, in quo Christus sumitur: recolitur memoria passionis ejus: mens impletur gratia: &amp; futurae gloriae nobis pignus datur, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ (B, B.ref on f. 35v) f. 40r-v</td>
<td>(fnp)</td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) p. 134</td>
<td>+ (H6.id) f. 65v-66r</td>
<td>+ (H28.id) f. 45r-v</td>
<td>+ ff. 56v-57r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC.O.S.V. P3</td>
<td>Calicem salutaris accipiam, &amp; sacrificabo hostiam laudis.</td>
<td>+ CC.V1.P3 &gt; CC.V.P3 (B.ri) f. 34v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ CC.V1.P3 &gt; CC.V.P3 (H6.ri) f. 61r-v</td>
<td>+ CC.V1.P3 &gt; CC.V.P3 (Un.ri) f. 49r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satiat nos Dominus.</td>
<td>CC.V.P5 (B.ri) f. 35r</td>
<td>CC.V.P5 (H6.ri) f. 61v</td>
<td>CC.V.P5 (Un.ri) f. 39r</td>
<td>CC.V.P5 (Un.ri) f. 49r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puer Samuel ministrabat ante Deum coram Heli, &amp; sermo Domini erat pretiosus cum eo.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus Dominus Deus meus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* f. 252v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per singulos dies benedicam te Domine.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudabo Deum meum in vita mea.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deo nostro jucunda sit laudatio.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauda Jerusalem Dominum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fidelis Samuel Prophetae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sede Domini.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Per signum Crucis de inimicis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nostris libera nos Deus noster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Per signum Crucis.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exaltation.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BV.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sancta Maria.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Succurre miseris,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>juva pusillanimes,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>refere flebilis,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ora pro populo,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>interveni pro clero,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>intercede pro devoto</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>femineo sexu:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sentiant omnes tuum juvamen,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quicunque celebrant tuam</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sanctam commemorationem.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sancta Maria,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sacre tua</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pace Domine in diebus nostris,</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qua non est alius qui pugnet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pro nobis nisi tu Deus noster.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Da pacem Domine</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 48v</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 146</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 77r</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 56r</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 88v</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Machabees.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sab2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V.M</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>f. 83r</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit Dominus Domino.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>meo: Sede a dextrae meis.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>add (H1)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p. 366</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sede a dextrae meis.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dixit Dominus.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>x</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un also added this antiphon to IV 90, f. 18v.
<p>| Pen.S.V2. P2 | Fidelia omnia mandata ejus, confirmata in saeculum saeculi. | x | + p. 367 | + f. 248r-v | x | x | + 2: f. 90r |
| Pen.S.V2. P3 | In mandatis ejus cupid nimis. | x | + volet &gt; cupid (B) p. 367 | + volet f. 248v | x | x | + volet 2: f. 90r |
| Pen.S.V2. P4 | Sit nomen Domini benedictum in saecula. | x | + p. 367 | + f. 248v | x | x | + 2: f. 90v |
| Pen.S.V2. P5 | Nos qui vivimus, benedicitis Domino. | x | + p. 367 | + f. 248v | x | x | + 2: f. 90v |
| Pen.S5.V1.M | Montes Giboe, nec ros nec pluvia veniant super vos: quia in te abjectus est clypeus fortium, clypeus Saul, quasi non esset unctus oleo. Quomodo ceciderunt fortes in bello: Jonathas in excelsis interfectus est: Saul &amp; Jonathas amabiles, &amp; decore valde in vita sua, in morte quoque non sunt divisī. | x | x | x | x | x | x | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f. 52v</th>
<th>p. 153</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S7.V1.M</td>
<td>Unxerunt Salomonem Sadoc sacerdos, &amp; Nathan Propheta regem in Gihon, &amp; ascendentes laeti dixerunt: Vivat rex in aeternum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S8.V1.M</td>
<td>Exaudisti Domine orationem servi tui, ut aedificarem templum nomini tuo.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S9.V1.M</td>
<td>Dum tolleret Dominus Eliam per turbinem in coelum, Eliseus clamabat: Pater mi, currus Israel, &amp; auriga ejus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.S3.V 1.M</td>
<td>Omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est, &amp; cum illo fuit semper, &amp; est ante aevum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.S1.V 1.M</td>
<td>Cum audisset Job nuntiorum verba sustinuit patienter, &amp; ait: Si bona susceptimus de manu Domini, mala autem quare non sustineamus? In omnibus his non peccavit Job labiis suis, neque stultum aliquid contra Deum locutus est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.S2.V 1.M</td>
<td>In omnibus his non peccavit Job labiis suis, neque stultum aliquid contra Deum locutus est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.S1.V1.M</td>
<td>Vidi Dominum sedentem super solium excelsum, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S13.V2.M</td>
<td>Unus autem ex illis, ut vidit quod mundatus est regressus est cum magna voce magnificans Deum,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S22.V 2.M</td>
<td>Reddite ergo quae sunt Caesaris, Caesaris: &amp; quae sunt Dei, Deo, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S23.V 2.M</td>
<td>At Jesus conversus, &amp;videns eam, dixit: Confide filia, fides tua te salvam fecit, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S24.V 2.M</td>
<td>Amen dico vobis, quia non praeertibit generatio haec, donec omnia fiant: coelum &amp; terra transibunt, verba autem mea non transibunt, dicit Dominus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Antiphon</td>
<td>IV 4</td>
<td>IV 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew the Apostle (30 November): second class double</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.4.6: The Proper of Saints for the Winter Half of the Year**
<p>| AndrewApostle.V2.M | Cum pervenisset beatus Andreas ad locum, ubi crux parata erat, exclamavit &amp; dixit: O bona crux, diu desiderata, &amp; jam concupiscenti animo praeparata: | (H1.id) ita ut et f. 229r | (H1.id) ita ut et pp. 166-167 | (H1.id) ita ut et f. 173r-v | (H1.id, B.id, B.ref on 2: f. 13v) ita ut et 2: f. 7r-v |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AndrewApostle.V2.</th>
<th>ConfBis.V1.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Conception of the Blessed Virgin (8 December): second class double with an octave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConceptionBV.V.P1</th>
<th>Conceptio gloriosae virginis Mariae ex semine Abrahae, ortae de tribu Juda, clara ex stirpe David.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV. L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV. V2.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV. V.P1 (H1.ri, B.head) orta &gt; ortae (B) p. 178</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV. L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV. V.P1 (H1.ri, H7.head) orta f. 185v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri, B.head) orta f. 245v</td>
<td>+ NativityBV.L.P5 &gt; NativityBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri) Nativitas, orta 2: ff. 128v-129r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V.P1 (H1.ri) f. 244v</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri) orta f. 22r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V.P2 (H1.ri) f. 244v</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri) orta f. 21v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V2.P1 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P2 (H1.ri) f. 244v</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P2 (Un.ri) orta f. 18r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V.P2 (H1.ri) f. 176</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P5 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P2 (Un.ri) orta f. 17v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P1 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P1 (H1.ri) f. 245r</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P1 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P2 (Un.ri) orta &gt; exorta (B) p. 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V2.P1 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Ho.ri, B.head) orta &gt; exorta (B) p. 177</td>
<td>+ NativityBV.L.P3 &gt; NativityBV.V.P3 (Ho.ri) orta &gt; exorta (Un) 2: f. 128v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P3 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P3 (H1.ri, H7.head) orta f. 185v</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P3 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Un.ri) orta f. 21v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V.P3 (H1.ri) f. 245r</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P3 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Un.ri) orta f. 18v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Ho.ri) orta f. 177</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.L.P3 &gt; ConceptionBV.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 13r, Un.ri, B.ri) orta f. 17v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConceptionBV.V.P4</th>
<th>Corde &amp; animo Christo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
<td>+ NativityBV.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
<td>+ ConceptionBV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
canamus gloriam, in hac sacra solemnitate praecelsae genitricis Dei Mariae.

ConceptionBV.V.P5
Cum jucunditate Conceptionem beatae Mariae celebremus, ut ipsa pro nobis intercedat ad Dominum Jesum Christum.

ConceptionBV.V1.M
Gloriosae virginis Mariae Conceptionem dignissimam recolamus, quae & genitricis dignitatem obtinuit, & virginalem pudicitiam non amasit.

ConceptionBV.V2.M
Conceptio tua, Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConceptionBV.V2.C</th>
<th>IMar.V1.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lucy of Syracuse (13 December): double**

| LucySyracuse.V.P1 | Orante sancta Lucia, apparuit ei beata Agatha, & consolabatur ancillam Christi. | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 > LucySyracuse.V.P1 (H1.ri) f. 248v | add (B) p. 178 | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 > LucySyracuse.V.P1 (H1.ri, H7.head) f. 187v | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 2: f. 57v-[fnp] | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 > LucySyracuse.V.P1 (Un.ri) f. 24r | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 > LucySyracuse.V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 19r, H1.ri, B.ri) 2: f. 20r-v | + LucySyracuse.L.P1 > LucySyracuse.V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 18r, Un.ri, B.ri) 2: f. 19r-v |
|------------------|---------|
| LucySyracuse.V.P3 | Per te Lucia virgo, civitas Syracusana decorabitur a Domino Jesu Christo. | + LucySyracuse.L.P3 > LucySyracuse.V.P3 (H1.ri) ff. 248v-249r | add (B) pp. 179-180 | + LucySyracuse.L.P3 > LucySyracuse.V.P3 (H1.ri, H7.head) ff. 187v-188r | [fnp] | + LucySyracuse.L.P3 > LucySyracuse.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 19r, H1.ri, B.ri) 2: f. 20v | + LucySyracuse.L.P3 > LucySyracuse.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 18r, Un.ri, B.ri) 2: f. 19v |
| LucySyracuse.V.P4 | Benedico te | + | add (B) | | [fnp] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In tua patientia possedisti animam tuam, Lucia sponsa Christi: odisti quae in mundo sunt, & coruscas cum Angelis: sanguine proprio inimicum vicisti. | + (H1.id) subisti ff. 245v-246r | + (Ho.id, B.head.id) subisti > vicisti (B) pp. 178-179 | + (H7.id) subisti ff. 186r-v | + subisti 2: f. 57v | + (H26.id) subisti f. 22v |
| Dedisti Domine habitaculum martyri tuo Clementi in mari, in modum templi marmorei, Angelicis manibus | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
praeparatum, iter praebens populo terrae, ut enarrent mirabilia tua.


Conceptio tua, Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster: qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem; & confundens mortem, donavit nobis vitam sempiternam.

LucySyracuse.V2.M

Tanto pondere eam fixit Spiritus sanctus, ut virgo Christi immobils permaneret.

LucySyracuse.V2.Com.BibianaRome

Virga. V.M

LucySyracuse.V2.Com.ConceptionBV.O6

Conceptio tua, Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit.
universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster: qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem; & confundens mortem, donavit nobis vitam sempiternam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominum: ecce concipies, &amp; paries filium, alleluia.</td>
<td>rd.V.P3 (Un.ri)</td>
<td>paries filium f. 292r-v</td>
<td>rd.V.P3 (B.ref on p. 177, Ho.ri) paries filium p. 200</td>
<td>d.V.P3 (Un.ri) paries filium ff. 225v-226r</td>
<td>Lord.V.P3 (Ho.ri) paries filium f. 67r</td>
<td>rd.V.P3 (Un.ri) paries filium 2: ff. 65v-66r</td>
<td>rd.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: 54r, B.ri, B.ri) paries filium 2: f. 58v</td>
<td>rd.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: 51v, H1.ri, B.ri) paries filium 2: f. 55v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpectationBV.V1.C</td>
<td>O Sapientia, quae ex ore Altissimi prodiisti, attingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, suaviter disponens omnia, veni ad docendum nos viam prudentiae.</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 prodisti; suaviter disponensque f. 21r-v</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 prodisti (B.ri) prodiisti &gt; prodiisti (B); suaviter disponensque &gt; suaviterque disponens (B) p. 11</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 prodisti; suaviter disponensque f. 7v</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 prodisti; suaviter disponensque 2: f. 1r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 (B.ri) prodisti; suaviter disponensque 1: f. 13r</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA1 (B.ri) prodisti; suaviter disponensque 1: f. 12r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The seven major antiphons are reidentified in the sense that the rubrics of the Roman Breviary assign them to specific dates from 17 to 23 December (e.g. IV 65:1, pp. 165-166), which was made explicit by H1 in KHS 28, 1: ff. 12r-13r but was implicitly intended by B as well. The rubrics of the manuscripts, however, distribute the major antiphons across the days between the feast of Lucy of Syracuse (13 December) and the vigil of Christmas (24 December) (e.g. KHS 28, 1: f. 12r). These are ten days rather than seven, but at both Vespers of the feast of Thomas the Apostle (21 December) the antiphon O Thoma Didime was prayed (cf. KHS 28, 1: ff. 13v, 24r), bringing the total number of antiphons to ten.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Dimensions: 841.9x595.3</th>
<th>201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filiae Jerusalem quid me admiramini? Divinum est mysterium hoc quod cernitis.</td>
<td>plena, Dominus tecum: benedicta tu in mulieribus, alleluia. p. 200 [fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas the Apostle (21 December): second class double</td>
<td>+ Adv.MA2 (B.ri) 1: f. 13r-v + Adv.MA2 (B.ref on 1: f. 7r, H1.ri) 1: f. 12r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nemo aperi: veni, &amp; educ vincum de domo carceris, sedentem in tenebris, &amp; umbra mortis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Name of Jesus (second Sunday after the Epiphany): second class double</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P1</td>
<td>Omnis qui invocaverit nomen Domini, salvus erit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P2</td>
<td>Sanctum &amp; terribile nomen ejus, initium sapientiae timor Domini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P3</td>
<td>Ego autem in Domino gaudebo, &amp; exultabo in Deo Jesu meo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P4</td>
<td>A solis ortu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ho also wrote this antiphon in IV 3, pp. 405-406, as did H30 on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97 and H32 in IV 8, f. 147r.
2 H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97, as did H32 in IV 8, f. 147r.
3 H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97, as did H32 in IV 8, f. 147r-v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P5²</td>
<td>usque ad occasum laudabile nomen Domini.</td>
<td>p. 58</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V1.M¹</td>
<td>Sacrificabo hostiam laudis, &amp; nomen Domini invocabo.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 59</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V1.Com. Ep.S2</td>
<td>Fecit mihi magna qui potens est, &amp; sanctum nomen ejus, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V2.M⁴</td>
<td>Suscepit Deus Israel puerum suum: sicut locutus est ad Abraham, &amp; semen ejus: exaltare humiles usque in saeculum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V2.M⁴</td>
<td>Vocabis nomen ejus Jesum, ipse enim salvum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 59</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97. As did H32 in IV 8, f. 147v.
² H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97. As did H32 in IV 8, f. 147v.
³ H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97.
⁴ H30 also wrote this antiphon on a slip of paper in IV 19, between pp. 96-97. As did H32 in IV 8, f. 147v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>V2.Com.</th>
<th>Deficiente</th>
<th>vino, jussit</th>
<th>Jesus impleri</th>
<th>hydrias aqua,</th>
<th>queae in vinum</th>
<th>conversa est,</th>
<th>alleluia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Peter’s Chair at Rome (18 January): greater double**

| ChairRome.V.P1 | Ecce sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis placuit Deo, & inventus est justus. | + | ConfBis.L.P1 f. 318r | + | ConfBis.V2.P1 > ConfBis.V.P1 (H7.ri) p. 354 | x | + | ConfBis.L.P1 > ConfBis.V.P1 (H7.ri) f. 253r-v | x | + | ConfBis.L.P1 > ConfBis.V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 27v, B.head.ri) 3: p. 11 |

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tu es pastor ovium, princeps Apostolorum,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 183</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (H12) PeterPaul.V1.M f. 106r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) 2: f. 27v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tibi traditae sunt claves regni coelorum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancte Paule Apostole, praeidator veritatis, &amp; doctor Gentium, intercede pro nobis ad Deum, qui te elegit.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairRome.V1.Com. PriscaRome</td>
<td></td>
<td>1Vir.V.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agnes of Rome (21 January): double
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgnesRome.V1.M</td>
<td>Beata Agnes in medio flammarnum expansis manibus orabat; Te deprecor omnipotens adorande, colende, Pater metuende, quia per sanctum Filium tuum evasi minas sacrilegi tyranni, &amp; carnis spurcitas immaculato calle transivi: &amp; ecce venio ad te, quem amavi, quem quaesivi, quem semper optavi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ deprecor venerande, minas evasi f. 249v-250r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id, B.head.id) deprecor venerande &gt; deprecor omnipotens adorande (B), minas evasi &gt; evasi minas (B) p. 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ deprecor venerande, minas evasi f. 188v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ deprecor venerande, minas evasi f. 25r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) deprecor venerande &gt; deprecor omnipotens adorande (B), minas evasi &gt; evasi minas (B) 2: f. 28r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) deprecor venerande &gt; deprecor omnipotens adorande (B), minas evasi &gt; evasi minas (B) 2: f. 20r-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VincentSaragossa.V1.P1</td>
<td>Qui me confessus fuerit coram hominibus, confitebor &amp; ego eum coram Patre meo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 f. 305v</td>
<td>+ 1Mar.V2.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (H2.ri, H7.ri) f. 233v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis locum, Angelum</td>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) p. 347</td>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 155v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.V1.P1 (Ho.id, B.head.id)</td>
<td>+ + AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis locum, Angelum Domini praeparatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 1 &gt; AgnesRome.V1.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 27r)</td>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 1 &gt; AgnesRome.V1.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 27r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qui me confessus fuerit coram hominibus, confitebor &amp; ego eum coram Patre meo.</td>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 f. 305v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 f. 305v</td>
<td>+ 1Mar.V2.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (H2.ri, H7.ri) f. 233v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis locum, Angelum</td>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) p. 347</td>
<td>+ 1Mar.L.P1 &gt; 1Mar.V.P1 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 155v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.V1.P1 (Ho.id, B.head.id)</td>
<td>+ + AgnesRome.L.P1 Ingressa Agnes turpitudinis locum, Angelum Domini praeparatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 1 &gt; AgnesRome.V1.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 27r)</td>
<td>+ AgnesRome.L.P1 1 &gt; AgnesRome.V1.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 27r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VincentSaragossa.V1.M</td>
<td>1Mar.V1.M</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>AgnesRome.L.B</td>
<td>Stans beata Agnes in medio flammæ, expansis manibus oratæ ad Dominum: Omnipotens, adorante, colende, tremende, benedico te, &amp; glorifico nomen tuum in aeternum. f. 256r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>AgnesRome.L.B</td>
<td>Stans beata Agnes in medio flammæ, expansis manibus oratæ ad Dominum: Omnipotens, adorante, colende, tremende, benedico te, &amp; glorifico nomen tuum in aeternum. f. 193v-194r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Espousal of the Blessed Virgin (23 January): greater double**


| VincentSaragossa.V2.Gloriosae | x | add (B, B.ref on) | x | x | x | add (B, B.ref on) | add (B, B.ref on) |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| EspousalBV.V2.P1 | Desponsatio gloriosae virginis Mariae, ex semine Abrahae, ortae de tribu Juda, clara ex stirpe David. | x + ConceptionBV. V2.P5 > ConceptionBV. V.P1 (Ho.ri) Conception > Desponsatio (B, B.ref on p. 185), orta > ortae (B) p. 178 | + ConceptionBV. L.P5 > ConceptionBV. V.P1 (H1,ri, H7.head) Conception > Desponsatio (H15), orta f. 185v | + ConceptionBV. L,P5 > ConceptionBV. V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 14r, Un.ri, B.ri) Conception > Desponsatio (Un), orta > ortae (B) 2: f. 18v |
| EspousalBV.V2.P2 | Desponsatio est hodie sanctae Mariae virginis, cujus vita inclyta cunctas illustrat Ecclesias. | x + ConceptionBV. V2.P1 > ConceptionBV. V.P2 (B.ref on p. 185, Ho.ri, B.head) Conception > Desponsatio (B, B.ref on p. 185) p. 176 | + ConceptionBV. L.P1 > ConceptionBV. V.P2 (H1,ri) Conception > Desponsatio (H15) f. 183r | + ConceptionBV. L.P1 > ConceptionBV. V.P2 (Un.ri) Conception f. 21v |

1 Un changed the word *Nativitas* to *Desponsatio* in NativitasBV.L.P5 in IV 15, f. 179v.
2 Un changed the word *Nativitas* to *Desponsatio* in NativitasBV.L.P5 in IV 15, f. 179v.
| EspousalBV.V2.P3 | Regali ex progenie Maria exorta refugel: cujus precibus nos adjuvari mente & spiritu devotissime poscimus. | + ConceptionBV.L.P3 > ConceptionBV.V.P3 (H1.ri) orta f. 245r | + ConceptionBV.V2.P3 > ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Ho.ri) orta > exorta (B) p. 177 | + ConceptionBV.L.P3 > ConceptionBV.V.P3 (H1.ri, H7.head) orta f. 185v | + NativityBV.L.P3 > NativityBV.V.P3 (Ho.ri) orta > exorta (Un) 2: f. 128v | + ConceptionBV.L.P3 > ConceptionBV.V.P3 (Un.ri) orta > exorta (B) f. 2: f. 128v | 2: f. 17r |

EspousalBV.V2.M | Desponsatio x | + | + | + | + | + | + |
tua, Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster: qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem; & confundens mortem, donavit nobis vitam sempiternam.

ConceptionBV. V1.M > ConceptionBV. V2.M (B.ref on p. 185, Ho.ri, B.head) Conception > Desponsatio (B, B.ref on p. 185) pp. 175-176


ConceptionBV. V1.M > ConceptionBV. V2.M (H15) f. 180v

ConceptionBV. V1.M > ConceptionBV. V2.M (H26.ri) Conception > Desponsatio (H15) f. 180v

ConceptionBV. V1.M > ConceptionBV. V2.M (B.ref on p. 185, Ho.ri, B.ri) Conception > Desponsatio (B, B.ref on p. 185) f. 180v

Conversion of Paul (25 January): greater double


ConversionPaul.V.P1 1 H3 reidentified his antiphon, which was CommemorationPaul.L.P1, as ConversionPaul.V.P1 in IV 21, f. 99r.

ConversionPaul.V.P2 2 H3 reidentified his antiphon, which was CommemorationPaul.L.P2, as ConversionPaul.V.P2 in IV 21, f. 99r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul.V.P5</td>
<td>Ter virgis caesus sum, semel lapidatus sum, ter naufragium pertuli pro Christi nomine.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 185</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (H12) CommemorationPaul.L.P5 3 f. 106r</td>
<td>add (B, Ho. ref on 2: f. 37v) 2: f. 37v int schrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul.V1. M</td>
<td>Vade Anania, &amp; quaere Saulum: ecce enim orat: quia vas electionis est mihi, ut portet nomen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 183</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) 2: ff. 33v-34r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H3 reidentified his antiphon, which was CommemorationPaul.L.P4, as ConversionPaul.V.P3 in IV 21, f. 99v.
2 H3 reidentified his antiphon, which was CommemorationPaul.L.P5, as ConversionPaul.V.P4 in IV 21, f. 99v.
3 H12 erroneously dates the feast to 30 July rather than 30 June.

**Purification of the Blessed Virgin (2 February): second class double**

<p>| PurificationBV.V1.P l | O admirabile commercium! Creator generis humani, animatum corpus sumens, de Virgine nasci dignatus est: &amp; procedens homo sine | + Cir.L.P1 ff. 90v-91r | + (B.head.id) pp. 186-187 | + Cir.L.P1 &gt; Cir.V.P1 (H7.ref on f. 206r, H7) ff. 61v-62r | [fnp] | + Cir.L.P1 Fr. 1 | + Cir.L.P1 &gt; Cir.V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 38v, B.head.ri) 1: f. 61v | + Cir.L.P1 &gt; Cir.V.P1 (B.ref on 2: f. 36v, B.head.ri) 1: f. 60v |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PurificationBV.V1.P 2</th>
<th>Quando natus es ineffabiliter ex Virgine, tunc impletae sunt Scripturae: sicut pluvia in vellus descendisti, ut salvum faceres genus humanum: te laudamus Deus noster.</th>
<th>+ Cir.L.P2 de f. 91r</th>
<th>+ (B.head.id) de &gt; ex (B) p. 187</th>
<th>+ Cir.L.P2 &gt; Cir.V.P2 (H7.ref on f. 206r, H7) de f. 62r</th>
<th>[fnp]</th>
<th>+ Cir.L.P2 de Fr. 1</th>
<th>+ Cir.L.P2 &gt; Cir.V.P2 (B.ref on 2: f. 38r, B.head.ri) de 1: f. 61v</th>
<th>+ Cir.L.P2 &gt; Cir.V.P2 (B.ref on 2: f. 36v, B.head.ri) de 1: f. 60v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV.V1.P 3</td>
<td>Rubum, quem viderat Moyses incumbustum, conservatam agnovimus tuam laudabilem virginitatem: Dei genitrix intercede pro nobis.</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P3 f. 91r-v</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) pp. 187-188</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P3 &gt; Cir.V.P3 (H7.ref on f. 206r, H7) f. 62r-v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P3 Fr. 1 [incomplete]</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P3 &gt; Cir.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 38r, B.head.ri) 1: f. 61v-62r</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P3 &gt; Cir.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 36v, B.head.ri) 1: f. 60v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV.V1.P 4</td>
<td>Germinavit radix Jesse, orta est stella ex Jacob, Virgo peperit Salvatorem: te laudamus Deus noster.</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P4 f. 91v</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) p. 188</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P4 &gt; Cir.V.P4 (H7.ref on 2: f. 206r, H7) f. 62v</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P4 &gt; Cir.V.P4 (B.ref on 2: f. 38r, B.head.ri) 1: f. 62r</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P4 &gt; Cir.V.P4 (B.ref on 2: f. 36v, B.head.ri) 1: f. 61r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV.V1.P 5</td>
<td>Ecce Maria genuit nobis</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P5</td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) exclamabat &gt;</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P5 &gt;</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P5 &gt;</td>
<td>+ Cir.L.P5 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Salvatorem, quem Joannes videns exclamavit, dicens: Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>PurificationBV.V1. M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Senex puer portabat, puer autem senem regebat; quem virgo peperit, &amp; post partum virgo permanit: ipsum quem genuit, adoravit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>PurificationBV.V2.P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Simeon justus &amp; timoratus expectabat redemptionem Israel, &amp; Spiritus sanctus erat in eo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>PurificationBV.V2.P 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Responsum accepit Simeon a Spiritu sancto, non visurum se mortem, nisi videret Dominum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>PurificationBV.V2.P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Accipiens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV.V2.M</td>
<td>Hodie beata virgo Maria puerum Jesum praesentavit in templo, &amp; Simeon repletus Spiritu sancto acceptum in ulnas suas, &amp; benedixit Deum in aeternum.</td>
<td>+ f. 271r-v</td>
<td>+ (Ho.id, B.head)³ p. 191</td>
<td>+ (H2.id) f. 207r</td>
<td>+ (H10.id) f. 46r</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 2: f. 43r, B.id) f. 43v</td>
<td>+ (B.ref on 2: f. 36v, B.id) f. 41v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV.V2.GaudentiusNovara</td>
<td>ConfBis.V1.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, p. 425.
² B’s header erroneously speaks of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin (21 November).
³ B’s header erroneously speaks of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin (21 November).
|---|---|

**Agatha of Sicily (5 February): double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GilbertSempringham .V2.P1-5</th>
<th>Conf.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**AgathaSicily.V1.M**

| Stans beata Agatha in medio carceris, expansis manibus orabat ad Dominum: Domine Jesu Christe, magister bone, gratias tibi ago, qui me fecisti vincere tormenta carnificum: jube me Domine ad tuam immarcessibilem gloriam feliciter pervenire. | x | add (B) pp. 193-194 | x | x | x | add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 48r) 2: ff. 44v-45r | add (B) 2: ff. 45v-46r |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conf.V2.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**AgathaSicily.V2.P1**


---

1 The scribe of IV 7 only refers to this antiphon, without giving the chant itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgathaSicily.V2.P5</td>
<td>Qui me dignatus est ab omni plaga curare, &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The scribe of IV 7 erroneously gives this antiphon as the fifth psalm antiphon at second Vespers of Agatha, and *Qui me dignatus est* as the sixth, but cf. KHS 28, 2: 46r, where the rubric says that *Qui me dignatus est* is the fourth psalm antiphon at Lauds, and that the fourth antiphon at second Vespers is *Meus mea solidata est a Christo fundata*, and the fifth *Qui me dignatus est*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stans beata Agatha in medio carceris, expansis manibus orabat ad Dominum: Domine Jesu Christe, magister bone, gratias tibi ago, qui me fecisti vincere tormenta carnificum: jube me Domine ad tuam immarcessibilem gloriam feliciter pervenire.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) AgathaSicily.V1.M pp. 193-194</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peter’s Chair at Antioch (22 February): greater double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChairAntioch.V.P1</th>
<th>ConfBis.L.P1 f. 318r</th>
<th>ConfBis.V2.P1 &gt; ConfBis.V.P1</th>
<th>ConfBis.L.P1 &gt; ConfBis.V.P1</th>
<th>ConfBis.L.P1</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>ConfBis.L.P1 &gt; ConfBis.V.P1</th>
<th>ConfBis.L.P1 &gt; ConfBis.V.P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecce sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.P2</td>
<td>placuit Deo, &amp; inventus est justus.</td>
<td>(Ho.ri, B.head) p. 354</td>
<td>(H7.ri) f. 253r-v</td>
<td>ConfBis.V.P1 (Ho.ri)1 2: f. 161r-v</td>
<td>(B.ref on 2: f. 27v, B.head.ri) 3: p. 11</td>
<td>(B.ref on 2: f. 19v, B.head.ri) 3: p. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.P2</td>
<td>Non est inventus similis illi, qui conservaret legem Excelsi.</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P2 f. 318r</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.V.P2 &gt; ConfBis.V.P2 (Ho.ri, B.head) p. 354</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P2 &gt; ConfBis.V.P2 (H7.ri) f. 253v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P2 &gt; ConfBis.V.P2 (B.ref on 2: f. 27v, B.head.ri) 3: p. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.P3</td>
<td>Ideo jurejurando fecit illum Dominus crescere in plebem suam.</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P3 f. 318r</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.V.P3 &gt; ConfBis.V.P3 (Ho.ri, B.head) p. 354</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P3 &gt; ConfBis.V.P3 (H7.ri) f. 253v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ ConfBis.L.P3 &gt; ConfBis.V.P3 (B.ref on 2: f. 27v, B.head.ri) 3: p. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.P4</td>
<td>Sacerdotes Dei benedicite Dominum, servi Domini, hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) ConfBis.V.P4 p. 355</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 27v) ConfBis.V.P4 3: p. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.P5</td>
<td>Serve bone &amp; fidelis, intra in gaudium Domini tui.</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P4 f. 319v</td>
<td>+ Conf.V.P4 &gt; ConfBis/Conf.V.P5 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) p. 357</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P4 &gt; ConfBis/Conf.V.P5 (Ho. ri) Fr. 33:3-2: f. 162r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P4 &gt; ConfBis/Conf.V.P5 (B.ref on 3: p. 12, B.head.ri) 3: p. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V1.M</td>
<td>Tu es pastor ovium, princeps Apostolorum, tibi traditae sunt claves regni coelorum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) ChairRome.V1.M p. 183</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 49r) ChairRome.V1.M 2: f. 27v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V2.M</td>
<td>Dum esset summus Pontifex, terrena non metuit, sed ad coelestia regna gloriosus migravit.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>second translation of Augustine of Hippo (28 February): double</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeanderSeville.V2.P1-5</td>
<td>Praesul sanctissime Augustine, via morum, scripturae secretum, Doctor egregie, lux Doctorum, vitae nostrae decretum: roga mitissime, Christi nos adire secretum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TranslationIIAugustine.V1.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TranslationIIAugustine.V2.P1-5</td>
<td>ConfBis.V.P1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlbinusAngers.V1.M</td>
<td>ConfBis.V1.M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AlbinusAngers.V1.Com.TranslationIIO Augustine</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**All Holy Canons Regular of Augustine (5 March): double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HolyCanons.V.P1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laudemus viros gloriosos, &amp; parentes nostros in generatione sua.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HolyCanons.V.P2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnes isti in generationibus gentis suae gloriae adepti sunt: &amp; in diebus suis habentur in laudibus.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HolyCanons.V.P3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpora sanctorum in pace sepulta sunt, &amp; vivent</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HolyCanons.V.P4</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HolyCanons.V.P5</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HolyCanons.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OlegariusBonestruga.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>ConfBis.V1.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OlegariusBonestruga.V1.Com.HolyCanon</strong></td>
<td>Sancti, &amp; justi in Domino gaude: vos elegit Deus in haereditatem sibi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gabriel the Archangel (18 March): greater double</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GabrielArchangel.V1.P1</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **HolyCanons.V.P4**
  - Sancti Spiritus, & animae justorum, hymnum dicite Deo.
  - Sanctorum nomina eorum in aeternum.

**HolyCanons.V.P5**
- Sapientiam ipsorum narrent populi, & nomen eorum nuntiet Ecclesia.

**HolyCanons.V1.M**
- Lux perpetua lucebit Sanctis tuis Domine, & aeternitas temporum.

**HolyCanons.V1.Com.CasimirPoland**
- Conf.V2.M

**OlegariusBonestruga.V1.M**
- ConfBis.V1.M

- Sancti, & justi in Domino gaude: vos elegit Deus in haereditatem sibi.

**Gabriel the Archangel (18 March): greater double**
- Ingresso Zacharia templum Domini, apparuit ei Gabriel Angelus, stans a dextris altaris.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GabrielArchangel.V1.P2</th>
<th>Ait autem Angelus: Ne timeas Zacharia, quoniam exaudita est deprecatio tua.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>add (B) p. 196</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>add (B) p. iii</th>
<th>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 50v) p. iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P3</td>
<td>Ego sum Gabriel Angelus, qui asto ante Deum, &amp; missus sum loqui ad te.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 196</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. iii</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 50v) p. iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P4</td>
<td>Gabriel Angelus locutus est Mariae, dicens: Ecce concipies in utero, &amp; paries filium: &amp; vocabis nomen ejus Jesum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 196</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. iii</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 50v) p. iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P5</td>
<td>Dixit autem maria ad Angelum: Quomodo fiet istud, quoniam virum non cognosco? Et respondens Gabriel Angelus, dixit ei: Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, &amp; virtus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 196</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. iii</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 50v) p. iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.M</td>
<td>Ingressus Gabriel Angelus ad Mariam virginem, dixit: Ave gratia plena, Dominus tecum: benedicta tu in mulieribus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) pp. 196-197</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V1.P1¹</td>
<td>Jacob autem genuit Joseph virum Mariae, de qua natus est Jesus, qui vocatur Christus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 201</td>
<td>add (H16) f. 226v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. i</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) p. ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V1.P2²</td>
<td>Missus est Angelus Gabriel a Deo ad Virginem despersatatam viro, cui nomen erat Joseph, de domo David, &amp; nomen virginis Maria.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 201</td>
<td>add (H16) f. 226v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. i</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) p. ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433, as did B, as PatronageJoseph.V.P1 to IV 6, f. 1r.
² H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
| JosephSpouseBV.V1.P3 | Cum esset desponsata Mater Jesu Maria Joseph, antequam convenirent, inventa est in utero habens de Spiritu sancto. | x | add (B) p. 201 | add (H16) f. 227r | x | x | add (B) p. i | add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) p. ii |
| JosephSpouseBV.V1.P4 | Joseph vir ejus, cum esset justus, & nollet eam traducere, voluit occulte dimittere eam. | x | add (B) p. 201 | add (H16) f. 227r | x | x | add (B) p. i | add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) p. ii |
| JosephSpouseBV.V1.P5 | Angelus Domini apparuit Joseph dicens: Joseph fili David noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam; quod enim in ea natum est, de Spiritu sancto est; pariet autem filium, & vocabis nomen ejus Jesum. | x | add (B) p. 201 | add (H16) f. 227r-v | x | x | add (B) p. i | add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) p. ii |
| JosephSpouseBV.V1 | Exurgens | x | add (B) | add (H16) | x | x | add (B) | add (B, B.ref on 2: f. 51r) |

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
3 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Joseph a somno fecit, sicut praecepit ei Angelus Domini, &amp; accepit Conjungem suam.</th>
<th>p. 202</th>
<th>f. 228r</th>
<th>p. ii</th>
<th>2: f. 51r) p. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2 .P1²</td>
<td>Ibid Parentes Jesu per omnes annos in Jerusalem, in die solemni Paschae.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>add (H16)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2 .P2³</td>
<td>Cum redirent, remansit puer Jesus in Jerusalem, &amp; non cognoverunt Parentes ejus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>add (H16)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2 .P3⁴</td>
<td>Non invenientes Jesum, regressi sunt in Jerusalem requirentes eum, &amp; post triduum invenerunt illum in templo sedentem in medio Doctorum.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>add (H16)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.  
² H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.  
³ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.  
⁴ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Class</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2.P4</td>
<td>Dixit Mater ejus ad illum: Fili quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce Pater tuus, &amp; ego dolentes, quaerabamus te.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 202</td>
<td>add (H16) f. 228r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2.P5</td>
<td>Descendit Jesus cum eis, &amp; venit Nazareth, &amp; erat subditus illis.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 202</td>
<td>add (H16) f. 228r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseBV.V2.M</td>
<td>Ecce fidelis servus, &amp; prudens, quem constituit Dominus super familiam suam.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 202</td>
<td>add (H16, B) f. 228r-v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annunciation of the Lord (25 March): first class double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
3 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
4 Ho also wrote this antiphon on a loose sheet preserved in Mater 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Primary Line(s)</th>
<th>Secondary Line(s)</th>
<th>Tertiary Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation Lord V. P3</td>
<td>Ne timeas Maria, invenisti gratiam apud Dominum: ecce concipies, &amp; paries filium.</td>
<td>+ Annunciation Lord L.P1 &gt; Annunciation Lord V.3.P3 (Un.ri) f. 292r-v</td>
<td>+ Annunciation Lord L.P1 &gt; Annunciation Lord V.3.P3 (Un.ri) f. 225v-226r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation Lord V. P4(^1)</td>
<td>Dabit ei Dominus sedem David patris ejus, &amp; regnabit in aeternum.</td>
<td>+ Annunciation Lord V.1.P3 &gt; Annunciation V.4.P4 (Un.ri) illi, sui f. 287r</td>
<td>+ Annunciation Lord L.P2 &gt; Annunciation Lord V.4.P4 (Un.ri) illi, sui f. 221r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation Lord V. P5</td>
<td>Ecce ancilla Domini: fiat</td>
<td>+ Annunciation</td>
<td>+ Annunciation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Un also added this antiphon to IV 18, between pp. 4-5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnnunciationLord.V 1.M</td>
<td>Spiritus sanctus in te descendet Maria, &amp; virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) tibi alleluja p. 198</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on f. 2: 54r) tibi alleluja 2: f. 57r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnnunciationLord.V 2.M</td>
<td>Gabriel Angelus locutus est Mariae, dicens: Ave gratia plena, Dominus tecum: benedicta tu in mulieribus.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) mulieribus alleluja p. 200</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on f. 2: 45r) mulieribus alleluja 2: f. 58r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4.7: The Proper of Saints for the Summer Half of the Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 6</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 15</th>
<th>IV 21</th>
<th>IV 25</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>patronage of Joseph (third Sunday after Easter): double¹</td>
<td>Jacob autem genuit Joseph virum Mariae, de qua natus est Jesus, qui vocatur Christus.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 1r</td>
<td>add (B) JosephSpouseBV.V 1P1 p. 201</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PatronageJoseph.V.P2</td>
<td>Missus est Angelus Gabriel a Deo in civitatem Galilaeae, cui nomen Nazareth ad Virginem despensatam viro, cui nomen erat Joseph alleluja.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PatronageJoseph.V.P3</td>
<td>Ascendit autem Joseph a Galilaeae de civitate Nazareth in Judaeam, in civitam David, quae vocatur Bethlehem alleluja.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PatronageJoseph.V.P4</td>
<td>Et venerunt festinantes, et</td>
<td>add (B) f. 1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This feast is not present in IV 63 or IV 65:1, but a commemoration is included by B in IV 65:3 (cf. Table 3.3, no. 5), and the antiphons given here are also given by B in IV 6. The rank of the feast is not given, but by analogy of the feast the patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November), I determined it to be a double. Cf. IV 8, f. 120r-v, where the same antiphons are given, though with different melodies.

² H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PatronageJoseph.V.P5</th>
<th>invenerunt Mariam et Joseph et infantem positum in praesepio alleluja.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 1r</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PatronageJoseph.V1.M</td>
<td>Cum esset desponsata Mater Jesu Maria Joseph, antequam convenirent, inventa est in utero, habens de Spiritu sancto, alleluja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) JosephSpouseBV.V 1.P3 sancto p. 201</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is one of the antiphons which B provides for this feast in IV 65:3 (cf. Table 3.3, no. 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patronage</th>
<th>Joseph.V2.M</th>
<th>Fili quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce pater tuus, et ego dolentes quaeremus te alleluia.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 1r</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Philip and James (1 May): second class double**

| PhilipJames.V.P1 | Domine, ostende nobis Patrem, & sufficit nobis, alleluia. | + PhilipJames.L.P3 > PhilipJames.V.P1 (H1, B.ri) nobis alleluia Philippe qui videt me videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia > nobis alleluia (B) f. 67v | + PhilipJames.V2.P3 > PhilipJames.V.P1 (Ho.ri, B.ri) nobis alleluia Philippe qui videt me videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia > nobis alleluia (B) p. 208 | + PhilipJames.L.P3 > PhilipJames.V.P1 (H28.ri) nobis alleluia Philippe qui videt me videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia f. 78r-v | + PhilipJames.L.P3 > PhilipJames.V.P1 (Ho.ri) nobis alleluia Philippe qui videt me videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia f. 128v | + PhilipJames.L.P3 > PhilipJames.V.P1 (Ho.ri) nobis alleluia Philippe qui videt me videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia > nobis alleluia (H3) 2: f. 92v |

---

1 This is one of the antiphons which B provides for this feast in IV 65:3 (cf. Table 3.3, no. 5).
<p>| PhilipJames.V.P2 | Philippe, qui videt me, videt &amp; Patrem meum, alleluia. | + PhilipJames.L.P 5 &gt; PhilipJames.V.P 2 (H1.ri) me alleluia videt &gt; me videt (B) f. 67v | + PhilipJames.V2.P5 &gt; PhilipJames.V.P2 (Ho.ri) me alleluia videt &gt; me videt (B) p. 209 | + PhilipJames.V 2.P5 &gt; PhilipJames.V.P2 (H28.ri) me alleluia videt f. 78v | + PhilipJames.V2.P5 &gt; PhilipJames.V.P2 (Ho.ri) me alleluia videt f. 129r | + PhilipJames.V2.P5 &gt; PhilipJames.V.P2 (H0.ri, H3.ri) me alleluia videt 2: ff. 92v-93r |
| PhilipJames.V.P5 | Si diligitis me, mandata mea servate, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia. | add (B) f. 67v | add (B) p. 209 | add (H23, H26. ref on f. 119r) back pastedown in schrift | add (H3, H28. ref on f. 78r f. 119r) | add (Ho) f. 120r | add (H3) 2: ff. 91v-92r |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PhilipJames.V1.Com. CatherineSiena</strong></td>
<td>I Vir. ET. V. M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Si manseritis in me, &amp; verba mea in vobis manserint, quocumque pieteritis, fiet vobis, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</strong></td>
<td>+ PhilipJames.L.P 4 &gt; PhilipJames.V2.M (H1.ri, B.head) volueritis &gt; petieritis (B), alleluia &gt; alleluia alleluia alleluia (B) f. 67v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 1 (H3.ri) tunc est quando in ligno mortua &gt; tunc est in ligno mortua (H3), fuit f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 159v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 tunc est quando in ligno mortua 2: f. 131r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invention of the Cross (3 May): second class double</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>InventionCross.V.P1</strong></td>
<td>O magnum pietatis opus! mors mortua tunc est, in ligno quando mortua vita fuit, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) f. 68r + ExaltationCross.L.P1 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P1 (H26.ri) tunc est quando in ligno mortua f. 182r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) p. 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 1 (H3.ri) tunc est quando in ligno mortua &gt; tunc est in ligno mortua (H3), fuit f. 159v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 182r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 tunc est quando in ligno mortua 2: f. 131r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>InventionCross.V.P2</strong></td>
<td>Salva nos Christe Salvator per virtutem Crucis, qui salvasti Petrum in mari, misericere nobis, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P2 (B.ref on f. 68r, H1.ri, B.ri) nobis f. 132r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) pp. 210-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 159v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 tunc est quando in ligno mortua 2: f. 131r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>InventionCross.V.P3</strong></td>
<td>Ecce Crucem Domini, fugite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P2 (B.ref on f. 68r, H1.ri, B.ri) nobis f. 132r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) pp. 211-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 159v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 2 &gt; ExaltationCross.V.P 2 (H3.ri) nobis f. 199v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ExaltationCross.L.P 1 tunc est quando in ligno mortua 2: f. 131r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
praesentem catervam in tuis hodie laudibus congregatam, alleluia, alleluia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross.V2.M</td>
<td>Crucem sanctam subiit, qui infernum confregit, accinctus est potentia, surrexit die tertia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ET.F.V.Com.Cross f. 24v</td>
<td>+ ET.F.V.Com.Cross f. 16v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ET.F.V.Com.Cross f. 16v</td>
<td>+ ET.F.V.Com.Cross &gt; ET.S.V.Com.Cross (Ho.ri) f. 14r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fnp]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversion of Augustine (5 May): greater double

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConversionAugustine.V1.P1(^1)</th>
<th>Laetare mater nostra Jerusalem: quia rex tuus dispensatorem strenuum, &amp; civem fidelissimum, de servitute Babylonis, tibi redemit Augustinum, Alleluia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P1 (B.ref on f. 70r, B.id) f. 115r</td>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P1 (B.head.id) p. 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (B.head.id) ff. 133v-134r</td>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P1 (H28.id) f. 166r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (H28.id) f. 179r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (Un.id) f. 180r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConversionAugustine.V1.P2(^2)</th>
<th>Hujus mater devotissima, quem carne prius pepererat mundo,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (Un.id) f. 134r</td>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (Un.id) f. 134r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AugustineHippo.V1.P2 (Un.id) f. 180r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.

\(^2\) B did not fill in the folium number.

\(^3\) H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
Conversion Augustine. V1.P3

Distulit tamen diu baptismi gratiam, quia tumens inani Philosophia, volebat humana ratione comprehendere, quod pia mens vivacitate fidei nititur apprehendere, Alleluia.

Conversion Augustine. V1.P4

Surgens autem post multos circuitus errorum, circuibat Civitatem per vicos, & plateas, quaerendo verum anima virum, pro quo ne moreretur, dignum judicaret mori, ut ejus semper inhaeret amori, Alleluia.

Conversion Augustine. V1.P5

Inventus igitur a custodibus Civitatis, & pallio

---

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
3 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
| ConversionAugustine. V1.Com.MonicaHippo | | | | | | |

**John before the Latin Gate (6 May): greater double**

| JohnGate.V.1.P1-5 | ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P1-5 |
| JohnGate.V.M | In ferventis olei doliu missus beatus Joannes Apostolus, divina se protegente gratia illesus exivit, Alleluia. | + Johngate.L.B > JohnGate.V.M (B,ri) missus Johannes, illesus evasit between ff. 170-171 | add (B) p. 214 | add (H4) missus Johannes, illesus evasit f. 71r | + Johngate.L.B missus iohannes, illesus evasit ff. 82v-83r | + Johngate.L.B > JohnGate.V.M (Ho,ri) missus Johannes, illesus evasit f. 133r | + Johngate.L.B missus iohannes, illesus avasit 2: f. 96r |
| JohnGate.V1.Com.Con | Non satiabatur | + | x | x | + | + | x |


**Apparition of Michael the Archangel (8 May): greater double**


| Apparition Michael V. P3 | Archangele Michael, constitui te principem super omnes animas | + Dedication Michael L.P3 > Dedication Michael V.P3 (B. ref) pp. 292-293 | + Dedication Michael L.P3 > Dedication Michael V.P3 (H6. ri) f. 192v-193r | + Dedication Michael L.P1 > Dedication Michael V.P2 (H1. ri) f. 176v |

---

1 B did not fill in the folium number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ApparitionMichael.V2. M</td>
<td>Princeps gloriissime,</td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on f. 71r)</td>
<td>add (B) DedicationMichael.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ApparitionMichael.V2.Com.GregoryNazianzus**

**Nativity of John the Baptist (24 June): first class double with an octave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NativityJohn.V1.P1</th>
<th>Ipse praeibit ante illum in spiritu &amp; virtute Eliae, parare Domino plebem perfectam.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 75v</th>
<th>add (B) p. 219</th>
<th>x H4.ref on f. 124v in <em>schrift</em></th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Iste: vinum &amp; siceram non bibet, &amp; omne immundum non manducabit ex utero matris sua.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 89r</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V1.P5 (Ho.ri) f. 139r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2.P5</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V1.P5 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 100r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
<td>Ingresso Zacharia templum Domini; apparuit ei Gabriel Angelus, stans a dextris altaris incensi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (Ho.id)</td>
<td>NativityJohn.O.P1 &gt; NativityJohn.V2.P1 (Ho.ri, B.head) p. 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ f. 123v</td>
<td>NativityJohn.O.P1 &gt; NativityJohn.V2.P1 (Ho.ri) f. 88r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ f. 83r-v</td>
<td>NativityJohn.O.P1 &gt; NativityJohn.V2.P1 (Ho.ri) f. 138r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ f. 133v</td>
<td>NativityJohn.O.P1 &gt; NativityJohn.V2.P1 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 98r-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L. P1</td>
<td>Elisabeth Zachariae magnum virum genuit, Joannem Baptistam praecursorem Domini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P2</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P2 (Ho.ri) f. 88r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P2</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P2 (Ho.ri) f. 138r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P2</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P2 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 98v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.O.P3</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P3 (Ho.ri) p. 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P3</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P3 (Ho.ri) f. 138v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P3</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P3 (Ho.ri) 2: f. 98v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L. P4</td>
<td>Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major Joanne Baptista.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P4</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.P4 (Ho.ri) f. 88v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.</td>
<td>Tu puer, Propheta Altissimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.O.P5</td>
<td>NativityJohn.L.P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P5</td>
<td>NativityJohn.L.P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ NativityJohn.L.P5</td>
<td>NativityJohn.L.P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John and Paul (26 June): double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**WilliamVercelli.V2.P1-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JohnPaul.V1.M</th>
<th>Astiterunt justi ante Dominum, &amp; ab invicem non sunt separati: calicem Domini biberunt, &amp; amici Dei appellati sunt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add (B) pp. 225-226</td>
<td>+ JohnPaul.L.B facti sunt f. 91r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ JohnPaul.L.P1 &gt; Paulus &amp; Joannes dixerunt Juliano:</td>
<td>+ Ho.id, B.head dixerunt ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ JohnPaul.L.P1 &gt; Paulus &amp; Joannes dixerunt Juliano:</td>
<td>+ JohnPaul.L.P1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 3, between pp. 486 and 487.
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

1 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 3, between pp. 486 and 487.
2 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 3, between pp. 486 and 487.
3 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 3, between pp. 486 and 487.
4 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 3, between pp. 486 and 487.
<p>| Peter and Paul (29 June): first class double with an octave | | | | | | |
| PeterPaul.V1.P3 | Dixit Angelus ad | + | add (B) | x | + | + | x |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Petrum: Circumda tibi vestimentum tuum, &amp; sequere me.</td>
<td>PeterPaul.M.N3.P2 &gt; PeterPaul.V1.P3 (B.ref on f. 78v, H1.ri, B.ri) Circumda te &gt; Circumda tibi (B) f. 82r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu es Petrus, &amp; super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam.</td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.L.P5 &gt; PeterPaul.V1.P5 (Ho.ri) f. 149v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.L.P5 2: f. 102v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ ApEv.V2.P1 f. 229r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un also reidentified the antiphon ChairAntioch.L.P5 as being PeterPaul.V1.P5 in 130 G 18, f. 60v.
2 H12 also added this antiphon to 130 G 18, f. 106r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commemoration of Paul (30 June): double</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingresso Zacharia templum Domini; apparuit ei Gabriël Angelus, stans a dextris altaris incensi.</td>
<td>+ (B.id) NativityJohn.V1.M f. 71r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) NativityJohn.V1.M p. 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ NativityJohn. V1.M f. 123r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H28.id) NativityJohn.V1.M f. 83r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) NativityJohn.V1.M f. 133v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) NativityJohn.V1.M 2: f. 98r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityJohn.O7.V.Co.PeterPaul.O2 1</td>
<td>PeterPaul.O.V. M (B.ri) f. 84r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (H17.ri) p. 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND f. 98v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND f. 131v-132r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 103v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitation of the Blessed Virgin (2 July): greater double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VisitationBV.V.P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exurgens Maria abiit in montana cum festinatione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (B.ri) p. 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND f. 98v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND f. 131v-132r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2. ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H17 also added this antiphon to IV 18, between pp. 504-505, as did H30 in IV 19, between pp. 460-641.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VisitationBV.V.P2</th>
<th>Intravit Maria in domum Zachariae, &amp; salutavit Elisabeth.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 89v</th>
<th>add (B) p. 233</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VisitationBV.V.P3</td>
<td>Ut audivit salutationem Mariae Elisabeth, exultavit infans in utero ejus, &amp; repleta est Spiritu sancto, alleluia.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 90r</td>
<td>add (B) p. 234</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VisitationBV.V.P4</td>
<td>Benedic和平 tu inter mulieres, &amp; benedictus fructus ventris tui.</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.M.N1.P1 &gt; VisitationBV.V.P4 (H1.ri, B.ri) in mulieribus &gt; inter mulieres (B) f. 90v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 234</td>
<td>add (H6) in mulieribus ff. 137v-137ar</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.M.N1.P1 &gt; VisitationBV.V.P4 (Un.ri) in mulieribus ff. 101v-102r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.M.N1.P1 &gt; VisitationBV.V.P4 (Ho.ri) in mulieribus f. 156r-v</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VisitationBV.V.P5</td>
<td>Ex quo facta est vox salutationis tuae in auribus meis, exultavit infans in utero meo, alleluia.</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.L.B &gt; VisitationBV.V.P5 (H1.ri, B.ri) exultavit in gaudio infans f. 94v</td>
<td>add (B) exultavit in gaudio infans pp. 234-235</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.L.B &gt; VisitationBV.V.P5 (Un.ri) exultavit in gaudio infans ff. 106v-107r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.L.B &gt; VisitationBV.V.P5 (Ho.ri) exultavit in gaudio infans ff. 161v-162r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.L.B &gt; VisitationBV.V.P5 (Ho.ri) exultavit in gaudio infans 2: f. 107v</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Image Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>est enim, de quo Salvator ait: Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major Joanne Baptista.</td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.M (H1.ri) f. 76r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.M (Ho.ri, B.head) p. 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 125v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.M (H28.ri) f. 89v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.M (Ho.ri) f. 139v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NativityJohn.V2.M (Ho.ri) 2: f. 100v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (B.ri) f. 84r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (H17.ri) p. 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 131v-132r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 98v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) 2: f. 103v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 &gt; VisitationBV.V2.M (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 90r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 Deus f. 135r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 Deus f. 101r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 Deus f. 155r-v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5Deus f. 105r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (B.ri) f. 84r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (H17.ri) p. 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 131v-132r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 98v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) 2: f. 103v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>octave day of Peter and Paul (6 July): double</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (B.ri) f. 84r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (H17.ri) p. 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 131v-132r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 98v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) 2: f. 103v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PeterPaul.O8</td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (B.ri) f. 84r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (H17.ri) p. 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND f. 98v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND &gt; PeterPaul.O.V.M (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ PeterPaul.C2.ND 2: f. 103v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Our Lady of Mount Carmel (16 July): greater double

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLCarmel.V1.P1-5</th>
<th>BV.V1.P1-51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND &gt; sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (B) f. 109r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (B) f. 109r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (B) f. 109r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, B.ref on p. 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSnow.V1.M sanitatem festivitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; sollemem Commemorationem (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLCarmel.V2.M3</td>
<td>Gloria Libani data est ei: decor Carmeli, &amp; Saron,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) f. 94v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) p. 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 H4 erroneously reidentified the antiphon VisitationBV.L.P5 as OLCarmelBL.V.P1 in IV 15, f. 137v.

2 H18 added the antiphon Ave Regina caelorum as OLCarmel.V1.M in PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 42. The feast had this antiphon in the office used by the subjects of the King of Spain (cf. IV 60, p. cxxii), before it was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726 (Schober 1891, 228).

3 This antiphon was also added by Un on the verso of a piece of paper added in IV 18, between pp. 504-505. H18 added the antiphon Alma Redemptoris mater as OLCarmel.V2.M in PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 42. The feast had this antiphon in the office used by the subjects of the King of Spain (cf. IV 60, p. cxxv), before it was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 24 September 1726 (Schober 1891, 228).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Codex</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Magdalene (22 July): double</td>
<td>BonaventureBagnoregio.V2.P1-5</td>
<td>ConfBis.V1.P1-5</td>
<td>Mulier, quae erat in civitate peccatrix, ut cognovit quod Jesus accubuit in domo Simonis leprosi, atulit alabastrum unguenti, &amp; stans retro secus pedes Jesu lacrymis coepit rigare pedes ejus, &amp; capillis capitis sua tergebat, &amp; osculabatur pedes ejus, &amp; unguento ungebati. add (B) ff. 95r-96r pp. 237-239 x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaryMagdalene.V2.P 1-5</td>
<td>NoVir.V.P1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedes ejus, &amp; capillis capitis sui tergebant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peter in Chains (1 August): greater double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PeterChains.V.P1</th>
<th>Herodes rex apposuit ut apprehenderet &amp; Petrum: quem cum apprehendisset, misit in carcerem, volens post Pascha producere eum populo.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 97v add (H16) f. 204v</th>
<th>add (B) p. 241</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>add (Ho.ri) f. 150r</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PeterChains.V.P2</td>
<td>Petrus quidem servabatur in carcere: oratio autem fiebat sine intermissione ab Ecclesia ad Deum pro eo.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 98r add (H16) f. 204v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 242</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (Ho.ri) f. 150r</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un also reidentified the antiphon ChairAntioch.L.P5 as PeterChains.V.P5 in 130 G 18, f. 60v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Our Lady of the Snow (5 August): greater double</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLSnow.V1.P1-5</strong></td>
<td><strong>BV.V.P1-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLSnow.V1.M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Maria succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clero, intercede pro devoto feminine sexu: sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam festivitatem.</td>
<td>+ AssumptionBV.C1.ND (B.ref on f. 94v) sexu &gt; sexu sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam festivitatem (B) f. 109r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) pp. 243-244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transfiguration of the Lord (6 August): greater double</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransfigurationLord.V.P1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumpsit Jesus Petrum, &amp; Jacobum, &amp; Joanne fratrem ejus, &amp; duxit eos in montem excelsum seorsum, &amp; transfigurator est ante eos.</td>
<td>add (B) ff. 98v-99r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add (B) p. 245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TransfigurationLord.V.P2** |  |
| Resplenduit facies ejus sicut sol, vestimenta autem ejus facta sunt alba sicut nix, alleluia. | add (B) f. 99r |
|  | add (B) p. 246 |

1 H30 also reidentified and rephrased the antiphon OLCarmel.V1.M as OLSnow.V1.M on a sheet of paper in IV 18, between pp. 524-525.
| TransfigurationLord.V.P3 | Et ecce apparuerunt eis Moyses & Elias, loquentes cum Jesu. | add (B) f. 99v | add (B) pp. 246-247 | x | x | x | x |
| TransfigurationLord.V.P4 | Respondens autem Petrus dixit ad Jesum: Domine, bonum est nos hic esse. | add (B) ff. 99v-100r | add (B) p. 247 | x | x | x | x |
| TransfigurationLord.V.P5 | Adhuc eo loquente, ecce nubes lucida obumbravit eos. | add (B) f. 100r | add (B) pp. 247-248 | x | x | x | x |
| TransfigurationLord.V.1.M | Christus Jesus splendor Patris, & figura substantiae ejus, portans omnia verbo virtutis suae, purgationem peccatorum faciens, in monte excelsa gloriosus apparere hodie dignatus est. | add (B) ff. 100v-101r | add (B) p. 247 | x | + | + | x |
|  |  |  |  |  | TransfigurationV.1.M (H4.id) Visionem quam vidistis nemini dixeritis donec a mortuis resurgat filius hominis f. 153r-v | x | x | x |

1. The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
| TransfigurationLord.V 2.M | Et audientes discipuli ceciderunt in faciem suam, & timuerunt valde: & accessit Jesus, & tetigit eos, dixitque eis: Surgite, & nolite timere, alleluia. | add (B) ff. 101r-102r | add (B) pp. 248-249 | x | x | x | x |

**Cajetan of Thiene (7 August): double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CajetanThiene.V2.P1-5</th>
<th>Conf.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CajetanThiene.V2.M</td>
<td>Quaerite primum regnum Dei, &amp; justitiam ejus; &amp; haec omnia adjicientur vobis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lawrence of Rome (10 August): second class double with an octave**

Laurentius bonum opus operatus est, qui per signum crucis caecos illuminavit.

Adhaesit anima mea post te, quia caro mea igne cremata est pro te Deus meus.

Misit Dominus Angelum suum, & liberavit me de medio ignis, & non sum aestuatus.

Beatus Laurentius orabat, dicens: Gratias tibi ago Domine, quia januas tuas ingredi merui.
| LawrenceRome.V2.M | Beatus Laurentius dum in craticula superpositus uleretur, ad impiissimum tyrannum dixit: Assatum est jam, versa, & manduca: nam facultates Ecclesiae, quas requiris, in coelestes thesauros manus pauperum deportaverunt. | + (B.id) superpositus > superpositus (B), Assatus sum > Assatum est (B), nam et facultates ff. 107v-108r | + (Ho.id, B.head) superpositus > superpositus (B), Assatus sum > Assatum est (B), nam et facultates > nam facultates (B) p. 252 | + (H4.id) superpositus, Assatus sum, nam et facultates ff. 157v-158r | + (H28.id) superpositus, Assatus sum > Assatus est (H3), nam et facultates > nam facultates (H3) ff. 123v-124r | + (H1.id) superpositus, Assatus sum, nam et facultates ff. 169v-170r | + (Ho.id) superpositus, Assatus sum, Assatus est (H3), nam et facultates 2: ff. 113v-114r |
| AssumptionBV.V.P3 | In odorem unguentorum tuorum currimus: adolescentulae dilexerunt te nimiris. | f. 112v | f. 161r |
| AssumptionBV.V.P4 | Benedicta filia tua Domino, quia per te fructum vitae communicavimus. | f. 112v | f. 161v |
| AssumptionBV.V.P5 | Pulchra es, & decora filia Jerusalem, terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata. | f. 112v-113r | f. 161v-162r |
| AssumptionBV.V1.M | Virgo prudentissima, quao progreseris, quasi aurora valde rutilans? filia Sion tota formosa & suavis es; pulchra ut luna, electa ut sol. | f. 108v | f. 160r-v |
| AssumptionBV.V2.M | Hodie Maria virgo coelos ascendit: gaudete, quia cum Christo regnat in aeternum. | f. 114v | f. 166r |
| AssumptionBV.V2.Co m.HyacinthPoland | Conf.V1.M | f. 166r | f. 179v |
### Joachim (Sunday in the octave of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin): greater double

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joachim.V.P1-5</th>
<th>Conf.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joachim.V1.M(^1)</td>
<td>Laudemus virum gloriosum in generatione sua, quia benedictionem omnium gentium dedit illi Dominus, &amp; testamentum suum confirmavit super caput ejus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Augustine of Hippo (28 August): first class double with an octave

| AugustineHippo.V1.P 1\(^2\) | Laetare mater nostra Jerusalem: quia Rex tuus dispensatorem strenuum, & civem fidelissimum, de servitute Babylonis, tibi redemit Augustinum. | + (B.id) f. 115r | + (B.head.id) p. 263 | + (Un.id) f. 166r-v | + (H28.id) ff. 133v-134r | + f. 179r | [fnp] |

| AugustineHippo.V1.P 2\(^3\) | Hujus mater devotionis, | + (B.id) f. 115r | + (B.head.id) p. 264 | + (Un.id) f. 166v-167r | + (H28.id) f. 134r | + f. 180r | [fnp] |

---

\(^1\) Ho also added this antiphon to IV 3, pp. 573-574.  
\(^2\) H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.  
\(^3\) H30 also added this antiphon, reading *Augustini mater*, to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
AugustineHippo.V1.P 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quem carne prius pepererat mundo, charitatis visceribus postmodum, multo semine lacrymarum genuit Christo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id) sagacitate fidei f. 115r-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AugustineHippo.V1.P 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surgens autem post multos circuitus errorum, circuibaiv civitatem per vicos, &amp; plateas, quaerendo verum animea virum, pro quo ne moreretur, dignum judicaret mori; ut ejus semper inhaeret amore.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id) f. 115v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AugustineHippo.V1.P 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventus igitur a custodibus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (B.id) f. 115v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
3 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
4 IV 63, p. 172 erroneously has *Juventus*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AugustineHippo.V1.M</th>
<th>Adest nobis dies celebri, quo solutus nexu carnis sanctus Praesul Augustinus, assumptus est cum Angelis: ubi gaudent cum Prophetis, laetatur cum Apostolis: quorum plenus spiritu, quae praedixerunt mystica, fecit nobis pervia: post quos secunda dispensandi verbi Dei, primus refulsit gratia.</th>
<th>+ (B.id) dies &gt; nobis dies (B), ab Angelis ff. 115v-116r</th>
<th>+ (B.head.id) dies &gt; nobis dies (B), ab Angelis &gt; cum Angelis (B) pp. 268-269</th>
<th>+ (Un.id) dies, ab Angelis ff. 169v-170r</th>
<th>+ dies, ab Angelis f. 135r</th>
<th>+ dies, ab Angelis f. 180r</th>
<th>+ dies, ab Angelis 2: f. 121r-v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

¹ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
² H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
³ H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.M2</td>
<td>Hodie gloriosus Pater Augustinus dissoluta hujus habitationis domo, domum non manufactam accept in coelis, quam sibi cooperante Dei gratia, manu, lingua, fabrefecit in terris: ubi jam quod sitivit internum, gustat aeternum decoratus una stola, securusque de reliqua.</td>
<td>+ (B.id) Christi gracia &gt; Dei gracia (B) f. 122v</td>
<td>+ (B.id) Christi gracia &gt; Dei gracia (B) p. 274</td>
<td>+ (Un.id) Christi gracia ff. 174v-175v</td>
<td>+ Christi gracia ff. 143v-144r</td>
<td>+ Christi gracia f. 190r-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
2 H30 also added this antiphon to IV 19, between pp. 432-433.
| BeheadingJohn.V2.P5 | Da mihi in disco | f. 126r | + (Ho.id, B.head) | + | + | + | + | + |

**Guardian Angels (first Sunday in September): second class double**

| GuardianAngels.V.P1 | Angelis suis Deus mandavit de te, ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis. | add (B) f. 123v | add (B) p. 280 | x | x | x | x | x |
| GuardianAngels.V.P2 | Laudemus Dominuni, quem laudant Angeli, quem Cherubim & Seraphim, Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, proclamant. | add (B) ff. 123v-124r | add (B) p. 280 | x | x | x | x | x |
| GuardianAngels.V.P3 | Angeli eorum semper vident faciem Patris mei, qui est in coelis. | add (B) f. 124r-v | add (B) p. 281 | x | x | x | x | x |

1 H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [148]v.
2 H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [148]v.
3 H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [148]r-v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GuardianAngels.V.P4¹</th>
<th>Benedictus Deus, qui misit Angelum suum, &amp; eruit servos suos, qui crediderunt in eum.</th>
<th>add (B) f. 124v-125r</th>
<th>add (B) p. 281</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngels.V.P5²</td>
<td>Laudate Deum omnes Angeli ejus; laudate eum omnes virtutes ejus.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 125r</td>
<td>add (B) p. 281</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngels.V1.M³</td>
<td>Omnes sunt administratorii spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos, qui hereditatem capiunt salutis.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 281</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngels.V2.M⁴</td>
<td>Sancti Angeli Custodes nostri, defendite nos in praelio, ut non pereamus in tremendo judicio.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 125v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 281</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (8 September): second class double with an octave**

| NativityBV.V.P1 | Nativitas gloriosae virginis Mariae, ex semine Abrahe, ortae de tribu Juda, clara ex stirpe David. | + NativityBV.L.P5 > NativityBV.V.P1 (B.ref on f. 126v, Un.ri, B.ri) ff. 130v-131r | + NativityBV.V2.P5 > NativityBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri, B.head) p. 280 | + NativityBV.V.2.P5 > NativityBV.V.P1 (H1.ri) f. 154r | + NativityBV.L.P5 > NativityBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri) f. 198r | + NativityBV.L.P5 > NativityBV.V.P1 (Ho.ri, Un.ri) 2: ff. 128v-129r |

¹ H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [148]v.
² H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, ff. [148]v-[149]r.
³ H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [149]r.
⁴ H32 also added this antiphon in IV 8, f. [149]r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V.P2</td>
<td>Nativitas est hodie sanctae Mariae virginis, cujus vita inclyta cunctas illustrat Ecclesias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V.P3</td>
<td>Regali ex progenie Maria exorta refugiel: cujus precibus nos adjuvari mente &amp; spiritu devotissime poscimus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V.P4</td>
<td>Corde &amp; animo Christo canamus gloriam, in hac sacra solemnitate praeceelsae genitricis Dei Mariae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V.P5</td>
<td>Cum jucunditate Nativitatem beatæ Mariae celebremus, ut ipsa pro nobis intercedat ad Dominum Jesum Christum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V1.M</td>
<td>Gloriosae virginis Mariae ortum dignissimum recolamus, quae &amp; genitricis dignitatem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(add (B) ff. 126v-127r)
| Page Dimensions: 841.9x595.3 | obtinuit, & virginalem pudicitiam non amisit. | | | |


**Holy Name of Mary (Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin): greater double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NameMary.V.P1-5</th>
<th>BV.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ H30 also reidentified and rephrased the antiphon OLCarmel.V1.M as NameMary.V1.M on a leaf in IV 18, between pp. 524-525.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exaltation of the Cross (14 September): greater double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ExaltationCross.V.P1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro devoto femino sexu: sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tu sancti Nominis commemorationem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quicumque celebrant tuum sancti Nominis commemorationem (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NameMary.V2.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beatam me dicent omnes generationes, qua ancillam humilem respexit Deus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ExaltationCross.V.P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O magnum pietatis opus! mora mortua tunc est, in ligno quando mortua vita fuit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ExaltationCross.V.P3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salva nos Christe Salvator per virtutem Crucis, qui salvasti Petrum in mari, miserere nobis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ExaltationCross.V.P3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.

**Dedication of Michael the Archangel (29 September): second class double**

<p>| DedicationMichael.V.P1 | Stetit Angelus juxta aram templi, habens thuribulum aureum in manu | + DedicationMichael.M.N1.P2 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P1 (H1.ri) | add (B) p. 291 | add (H29) between ff. 137a-138 | + DedicationMichael.M.N1.P2 (H6.ref on f. 176v) f. 171r-v | x | x |   |
| DedicationMichael.V. P2 | Dum praeliaretur Michael Archangelus cum dracone, auditae est vox dicentium: Salus Deo nostro, alleluia. | add (B) pp. 291-292 |  |  | + DedicationMichael.L.P1 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P2 (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 176v | + DedicationMichael.L.P1 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P2 (H1.ri) f. 205v | + DedicationMichael.L.P1 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P2 (Ho.ri) f. 136r |
| DedicationMichael.V. P3 | Archangelus Michael, constituit principem super omnes animas susciendas. | add (B) pp. 292-293 |  |  | + DedicationMichael.L.P3 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P3 (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 193r | + DedicationMichael.L.P3 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P3 (H1.ri) f. 206r | + DedicationMichael.L.P3 &gt; DedicationMichael.V.P3 (Ho.ri) f. 136v |
| DedicationMichael.V1 .M | Dum sacrum mysterium cerneret Joannes, Archangelus Michael tuba cececit: Ignosc Domine Deus | + (B.id) dignus es Domine, accipere librum &gt; qui aperis librum (B), aperire |  |  | + (H6.id) dignus es Domine &gt; Ignosc Domine (B), accipere librum, aperire signacula &gt; solvis | + (H3.id) dignus es Domine &gt; Ignosc Domine (H3), accipere librum &gt; qui aperis librum (H3), aperire signacula &gt; solvis | + (Ho.id) dignus es Domine, accipere librum, aperire signacula f. 205r | + (Ho.id) dignus es Domine, accipere librum, aperire signacula 2: ff. 135v-136r |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DedicationMichael.V2.M</th>
<th>Princeps gloriosissime, Michael Archangels, esto memor nostri; hic &amp; ubique semper precare pro nobis Filium Dei, alleluia, alleluia.</th>
<th>add (B) ff. 144v-145r</th>
<th>add (B) pp. 294-295</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rosary of the Blessed Virgin (first Sunday in October): greater double**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RosaryBV.V1.P1-5</th>
<th>BV.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
| Thomas of Villanova (7 October): semidouble¹ |  |
|-------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| BrunoCologne.V2.P1-5                      | Conf.V.P1-5                         | Ho.ri) p. 20 |  |
| BrunoCologne.V2.Com.ThomasVillanova       | Dispersit, dedit pauperibus: justitia ejus manet in saeculum saeculi. | add (B) ThomasVillanova.V.M f. 139r | add (B) ThomasVillanova.V.M p. 289 |
| BrunoCologne.V2.Com.Mark                  |                                   | x           | x           | x | x |
| BrunoCologne.V2.Com.SergiusComp           |                                   |             |             |  |
| BridgetSweden.V1.P1-5                     |                                  |             |             |  |
| BridgetSweden.V1.M                        |                                  |             |             |  |
|                                          |                                  | x           | x           | x | x |

| first translation of Augustine of Hippo (11 October): double |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| FrancisBorgia.V2.P1-5                                      | Conf.V.P1-5                       |  |
| FrancisBorgia.V2.Com.TranslationIAugustine                | Praesul sanctissime Augustine, via morum, scripturae secretum, Doctor egregie, lux Doctorum, vitae nostrae decretum: roga mitissime, Christi nos adire | add (B) TranslationII.Augustine.V.M pp. 185-186 | add (H6) TranslationII.Augustine.V.M f. 301r |
|                                                            | x                               | x           | x           |

¹ Cf. vol. 1, p. 116 on this feast, the reason for its absence from the calendar in IV 58 and the date to which it was probably transferred.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TranslationIAugustine.V2.P1-5</th>
<th>ConIBis.V.P1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CerboniusPopulonia.V1.M</td>
<td>ConIBis.V1.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CerboniusPopulonia.V1.Com.TranslationIAugustine</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praesul sanctissime Augustine, via morum, scripturae secretum, Doctor egregie, lux Doctorum, vitae nostrae decretum: roga mitissime, Christi nos adire secretum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ursula and companions (21 October): double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JohnCantius.V2.P1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrsulaComp.V1.Com.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnCantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrsulaComp.V2.P1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| x | x | x | x |

| JohnCantius | HilarionGaza | |
| + | 1Vir.L.P4 > 2Vir.V.M (B.ri) lampades vestras > vestras lampades (B) |
| + | 1Vir.V2.P4 > 2Vir.V.M (B.head.ri) lampades vestras > vestras lampades |
| + | 1Vir.L.P4 > UrsulaComp.V.M (H7.ri) lampades vestras |

| x | x | x | x |

<p>| JohnCantius | HilarionGaza | |
| + | 1Vir.L.P4 &gt; 2Vir.V.M (B.ri) lampades vestras &gt; vestras lampades (B) |
| + | 1Vir.V2.P4 &gt; 2Vir.V.M (B.head.ri) lampades vestras &gt; vestras lampades |
| + | 1Vir.L.P4 &gt; UrsulaComp.V.M (H7.ri) lampades |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raphael the Archangel (24 October): greater double</th>
<th>f. 193r</th>
<th>(B) p. 361</th>
<th>ff. 231v-232r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V.P 1¹</td>
<td>Missus est Angelus Raphael ad Tobiam &amp; Saram, ut curaret eos.</td>
<td>add (B) ff. 145v add (H31) f. 204v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V.P 2²</td>
<td>Ingressus Angelus ad Tobiam, salutavit eum, &amp; dixit: Gaudium sit tibi semper.</td>
<td>add (B) ff. 145v-146r add (H31) f. 204v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V.P 3³</td>
<td>Forti animo esto Tobias, in proximo enim est, ut a Deo cureris.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 146r add (H31) f. 204v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V.P 4⁴</td>
<td>Benedicite Deum coeli, &amp; coram omnibus viventibus confitemini illi, quia fecit vobiscum misericordiam suam.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 146r-v add (H31) ff. 204v-205r</td>
<td>add (B) pp. 296-297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V.P 5⁵</td>
<td>Pax vobis, nolite timere: Deum benedicate, &amp; cantare illi.</td>
<td>add (B) f. 146v add (H31) f. 205r</td>
<td>add (B) p. 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaphaelArchangel.V1. M¹</td>
<td>Ego sum Raphael Angelus, qui asto</td>
<td>add (B) f. 147r</td>
<td>add (B) p. 297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40.
² H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40.
³ H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40.
⁴ H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: pp. 40–41.
⁵ H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PatronageBV.V1.M²</th>
<th>Sancta Maria succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clerio, intercede pro devote femineo sexu: sentiant omnes tuum jujvamen, quicunque</th>
<th>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND (B.ref on f. 94v) sexu &gt; sexu senciant omnes tuum jujvamen, quicunque celebrant tuam sanctam festivitatem (B) f. 109r</th>
<th>add (B, B.ref on p. 307) OLSnow.V1.M pp. 243-244</th>
<th>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu &gt; sexu senciant omnes tuum jujvamen quicunque celebrant tuam santam Commemorati onem (H6)</th>
<th>+ AssumptionBV.V.C1.ND sexu f. 125v</th>
<th>+ BV.V1.M sexu f. 240r-v</th>
<th>+ BV.V1.M sexu 2: f. 167v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PatronageBV.V.P1-5</td>
<td>BV.V.P1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**patronage of the Blessed Virgin (any Sunday in November): double**

---

¹ H18 also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 41, as did H34 to IV 17, between ff. 139-140, and H35 to IV 90, f. 16v.
² B also added this antiphon to PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 30 and KHS 28, 3: p. 22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PatronageBV.V2.M</th>
<th>Beatam me dicent omnes generationes, qua ancilam humilem respexit Deus</th>
<th>ff. 160v-161r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.P5 &gt; VisitationBV.V2.M (H1.ri, B.ri) f. 90r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 f. 135r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V1.P5 f. 155r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ VisitationBV. V1.P5 f. 105r</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.V2.M (H2.ri) f. 155r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Saints (1 November): first class double with an octave**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AllSaints.V.P1</th>
<th>Vidi turbam magnam, quam dinumerare nemo poterat, ex omnibus gentibus, stantes ante thronum.</th>
<th>add (B) p. 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P1 &gt; AllSaints.V.P1 (B.ri) f. 151r</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P 1 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 1 (Un.ri) f. 198r-v</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P1 f. 183v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P 1 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 1 (Un.ri) f. 198r-v</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P2 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 2 (Un.ri) conspicu agni f. 198v</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P2 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 2 (H2.ri) conspicu agni f. 209r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P 2 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 2 (Un.ri) conspicu agni f. 198v</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P3 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 3 (Un.ri) nos Deo in &gt; nos Domine Deus in (B), regnum alleluia f. 198v-199r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P3 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 3 (Un.ri) nos Deo in, regnum alleluia f. 198v-199r</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P3 nos Deo in &gt; nos Domine Deus in (Un), regnum alleluia f. 184r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P3 nos Deo in &gt; nos Domine Deus in (Un), regnum alleluia f. 184r</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P3 &gt; AllSaints.V.P 3 (H2.ri) nos Deo in, regnum alleluia f. 209r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AllSaints.V.P4</th>
<th>Benedicte&lt;br&gt;Domini omnes&lt;br&gt;electi ejus, agite&lt;br&gt;die laetitiae, &amp;&lt;br&gt;confitemini illi.</th>
<th>+ AllSaints.L.P4&lt;br&gt;add (B) p. 302</th>
<th>+ AllSaints.L.P4&lt;br&gt;Add (B) Domino&lt;br&gt;f. 151v</th>
<th>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;f. 184r</th>
<th>AllSaints.L.P4&lt;br&gt;Add Domino&lt;br&gt;f. 151v</th>
<th>AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;f. 184r</th>
<th>[fnp]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AllSaints.V.P5</td>
<td>Hymnus omnibus&lt;br&gt;Sanctis ejus filiis&lt;br&gt;Israel, populo&lt;br&gt;appropinquanti&lt;br&gt;sibi, gloria haec&lt;br&gt;est omnibus&lt;br&gt;Sanctis ejus.</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;add (B) p. 303</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;Add (B) f. 151v</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;f. 184r</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;f. 184r</td>
<td>AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;f. 184r</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllSaints.V1.M</td>
<td>Angeli, Archangeli,&lt;br&gt;Throni &amp; Dominationes,&lt;br&gt;Principatus &amp;&lt;br&gt;Potestates, Virtutes&lt;br&gt;coelorum, Cherubim atque&lt;br&gt;Seraphim, Patriarchae &amp;&lt;br&gt;Prophetae, sancti&lt;br&gt;legis Doctores, Apostoli, omnes&lt;br&gt;Christi Martyres, sancti&lt;br&gt;Confessores, Virgines Domini,&lt;br&gt;Anachoritae, Sanctique omnes&lt;br&gt;intercedite pro&lt;br&gt;nobis.</td>
<td>+ AllSaints.L.P5&lt;br&gt;Add ff. 148v-149v&lt;br&gt;add (B) pp. 303-305</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllSaints.V2.M</td>
<td>O quam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gloriosum est regnum, in quo cum Christo gaudent omnes Sancti, amicti stolis albis sequuntur Agnum quocunque ierit.
<p>| MartinTours.V.P2 | Domine, si adhuc populo tuo sum necessarius, non recuso laborem, fiat voluntas tua. |  + MartinTours.L. P2 &gt; MartinTours.V.P2 (B.head.ri) f. 157v  + MartinTours.V2.P2 &gt; MartinTours.V.P2 (B.head.ri) p. 308 |  + MartinTours. L.P2 ff. 204v-205r  + MartinTours.L.P2 f. 212v  + MartinTours.L.P2 2: f. 144r-v |
| MartinTours.V.P3 | O virum ineffabilem, nec labore victum, nec morte vincendum, qui nec mori timuit, nec vivere recusavit. |  + MartinTours.L. P3 &gt; MartinTours.V.P3 (B.ri) ff. 157v-158r  + MartinTours.V2.P3 &gt; MartinTours.V.P3 (B.head.ri) pp. 308-309 |  + MartinTours. L.P3 f. 205r  + MartinTours.L.P3 ff. 212v-213r  + MartinTours.L.P3 2: f. 144V |
| MartinTours.V.P4 | Oculis ac manibus in coelum semper intentus; invictum ab oratione spiritum non relaxabat, alleluia. |  + MartinTours.L. P4 &gt; MartinTours.V.P4 (B.ri) relaxabat alleluia alleluia &gt; relaxabat alleluia (B) f. 158r  + MartinTours.V2.P4 &gt; MartinTours.V.P4 (B.head.ri) relaxabat alleluia alleluia &gt; relaxabat alleluia (B) p. 309 |  + MartinTours. L.P4 relaxabat alleluia alleluia f. 192r  + MartinTours.L.P4 relaxabat alleluia alleluia f. 213r  + MartinTours.L.P4 relaxabat alleluia alleluia 2: f. 144r |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation of the Blessed Virgin (21 November): double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PresentationBV.V.P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PresentationBV.V.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| + (B.id) f. 153v |
| + (B.head.id) p. 307 |
| + f. 204r-v |
| + f. 186v |
| + f. 212r-v |
| + 2: f. 143v |

| RufusAvignon.V1.M | ConfBis.V1.M |
| * MartinTours.V2.M (B.id) principatum o Martine dulcedo medicamentum et medice o > principatum o (B), tamen palamam f. 158v |
| + MartinTours.V2.M (B.id) principatum o Martine dulcedo medicamentum et medice o > principatum o (B), tamen palamam f. 206r-v |
| + MartinTours. V2.M principatum o Martine dulcedo medicamentum et medice o, tamen palamam ff. 192v-193r |
| + MartinTours.V2.M principatum o Martine dulcedo medicamentum et medice o, tamen palamam ff. 213v-214r |
| + MartinTours.V2.M principatum o Martine dulcedo medicamentum et medice o, tamen palamam 2: ff. 145v-146r |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| **sacrarium Spiritus sancti, sola sine exemplo placuisti Domino nostro Jesu Christo, alleluia.** |

| PresentationBV.V2.Com.CeciliaRome |  |
|----------------------------------|  |
| **Est secretum Valeriane, quod tibi volo dicere: Angelum Dei habeo amatorem, qui nimio zelo custodit corpus meum.** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (Ho.id, B.head) p. 311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P2 &gt; CeciliaRome.V1.M (Ho.ri, B.head) pp. 311-312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P2 f. 198r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P2 f. 198r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V2.P2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V1.M (Ho.ri) f. 215r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V2.P2 f. 198r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V2.P2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P3 &gt; CeciliaRome.V2.P2 (H3.ri) f. 198r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V2.P2 (Ho.ri) ff. 214v-215r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P5 f. 208r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P5 &gt; CeciliaRome.V2.P3 (H3.ri) f. 198v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.P5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.V2.P3 (Ho.ri) f. 215r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CeciliaRome.L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Christi, quia per Filium tuum ignis extinctus est a latere meo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceciliarome.V2.P5</td>
<td>Triduana a Domino poposci inducias, ut domum meam Ecclesiam consecrarem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement I (12 December): semidouble</td>
<td>DamasusL.V2.P1-5 Conil.Bis.V.P1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The scribe of IV 6 made an error here. Because the verse of ClementL.M.N3.R2 is the same as the first words of ClementL.L.P2 he confused the two, and wrote down the antiphon where he should have written down the responsory, followed by the third antiphon, etc. He realised his error, however, and did not not add notes for the words that do not appear in the responsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptio tua, Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster: qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem; &amp; confundens mortem, donavit nobis vitam sempiternam.</td>
<td>+ NativityBV.V1. M &gt; Nativity.BV.V2. M (Ho.ri) Nativitas ff. 192r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orante sancta Lucia, apparuit ei beata Agatha, &amp; consolabatur ancillam Christi.</td>
<td>+ LucySyracuse.V1.2: f. 57v-[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) LucySyracuse.V.P1 p. 178</td>
<td>+ LucySyracuse.L.P1 2: f. 57v-[fnp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Clement.L.P3 &gt; Clement.V2.P1 (H1.ri) Orante sancto Clemente apparuit ei Agnus Dei. f. 163ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Clement.L.P3 &gt; Clement.V2.P1 (H1.ri) Orante sancto Clemente apparuit ei Agnus Dei. f. 209v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Clement.L.P3 &gt; Clement.V2.P1 (H28.ri) Orante sancto Clemente apparuit ei Agnus Dei. f. 217v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Clement.L.P3 &gt; Clement.V2.P1 (H3.ri) Orante sancto Clemente apparuit ei Agnus Dei de sub cuius pede fons vivus emanat fluvius impetus letificat civitatem Dei &gt; Orante sancto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Clement.L.P3 &gt; Clement.V2.P1 (H28.ri) Orante sancto Clemente apparuit ei Agnus Dei. f. 147v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 The scribe of IV 6 made an error and had ClementI.M.N3.R2 be followed by ClementI.L.P3.
| LucySyracuse.V1.M | In tua patientia possedisti animam tuam, Lucia sponsa Christi: odisti quae in mundo sunt, & coruscas cum Angelis: sanguine proprio inimicum vicisti. | x + (Ho.id, B.head.id) subisti > vicisti (B) pp. 178-179 x + x + + subisti 2: f. 57v |
| LucySyracuse.V1.Com | Conceptio tua, | + + + + + + |
Dei genitrix virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo: ex te enim ortus est sol justitiae, Christus Deus noster; qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem; & confundens mortem, donavit nobis vitam sempiternam.
Table 3.4: The Common of Saints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>IV 4</th>
<th>IV 6</th>
<th>IV 7</th>
<th>IV 15</th>
<th>IV 21</th>
<th>IV 22</th>
<th>IV 25</th>
<th>IV 83 + Fr. 33:3</th>
<th>PBF 6168 Hs</th>
<th>KHS 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ The scribe of IV 15 erroneously omitted this antiphon.
<p>| ApEv.V1. M | Tradent enim vos in conciliis, &amp; in synagogis suis flagellabunt vos, &amp; ante reges &amp; praesides ducemini propter me, in testimonium illis, &amp; Gentibus. | x | add (B) f. 169r | add (B) p. 343 | x | x | x | add (B, B.ref on 3: p. 3) 3: p. 1 | add (B, B.ref on 3: p. 4) 3: p. 1 |
| ApEv.V2.P 2 | Collocet eum Dominus cum principibus populi sui. | + f. 300v | + (B.head.id) f. 174v | + (B.head.id) p. 343 | + f. 217v | x | + (H7.head.id) f. 241v | + f. 229r | + 2: f. 152v | + (B.head.id) 3: p. 4 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ApEv.Mar.</td>
<td>In velamento x + add (B, B.ref on p. 345) f. 64r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET.V.P3</td>
<td>clamabant sancti tui Domine, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.ET.L.P3 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P3 (H19,ri, B,ri) clamabunt f. 64v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ref on p. 345</td>
<td>2Mar.ET.L.P3 &gt; ApEv/Mar.E.T.V.P3 (H6,ri) clamabunt f. 116v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.E.T.L.P3 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P3 (Un,ri) clamabunt f. 75r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.ET.L.P3 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P3 (Ho,ri, Ho,ri) clamabunt f. 125v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P4</td>
<td>Spiritus &amp; animae justorum hymnum dicite Deo nostro, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ 2Mar.ET.L.P4 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P4 (H19,ri, B,ri) f. 64v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B, B/ref on p. 345)</td>
<td>+ 2Mar.ET.L.P4 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P4 (H6,ri) ff. 116v-117r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ 2Mar.E.T.L.P4 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P4 (H6,ri) f. 75v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApEv/Mar.ET.V.P5</td>
<td>Fulgebunt justi sicut sol in conspectu Dei, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B, H19/ref on f. 64v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B, B/ref on p. 345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B, B/ref on p. 345)</td>
<td>add (B, H6/ref on f. 116v) between ff. 170v-171r in schrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (Ho) f. 120r</td>
<td>add (H3) 2: ff. 90v-91r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ 2Mar.ET.L.P2 &gt; ApEv/Mar.ET.V1.M (H19,ri, B,ri) Sancti et iusti in Domino gaudete alleluia vos elegit Deus in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B, B/ref on p. 345)</td>
<td>+ Eas.V.Con.Alsaints Domine alleluia et &gt; Domine et (Un), alleluia alleluia alleluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Eas.V.Com.Alsaints Domine alleluia et &gt; alleluia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Eas.V.Com.Alsaints Domine alleluia et, alleluia alleluia alleluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>+ Eas.V.Com.Alsaints Domine alleluia et &gt; Domine et (Un), alleluia alleluia alleluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[fn]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The first part of the antiphon, on f. 90v, is covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. 64v</td>
<td>Sancti &amp; justi in Domine gaudete, alleluia: vos elegit Deus in hereditatem sibi, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 116v</td>
<td>Qui me confessus fuerit coram hominibus, confitebor &amp; ego eum coram Patre meo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 178r</td>
<td>Qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris, sed habebit lumen vitae, dicit Dominus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Mar.V.P3</strong></td>
<td>Qui mihi ministrat, me sequatur: &amp; ubi ego sum, illic sit &amp; minister meus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.L.P3 &gt; 1Mar.V.P3 (B.ri)</td>
<td>illic et minister meus erit f. 306r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.V2 .P3 &gt; 1Mar.V. P3 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit &gt; illic sit et minister meus (B) ff. 178v-179r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>1Mar.L.P3 &gt; 1Mar.V.P3 illic et minister meus erit f. 220r-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1Mar.V.P4** | Si quis mihi ministraverit, honorificabit eum Pater meus, qui est in coelis, dicit Dominus. |
| 1Mar.L.P4 > 1Mar.V.P4 (B.ri) | f. 179r |
| 1Mar.V2 .P4 > 1Mar.V. P4 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P4 > 1Mar.V.P4 illic et minister meus erit f. 232v |

| **1Mar.V.P5** | Volo pater, ut ubi ego sum, illic sit & minister meus. |
| 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 (B.ri) | f. 179r |
| 1Mar.V2 .P5 > 1Mar.V. P5 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 348 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 illic et minister meus erit f. 233v |

| **1Mar.V1.M** | Iste sanctus pro lege Dei sui certavit usque ad mortem, & |
| x | add (B) f. 169v |
| x | add (B) f. 346 [fn] f. 301r |

| **1Mar.L.P3** | x |
| 1Mar.L.P3 > 1Mar.V.P3 (B.ri) | add (B) 3: p. 6 |
| 1Mar.V2 .P3 > 1Mar.V. P3 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P3 > 1Mar.V.P3 illic et minister meus erit f. 220r-v |

| **1Mar.V.P4** | x |
| 1Mar.L.P4 > 1Mar.V.P4 (B.ri) | add (B) 3: p. 7 |
| 1Mar.V2 .P4 > 1Mar.V. P4 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P4 > 1Mar.V.P4 illic et minister meus erit f. 232v |

| **1Mar.V.P5** | x |
| 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 (B.ri) | add (B) 3: p. 6 |
| 1Mar.V2 .P5 > 1Mar.V. P5 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 illic et minister meus erit f. 233v |

| **1Mar.V1.M** | x |
| 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 (B.ri) | add (B) 3: p. 6 |
| 1Mar.V2 .P5 > 1Mar.V. P5 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit > illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P5 > 1Mar.V.P5 illic et minister meus erit f. 233v |

<p>| <strong>1Mar.V2.P</strong> | x |
| 1Mar.L.P2 &gt; 1Mar.V.2.P (B.ri) | add (B) 3: p. 6 |
| 1Mar.V2 .P2 &gt; 1Mar.V. P2 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri) et minister meus erit &gt; illic sit et minister meus (B) p. 347 |
| x | 1Mar.L.P2 &gt; 1Mar.V.2.P illic et minister meus erit f. 233v |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.V2.M</td>
<td>Qui vult venire post me, abneget semetipsum, &amp; tollat crucem suam, &amp; sequatur me.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V1.M</td>
<td>Istorum est enim regnum coelorum, qui contempserunt vitam mundi, &amp; pervenerunt ad praemia regni, &amp; laverunt stolas suas in sanguine Agni.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P 1</td>
<td>Istit sunt sancti, qui pro testamento Dei sua corpora tradiderunt, &amp; in sanguine Agni laverunt stolas suas.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P 2</td>
<td>Sancti per fidem vicerunt regna, operati sunt justitiam, adepti sunt repromissiones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promissiones f. 312v-312v</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P5 &gt; 2Mar.V2.P2 (Ho.ri, B.head.ri)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promissiones &gt; repromissiones (B) p. 351</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P5 &gt; 2Mar.V2.P2 (Ho.ri)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repromissiones (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repromissiones &gt; repromissiones (B) 3: p. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repromissiones &gt; repromissiones (B) 3: p. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ (Un.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu f. 312</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Un.id, B.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu f. 183v-184r</td>
<td>+ (Ho.id, B.head.id) renovatur et floret ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovatur et florebunt sicut lilium in civitate (B) p. 351</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (Un.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu f. 224v</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (H2, H7.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu f. 247r</td>
<td>+ (Un.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu f. 231v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ho.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovatur et florebunt sicut lilium in civitate (B) 3: p. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (Ho.id) renovabitur et florent ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovatur et florebunt sicut lilium in civitate (B) 3: pp. 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (B.head.id) renovabitur et floret ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovabitur floribunt sicut lilium in civitate (B) 3: p. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B.head.id) renovabitur et floret ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovabitur floribunt sicut lilium in civitate (B) 3: pp. 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2Mar.V2.P 4 | Absterget Deus omne lacrymam ab oculis sanctorum: & |  |  |  |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2Mar.V2.P4 (B.head.ri)</td>
<td>3: p. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add (B) 3: pp. 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The scribe of KHS 28 erroneously omitted this antiphon.
| 2Mar.V2.P5 | In coelestibus regnis sanctorum habitatio est, & in aeternum requies eorum. | x | add (B) f. 183v | add (B) p. 351 | x | x | x | H2.ref on f. 246v | x | x | add (B) 3: p. 10 | add (B) 3: p. 12 |

1 The antiphon is referred to as *ut supra de omnibus sanctis* ('as above for All Saints', f. 307), but the office for the feast of All Saints (1 November) is not present in IV 4, which is a winter antiphonary.

2 The antiphon is referred to as *ut supra de omnibus sanctis* ('as above for All Saints', f. 242v), but the office for the feast of All Saints (1 November) is not present in IV 22, which is a winter antiphonary.

3 The reidentification is probably covered by a piece of paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>ConfBis.V. P2</th>
<th>Non est inventus similis illi, qui conservaret legem Excelsi.</th>
<th>p. 354</th>
<th>161r-v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V. P3</td>
<td>Ideo jurejurando fecit illum Dominus crescere in plebem suam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V. P4</td>
<td>Sacerdotes Dei benedicite Dominum, servi Domini, hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) f. 188v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc.V.M</td>
<td>O Doctor optime, Ecclesiae sanctae lumen, beate N., divinae legis amator, deprecare pro nobis Filium Dei.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) f. 188v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope.V2.M</td>
<td>Dum esset summus Pontifex, terrena non metuit, sed ad coelestia regna gloriosus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B) p. 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V1.M</td>
<td>Similabo eum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
<td>add (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V4</td>
<td>Beatus ille servus, quem cum venerit dominus ejus, &amp; pulsaverit januam, invenit vigilantem.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>add (B, H20.ref on f. 189v) f. 189v</td>
<td>add (B) p. 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V3</td>
<td>Fidelis servus &amp; prudens, quem constituit Dominus super familiam suam.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>add (B, H20.ref on f. 189v) f. 189v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V1</td>
<td>Domine, quinque talenta tradidisti mihi: ecce alia quinque superlucratus sum.</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P1 &gt; Conf.V.P1 (B. ri) f. 189v</td>
<td>+ Conf.V2. P1 &gt; Conf.V.P 1 (Ho.r, B.head) p. 357</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P1 f. 229r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P1 &gt; Conf.V.P1 (B.ri) f. 189v</td>
<td>+ Conf.V2. P1 &gt; Conf.V.P 1 (Ho.r, B.head.ri) p. 357</td>
<td>+ Conf.L.P1 &gt; Conf.V.P1 (H7, ri) f. 255r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

migravit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.P1</td>
<td>Haec est virgo sapiens, &amp; una de numero prudentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.P2</td>
<td>Haec est virgo sapiens, quam Dominus vigilantem invent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V3</td>
<td>Haec est quae nescivit torum in delicto: habebit fructum in respectione animarum sanctarum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V4</td>
<td>Veni electa mea, &amp; ponam in te thronum meum, alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V5</td>
<td>Ista est speciosa inter filias Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Vir.VM</td>
<td>Veni sponsa Christi, accipe coronam, quam tibi Dominus praeparavit in aeternum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This reference was later struck through.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Vir.V.M</td>
<td>Prudentes Virgines, aptate vestras lampades: ecce sponsus venit, exite obviam ei.</td>
<td>+ 1Vir.L.P4 lampades vestras f. 324v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V.P1</td>
<td>Dum esset Rex in accubitu suo nardus mea dedit odorem suavitatis.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V.P2</td>
<td>In odorem unguentorum tuorum currimus, adolescentulae dilexerunt te nimis.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V.P3</td>
<td>Jam hiems transiit, imber abiit, &amp; recessit: surge amica mea, veni.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V.P5</td>
<td>Ista est speciosa inter filias Jerusalem.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V2.M</td>
<td>Manum suam aperuit inopi, &amp; palmas suas extendit ad</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ded.V.P3</td>
<td>Hae est domus Domini firmiter aedificata, bene fundata est supra firmam petram.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ded.V1.M</td>
<td>Sanctificavit Dominus tabernaculum suum: quia haec est domus Dei, in qua invocabitur nomen ejus, de quo scriptum est: Et erit nomen meum ibi, dicit Dominus.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V.P1</td>
<td>Dum esset Rex in accubitu suo nardus mea dedit odorem suavitatis.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V.P2</td>
<td>Laeva ejus sub capite meo, &amp; dextera illius amplexabitur me.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V.P3</td>
<td>Nigra sum, sed formosa, filiae Jerusalem; ideo dilexit me Rex,</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V.P5</td>
<td>Speciosa factes, &amp; suavis in deliciis tuis, sancta Dei genitrix.</td>
<td>+ VisitationBV.M.N3.P2 &gt; BV.V.P5 (B.ref on f. 194v, B.ri) f. 93r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V1.M</td>
<td>Beata mater, &amp; intacta virgo, gloriosa Regina mundi, intercede pro nobis ad Dominum.</td>
<td>x + Sancta Maria succurre miseris iuva pusillanimes refove flebiles ora pro populo interveni pro clero intercede pro devoto femineo sexu. sexu &gt; sexu sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam commemorati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>onem (H6) f. 330v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2: f. 167v</td>
<td>celebrant tuam sanitam commemorationem (B) 3: p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3: p. 22</td>
<td>tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam commemorat ionem (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>femineo sexu: sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam festivitatem pp. 243-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>juvamen quicumque celebrant tuam sanitam commemorat ionem (H6) ff. 160v-161r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: The Melodies of Antiphons Added or Revised

The following tables provide descriptions of the sources of the melodies of antiphons that were added to the liturgical books of Soeterbeeck by post-medieval hands, and of post-medieval additions or revisions to melodies that were already present in these books. All books once owned by Soeterbeeck have been considered, not only those that have columns in the tables describing the antiphons’ text and function (Table 3.4), but also those mentioned in the footnotes to these tables.

There are three options. The melody is 1) identical to that which the antiphon in question has in Soeterbeeck’s late medieval manuscripts, 2) identical to that in Soeterbeeck’s copies of the Roman Antiphonary, or 3) different from both of these and therefore possibly derived from another source. The three right-most columns in either table correspond to these three possibilities. If options 1 or 2 apply, this is most often indicated by an x in the right column.

It is often difficult to determine in the case of small differences whether these are intentional or merely due to scribal error. With an eye to my musicological ignorance, I make no judgement, describe the discrepancy with the source to which the antiphon in question is closest, and in most cases place the antiphon in the rightmost column no matter how small the difference. There are three circumstances in which the latter procedure is not followed: 1) when the wrong clef is used, 2) when a flat, sharp or natural sign is omitted, 3) when the number of groups of notes does not correspond with the number of syllables, so that it is clear that there is an erroneous omission. The first two errors are so easily made, and the third is so clear, that in these three cases, the antiphon is considered to be derived from the source to which it is closest, although the differences are still reported. In some cases the printed antiphonaries provide flat signs for each staff of an antiphon, to cover the entire chant. In these cases, Beckers often gives just one flat sign at the beginning of the antiphon, and as it is clear that this was intended to have the same meaning, this difference in treatment is not mentioned.

In cases where an antiphon was added to more than one manuscript by various hands, at least one addition by each hand was considered for comparison. If an antiphon was added to more than one manuscript by the same person, as was often done by Beckers, only one of these additions was considered for comparison. This is due to practical considerations, and based on the assumption that a person aims at consistency, and that any variants between the same antiphon as added to different books are unintentional. Only when there turn out to be one or more differences between an added antiphon and the version in both the manuscripts and the Roman Antiphonaries, have I considered every single instance of that added antiphon. In cases where there turned out to be differences among the additions, these are described. In cases where there is a difference between the antiphons as added in different manuscripts or in different hands, the shelf mark or the hand is placed in the corresponding column.

For the antiphons added by Beckers, the ‘base’ manuscript used for comparison is IV 7, because that book contains the most additions, covers the entire liturgical year and was revised most carefully of all as far is its text is concerned, and therefore possibly also with reference to the notes.

As representatives of the manuscript tradition, the winter antiphonary KHS 28 and the summer antiphonary IV 6 are used. The reason for this is that these books were both heavily revised by Beckers, which proves that he was familiar with their contents. Only when the melody of an antiphon added in another book did not match the corresponding antiphon in one of these manuscripts, did I turn to the other revised manuscripts for comparison. The reason for this is that the goal of the following tables is not to describe the chants in the
manuscripts of Soeterbeeck, but to determine the sources of the antiphons that have been added to them.

The representative I used of the Roman Antiphonaries from the library of Soeterbeeck is IV 3 (Tournai: Adrianus Quinque, 1627). This is the oldest of the printed antiphonaries, and the only one to contain datable seventeenth-century additions and revisions directly on the page, proving that it was already at Soeterbeeck. In those cases when reference was made to one of the later Roman Antiphonaries because the antiphon in question is not present in IV 3, for instance because the feast on which it was used was introduced after the year in which IV 3 was printed, this is indicated in the tables.

In strings of transcribed notes, a / denotes a syllable boundary.

Table 3.5.1 concerns the antiphons that were added in their entirety. Only the books in which both text and melody were added are included in the table. In many cases, however, the melody of an antiphon added to one or more books was revised or replaced in another. This is described in the notes.

Table 3.5.1: The Melodies of Added Antiphons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Added in</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Roman Antiphonary</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nat.V1.P1</td>
<td>Rex pacificus magnificatus est, cujus vultum desiderat universa terra.</td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 29r (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StephenMartyr.V1.M</td>
<td>Stephanus autem plenus gratia &amp; fortitudine, faciebat signa magna in populo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 35 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V1.M</td>
<td>Iste est Joannes, qui supra pectus Domini in coena recubuit: beatus Apostolus, cui revelata sunt secreta coelestia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 36 (B)</td>
<td>x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef, and omits the final note on caelestia.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnEvangelist.V2.M¹</td>
<td>Exiit sermo inter fratres, quod discipulus ille non moritur, &amp; non dixit Jesus, non moritur: sed, Sic eum volo manere, donec veniam.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 37 (B)</td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 51r (B)</td>
<td>KHS 28, 1: f. 50v (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V1.M</td>
<td>Hi sunt, qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati: Virgines enim sunt, &amp; sequuntur Agnum quocumque ierit.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 38 (B)</td>
<td>x (B omits the flat sign for Hi.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V1.M</td>
<td>Propter nimiam charitatem suam, qua dilexit nos Deus, Filium suum misit in similitudinem carnis peccati, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 47 (B)</td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 62r (B)</td>
<td>KHS 28, 1: f. 60v (B)</td>
<td>Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StephenMartyr.O8.V.P1</td>
<td>Lapidaverunt Stephanum, &amp; ipse invocabat Dominum, dicens: Ne statuas illis hoc peccatum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 35 (B)</td>
<td>Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StephenMartyr.O8.V.P2</td>
<td>Lapides torrentis illi dulces fuerunt: ipsum sequuntur omnes animae justae.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 35</td>
<td>Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho) (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StephenMartyr.</td>
<td>Stephanus vidit coelos apertos.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 35 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 15r with those of the Roman Antiphonary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O8.V.P4</th>
<th>vidit &amp; introivit: beatus homo, cui coeli patebant.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Martyr. O8.V.P5</td>
<td>Ecce video coelos apertos, &amp; Jesum stantem a dextris virtutis Dei.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 35 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho) Mater 3 (Ho uses a do clef instead of a fa clef after Jesum.)</td>
<td>IV 7 is identical to the manuscript tradition, except for the notes on virtutis (a word which does not appear there); these notes (so / mi / mi) are identical to those in IV 8, f. 16r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evangelist. O8.V.P2</td>
<td>Hic est discipulus ille, qui testimonium perhibet de his: &amp; scimus quia verum est testimonium eius.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 36 (B) Fr. 1 (H4)</td>
<td>Fr. 1 IV 7 is almost identical to the Roman Antiphonary, except that B gives the notes so / so / so / so / fa / mi / fa mi / mi instead of so / so / so / mi / mi / mi for testimonium eius, to which I have not been able to find a counterpart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.P1</td>
<td>Ante luciferum genus, &amp; ante saecula, Dominus Salvator noster hodie mundo apparuit.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 49 (B) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.P2</td>
<td>Venit lumen tuum Jerusalem, &amp; gloria Domini super te orta est: &amp; ambulabunt Gentes in lumine tuo, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 50 (B) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.P3</td>
<td>Apertis thesauris suis obtulerunt Magi Domino aurum, thus, &amp; myrrham, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 51 (B) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 B revised the melody of this antiphon in PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 64r and KHS 28, 1: f. 63r, making it slightly more similar, though not identical, to that in IV 7.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 3, pp. 99-100 with those of the manuscript tradition.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 3, p. 100 with notes for which I have not been able to identify a source.
4 Un changed the notes in IV 3, p. 100 into those of the manuscript tradition, whereas another hand partly covered them with slips of paper and replaced them with notes for which I have not been able to identify a source.
|   | Ep.V.P4 | Maria & flumina benedicite Domino: hymnum dicite fontes Domino, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 52 (B) | x | IV 7  
IV 15, loose sheet at the back (H11)  
IV 25, f. 103v (H16)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 76r (B)  
KHS 28, 1: f. 74r (B) | x | IV 7  
IV 15  
PBF 6168  
Hs  
KHS 28  
IV 25 is identical to the Roman Antiphonary, except that H16 gives the notes fa / mi / fa instead of fa / so / la on farine, to which I have not been able to find a counterpart.  
|   | Sex.V1.M | Dixit Dominus ad Noe: Finis universae carnis venit coram me: fac tibi arcam de lignis laevigatis, ut salvetur universum semen in ea. | 130 G 18, f. 93br (H13)  
130 G 18, f. 106v (H11) | x |   
|   | Sex.V2.M | Vobis datum est nosse mysterium regni Dei, ceteris autem in parabolis, dixit Jesus discipulis suis. | 130 G 18, f. 107v (H12) | x |   
130 G 18, ff. 107v-108r (H12)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 1: ff. 80v-81r (B)  
KHS 28, 1: ff. 82v-83r (B) | x (B omits the flat sign for adduci, as happen s in IV 18 and IV 19.) |   
|   | Quad.S3.V1.M | Dixit autem pater ad servos suos: Cito proferte stolam primam, & induite illum, & dare annulum in manu ejus, & calceamenta in pedibus ejus. | IV 15, loose sheet at the back (Ho) | x |   
|   | Quad.S4.V2.M | Subiit ergo in montem Jesus, & ibi sedebat cum discipulis suis. | IV 7, p. 79 (B) | x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef, and omits the flat sign for ergo.) |   
|   | Quad.S4.F2.V M | Solvite templum hoc, dicit Dominus; & post triduum reaedificabo illud: hoc autem dicebat de templo corporis sui. | 130 G 18, f. 93ar (H4) | x |   
130 G 18, f. 93bv (H4)  
PBF 6168 Hs, | IV 7 is identical to the manuscript |   

1 Un changed the notes in IV 3, p. 100 into those of the manuscript tradition, whereas another hand partly covered them with slips of paper and replaced them with notes for which I have not been able to identify a source.
snippets between pp. iv-vii and back pastedown and back flyleaf (H18)

<p>| Pas.V2.M | Abraham pater vester exultavit ut videret diem meum: vidit, &amp; gavisus est. | IV 7, p. 81 (B) | IV 7 resembles the manuscript tradition most, but B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef and gives the notes si do re / re (or mi fa so / so) instead of mi / fa so for the final two syllables of Abraham, and the notes la do la so (or re fa re do) instead of re fa re do on the second |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eas.V2.P1</th>
<th>Angelus autem Domini descendit de coelo, &amp; accedens revolvit lapidem, &amp; sedebat super eum, alleluia, alleluia.</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 93 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</th>
<th>Mater 3</th>
<th>IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B gives a fa instead of a so on the final syllable of <em>lapidem</em>, as does IV 8, f. 37v.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P2</td>
<td>Et ecce terraemotus factus est magnus: Angelus enim Domini descendit de coelo, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 93 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</td>
<td>x (B and Ho give a la on the second syllable of <em>Angelus</em>, whereas IV 6 gives a si. IV 15, IV 21, IV 25, IV 83 all give a la.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P3¹</td>
<td>Erat autem aspectus ejus sicut fulgur, vestimenta autem ejus sicut nix, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 93 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</td>
<td>Mater 3</td>
<td>IV 7 is identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B gives the notes si la / so / si / so on <em>autem eius</em> where the manuscripts only have <em>eius</em> with si la / so. B also provides notes (la / la / so / so) for a second <em>alleluia</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ B revised the text and the melody of this antiphon in IV 6, making it identical to that in IV 7. In IV 25 he did the same, though without adding the *alleluia.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eas.V2.P4</th>
<th>Prae timore autem ejus exterriti sunt custodes, &amp; facti sunt velut mortui, alleluia.</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 93 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</th>
<th>x (Ho omits a do on the first syllable of <em>facti.</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.P5</td>
<td>Respondens autem Angelus, dixit mulieribus: Nolite timere: scio enim quod Jesum quaeritis, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 93 (B) Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.V2.M</td>
<td>Et respicientes viderunt revolutum lapidem: erat quippe magnus valde, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 4r (B) IV 7, pp. 93-94 (B) IV 15, f. 261v (H11) IV 25, f. 4r (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.S2.V2.M</td>
<td>Ego sum pastor bonus, qui pasco oves meas, &amp; pro ovibus meis pono animam meam, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 107 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.S4.V2.M</td>
<td>Vado ad eum qui misit me: sed quia haec locutus sum vobis, tristitia implevit cor vestrum, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 112 (B)</td>
<td>x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.P4</td>
<td>Fontes, &amp; omnia quae moventur in aquis, hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 126 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S.V2.P1</td>
<td>Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meis.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 366 (H1) IV 90, f. 18v (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.Com.BV</td>
<td>Sancta Maria, succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clero, intercede pro devoto femineo sexu: sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanitam commemorationem.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 243-244 (B)</td>
<td>The antiphon follows the manuscript tradition until <em>sexu</em>, and from <em>sentiant</em> onwards the Roman Antiphonary (because that part does not occur in the manuscripts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S5.V2.M</td>
<td>Si offers munus tuum ad altare, &amp; recordatus fueris quia frater tuus habet aliquid</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 153 (B) IV 15, loose sheet at the back</td>
<td>IV 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S7.V1.M</td>
<td>adversus te; relinque ibi munus tuum ante altare, &amp; vade prius reconciliari fratri tuo: &amp; tunc veniens offeres munus tuum, alleluia.</td>
<td>(H24) manuscript tradition most, except that H24 adds a flat sign for every si, gives a re instead of a mi on the second syllable of the first <em>offers</em>, omits the fa on the first syllable of <em>vade</em>, and from <em>reconciliari</em> to the second <em>offers</em> uses a fa clef instead of a do clef.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S9.V2.M</td>
<td>Unxerunt Salomonem Sadoc sacerdos, &amp; Nathan Propheta regem in Gihon, &amp; ascendentes laeti dixerunt: Vivat rex in aeternum.</td>
<td>IV 15, loose sheet at the back (H11) x (H11 omits the flat sign for <em>aeternum</em>, as do IV 18 and IV 19.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S10.V2.M</td>
<td>Scriptum est enim: Quia domus mea domus orationis est cunctis gentibus: vos autem fecistis illam speluncam latronum: &amp; erat quotidie docens in templo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 154 (B) x (B gives the notes so la do si do instead of so la do la si do on the first syllable of <em>docens</em>, omitting the second la. This note was also removed from IV 8, f. 28r.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S14.V2.M</td>
<td>Bene omnia fecit, &amp; surdos fecit audire, &amp; mutos loqui.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 156 (B) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S10.V2.M</td>
<td>Quaerite primum regnum Dei, &amp; justitiam ejus, &amp; haec omnia adjicientur vobis, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 156 (B) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un added the notes to this antiphon, including the la on *docens* which B omits, to IV 25, f. 111r.
| Pen.S18.V2.M<sup>1</sup> | Tulit ergo paralyticus lectum suum, in quo jacebat, magnificans Deum: & omnis plebs, ut vidit, dedit laudem Deo. | IV 7, pp. 157-158 (B) | IV 7 is identical to the manuscript tradition, except for the notes on *paralyticus* (a word which does not appear there); these notes (five *mis*) are identical to those in IV 8, f. 62v. |
| Pen.S20.V2.M | Cognovit autem pater, quia illa hora erat, in qua dixit Jesus, Filii tuus vivit, & credidit ipse, & domus ejus tota. | IV 7, pp. 159-160 (B) | x |
| Pen.S21.V2.M | Serve nequam, omne debitum dimisi tibi quoniam rogasti me: nonne ergo oportuit & te misereri conservi tui, sicut & ego tui misertus sum? alleluia. | IV 7, pp. 160-161 (B) | IV 7 is identical to the manuscript tradition, except for the notes on *sicut et ego tui misertus sum? alleluia* (words which do not appear there); these notes are identical to those in IV 8, f. 63v. |
| Pen.S22.V2.M<sup>2</sup> | Reddite ergo quae sunt Caesaris, Caesari: & quae sunt Dei, Deo, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 162 (B) | x |
| Pen.S23.V2.M<sup>3</sup> | At Jesus conversus, & videns eam, dixit: Confide filia, fides tua te salvam fecit, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 162 (B) | IV 25 | IV 7 gives the notes *mi / fa so instead of mi fa / so on Jesus,* for Jesus, for |

---

<sup>1</sup> B revised the text and the melody of this antiphon in IV 6, making it identical to that in IV 7.

<sup>2</sup> Un added the notes of the Roman Antiphonary to this antiphon in IV 25, f. 119r-v.

<sup>3</sup> Un changed the notes in IV 8, f. 63v to those of B.
| Pen.S24.V2.M | Amen dico vobis, quia non praeteribit generatio haec, donec omnia fiant: coelum & terra transibunt, verba autem mea non transibunt, dicit Dominus. | IV 7, p. 162 (B) | IV 7 is almost identical to the Roman Antiphonary, except for the notes on *et*, which are so *fa* instead of just *fa*. The same is true for IV 8, f. 64v. |
| AndrewApostle.V.P1 | Salve crux pretiosa, suscipe discipulum ejus, qui pendit in te magister meus Christus. | IV 7, p. 163 (B) | x |
| AndrewApostle.V.P2 | Beatus Andreas orabat, dicens: Domine Rex aeternae gloriae, suscipe me pendentem in patibulo. | IV 7, p. 164 (B) | IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B gives the notes *re* *mi* instead of *re* *mi* *re* instead of *re* *mi* *re* for *Rex*, omitting the double *mi*, as do IV 8, f. 65r and the Roman Antiphonaries. |
| AndrewApostle.V.P3 | Andreas Christi famulus, dignus Dei Apostolus, germanus Petri, & in passione socius. | IV 7, p. 165 (B) | x |
| AndrewApostle.V1.M | Unus ex duobus, qui secuti sunt Dominum, erat Andreas frater Simonis Petri, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 166 (B) | x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef.) |
| ConceptionBV/ EspousalBV/ Nativity.V1.M | Gloriosae virginis Mariae Conceptionem/Desponsationem dignissimam recolamus, quae & genitricis dignitatem obtinuit, & virginalem pudicitiam non amisit. | IV 7, pp. 176-177 PBF 6168 Hs, 2: ff. 14v-15r (B) KHS 28, 2: f. 14v (B) | x |
| LucySyracuse.V.P1 | Orante sancta Lucia, apparuit ei beata Agatha, & consolabant ancillam Christi. | IV 7, p. 178 (B) | x |

1 Un replaced the notes on *Conceptionem* or *Desponsationem* with those of the Roman Antiphonary in IV 8, f. 72v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LucySyracuse. V.P2</th>
<th>Lucia virgo quid a me petis, quod ipsa poteris, praestare continuo matri tuae?</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 179 (B)</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LucySyracuse. V.P3</td>
<td>Per te Lucia virgo, civitas Syracusana decorabitur a Domino Jesu Christo.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 179-180 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LucySyracuse. V.P4</td>
<td>Benedico te Pater Domini mei Jesu Christi, quia per Filium tuum ignis extinctus est a latere meo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 180 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanto pondere eam fixit Spiritus sanctus, ut virgo Christi immobiles permaneret.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 179 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(IV 7 differs from KHS 28 in the notes (si do re mi / re / do si do) on the second, third and fourth syllables of <em>immobilis</em>, but agrees with those in IV 4, IV 22, 130 G 18 and PBF 6168 Hs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P1</td>
<td>Omnis qui invocaverit nomen Domini, salvus erit.</td>
<td>IV 3, pp. 405-406 (Ho) IV 7, p. 57 (B) IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30) PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B) KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td>IV 19 (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P2</td>
<td>Sanctum &amp; terrible nomen ejus, initium sapientiae timor Domini.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 57 IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30) PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B) KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td>IV 19 (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P3</td>
<td>Ego autem in Domino gaudebo, &amp; exultabo in Deo Jesu meo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 58 IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30) PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B) KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td>IV 19 (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.P4</td>
<td>A solis ortu usque ad occasum laudabile nomen Domini.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 58 IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30) PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B) KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td>IV 19 (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 67v with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 67v with those of B.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 68r with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 59</th>
<th>IV 19, between</th>
<th>a source.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus.V.P</td>
<td>Sacrificabo hostiam laudis, &amp; nomen Domini invocabo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus.V.1.M</td>
<td>Fecit mihi magna qui potens est, &amp; sanctum nomen ejus, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>compa (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus.V.2.M</td>
<td>Vocabis nomen ejus Jesum, ipse enim salvum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td>compa (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, p. 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 96-97 (H30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, p. ix (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KHS 28, p. i (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Rome/Cha</td>
<td>Tu es pastor ovium, princeps Apostolorum, tibi traditae sunt claves regni coelorum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir/Antioch/Peter</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 78v (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul.V1.M</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 183 (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes/Rome.V2 .P4</td>
<td>Benedico te Pater Domini mei Jesu Christi, quia per Filium tuum ignis extinctus est a latere meo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 182-183 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul .V.P1</td>
<td>Ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit, Deus autem incrementum dedit, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, p. 184 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul .V.P2</td>
<td>Libenter gloriabor in infirmitibus meis, ut inhabitet in me virtus Christi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, p. 184 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul .V.P3</td>
<td>Gratia Dei in me vacua non fuit, sed gratia ejus semper in me manet.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, p. 184 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul .V.P4</td>
<td>Damasci, praepositus gentis Aratae regis voluit me comprehendere: a fratribus per murum demissus sum in sporta, &amp; sic evasi manus ejus, in nomine Domini.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 184-185 (B)</td>
<td>x (B omits the final note on sporta.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul .V.P5/ConversionPaul.V1.P5</td>
<td>Ter virgis caesus sum, semel lapidatus sum, ter naufragium pertuli pro Christi nomine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 6, f. 88v (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, p. 185 (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130 G 18, f. 106r (H12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 27v (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KHS 28, 2: f. 19v (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 68r with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 69v-70r with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConversionPaul V1.M</th>
<th>Vade Anania, &amp; quaere Saulum: ecce enim orat: quia vas electionis est mihi, ut portet nomen meum coram Gentibus, &amp; regibus, &amp; filiis Israel.</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 183 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 33v-34r (B) KHS 28, 2: ff. 31v-32r (B)</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul V2.M</td>
<td>Sancte Paule Apostole, praedicator veritatis, &amp; doctor Gentium, intercede pro nobis ad Deum, qui te elegit.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 185 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV. V2.P1</td>
<td>Simeon justus &amp; timoratus expectabat redemptionem Israel, &amp; Spiritus sanctus erat in eo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 189 (B)</td>
<td>IV 7 most resembles the manuscript tradition, except that B provides a single rather than a double do for the final syllable of Simeon (as does IV 8, f. 73r), from Israel onwards is consistently two tones higher (as is IV 8), and gives a so (or a mi) rather than a fa (or a re) for the final syllable of sanctus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV. V2.P2</td>
<td>Responsum accepit Simeon a Spiritu sancto, non visurum se mortem, nisi videret Dominum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 190 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV. V2.P3</td>
<td>Accipiens Simeon puerum in manibus, gratias agens benedit Dominum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 191 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV. V2.P4</td>
<td>Lumen ad revelationem Gentium, &amp; gloriam plebis tuae Israel.</td>
<td>IV 19, p. 425 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurificationBV. V2.P5</td>
<td>Obtulerunt pro eo Domino par turturum, aut duos pullos Columbarum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 192 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgathaSicily.V.M</td>
<td>Stans beata Agatha in medio carceris, expansis manibus orabat ad Dominum: Domine Jesu Christe, magister bone, gratias tibi ago, qui me fecisti vincere tormenta carnificum: jube me Domine ad tuam</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 193-194 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 2: ff. 44v-45r (B) KHS 28, 2: ff. 45v-46r (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agatha Sicily. V 2.P1</td>
<td><em>Quis es tu, qui venisti ad me curare vulnera mea? Ego sum Apostolus Christi: nihil in me dubites filia.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation II/Translation I. Augustine. V.M</td>
<td><em>Praesul sanctissime Augustine, via morum, scripturae secretum, Doctor egregie, lux Doctorum, vitae nostrae decretum: roga mitissime, Christi nos adire secretum.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Canons. V. P1</td>
<td><em>Laudemus viros gloriosos, &amp; parentes nostros in generetatione sua.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Canons. V. P2</td>
<td><em>Omnes isti in generationibus gentis suae gloriem adepti sunt: &amp; in diebus suis habentur in laudibus.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Canons. V. P3</td>
<td><em>Corpora sanctorum in pace sepulta sunt, &amp; vivent nomina eorum in aeternum.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Canons. V. P4</td>
<td><em>Sancti Spiritus, &amp; animae justorum, hymnum dicite Deo.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Canons. V. P5</td>
<td><em>Sapientiam ipsorum narrent populi, &amp; nomen eorum nuntiet Ecclesia.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 75r with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 75r with those of B.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 75r with those of B.
4 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 75r with those of B.
5 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 75r with those of B.
6 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76r with those of B, except that the notes on the second syllable of *lucebit* are *la re* instead of *la si re*, and the final note on *temporum* is omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GabrielArchangel.V1.P1</th>
<th>Ingresso Zacharia templum Domini, apparuit ei Gabriel Angelus, stans a dextris altaris incensi.</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 196 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</th>
<th>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 79r.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P2</td>
<td>Ait autem Angelus: Ne timeas Zacharia, quoniam exaudita est deprecatio tua.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 196 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 79r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P3</td>
<td>Ego sum Gabriel Angelus, qui esto ante Deum, &amp; missus sum loqui ad te.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 196 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 79r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P4</td>
<td>Gabriel Angelus locutus est Mariae, dicens: Ecce concipies in utero, &amp; missus sum loqui ad te.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 196 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 79r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.P5</td>
<td>Dixit autem maria ad Angelum: Quomodo fiet istud, quoniam virum non cognosco? Et respondens Gabriel Angelus, dixit ei: Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, &amp; virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 196 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 79r-v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GabrielArchangel.V1.M</td>
<td>Ingressus Gabriel Angelus ad Mariam virginem, dixit: Ave gratia plena, Dominus tecum: benedicta tu in mulieribus.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 196-197 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, p. iii (B) KHS 28, p. iv (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes are different from those in IV 8, f. 80r-v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B) IV 7, p. 201 (B) IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) IV 22, f. 226v (H16) PBF 6168 Hs, p. i (B) KHS 28, p. ii (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for IV 6, IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. In IV 22 and KHS 28 Christus is two tones higher: so la so / so instead of mi fa mi / mi. In IV 6, the notes on the first syllable of Christus are so la.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 7, p. 201 (B) IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) IV 22, f. 226v (H16) PBF 6168 Hs, p. i (B) KHS 28, p. ii (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 7, p. 201 (B) IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) IV 22, f. 227r (H16) PBF 6168 Hs, p. i (B) KHS 28, p. ii (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 7 and PBF 6168 Hs omit the flat signs for antequam and habens, and IV 22 has fa so fa on the first syllable of sancto instead of just fa so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76r with those of B, except that the first syllable of autem is given do re instead of only do, and the first syllable of Christus only mi fa instead of mi fa mi as in IV 7 and PBF 6168 Hs.

2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76r with those of B.

3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76r-v with those of B, without the flat sign for antequam.

4 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76v with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Dimensions: 595.3x841.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voluit occulte dimittere eam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 22, f. 227r (H16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, p. i (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS 28, p. ii (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 22 has re fa / mi re / fa mi / re mi / re do instead of re fa so / mi re / fa mi / re mi / re do on eam traducere and a do clef instead of a fa clef from occulte onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseB V.V1.P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelus Domini apparuit Joseph dicens: Joseph fili David noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam; quod enim in ea natum est, de Spiritu sancto est: pariet autem filium, &amp; vocabis nomen ejus Jesum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 7, p. 201 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 22, f. 227r-v (H16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF 6168 Hs, p. i (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS 28, p. ii (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. All manuscripts but KHS 28 omit the flat signs for timere and natum. IV 22 has a do clef instead of a fa clef throughout; IV 7 from the second syllable of sancto onwards. IV 22 also has do si la si / la / la (or fa mi re mi re re) instead of fa mi re / mi re / re on conjugem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseB V.V1.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exurgens Joseph a sommo fecit, sicut pracepect ei Angelus Domini, &amp; acceptit Conjugem suam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 7, p. 202 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 76v with those of B, without the flat signs for timere and natum, and do re instead of do re do on the first syllable of Jesum.

2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 77v with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JosephSpouseB V.V2.P1&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Iabant Parentes Jesu per omnes annos in Jerusalem, in die solemni Paschae.</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 202 (B)</th>
<th>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</th>
<th>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</th>
<th>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</th>
<th>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseB V.V2.P2&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Cum redirent, remansit puer Jesus in Jerusalem, &amp; non cognoverunt Parentes ejus.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 202 (B)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosephSpouseB V.V2.P3&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Non invenientes Jesum, regressi sunt in Jerusalem requirentes eum, &amp; post triduum invenerunt illum in templo sedentem in medio</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 202 (B)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 77v with those of B.

<sup>2</sup> Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 77v with those of B.

<sup>3</sup> Un replaced the notes in IV 8, ff. 77v-78r with those of B.
| Doctorum, audientem, & interrogantem eos. | 228r (H16) PBF 6168 Hs, p. ii (B) KHS 28, p. iii (B) | of a re on the second syllable of medio. | PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 7 omits the flat signs for requirentes and in templo, has do re do instead of do re on the first syllable of Jesum, a si instead of a do on the third syllable of Jerusalem, so la so instead of so la on the second syllable of sedentem, and la so fa instead of so fa on the first syllable of eos. KHS 28 omits the flat sign for in, and only has one for templo. IV 22 has la si la / la instead of do re do / do on Jesum, a si instead of a do on the second syllable of Jerusalem, sa la instead of so sa la on the third syllable of requirentes, do la instead of la do on post, re do instead of do re do on the final syllable of invenerunt, so la so instead of so la on the |
| JosephSpouseB  | Dixit Mater ejus ad illum: Fili quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce Pater tuus, & ego dolentes, quaerebamus te. | IV 7, p. 202 (B)  
IV 19, between pp. 432-433  
(H30)  
IV 22, f. 228r  
(H16)  
PBF 6168 Hs, p. ii (B)  
KHS 28, p. iii (B) | IV 19  
I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 22 has la instead of re on the second syllable of *Mater*. |
| JosephSpouseB  | Descendit Jesus cum eis, & venit Nazareth, & erat subditus illis. | IV 7, p. 202 (B)  
IV 19, between pp. 432-433  
(H30)  
IV 22, f. 228r  
(H16)  
PBF 6168 Hs, p. ii (B)  
KHS 28, p. iii (B) | IV 19  
I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 7 has a si instead of a do in the last syllable of *venit* and the final two syllables of *Nazareth*, and la si do instead of si do re on the second *et*. IV 22 has every note two tones too low from the first *et* onwards, and also has a so (or a si) instead of a |

---

1. Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 78r with those of B.
2. Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 78r with those of B.
| JosephSpouseBV.V2.M | Ecce fidelis servus, & prudens, quem constituit Dominus super familiam suam. | IV 7, p. 202 (B)
IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)
IV 22, f. 228r-v (H16)
PBF 6168 Hs, p. ii (B)
KHS 28, p. iii (B) | IV 19 | I have not been able to identify a source for IV 7, IV 22, PBF 6168 Hs and KHS 28. IV 7 and IV 22 both have do / mi / re / fa / mi instead of re / re / re / re on servus et prudens. IV 7 also has la / si instead of la si do / do on the first two syllables of Dominus and re si / si instead of re do / do si on the second and third syllables of familiam. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AnnunciationLord.V.P1 | Missus est Gabriel Angelus ad Mariam virginem desponsatam Joseph. | IV 7, p. 197 (B)
Mater 3, loose sheet (Ho) | x |  |
| AnnunciationLord.V.P4 | Dabit ei Dominus sedem David patris ejus, & regnabit in aeternum. | IV 18, between pp. 4-5 (Un) |  | I have not been able to identify a source. |
| AnnunciationLord.V1.M | Spiritus sanctus in te descendet Maria, & virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi. | IV 7, p. 198 (B)
PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 57r (B)
KHS 28, 2: f. 51v (B) | x (B has tibi followed by alleluia, but gives the notes for tibi outside ET.) |  |
| AnnunciationLord.V2.M | Gabriel Angelus locutus est Marieae, dicens: Ave gratia | IV 7, p. 200 (B)
PBF 6168 Hs, 2: | IV 7 resembles |  |

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 79r with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 81r with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patronage</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josep h.V.P2</td>
<td>Missus est Angelus Gabriel a Deo in civitatem Galilaeae, cui nomen Nazareth ad Virginem desponsatam viro, cui nomen erat Joseph alleluja.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 120r are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep h.V.P3</td>
<td>Ascendit autem Joseph a Galilaea de civitate Nazareth in Judaeam, in civitam David, quae vocatur Bethlehem alleluja.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 120r are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep h.V.P4</td>
<td>Et venerunt festinantes, et invenerunt Mariam et Joseph et infantem positum in praesepio alleluja.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 120r-v are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep h.V.P5</td>
<td>Et ipse Jesus erat incipiens quasi annorum triginta, ut putabatur filius Joseph alleluja.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 78v are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep h.V.M</td>
<td>Fili quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce pater tuus, et ego dolentes quaeramus te alleluja.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 120v are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip James V. P5</td>
<td>Si diligitis me, mandata mea servate, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 67v (B)</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 209 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilipJames.V1 .M</td>
<td>Non turbetur cor vestrum, neque formidet: creditis in Deum &amp; in me credite: in domo Patris mei mansiones multae sunt, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 207 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.P1</td>
<td>O magnum pietatis opus! mors mortua tunc est, in ligno quando mortua vita fuit, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 68r (B) IV 7, p. 210 (B)</td>
<td>x (B adds <em>alleluia</em>, with notes that are identical to those in IV 8, f. 85v and the Roman Antiphonary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.P2</td>
<td>Salva nos Christe Salvator per virtutem Crucis, qui salvasti Petrum in mari, miserere nobis, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 210-211 (B)</td>
<td>x (B adds <em>alleluia</em>, with notes that are identical to those in IV 8, f. 85v and the Roman Antiphonary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.P3</td>
<td>Ecce Crucem Domini, fugite partes adversae, vicit leo de tribu Juda, radix David, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 211-212 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.P4</td>
<td>Nos autem gloriari oportet in Crucem Domine nostri Jesu Christi, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 212 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.P5</td>
<td>Per signum Crucis de inimicis nostris libera nos Deus noster, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 212-213 (B)</td>
<td>B adds <em>alleluia</em>, with notes that are identical to those in IV 8, f. 85v, not to the Roman Antiphonary. He also uses a do clef instead of a fa clef, also in conformity with IV 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnGate.V.M</td>
<td>In ferventis olei dolium missus beatus Joannes Apostolus, divina se protegende gratia</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 214 (B) IV 15, between ff. 170-171 (H4)</td>
<td>IV 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativitJohn.V1.P1</td>
<td>Ipse praeibit ante illum in spiritu &amp; virtute Eliae, parare Domino plebem perfectam.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 75v (B)</td>
<td>x (Bo imits the natural sign for perfect am, as does IV 8, f. 89v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnPaul.V1.M1</td>
<td>Astiterunt justi ante Dominum, &amp; ab invicem non sunt separati: calicem Domini biberunt, &amp; amici Dei appellati sunt.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 225-226 (B)</td>
<td>The antiphon resembles the manuscript tradition, except that B gives the notes fa so instead of fa fa so for the second syllable of biberunt, as does IV 8, f. 92r. Also different are the notes for appellati (the word which replaces facti in the manuscript). These notes are different from those in the Roman Antiphonary. They are re / re / re / do re; in IV 6, f. 78r, where...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 92r with those of B.
| JohnPaul.V2.P1 | Paulus & Joannes dixerunt Juliano: Nos unum Deum colimus, qui fecit coelum & terram. | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 (H17) | x (as revised by B) |
| JohnPaul.V2.P2 | Paulus & Joannes dixerunt Terentiano: Si tuus dominus est Julianus, habeto pacem cum illo: nobis alius non est, nisi Dominus Jesus Christus. | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 (H17) | x (as revised by B; H17 gives the notes la / so fa instead of la so / fa for illo) |
| JohnPaul.V2.P3 | Joannes & Paulus agnoscentes tyrannidem Juliani, facultates suas pauperibus erogare coeperunt. | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 (H17) | x (H17 gives the notes mi / fa so instead of mi fa / so for the final two syllables of erogare) |
| JohnPaul.V2.P4 | Sancti spiritus & animae justorum hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia. | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 (H17) IV 7, p. 225 (B) | x |
| JohnPaul.V2.P5 | Joannes & Paulus dixerunt ad Gallicanum: Fac votum Deo coeli, & eris victor melius quam fuisti. | IV 3, between pp. 486-487 (H17) | x |
| PeterPaul.V1.P1 | Petrus & Joannes ascendeant in templum ad horam orationis nonam. | IV 7, p. 227 (B) | x |
| PeterPaul.V1.P2 | Argentum & aurum non est mihi: quod autem habeo, hoc tibi do. | IV 7, p. 228 (B) | x |
| PeterPaul.V1.P3 | Dixit Angelus ad Petrum: Circumda tibi vestimentum tuum, & sequere me. | IV 7, p. 229 (B) | x (IV 7 adds an extra re for tibi, which replaces te in the original text.) |
| PeterPaul.V1.P4 | Misit Dominus Angelum suum, & liberavit me de manu Herodis, alleluia. | IV 7, pp. 229-230 (B) | x |
| PeterPaul.V1.P5 | Tu es Petrus, & super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. | IV 7, p. 230 (B) | x |
| PeterPaul.V2.M | Hodie Simon Petrus ascendit crucis patibulum, alleluia: hodie claviculares regni gaudens migravit ad Christum: hodie Paulus Apostolus, lumen orbis terrae, inclinato capite pro Christi nomine martyrio coronatus est, alleluia. | IV 6, ff. 80v-81r (B) IV 7, pp. 231-232 (B) IV 25, f. 152v (Ho) | x |
| PeterPaul.O.V. M | Petrus Apostolus, & Paulus Doctor Gentium, ipsi nos | IV 18, between pp. 504-505 | x |

B replaced the original reading, he gives re / do re / re / re instead.
<p>| VisitationBV.V | Exurgens Maria abiit in montana cum festinatione in civitatem Juda. | IV 6, f. 89v (B) | IV 7, p. 233 (B) | x |
| VisitationBV.V | Intravit Maria in domum Zachariae, &amp; salutavit Elisabeth. | IV 6, f. 89v (B) | IV 7, p. 233 (B) | x |
| VisitationBV.V | Ut audivit salutationem Mariae Elisabeth, exultavit infans in utero ejus, &amp; repleta est Spiritu sancto, alleluia. | IV 6, f. 90r (B) | IV 7, p. 234 (B) | The antiphon resembles the Roman Antiphonary, except that B gives the third syllable of Elisabeth the notes fa so instead of only a so, as does IV 8, f. 95v. |
| VisitationBV.V | Benedicta tu inter mulieres, &amp; benedictus fructus ventris tui. | IV 7, p. 234 (B) | IV 15, ff. 137v-137ar (H6) | x (The text of this antiphon was changed from in mulieribus to inter mulieres, which forced B to distribute the notes differently across the words. H6 did not carry out this revision, but accidentally only gave a la instead of la so for the second syllable of mulieribus. |
| VisitationBV.V | Ex quo facta est vox salutationis tuae in auribus meis, exultavit infans in utero meo, alleluia. | IV 7, pp. 234-235 (B) | B omits the double do on the first syllable of facta (as does IV 8, f. 96r), and gives the notes so / so / la so / fa instead of so / so la so / fa / fa on |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLCarmel.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum, Ave Domina Angelorum: Salve radix sancta, Ex qua mundo lux est orta: Gaude Virgo gloria, Super omnes speciosa: Vale valde decora, Et pro nobis semper Christum exora.</td>
<td>PBF6168hs, 3: p. 42 (H18)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLCarmel.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Alma Redemptoris mater, quae pervia caeli Porta manes, &amp; stella maris, succurre cadenti, Surgere qui curat, populo: tu quae gemisti, Natura mirante, tuum sanctum Genitorem, Virgo prius, ac posterius, Gabrielis ab ore Sumens illud Ave, peccatorum miserere.</td>
<td>PBF6168hs, 3: p. 42 (H18)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLCarmel.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Gloria Libani data est ei: decor Carmeli, &amp; Saron, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 94v (B) IV 7, p. 236 (B) IV 18, between pp. 504-505 (Un)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The unidentified hand in IV 18 provides an entirely different melody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MaryMagdalen.e.V1.M</strong></td>
<td>Mulier, quae erat in civitate peccatrix, ut cognovit quod Jesus accubuit in domo Simonis leprosi, attulit alabastrum unguenti, &amp; stans retro secus pedes Jesu lacrymis coepit rigare pedes ejus, &amp; capillis capitis sui tergebat, &amp; osculabatur pedes ejus, &amp; unguento ungebat.</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 95r-96r (B) IV 7, pp. 237-239 (B)</td>
<td>x (IV 3 reads pedes Domini Jesu, whereas B omits Domini.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MaryMagdalen.e.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Mulier, quae erat in civitate peccatrix, attulit alabastrum unguenti, et stans retro secus pedes Domini, lacrymis coepit rigare pedes ejus, &amp; capillis capitis sui tergebat.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 96v (B) IV 7, pp. 239-240 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PeterChains.V.P1</strong></td>
<td>Herodes rex apposuit ut apprehenderet &amp; Petrum: quem cum apprehendisset, misit in carcerem, volens post Pascha producere eum populo.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 97v (B) IV 6, f. 204v (H16) IV 7, p. 241 (B) IV 25, f. 150r (Ho)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PeterChains.V.P2</strong></td>
<td>Petrus quidem servabatur in carcere: oratio autem fiebat sine intermissione ab Ecclesia ad Deum pro eo.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 98r (B) IV 6, f. 204v (H16) IV 7, p. 242 (B) IV 25, f. 150r</td>
<td>IV 6 IV 6 IV 7 IV 25 gives the notes fa / so la instead of fa so / la on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 97r with those of B, omitting the flat sign for decor.
2 B replaced the notes of this antiphon, reading pedes Jesu, in IV 8, f. 97v with those of the Roman Antiphonary.
3 B replaced the notes in IV 8, ff. 97v-98r with those of the Roman Antiphonary.
Transfiguration Lord.V.P1

Assumpsit Jesus Petrum, & Jacobum, & Joannem fratem ejus, & duxit eos in montem excelsum seorsum, & transfigurat us est ante eos.

Transfiguration Lord.V.P2

Resplenduit facies ejus sicut sol, vestimenta autem ejus facta sunt alba sicut nix, alleluia.

Transfiguration Lord.V.P3

Et ecce apparuerunt eis Moyses & Elias, loquentes cum Jesu.

Transfiguration Lord.V.P4

Respondens autem Petrus dixit ad Jesum: Domine, bonum est nos hic esse.

Transfiguration Lord.V.P5

Adhuc eo loquente, ecce nubes lucida obumbravit eos.

Transfiguration Lord.V1.M

Christus Jesus splendor Patris, & figura substantiae ejus, portans omnia verbo virtutis

(Ho)

IV 6, ff. 98v-99r (B)
IV 7, p. 245 (B)

IV 6, f. 99r (B)
IV 7, p. 246 (B)

IV 6, f. 99v (B)
IV 7, pp. 246-247 (B)

IV 6, ff. 99v-100r (B)
IV 7, p. 247 (B)

IV 6, f. 100r (B)
IV 7, p. 247 (B)

IV 6, ff. 100v-101r (B)
IV 7, p. 247 (B)

The antiphon resembles the Roman Antiphonary, but I have not been able to find a source for this antiphon, which is identical to that in IV 8, f. 99v, except that B omits the flat sign for seorsum.

The antiphon is almost identical to the Roman Antiphonary, except that B gives the notes mi / fa so fa instead of mi fa / so fa on sicut, and the notes fa la / so / fa mi / mi instead of fa la / so fa / mi / mi on alleluia.

The antiphon resembles the Roman Antiphonary, but I have not been able to find a source.

IV 6 and IV 7 are almost identical to
| Transfiguration | Et audientes discipuli | IV 6, ff. 101r-102r (B) | x |
| CajetanThiene. V.M | Quaerite primum regnum Dei, & justitiam ejus; & haec omnia adjicientur vobis. | IV 6, f. 103r (B) | x (B omits the flat sign for *primum*, and gives the notes that the manuscript tradition use for *alleluia on vobis*, and omits those for *vobis*.) |
| Joachim.V1.M¹ | Laudemus virum gloriosum in generatione sua, quia benedictionem omnium gentium dedit illi Dominus, & testamentum suum confirmavit super caput ejus. | IV 3, pp. 573-574 (Ho) | x (compared with IV 19) |
| AugustineHippo.V1.P1 | Laetare mater nostra Jerusalem: quia Rex tuus dispensatorem strenuum, & civem fidelissimum, de servitute Babylonis, tibi redemit Augustinum. | IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) | x (compared with IV 18) |
| AugustineHippo.V1.P2 | Hujus mater devotissima, quem carne prius pepererat mundo, charitatis visceribus postmodum, multo semine lacrymarum genuit Christo. | IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) | x (compared with IV 18) |
| AugustineHippo.V1.P3 | Distulit tamen diu baptismi gratiam: quia tumens inani Philosophia, volebat humana ratione comprehendere, quod pia mens vivacitate fidei nitor aprehendere. | IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) | x (compared with IV 18) |
| AugustineHippo.V1.P4 | Surgens autem post multos circuitus errorum, circuitab civitatem per vicos, & plateas, quarerendo verum animea | IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30) | x (compared with IV 18) |

¹ Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 102r-v with those of the Roman Antiphonary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AugustineHippo.V1.P5</th>
<th>Inventus igitur a custodibus civitatis, &amp; pallio vetustatis exutus, diligenter pertractata cum illis veritate, quem desiderabat invent, &amp; castis ejus amplexibus ardenter inhaesit.</th>
<th>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</th>
<th>x (compared with IV 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V1.M</td>
<td>Adest nobis dies celebris, quo solutus nexu carnis sanctus Praesul Augustinus, assumptus est cum Angelis; ubi gaudet cum Prophetis, laetatur cum Apostolis: quorum plenus spiritu, quae praedixerunt mystica, fecit nobis pervia: post quos secunda dispensandi verbi Dei, primus refusit gratia.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.P1</td>
<td>Post mortem matris reversus est Augustinus ad agros proprios; ubi cum amicis, jejunis &amp; orationibus vacans, scribebat libros, &amp; docebat indoctos.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.P2</td>
<td>Comperta autem ejus fama Beatus Valerius Hipponensis Episcopus, eum a populo apprehensum, ac sibi praesentatum, licet invitum, Presbyterum ordinavit.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.P3</td>
<td>Factus ergo Presbyter, Monasterium Clericorum mox instituit, &amp; coepit vivere secundum regulam sub sanctis Apostolis constitutam.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.P4</td>
<td>Sanctus autem Valerius ordinator ejus, exultatuberius, hominem sibi talem datum divinitus, qui in doctrina sana aedificare Ecclesiam esset idoneus.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.P5</td>
<td>Eodem tempore Fortunatus Presbyter Manichaeorum versutia plurimos seducebat: quem sanctus Augustinus in conventu omnium disputans publice superavit.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V2.M</td>
<td>Hodie gloriosus Pater Augustinus dissoluta hujus habitacionis domo, domum non manufactam accepit in coelis, quam sibi cooperante Dei gratia, manu, lingua, fabrefecit in terris: ubi jam quod sitivit internum, gustat aeternum decoratus una stola, securesque de reliqua.</td>
<td>IV 19, between pp. 432-433 (H30)</td>
<td>x (compared with IV 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeheadingJohn. V1.M</td>
<td>Misso Herodes spiculatore praecipit amputari caput Joannis in carcere: quo audito, discipuli ejus venerunt, &amp; tulerunt corpus ejus, &amp; posuerunt illud in monumento.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 275-276 (B) IV 15, between ff. 123-124 (H4) x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef until venerunt and omits the flat signs for Herodes and venerunt.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V.P1</td>
<td>Angelis suis Deus mandavit de te, ut custodian te in omnibus viis tuis.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 123v (B) IV 7, p. 280 (B) IV 8, f. [148]v (H32) x (compared to IV 19; B and H32 use a do clef instead of a fa clef, and omit the flat sign for suis.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V.P2</td>
<td>Laudemus Dominum, quem laudant Angeli, quem Cherubim &amp; Seraphim, Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, proclamant.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 124r-v (B) IV 7, p. 280 (B) IV 8, f. [148]r-v (H32) x (compared with IV 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V.P3</td>
<td>Angeli eorum semper vident faciem Patris mei, qui est in coelis.</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 123v-124r (B) IV 7, p. 281 (B) IV 8, f. [148]r-v (H32) x (compared with IV 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V.P4</td>
<td>Benedictus Deus, qui misit Angelum suum, &amp; eruit servos suos, qui crediderunt in eum.</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 124v-125r (B) IV 7, p. 281 (B) IV 8, f. [148]v-[149]r (H32) x (compared with IV 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V.P5</td>
<td>Laudate Deum omnes Angeli ejus: laudate eum omnes virtutes ejus.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 125r (B) IV 7, p. 281 (B) IV 8, ff. [148]v-[149]r (H32) x (compared with IV 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V1.M</td>
<td>Omnes sunt administratorii spiritus, in ministerium missi propter cos, qui hereditatem capiunt salutis.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 281 (B) IV 8, f. [149]r (H32) x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuardianAngel s.V2.M</td>
<td>Sancti Angeli Custodes nostri, defendite nos in praelio, ut non pereamus in tremendo judicio.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 125v (B) IV 7, p. 281 (B) IV 8, f. [149]r (H32) x (compared with IV 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NativityBV.V1.</td>
<td>Gloriosae virginis Mariae</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 126v-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 108r with those of the Roman Antiphonary, using a do clef and omitting the flat sign for suis.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 108r with those of the Roman Antiphonary, omitting the flat sign for omnes.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, ff. 107v-108r with those of the Roman Antiphonary.
4 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 109r with those of the Roman Antiphonary, omitting the flat sign for praelio.
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael.V.P1 | Stetit Angelus juxta aram templi, habens thuribulum aureum in manu sua. | IV 7, p. 291 (B) | x (H29 uses a do clef instead of a fa clef) |
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael.V.P2 | Dum praeliiaretur Michael Archangelus cum dracone, auditae est vox dicentium: Salus Deo nostro, alleluia. | IV 7, pp. 291-292 (B) | x |
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael.V.P3 | Archangele Michael, constitutae principem super omnes animas susci piandas. | IV 7, pp. 292-293 (B) | x |
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael.V.P4 | Angeli Domini Dominum benedicite in aeternum. | IV 7, pp. 293 (B) | x |
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael.V.P5 | Angeli, Archangeli, Throni, & Dominations, Principatus & Potestates, Virtutes coelorum, laudate Dominum de coelis, alleluia. | IV 7, pp. 293-294 (B) | x |
| DedicationMichaeei/ Apparition Michael/Raphael.V.P1 | Princeps gloriosissime, Michael Archangeli, esto memor nostri; hic & ubique semper precare pro nobis Filium Dei, alleluia, alleluia. | IV 6, ff. 144v-147r (B) | x |
| ThomasVillanova.V.M | Dispersit, dedit pauperibus: justitia ejus manet in saeculum saeculi. | IV 6, f. 139r (B) | I have not been able to identify a source for this antiphon. |
| RaphaelArchangele.V.P1 | Missus est Angelus Raphael ad Tobiam & Saram, ut curaret eos. | IV 6, f. 145v (B) | I have not been able to identify a source for this antiphon. B gives the notes so lasi for the final two syllables of curaret, whereas H18 and H31 give the notes so l si. |
| RaphaelArchangele.V.P2 | Ingressus Angelus ad Tobiam, salutavit eum, & dixit: Gaudium sit tibi semper. | IV 6, ff. 145v-146r (B) | I have not been able to identify a source. H31 |

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 109v with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112r with those of B.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112r with those of B, omitting the flat sign for Angelus.
| RaphaelArchangeL.V.P3 | Forti animo esto Tobias, in proximo enim est, ut a Deo cureris. | IV 7, p. 296 (B)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40 (H18) | omits the flat sign for *Angelus*. |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| RaphaelArchangeL.V.P4 | Benedicite Deum coeli, & coram omnibus viventibus confitemini illi, quia fecit vobiscum misericordiam suam. | IV 6, f. 146r-v (B)  
IV 6, ff. 204v-205r (H31)  
IV 7, pp. 296-297 (B)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 3: pp. 40-41 (H18) | I have not been able to identify a source. B gives the notes so fa / mi for *Deo*, whereas H18 and H31 give the notes so / fa mi. |
| RaphaelArchangeL.V.P5 | Pax vobis, nolite timere: Deum benedicite, & cantare illi. | IV 6, f. 146v (B)  
IV 6, f. 205r (H31)  
IV 7, p. 297 (B)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 40 (H18) | I have not been able to identify a source. B gives the notes la / so / la sa / re / re, si / la / so fa / so / la / so / so / mi / fa / so / la, si / la so and so fa / mi respectively. |

1 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112r with those of B.
2 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112r with those of B.
3 Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112v with those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RaphaelAngel.V1.M¹</th>
<th>Ego sum Raphael Angelus, qui asto ante Dominum: vos autem benedicite Deum, &amp; narrate omnia mirabilia ejus.</th>
<th>IV 6, f. 147r (B)</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 297 (B)</th>
<th>IV 17, between ff. 139-140 (H34)</th>
<th>IV 90, f. 16v (H35)</th>
<th>PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 41 (H18)</th>
<th>H18 and H31 give the notes la / so la / si la. H31 also uses a fa clef instead of a do clef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AllSaints.V.P1</td>
<td>Vidi turbam magnam, quam dinumerare nemo poterat, ex omnibus gentibus, stantes ante thronum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 300 (B)</td>
<td>x (B includes a flat sign for <em>quam</em>, as does IV 8, f. 113v. One was also added to IV 15, f. 198r.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. B gives the notes fa / la do for <em>ante</em>, so fa / mi / so / fa / mi / mi re / re for <em>autem benedicite</em> and so / so la / la / fa / fa / so la / so / fa for <em>omnia mirabilia</em> whereas H18 and H35 give the notes fa la / do, so / so mi / so / fa mi / mi / re / re and so / so la / fa / fa / so la / so fa / fa respectively. H34 provides an entirely different melody.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllSaints.V.P2</td>
<td>Et omnes Angeli stabant in circuitu throni, &amp; ceciderunt in conspectu throni in facies suas, &amp; adoraverunt Deum.</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 300-301 (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B gives the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Un replaced the notes in IV 8, f. 112r with those of B.
| AllSaints.V.P3 | Redemisti nos Domine Deus in sanguine tuo ex omni tribu, & lingua, & populo, & natione; & fecisti nos Deo nostro regnum. | IV 7, pp. 301-302 (B) | IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B adds (both in IV 7 and in IV 6) the word *Domine* with notes (three sos), as in IV 8, f. 114r, gives a la instead of a so on the *et* before *lingua*, and gives the notes so / so instead of so / fa for *regnum*. The la for *et* is also present in IV 8, IV 21 and IV 25, and the so was changed into a la in IV 15. In IV 6, an unidentified hand changed the notes of *regnum* into fa so / so. These are the notes in IV 8, f. |
| AllSaints.V.P4 | Benedicte Dominum omnes electi ejus, agite dies laetitiae, & confitemini illi. | IV 7, p. 302 (B) | x |
| AllSaints.V.P5 | Hymnus omnibus Sanctis ejus, filiis Israel, populo appropinquanti sibi, gloria haec est omnibus Sanctis ejus. | IV 7, p. 303 (B) | x (From haec onwards all notes are two tones too high.) |
| AllSaints.V1.M | Angeli, Archangeli, Throni & Dominationes, Principatus & Potestates, Virtutes coelorum, Cherubim atque Seraphim, Patriarchae & Prophetae, sancti legis Doctores, Apostoli, omnes Christi Martyres, sanctii Confessores, Virgines Domini, Anachoritae, Sanctique omnes intercedite pro nobis. | IV 6, ff. 148v-149v (B) IV 7, p. 303-305 (B) | x |
| OffDead.V.P1 | Placebo Domino in regione vivorum. | IV 6, f. 205r (B) | x (B omits the double re on the first syllable of Domino, as does IV 8, f. 139r.) |
| OffDead.V.P2 | Hei mihi Domine, quia incolatus meus prolongatus est. | IV 6, f. 205r (B) | x (B gives three res on Domine, a word which he added to IV 7 with the same notes, which are in agreement with IV 8, f. 139r.) |
| OffDead.V.P3 | Dominus custodit te ab omni male, custodiat animam tuam Dominus. | IV 6, f. 205r (B) | x (B omits the double re on the second Dominus, as does IV 8, f. 139v.) |
| OffDead.V.P4 | Si iniquitates observaveris Domine, Domine quis sustinebit? | IV 6, f. 205r (B) | x |
| OffDead.V.P5 | Opera manuum tuarum Domine ne despicias. | IV 6, f. 205r (B) | x (B gives fa / mi fa on Domine, a word which he added to IV 7 with the same notes.) |
| OffDead.V.M | Omne quod dat mihi Pater, ad me veniet: & eum qui venit ad me, non ejiciam foras. | IV 6, f. 205r (B) IV 7, p. 337 (B) IV 15, f. 300v (H21) IV 15, between ff. 114-115 | x |
| PresentationBV.V.M¹ | Beata Dei genitrix Maria, virgo perpetua, templum Domini, sacrarium Spiritus sancti, sola sine exemplo placuisti Domino nostro Jesu Christo, alleluia. | IV 6, f. 158v (B)  
IV 7, pp. 310-311 (B) | x |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CeciliaRome.V 2.P4</td>
<td>Benedico te Pater Domini mei Jesu Christi, quia per Filium tuum ignis extinctus est a latere meo.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 312 (H25)</td>
<td>IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that the notes on the first two syllables of latere are mi fa so / la instead of mi fa / so la, as is the case in IV 8, f. 116v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CeciliaRome.V 2.P5  | Triduanas a Domino poposci inducas, ut domum meam Ecclesiam consecrarem. | IV 6, f. 162v (B)  
IV 6, f. 205r (H31)  
IV 7, p. 313 (H25)  
IV 15, between ff. 126-127 (H22)  
IV 21, f. 198v (H3)  
IV 25, f. 223v (H4) | I have not been able to identify a source for this antiphon. H22 gives the notes re / mi re / do / do instead of re / mi / re do / do on consecrare m. H31 has a do clef instead of a fa clef and has the notes la si / la / so / so (or re mi / re / do / do) on consecrare m. |
| ApEv.V1.P1         | Hoc est praeceptum meum, ut diligatis invicem, sicut dixi vos. | IV 7, p. 342 (B) | x |
| ApEv.V1.P2         | Majorem charitatem nemo habet, ut animam suam ponat | IV 7, p. 342 (B) | x (B uses a do clef instead of |

¹ In IV 8, f. 138r-v, the notes over the words Domino nostro Jesu Christ alleluia were covered as if they were to be replaced, but this never happened.
| ApEv.V1.P3 | Vos amici mei estis, si feceritis quae praecipio vobis, dicit Dominus. | IV 7, p. 342 (B) | x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef.) |
| ApEv.V1.P4 | Beati pacifici, beati mundo corde: quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt. | IV 7, p. 342 (B) IV 15, ff. 216v-217r (B) | x (B simply uses the notes for Beati mundo corde for the added words Beati pacifici, as does IV 8, f. 122r.) |
| ApEv.V1.P5 | In patientia vestra possidebitis animas vestras. | IV 7, p. 342 (B) | x (B uses a do clef instead of a fa clef.) |
| ApEv.V1.M | Tradent enim vos in conciliis, & in synagogis suis flagellabunt vos, & ante reges & praesides ducemini propter me, in testimonium illis, & Gentibus. | IV 6, f. 169r (B) IV 7, p. 343 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 1 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 1 (B) | x |
| ApEv.V2.M1 | Estote fortes in bello, & pugnate cum antiquo serpente: & accipietis regnum aeternum, alleluia. | IV 6, f. 169v (B) IV 7, p. 344 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 1 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 1 (B) | The antiphon B gives is almost identical to the one in the Roman Antiphonary, except that the notes on the final syllable of pugnate are do si instead of re do. |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V.P1 | Sancti tui Domine florebunt sicut lilium, alleluia, & sicut odor balsami erunt ante te, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 344 (B) | x |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V.P2 | In coelestibus regnis sanctorum habitatio est, alleluia; & in aeternum requies eorum, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 345 (B) | x |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V.P3 | In velamento clamabant sancti tui Domine, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 345 (B) | x |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V.P4 | Spiritus & animae justorum hymnum dicite Deo nostro, alleluia, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 345 (B) | IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that the notes on Spiritus are mi fa so / so |

1 Un changed the notes in IV 8, f. 122v into those of B.
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V.P5 | Fulgebunt justi sicut sol in conspectu Dei, alleluia. | IV 6, f. 64v (B)  
IV 7, p. 345 (B)  
IV 15, between ff. 170v-171r  
(H4)  
IV 25, f. 120r  
(Ho)  
IV 83, 2: ff. 90v-91r (H3) | x (H4 uses a C clef instead of a fa clef.) |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V1.M | Lux perpetua lucebit sanctis tuis Domine, & aeternitas temporum, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 345 (B) | I have been unable to find a source for this antiphon. |
| ApEv/Mar.ET. V2.M | Sancti & justi in Domine gaudete, alleluia: vos elegit Deus in hereditatem sibi, alleluia. | IV 7, p. 345 (B) | x |
| 1Mar.V1.M | Iste sanctus pro lege Dei sui certavit usque ad mortem, & a verbis impiorum non timuit: fundatus enim erat supra firmam petram. | IV 6, f. 196v (B)  
IV 7, p. 346 (B)  
IV 15, p. 301  
(H6)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 6 (B)  
KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B) | x |
| 1Mar.V2.M | Qui vult venire post me, abneget semetipsum, & tollat crucem suam, & sequatur me. | IV 6, f. 196v (B)  
IV 7, p. 347 (B)  
PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 6 (B)  
KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B) | x |
| 2Mar.V1.P1 | Omnes sancti, quanta passi sunt tormenta, ut securi pervenirent ad palmam martyrii. | IV 7, p. 350 (B) | x |
| 2Mar.V1.P2 | Cum palma ad regna pervenerunt sancti, coronas decoris meruerunt de manu Dei. | IV 7, p. 350 (B) | x |
| 2Mar.V1.P3 | Corpora sanctorum in pace sepulta sunt: & vivent nomina eorum in aeternum. | IV 7, p. 350 (B) | x |
| 2Mar.V1.P4 | Martyres Domini Dominum benedicite in aeternum. | IV 7, p. 350 (B) | x (B gives the notes la / so / fa / mi / re on benedicite, as do all manuscripts except IV 6, |

1 Un the notes in IV 6, IV 8 and IV 15 into those of B, except that te latter did not include a new do clef before et.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V1.P5</td>
<td>Martyrum chorus laudate Dominum de coelis, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 350 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V1.M</td>
<td>Isto rum est enim regnum coelorum, qui contemserunt vitam mundi, &amp; pervenerunt ad praemia regni, &amp; laverunt stolas suas in sanguine Agni.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 196v (B) IV 7, p. 350 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: pp. 7-8 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B)</td>
<td>I have been unable to identify a source for this antiphon, which is also present in IV 8, f. 128v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P1</td>
<td>Istit sunt sancti, qui pro testamento Dei sua corpora tradiderunt, &amp; in sanguine Agni laverunt stolas suas.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 183v (B) IV 7, p. 351 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 9 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 10 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P4</td>
<td>Absterget Deus omnem lacrymam ab oculis sanctorum: &amp; jam non erit amplius neque luctus, neque clamor, sed nec ullus dolor: quoniam priora transierunt.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 351 (B) KHS 28, 3: pp. 10-11 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P5</td>
<td>In coelestibus regnis sanctorum habitatio est, &amp; in aeternum requies eorum.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 183v (B) IV 7, p. 351 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 10 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 12 (B)</td>
<td>I have been unable to identify a source for this antiphon, which is also present in IV 8, f. 129v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V.P4</td>
<td>Sacerdotes Dei benedicite Dominum, servi Domini, hymnum dicite Deo, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 188v (B) IV 7, p. 355 (B) IV 22, f. 253v (H7) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 12 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 13 (B)</td>
<td>B and H7 give two sos instead of two fas on the final two syllables of alleluia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V1.M</td>
<td>Sacerdos Pontifex, &amp; virtutum opifex, pastor bone in populo, ora pro nobis Dominum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 355 (B)</td>
<td>IV 7 is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that B gives the notes re fa re do instead of re fa re do on the final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un changed the notes in IV 3, p. xlv into those of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc.V.M</td>
<td>O Doctor optime, Ecclesiae sanctae lumen, beate N., divinae legis amator, deprecare pro nobis Filium Dei.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 188v (B) IV 7, p. 356 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 12 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B)</td>
<td>syllable of Pontifex, eliminating the double re, as does IV 8, f. 130v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope.V2.M</td>
<td>Dum esset summus Pontifex, terrena non metuit, sed ad coelestia regna gloriösus migravit.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 356 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 12 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.P3</td>
<td>Fidelis servus &amp; prudens, quem constituit Dominus super familiam suam.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 189v (B) IV 7, p. 356 (B) IV 22, f. 255r (H7) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 14 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 14 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.P4</td>
<td>Beatus ille servus, quem cum venerit dominus ejus, &amp; pulsaverit januam, invenerit vigilantem.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 189v (B) IV 7, p. 356 (B) IV 22, ff. 255v-256r (H7) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 14 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 15 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V1.M</td>
<td>Similabo eum viro sapienti, qui aedificavit domum suam supra petram.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 189r (B) IV 7, p. 356 (B) IV 15, f. 300v (H6) IV 22, ff. 255v-254r (H7) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 14 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 6 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 16 (B)</td>
<td>x (H7 omits the flat sign for sapient i.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.P3</td>
<td>Haec est quae nescivit torum in delicto: habebit fructum in respectione animarum sanctarum.</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 360 (B) IV 15, back pastedown (H12) KHS 28, 3: p.</td>
<td>IV 7 KHS 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Un changed the first note in IV 3, p. xlv into that of B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vir.V.P5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Vir.V.M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVir/BV.V.P1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVir.V.P2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVir.V.P3/BV.V.P4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVir.V1.M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NoVir.V2.M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5.2 concerns those antiphons that were already present in the manuscripts or the printed books, but whose melody was changed for some reason, for instance to accommodate a textual addition or revision. It seeks to identify the source of the new melody or the additional notes. The deletion of notes is not reported, and manuscripts already discussed in the footnotes to the first table are not included.

If the column with the affected text is empty, the revision or replacement of the melody affects (almost) the entirety of the antiphon. The formula … > [text] indicates an addition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Affected text</th>
<th>Added in</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Roman Antiphonary</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P1</td>
<td>Ecce in nubibus coeli Dominus veniet cum potestate magna, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 3, p. 22 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P3</td>
<td>Ecce apparebit Dominus &amp; non mentietur: si moram fecerit, expecta eum, quia veniet &amp; non tardabit, alleluia.</td>
<td>apparebit Dominus &amp; non mentietur: si moram fecerit, expecta eum, quia veniet &amp; non tardabit, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 22 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P4</td>
<td>Montes &amp; colles cantabant coram Deo laudem, &amp; omnia ligna silvarum plaudent manibus: quoniam veniet Dominator Dominus in regnum aeternum, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 3, pp. 22-23 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S2.V2.P5</td>
<td>Ecce Dominus noster cum virtute veniet, &amp; illuminabit oculos servorum suorum, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 3, p. 23 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S3.V2.M</td>
<td>Beata es Maria, quae credisti Domino: perficientur in te, quae dicta sunt tibi a Domino, alleluia.</td>
<td>... &gt; Domino</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 8-9 (B) IV 8, f. 6v (Un)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 6v have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.MA1</td>
<td>O Sapientia, quae ex ore Altissimi prodiisti, atingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, suaviterque disponens omnia, veni ad</td>
<td>prodisti &gt; prodiisti, suaviter disponensque &gt; suaviterque</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 10 (B)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</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>Adv.S4.V2.P1</td>
<td>Canite tuba in Sion, quia prope est dies Domini: ecce veniet ad salvandum nos, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 43 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S4.V2.P4</td>
<td>Dominus veniet, occurrere illi, dicentes: Magnum principium, &amp; regni ejus non erit finis: Deus fortis, dominator, princeps pacis, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 44 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.S4.V2.P5</td>
<td>Omnipotens sermo tuus Domine a regalibus sedibus veniet, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 44 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V2.M</td>
<td>Magnum hereditatis mysterium: templum Dei factus est uterum nescientis virum: non est pollutus ex ea carnem assumens: omnes Gentes venient, dicentes: Gloria tibi Domine.</td>
<td>nesciens &gt; nescientis</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 49 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 62v (B) KHS 28, 1: f. 61r-v (B) I have not been able to identify a source. IV 3, IV 18 and IV 19 all read nesciens. The revision corresponds with IV 8, f. 18v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.P5</td>
<td>Stella ista sicut flamma coruscat, &amp; Regem regum Deum demonstrat: Magi eam viderunt, &amp; magno Regi munera obtulerunt.</td>
<td>IV 3, pp.100-101 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V1.M</td>
<td>Magi videntes stellam, dixerunt ad invicem: Hoc signum magni Regis est: eamus &amp; inquiramus eum: &amp; offeramus ei munera, aurum, thus, &amp; myrrham, alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; alleluia</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 50 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f. 65r (B) KHS 28, 1: ff. 63v-64r (B) I have not been able to identify a source. IV 7 and PBF 6168 Hs give the notes la / so / so / so / so (with one note too many), whereas KHS 28 gives la / la / so / so (after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</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><strong>Ep.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Tribus miraculis ornatum diem sanctum colimus: hodie stella Magos duxit ad praesepium: hodie vinum ex aqua factum est ad nuptias: hodie in Jordane a Joanne Christus baptizari voluit, ut salvaret nos, alleluia.</td>
<td>... &gt; in Jordane</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 101 (Un) IV 7, p. 52 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 1: ff. 69v-70r (B) KHS 28, 1: f. 68v (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sep.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Dixit paterfamilias operarifi suis: Quid hic statis tota die otiosi? At illi respondentes dixerunt: Quia nemo nos conduxit. It &amp; vos in vineam meam: &amp; quod justum fuerit, dabo vobis.</td>
<td>... &gt; et vos</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 61-62 (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quad.S1.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Ecce nunc tempus acceptabile, ecce nunc dies salutis: in his ergo diebus exhibeamus nosmetipso sicut Dei ministros, in multa patientia, in jejuniis, in vigiliis, &amp; in charitate non ficta.</td>
<td>nos sicut &gt; nosmetipso sicut</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 69 (B) IV 8, f. 27v (Un) PBF 6168 Hs, 1: ff. 82r-v (B) KHS 28, 1: f. 87v (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quad.S3.V2.M</strong></td>
<td>Extollens vocem quaedam mulier de turba, dixit: Beatus venter qui te portavit, quedam mulier vocem &gt; vocem</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 76-77 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 1: f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>Notes</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>Eas.V1.P</td>
<td>&amp; ubera quae suxisti. At Jesus ait illi: Quinimmo beati qui audiunt verbum Dei, &amp; constodiunt illud.</td>
<td>addition corresponds with IV 8, f. 31r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O2.V.M</td>
<td>Qui sunt hi sermones, quos confertis ad invicem ambulantes, &amp; estis tristes, alleluia.</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 37r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eas.O8.V.P</td>
<td>Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc.V1.M</td>
<td>Pater, manifestavi nomen tuum hominibus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101r (B)</td>
<td>KHS 28, 1: f. 105r-v (B)</td>
<td>addition corresponds with IV 8, f. 31r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 6, f. 2r (B)</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 94 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 8, f. 37r (Un)</td>
<td>IV 25, f. 1r (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 6, f. 7r (B)</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 99 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 15, ff. 11v-12v (Un)</td>
<td>IV 25, f. 6r-v (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>(For the replacement alleluia Beckers used the melody of the second alleluia in the original antiphon according to the manuscript tradition. This is identical to the notes in IV 8, f. 38v. The unidentified hand in IV 15 deleted the wrong alleluia and retained the first instead of the second one.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 8, f. 39v (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 6, f. 22r-v (B)</td>
<td>IV 7</td>
<td>I have not been able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.P1</td>
<td>Cum complerentur dies Pentecostes, erant omnes pariter in eodem loco, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 29v (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.P3</td>
<td>Repleti sunt omnes Spiritu sancto, &amp; coeperunt loqui, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 29v-30r (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.Com.BV</td>
<td>Sancta Maria, succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clero, intercede pro devoto feminine sexu: sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicumque celebrant tuam sanctam commemorat ionem.</td>
<td>IV 4, f. 330v (H6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri.V.P5</td>
<td>Ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia: ipsi gloria in saecula.</td>
<td>IV 8, f. 47v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identification**: Identify a source for the revision in IV 6, where B gives the second and third syllables of *venio* notes *mi / re* do instead of *re / do* as in IV 7.

**Pen.V.P3**: I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 45r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.

**Pen.V.Com.BV**: I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 45r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.

**Tri.V.P5**: The replacement melody is almost identical to the manuscript tradition. However, the final word of the antiphon, where IV 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC.OS.V2.M</td>
<td>Exi cito in plateas &amp; vicis civitatis: &amp; pauperes ac debiles, caecos &amp; claudos compelle intrare, ut impletur domus mea, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. 311 (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S6.V2.M</td>
<td>Misereor super turbam: quia ecce jam triduo sustinent me, nec habent quod manducant. &amp; si dimisero eos ejunos, deficient in via, alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; ecce</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 52v (B) IV 7, p. 153 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S7.V2.M</td>
<td>Non potest arbor bona fructus malos facere, nec arbor mala fructus bonos facere; omnis arbor, quae non facit fructum bonum, excidetur &amp; in ignem mittetur, alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; omnis arbor, quae non facit fructum bonum, excidetur et in ignem mittetur, alleluia</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 154 (B) IV 8, f. 59r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.S13.V2.M</td>
<td>Unus autem ex illis, ut vidit quod mundatus est regressus est cum magna voce magnificans Deum, alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; alleluia</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 158 (B) IV 8, f. 61r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConceptionBV/EspousalBV/NativityBV.V.P3</td>
<td>Regali ex progenie Maria exorta refuglet: cujus precibus nos adjuvari mente &amp; spiritu devotissime poscimus.</td>
<td>orta &gt; exorta</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 177 PBF 6168 Hs, 2: f. 18v (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgathaSicily.V2.P3</td>
<td>Gratias tibi ago, Domine Jesu Christe, quia memor es mei, &amp; misisti ad me Apostolum tuum curare vulnera mea.</td>
<td>… &gt; Jesu Christe</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 193 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 6, f. 52v have been replaced with ones corresponding with IV 7, p. 153. I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 59r have been replaced with ones corresponding with Beckers’. I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 61r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’. I have not been able to identify a source. The added note corresponds with IV 8, f. 72r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhilipJames.V.P1</th>
<th>Domine, ostende nobis Patrem, &amp; sufficit nobis, alleluia.</th>
<th>alleluia Philippe qui videt et Patrem alleluia alleluia &gt; alleluia</th>
<th>IV 7, p. 208 (B)</th>
<th>x (B reused the first <em>alleluia</em> of the original antiphon.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhilipJames.V.P4</td>
<td>Si cognovissetis me, &amp; Patrem meum utique cognovissetis, &amp; amodo cognoscetis eum, &amp; vidistis eum, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>vidistis alleluia &gt; vidistis eum, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 67r-v (B) IV 7, p. 208 (B) IV 83, 2: f. 92r-v (H3)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The added notes correspond with IV 8, f. 84r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilipJames.V2. M</td>
<td>Si manseritis in me, &amp; verba mea in vobis manserint, quodcumque pieteritis, fiat vobis, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>alleluia &gt; alleluia, alleluia, alleluia</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 67v (B) IV 7, pp. 208-209 (B) IV 83, 2: f. 92v (H3)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross.V1.M</td>
<td>O Crux, splendior cunctis astris, mundo celebris, hominibus multum amabilis, sanctior universis: quae sola fuisti digna portare talentum mundi: dulce lignum, dulces clavos, dulcia ferens pondera: salva praesentem catteram in tuis hodie laudibus congregatam, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>alleluia &gt; alleluia, alleluia</td>
<td>IV 7, pp. 212-213 (B) IV 8, f. 85r-v</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 85v have been replaced with ones correspondi ng with Beckers’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionAugustine.V1.M</td>
<td>Aperuit Augustinus codicem Apostolicum, &amp; conjectis oculis ad primum capitulum, legit: induimini Dominum Jesum Christum; &amp; statim quasi infusa luce securitatis, ab eo omnes dubietatis tenebrae diffugerunt, Alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; alleluia</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 116v (B) IV 8, f. 88r</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 88r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionAugustine.V2.M</td>
<td>Non satiabatur illis diebus, dulcedine mirabili, considerare altitudo con consili divini, super salutem generis humani, Alleluia.</td>
<td>… &gt; alleluia</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 118v (B) IV 8, f. 88r</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 88r have been changed to correspond with Beckers’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ApparitionMicha
el/DedicationMicha
el.V1.M            | Dum sacrum mysterium cerneret Joannes, Archangelus Michael tuba cecinit: Ignosce Domine Deus noster, quia peris librum, & solvis signacula ejus, alleluia. aperiire > solvis | IV 6, f. 140v (B) | The notes over aperiire were so / so / so / so. For solvis, Beckers needed so la / so. In IV 7, p. 294 he achieved this by deleting the first two sos, and in IV 6 by deleting so la / so, having therefore to add a la to the first so. |
| JohnPaul.V2.M     | Isti sunt duae olivae, & duo candelabra lucentia ante Dominum: habent potestatem claudere coelum nubibus, & aperiire portas ejus: quia linguæ eorum claves coeli factae sunt. | IV 3, p. 486 (Un) | x | I have not been able to identify a source. |
| VisitationBV.V1.
M                                     | Beata es Maria, quae credidisti: perficientur in te quae dicta sunt tibi a Domino, alleluia. Maria | IV 3, p. 490 (Un) | I have not been able to identify a source. |
| PeterChains.V2.
M                                     | Solve jubente Deo terrarum Petre catenas, qui facis ut pateant coelestia regna beatis. | IV 8, ff. 98v-99r (Un) | x | |
| LawrenceRome.
V1.M                              | Levita Laurentius bonum opus operatus est, qui per signum crucis caecos illuminavit, & thesauros Ecclesiae dedit pauperibus. & thesauros Ecclesiae dedit pauperibus. | IV 7, p. 250 (B) IV 8, f. 100v IV 21, f. 123r (H3) | I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 100v have been replaced with ones correspondiing with Beckers’. |
| AugustineHippo.
V1.P1                                 | Laetare mater nostra Jerusalem: quia Rex tuus dispensatorem strenuum, & civem fidelissimum, de servitute Babylonis, tibi redemit Augustinum. | IV 8, f. 102v | I have not been able to identify a source. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AugustineHippo. V1.P2</th>
<th>Hujus mater devotissima, quem carne prius pepererat mundo, charitatis visceribus postmodum, multo semine lacrymarum genuit Christo.</th>
<th>IV 8, f. 102v</th>
<th>I have not been able to identify a source.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V1.P3</td>
<td>Distulit tamen diu baptismi gratiam: quia tumens inani Philosophia, volebat humana ratione comprehendere, quod pia mens vivacitate fidei nititur apprehendere.</td>
<td>IV 8, ff. 102v-103r</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V1.P4</td>
<td>Surgens autem post multos circuitus errorum, circuibat civitatem per vicos, &amp; plateas, quaerendo verum animea virum, pro quo ne moreretur, dignum judicaret mori; ut ejus semper inhaereret amori.</td>
<td>IV 8, f. 103r</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V1.P5</td>
<td>Inventus igitur a custodibus civitatis, &amp; pallio vetustatis exutus, diligenter pertractata cum illis veritate, quem desiderabat invenit, &amp; castis ejus amplexibus ardenter inhaesit.</td>
<td>IV 8, f. 103r-v</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V1.M</td>
<td>Adest nobis dies celebris, quo solutus nexu carnis sanctus Praesul Augustinus, assumptus est cum Angelis: ubi gaudet cum Prophetis, laetatur cum Apostolis: quorum plenus spiritu, quae praedixerunt mystica, fecit nobis pervia: post quos secunda dispensandi verbi Dei, primus refulsit gratia.</td>
<td>adest dies &gt; adest nobis dies</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 115v-116r (B) IV 7, pp. 268-269 (B) IV 8, f. 104r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V2.P2</td>
<td>Comperta autem ejus fama Beatus Valerius Hipponensis</td>
<td>ad se accersiri fecit et licet</td>
<td>IV 6, f. 121v (B) IV 7, p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopus, eum a populo apprehensum, ac sibi praesentatum, licet invitum, Presbyterum ordinavit.</td>
<td>invitum &gt; a populo apprehensum, ac sibi praesentatum licet invitum</td>
<td>270 (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo. V2.P3</td>
<td>Factus ergo Presbyter, Monasterium Clericorum mox instituit, &amp; coepit vivere secundum regulam sub sanctis Apostolis constitutam.</td>
<td>secundum regulam sub sanctis Apostolis constitutam</td>
<td>IV 8, ff. 104v-105r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExaltationCross. V2.M</td>
<td>O Crux benedicta, quae sola fuisti digna portare Regem coelorum, &amp; Dominum, alleluia.</td>
<td>alleluia</td>
<td>IV 8, f. 109r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CeciliaRome.V2. M</td>
<td>Virgo gloriosa semper Evangelium Christi gerebat in pectore suo, &amp; non diebus neque noctibus a colloquiis divinis &amp; oratione cessabat.</td>
<td>suo non &gt; suo et non</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 311 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.V.P3</td>
<td>Qui mihi ministrat, me sequatur: &amp; ubi ego sum, illic sit &amp; minister meus.</td>
<td>et minister meus erit &gt; sit et minister meus</td>
<td>IV 6, ff. 178v-179r (B) IV 7, p. 347 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p.6 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 7 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one note was added: a fa for sit. I have not been able to identify a source. The addition corresponds with IV 8, f. 126v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P2</td>
<td>Sancti per fidem vicerunt regna, operati sunt justitiam, adepti sunt repromissiones.</td>
<td>promissiones &gt; repromissiones</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 351 (B) PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 10 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V2.P3</td>
<td>Sanctorum velut aquilae juventus renovabitur: florebunt sicut lilium in civitate Domini.</td>
<td>renovabitur et floret ut lilium in conspectu &gt; renovabitur florebunt sicut lilium in civitate</td>
<td>IV 7, p. 351 (B) IV 8, f. 129r-v PBF 6168 Hs, 3: p. 10 (B) KHS 28, 3: p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source. The notes in IV 8, f. 129v have been changed to correspond with Beckers’ as far as sicut is concerned, although the notes for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.P1</td>
<td>Domine, quinque talenta tradidisti mihi: ecce alia quinque superlucratus sum.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lviii (Un)</td>
<td>florebunt are different and those for civitate were already the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.P2</td>
<td>Euge serve bone, in modico fidelis, intra in gaudium Domini tui.</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>The revision is almost identical to the manuscript tradition, except that the notes on alia are fa so la / so / so instead of fa so / la / so, as is the case in IV 8, f. 131v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.P5</td>
<td>Serve bone &amp; fidelis, intra in gaudium Domini tui.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lix (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V2.M</td>
<td>Hic vir despiciens mundum, &amp; terrena, triumphans, divitias coelo condidit ore, manu.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lx (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.P1</td>
<td>Haec est virgo sapiens, &amp; una de numero prudentum.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lxvi (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.P2</td>
<td>Haec est virgo sapiens, quam Dominus vigilantem invenit.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lxvi (Un)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir/NoVir.V.P4</td>
<td>Veni electa mea, &amp; ponam in te thronum meum, alleluia.</td>
<td>IV 3, p. lxvii (Un)</td>
<td>I have not been able to identify a source for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | meum, alleluia | IV 7, p. 361 (B)  
PBF 6168  
Hs, 3: p. 21 (B)  
KHS 28, 3: pp. 18-19 (B) | the notes on the added *alleluia*, which are fa so / fa / fa / fa in all cases except in KHS 28. The latter reading seems to have been the original one of IV 8, f. 133r, which was later changed to correspond with Beckers’ general reading. The notes on the entire antiphon in IV 3 were changed to correspond with Beckers’. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2Vir.V.M | Prudentes Virgines, aptate vestras lampades: ecce sponsus venit, exite obviam ei. | lampades  
vestras > vestras lampades | x (B omits the flat sign for *vestras*. ) |
Table 3.6: The Revision of Two Late Medieval Hymnals from the Library of Soeterbeeck, Including IV 19 and Add. 10

The following table includes every hymn that would have been used at Vespers at Soeterbeeck according to the Roman Breviary (as exemplified by the diurnal IV 65, but expanded for completeness’ sake with the hymn Gentis Polonae gloriae for the feast of John Cantius (20 October), established by Clement XIV after that volume was printed, on 8 September 1770),¹ and the Windesheim proper of saints (as exemplified by IV 63). Several of these hymns are used on more than one feast, and many feasts use one from the common of saints. For this reason, the hymns of all of those feasts are listed that are also included in the tables of the antiphons, while omitting their use on feasts not included there. Because octave days generally use the same hymn as the feast itself, these are not listed, except for the octave day of Peter and Paul, where another hymn is used.

The table is concerned with the revision of the hymns’ text in order to bring them in line with the new hymns as promulgated by Urban VIII in 1632. It is not possible, within the scope of this table, to provide full comparisons of what the differences are between the original and the revised hymns. In cases where a hymn was revised, a footnote is therefore added to the first line of the original version with a reference to McGrath’s description of its revision.² If a hymn was not revised, there is a note in the same place with an explanation of why it was not.

The function column refers to the feast(s) on which a hymn would be used according to the rubric that accompanies it in the book(s) listed in the four right-hand columns, combined with the office on which it would have been used at Soeterbeeck according to its particular calendar. As indicated, only the office of Vespers is taken into consideration.

The four right-hand columns list if and where in each book a hymn is included, and if its text was revised or not. If only some verses are included, those specific verses are listed. If no verses are mentioned, the entire hymn is present. Descriptions of hymns that were left in their original version without being revised are given in grey.

Expansions of most of the abbreviations that are used can be found in the list of liturgical abbreviations at the beginning of the book,³ and in the introduction to Table 3.⁴ In addition to the ones listed there, the following are used in the tables on the hymns:

- `add` the hymn’s text has been added by a post-medieval hand
- `nv` the hymn is present in its new version
- `ov` the hymn is present in its original version and has not been revised
- `rev` the hymn is present in its original version and has been revised

The final verse or doxology of each hymn was adapted according to the type of feast or the time of year, if the metre allowed this. These variant doxologies are not taken into account in the following table, but a list of them follows here:

| NT³ | Jesu tibi sit gloria, |
|     | qui natus es de Virgine, |
|     | cum Patre, & almo Spiritu, |
|     | in sempiterna saecula. Amen. |

| Ep.O⁶ | Jesu, tibi sit gloria, |
|       | qui apparuisti gentibus, |
|       | cum Patre, & almo Spiritu |
|       | in sempiterna saecula. Amen. |

¹ Schober 1891, 255.
² McGrath 1939.
³ See pp. xi-xii.
⁴ See pp. 128-130.
⁵ IV 65:1, p. 175. H30 also added this doxology to IV 8, f. [148]r.
⁶ IV 65:1, p. 200.
ET,¹ Pen.O² Deo Patri sit gloria,  
et Filio, qui a mortuis  
surrexit, ac Paraclito,  
in sempiterna saecula. Amen.  
AT³ Jesu, tibi sit gloria,  
qui victor in coelum redit,  
cum Patre, & almo Spiritu,  
in sempiterna saecula. Amen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Original version</th>
<th>IV 15</th>
<th>IV 19</th>
<th>IV 52</th>
<th>Add. 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.V1.H</td>
<td>Jam sol recedit igneus</td>
<td>O lux, beata Trinitas⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv p. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.V1.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex.V1.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin.V1.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri.V.H⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.V2.H</td>
<td>Lucis creator optime</td>
<td>Lucis creator optime⁶</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>nv p. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.V2.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex.V2.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin.V2.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H</td>
<td>Te lucis ante terminum</td>
<td>Te lucis ante terminum⁷</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>nv p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. 296r v. 1</td>
<td>f. 353-359</td>
<td>f. 31r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.V.H</td>
<td>Creator alme siderum</td>
<td>Conditor alme siderum⁸</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. 1-3</td>
<td>f. 31r-v</td>
<td>f. 2, 4 and 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv, add (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation BV.V.H (18 December)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu redemptor omnium</td>
<td>Christe redemptor omnium⁹</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>ov</td>
<td>nv</td>
<td>nv p. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. 32-34 rev, add</td>
<td>nv, add (B)</td>
<td>f. 30v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IV 65:1, p. 266. The hymn *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, used at Vespers on the feast of the Invention of the Cross (3 May), is explicitly mentioned as not receiving this doxology.
² IV 65:1, p. 289.
³ IV 65:1, pp. 282-283. The hymn *Salutis humanae sator*, used at Vespers in Ascensiontide, is explicitly mentioned as not receiving this doxology.
⁴ McGrath 1939, 126, no. 29.
⁵ H39 also added the original version of this hymn to IV 76, f. 211r-v, as did H18 in IV 92:2, ff. 108r, 109r-v.
⁶ McGrath 1939, 120, no. 23.
⁷ McGrath 1939, 103, no. 5.
⁸ McGrath 1939, 127, no. 35.
⁹ McGrath 1939, 130, no. 38.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cir.V.H</td>
<td>(H30) between pp. 32-33</td>
<td>ref in index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V 2.H (28 December)</td>
<td>Salvete flores martyrum</td>
<td>partly rev (H30) pp. 73-74</td>
<td>nv, add (B) vv. 1 and 3 ff. 34v-35r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.H</td>
<td>Crudelis Herodes, Deum</td>
<td>rev (H30) pp. 84-85</td>
<td>rev (B) vv. 1, 3 and 5 ff. 35r-36r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad.V.H</td>
<td>Audi, benign conditor</td>
<td>rev (H30) pp. 108-109</td>
<td>nv, add (B) vv. 1, 3 and 5 ff. 38v-39v ov, add (H30) vv. 1-5 f. 153r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pas.V.H</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
<td>rev (H30) pp. 129-131</td>
<td>rev (B) vv. 1-78 ff. 40v-41v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCr oss.V.H (3 May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExaltationCr oss.V.H (14 September)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET.V.H</td>
<td>Ad regias Agni dapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad cenas Agni providi</td>
<td>ov f. 262r-v</td>
<td>ov pp. 214-216</td>
<td>ov ff. 42v-43v ov, add (B) vv. 2, 4 and 6 f. 42v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H18 also added the original version of this hymn to IV 82:1, ff. 1r-2r and to IV 92:2, ff. 134v-135v.
2 McGrath 1939, 133, no. 42.
3 McGrath 1939, 134, no. 46.
4 No changes were made to the second, third and fourth verses of this hymn in the seventeenth-century Urbanian revision, so B did not revise them either, making it impossible to say with certainty which verses he wished to be included in his revised version. Based on the pattern established by the other hymns, however, it would seem that these would have been the odd verses only.
5 H15 also added the original version of vv. 1, 3 and 5 of this hymn to IV 90, ff. 3v-4v.
6 McGrath 1939, 136, no. 48.
7 McGrath 1939, 139, no. 51.
8 There are no differences between the version of the third and fourth verses of this hymn in IV 52:2 and the seventeenth-century revision (except that the former has cecinit in the third verse where the latter has concinit, a variant which is recorded in Walpole 1922, 175), so B did not revise them either, making it impossible to say with certainty which verses he wished to be included in his revised version. He seems, however, to have wanted to revise the entire hymn.
9 McGrath 1939, 142, no. 60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AT.V.H</th>
<th>Salutis humanae sator</th>
<th>Jesu nostra redemptio¹</th>
<th>rev (H30) pp. 225-226</th>
<th>ov ff. 45v-46r nv, add (B) vv. 1, 3 and 5 ff. 45v-46r</th>
<th>nv pp. 8-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.H</td>
<td>Veni, Creator Spiritus</td>
<td>Veni, Creator Spiritus²</td>
<td>ov pp. 231-233</td>
<td>rev (B) v. 7³ ff. 46v-47r</td>
<td>nv pp. 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus. V.H (second Sunday after the Epiphany)</td>
<td>Jesu dulcis memoria⁵</td>
<td>add (H30) between pp. 96-97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SevenFounders.V1.H (11 February)</td>
<td>Jam nimis terris facinus per omne⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairRome. V.H (18 January)</td>
<td>Quodcumque in orbe nexibus revinixeris</td>
<td>Quodcumque vinclis super terram strinxeris⁷</td>
<td>ov pp. 413-414</td>
<td></td>
<td>nv p. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairAntioch.V.H (22 February)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TranslationIAugustine. V1.H (28 February)</td>
<td>Magne pater Augustine⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AugustineHippo.V.H (28 August)¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 278r-279v</td>
<td>add (H30) between pp. 432-433</td>
<td>ff. 53r-54r ref in index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ McGrath 1939, 147, no. 65.
² McGrath 1939, 149, no. 68.
³ B only revised the seventh verse, although the second, third and sixth verses were also partially revised by Urban VIII.
⁴ The feast of the Holy Name of Jesus was extended to the universal Church by Innocent XIII on 29 November or 20 December 1721 (Schober 1891, 186).
⁵ The feast of the Seven Founders of the Servite Order was only pro aliquibus locis until it was extended to the universal Church by Leo XIII on 20 December 1888 (Schober 1891, 197).
⁶ McGrath 1939, 156, no. 89.
⁷ McGrath 1939, 157, no. 90.
⁸ This hymn is proper to the Congregation of Windesheim, and does not appear in the Roman Breviary. It is included in IV 18, pp. 560-562, however, where Un changed unire in the first verse into placare and monachorum in the fourth into clericorum, in accordance with the text in IV 63, p. 163.
⁹ H42 also added this hymn to IV 65:3.
¹⁰ The feast of the Holy Canons Regular of Augustine is proper to the Congregation of Windesheim.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Spouse.BV.V.H (19 March)</td>
<td>Te, Joseph, celebrent agmina coelitum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage Joseph.H (third Sunday after Easter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sorrows.BV.V.H (Friday before Palm Sunday)</td>
<td>Stabat mater dolorosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanegild Spain.V.H (13 April)</td>
<td>Regali solio fortis Iberiae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparition Michael.V.H (8 May)</td>
<td>Te splendor, &amp; virtus Patris</td>
<td>Tibi Christe splendor Patris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication Michael.V.H (29 September)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venantius Camerino.V.H (18 May)</td>
<td>Martyr Dei Venantius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Falconieri.V.H (19 June)</td>
<td>Caelestis Agni nuptias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H37 also added the revised version of this hymn to RHCE, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699, verso front flyleaf.
2 McGrath 1939, 169, no. 135.
3 H35 also added this hymn to IV 90, ff. 15v-16r.
4 This hymn only entered the Roman Breviary when the feast of Joseph was given a new office by Clement XI on 3 February 1714; before that, the hymn *Iste Confessor Domini* was used (Schober 1891, 201).
5 That this hymn should be used on the feast of the patronage of Joseph is a surmise based on the fact that it is used on 19 March. Neither IV 6, f. 1r, nor IV 8, f. 120r-v provide any information on the hymn for the office of the third Sunday after Easter.
6 Snippets of a piece of paper on which H6 wrote the hymn for this feast are included in Tilburg, UL, KHS 28, 3: between pp. 30-31.
7 The feast of the Seven Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin was extended to the universal Church by Benedict XIII on 22 August 1727 (Schober 1891, 203).
8 This hymn was composed by Urban VIII (Connelly 1957, 190-191, no. 110).
9 McGrath 1939, 168, no. 134.
10 The feast of Venantius of Camerino was extended to the universal Church by Clement X on 28 November 1670 (Schober 1891, 212).
11 The feast of Juliana Falconieri was extended to the universal Church by Clement XII on 8 March 1738 (Schober 1891, 219).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>Mcgrath</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nativity Joh  
V.H (24 June) | Ut queant laxis resonare fibris | Ut queant laxis resonare fibris\(^1\) | ov pp. 445-446 | ov, but the revision only affected its doxology and that is not included here ff. 48v-49r | nv pp. 23-24 |
| Peter Paul. V. H  
(29 June) | Decora lux aeternitatis auream | Aurea lux, et decore roseo\(^2\) | ov ff. 272v-274v | Un.id ov ff. 49r-50r | nv pp. 24-25 |
| Elizabeth Portugal. V. H  
(11 July) | Domare cordis impetus Elisabeth\(^3\) | - | - | - | p. 25 |
| Mary Magdalene. V. H  
(22 July) | Pater superni luminis | Lauda mater ecclesia\(^4\) | ov pp. 464-466 | nv, add (H38) vv. 1, 3 and 5 on f. 152v, with an entirely different doxology vv. 2 and on f. 152v (without notes) f. 152r-v | nv pp. 25-26 |
| Peter Chains. V. H  
(1 August) | Miris modis repente liber, ferrea | Petrus beatus catenarum laqueos\(^5\) | ov pp. 470-471 | - | nv p. 26 |
| Transfiguration Lord. V. H  
(6 August) | Quicumque Christum quaeritis | Quicumque Christum quaeritis\(^6\) | ov pp. 475-476 | - | nv pp. 26-27 |
| Guardian Angels. V. H  
(first Sunday in September) | Custodes hominum psallimus angelos\(^7\) | - | pp. 547-549 | - | pp. 27-28 |
| Teresa Avila. V. H  
(15 October) | Regis superni nuntia\(^8\) | add (H29) vv. 1, 2, 3 and 4 between ff. 137a-138, 159-160 add (H41) vv. 2 and 4 f. 82v | add (H41) vv. 2 and 4 f. 82v | - | p. 29 |

\(^1\) McGrath 1939, 158, no. 113.  
\(^2\) McGrath 1939, 161, no. 116.  
\(^3\) This hymn was composed by Urban VIII (Connelly 1957, 212-213, no. 123).  
\(^4\) McGrath 1939, 162, no. 125.  
\(^5\) McGrath 1939, 165, no. 128.  
\(^6\) McGrath 1939, 166, no. 129.  
\(^7\) The feast of the guardian angels was extended to the universal Church for celebration ad libitum by Paul V on 27 September 1608, and was made obligatory by Clement X on 13 September 1670 (Schober 1891, 251).  
\(^8\) This hymn was composed by Urban VIII (Connelly 1957, 238-239, no. 144).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 October</td>
<td>John Cantius</td>
<td>Gentis Polonae gloriae¹</td>
<td>between ff. 180-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October</td>
<td>Raphael Archangel V.H.</td>
<td>Tibi Christe splendor Patris²</td>
<td>p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>All Saints V.H</td>
<td>Placare, Christe, servulis</td>
<td>Chríste redemptor omnium³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ov pp. 514-516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ov, add (H4) v. 1, 3, 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. 132-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>Ap Ev. V.H</td>
<td>Exultet orbis gaudiis</td>
<td>Exultet caelum laudibus⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ov ff. 290r-291r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rev (H30) pp. ii-iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 November</td>
<td>Andrew Apostle V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 December</td>
<td>Thomas Apostle V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 December</td>
<td>John Evangelist V. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>Peter Paul O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>John Gate V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>1 Mar V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September</td>
<td>The feast of John Cantius was extended to the universal Church by Clement XIV on 8 September 1770 (Schober 1891, 255).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September</td>
<td>Raphael’s hymn Tibi Christe splendor Patris is identical to the original version of Te splendor, &amp; virtus Patris, for Michael the Archangel. The feast of Raphael was only pro aliquibus locis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>H4 also added the original version of this hymn to IV 90, ff. 2v-3r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>McGrath 1939, 170, no. 147.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>McGrath 1939, 145, no. 63.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>McGrath 1939, 178, no. 155.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.ET.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>xviii-xx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Martyr.V2.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>rev (H30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26 December)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 63-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VincentSara gossa.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22 January)</td>
<td></td>
<td>nv, add (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Rome.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>vv. 1, 3 and 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 August)</td>
<td></td>
<td>f. 33v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement.I.V</td>
<td></td>
<td>ov ff. 292v- 293r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 December)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V.H²</td>
<td></td>
<td>rev (H30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctorum meritis inclyta gaudia</td>
<td>Sanctorum meritis inclyta gaudia³</td>
<td>pp. xxvi-xxviii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnPaul.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>ref in index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26 June)</td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 35-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.ET.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>ov ov ff. 293r-294v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex gloriose martyrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>rev (H30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iste confessor Domini,</td>
<td></td>
<td>ppx. xxxvi-xxxvii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colentes</td>
<td></td>
<td>rev (B) vv. 1, 3 and 5 ff. 60r-v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>ov ov pp. xlvi- xlvi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuarinusPal estrina.V1.H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 February)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeterFourier V1.H (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ H32 also added the revised version of this hymn to IV 8, f. 147r.
² H18 also added the original version of this hymn to IV 82:1, f. 1r.
³ McGrath 1939, 182, no. 159.
⁴ McGrath 1939, 180, no. 157.
⁵ H30 also added the first verse of the revised version of this hymn to IV 54, pp. 27, 29.
⁶ McGrath 1939, 183, no. 160.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CajetanThiene.V2.H (7 August)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim.V. H (Sunday in the octave of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrunoCologne.V.H (6 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrancisBorgia.V.H (10 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CerboniusPopolonia.V. H (12 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JohnBridlington.V1.H (22 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MartinTours.V1.H (11 November)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RufusAvignon.V1.H (12 November)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrudoSint-Truiden.V1.H (23 November)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vir.V.H</strong></td>
<td>Jesu, corona virginum</td>
<td>Jesu, corona virginum</td>
<td>ov f. 294v-295v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LucySyracuse.V.H (13 December)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ov p. 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgathaSicily.V1.H (5 February)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RosaliaLima.V1.H (30 August)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrsulaComp.V1.H (21 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H39 also added a variant version of this hymn to IV 76, ff. 198r-199r.
2 McGrath 1939, 186, no. 163.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NoVir.V.H</th>
<th>Fortem virili pectore¹</th>
<th>rev (H30) pp. lix-lx</th>
<th>nv pp. 38-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BridgetSoden.V.H (8 October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelestis urbs Jerusalem</td>
<td>Urbs beata Jerusalem²</td>
<td>ov H4.id ff. 287v-289r ov, add (H29) vv. 1, 3 and 5 at the back</td>
<td>rev (B) v. 1³ ov pp. lviii-lixiv ft. 59r-60r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nv pp. 39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV.V1.H</td>
<td>Ave maris stella</td>
<td>[not revised]⁴</td>
<td>pp. lxxi-lxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ft. 36v-37v This hymn was not revised by Urvan VIII, but the text in IV 52 does contain several variants from that in the Roman Breviary, and these were not emended by Beckers. The variants are: nomen Eve rather than Evae nomen in the second verse, precem rather than preces in the fourth verse, and honor trinus et instead of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 40-41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This hymn, and indeed the entire common office for holy women who were neither virgins nor martyrs, entered the Roman Breviary in the revision of Clement VIII, published in 1602 (Bäumer 1895, 494). At one point, the word Christi in the first line of the second verse was changed into sancto (Connelly 1957, 156-157, no. 92), and that is the revision carried out in IV 19.

² McGrath 1939, 188, no. 166.

³ Almost the entire text of this hymn has been covered with slips of paper, but only the first word of the revision has actually been written on them.

⁴ McGrath 1939, 172, no. 149.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conception</td>
<td>BV.V.H (8 December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espousal</td>
<td>BV.V2.H (23 January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purification</td>
<td>BV.V.H (2 February)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>Lord.V.H (25 March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>BV.V.H (2 July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Carmel</td>
<td>V.H (15 July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Snow</td>
<td>V1.H (5 August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>BV.V.H (15 August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity</td>
<td>BV.V.H (8 September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Mary</td>
<td>V.H (Sunday in the octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary</td>
<td>BV.V.H (first Sunday in October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage</td>
<td>BV.V.H (any Sunday in November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>BV.V.H (21 November)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 On these variants, see Lausberg 1976, 20.
Table 3.7: The Tones of the Hymns in IV 15, IV 19, IV 52 and Add. 10

This table describes the tones of the hymns in IV 15, IV 19, IV 52 and Add. 10. Of the hymns referred to in Table 3.6, only those are included here for which these books providee notes as well as text. The goal of this table is not to describe the tones to which the hymns were sung, but to determine to what extent the hymns match melodically from book to book, with an eye to their choral performance.

Four different melodic traditions are distinguished:

- **G** the tones in the eighteenth-century manuscripts produced at Gaesdonck, of which the hymnal Add. 10 is used as representative because Beckers added the hymn Deus tuorum militum to the front pastedown of that book
- **RA1** the old tones of the Roman Antiphonary, of which IV 19 is the representative because its hymns were revised
- **RA2** the new tones of the Roman Antiphonary, for which I referred to IV 18, which is the only surviving copy from the library of Soeterbeeck to include them
- **S** the tones in the medieval manuscripts of Soeterbeeck, of which IV 15 and IV 52:2 are the representatives because Beckers revised some of the hymns in these books

Each of the hymns referred to in Table 3.6 that fits one of these categories is included and represented by way of the shelf mark of the book and the pages on which it appears.

For the sake of this comparison, double notes on the same syllable have been ignored, and the omission of flat signs is mentioned but not taken into consideration. Scribal errors are described in footnotes.

For some hymns, G is the same as S. If this is the case, the shelf mark Add. 10 is placed in the column for S. Hymns whose tones do not agree precisely with any of these four categories are listed in footnotes, where appropriate.

In addition to the abbreviations listed at the beginning of the book and in the introduction to Tables 3.4 and 3.6, the following two are also used in this table:

- **rm** revised melody
- **om** original melody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>RA1</th>
<th>RA2</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep/Tri.V.H</td>
<td>Jam sol recedit igneus (O lux, beata Trinitas)</td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 52:2 f. 47r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 252-253</td>
<td>IV 19 (H30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 76 (H39) f. 211r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between pp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 92:2 (H18) f. 108r, 109r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>432-433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.V2.H</td>
<td>Lucis creator optime</td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 15, f. 249r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 341-344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H</td>
<td>Te lucis ante terminum</td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 353-359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.V.H</td>
<td>Creator alme siderum (Conditor alme siderum)</td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 52:2 f. 31r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Other examples of G in the Soeterbeeck Collection are IV 8 and IV 54.
2 See pp. xi-xii, 128-130 and 371.
3 In IV 76 the notes on the final two syllables of recedit in the first verse are two tones too low, but a comparison with the corresponding words in the other verses shows that this is a scribal error.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu redemptor omnium (Christe, redemptor omnium)</td>
<td>IV 52:1 (B, without the flat signs) f. 30v Add. 10 pp. 1-3</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 32-34 IV 19 (H30) between pp. 32-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocents.V2.H</td>
<td>Salvete flores martyrum</td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 3</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 73-74 IV 52:2 ff. 34v-35r IV 82 (H18) I: ff. 1r-2r IV 92:2 (H18) ff. 134r-135v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.V.H</td>
<td>Crudelis Herodes, Deum (Hostis Herodes impie)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 3-4 IV 19 (rm, Un) pp. 84-85</td>
<td>IV 19 (om) pp. 84-85 IV 52:2 ff. 35r-36r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad.V.H</td>
<td>Audi, benigne Conditor</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 5-6</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 108-109 IV 52:2 ff. 38v-39v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal/Pas.V.H</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 6-7</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 129-131 IV 52:2 ff. 40v-41v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InventionCross/ExaltationCross.V.H</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 18-19</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 438-440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET.V.H</td>
<td>Ad regias Agni dapes (Ad cenum Agni providi)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 7-8</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 214-216 IV 15 f. 262r-v IV 52:2 f. 42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT.V.H</td>
<td>Salutis humanae sator (Jesu nostra redemptio)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 8-9</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 225-226 IV 52:2 ff. 45v-46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen.V.H</td>
<td>Veni, Creator Spiritus</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 9-10</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 231-233 IV 52:2 ff. 46v-47r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC.V.H</td>
<td>Pange lingua gloriosi</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 10-11</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 260-262 IV 52:2 ff. 47v-48v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NameJesus.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu dulcis memoria</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 4-5</td>
<td>IV 19 (H30) between pp. 96-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChairRome.V.H</td>
<td>Quodcumque in orbe nexibus revinxeris (Quodcumque vincis super terram strinxeris)</td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 12</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. 413-414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionPaul.V.H</td>
<td>Egregie doctor Paule mores instrue (Doctor egregie Paule mores instrue)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 12-13</td>
<td>IV 19 p. 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConversionAugustine/ AugustineHippo.V.H</td>
<td>Magne pater Augustine</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 19-20</td>
<td>IV 19 (H30) between pp. 432-433 IV 15 ff. 278r-279v IV 52:2 ff. 53r-54r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HolyCanons.V1.H</td>
<td>Coelitum princeps tua, Christe, laus est</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 13-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H18 gives a la instead of a re for ceu in the first verse, but comparison with the corresponding words in the other verses shows that this is a scribal error.

2 The tone in IV 52, f. 153r-v (H38) and IV 90, ff. 3v-4v (H15) is a variant of S, with a so instead of a fa on hoc in the first verse and the corresponding syllable in all verses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Add. 10</th>
<th>IV 19 (H30)</th>
<th>IV 15 (H31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Spouse</td>
<td>Te, Joseph, celebrent agmina coelitum</td>
<td>pp. 15-16</td>
<td>between pp. 432-433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sorrows</td>
<td>Stabat mater dolorosa</td>
<td>after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermenegild Spain</td>
<td>Regali solio fortis Iberiae</td>
<td>pp. 16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparition Michael V</td>
<td>Te splendor, &amp; virtus Patris (Tibi Christe splendor Patris)</td>
<td>pp. 21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication Michael V</td>
<td>Te splendor, &amp; virtus Patris (Tibi Christe splendor Patris)</td>
<td>pp. 28-29</td>
<td>508-510</td>
<td>ff. 285r-286r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venantius Camerino V</td>
<td>Martyr Dei Venantius</td>
<td>pp. 16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 57v-58v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Falconieri V</td>
<td>Caelistis Agni nuptias</td>
<td>pp. 22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity John V</td>
<td>Ut queant laxis resonare fibris</td>
<td>pp. 22-23</td>
<td>445-446</td>
<td>48v-49r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Paul V</td>
<td>Decora lux aeternitatis auream (Aura lux, et decore roseo)</td>
<td>pp. 24-25</td>
<td>456-458</td>
<td>ff. 272v-274v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Portugal V</td>
<td>Domare cordis impetus Elisabeth</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>ff. 49r-50r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Magdalene V</td>
<td>Pater superni luminis (Lauda mater Ecclesia)</td>
<td>pp. 25-26</td>
<td>464-466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Chains V</td>
<td>Miris modis repente liber, ferrea (Petrus beatus catenarum laqueos)</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>470-471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfiguration Lord V</td>
<td>Quicumque Christum quaeritis</td>
<td>pp. 26-27</td>
<td>475-476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Angels V</td>
<td>Custodes hominum psallimus angelos</td>
<td>pp. 27-28</td>
<td>547-549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Avila V</td>
<td>Regis superni nuntia</td>
<td>p. 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael Archangel V</td>
<td>Tibi Christe splendor Patris</td>
<td>p. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints V</td>
<td>Placare, Christe, servulis (Christe redemptor omnium)</td>
<td>pp. 30-31</td>
<td>514-516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApEv V</td>
<td>Exultet orbis gaudii (Exultet caelum laudibus)</td>
<td>p. 32</td>
<td>519-520</td>
<td>290r-291r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Apostle V</td>
<td>Exultet orbis gaudii (Exultet caelum laudibus)</td>
<td>p. 412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evangelist V</td>
<td>Exultet orbis gaudii</td>
<td>IV 19</td>
<td>IV 52:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The tone in IV 90, ff. 15v-16r (H35) does not fit any of the categories.
2 The tones in Add. 10, between pp. 20-21 (H40), and in Tilburg, UL, KHS 28, 3: between pp. 30-31 (H6) do not fit any of the categories.
3 The tone in IV 52, f. 152r-v (H38) does not fit any of the categories.
4 The tone in IV 15, between ff. 180-181 and IV 52:2, f. 82v (H41) does not fit any of these categories.
5 The tones in IV 52, f. 132r-v (H4) and IV 90, ff. 2v-3r (H4) are variants that do not fit any of the categories.
6 The tone in RHCe, Archief A-2063 Heerlijkheid Helmond, inventarisnr. 699, ff. 12r-14r (H36) does not fit any of the categories.
7 The tone in IV 82, 2: ff. 33r-36r (H18) does not fit any of the categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymn</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Added Pages</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.V.H</td>
<td>Deus tuorum militum</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 34-35</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. xviii-xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mar.ET.V.H</td>
<td>Deus tuorum militum</td>
<td>Add. 10 p. 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 15 (H24) between ff. 211-212</td>
<td>IV 52:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StephenMartyr.V2.H</td>
<td>Deus tuorum militum</td>
<td>Add. 10 (B) front pastedown IV 8 (H32) f. 147r</td>
<td>IV 19 (om) pp. 63-65</td>
<td>IV 52:2</td>
<td>ff. 33v-34r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.V.H</td>
<td>Sanctorum merits inclyta gaudia</td>
<td>IV 82 (H18) l: f. 1r Add. 10 pp. 35-36</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. xxvi-xxvii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mar.ET.V.H</td>
<td>Rex gloriose martyrum</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 33-34</td>
<td>IV 15 ff. 292v-293r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConfBis.V.H</td>
<td>Iste confessor Domini, colentes (Iste confessor Domini sacratus)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 33-34</td>
<td>IV 19 (om) pp. xxxvi-xxxvii</td>
<td>IV 15 ff. 293r-394v</td>
<td>IV 52:2 ff. 60r-v IV 54 (H30) pp. 27, 29 Add. 10 pp. 36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.V.H</td>
<td>Iste confessor Domini, colentes (Iste confessor Domini sacratus)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 36-37</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. xlv-xlvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu, corona virginum</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 37-38</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. lii-liv</td>
<td>IV 15 ff. 294v-295v</td>
<td>IV 52:2 f. 61r-v IV 76 (H39) ff. 198r-199r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LucySyracuse.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu, corona virginum</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19 p. 410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgnesRome.V.H</td>
<td>Jesu, corona virginum</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV 19 p. 417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoVir.V.H</td>
<td>Fortem virili pectore</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 38-39</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. lix-lx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ded.V.H²</td>
<td>Caelestis urbs Jerusalem (Urbs beata Jerusalem)</td>
<td>Add. 10 pp. 39-40</td>
<td>IV 19 pp. lxiii-lxiv</td>
<td>IV 15 ff. 287v-289r</td>
<td>IV 52:2 f. 59r-60r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Un revised the tone of this hymn in IV 19, pp. 63-65 to conform to the original tone of *Jesu redemptor omnium*, contrary to the rubrics indicating that, from the Nativity of the Lord (25 December) to the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (2 February), all hymns at Vespers in an iambic dimeter quatrain should be sung to the tone of *Asolis ortus cardine* (IV 19, p. 55).

² The tone in IV 15, at the back (H29) does not fit any of the categories.
Table 4.1: Beckers’ Expansions in IV 47

This table lists Beckers’ expansions of several verses in the Little Office of the Virgin in IV 47. This book’s folia were severely trimmed after Beckers added his expansions.¹ The letters that were cut off are given between square brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Manuscript Reading</th>
<th>Beckers’ Expansions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>L.Suf.AllSaints.Ver, V.Suf.AllSaints.Ver</td>
<td>versus. Letamini in Domino.</td>
<td>Et ex(ultate just(i)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40r</td>
<td>Pr.Rd (<em>Criste fili Dei vivi</em>)</td>
<td>Gloria.</td>
<td>Patr(i) et Fi(lio) et Spi(ritu) Sa(nto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43r</td>
<td>T.Ver</td>
<td>versus. Aduvabit eam.</td>
<td>Deu(s) vul(tu) suo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45r</td>
<td>S.Ver</td>
<td>versus. Diffusa.</td>
<td>est gra(tia) in la(biis) tuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v</td>
<td>N.Ver</td>
<td>versus. Post partum virgo.</td>
<td>(in)violata (p)erman(s)ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v</td>
<td>V.Rd (<em>Cristi virgo dilectissima</em>)</td>
<td>Gloria.</td>
<td>(Gl)oria (P)atri et (F)ilio et (S)p(iritui) (S)ancto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ On the rebinding of IV 47, see vol. 1, pp. 206-208.
This table lists the contents of IV 55. The column describing the chants’ function refers to the rubrics of medieval manuscripts from the library of Soeterbeeck and disregards the function the chants may have been envisioned to have had by Beckers, which is uncertain. The references in the notes are not meant to indicate Beckers’ sources, but to identify parallels and to back up the identifications given in the table. Usually reference is made to a book which contains traces of Beckers’ use and which is therefore described elsewhere, except when a text does not appear in any of these, in which case another is referred to which does include the chant. These additional books are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>P(p.)</th>
<th>Chant</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>IV 10b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rr. Homo quidam</td>
<td>CC.Pro.R9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Rv. Benedictus Abraham</td>
<td>Rv and Rd of CC.V2.R, Melchisedech vero10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Defensor noster aspice</td>
<td>v. 5 of Quad.C.H, Christe qui lux es et dies (or its variant, Christe qui splendor et dies)11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 On IV 46, see Kienhorst 2005, 74-75.
2 On IV 77, see Kienhorst 2005, 96-97.
3 On IV 81, see Kienhorst 2005, 106-107.
4 On IV 138, see Kienhorst 2005, 140-141. The text in this manuscript was edited by Frenken 1931/32, 255-267.
5 On Fr. 33:2 (olim HS Fr 79A), see Kienhorst 2005, 92-93.
6 On Nolmans, see vol. 1, p. 256 n. 7. His hand can be identified on the basis of ASP 667, which he signed with his name (see vol. 1, p. 256 n. 6).
7 On CAG, Monastic Library, Höv 16, see Hövelmann 1987e, 66, no. 16.
8 Cf. IV 6, ff. 168v-169r; IV 52:1, ff. 22r-23r, although the melody provided there is entirely different from Beckers’. His melody does correspond largely with that in, for instance, Höv 16, pp. 29-31, although there are some differences there as well.
9 Cf. IV 77, ff. 147r-148r. In IV 3, p. 310 the melody for this responsory has been revised, but not to bring it into accordance with that in IV 55.
10 On IV 46, see Kienhorst 2005, 74-75. The reference is made to a book which contains traces of Beckers’ use.
11 Cf. IV 81:1, ff. 12v-13r, although the melody provided there is entirely different from Beckers’. H39 also added the hymn to IV 76, f. 183r, as did H18 in IV 82:1, ff. 8v-9r, with nearly the same melody as Beckers’ version.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>O quam suavis est CC.V.I.M and CC.Pro.A&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>In mortem vv. 2, 4 and 6 CC.L.H. Verbum supernum&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Veni, Creator Spiritus Pen.V.H, Pen.C.H, and at the investment of a sister (as revised by Urban VIII)&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>O lux, beata Trinitas Tri.V.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>A. Exurge Domine Ps. Deus auribus nostris Pro.A on the Rogation days&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>Haec est praeclaram vas A against the plague&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>Alma redemptoris mater Marian A for greater doubles and up in Ordinary Time&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Ave regina caelorum Marian A for doubles in Ordinary Time&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Regina caeli Marian A for ET and Pen.O&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>Salve regina Marian A for ferias and feasts of nine lessons and lesser in Ordinary Time&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>Lumen ad revelationem gentium PurificationBV.Pro.A&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>Ave gratia plena PurificationBV.Pro.A&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>Pueri Hebraeorum portantes ramos Pal.Pro.A, upon the distribution of the palms&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-33</td>
<td>Pueri Hebraeorum vestimenta prosternabant Pal.Pro.A, upon the distribution of the palms&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>R. Ingrediente Domino Pal.Pro.R&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. IV 52:1, f. 19r-v.  
<sup>2</sup> Cf. IV 6, f. 35v; IV 52:1, f. 20r.  
<sup>4</sup> Cf. IV 81:1, ff. 30r-31r.  
<sup>5</sup> Cf. Add. 10, pp. 6-7.  
<sup>6</sup> Cf. Add. 10, pp. 9-10; IV 138, p. 2.  
<sup>7</sup> Cf. IV 52:2, f. 47r-v. H29 also added this hymn to IV 76, f. 211r-v, as did H18 in IV 92:2, ff. 108r, 109r-v.  
<sup>8</sup> For the antiphon Media vita, cf. IV 52:2, f. 75r. The responsory Exaudi nos was also added, with the same melody, to IV 82:1, f. 170v and IV 88, f. 9v. A slightly different version of this responsory, with an antiphon against the plague, occurs on f. 4v of the gradual-cum-vesperal Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, BMH h23, f. 4v. In the parish church of Treis a similar antiphon and responsory were said upon the elevation during Mass in the octave of Corpus Christi, as late as the eighteenth century (Heinz 1981, 125-126).  
<sup>9</sup> Cf. IV 52:1, ff. 17v-18r, although there are some minor melodic differences.  
<sup>10</sup> Cf. IV 77, ff. 149r-150v.  
<sup>11</sup> Cf. IV 81:2, f. 47r; see IV 47, ff. 54v-55r for the rubric. The Marian antiphon was also added to IV 92:2, ff. 137v-138v.  
<sup>12</sup> Cf. IV 81:2, f. 47v; see IV 47, f. 55r for the rubric. The Marian antiphon was also added to IV 92:2, ff. 138v-139r.  
<sup>13</sup> Cf. IV 81:2, f. 48r-v; see IV 47, f. 54v for the rubric. The Marian antiphon was also added to IV 92:2, f. 139r-v.  
<sup>14</sup> Cf. IV 81:2, f. 47v-48r, see IV 46, f. 34r-v for the rubric. The Marian antiphon was also added to IV 92:2, f. 137r-v.  
<sup>15</sup> Cf. IV 11:1, pp. 324-325, although the melody provided there is entirely different from Beckers’.  
<sup>16</sup> Cf. IV 52:1, f. 6r.  
<sup>17</sup> Cf. IV 52:1, ff. 1v-2r, although there are minor textual and melodic differences.  
<sup>18</sup> Cf. IV 52:1, f. 2r, although there are minor melodic differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Manuscript Date/Location</th>
<th>Chant Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rv. Cum audisset</td>
<td>R for the adoration of the cross on Good Friday(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Rv. Ecce lignum crucis</td>
<td>R for the adoration of the cross on Good Friday(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Venite adoremus</td>
<td>Rv. Quia eduxi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>Rv. Crux fidelis</td>
<td>Rvv. 1-3 and 11 for the adoration of the cross on Good Friday(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Dulce lignum</td>
<td>Rv. Fange lingua</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. De parentis</td>
<td>Rv. Gloria et honor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Rv. Regnum mundi</td>
<td>Vir.M.N3.R3 and R at the investment and profession of a sister(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Euctavit cor meum</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prudentes virgines</td>
<td>Vir.L.P4, Vir.V2.P4, and A at the investment and profession of a sister (^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>Tunc surrexerunt [...] et quae paratae</td>
<td>Vir.L.P5, Vir.V2.P5, and A at the investment and profession of a sister(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Veni sponsa Christi</td>
<td>Vir.L.B, and A at the investment and profession of a sister(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Veni Sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>Pen.V1.P, and A at the profession of a sister(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>Venite venite venite pastores</td>
<td>chant for Nat(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>Cantate cantate cantate paschale</td>
<td>chant for Eas(^10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Triumpha triumpha triumpha Maria</td>
<td>chant for BV(^11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>Triumpha triumpha triumpha per magn</td>
<td>chant for AugustineHip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>Virginis proles</td>
<td>Vir.M.H (as revised by Pope Urvan VIII)(^13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>Stabat mater dolorosa</td>
<td>SevenSorrowsBV.H(^16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Cf. IV 52:1, ff. 7v-7, 5r-6. The first eight folia of this manuscript have been put in the wrong order when the manuscript was rebound. The correct order is 6, 8, 1-4, 7, 5.
\(^2\) Cf. IV 52:1, f. 5v.
\(^3\) The responsory Popule meus is only referred to in IV 52:1, f. 5r6, but is present (with the same melody) in IV 11:1, pp. 116-117. The melody of the Trisagion as given by Beckers is slightly different from that in IV 11:1 but identical to that in IV 52:1, f. 5v (with the exception that double notes on the same syllable are reduced to a single note).
\(^4\) Cf. IV 52:1, ff. 9r-10r, 11v.
\(^5\) Cf. IV 6, ff. 192v-193r; IV 138, pp. 6-8, 19.
\(^6\) Cf. IV 6, f. 193r; Mater 4, pp. 17-18, 38. Beckers’ melody is the same as that in Mater 4.
\(^7\) Cf. IV 6, f. 193-v; IV 77, ff. 49r-v; Mater 4, pp. 18, 38. Beckers’ melody is the same as that in Mater 4.
\(^8\) Cf. IV 6, f. 193v; Mater 4, pp. 18-19, 38. Beckers’ melody is almost identical to that in Mater 4, except that the final two syllables of Dominus have a single so followed by a la-si-la torculus, rather than Beckers’ combination of so-la-si on the first syllable and a single la on the last.
\(^9\) Cf. IV 6, f. 28v; Mater 4, pp. 21-22. Beckers’ melody is almost identical to that in Mater 4, except that the first two syllables of accende have a fa-so-la torculus and a so, rather than Beckers’ two fa-so pedes.
\(^10\) Cf. IV 11:3, pp. 35-36. Only the opening neume is different in Beckers’ version: a re-mi pes rather than a re.
\(^11\) Cf. IV 11:3, p. 37-38. Only the opening neume is different in Beckers’ version: a re-mi pes rather than a re.
\(^12\) Cf. IV 11:3, pp. 38-39. Only the opening neume is different in Beckers’ version: a re-mi pes rather than a re.
\(^13\) Cf. IV 11:3, p. 50. Only the opening neume is different in Beckers’ version: a re-mi pes rather than a re.
\(^14\) This chant is provided, with only very minor differences in the melody, on a loose sheet of paper kept between pp. 19 and 20 of Add. 10.
\(^15\) Cf. Fr 33:3 for the unrevised version, although the melody provided there is entirely different from Beckers’. H36 also provides the unrevised hymn on a loose sheet of paper kept in Mater 3, with almost the same melody as in IV 55.
\(^16\) Cf. Add. 10, p. [45];
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>32-34</td>
<td>Sacris solemniis</td>
<td>vv. 1, 3, 5 and 7 of CC.M.H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>Rorate caeli</td>
<td>chant for Advent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>Tota pulchra es Maria</td>
<td>BV.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>A. Portio mea Ps. Iubilate Deo</td>
<td>chants for the fiftieth anniversary of a sister’s investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>In paradisum</td>
<td>A at the funeral of a sister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Cf. Add. 10, pp. [46]-[47]. H16 provided the entire hymn on a loose sheet of paper that is kept at the back of IV 15, as did H22 for the end, from O res mirabilis onwards, on a loose sheet of paper in IV 31, between ff. 12-13.
3 Cf. IV 11:3, pp. 50-51.
4 These chants were also given by Beckers himself in Mater 5, on which see vol. 1, pp. 218-219 and Figure 4.3.
5 Cf. IV 59, p. 159, although the melody provided there is different from Beckers’: the second syllable of adventus has a re-do clivis rather than a do-re pes, and all syllables of requiem have a so, whereas Beckers has a fa for the second syllable.
This table lists the contents of IV 10b. Many of the chants in this manuscript also occur in IV 55, and for this reason the rightmost column of this table is keyed to Table 4.2 of the contents of that book. The chants’ liturgical functions are described there. The numbering of the chants is mine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>P(p).</th>
<th>Chant</th>
<th>IV 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Five tones for the Benedicamus Domino</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Two tones for C.R and C.Ver (for Ordinary Time and ET):\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rr. In manus tuas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Redemisti nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ver.V. Custodi nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VerR. Sub umbra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Venite venite venite pastores</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Rr. Benedic Domine domum istam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Conserva Domine in ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>O sacrum convivium</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>O quam suavis est</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>O lux. beata Trinitas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Veni, Creator Spiritus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. Media vita</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rr. Exaudi nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. O adorande plasmator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rr. Exaudi nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. O piissime redemptor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rr. Exaudi nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. O miserator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-6r</td>
<td>Haec est praeclarum vas</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6r-7r</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7r-8</td>
<td>Vexilla Regis prodeunt</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Virginis proles</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Rr. Regnum mundi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Eructavit cor meum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prudentes virgines</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10-11a</td>
<td>Tunc surrexerunt […] et quae paratae</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Veni sponsa Christi</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Veni Sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11a-b</td>
<td>Tota pulchra es Maria</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11b-12</td>
<td>A. Portio mea</td>
<td>part of 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps. Iubilate Deo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>In paradisum</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A. Exurge Domine</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps. Deus auribus nostris audivimus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>[13r]</td>
<td>Lumen ad revelationem gentium\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>[13v]</td>
<td>Pueri Hebraeurum portantes ramos</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>[13v]-[14r]</td>
<td>Pueri Hebraeurum vestimenta prosterabant</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[14r]</td>
<td>Rr. Ingrediente Domino</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} The book’s pagination is complicated. The verso of the first folium is numbered 1. Then each page is numbered consecutively until the fourth and the fifth folia, which are foliated (6 and 7 respectively). The sixth and seventh folia are paginated again (8-11). The eighth folium is also paginated, but wrongly, as 11-12. The ninth folium has been largely cut off except for a strip of three staves, and the tenth folium is not foliated at all. I refer to the first page that is numbered 11 as 11a and the second page as 11b, and to the ninth folium as f. [13] and the tenth as f. [14].

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. IV 18, pp. 381-382.

\textsuperscript{3} Most of the folium on which this chant appears has been cut off, so that only the final part remains. Cf. IV 55, p. 17, l. 3-p. 18, l. 2.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>[14]r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rv. Ecce lignum crucis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rr. Venite adoremus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1: Personal Ownership Notes of Sisters by Arnoldus Beckers

This table presents a survey of all ownership notes in Beckers’ hand that attribute books to individual sisters. In the third column, a shelf mark in bold refers to a book where the ownership mark in question was also written by the rector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Ownership Note</th>
<th>Name of Sister and Other Books with her Ownership Note</th>
<th>Other Ownership Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III 111: Mathias Croonenborch. <em>Den verlichtenden wegh, zynde het II. deel van Den geestelycken leydts-man.</em> Brussels: Jacob vande Velde.</td>
<td><em>Suster Constantia van Soelen, religieuse in Nieuwsoeterbeek, 1778 (front flyleaf)</em></td>
<td>Constantia van Soelen <em>(III 110, III 135)</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 135: <em>Kleynen geestelycken blaeshalgh.</em> Antwerp: Alexander Everaerts.</td>
<td><em>Suster Constantia van Soelen, religieus in Nieuwsoeterbeek, 1787 (front flyleaf)</em></td>
<td>Constantia van Soelen <em>(III 110, III 111)</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 40: <em>Officia</em></td>
<td><em>Suster Maria Theresia Heijnen,</em></td>
<td>Theresia Heijnen <em>(IV 55)</em></td>
<td>before Heijnen: *Suster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ On Van Soelen, see Appendix A.1, no. 30.
² On Lips, see Appendix A.1, no. 11.
³ On Teunissen, see Appendix A.2, no. 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>propria sanctorum ordinis</em>. Brussels: Franciscus Foppens, 1699.</td>
<td>Elisebe(th) de Wit heeft desen boek in bewaarrenis soe lanck alst haer overten belieft. Bidt om Gods wil voor haer (front flyleaf); after Heijnen: J.M.J.A. [Jezus, Maria, Jozef, Augustinus] Dit is een s.b. [souter boeck] van suster Maria Clara Zeelanda, 18013. B.v.m. om G. [Bidt voor mij om God] (note on piece of paper pasted on top of the front flyleaf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religieuse in Soeterbeek, 1785 (front flyleaf)</td>
<td>V 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 55: liturgical manuscript by Beckers, 1788</td>
<td>Suster Maria Theresia Heijnen, mater religieuse in ’t klooster Nieuwsoeterbeek, 1788 (second front flyleaf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresia Heijnen (IV 40, V 208)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 208: <em>Vertroostingen in lyden en tegenspoeden</em>. Amsterdam: F.J. van Tetroode.</td>
<td>Suster Maria Theresia Heijnen, mater der religieuse in Soeterbeek, 1807 (title page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresia Heijnen (IV 40, IV 55)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 On Heijnen, see Appendix A.1, no. 7.
2 On De Wit, see vol. 1, p. 233 n. 6.
3 Cf. Zeelands’ ownership note on the second flyleaf of IV 75, a psalter with hymnal printed by Magdalena Boursette in Paris in 1552, which also uses this phrase.
4 On Zeelands, see Appendix A.1, no. 34. Her ownership note also appears in IV 75, in the same hand.
5 On Camp, see vol. 1, p. 233.
Table 5.2: Library Marks by Arnoldus Beckers

This table presents a survey of all ownership notes in Beckers’ hand that indicate that a book was owned by the convent of Soeterbeeck in general. The rightmost column lists ownership marks that were added to the book in question before Beckers added his library mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Library Mark</th>
<th>Older Ownership Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III 12: Joannes David. <em>Christeliicken waerseggher</em>. Antwerp: Jan Moerentorf, 1603.</td>
<td><em>Conventius in Soeterbeek prope Ravestein in Deursen</em> (flyleaf); <em>Soeterbeek</em> (general title page)</td>
<td><em>I. Verheijden c.r., pr. [canonicus regularius, presbyter ot professus]</em> in <em>Woensel, me possidet</em> (general title page)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 8: manuscript antiphonary</td>
<td><em>Ioannes Ægidius van Steenbergen, canonicus regularis et iubilarius in Gaesdonck, conventui nostro Soeterbeek dono dedit 1793 10ma septembri, dum suum solemne celebraret iubilæum.</em> (second front flyleaf)</td>
<td><em>I.Æ.v.S. [Ioannes Ægidius van Steenbergen]&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</em> (initials on the binding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSA A-0925: Franciscus Costerus. <em>VIijfhielen catholicke sermoonen op de evangelien der sondaghen van den vasted tot de H. Driivvldichzyt</em>. Antwerp: Joachim Trognesius, 1604.</td>
<td><em>Soeterbeek</em> (title page)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSA C-0707: Marcus Antonius Flaminius. <em>In librum Psalmorum brevis explanatio</em>. Lyon: Gulielmus Rouilius, 1548.</td>
<td><em>Soeterbeek</em> (title page)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> On Verheijden, see vol. 1, p. 100 n. 2.
<sup>2</sup> On Van Steenbergen, see Appendix B, no. 16.
<sup>3</sup> Vermey was born in Bodegraven in 1684 and educated in Louvain. He was priest of the mission of Nibbixwoude from 1710 to 1718, became priest of the mission of Langeraar and Corteraar in 1718 and afterwards became dean of Rijnland. He left Langeraar in April 1755 and went to Ravenstein, where he died later that same year (Van Lommel 1886, 450-451; 1887, 93-94; 1891, 209-210; Van der Loos 1931, 86; Wils 1915, 270-272, 287). He also left ownership marks in V 148-V 151, all four volumes of a copy of Joannes Crasset’s *Christelycke bemerkeningen voor alle de dagen van ’t jaer* (Ghent: Franciscus Hieronymus vander Ween, 1716), which therefore may have entered Soeterbeeck’s library via Beckers as well.
<sup>4</sup> On Wagheschot, see vol. 1, p. 238 n. 7
<sup>5</sup> On Van Woestenborch, see vol. 1, p. 238 n. 9.
Table 5.3: Other Library Marks in Books from the Library of Soeterbeeck

This table presents a survey of all ownership notes in books from the library of Soeterbeeck that attribute books to the conventual library but are not in Beckers’ hand. They are listed according to hand. For those by Beckers, see Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV 4</td>
<td><em>Dit boeck hoort toe ’t convent van Soeterbeeck 1607.</em></td>
<td>This hand is similar to one of the ownership note of Rector Wouter Willems in V 3.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>V 38</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck 1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V 59</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IV 16</td>
<td><em>Convents te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 21</td>
<td><em>Te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 22</td>
<td><em>Te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 71</td>
<td><em>Convents te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JRL, Latin 439</td>
<td><em>Te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KHS 28</td>
<td><em>Convent te Soeterbeeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>III 90</td>
<td><em>Dese boeck daet hoert aan het kloester van Soeterbeck(e) toe dat moete seijen wederom gheven seij(en)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>III 10</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck, followed by 1798 (see 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 49</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 50</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 57</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 59</td>
<td><em>Nu int gemeijn</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(prob.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 62</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 228</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 229</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 230</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 59</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>III 73</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 26</td>
<td><em>Deesen boeck hoort toe het convent van Soeterbeeck (pastedown) and Nu Soeterbeeck (title-page)</em></td>
<td>This hand might belong to Rector Joannes Verheijden.² On the title-page of IV 23 the same hand wrote: <em>Hoort toe de Rect(or) van Soeterbeeck.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV 38</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 70</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>V 6</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 95</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 143</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>III 44</td>
<td>Nieuw-Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 76</td>
<td><em>Nieuw Soeterbeeck</em> (flyleaf and half-title-page)*</td>
<td>This is the hand of Prioress Theresia Heijnen.³ The attribution is based on a comparison with Heijnen’s notes in Soeterbeeck’s memorial book.⁴ (ASP 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V 60</td>
<td>In Nieuw Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>V 156</td>
<td>Nieuw Soeterbeeck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>III 10</td>
<td>1798, following Soeterbeeck (see 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III 80</td>
<td>Soeterbeeck 1798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V 81</td>
<td>Soeterbik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 147</td>
<td>Soeterbek 1807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ On Willems, see vol. 1, p. 68 n. 4.
² On Verheijden, see vol. 1, p. 100 n. 2.
³ On Heijnen, see Appendix A.1, no. 7.
⁴ ASP 1, entry October 1788.
Library stamps of the Reguliere kanunnikessen van de heilige Augustinus ‘Soeterbeeck’ Deursen-Ravenstein appear in III 1-III 12, III 195, III 200 and V 164 (both with a note in pencil: eigendom), and Add. 1-Add. 6 (with a note in pencil: magazijn, in Add. 3 and Add. 4).
Table 5.4: Books Owned by Arnoldus Beckers

This table presents a survey of all known books with a personal ownership note by Arnoldus Beckers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Ownership Note</th>
<th>Other Ownership Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV 63: Officia propria sanctorum ordinis. Maastricht: Jacobus Lekens, 1753.</td>
<td>Sum A. Beckers (title page)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSA, B-3361: Jacques Biroat. La condamnation du monde. Latest ed. Paris: Edme Couterot, 1688.</td>
<td>Sum A. Beckers in Gaesdonck (title page)</td>
<td>G. van Lith (front flyleaf);³ Crosiers in Uden (stamp on the front flyleaf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Batavia sacra was not prohibited on 29 July 1722 but on 5 August 1716 (De Bujanda 2002, 908).
² On Roefen, see vol. 1, p. 242 n. 2. Although LCSA, A-0706 does not have a stamp of the Crosiers in Uden on one of its flyleaves, as all the other books listed here do, Otto Lankhorst, librarian of the ENK, reports that this one, too, came to the library of Sint Agatha from Uden (private communication with the author, 12 April 2013).
³ On Van Lith, see vol. 1, p. 242 n. 3.
⁴ On De Groot, see vol. 1, p. 242 n. 5.
|---|---|---|

1 The second volume is not present in the LCSA and may not survive.
Table 6: Certificates of Authenticity of Relics Identified by Beckers

The table below lists the certificates of authenticity of relics in ASP 250 that bear a brief identifying note by Rector Beckers on their back. The certificates are ordered chronologically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Certificate</th>
<th>Relic</th>
<th>Beckers’ Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 April 1730</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Paschal Baylon</td>
<td>reliquien van den H. belijder Paschals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 1733</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Francis Xavier</td>
<td>reliquien van den H. Franciscus Xaverius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 October 1733</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Francis Borgia</td>
<td>reliquien van den H. Franciscus Borgias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 October 1733</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Ignatius of Loyola</td>
<td>reliquien van den H. Ignatius Loyola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 1736</td>
<td>hairs of the Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
<td>geautenticeerde reliquien van de H. maghet Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 1743</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Catherine of Alexandria</td>
<td>reliquien van de H. Catharina maghet en martelaressse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 1743</td>
<td>relic of the undergarment of Aloysius Gonzaga</td>
<td>reliquien van 't kleet van den H. Aloysius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 October 1748</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Matthias the Apostle</td>
<td>reliquieae van den H. apostel Mathias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 1750</td>
<td>particle of the cloak of Joseph</td>
<td>reliquien van den mantel van den H. Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 1750,</td>
<td>relics of Peter and Paul, Aloysius Gonzaga, Alexius of Rome and Hatebrand of Oldenklooster</td>
<td>reliquien van de heiligen Petrus en Paulus, van den H. Aloysius, Alexius en Hatebrandus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 September 1753</td>
<td>particles of the bones of Ursicius of Nicomedia</td>
<td>reliquien van den H. Ursicius martelaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 September 1773</td>
<td>particle of the bones of Donatus of Münstereifel</td>
<td>geautentiseerde reliquien van den H. Donatus martelaar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ASP 250, letter of 4 March 1778.
Table 8: The Family of Arnoldus Beckers

The table below provides biographical information on Arnoldus Beckers’ immediate family members. Its sources are the two seventeenth- and eighteenth-century registers of the parish of St Lawrence in Uedem (Duisburg, North Rhine-Westphalia State Archive, Rhineland Department, Rhineland Civil Archives, BA 2597 and BA 2598),¹ the eighteenth-century baptismal registers of the parish of St Vitus in Well (Driessen op ten Bulten 2006-2014), several archival records concerning Arnoldus Beckers (CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21), a necrology of the clergy in the diocese of Cologne (Janssen and Lohmann 1935-1936), Hermann-Josef Heinrich’s miscellany of newspaper cuttings on Uedem (1993), and the Brüx family tree (Perau and Siskens 2009).

Arnoldus’ father, Segerus Beckers, married twice. His first wife was Margaretha Brucx, by whom he had four sons: Joannes Henricus, Arnoldus, Jacobus and Wilhelmus. After her death he married Joanna Calenbergh, who gave him two more: first Joannes,² and then Godefridus.³ He was a farmer by profession, and appears to have been the head of a pious family.⁴ Not only was he the captain of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin at Uedem when he died, two of his sons, Joannes Henricus and Jacobus, would go on to become the parish priest of Uedem.⁵ Arnoldus, of course, entered the convent of Gaesdonck and became rector of Soeterbeeck.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Segerus Beckers</td>
<td>Parents: Joannes Beckers and Arnolda Hoeck</td>
<td>A 21, declaration 30 July 1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(father)</td>
<td>Godparents: Joanna ab Holsaet loco</td>
<td>BA 2598, pp. 86, 96, 102, 109, 178, 207, 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joannes Beck and Maria vanden Bergh</td>
<td>Driessen op ten Bulten 2006-2014, year 1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth and baptism: Well, 20 January 1704</td>
<td>Perau and Siskens 2009, 7, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death: Uedem, 12 July 1772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Margaretha Brucx</td>
<td>Parents: Henricus Brugs and Sibilla Tack</td>
<td>BA 2597, p. 103, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mother)</td>
<td>Godparents: Joanna Baeijen (paternal grandmother), Catharin Brucx and Berndt Hemingh</td>
<td>BA 2598, pp. 86, 96, 102, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birth: Uedem, 19 February 1711</td>
<td>Perau and Siskens 2009, 6-7, 11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For studying these files, I used the digital edition by Bartels et al. 2010.
² On the title page of V 67:1 in the Soeterbeeck Collection is an ownership note by Fr. Joannes Beckers. S. Ordinis Prædicatorûm conv. Sittard 1720 (‘Brother Joannes Beckers of the H. Order of Preachers, convent of Sittard, 1720’). This is not Arnoldus’ younger brother, who was born in 1760 (BA 2598, p. 178), and it is not likely that he was a relative. He is probably the Joannes Beckers who was born in Sittard on 8 June 1678 and invested in the community of Dominicans there on 30 June 1697. This Joannes made his profession on 22 July 1698, and was appointed as lecturer in philosophy at the seminary in Roermond on 7 November 1711. He was prior of the Dominican convents in Sittard and Tongeren from 1713 to 1716 and from 6 October 1735 to 23 October 1738, and eventually obtained the honorary title of preacher general. He died on 15 June 1740 (Meijer 1911, 340, 367-368, 388). The front pastedown of V 67 also has ownership notes by a certain brother M.G. Basten or Barten and by Haasje Dobelman (d. 1861), one of the boarders who lived in the convent of Nazareth in Ravenstein after Beckers’ death (Sluijters 1982a, 128). It is likely that this book entered the library of Soeterbeek via Ms Dobelman, in which case there need not have been any direct connections between Soeterbeek and the Dominicans of Sittard. It is noteworthy, though, that fragments of three manuscript breviaries from Soeterbeek (Fr. 33:1-3) ended up in the possession of the Dutch province of the Order of Preachers (Kienhorst 2009, 92-95), which does seem to be indicative of a connection at some point.
³ BA 2598, pp. 86, 96, 102, 109, 178, 207, 178, 207; CAG, Monastic Archives, A 21, act 30 July 1791 and letter 19 August 1811.
⁴ On Segerus’ profession, see Perau and Siskens 2009, 11. Segerus’ youngest son, Godefridus Beckers, may have been a farmer too (Heinrich 1993, 77-78, 80).
⁵ On Segerus and Joannes Henricus, see the notes left by Jacobus in the parish register of St Lawrence (BA 2598, pp. 377-378). On the brothers’ ecclesiastical careers, see Heinrich 1993, 81, 91 and Janssen and Lohmann 1935-1936, 1: 68-69, 71.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 | Joanna Calenbergh (stepmother) | Parents: possibly Joannes Calenbergh and Helena van Treel  
Godparents: possibly Petrus te Loij and Sibilla van Loock  
Baptism: possibly 23 April 1733  
Marriage with Segerus Beckers: between 29 June 1745 and 28 January 1760  
Death: after 30 July 1791 | A 21, declaration 30 July 1791,  
BA 2598, p. 178, 207  
possibly BA 2598, p. 55 |
| 4 | Joannes Henricus Beckers (brother) | Godparents: Bernardus Heiming and Aldegundis Beckers (paternal aunt)  
Baptism: Uedem, 20 May 1740  
Ordination: 1763  
Coadjutor of parish priest of Uedem: 1 May 1765 to 30 May 1767  
Parish priest of Uedem: 30 May 1767 to 8 October 1773  
Death: Uedem, 9 November 1773 | BA 2598, p. 86, 378  
Driesen op ten Bulten 2006-2014, year 1712  
Heinrich 1993, 91  
Janssen and Lohmann 1935-1936, 1: 71 (no. 315)  
Perau and Siskens 2009, 12 |
| 5 | Jacobus Beckers (brother) | Godparents: Gerardus Bögers and Gertrudis Beckers (paternal aunt)  
Baptism: Uedem, 3 January 1744  
Ordination: 1 March 1765  
Parish priest of Uedem: 8 October 1773 to 9 June 1802  
Desservant of Uedem: 11 June 1804 to 18 March 1813  
Death: Uedem, 18 March 1813 | A 21, declaration 30 July 1791,  
letter 19 August 1811  
BA 2598, p. 102  
Driesen op ten Bulten 2006-2014, year 1708  
Heinrich 1993, 81, 91  
Janssen and Lohmann 1935-1936, 1: 68-69 (no. 288)  
Perau and Siskens 2009, 12 |
| 6 | Wilhelmus Beckers (brother) | Godparents: Theodorus Heiming and Catharina Beckers  
Baptism: Uedem, 29 June 1745  
Death: probably before 30 July 1791 | BA 2598, p. 109  
Perau and Siskens 2009, 12 |
| 7 | Joannes Beckers (paternal half-brother) | Godparents: Theodorus Heiming and Gesina Calenberg  
Baptism: Uedem, 28 January 1760  
Death: after 30 July 1791 | A 21, declaration 30 July 1791  
BA 2598, p. 178 |
| 8 | Godefridus Beckers (paternal half-brother) | Godparents: Theodorus Calenberg and Maria Anna Burgers  
Baptism: Uedem, 10 December 1766  
Death: after 30 July 1791 | A 21, declaration 30 July 1791,  
will 8 July 1810  
BA 2598, p. 207  
possibly Heinrich 1993, 77-78, 80 |