Introduction

First of all, I would like to express my thanks for very useful comments that not only were of great help to correct inconsistencies and unclear terminology I had not noticed myself, but also made me reflect once more on several other aspects of my paper.

Since the article is a contribution to a non-musicological journal, I have tried to make it as little music-specific as possible – modes being the exception – and rather include a description of sources that can easily be identified as monastic also for non-musicologists or liturgists, even though they might not seem as interesting to specialists in these fields as the Olav source is.

My thoughts for the paper were going along the following lines:

Intro:

- Musical sources in Northern Europe are in general fragmentary (and I provide some background to why this is so).
- Fragments from monastic office books can sometimes be recognized due the number and order of items from matins.
- There are several sources in Iceland that can be identified as being from a monastic institution due to this "method", one of them contain chants for St Olav.

Main text:

- I start with the fragment containing the office for St Olav to connect the difficult matter of fragment studies to a saint most readers interested in Nordic monasticism will have heard about. Here also the order of modes can be a useful "tool" to look at the relation between the secular and monastic form of the office. A Swedish source adds more information on this and has been included for that reason. It has not been a goal to provide a complete history of the office.
- The other Icelandic monastic sources have not been given much attention in international research to so far and are presented here in addition to the Olav's fragment to point out that there is more material that can throw light on music in Icelandic monasteries.

Conclusion:

- Summary of the above.

There is no doubt that the office of St Olav has received a major portion of the available space and attention in the text. I had hoped that the article still would be seen as a more general paper on how to recognize musical sources from monastic institutions (with additional focus on one of them), not a paper on the history on the office of St Olav. There would be much more to be said on the latter than what has been done here (and what is possible to achieve for me within the 10 days I have been given for revision). I would therefore like to stick to the original plan and have tried to make some adjustments, mainly in the first and last parts of the text, hoping that this will make it clearer what the goal of the article is. I have not added more information on the Olav's office in order not to put even more emphasis on this subject.

I agree that the title does not quite reflect the content. Since my main focus is on sources in Iceland (the Swedish source acts as a supplement to the Icelandic Olav's manuscript), perhaps a more appropriate title could be *Monastic musical fragments from Iceland*. I would appreciate help from the editor with this matter.

Below I comment on the reviewer's remarks one by one.

General remarks:

1. The introduction is more of a general background than directed towards what is being discussed in the article. It would be better to go more directly into the case presented in the article and frame the research questions explicitly. Since I suppose most readers of *Religions* not are familiar with St Olav, liturgy in the middle ages, saints' offices and plainchant, these issues need to be briefly explained to enhance transparency. The prime method used seems to be comparing monastic and secular cursus in order to discern the number of matins' antiphons and matins responsories. Since this methodology appears to be crucial for the discussion of the findings it needs to be emphasised more and clearly put forth as the methodological tool. It is also an important methodological contribution to the field of fragment studies in the Nordic countries so it could be put forth as an important way of working with questions on attribution of this material. There is a lot of interesting information in the article but a major revision is needed in order to clarify this and to make the pieces fit together.

I have tried to address this in my introduction (and to attend to it in the article).

2. Spelling and terminology: make sure that antiphon/-s is used throughout.

Checked.

Write vespers, not vesper.

Checked.

Saint or St Olav, now bot are used.

Checked.

Little hours is the correct term.

Checked.

3. The title of the article promises more than what is achieved in the article. Rename the article so that it reflects what is actually discussed. The introduction states that sources from Iceland and Sweden (today's Sweden or Sweden in the middle ages?) are discussed from a very specific viewpoint: Olav's office so in other words much more limited than the content of the article. Northern Europe is not really covered in this research.

See introduction above.

4. Use a consistent way of naming the liturgical occasions throughout using table 1 as a model. That means that the listing starting on line 77 will need to add M in front of the abbreviations. R meaning responsory can mean several types of responsorial liturgical singing so good to be clear on this point what is meant here. The information in footnote 8 might be moved to the end of the article in a list of terminology so that the unexperienced reader easily can orientate in the vocabulary.

I have removed the footnote, changed the abbreviations to be consistent throughout the text, and added a list of abbreviations at the end of the article which I hope will clarify the issues addressed both here and below.

This list beginning line 77 also needs reference to the source it is based on.

The list gives the contents of the fragment under discussion. I don't see what kind of reference is asked for. Perhaps you could be so kind as to explain this once more with different words?

Line 51: “some sources”: state clearer how many.

I have removed "some" to avoid the confusion with regard to whether fragments from the same manuscript kept at different archives are considered different sources or not.

Line 53: 3. A monastic office for Saint Olav: state at the beginning of the paragraph which fragment is discussed, this is impossible to understand now.

Added in the footnote.

Line 97: Needs a bit more information concerning chronology and context. For example: From when are the earliest sources for Olav’s office? First notated sources? The adding of different items, when did that take place in time? Transmission history? How many sources? Short information on his cult. These bits of information are found on different places in the article, but it would be very helpful to have them gathered in one place, preferable somewhere at the beginning of the article before going into detail concerning liturgy and sources.

See introduction above.

Footnot 7: Looks as a Latin mnemonic device or exercise?

Could well be that.

Line 111-112: Explain in what why the ordering of matins responsories would be distorted if the proper chants not was kept as the final responsory in each nocturn.

Adding extra chants always changes the ordering, independently where the new chants appear in the original sequence. Is this perhaps unclear in the text?

Line 116-117: “Here three responsories … to fill the gap.” Does this mean matins responsories 7, 8, and 9?

Three responsories have been added at the end of a series of nine responsories, this makes them responsories 10-12.

Line 126: Using *compiling* talking about new texts and melodies seems contradictionary. What is described in the preceding sentence are contrafact techniques, but the author seems more to mean composition in the modern sense? Maybe composition, compilation, contrafact need some explanation for the reader not familiar with how plainchant was thought about in the middle ages.

"Compile" = put together (with the already existing series of chants). Replaced with "add" to avoid misunderstanding.

Line 131-133: “Celebrating a saint … this particular saint”. This statement can and must be backed up by references, there is plenty of research to refer to.

This matter is so well known that I considered it not necessary to provide a reference. Done now (for the case of St Olav).

Line 142-143: “The choice of Miles Christi … in connection with St Olav.” This statement is referred using a source from 1519 (Nidaros Breviary) but this is such a late date that it not is surprising that lots of existing traditions existed at this time. Was it maybe a way of codifying a diocesan liturgy and legitimize it by help of Olav, in line with how many other dioceses acted at this time in Europe?

I find it worth mentioning that the printed Nidaros book picks up on an early tradition using a chant from the Common in this place instead of providing one of the proper items that we find in most other (late) sources containing the Olav's office. However, I don't want to suggest a reason for this choice. But it is certainly an interesting question.

Line 150 and the following: Modal order comes a bit out of the blue: explain why this is interesting. You have this far only discussed matins, now comes vespers and lauds which are services that need some explanation. The text from 150 up to line 168 is very condensed and difficult to follow.

Thanks for pointing this out. I have added some sentences to – hopefully – make it more understandable.

The x in line 168 is enigmatic.

I have added a footnote to explain what it stands for.

Line 174-177: This gives a bit of important background information on Olav’s office which need to come earlier together with a general introduction to the office.

I could agree if the main focus of the paper was a presentation of the Olav's Office. In this case the information is used to make a connection to Sweden (next section), and I would therefore like to leave it where it is.

Line 178: Why is the attribution Cistercian and by whom is this made? By the author? If not, does the author agree? A few words on this would strengthen the connection with the title of the article if retained. The origin is mentioned on line 238 referring to a publication from 1971, but since this is an important part of the argument the reader would need to know more about this attribution, which according to the footnote seems to be made based on the

formulas. There is a substantial and living research going on on the Cistercian order, I think this could be discussed a bit more since it is an important part of the argument.

I am not a liturgist and rely in this case on the judgement of the two excellent scholars who did the cataloguing of the MPO-fragments (finished in 2004). It would be very welcome if a specialist on Cistercian liturgy would pick up this issue on the basis of the present paper and either confirm or correct the attribution.

Line 184: The abbreviations AA1-6 an RR1-2 needs explanation.

Replaced with "antiphons 1-6" and "responsories 1-2".

Line 188 and 198: Folio 1 and folio 2 need reference to which fragment it concerns.

I have exchanged "folio" with the fragment numbers.

Line 210: “The Swedish source…”: give exact source.

I use the term "Swedish source" to distinguish it from the "Icelandic Olav's fragment" mentioned earlier in the same paragraph. The name and place of the archive and the fragment numbers have been given in the previous paragraph. I can't see that a repetition in this place is necessary?

Line 214-215: regarding the antiphons … it contains.” The sentence is a bit unclear. Does it mean that this fragment (=29710 and 29711, one of them or both?) has the biggest number of chant items for the feast of Olav than any other source?

I have changed the text to make it clearer (I hope).

Line 219: Which cantica is meant by *ad cantica*? Readers might not be familiar with that cantica refers to a text from the New testament while psalms come from the Old testament Book of Palms.

I have replaced "antiphon *ad cantica*" with "single antiphon" since the canticle is not relevant in this context.

The paragraph in lines 214-232 seems to describe the situation in the 15th century departing from the fragments 29710 and 29711. It would be helpful with more discussion on the transmission history, when different uses can be established etc. and the chronology emphasised more so that the reader can understand how the Olav office developed over time.

See introduction above.

234: Table 1 is very informative and uses a naming I would recommend throughout the article with a list of abbreviations explaining them all.

A list of abbreviations has been added at the end.

Siglum for the sources must be inserted in the table.

Done.

Including the incipits for the chants would make the table even more useful, now it is only found in three cases.

I have included the text of the two added responsories not present in the secular office to make them stand out.

This makes it for example difficult to know if the Magnificat antiphon is the same in secular use, monastic use and the Swedish source.

I agree that it would be a good thing to include the incipits in the table. I did so when I prepared it in the first place, but unfortunately, they took so much space that the table didn't fit any more on the available space (there is a limit to how small the font size can be).

Why are there no modes for for example matins invitatory antiphon and the Magnificat antiphons in first vespers?

They are not relevant for the modal order of the office that show the re-ordering of the items.

Especially the moving around with matins responsories can easily be demonstrated in the table if inserted.

When items have been moved to a new place I have tried to indicate the original placement (in the secular office) of both antiphons and responsories in square brackets.

The antiphons for the little hours in the monastic use is unclear, it seems to mean that lauds antiphons are used for the little hours?

Yes. I have not found a better way to express this in the table.

I think there is a lot of interesting information in this table that can be more fleshed out in the text!

See introduction above. I added the table only in order to visualize the modal order and movement of the chants described in the text.

Line 249: Interesting information on that a secular office existed in 1237, this needs to come earlier on the transmission history of the office.

See introduction above.

Line 252: “All of the Swedish fragments…”: That means six fragments in total?

Yes. I have added "six" to make this completely clear.

I think the discussion on the provenance will need to come at the beginning of this section before going into detail about the content.

Since the content of the source is the main reason to include it, I would like to keep the order of the discussion (content first, provenance later).

All fragments need to be listed in the references.

I have added a list of sources discussed in the article.

Line 262: Here begins a section on more general matters concerning preserved fragments from Icelandic religious institutions. It is difficult to see how this connects to the previous very detailed discussion on the office of Olav. In order to frame the article better this section could be omitted or placed in an abbreviated form at the beginning of the article describing the source situation in general before going into detail on Olav.

See introduction above.

Line 269: Which National Archives?

Added: in Reykjavik

Line 272: Which National Library?

Added: in Reykjavik

Footnote 27: Give English translation of Icelandic quotation.

The main point of the quotation (the fragment being a book cover from the Northwest of Iceland) is already mentioned in the main text. If a translation is required here then I also should translate the other Icelandic quotations (which also are summarized in the main text) to be consistent. And what about the German quote from the MPO-catalogue? I would prefer to skip translations that do not add much to the understanding of the main text. Perhaps the editor can make that decision?

Line 313: Conclusion could be more specific. Here it appears as Benedictine Icelandic institutions were of prime importance in the article. State research question/s at the beginning which you return to clearly at the end. Which new knowledge has been achieved by the investigation of these fragments?

The text has been revised to try to meet the objections/recommendations.

Line 328 References: The sources discussed also need to be included in the references (see comment line 252).

I added a list of sources at the end of the article (see comment above). If they are required to be part of the references, I will move them there.