

Before the former example this Character of the Perfect  
of the More Prolation should be plac'd thus.  $\odot$

3

**P**erfect of the lesse Prolation or the lesse extenuation in the lesse Perfect Moode in his proper forme (according to those, whose ensamples ought to be the same with their reasons) in my opinion should be thus Charactered  $\odot$ , but with diuers it is thus  $\circ$ , thus  $\circ$ , and thus  $\circ$ ; according to which differences, wee finde great Masters in their workes (especially in their ensamples) much ranging, although the most of them confesse this <sup>(1)</sup> Perfect of the lesse Prolation to be the lesse Moode Perfect: Time perfect, and the great Moode, (which is 3. Longs to the Large) and perfect Prolation (which is 3. Minimes to the Semi-breue) to be Imperfect, and that Perfection is by 3. and Imperfection by 2. Why? either the omitting of the Numbers, and the Binary Number signifying Imperfection, or the single Ternary, although in the Perfect of the more Prolation, the single Ternary noteth the Perfection of both moodes, <sup>(2)</sup> and wheresoever the Greater is there is the Lesse, but not contrarily; by which reason it makes good the aforesaid Charactering, and allowes vs for the signifying of the greater Moode Imperfect the Binary Number, for the Lesse Moode perfect the Ternary, for the Time perfect the Round Circle, and for Prolation Imperfect, the absence of the Point or pricke, Example.  $\circ$

(1) Sebald: Hey:  
lib. 2. cap. 1.  
Glareas: Dode  
lib. 3. cap. 5.  
John Dunstons  
cap. 10.  
Ornitho: lib. 2  
cap. 4.  
Morley lib. 1.  
fol. 13.

(2) Ornitho.  
lib. 2. cap. 5.

2-3.

Example.