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GENERAL
INTRODUCTION
1 Aim and Purpose

The sequence commentary, part of the vast commentary literature of the Middle Ages, emerged in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a new field for writing expositions on liturgical poetry. It is, however, a genre that has been practically neglected by modern research.

This lacuna in the scholarship on Latin commentary literature was recognised a few decades ago, first by Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny, who brought attention to sequence commentaries in 1965 when editing Alan of Lille’s (†1203) exposition on the sequence *Ad celebres rex*, commenting that the genre is unexplored and worthy of a study.¹ A few years later, while making a similar observation, R. B. C. Huygens identified the lack of editions as one of the reasons for the little research performed in this area.²

In the light of these remarks, I began the present work in order to attempt a first larger presentation of the genre by making available editions of sequence commentaries. The surprising and unexpected wealth of previously unexplored material forced a narrowing of the focus for the research, as the number and diversity of the discovered texts meant that it was not useful to concentrate on just one manuscript or one set of commentaries; without a thorough examination of the complete material—a procedure too extensive to be performed within the frame of the present work—it would be impossible to know if the chosen text was representative of the genre as a whole or an atypically original work. Instead, a quite different method has been chosen by concentrating on commentaries on a single sequence in a large number of different sources. Through such a method both the continuity and the development of the genre can be traced, and texts to be edited can be chosen that both display the range of the sequence commentary genre and that provide examples of a variety of commentary techniques.

The choice was made to focus on commentaries on *Ad celebres rex*, a sequence for the feast of St Michael on 29 September, the earliest known textual witnesses for which are dated to before 1000.³ The main reason for selecting this sequence is that its manuscript sources reveal that it spread

¹ D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 91, note 82.
² HUYGENS (2000), p. 413. The article was originally published in 1969.
³ The sequence and its angelic theme are treated in Section 3.1 below.
CHAPTER 1

internationally very early on, which increased the chances of finding commentaries from a wide variety of regions. A second reason is that this is the sequence which Alan of Lille comments upon in his *Expositio prosae de angelis*, referred to above, which exposition could then act as a point of reference for the others.

The present work thus offers critical editions of seven separate commentaries on *Ad celebres rex*, together with four sequence commentary prologues. All the texts are previously unedited. Each edition is preceded by an introduction comprising manuscript descriptions, an outline of the contents of the texts and a discussion of manuscript interrelations and textual problems.

In connection with this it must be pointed out that although this work revolves around *Ad celebres rex*, this sequence is not *per se* the focus here. As has been mentioned, the main aim is to provide examples of commentary texts showing both similarities and differences in order to display the character and the range of the genre; the text of *Ad celebres rex* is the vehicle for this endeavour.

The same ambition motivates the inclusion of the four sequence commentary prologues. Although these prefatory texts introduce collections of sequence commentaries and are thus not specifically connected with *Ad celebres rex*, they provide valuable insights as to the scope of the genre by attesting to the interpretational framework and the methodology the commentators themselves profess as their own.

This work is divided into two parts. The first, the general introduction, aims to provide a background as regards previous research and an overview of the sequence commentary material I have hitherto located. In Chapter 2 there is also an account of the different levels of texts included in the sequence commentaries.

The second part, Chapters 3–8, presents first the sequence text itself, *Ad celebres rex*, and the first known commentary on this work by Alan of Lille. The editorial methods employed in this work are presented in Chapter 4. Chapters 5–8, which constitute the principal part of this work, contain the editions of the commentaries and the prologues together with the introductions.

In the extensive sequence commentary material, we find a number of examples attesting to different kinds of medieval instructional and interpretational practices. It is to be hoped that these editions may form a basis for further studies of the genre as a whole, its origins and its connections with
Aim and Purpose

the related genres of hymn and psalm commentaries, its uses in various instructive situations and its employment of pedagogical techniques.4

In this work I do not discuss musical aspects of the sequences. Thus the term ‘sequence’ will here generally be used to refer to the literary composition. Where it has seemed necessary, I have specified further by adding the word ‘text’.

The sequence commentary manuscripts are referred to throughout the present work with the sigla I have assigned them. These consist of two letters taken from the name of the place where the manuscript is now held and a numeral, since there are sometimes several manuscripts in the same library: for example, Gr1, Gr2, etc. An inventory of the complete sequence commentary material hitherto located is found as Appendix 2, where the manuscripts, almost a hundred in number, are listed alphabetically after these sigla.

4 Studies on the commentators’ use of mnemonic verses, their etymological analyses and their choice of sources would give insights into pedagogical techniques and intended audiences for these texts but lie outside the frame of the present work. Still, some central source texts for these commentaries are briefly discussed here in the introductory sections to each edition.
2 The Genre of the Sequence Commentary

2.1 Previous Research

While the sequence as such has been the subject of numerous modern studies from both textual and musical points of view, medieval commentaries on sequence texts have received very little attention. As previously mentioned, only very few commentaries are available in modern editions, which in turn means that no general studies have been made on the genre itself. The earliest currently known example of a sequence commentary is the *Expositio prosae de angelis* of Alan of Lille, available in the edition by Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny referred to above. In addition to the manuscripts containing Alan’s texts or adaptations of it, d’Alverny signals Mü5 as another textual witness to this genre, while commenting that the subject of sequence commentaries is an unexplored field.

Even though Alan’s exposition may be the earliest specimen of this genre, the first sequence commentary to have been published in a modern work predates d’Alverny’s edition by a century. For his *Œuvres de Gerbert*, published in 1867, A. Olleris originally wished to include the text of *Ad celebres rex* as being one of the works attributed to Gerbert of Aurillac († 1003), later Pope Sylvester II, and wrote to H. O. Coxe, Bodley’s librarian, for assistance. Coxe was not able to locate the sequence itself in Oxford, but sent instead a transcription of a commentary on it, which Olleris published. This text, preserved in the

---

1 A full presentation of modern research on the sequence would be out of place here. However, mention must be made of the editions of *Analecta Hymnica* (henceforth AH), an editorial project of massive proportions consisting of 55 volumes of hymns, sequences, tropes, rhymed offices, canticles, motets, rhymed prayers and psalms, which includes approximately 4,500 sequence texts (the figure is from KRUCKENBERG (1997), p. 20). For an extensive bibliography of text editions and modern studies on the genre of sequences from both musical and textual approaches, see KRUCKENBERG (1998).

2 D’ALVERNY (1965). Alan of Lille’s commentary will be treated further in Section 3.2 below.

3 D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 91, n. 82. See the manuscript list in Appendix 2. The commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in Mü5 is edited below as Edition 7: *Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5*.

4 OLLERIS (1867); the commentary text occupies pp. 568–572. For the tradition of Gerbert as the author of this sequence, see Section 3.1 below.
CHAPTER 2

thirteenth-century manuscript Ox4, has shown itself to be a fragment of an adapted version of Alan’s Expositio prosae de angelis.5

Other editions of sequence commentaries include an exposition on the sequence Ave praeclara maris stella by the Cistercian Caesarius of Heisterbach (†ca 1240), which has been edited by R. B. C. Huygens together with two other commentaries on the same text.6 Huygens dates these three texts to the thirteenth century, although Caesarius’s work seems to precede the other two; the year 1210 is suggested as a possible date for its composition. Further manuscripts are signalled; amongst these, the manuscript Ca4 is said to present a commentary of Stephen Langton (†1228) on the sequence Ave maris stella.7

Approaching the subject from a different angle, Judson B. Allen, in his article on medieval literary practice, included a number of accessus to both sequence and hymn commentaries in his discussion, taking the commentators’ understanding of the forma tractandi—the form of treatment—of the hymns and sequences as a point of departure for an examination of medieval views on poetry.8 While commenting that the ‘hymn commentaries, the later and more elaborate of which have apparently escaped modern scholarly notice’, Allen also reminds us that these texts are a valuable and informative source for medieval

5 The manuscript is mentioned by D’Alverny (1965), p. 187. At the time of the publication of Olleris’s work, the Expositio prosae de angelis was not known as one of Alan of Lille’s compositions. The influence of Alan’s text on this and other commentaries will be discussed briefly below; see Section 3.2.1.

6 Huygens (2000). The editions of both Caesarius’s and the anonymous commentary on the sequence were first published in Cîteaux in 1969. For their second publication in CCCM a newly discovered third commentary—based upon Caesarius’s exposition and developed with the help of the anonymous text—was incorporated into the edition in the form of an apparatus accounting for its alternative readings.

7 Huygens (2000), p. 413, n. 7. Here Huygens explicitly states that Langton comments on the sequence beginning Ave maris stella, referring also to further manuscripts now in the British Library; information in manuscript catalogues, though, indicates that it is the hymn with the same incipit that is commented upon. In the same note, Huygens also reports the manuscripts Du1 and Br1 as if they comprise sequence commentaries although the information provided makes it difficult to judge exactly what kinds of texts they include. The three manuscripts have, nevertheless, been incorporated into the manuscript list in Appendix 2.

8 Allen (1973). These texts are also of importance in similar discussions in Allen (1971) and Allen (1982).
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critical practice and theory.9 He reports nineteen manuscripts comprising both hymn and sequence commentaries with accessus:10

The sequence commentary is furthermore treated briefly in the chapter on literary scholarship on the sequence in Lori Kruckenberg’s unpublished doctoral thesis, which concerns the development of the genre of the sequence between 1050 and 1150.11 Kruckenberg notes that literary interest in the sequence seems to have been especially strong in the German-speaking regions, exemplifying this with the commentaries by Jacob Wimpheling, Johannes Adelphus and Hermann Torrentinus printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.12 St Gall, home of the famous author of sequences Notker Balbulus (†912), is pointed out as a particular centre for this interest, and Kruckenberg accounts for the sequence-related material produced in preparation for the six-hundredth anniversary of Notker. That interest was also shown earlier at St Gall is made clear by the manuscript Sg2 mentioned by Kruckenberg,13 a volume compiled by the St Gall monk Gallus Kemli in the fifteenth century.

10 Nine of these include sequence commentaries. Three of the prologues for the sequence commentaries discussed or listed by Allen are edited here: Edition 4: Dicit Aristoteles, Edition 5: Vir speculativus, and Edition 6: Sapientia vincit malitiam.
12 K RUCKENBERG (1997), p. 9. The printed books referred to by Kruckenberg are: De Hymnorum et Sequentiuarum auctoris generibusque carminum quae in hymnis inventuntur (n. p., 1499), Sequentiuarum lucenta interpretatio (Strasbourg, 1513) and Hymni et Sequentiuarum difficultiorum vocabulorum interpretatione omnis et scholasticis et ecclesiasticis (Cologne, 1512). In addition, there seems to have been a particular interest in the genre in the British Isles at this time, as is attested to by numerous printed sequence commentaries exemplified here with Expositio sequentiuarum secundum usum Sarum (London, 1497), Expositio sequentiuarum secundum usum Sarum. Diligenter recognita et aucta (Paris, 1502) and Expositio sequentiuarum (Rouen, 1506). (According to information on the last page of the latter work, this is also a collection of sequences following the Sarum Use.) The text commenting on Ad celebres rex does not show close similarity with any of the commentaries edited here, although resemblances with the commentary in Lo3, Ox1, Ox3, Ox5, Ox6 and Ox7 may be seen in certain expressions. To follow the sequence commentary from manuscript to printed book would be an interesting field for research but lies outside the scope of the present work.
13 KRUCKENBERG (1997), p. 9. The manuscript Sg2 is described below in Section 8.2.1 and is collated for the edition of the prologue Dicit Aristoteles. This manuscript also presents a commentary on Ad celebres rex.
which presents a collection of commentaries to hymns and sequences.\textsuperscript{14} Kruckenberg furthermore reports that, according to a fifteenth-century library catalogue, St Gall held four such volumes at that time, although she does not identify these books within the library.\textsuperscript{15}

A related and almost equally unexplored field is the genre of hymn commentaries. A collection of such commentaries, generally referred to as Hilarius’s \textit{Expositio hymnorum}, is well known from numerous early printed works, but is still not available in a modern critical edition.\textsuperscript{16} In Chapter 9 of Helmut Gneuss’s study and edition of the Anglo-English hymnal and its Old English glosses, the \textit{Expositio hymnorum} is discussed as regards its possible conception, development and particularly its diffusion in England. A few subtypes of it, as found in early printed books, are also defined.\textsuperscript{17} The sequence commentary is mentioned briefly as an occasional accompanying component to the hymn commentary, and two such manuscripts are signalled by Gneuss.\textsuperscript{18}

The only hymn commentary available in a critical edition is the \textit{Explanatio super hymnos quibus utitur ordo cisterciensis}, edited by Beers in 1982, which does not reveal any influence or knowledge of Hilarius’s work; Beers suggests that the Cistercian author and Hilarius could have been contemporary.\textsuperscript{19} The Cistercian commentary differs from Hilarius’s text in that its main concern is not to

\textsuperscript{14} This information is taken from the forthcoming manuscript catalogue for St Gall being prepared by Beat von Scarpatetti, a copy of which was kindly shown to me by Theres Flury at the Stiftsbibliothek, St Gall. Kruckenberg states that the commentary collection was ‘authored’ by Kemli, which seems to be based on the information in DUFT (1990), p. 123. On this, see more below, Section 8.2.1.

\textsuperscript{15} I have located two further sequence commentaries from St Gall, the manuscripts \textit{Sg1} and \textit{Sg3}.

\textsuperscript{16} At least forty incunabula are known of this work; see GNEUSS (1968), p. 202. Hilarius is believed to have been a pupil of Abelard’s in Paris at the beginning of the twelfth century, though according to Gneuss this can be nothing more than a \textit{Vermutung}; GNEUSS (1968), p. 200. Hilarius’s commentary includes a brief \textit{accessus} discussing the author and his intention, the title and the subject-matter of the work, its utility and to what part of philosophy it belongs. The expositions themselves consist mostly of literal paraphrases of the hymn texts and construing remarks; see ALLEN (1973), p. 31. A critical edition of Hilarius’s hymn commentary is currently in preparation by Dr Mechthild Pörnbacher, Munich.

\textsuperscript{17} GNEUSS (1968), pp. 194–206.

\textsuperscript{18} GNEUSS (1968), p. 205. These are the manuscripts \textit{Ca2} and \textit{Ox8} in the manuscript list, Appendix 2.

\textsuperscript{19} BEERS (1982), p. xxiv.
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Paraphrase and construe the hymn texts, but is more centred on detailed explanations of metaphorical language and theological commentary.

An exposition on the hymn *Ut queant laxis* as found in two fourteenth-century manuscripts has yet a different focus. This text, examined by Peter Stotz in a recent article,\(^20\) concerns primarily linguistic instruction and the hymn text is used as the point of departure for detailed grammatical analysis and discussions.

Although not continuous commentary texts, the Latin glosses on hymns which have been studied by the American musicologist Susan Boynton may be added to the above-mentioned expository works. She has identified traditions of gloss sets in eleventh-century continental hymnaries, and has examined and discussed these within a pedagogical context, both in her doctoral thesis and in a number of articles.\(^21\)

The relation between hymn glosses and the continuous hymn commentary does not seem possible to define at the moment, on account of the lack of editions and other studies. Allen and Gneuss, however, seem to concur in the view that the hymn commentary developed from the glosses and the prose paraphrases.\(^22\)

Beers, on the other hand, emphasises the similarities between the Cistercian hymn commentary and Scriptural commentaries, especially the commentaries on the Psalms—both of the Church Fathers, such as Augustine and Jerome, and of later writers such as Peter Lombard or Bernard of Clairvaux. Here, Beers argues, the Cistercian author found a fully developed method which he could apply to this new material.\(^23\)

The origins of the sequence commentary are likewise obscure. To judge from the manuscript material, a collection of commentaries on sequences for the entire liturgical year seems to be a later creation than the corresponding collection of hymn commentaries, which fact could suggest a certain dependence upon the latter for the sequence commentary, at least from a conceptual point of view. However, to claim, as Allen, that Hilarius’s hymn commentary was ‘imitated by a companion volume on the sequences’ with a reference to an early print seems to be a slightly premature statement at this point. It is true that quite a number of fifteenth-century sequence

---

\(^{20}\) Stotz (2001).


commentaries in my material are ‘preoccupied with “construe” instructions, and are doubtless intended for a quite elementary audience’, as Allen describes the early printed work, but I believe that until we have more editions of both hymn and sequence commentaries showing the range of the two genres it is impossible to state that the sequence commentary collections were made in direct imitation of Hilarius’s work. It seems that statements about the origins of the genre can at present only be speculative.

2.2 SUMMARIZATION PRESENTATION OF THE SEQUENCE COMMENTARY MATERIAL

Research for the present work has resulted in an extensive inventory of manuscripts; nearly a hundred textual witnesses have been located at the time of writing. The manuscripts date from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries and come from places spanning across medieval Europe. The vast majority, though, date from the later medieval period (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) and originate from central Europe (the southern parts of modern Germany, Austria and Switzerland). The earliest examples of this commentary genre seem to be the expositions of Alan of Lille and Caesarius of Heisterbach mentioned above.

Most of these manuscripts are miscellanies, usually including other instructive texts in addition to the sequence commentaries, such as grammatical treatises, vocabularies and various other commentaries, such as hymn commentaries. Sometimes sermons of various kinds are also found in the same volumes. Some manuscripts present a commentary on a single sequence or only

24 ALLEN (1973), p. 31, n. 12. The publication referred to by Allen is Expositio sequentiarum recentissime Impressa Rothomagi Impensis Raulini Gaultier ibidem incola tardellum commorantis (1510). Regarding commentaries intended for a less advanced audience, compare Edition 7: Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü 5 below. Other commentaries intended for more elementary audiences are found for instance in Lo3, Mi2, Mü2 (the second commentary collection), Oo3, Oo5, Oo7 and Pr3. Oo7 is mainly concerned with sequence paraphrases.

25 A list of sequence commentary manuscript is found as Appendix 2. It makes no claims to being exhaustive. In addition to the commentary manuscripts located by myself it also includes the manuscripts signalled by d’Alverny, Huygens, Gneuss, Allen and Kruekenberg.

26 Sequence commentary manuscripts from Italy and France are scarce. However, it is not possible to draw any conclusions as regards the actual diffusion of sequence commentaries based on this as the present findings are dependent upon indexed manuscript catalogues and electronically searchable databases.
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a few of them, whereas the majority comprise a large collection of commentaries on sequences for the whole liturgical year.

The provenance is known for almost half of the manuscripts, and the information suggests that the sequence commentary was a genre of interest and concern for both monasteries and cathedral chapters alike. Of the monastic orders the Benedictine is the most common but the Cistercian is also present.27

With the exception of a few single pieces, all sequence commentaries in the manuscripts are anonymous works. In addition to the compositions of Alan of Lille and Caesarius of Heisterbach, and possibly Stephen Langton, referred to above, there is an English manuscript in which the collection of commentaries is attributed to one Thomas Haume.28

The term used in the commentaries to denote a sequence varies, although the most common seems to be sequentia.29 In the title of Alan of Lille’s commentary, Expositio prosae de angelis, the word prosa is used although in the text itself Alan refers to Ad celebres rex as a canticum.30 This appellation is repeated by the commentator of Ox6 (Edition 1), who was much influenced by Alan’s Expositio prosae de angelis, although the commentator of Ox6 also uses sequentia.31 In the commentary of St2 (Edition 3) the author uses both sequentia and prosa without differentiating between them. In a commentary in the

27 According to the library catalogues, the manuscripts Gr3 and Mū6 originally belonged to Cistercian libraries.
28 This is the manuscript Ox5, presenting a sequence commentary collection following the Sarum Use. We do not have a date for the birth or death of Thomas Haume, who seems to be known from this work only. In the manuscript Ox9 his name has been crossed out and the name Henry Hume written instead; SHARPE (1997), p. 660.
29 This is the term used by Caesarius of Heisterbach in his commentary on Ave praeclara maris stella as well as by the anonymous commentary on the same text, both edited by HUYGENS (2000). Sequentia is also used in the commentary in Ox1 edited here and seems furthermore to be the preferred term in the commentaries belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’. On this tradition, see Chapter 8 below.
30 It does not seem to be possible to say whether the use of prosa in the title is Alan’s own. The title is found in some manuscripts, among them Cat1, which presents an abbreviated version of Alan’s text. As can be seen on Plate 1, prosa is used also in the title of Up1. That Alan refers to sequences with both the words prosa and sequentia is evident in his Distinctiones.
31 The relation between the commentary of Alan of Lille and that in Ox6 is discussed in Section 5.3 below.
manuscript Krl, the sequence *Ad celebres reg* is referred to as a *palinodium.*32 In the colophon to the manuscripts Ox1 and Ox5, the sequence collection is called a *troparium,* which term is accompanied by an etymology in the latter manuscript.

### 2.2.1 Text categories

As with all commentary literature, the expositions include different kinds of texts: an introductory section, the sequence text itself, the commentary text and sometimes also interlinear glosses. In the following, there will be brief and general descriptions of these types of text as found in the sequence commentary material.

#### 2.2.1.1 Prologues

Both the large collections and the single commentary pieces are generally preceded by a prologue varying in both length and character. Most of these follow the traditional schemes for medieval academic prologues—*accessus*—to introduce works from a variety of disciplines. In these, a range of issues regarding the work in question is discussed. Following the categorisation made by Richard Hunt in 1948 and discussed further by Alastair Minnis, representatives of a so-called ‘type C prologue’ are found in the sequence commentary material together with examples of an ‘Aristotelian prologue’, a term coined by Minnis. Both types will be briefly described here.33

**Type C prologue**

The set of headings discussed in a type C prologue could be modified, abbreviated or elaborated according to the commentator’s needs, but generally

---

32 Krl, fol. 199; this commentary is not edited here. The prologue *Sapientia vincit malitiam* from this manuscript is collated for the text in Edition 6 of the present work and the manuscript is described in Section 8.4.1. In his explanation of the word *odas,* Alan of Lille mentions the word *palinodium,* quoting a phrase from the sequence *Alle caeleste* (AH 7, 98; AH 53, 97), which composition is nevertheless referred to as a *canticum.*

33 Richard Hunt identified four types of medieval *accessus,* types A, B, C and D, depending on the headings discussed. For a fuller account of the different types of prologues and a discussion of the headings, see Hunt (1948) and Minnis (1988), pp. 9–72. For the type C prologue, see also Quain (1945).
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include the following eight topics: nomen auctoris, titulus libri, intentio auctoris, materia libri, modus agendi, ordo libri, utilitas and cui partis philosophiae supponitur.34

In addition to naming the author of the work, the commentator could also include a brief description of his life, just as the heading titulus could be expanded by an etymological analysis in order to justify and explain it further. The author’s purpose in writing the work in question is described under intentio; the materia is the subject-matter of the work. For the term modus agendi the alternatives modus scribendi or modus tractandi are also found. In discussing this ‘mode of procedure’ or ‘mode of treatment’, the commentators usually set out to detect and define the method or methods employed by the author in his work. The order of the work, ordo libri, concerns the arrangement of the inherent parts. The heading utilitas considers the reasons for studying the work. The last heading, the part of philosophy to which a work belongs, identifies the branch of learning into which the commentator sorts the work in question, thus defining its place within a systematised scheme of human knowledge.

Although the origins of the type C prologue are obscure, it seems to have been diffused in the Latin West mainly through Boethius’s commentary on Porphyry’s Isagoge. It spread widely and became the most popular type of prologue in the twelfth century. In slightly varying forms it was used in accessus to works of a variety of subjects including theology and commentaries on Biblical books, medicine, law and grammar up to the thirteenth century and in some cases even later.35

The ‘Aristotelian prologue’

In the thirteenth century, under the influence of the theory of the four causes, a new type of introduction emerged, the ‘Aristotelian prologue’ to use Minnis’s term.36 This form of prologue quickly established itself as a popular type and was soon used in introductions to works in many disciplines. In an Aristotelian prologue, the commentator discusses the work in question using the four causes as the basis: causa finalis discusses the end, the purpose of the work, and causa efficientis its author. Causa materialis is the literary material used by the author and finally causa formalis, which is always duplex, consists of forma tractandi and forma tractatus. The former is equivalent to the modus agendi of the type C

34 These headings and the brief description of them are based on the account in MINNIS (1988), pp. 19–27.
prologue and concerns the mode or the form of the treatment; the latter, the *forma tractatus*, answers in part to the heading *ordo libri*, as it concerns the organisation of the work and its parts, that is, its structure.

Introducing the art and the work

In introducing the specific work in question, an academic prologue could also define and describe the disciplinary context within which the work under scrutiny was to be placed. In such an ‘extrinsic’ section of a prologue, the art itself was often delimited and discussed as regards its utility and the place it occupies in a hierarchy of human knowledge. The part of the prologue that is specifically concerned with the work in question, often treating the author’s subject-matter, his intention and his mode of proceeding, can be referred to as the ‘intrinsic’ section. In both the intrinsic and extrinsic prologue sections, commentators could form their descriptions and arguments around the headings from the type C prologue as well as the Aristotelian four causes, or a combination of the two.  

Sequence commentary prologues

The prologues in the sequence commentary material are found either as more or less integral parts of a single commentary piece or as a more separate text introducing a collection of commentaries.  

The integrated prologues in this material are of varying kinds. In the introductory section of Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* a selection of headings from the type C prologue is discussed: *auctor*, *intentio* (expressed as ‘que causa ad hoc opusculum eum inuitauit’), *materia libri* and *modus tractandi*.  

With the exception of the question of author for the sequence, the same selection of headings is used in the commentary of the manuscript *St2*. With the exception of the question of author for the sequence, the same selection of headings is used in the commentary of the manuscript *St2*.  

37 The adjectival names of the *formae tractandi*, when enumerated, are generally given in the masculine, indicating an underlying *modus* as the headword. See for example Edition 5: *Vir speculative*, lines 86–88.  

38 For a brief account of the development and the origin of extrinsic and intrinsic sections in prologues, see MINNIS (1988), pp. 30–33, where a number of examples of possible headings to be discussed in the two sections are provided.  
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commentary a fourth heading, ‘in quo vel in quibus consistat sequencia sive prosa’, is referred to and discussed, which could be viewed as a detailed extension and elaboration of the question of materia libri.42

The commentary on Ave praeciosa maris Stella by Caesarius of Heisterbach is not preceded by an academic prologue of the above-mentioned type. Instead, his commentary opens with a brief epistola in which the obscurity of the sequence text is mentioned as the reason for the exposition, with an added remark that if his explanations do not suffice there are other viri literati of whom greater and more subtle comments can be expected.43 In contrast, the introductory section of the anonymous commentary on the same sequence contains a discussion of the author of the sequence, Hermannus Contractus, including a description of him with a few details from his life. Although the commentator does not use the term utilitas, he puts forth four reasons for the excellence of this sequence before others, functioning as a motivation for his choice of text to comment upon.44

A component which seems to be common for both separate pieces and integrated prologues is a definition of the term used to denote the sequence. The terms mentioned above for denoting the sequence in the commentaries are all followed by explanations of this kind.45 Such definitions, albeit of the term hymnus, are a standard feature in the hymn commentaries46 as well as in prologues to psalm commentaries.47

The separate prologue texts are likewise found in different forms. Some combine a selection of headings from the type C prologue with a discussion based on the four causes, as in the prologues of the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ edited below; others are not as easily definable. The prologue Quoniam . . . tria cantica edited here, for example, is not possible to classify according to any of the prologue types described above. In addition to the standard definition of the term for sequence, in this case canticum as found in Alan’s text, there is a

42 See further Section 7.2 below.
45 See Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 194; Edition 1: Quoniam . . . tria cantica, lines 12–16; Edition 3: Expositio St2, lines 21–32; Edition 5: Vir speculativus, lines 105–110. In Kr1, fol. 199, the term palinodium is etymologised.
47 See for example the definition of hymnus in the psalm commentaries of Remigius of Auxerre (Pl. 130, 148a), Honorius of Autun (Pl. 172, 270c) and Peter Lombard (Petr. Lomb., in psalm. praefatio, Pl. 191, 58a). The definition seems to derive from Augustine (Aug., in psalm. 27, 1).
brief account of the four modes of interpreting Scripture, but without explicitly connecting the sequences to this kind of interpretational method.48

The prologues belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’49 may be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic sections, as described above. The extrinsic parts are all concerned with proving, in logical argumentation, the excellence and primacy of theology, to which discipline the sequences, being divine praise, are said to belong either implicitly or explicitly. In the prologue Sapientia vincit malitiam, the status of the discipline of theology is developed further and centred around the four causes.50

The intrinsic sections of these prologues consist of a combination of headings from the type C prologue and the Aristotelian four causes. In the prologue Dicit Aristoteles (Edition 4) only one heading is explicitly mentioned, cui partis philosophiae, although in answering this the commentator seems also to address the question of materia libri, since the book of sequences is said to belong to the discipline of theology on account of its subject-matter, which is divine praise. The title of the book is discussed in both Vir speculativus (Edition 5) and Sapientia vincit malitiam (Edition 6). The latter also treats the heading cui parti whereas the former instead discusses the utilitas of the sequences.

One of the more interesting issues in the intrinsic sections is the commentators’ view on the forma tractandi of the sequences, often equalled with and used alongside the term modus tractandi. Although numerous modi are referred to in the commentary literature at large,51 Allen claims that commentators on informative works in various disciplines generally identify and refer to a conventional set of five: the definitive, the divisive, the proving, the disproving and the mode of applying examples.52 For poetical works, Allen argues, the commentators vary these modi to a great extent by limiting their number, by defining and referring to other modi than the conventional five, or by denying that there is an identifiable forma tractandi at all.53 One of the three prologues of the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ edited here, Vir speculativus, limits the number of modes identified in the sequences to the modes of proving and

48 This prologue is described and discussed further in Section 5.2 below.
49 See Chapter 8 below.
50 For examples of other extrinsic and intrinsic prologues formed around the four causes, see MINNIS (1988), p. 32.
51 In the index of MINNIS (1988), p. 315, under modus agendi, there is an extensive list of various modi identified by commentators. In many cases, these modes are found in commentaries on Scripture.
applying of examples. In the prologues *Dicit Aristoteles* and *Sapientia vincit malitiam*, on the other hand, the commentators go beyond the five identified as the standard set by Allen: in *Dicit Aristoteles* the commentator claims a single *modus*, the persuasive, whereas in *Sapientia vincit malitiam* the sequences are said to be in the laudative and supplicative modes.

### 2.2.1.2 Sequence texts

The commentaries display a variety of ways for presenting and referring to the sequence texts. It seems that, generally, four different models are employed in the sequence commentary material, although the boundaries between them are not always firm.

A very common method of referring to the sequence text is to use the conventional practice of quoting the incipit of the strophe or strophes to be commented upon at the beginning of each commentary section. This section, then, generally opens with a prose paraphrase of the strophes in question, which are often supplemented with implied words or brief explanatory phrases. This means that the sequence text is often not reproduced in its original form in these manuscripts. Examples of this method in the texts edited here are Edition 2: *Expositio Ox1*, Edition 5: *Expositio Kf4* and Edition 6: *Expositio Kf1*.55

Some manuscripts include the complete sequence text as a coherent composition, either preceding the actual exposition or alongside the commentary on the same page, where the commentary sometimes spills over in the top and bottom margins. An example of the latter type is edited here as Edition 7: *Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5*.56 The sequence text can also be broken up into shorter segments which introduce the section commenting on them.57

---

54 The list of *modo* in this prologue is among the examples referred to by ALLEN (1973), p. 33.
55 The beginnings of the commentaries on *Ad celebres rex* in *Ox1*, *Kf4* and *Kf1* are reproduced as Plates 4, 9, and 11. Other examples of such commentaries are found in the manuscripts *Fr3*, *Gr4*, *Gr5*, *Ke1*, *Ma1* and *Ma2*, among many others.
56 See Plate 12 for the layout of this manuscript. Other examples with a similar layout are the manuscripts *Fr2* (some pieces lack commentaries), *Gr3*, *Kb2* (many pieces lack both glosses and commentaries), *St1* (some pieces lack comments and glosses) and *Me1*. The scribe of *Ga3* has accommodated for commentaries in the outer half of the page, but these were never written in.
57 Examples of manuscripts where the sequence text is broken up into shorter segments are *Kb1*, *Ma3* and *Mü2* (in the first collection of commentaries); examples of manuscripts presenting the whole text before the exposition are *Er1*, *Mü1*, *Mü2* (in the second collection), *Ox7*, *St3* and *Wi1*.
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all these cases the sequence text is written in a larger script than the commentary text, with ample space between the lines for the interlinear glosses that are also present in the majority of these manuscripts.

Other manuscripts also include the sequence text broken up into shorter segments, but unlike the previous model, the lemmata are here generally much shorter in length and not written in a larger script to set them off visually from the commentary text. Instead, the phrases from the sequence function as a heading for the comments to follow, which will generally include a prose paraphrase of the sequence text, unless it consists of only a few words. Examples of this method in the present work are found in Edition 1: Expositio Ox6 and Edition 4: Expositio Gr1.58

In other expositions the commentary text seems to flow in and out of the sequence text in an interwoven, almost seamless, fashion, elucidating and paraphrasing it at the same time. Examples of this method in the material discussed and edited here can be seen in the Expositio prosae de angelis of Alan of Lille and in Edition 3: Expositio St2. In addition to this ‘flowing’ technique Alan of Lille also comments separately on a single word at a time.59

2.2.1.3 Interlinear glosses

Many of the manuscripts that include the sequence text set apart from the commentary text, either as an uninterrupted text or broken up into segments, also comprise interlinear glosses. Among these, a variety of gloss types may be identified and classified in accordance with the definitions set up by Wieland in his study of the Latin glosses on Arator.60 Some manuscripts present both Latin and vernacular glosses.61

One particular kind of syntactical gloss needs special mention here. The function of syntactical glosses is to guide the reader through the syntax of the

58 In the second, anonymous, commentary on Ave praeclara maris stella in the edition by HUYGENS (2000), pp. 442–490, the commentator uses this method, generally quoting a full strophe before a new section of commentary text. Towards the end of the commentaries in both Ox6 and Gr1, this method is sometimes abandoned in favour of the more ‘interwoven’ model used by Alan of Lille.

59 Extracts from Alan’s Expositio exemplifying his methods are found in Section 3.2 below.

In the commentary by Caesarius of Heisterbach, the sequence text is sometimes incorporated in a flowing manner into the expository text and sometimes parts of strophes are quoted at the beginning of a section, functioning almost as a heading; see the edition in HUYGENS (2000), pp. 425–436.

60 See WIELAND (1983).

61 Vernacular glosses are found alongside Latin ones in Mü2 and Pr4.
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clause, which may be achieved by means either of words or of symbols that indicate how the words should be construed. In the sequence commentary material, a very common type of syntactical gloss consists of sets of Arabic numerals. If the words of the sequence are read as indicated by the numerical glosses then a prose-like word-order is produced.62 There are whole collections of commentaries where each word in both the hymns and the sequences are furnished with such glosses.63 In the present work, this type of syntactical gloss can be seen in Edition 7: *Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5.*

2.2.1.4 Commentaries

It is hardly possible to generalise about the character of the commentary texts themselves. As will be evident in the editions and the accompanying introductory sections, the sequence commentary is a diverse genre. In the present volume we will find texts that range from Alan’s deeply philosophical and theological work to the commentary of *Ox1* (Edition 2), in which emphasis is placed on expanding the reader’s Latin vocabulary. We will find one commentary paying specific attention to musical theory and terminology (Edition 3: *Expositio St2*) and others that are more concerned with doctrinal matters, the correct interpretation of metaphors and identification of allusions in the sequence, as with the texts belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’. In addition, a number of more elementary commentaries range from brief literal paraphrase and the occasional word explanation to the more comprehensive, albeit basic, commentary in *Mù5* (Edition 7).65

2.3 OBSERVATIONS REGARDING INTENDED AUDIENCE AND USE

The range and the diversity of the sequence commentaries bear upon the intriguing question of intended audiences for these texts. The same can be said

---

62 An example of how these glosses function is found in Section 8.5.2 below.
63 For example in the manuscripts *Mù2, Go3* (although some pieces lack glosses altogether), *Kìb2, Me1* and *Sa1*.
64 Examples of different gloss-types and their functions in this commentary may be found in Section 8.5.2 below; see also Plate 12.
65 The manuscript *Ox7* is concerned mainly with prose paraphrases of the sequences. Other examples of elementary commentaries are found, for example, in the manuscripts *La3, Me2, Mü2* (in the second collection of commentaries), *Ox3, Ox5* and *Pr3*. 
for the prologues, where certain differences may be discerned in the methodological accounts and in the choice of auctoritates used for the basis of the argumentation. Although it is not possible to answer the question of intended audience completely and exhaustively here, I shall nevertheless make a few observations regarding this issue.

Concerning the prologues, a few differences may be noted regarding the professed utilitas of the sequences and their causa finalis in the 'Aristotelian tradition'.\(^6\) In the prologue Dicit Aristoteles (Edition 4), in which the supremacy of theology is linked to a definition of the concept of 'justice', the final cause of the sequences is said to be the knowledge of that which is treated, whereby eternal happiness may be obtained. A similar emphasis on the happiness that can be procured by science in general and by theology in particular is also seen in the causa finalis in the prologue Sapientia vincit malitiam (Edition 6). This goal is in contrast to that found in the prologue Vir speculativus (Edition 5), in which the causa finalis, and one part of the duplex utilitas of the sequences,\(^6\) is said to be the knowledge of the vocabulary of the sequences.\(^6\) A slightly greater interest for etymology and word definition can also be detected in the commentary on Ad celebres rex connected to this prologue. The two latter prologues also differ as regards the auctoritates used in their discussions of the status of theology. Where Sapientia vincit malitiam refers to passages from Scripture, we find in Vir speculativus quotations from philosophers and known school-texts.\(^6\)

The pedagogical function suggested by these sequence commentaries makes it interesting and valuable to study the focus and the principal concerns of the commentators. To identify both the presupposed and the emphasised information in the texts would certainly be meaningful in attempting to outline the intended audiences and the different uses of the commentaries.

As has been mentioned above, the commentaries display different degrees of complexity ranging from the extremes of very brief and literal paraphrase to the deeply philosophical text of Alan of Lille. In addition, a number of identifiable aims and principal concerns in the separate sequence commentaries suggest

\(^6\) See further Chapter 8 below.

\(^6\) The other part of the utilitas of the sequences is the divine remuneration given for the praise.

\(^6\) A similar goal is found in the colophon to the sequence commentary collection of Oël; see Section 6.2 below.

\(^6\) A comparison between the prologues Vir speculativus and Sapientia vincit malitiam (and their accompanying commentaries) is found in Section 8.4.3 below.
that the genre was of use for audiences at different levels of proficiency, a proficiency which could pertain to the Latin language, grammar, or literary or theological studies. Among the texts edited here, for instance, three expositions in the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ (Chapter 8, Editions 4–6) seem to be aimed at a fairly sophisticated audience: the thorough analyses of metaphorical language, the wealth of theological interpretations and the nature of the linguistic comments render these texts well rounded and comprehensive commentaries covering a wide range of issues. The ‘elementary version’ in the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ (Edition 7) shows, however, how a text could be adapted for changing needs in order to accommodate a less advanced audience.

A more specific focus is detectable in the commentary of Ox1 (Edition 2), where the principal concern is set on vocabulary, suggesting a text composed primarily for linguistic instruction, although doctrinal comments are not absent. Such a limited and particular focus is not visible in the commentary of St2 (Edition 3) nor of Ox6 (Edition 1) even though they too clearly have specific objectives. In St2, a commentary of a fairly high literary level and thus aimed at a more advanced audience, prominence is given to music theory and its terminology, whereas in Ox6 the angelic hierarchy forms the central core of the commentary. The latter text is to a certain extent an elementary version of Alan's *Expositio prosae de angelis*, although taking into account the subtlety of the subject-matter and the degree of difficulty as far as its language is concerned, it does not seem to be aimed at an elementary audience.

In one of her studies of hymn glosses, Susan Boynton has argued that the glosses could have been used as a means to deepen the understanding of the chants among singers in a monastic choir. It is not impossible that the sequence commentaries in some cases could have fulfilled a similar role, although a fundamental difference between the hymn glosses and the sequence commentary is that they generally appear in different kinds of books: chant books and instructional miscellanies. The inclusion of sequence commentaries in such miscellanies, often together with grammatical texts and vocabularies, is suggestive of them being part of a school curriculum and used in a formalised teaching situation of some kind. This is then quite different from the glossed Psalter Boynton refers to in her article, which is used by a single individual striving to improve his own contribution in the choir.

CHAPTER 2

Sequence commentaries, together with hymn commentaries, were part of a growing commentary literature developing from the twelfth century onwards, when new intellectual milieux were forming new approaches to texts of different kinds, including both Scripture and secular works. To comment on the sequence with the same or a similar method used for expounding on Scripture, the Psalms and the hymns could suggest an ambition to accord the same status to the genre of the sequence as to other poetic texts within the liturgy—to form a system where all the liturgical texts were provided with specialised commentaries.

Kruckenbeerg, though speaking of early-sixteenth-century works on the sequence and the activities surrounding Notker's six-hundredth anniversary, observes that this interest in the sequence grew as the importance of the genre itself was fading; after the twelfth century the genre had hardly developed stylistically. After that, Kruckenbeerg argues, ‘the sequence had become academic, an object of learned historical discussion because it was connected more with the past than with current practice.’

The manuscript material studied here seems to attest to the observation made by Kruckenbeerg, although it is evident that this interest in the sequence from a textual point of view originated already at the close of the twelfth century and seems to have grown steadily over the centuries. In these commentaries, the sequence text can be approached from a wide array of different angles, depending on the varying needs of the master and the students. What we seem to witness is a transformation of the sequence from a poetic composition performed in the liturgy to an object of study.

71 K RUCKENBERG (1997), p. 13; the wealth of sequence commentaries in early printed books seems furthermore to attest to Kruckenbeerg's theory.
THE TEXTS
3 Basis and Background

In this part, seven commentaries on the sequence *Ad celebres rex* and the prologues connected to four of them will be presented and critically edited. Each separate text edition is preceded by an introductory section, in which are included manuscript descriptions and an account of the content of the edited text, also comprising a brief examination of source texts and a comparison with other commentaries edited here. Since the material has demanded that different editorial methods be applied in the editions, depending on the characters of the textual witnesses to each text, these introductions also include more detailed discussions on textual problems and certain necessary emendations in the editions. The texts to be included in this study have been chosen from a number of commentaries to *Ad celebres rex* on account of their differing literary and pedagogical strategies and commentary techniques, in order to present expositions that both represent separate traditions and are of interest as regards their content.

In Edition 1 (Chapter 5) two texts are edited from the manuscript Ox6: the prologue, here entitled *Quoniam . . . tria cantica*, introducing a small commentary collection, and the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* from this collection. The commentaries on *Ad celebres rex* in the manuscripts Ox1 and St2 are edited in Edition 2 (Chapter 6) and Edition 3 (Chapter 7) respectively.1

Editions 4, 5, 6 and 7 contain the commentaries in the manuscripts Gr1, Kf4, Kf1 and Mü5, together with the prologues *Dicit Aristoteles*, *Vir speculativus* and *Sapientia vincit malitiam* attached to the three first commentaries respectively. These texts constitute a distinct group, which I have labelled the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ on account of the character and nature of the argumentation of the prologues and commentaries. Consequently, these commentaries are treated under the same chapter, Chapter 8 below, with a separate section for each commentary.

The four prologues edited in this work, *Dicit Aristoteles*, *Vir speculativus*, *Sapientia vincit malitiam* and *Quoniam . . . tria cantica*, introduce collections of commentaries to sequences and are thus not immediately linked specifically to

---

1 In Ox1 there is no prologue to the collection of commentaries; see further Section 6.1 below. In St2 there is a prologue, *Dicit Aristoteles*, and a commentary collection, but the commentary edited in Edition 3 is a separate piece, written in as an addition after the collection of sequence commentaries; see Section 7.1 below.
the commentary on *Ad celebres rex*. These prologues have nevertheless been
included in this study since the methodology and principles set forth in them
serve to contextualise both the sequence texts and their commentaries in an
interpretational framework, which is of importance for identifying distinct
commentary traditions and for a discussion of the possible audiences for the
separate texts.

Before the prologues and the commentaries are presented, though, some
further preliminary remarks and clarifications are in order. First, the text of the
sequence in focus here, *Ad celebres rex*, will be treated briefly together with some
aspects of its angelic theme, which will be of importance for the editions of the
commentaries. The *Expositio prosae de angelis*, the commentary by Alan of Lille
on this sequence, which at the same time happens to be the earliest currently
known example of a sequence commentary, will also be discussed with regard
both to its style and content and to its influence on the other commentaries in
our material. Thereafter follows an account of the editorial aims and methods
applied in the editing of the texts together with general principles regarding
orthography, punctuation, the *apparatus criticus and fontium*, and the layout of the
texts in the edition.

3.1 **THE SEQUENCE *AD CELEBRES REX***

*Ad celebres rex* is a sequence for the feast of St Michael on 29 September, and he
is therefore naturally part of its main theme, but in conjunction with the
exhortation to sing praises to God, all angels and their respective troops are
mentioned and addressed in the text.2

The opening strophes are an invitation to sing praises to God on the feast of
St Michael. The author then moves on to treat all angels, calling them God’s
primeval creatures, dividing their ninefold hierarchy into groups of three and
touching briefly upon their offices in the attributes to each. Michael, Gabriel
and Raphael are mentioned specifically, each with his own identifier: ‘the satrap
of heaven’, ‘giving the true message of the word’ and ‘the little slave of life’
respectively. The angels are furthermore described as the innumerable ministers

---

2 The sequence text is edited in AH 7, 178 (as *Hoc celebres rex*), and in AH 53, 190 (as *Ad
celebres rex*). The text is reproduced here as Appendix 1 with a critical apparatus presenting
the variants used in the commentaries edited here that are also reported by AH. For a
thorough study of the angelic theme in this sequence, see IVERSEN (1996); see also IVERSEN
and assistants of God in the heavenly hall to which Christ will lead the hundredth sheep and the tenth drachma, alluding to the Scriptural passages in Daniel 7, 10 for the number of angels and to the parables in Matthew 18, 12–14 and Luke 15, 1–10 for the sheep and the drachma that were both lost but later found. The final strophes of the sequence depict how both angels and humans in unison sing praises to God.

The earliest manuscript sources for this sequence come from France—from Limoges, Autun, Auch/Aurillac and Moissac. According to Gunilla Iversen, the earliest currently known textual witness, a troper from Auch/Aurillac, can be dated to before 1000. The sequence clearly had a wide transmission across Europe from a relatively early date, as textual witnesses from the eleventh century are found in France, Germany, England and Italy.

From the critical apparatus of the two editions of this sequence in AH, it is clear that the text as transmitted in the manuscript sources exists in several versions. This is also detectable in our commentaries, which do not always present the same sequence lemmata in the texts. One of the main and most interesting variants concerns the first line. All of our commentators use a text which opens with the words *Ad celebres rex*, which is the most widespread version. The variant *Has celebres rex* seems to have been the preferred text in the early southern French manuscripts and could possibly also have been the original reading. Among the commentaries studied here it seems that some of

---

3 AH 7, 178; AH 53, 190. For Italian sources of this sequence see also Brunner (1985), p. 207.
4 Iversen (1996), p. 123, n. 14. This is the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 1118, fol. 223v.
5 AH 53, pp. 307–309. It was in truth an international sequence, which is one of the reasons for choosing to base this study on commentaries on this sequence; see also Chapter 1 above.
6 In the edition of the sequence in AH 7, 178, the editor, G. M. Dreves, argues that the version *Ad celebres rex* derives from a scribal error, confusing the letters *s* and *d* in *As* without the initial *h*. Dreves also proposes the manuscript Paris, BnF lat. 1138, originating from St Martial, as a possible source for the error. Interestingly enough, in the edition of the sequence in AH 53, the editors C. Blume and H. M. Bannister dismiss the variant *Has celebres rex* as a ‘verderbte Lesart’ (AH 53, p. 309). There seems to have been a similar confusion in the Moissac source, Paris, BnF n.a. lat. 1871, where the *h* is written inside the large initial *A* (this page is reproduced in Iversen (2001) as Plate 33). The variant *Ad celebres rex* is more difficult syntactically as the verb *pango* must then be construed with the preposition *ad*. In the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ it will become clear that this was a demanding line for the commentators; see further Chapter 8.
the expositions belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ display a certain knowledge of the version Has celebres rex.\footnote{See Edition 5: Expositio Kf4, lines 55–56, and Edition 6: Expositio Kf1, lines 50–51.}

There is a medieval tradition attributing this sequence text to Gerbert of Aurillac (†1003), who was a master in Reims, appointed archbishop of Ravenna in 998 and later took charge of the Catholic Church as Pope Sylvester II for the last five years of his life. This tradition is adhered to by Alan of Lille in his commentary on the sequence, the \textit{Expositio prosae de angelis}, and the attribution is repeated in the commentary fragment heavily indebted to Alan’s exposition in the manuscript \textit{Ox4} mentioned above.\footnote{See Section 2.1 above and Section 3.2.1 below.} Further instances attesting to this medieval tradition are reported in the \textit{Histoire littéraire de la France}, where a twelfth-century historian writing a \textit{Lives of the popes} maintains that \textit{Ad celebres rex} is written in a style characteristic of Gerbert.\footnote{\textit{Histoire littéraire}, vol. 6, p. 586. This text is also printed as the introduction to Gerbert’s writings in PL 139.} It is further said in the \textit{Histoire} that this testimony could have influenced the chronicler Alberic of Trois Fontaines (†after 1252), who makes the same remark. In the fourteenth century, the music theorist Jacques de Liège also attributes authorship of this sequence to Gerbert in his treatise \textit{Speculum musicae}.\footnote{Jac. Leod., \textit{spec. mus.}, 6, 18.}

I will not attempt here to settle the question regarding authorship for this sequence, although it is an interesting and intriguing one. The strong predilection for words of Greek origin apparent in the sequence, such as \textit{agalma}, \textit{uranicus}, \textit{pneuma}, \textit{cathegorizo}, \textit{hyperlyricus} and \textit{usia} to name but a few, seem nevertheless to place it firmly in a cultural context where foreign and poetic words of this kind were in vogue.\footnote{See further \textsc{Iversen} (1996), p. 102.} It is also clear that the author, whoever it may be, shows familiarity with and a certain dependence on the first and most influential study of the angels, the \textit{Celestial hierarchy} of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (ca 500).

\section*{3.1.2 The angelic theme and the sources for the commentators}

The main theme of the sequence—the angels and the celestial hierarchy—naturally affects the commentary texts. This subject becomes one of the central issues in the expositions, although in varying degrees of depth and detail. The
amount of medieval writing on angels is vast and the commentators had access to an abundance of sources for explaining the nature and the functions of the angels.

The foundations of medieval Christian angelology were already laid in the patristic era. In Scripture angels appear in various books and guises; these passages were commented upon and treated exegetically by many of the Fathers, although most important for the later development of medieval angelology were the writings of Augustine and Jerome. Their general interpretations and understandings regarding the angels remained practically unchallenged in the subsequent centuries. In the following, we will briefly look at two of the most influential figures in medieval angelology, Dionysius and Gregory the Great.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite

The works of Dionysius, who for a long time was believed to be Paul’s disciple as mentioned in Acts 17, 34, are nowadays held to have been written sometime around 500. His works are characterised by a strong Neo-Platonic mystical influence and enjoyed great authority throughout the Middle Ages. In the ninth century, Charles the Bald asked John Scottus Eriugena († 877), head of the palace school, to translate the treatise on the celestial hierarchies, amongst other works, from Greek into Latin, a feat which was accomplished in 862.

The Dionysian hierarchical scheme places the Angels, the Archangels and the Principalities in the first and lowest sub-hierarchy, the Powers, the Virtues and the Dominions in the second, and in the third and the highest triad are found the Thrones, the Cherubim and the Seraphim. Through these nine orders divine illumination emanates from the Highest Being in accordance with the capacity of each order; the higher the order, the more direct the contemplation and the divine illumination. This scheme thus implies that the

---

12 In addition to the Celestial Hierarchy, which is of importance for our commentators, Dionysius’s surviving corpus consists of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, Mystical Theology, The Divine Names and ten letters.

13 Thirty years prior to John Scottus’s translation, Hilduin of St Denis in 838 had translated the Dionysian works into Latin, although the quality of the translation made it less useful. Hilduin nevertheless “contributed greatly to the status of Pseudo-Dionysius by conflating three persons—the author of the texts, the Dionysius of Acts 17:34, and the Dionysius who was the first bishop of Paris—thereby constituting a rather venerable authority indeed”; Keck (1998), p. 55.
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higher orders do not intervene in human affairs; only the lowest order of the angels interacts with and illuminates human life.14

Dionysius's influence on the sequence text may principally be observed in the division of the ninefold angelic hierarchy into groups of three, although the order of the separate angelic troops does not strictly follow that of Dionysius.15

Gregory the Great

Perhaps the most important and most influential theologian as far as medieval doctrine on angels is concerned was Gregory the Great, who presents a different angelic hierarchy which is in contrast to the static nature of the Dionysian scheme.16 Besides the inversion of the orders of the Principalities, the Powers and the Virtues, the main difference is in his understanding of the nature of the angelic orders, which are each attributed a special function. Many of them also fulfil important roles in the communication between God and man. According to Gregory, the angelic spirits make announcements of varying degrees of importance (the Angels and the Archangels), ward off malignant spirits (the Powers) or perform miracles and signs (the Virtues). However, Gregory is not unaware of the Dionysian system. In his Homily 34 on Luke 15, 1–10, Gregory refers explicitly to Dionysius and the difference between the two systems. The discrepancy is to some extent resolved in that he imparts a difference between administering and assisting angels, citing the well-known reference in Daniel 7, 10 to the thousands upon thousands who administer and the myriads upon myriads who assist.17

Gregory's understanding and analyses of the angels are found for instance in numerous passages throughout his *Moralia in Iob* and *Homiliae in Hierochilem*,

---

14 Chapters 6–9 of the *Celestial Hierarchy* treat the angelic hierarchy. Chapter 13 is entirely devoted to explaining why a seraph could be said to have purified the prophet Isaiah. For the Latin text, see Joh. Scot., *ier. Dion*.

15 Contrary to the remark in D'ALVERNY (1965), p. 86 and again in the apparatus of the edition p. 211, n. 47, the order of the angels in the sequence does not follow any of the hierarchical schemes set up by patristic or medieval theologians. In the sequence the order is: Angels, Archangels, Principalities, Virtues, Powers, Dominions, Thrones, Cherubim and Seraphim. In the Dionysian scheme, Virtues and Powers appear the other way round, while Gregory proposes a reversal of three of the orders: Angels and Archangels are followed by Virtues, Powers, then Principalities. Alan of Lille explains the divergence in the sequence as poetic licence; his own preferred scheme is Gregory's (Alan. Ins., *expos. pros. angel.*, p. 211).

16 D'ALVERNY (1965), p. 86.
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but his Homily 34 on Luke, which is also part of the traditional reading in the Office for the feast of St Michael, functions almost as a concise compendium on his angelological position.

Interpretations very similar to those found in Gregory’s writings were voiced by Isidore of Seville, who devoted Chapter 5 in Book 7 of his *Etymologiae* to the investigation of angels, their names, their nature and their offices. His text functions as one of the sources for the commentators in this material.18

Later sources

With John Scottus’s translation and commentary on Dionysius’s *Celestial Hierarchy*, a major work devoted entirely to the subject of the angels was made available to the Latin-reading West, although it was not until the beginning of the twelfth century and the rise of the cathedral schools that the writings of Dionysius made a larger impact on medieval angelology. “Through these cathedral schools, Pseudo-Dionysius entered into the *Sentences* and hence irrevocably into academic theology in the Middle Ages and beyond.”19 In Peter Lombard’s *Libri quattuor sententiarium*, the second to eleventh distinctions in Book 2 are devoted to the subject of angels. Through collecting and commenting on authoritative statements and arguments from the Fathers and other later writers, he scrupulously treats all aspects of the angels in one comprehensive text, and, when necessary, resolves seemingly contradictory views. In his ninth distinction he treats the issue of the celestial hierarchy, and Dionysius is indeed referred to as the authority for the threefold division of the ninefold hierarchy, although the order of the angels subsequently enumerated follows Gregory’s system. Gregory is also explicitly mentioned in the ensuing account of the interpretation of the names and the offices of the orders, an account which is textually very faithful to Homily 34, 10.20 Later in the text the Lombard addresses and resolves, again probably following Gregory’s lead, the question of whether the angelic orders are sent to intervene in human affairs,

---

18 See for instance Edition 2: *Expositio Ox1* below.
20 This fact seems to have escaped the notice of Keck, who argues that ‘after the acceptance of the Areopagite’s *Celestial Hierarchy*, his arrangement of the angels became standard’ (Keck (1998), p. 56), and then claims that for ‘those medieval theologians who were uninfluenced by Pseudo-Dionysius or the Lombard, particularly the Cistercians, his [i.e. Gregory’s] scheme was used’ (p. 57). As the Lombard himself uses Gregory’s order for the angels it does not seem to be possible to use this as a criterion to distinguish between different angelic ‘schools’.
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or, as Dionysius claims, are fixed and stable in the heavenly sphere, with the exception of the lowest order.

It was with the universal acclaim and acceptance of Peter Lombard’s *Libri quattuor sententiarum* as the principal school text that angelology received a fixed place in the theological training in the schools. Before, the subject of angels had been addressed wherever angels happened to occur in Scripture, with the result that it was difficult to create a comprehensive overview of the doctrine of the angels and their nature. With Peter Lombard’s work the subject of angelology not only found a place in the schedule but also grew in importance since every subsequent theology master had to lecture on and add his own comments on the *Sententiae*.

The Dionysian revival is especially noticeable in the new translations and commentaries that were composed in the twelfth century by for example Hugh of St Victor and John Sarracenus. That interest in Dionysius continued into the thirteenth century is attested by the commentaries on his works by Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure. Outside the cathedral schools and the universities, monks such as Caesarius of Heisterbach and Bernard of Clairvaux also wrote on the angels, albeit not in the same manner as in the schools.

From the patristic era through the high Middle Ages and into the scholastic period one can discern a basic continuity regarding the central beliefs and interpretations of the angels and their importance and role for humans. Most medieval writers on the subject of angels address these issues in a similar manner, referring to the same Biblical passages. Of course, not all theologians were unanimous in their view on every aspect of the angels, although they mostly agreed on the general assumptions. The scholastics added to the subject of angelology with their interest in metaphysical issues, some of which would contribute to one of the major disagreements between different ‘angelic schools’: the dispute regarding the corporeality of the angels. Are angels pure body or spirit, or both? Are they composed of both matter and form?

21 For the translation by John Sarracenus and a comparison with that made by John Scottus, see THÉRY (1948).

22 See for instance Bernard., *consid.* 5, 3, 5–5, 5, 12. Analyses of angels are also found in his commentary of the Song of Songs (Bernard., *serm. sup. cant.* 5; 19).


24 Thomas Aquinas follows the Dionysian understanding of the angels as pure spirituality, whereas Bonaventure, for example, argued that the principle of hylomorphism, that everything consists of form and matter, must be adhered to; see further KECK (1998), Chapter 5. For an overview of scholastic angelology in the earlier period, see COLISH (1995).
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from controversies such as these, ‘medieval angelological exegesis was [. . . ] remarkably unoriginal. Indeed the most noticeable medieval developments in this area [. . . ] are matters of emphasis rather than originality.’25

In our commentary texts we are never confronted with such problematic issues as this metaphysical question of the form and matter of angels. Instead, more general, less advanced and perhaps ‘safer’ issues are discussed. For the interpretations of the angelic theme in the sequence there is an abundance of sources available for our commentaries, sources which come from different milieux and represent certain ‘schools’ but which nevertheless generally attest to the same things regarding the issues discussed by our commentators.26 In the *apparatus fontium* of the editions a selection from these sources is reported.27

3.2 Alan of Lille’s *Expositio Prosa De Angelis*

In spite of his prolific writings and his epithet *doctor universalis* we do not possess much detailed knowledge about Alan’s life.28 He never attained high office in the church nor a post in the civil service, which makes tracing his career hazardous. The exact date of his birth is unknown,29 but a note by the Cistercian chronicler Alberic of Trois Fontaines (†after 1252) indicates that Alan died at Cîteaux in 1203.30 We do not know at what date he joined the Cistercians, although it must have been towards the end of his life. G. R. Evans suggests that he could have been at Paris for his training at the same time as John of Salisbury, whose account of his school-days and his masters in the *Metalogicon* could then also provide a picture of Alan’s schooling there. Alan seems to have spent time in Chartres, Orléans and Tours, and he was a master at Paris although the exact time and the circumstances are unclear. The appreciation of Alan as a teacher is attested to by one of his students, Raoul of Longchamps, who in his commentary to Alan’s *Anticlaudianus* says that the

26 The ‘Index de angelis’ in PL 219, 37–42, listing numerous important writings on certain aspects on the angels from patristic times up to the thirteenth century, attests to the wealth of material available for our commentators.
27 See Section 4.2.2 below.
28 The following outline of Alan’s life and works is to a large extent built upon the account in D’Alvernny (1965), pp. 11–29; see also Evans (1983), pp. 2–12.
29 A conjectured date for Alan’s birth is 1128, proposed by Hauréau (1886) as reported by D’Alvernny (1965), p. 20, n. 53.
memory of his master moves him to tears. Alan’s teaching seems also to have brought him to Montpellier at some point, as either a secular cleric or a canon, and it seems that it was here he wrote or completed his Distinctiones and the Contra haereticos.

Alan’s writings are numerous and cover a wide spectrum of subjects. His most influential and widely known work is perhaps the versified Anticlaudianus on the perfect man, a work which according to Alan can be read, like Scripture, in literal, moral and allegorical senses. His interest and zeal for pedagogical needs are seen in his Ars praedicandi, a preachers’ manual, in the Distinctiones, a veritable dictionary of theological terms, the Summa quoniam homines and the Regulae theologicae, a collection of theological axioms to show the truth inherent in Christian doctrine. His other writing include sermons, a commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium as well as various poems. Furthermore, he commented on the Song of Songs, the Lord’s Prayer, the creeds and, of importance for us here, on the sequence Ad celebres rex. Thus it seems that his epithet was well earned.

For Alan’s commentary on Ad celebres rex, the Expositio prosae de angelis, the editor Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny reports ten manuscripts containing the work or versions of it, although it is only explicitly attributed to Alan of Lille in the manuscript Up1 from the Brigittine Abbey in Vadstena, Sweden, now at Uppsala. However, there seems to be no reason to doubt this attribution when evidence both external—the inclusion of the work in manuscripts containing Alan’s other writings—and internal—references to numerous parallel passages in Alan’s other works—attest to his authorship of this commentary.

---

31 For an easy overview of his works, sorted according to Alan’s division of the subject of theology, see Evans (1983), pp. 14–19.
34 D’Alverny (1965), pp. 92, 185–190. The page containing the attribution to Alan and the opening paragraphs of his Expositio prosae de angelis is reproduced here as Plate 1. In addition to Alan’s commentary, the other main texts in this manuscript are Matthew of Krakow’s lectures and ‘Speculum felicitatis humanae’. The part containing Alan’s text is dated to 1410; see further MHUU, 2, p. 239.
35 D’Alverny (1965), p. 93. In the source apparatus to the edition, d’Alverny points out numerous similarities between the Expositio and other works by Alan, especially his Distinctiones and Summa quoniam homines.
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The commentary opens with an introduction defining first the word *cantium*, by which term this sequence is referred to. Alan addresses the traditional proemial questions as regards the author of the work, the incitement for the author to compose the work, the subject-matter and the mode of treatment (*modus tractandi*). As has been said above, Alan attributes the authorship of this sequence to Gerbert of Aurillac, later known as Pope Sylvester II; the intent of the author is to render tribute to the feast of St Michael and to disclose the nature, the offices and the orders of the heavenly creatures; the subject-matter is said to be the uncreated spirit; the *modus tractandi* is noted in specific parts of the sequence, identified by Alan as three. The first part invites us to sing praises, according to Alan, which would then make the mode exhortative. The two other parts would seem to be in the laudatory mode, as Alan states that they primarily commend God and the angels.

After this twofold introductory section the commentary proper begins. Alan of Lille examines the text scrupulously, commenting on almost every word. The commentary on the first strophes will here be quoted in full in order to present a specimen of Alan's style and technique.

Sermonem igitur dirigens ad auctorem omnium, ait: *v. rec.* Hic non a fortuna locus commendationis sumitur, sed a natura; non gratia fortune, ut materiales reges, eternus Auctor regnum sortitur, sed potius potentiali naturaliter iure, et ut ab eo terreni regni fragilis secludatur potestas, adnectit: *celice.* Nota ideo specialiter Deum dici regem celestium, cum et terrenorum rex esse appareat, quia in celestibus magis eius Potentia et specialior eius Sapientia relucet, vel quia 'celestia' spiritus celestes animorumque sanctorum dicuntur, in quibus non solum per naturam, verum etiam habitat per gratiam; nec una singularis persona, sed potius *caterua*, ecclesiastica quidem. In hoc fidelium multitudo ad laudem Dei inuitatur, nec una, sed *cuncta*, id est omnes per hoc spirituales fidelium ecclesiae ad glorificandum Deum commomentur. *Clangat*, id est cum quodam clangore in vocem prorumpat.

*Nunc*, id est in Michaelis sollemnitate. *Symphonia*, id est concordi mentis et oris et operis <h>armonia. Symphonia enim dicitur <h>armonia <ex concordi di->versorum sonoritate nascens concinnitas. Unde symphonia dicitur quasi *similium sonorum* 'phonos', id est sonoritas. Unde ergo mentis exultationi respondet oris vocalis applausio, bonique operis executio; ex tali sonoritate quedam nascitur symphonia. Unde ille egregius dictator in suo cantico ait:

---

36 These are then a selection of the regular headings of the ‘type C prologue’, described above in Section 2.2.1.1. The phrase ‘que causa ad hoc opusculum eum inuitauit’ (Alan. Ins., *expos. pros. angel.*, pp. 194–195) could be said to correspond to the heading *intentio auctoris*.

37 The theoretical terms ‘exhortative’ and ‘laudatory’ are not used by Alan himself; the *modus tractandi* is explained by descriptive language.
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Cum vox vitam non remordet
Dulcis est symphonia

Et hoc, non submissa voce, sed canora, ut et exaltatio fit in mentis exultatione, et eleuatio in vocali applausione, et intentio in boni operis executione; vel per ‘symphoniam canoram’ materialis vocum concinnitas intelligi potest, que ex diuersorum in choro canentium voce conformi nasci solet, ad quam materialem symphoniam haec auctor opusculi fideles hortatur, que interioris exultationis interpres esse coniectatur. Et hoc: ad celebres laudes tuas, id est, ut te celebriter laudet. Priuata laus est quando quis in mente laudat Deum, in ore vero tenet silentium; vel quando laudat ore, diffitetur vero corde. Cum vero vocalis laus mentaliter respondet, celebris laus dicitur; vel laus priuata appellatur que ab uno soluitur; celebris vero que a multitudine decantatur. Et quod sub obscuritate dixerat consequenter dicens, atque contio, per hoc iterum ecclesiastica multitudo innuitur; leta, exultatione habita de eternis; per hoc, cantici naturae exprimitur. Promat, non solum corde, sed ore. Odas, id est laudes; ‘odos’ laus interpretatur. Unde in alio canlico reperitur: ‘palinodiam canta’, id est, duplicem laudem; ‘palin’ enim duplex, ‘odos’ laus interpretatur.38

In this passage we may note that the sequence commented upon displays the textual variant Ad celebres rex (for Has celebres rex), as do all sequence commentaries in this material. Other variants noticed in this extract are clangat for the more usual pangat, promat for solvat and leta for nostra, of which clangat is the only variant used and commented upon in another commentary included in this study.39

The sequence lemmata are well incorporated into the commentary text, which moves in and out of the sequence in an almost seamless fashion, as can be seen for instance in the clauses explaining cetera and cuncta. Although Alan does not explicitly state that he will provide syntactical help for the reader by construing the clauses of the sequence, he nevertheless does so in a very elegant manner by commenting on the words not in the order in which they appear in the sequence, but rearranged to create a prose-like word order. If the words in italics are read in the order in which they appear in the passage above, the following text is obtained: ‘o rex celice, cetera cuncta clangat nunc symphonia canora ad celebres laudes atque contio leta promat odas’, which creates a very plain and clear syntactical structure.

Almost every word of the sequence is explained thoroughly. Regarding the word rex, for instance, Alan carefully distinguishes between the nature of and the conditions for God’s power in contrast to the power of terrestrial kings. In

Basis and Background

In a similar manner the modifying attribute celice is also examined and given two separate interpretations. The word symphonia likewise invites a longer analysis, beginning with a definition, which is subsequently further refined before a word-explanation bordering on an etymological analysis is given. To further illustrate the full meaning of symphonia Alan quotes two lines from the sequence Laudes crucis attollamus of Adam of St Victor († ca 1146).\textsuperscript{40} This is the first of two references to other sequence texts in the excerpt. The second can be found towards the end, where Alan mentions an alius canticum in which the phrase palinodium canta is used. This is taken from the third line of the sequence Alle caeleste.\textsuperscript{41} Alan often uses sequence texts as illustrative examples in his writings as can be seen, for instance, in his Distinctiones.\textsuperscript{42}

When comparing the above extract with the corresponding passages in the other commentaries incorporated into this study, the absence of purely grammatical comments, of lengthy etymological analyses and other kinds of lexical information is immediately striking. Such instructive comments are found on occasion in this commentary, but not to the extent revealed by the other texts edited here. In explaining the word inclita in the following, Alan remarks that ‘[. . . ] valde inclita, id est, valde gloriosa, “cleos” enim gloria interpretatur; unde inclitum quasi “valde gloriosum”, ut hec prepositio “in” nota sit intentionis.’\textsuperscript{43} Here we are presented with both an etymology for the word and some knowledge as to word-formation in general.

Most often, this kind of language instruction is embedded in other comments, as can be seen in the explanation of symbolum. The passage is quoted here in its entirety.


---

\textsuperscript{40} Edited in AH 54, 120.
\textsuperscript{41} Edited in AH 7, 98 and AH 53, 97.
\textsuperscript{42} For references to sequence texts in the Distinctiones, see PL 210, for example cols 699a, 722a, 728c, 743b, 779c, 811a, 834c, 901c, 935d, 959d, and 1012d.
\textsuperscript{43} Alan. Ins., expus. pros. angel., p. 197.
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est articulos christiane fidei, symbola, dico, theologa, id est in quibus ‘logos’, id est sermo, fit de ‘theos’; id est de Deo. Theos enim grece, Deus interpretatur latine. Angelorum ministerio frequenter mentibus hominum est intimatum quid Deo sit sentiendum. Vel symbola possunt dici enigmatice locutiones, que alid in superficie littere pretendunt, interius autem altiorem sensum intelligentie custodiant. Verbi gratia, cum legitur angelos habere currus igneos, vel alas, vel huiusmodi, locutio symbolica est; unde et Dionysius in Jerarchia has locutiones vocat symbolicas. Dicuntur autem huiusmodi locutiones symbola a ‘syn’, quod est simul, et ‘olon’, quod est totum, quia multiplex scientia in his sermonibus continetur, quia in superficie littere resonat litteralis intelligentia; interius autem et tropologia et anagogica intelligentia clauditur.44

The original meaning of symbolum as an individual’s offered portion or part in a larger whole exemplified in a transferred manner by the Creed will be repeated in some of the subsequent commentaries, although none as prolix and detailed as that of Alan of Lille.45 The brief digression on cathegorizo, which has the character of being a teacher’s opportunity to explain a related albeit not strictly necessary piece of information for the understanding of the sequence, will also appear in other commentaries. Alan’s last interpretation of the word, that it can denote the enigmatic statements in Scripture that are to be understood figuratively is, however, not picked up by the other commentators.46

The words pneuma, seraphin and cherubin lead Alan to present distinctions that separate different meanings of these words according to their spelling: pneuma denotes the spirits whereas (m)neuma denotes the iubilus.47 Seraphin with a final -n is neuter plural, designating the order of the spirits, in contrast to seraphim with a final -m, which is masculine plural and refers to several individuals from the same order. The simple seraph, Alan continues, denotes a single being from that order.48 Alan defers to Jerome for this difference in spelling and meaning, the knowledge of which seems to have been a matter of importance for many of the other commentators studied here, as it was for later grammarians; the same content as in Alan’s distinction is also found in versified form in the Doctrinale of Alexander de Villa-Dei (†1240).49

45 The commentaries belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ present a different etymology; see Section 8.1 below and Editions 4–7.
46 This interpretation seems to derive from Dionysius; see Joh. Scot., ier. Dion., cap. 2.
47 Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 198.
48 Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 212.
49 Alex. Villa-Dei, doctr., 514–517.
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Quite a number of the themes which Alan of Lille picked up and commented upon will be found again in the works of the other commentators presented in this study. Examples of such themes are the question of why man, and not the angel, is created in the image of God and the interpretations of the names Michael, Gabriel and Raphael. The understanding of the phrase dena pars electa in the sequence as referring to human kind being chosen by God to complement the nine orders of angels builds upon the previous references in the sequence to the tenth drachma and the hundredth sheep, and is also repeated in the other commentaries. The fact that all these themes are interpreted in similar ways in the subsequent commentaries does not necessarily imply that all commentators used Alan as their source or model; these interpretations are standard exegetical readings of the Biblical passages on which the sequence text is based.

No commentator escapes the puzzling word *agalma* (Gr. ‘honour; statue; picture’), which is in Latin traditionally translated and understood as ‘image’. The word was a challenge for John Scotus to explain: in his combined translation and commentary on Dionysius’s *Celestial hierarchy* he reports that the Greeks understand *agalma* both as ‘omnia expressam imaginem que intuentibus letitiam efficit’ and as an *idolum vel simulacrum* that shows great similarity to the one whose image or likeness it is. John Scotus also provides an etymology: ‘agalma quippe dictur quasi ἄγαν ἄλμα, hoc est valde excelsum’. Hugh of St Victor settled for *imago* in his translation. Although Alan points out, as do most commentators, that the word is used figuratively here as denoting the heavenly kingdom, he claims its original meaning to be ‘sheepfold’, which is of course fitting in this context: the Lord, the shepherd, brings his sheep, the angels and humans, to the security of the fold. The texts presented here will give several different etymological interpretations for this word.

54 On this word in Limousine sequences, see ELFVING (1962), p. 99.
56 Hugo S. Vict., *hier codd.*, PL 175, 987c
57 The interpretation of the word *agalma* will be discussed in all introductory sections to the subsequent commentaries. It should be noted that all Greek words will be discussed in this specific context formed by the sequence commentaries.
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The most conspicuous feature of this commentary is the digression from the sequence text proper made in connection with the account of the nine angelic orders.58 Alan begins with a definition of the concept of hierarchy, which is thereupon scrutinised thoroughly.59 He identifies three separate hierarchies—the supercelestial, which is the Trinity, the celestial, the angelic orders, and the subcelestial, the humans—and he points out the references to each in the sequence text. For a closer examination of the celestial hierarchy, Alan defers to John Scottus and cites a definition for *ordo angelicus*. In all, Alan attributes five quotations to John Scottus, three of which are introduced with his name. All quotations concern definitions of different concepts of vital importance for the understanding of the celestial hierarchy as described by Alan here. The definition of *ordo angelicus* is accompanied by definitions of *theophania*, of *epiphania* as the highest of the three orders, of *yperphania* as the middle, and of *ypophania* as the lowest order.

These quotations raised the suspicion of H.-F. Dondaine in 1950,60 who was introduced to some of them through Albert the Great. In his commentary on the *Sentences* Albert writes:

> Rejicimus autem verba quorumdam ficta, et contra sententiam Dionysii inventa, quae in nulla translatione inveniuntur. Dicunt enim quidam, quod dividit hierarchiam in epiphaniam et hyperphaniam et hypophaniam.61

In the subsequent paragraph Albert cites the definition for the *epiphania* and his verdict is that neither the words nor the sense is Dionysian; he identifies the sense as Gregorian although the words are not.

Through the careful research performed by Dondaine in search of the origin of these quotations it becomes clear that they were first circulated and used in the twelfth century by a group of scholars influenced by the Porretan school of thought, including Alan of Lille, Simon of Tournai and Radulfus Ardens, who all attribute these quotations explicitly to John Scottus in their writings. The same quotations are found in works by Praepositinus of Cremona (†1210), and Garnier of Rochefort (†1225).62 They continue to appear in various works in the thirteenth century, for example in the *Summa aurea* of William of Auxerre

58 The account and the definitions of the celestial hierarchy occupies pp. 202–210 of Alan’s commentary, that is, a third of the text.
59 This definition and its rendering in *Expositio Ox* are compared in Section 5.3 below.
60 See DONDAYNE (1950).
61 Albert. M., *in sent.*, 2, d. 9, a. 2.
62 For extracts of some of their writings, see DONDAINE (1950).
and other commentaries, although their popularity by that time seems to have been on the wane; according to Dondaine they are not to be found after Albert the Great and Bonaventure.

Dondaine concludes that the quotations must derive from an apocryphal work; neither the definitions nor all the names for the three separate groups are found in John Scottus’s known writings. Furthermore, the definitions of the hierarchy do not respect the Dionysian scheme, as happens in other works by John Scottus, but the order of the angelic troops follows instead Gregory’s system. The nature and the origin of these definitions are also discussed by d’Alverny and, since they cannot be attributable to the ninth-century translator of Dionysius’s works, she points out that their character seems to share similarities with the numerous compendia, florilegia and other learning aids that were produced by the masters and circulated among the students in the twelfth century.63 Admittedly, d’Alverny continues, these particular definitions are not as clear and immediately understandable as, for instance, Hugh of St Victor’s commentary on the Celestial hierarchy. The hellenisms and the fondness for unusual words suggest to d’Alverny a writer thoroughly steeped in rhetoric and grammar wishing to write in accordance with the tastes of certain writers in the twelfth century.

The Expositio prosae de angelis is only one work among Alan’s many in which these definitions are found. They appear also in the Summa quoniam homines, in his Regulae theologicae, in the Hierarchia Alani and to a certain extent in the Distinctiones. D’Alverny proposes Alan, albeit without full certainty, as a possible originator of the John Scottus compendium, remarking that he would at least have been capable of it; he often treats his authorities in a less than faithful manner. If not Alan, d’Alverny continues, it must have been someone whose writings Alan was introduced to shortly after their composition, as he seems to be the first to have used and commented upon them.64

Both the ideas and the language in the Expositio prosae de angelis are complex. This is particularly pronounced in the account of the celestial hierarchy and its abstruse definitions. The commentary is deeply concerned with issues of doctrinal importance, labouring on the explanations and carefully going through alternative interpretations. To some extent Alan is also preoccupied

64 D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 98. On this and the subsequent page d’Alverny shows that the other authors’ usage of the definitions could be indebted to Alan of Lille. It should be pointed out that when Dondaine performed his research in 1950 not all of Alan’s works containing the definitions were known.
with etymology, encyclopaedic information and definitions of words and concepts, but the lasting impression of the text is the high level of ambition conveyed by the author, which is revealed in the subject-matter and the complexity as regards the linguistic level. This is not a text for a new student, but for a reader well beyond the elementary stages and now grappling with more advanced subjects.

3.2.1 The influence of Alan’s *Expositio prosae de angelis*

As will become clear in the following, Alan’s commentary has had a certain impact on the subsequent commentaries on *Ad celebres rex*. Among the texts edited here, the commentary of Ox6, although being one of three in a collection of commentaries, uses Alan’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* as a basis. It could be characterised as a remodelling of Alan’s text with substantial rewritings, quite a few original additions and several abbreviations. A fuller comparison between these two texts will be made in Chapter 5.

In addition to the commentary of Ox6, there is the adaptation of Alan’s text found in the manuscript Ox4 and published by Olleris in 1867, mentioned above.65 This fragment of a text presents an integrated prologue following the structure of Alan’s *Expositio* albeit with some passages rewritten and others omitted. The commentary proper likewise follows Alan’s text generally, but displays some original alterations and additions, the most conspicuous being a digression in connection with *machina mundi* to comment on man as a microcosm with the four bodily humours corresponding to the four elements. Interestingly, there are several similar and identical passages in the two adapted commentaries of Ox4 and Ox6 not found in Alan’s text. The similarities, which could indicate a relation between the two Oxford manuscripts, include both brief phrases and longer passages such as the explanation of the definition of hierarchy.66 In addition to these, there are adapted versions of Alan’s commentary in the manuscripts Ca3 and Zw1, which are referred to and described by d’Alverny in her edition of the *Expositio prosae de angelis*.67

Another kind of influence is revealed in the manuscript Ms2, which presents a large collection of commentaries to both hymns and sequences, all of which are concerned with paraphrases, basic interpretations and word explanations.

---

65 See Section 2.1 above.
67 D’ALVERNY (1965), pp. 188–189. See also the manuscript list in Appendix 2.
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Still, the explanations in the commentary on *Ad celebres reg* in this collection are with very few exceptions faithfully drawn from the *Expositio prosae de angeli*. For example, the passage *catera ecclesiastica quidem [ . . . ] sonoritate nascens concinnitas* in the long quotation above from Alan’s *Expositio* is copied almost verbatim in the commentary of *Me2*. This could suggest a redactor who at some point extracted the purely explanatory passages from Alan’s text, leaving out the longer passages commenting on doctrine and discussing more advanced subjects in order to produce a commentary on a more basic level.

It is of course difficult to say anything with more certainty as regards Alan’s influence on commentaries on *Ad celebres reg* on account of the lack of editions and studies on the genre of the sequence commentary. For the time being, the manuscripts mentioned above and the text in *Ox6*, to be presented and edited in Chapter 5, seem to be the only known examples of texts clearly influenced by Alan of Lille’s commentary. In other texts, such as the commentary in *St2*, there are passages that could perhaps indicate a knowledge of Alan’s exposition.68

---

68 See further Section 7.2 below.
4 Methods and Principles

4.1 Editorial Aims and Methods

It is important to remember that commentaries such as the texts included in this study are utility texts, that is they are texts that were used and adapted for particular and varying functions and milieux. This circumstance greatly affects their textual tradition and their transmission, as Martin West remarks in his Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique:

Some texts were always subject to alteration. Commentaries, lexica and other works of a grammatical nature were rightly regarded as collections to be pruned, adapted or added to, rather than as sacrosanct literary entities. When the rewriting becomes more than superficial, or when rearrangement is involved, one must speak of a new recension of the work, if not of a new work altogether.¹

This specific genre characteristic has in turn affected the editorial methods applied in this work, which have had to be adapted according to the nature and conditions of each individual kind of text. The texts I have chosen to edit here can be said to fall into three separate categories: texts found in one unique source; texts found in more than one manuscript but where the changes, adaptations and textual variants are too numerous and diverse to render a collation fruitful; and texts of a more stable character found in many manuscripts from which a collation of variants can be done and can produce a better text. For each category I have formed a separate set of principles as regards the editorial aims and methods, which will be explained here.

4.1.1 Category 1: the unique textual witness

The editions of texts belonging to Category 1 are made from a single manuscript that is at the same time the only known source of the text in question, as is the case with the prologue Quoniam . . . tria cantica and the commentary in Ox6 as well as the commentaries in Ox1, S12 and Mü5. The principal aim for a Category 1 edition is to establish a text that makes full sense

¹ West (1973), p. 16.
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to the modern reader from the point of view of syntax and content, and at the same time is as close as possible to the text as transmitted in the manuscript. If an emendation is deemed necessary for reasons of syntax, grammar or content, it should wherever possible be made in accordance with a parallel or related passage in the text itself. As this is not always feasible, related passages or similar phrases in other contemporary texts have also been used as models. So far, all the texts in this category are anonymous, which means that it is not possible to make emendations based on an author’s stylistic preferences as seen in his other works. If an explicit or implicit source has been used for the text, emendations of a corrupt or erroneous passage have been made in accordance with this.

Category 1 editions:
Edition 1: Quoniam . . . tria cantica; Expositio Ox6
Edition 2: Expositio Ox1
Edition 3: Expositio St2
Edition 7: Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5

4.1.2 Category 2: the representative manuscript

The second editorial method applies to texts for which many textual witnesses survive but that have nevertheless been edited from a single representative manuscript. This method is applied in the editions of the commentaries of Gr1, Kf4 and Kf1, where the problematic nature of the genre as described above by West becomes very evident. The number and the nature of the adaptations, additions and omissions would render a collated edition with an exhaustive critical apparatus accounting for all the variants barely readable and practically impossible. The commentaries are furthermore affected by the scribe’s choice of whether to copy the whole sequence text in connection with the commentary (together with interlinear glosses) or to provide a prose version of it instead, studded with brief explanations functioning as glosses.

The aim of this type of edition is thus not to recreate an author’s presumed original or even an archetype of the commentary text in question, but instead to present one specific example of such an instructive work. The text is thus edited from a representative manuscript of that textual tradition, chosen on the basis of the quality of the text in combination with an early date. Corrupt and erroneous readings are emended with the help of the other textual witnesses of the same tradition. In such cases, the consensus or near-consensus reading of
the other manuscripts has been used as a corrective. As in the first method described above, explicit or implicit source texts have also influenced emendations in some cases.

Category 2 editions:
Edition 4: *Expositio Gr1*
Edition 5: *Expositio Kf4*
Edition 6: *Expositio Kf1*

4.1.3 Category 3: several textual witnesses

The third category of texts have prompted editions for which several textual witnesses have been collated, as in the editions of the prologues *Dicit Aristoteles*, *Vir speculativus* and *Sapientia vincit malitiam*. In contrast to the commentaries, these introductory texts have shown themselves to be of a more stable character, which could perhaps be accountable to their being considered as more ‘authoritative’ texts or because their logical and syllogistic structure in the argumentative sections to a certain degree prevents pieces from being added or omitted.2 For these texts it has proved useful and possible to apply the more traditional method of collating the extant witnesses in order to establish a text presumed to be closer to an author’s original.

The textual traditions for all three of these prologues are to varying degrees contaminated. The collations have therefore not resulted in the construction of a *stemma codicum* for each text. Furthermore, it could perhaps be argued that a proper stemma ought to take the complete work into consideration, which in this case would mean an inclusion of the total number of commentary texts and, in some cases, the accompanying volume of hymn commentaries, a task which is beyond the scope of the present work.

Instead, I have modified the method presented by Martin West on how to detect and account for contamination as well as on how to proceed in the establishing of a text of such a tradition.3 West proposes that the number of agreements in error between the manuscripts should be shown in a table where

---

2 Admittedly, this holds true only to a certain degree. Among the manuscripts listed in Appendix 2, there are at least four examples in the manuscript list (*Gr3, Sa1, Sf1* and *St1*) of prologues that have been adapted, abbreviated and sometimes combined to form a new text, although the passages containing the syllogistic argumentation are then omitted.

3 See West (1973), pp. 38–41.
each manuscript is given its own column. The figures in the table will then reveal closer or more distant relationships between the witnesses. The theory, in simple terms, is that if two manuscripts rarely or never share an error, then it is likely that they belong to independent traditions; hence the combined testimony of two such independent manuscripts must be considered seriously when judging between readings.

West's method has been successfully employed by David d'Avray in editing medieval Latin sermons. In the introduction to his edition of marriage sermons, he describes the procedure along with its merits and potential objections. A possible risk with using the so-called ‘West tables’ as concerns contamination, d'Avray argues, is that contamination in itself can produce a flawless text: a medieval scribe who has recourse to more than one manuscript could well be able to establish a text practically free from error in much the same way as a modern editor would. In connection with this issue d'Avray stresses the fact that some medieval scribes were themselves users of the texts they were copying, sometimes near-contemporary with the date of composition of the texts, and often part of the same milieu in which the texts were composed and used. Their command of this type of Latin and their knowledge of the textual genres in question ought to be respected, as should their possible corrections of a text. So the end result of d'Avray’s discussion is that West’s method works for one of two reasons:

[...]

either it gives manuscripts whose combined testimony carries weight because they are independent; or it represents the considered opinion of one or more scribes whose judgement commands respect. The former scenario remains the most probable. Either way the use of ‘West tables’ can be helpful in resolving uncertainties.

For establishing the texts of Category 3 editions, which are exclusively prologues as has been mentioned, the following method has been used. A base manuscript has been chosen that is both of an early date and displays a text of good quality. A third criterion is that the manuscript should also contain a commentary to Ad celebres rex, also of a good textual quality. (This will then

---

4 The following is a recapitulation of a much more detailed, well argued and eloquent passage in D'AVRAY (2001), pp. 38–40.
5 The term is coined by d'Avray and will be used in the following to refer to the tables showing agreements in error and alternative readings between manuscripts.
6 D’AVRAY (2001), p. 40, original emphasis.
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constitute the ‘representative manuscript’ in the edition of the commentary in accordance with the principles for editions of Category 2 texts.)

All other textual witnesses have been collated against the text of the base manuscript. As there are traces of contamination, to a greater or lesser extent, in all three textual traditions, lists have been made that account for all instances of agreement between pairs of manuscripts, that is to say agreements both in proper errors and other alternative, but discarded, readings. This is thus a modification of the method proposed by West, who speaks only of agreements in error, since I have judged it more profitable for these texts to include all agreements. The list of instances contains the same information as the critical apparatus but has the advantage of providing an immediate overview of the nature of the errors and other discarded readings that two manuscripts share.

The results of the lists are shown in two tables: the first accounts for the number of agreements between two textual witnesses, agreements which could also be shared by other manuscripts; the second table accounts for agreements exclusive to two manuscripts. The tables are included in the introductory section to each prologue whereas the lists of common errors and variants are found in Appendix 4.

The two tables work in combination with each other in such a way that they can reveal, for example, a link between two manuscripts sharing many readings and errors, but can also show that the link is not necessarily exclusive, that is, that there are no unique agreements. Conversely, the tables reveal instantly if two manuscripts seem to be independent of each other. If a link between two textual witnesses is detected, then the list of instances in the appendix will provide documentation of all the agreements, to enable an examination of the nature of the relation. Since the tables include both proper errors and alternative readings, it is necessary to check the nature of the agreements. In some cases the agreements may be of such minor significance that the manuscripts could be judged to be independent nevertheless. The combined testimony of two independent manuscripts has been considered in the

---

7 For an enumeration of variants not reported in the critical apparatus, see Section 4.2.3 below.
8 An attempt was made to sort the agreements into errors, sauts du même au même or other major redispositions, and alternative readings, but the outcome was unsatisfactory; the brevity of the texts and the nature of the variations made the results too disparate to function as a basis for the discussion.
establishing of the texts. The tables have been used in conjunction with the list of instances to identify and examine the interrelations or non-relations between manuscripts, and thus form the basis for my discussion of the manuscript tradition for each prologue.

Category 3 editions:
Edition 4: *Dicit Aristoteles*
Edition 5: *Vir speculatius*
Edition 6: *Sapientia vincit malitiam*

### 4.2 General Editorial Principles

The general principles set out here apply to all editions in the present work. Exceptions or additions to these for particular editions are found in the introductory chapter to the edited text in question. For easier orientation in the texts of the commentaries, the lemmata from the sequence are printed in capital letters. As mentioned above in Section 3.1, the sequence text is not stable but transmitted with several variations. I have therefore chosen to consider as a lemma any variant reported in the critical apparatus to the editions of the texts in AH 7 and AH 53. A transcript of the sequence text from AH 53, with the variants used by the commentators in this material placed in a critical apparatus, is found as Appendix 1. As regards Biblical references, only words cited verbatim from Scripture have been italicised; this is taken to include minor transpositions and deviations in spelling, but not in grammatical form. The edition of the commentary in *Mss* has a distinct layout from the others, the principles for which are described in the introductory chapter to that edition.

#### 4.2.1 Orthography and punctuation

As a general rule, the orthography of the single manuscript, for the Category 1 and 2 editions, or of the base manuscript for Category 3 editions, is generally

---

9 For examples of instances when the readings of independent manuscripts have been discussed and considered, see Sections 8.3.2.1 and 8.4.2.1 below. It should go without saying that syntax and content have naturally been the principal guides for choosing between readings.

10 The only exceptions are the forms *seraphin* and *cherubin* with a final -n, seen in all the commentaries edited here. The two editions in AH display these names with a final -m.
followed closely. This means that in addition to expected medieval spellings, such as e for the diphthongs ae and oe or -ei- for -hi-, other idiosyncracies of the manuscripts are also retained. These include for instance double consonants where a single is expected and vice versa,\textsuperscript{11} interchanges between f and ph, j and y, s and c, as well as additions or omissions of the letter h. Special notice should be made to the treatment of the letter g. A pronunciation of g as soft before the vowels e and i is sometimes reflected in the spelling, for example in the word \textit{theologia}, which in many manuscripts, and hence sometimes in the editions here, is rendered \textit{theoloya}.\textsuperscript{12} A related phenomenon is the insertion of a g in a corresponding position, which can be seen in the word \textit{alienum} spelt \textit{aligenum}.\textsuperscript{13} The spelling in the manuscripts is not consistent, and this is therefore true also of the editions. Certain words will appear in different guises, perhaps most noticeable in the word \textit{hierarchia}, for which the spellings \textit{ierarchia}, \textit{yerarchia}, \textit{gerarchia} and \textit{cherarchia} are found. Where necessary, in order to avoid misinterpretation, a remark preceded by \textit{id est} (i.e.) has been made in the critical apparatus.

A few standardisations have nevertheless been made. Irrespective of the spelling in the manuscripts, the letter v is used for the consonantal sound and u for the semi-consonantal and the vocalic. The different renditions of the letters -ii in the manuscripts have been standardised in the editions. These changes have not been remarked upon in the \textit{apparatus criticus}. Furthermore, in some manuscripts a vacillation can be noticed in the use of vowels. This concerns especially the usage of e for i and o for a and vice versa, but also to a lesser extent e for a and vice versa. In the editions, such interchanges have been disregarded and the spellings normalised, but always with a remark in the \textit{apparatus criticus}. These standardisations have also been made in cases where the alternative spelling of a word could be attested to reflect the local pronunciation. The main reason for the normalisation of the use of vowels is that the scribes’ indiscriminate vacillation renders it impossible to determine with certainty whether an e for an i reflects the pronunciation in the region or is a simple scribal error, especially when it changes the case of the word so that it no longer agrees with the syntax.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} The only exception to this rule is when a \textit{linea nasalis} is missing. Such corrections are, however, always commented on in the \textit{apparatus criticus}.

\textsuperscript{12} The same can be seen in other words ending in -gus or -gus as for instance \textit{anagoycus} and \textit{tropoloycus} in Edition 6: \textit{Sapientia vincit malitiam}, line 146.

\textsuperscript{13} See for instance Edition 6: \textit{Sapientia vincit malitiam}, line 151.

\textsuperscript{14} For the change in the quality of vowels, see VAANANEN (1981), §§ 52–58.
Abbreviated words are resolved in accordance with the general spelling of the scribe as displayed in the manuscript. The use of majuscules has been conformed to modern standards. A modern, mainly syntactical, punctuation has been introduced in the texts.

4.2.2 The *apparatus fontium*

The identified similar passages and sources to the prologues and the commentaries are reported in the *apparatus fontium*. Allusions or non-verbatim quotations are preceded by *cfr* (*confer*) in the apparatus. As a rule, the source texts have not been reproduced but are merely referred to. However, when the allusion demands a knowledge of the source in order to be comprehended, or when it has been changed so as not to conform with the sense of the original, the passage referred to has been quoted in full in the apparatus. This is also true for quotations containing a suspicious reading or a major textual problem, or in cases where the source is not readily available in a modern edition, but only in incunabula, other early editions, or on the internet.

As we have already seen, medieval theologians writing on the angels produced numerous important works examining the angelic nature, their creation, their appearances in Scripture, their offices and other related issues. In the editions here, the sources reported in the *apparatus fontium* have been limited to include primarily the sources explicitly mentioned by the commentators, when it has been possible to locate them. In addition, Gregory’s Homily 34 is generally reported in the apparatus, since this text was part of the reading for the Office, as mentioned above, while Isidore and Jerome are included as being the earliest sources for many of the interpretations. Peter Lombard’s *Libri quattuor sententiarum* are also referred to, when applicable, since his account of the angels became the standard school-text on which all subsequent writers and theology masters drew in one way or another.

When a text is heavily indebted to a single author, references are made to that text and not necessarily to the earliest known source for the interpretation. An example is Edition 2: *Expositio Ox1*, which draws heavily upon Isidore. Here, the *apparatus fontium* contains primarily references to his *Etymologiae* even though many of the interpretations are also found in Jerome’s *Liber*...

---

15 See Section 3.1.2 above.
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interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum. In some cases several sources for the same passage are reported in the apparatus.

This selective approach has been chosen for practical reasons. It means that the apparatus fontium makes no claims to being exhaustive and that other important works such as the translations and commentary on Dionysius’s Celestial hierarchy by Hugh of St Victor and the writings on the angels by Bernard of Clairvaux are generally not referred to. It is my hope that the present edition can form the basis for further studies on the selection and use of sources of the medieval commentators on sequences.

Possible sources for the sequence text itself are not quoted in the apparatus fontium.

4.2.3 The apparatus criticus

There are separate principles for the critical apparatus depending on which of the three methodical categories the edited text belongs to.

The basic principle for editions of texts belonging to the first two categories is that the text is edited from a single manuscript. The full text as transmitted in the manuscript is thus printed in the edition, either in the text itself or in the apparatus criticus. This means that with the exception of the general standardisations described above, all corrections are remarked upon in the apparatus. Marginal notes, scribal errors and corrections are also reported.

For Category 2 editions, simple scribal errors in the representative manuscript are emended without referring to the other manuscripts for support. All other emendations, however, are made with a note in the apparatus criticus on the manuscript(s) from which the reading is adopted.

The editions of texts belonging to Category 3 are the result of collations of several textual witnesses with a base manuscript to guide in the choice between readings of minor value. In these editions certain variant readings in the manuscripts have not been recorded in the apparatus. These include variations in the use of the pronouns hic / ille / iste / idem / is, variations of ergo / igitur / autem / enim / vero, videlicet / sicut / id est, and transpositions of two words, or three if one of them is a preposition, a conjunction or the copula. In all the above cases the base manuscript has determined the form to be printed in the edition.

These editions preserve the orthography of the base manuscript and orthographical variants in the other manuscripts, for example v for f or p for b, are not reported in the critical apparatus. Simple scribal errors in the other
manuscripts, such as an omitted horizontal stroke representing $u$ or $m$, have likewise been left out. The same rule applies to corrections made by the scribe if the result of the correction is a reading identical to the printed text. Exceptions to these rules have, however, been made in certain textually problematic or otherwise interesting passages.

With these exceptions, I have chosen to include in the *apparatus criticus* all other discarded readings of the manuscripts, since this is the first edition to be made of these texts. Subsequent manuscript discoveries may cast new light on the interrelations of the textual witnesses, the examinations of which will be facilitated by a comprehensive critical apparatus.
4.3 **ABBREVIATIONES ET SIGNA**

**Abbreviationes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abbr.</td>
<td>abbreviatio, -onis etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
<td>addidit / addiderunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>app. crit.</td>
<td>apparatus criticus, apparatus critici etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cett.</td>
<td>ceteri codices, ceterorum codicum etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cfr</td>
<td>confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod.</td>
<td>codex, -icis etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codd.</td>
<td>codices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr.</td>
<td>correctio, -onis etc., correxit / correxerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del.</td>
<td>delevit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloss.</td>
<td>glossa, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>id est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlin.</td>
<td>interlinearis, -e etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg.</td>
<td>legitur / leguntur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin.</td>
<td>linea, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litt.</td>
<td>littera, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marg.</td>
<td>margo, -inis etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om.</td>
<td>omisit, -erunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>pagina, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praem.</td>
<td>praemisit / praemiserunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>recto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>sub voce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scr.</td>
<td>scripsit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>verso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vid.</td>
<td>videtur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>supplenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>delenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>nova columna vel pagina codicis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>verbum vel verba (quae sequuntur) add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† †</td>
<td>turbata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 EDITION 1. The Prologue and Commentary of Ox6: the ‘Alan of Lille tradition’

The prologue *Quoniam . . . tria cantica* and the subsequent commentary on *Ad celebres rex* are found in a commentary collection that is among the oldest texts in the sequence commentary material so far discovered. Besides *Ad celebres rex*, the sequences *Alma chorus Domini* and *Alle caeleste* are also commented upon in this manuscript. The commentary on *Ad celebres rex* belongs to what I have chosen to call the ‘Alan of Lille tradition’ on account of the huge influence exerted on this commentary by the *Expositio prosae de angelis*.2

5.1 MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTION

**Ox6**

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 6. 8 (S. C. 8840)3

A miscellany comprising grammatical texts, vocabularies and commentaries.

Date: Late 13th century
Provenance: England
Material: Parchment
Size: 225 x 165 mm.
Folios: i + 69

Contents: fols 1ra–8vb: ‘Preposiciones Grece’. Inc.: ‘Communiter solet dici Grecos esse fontes Latinos autem’
fols 9ra–12vb: Alexander of Hales: Exoticon. On Greek words in theological texts. Only a part of this work is found in this manuscript; the rest has been bound up in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 92

---

1 A presentation and edition of the complete sequence commentary collection in this manuscript are to be found in Kihlman (forthcoming 2007).
2 For the influence of Alan of Lille’s exposition on other sequence commentaries, see Section 3.2.1 above.
3 This description is based upon information in the *Summary Catalogue* (see the bibliography under S. C.) and my own observations of the manuscript. Reproductions of the manuscript are found as Plate 2 (fol. 62r) and Plate 3 (fol. 63v).
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fols 13ra–61va: Osbern of Gloucester: Liber derivationum (also known as Panormia). Inc.: ‘amo, -as, amavi, amatum’ The second column on fol. 61v gives miscellaneous grammatical notes.
fols 62ra–65ra: A collection of sequence commentaries.
   fol. 62ra: Quoniam . . . tria cantica
   fols 63ra–65ra: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
   fols 65rb–66vb: The poem ‘Paeniteas cito’ with a commentary and interlinear glosses. Inc.: ‘Peniteas cito peccator cum sit miserator’
fols 67ra–68vb: Grammatical notes. Inc.: ‘Nota quod hec sunt nomina neutri generis qui declinantur tantum in plurali’

The text is written in double columns throughout the volume. The following remarks concern only the sequence commentary on fols 62ra–65ra. The columns comprise 56 lines each except for the last which is 54 lines, written in a small and neat cursive script with anglicana features.4 The margins are clean and do not display any immediate sign of use, such as added glosses or other marginal notes. There are a few ‘pointing hands’ to certain passages in the text, apparently contemporary with the main text. Concerning the texts edited here, pointing hands are found on fol. 63vb for the explanation and etymology of symbolum, on fol. 64ra for the differences between substantia naturalia and substantia accidentalia, and on fol. 64vb on the etymology of the name Gabriel. Space has been left for initials for the new sections of the text—that is, on fol. 62ra where the prologue begins, fol. 62vb where the second commentary begins, and on fol. 63va where the commentary to Ad celebres rex begins—but the initials have not been written in. The lemmata of the sequence are underlined, as are the lemmata of the quotations attributed to John Scottus in the definitions of the concept of hierarchy.

The question of the date of composition for the commentaries on the three sequences included in the collection is complex as there could be a possibility that the texts were composed separately and later copied together in this collection. However, the coherent style of the explanations and the commentary technique together with a cross-reference in the second commentary

4 For the anglicana script, see PARKES (1969) and DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 134–141.
pointing forward to the third argue against such a theory. In the prologue the author quotes verses from John of Garland’s *Carmen de Misteriis Ecclesie*, dated to 1245, which then constitutes a terminus post quem for these texts. According to the *Summary Catalogue*, the manuscript has been dated to the end of the thirteenth century, which also seems to agree with the appearance of the script. Thus, at present it does not seem possible to date the composition of these texts more precisely than to the late thirteenth century.

The sequence commentaries have not previously been treated although their presence in this manuscript is mentioned by Tony Hunt in his masterly *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*.8

5.2 ON THE TEXT—THE PROLOGUE *QUONIAM . . . TRIA CANTICA*

The prologue, here entitled *Quoniam . . . tria cantica*, is the only one edited here that does not adhere to the methodological schemata briefly described above.9 Instead, this prologue can be said to consist of two parts, each treating a separate theme.

The first part concerns words related to chant and opens with brief definitions of the three terms *canticum*, *iubilus* and *hymnus* (lines 5–8) in wordings similar to those found in Peter Lombard’s *Commentarius in psalmos*. These explanations are subsequently summarised in three hexameter lines (lines 9–11) taken from two different passages in Chapter 12 of the *Graecismus*, the versified grammar by Eberhard of Béthune (†1212).10 Adding a mnemonic verse at the end of an account as a summary is a technique employed by the author throughout the two texts.

---

5 The cross-reference is found on fol. 63rb, which reads: ‘[ . . . ] in gloria cherubin et seraphin, hoc est ab illis agminibus angelorum, de quibus tangendum est plenius in cantico sequenti’, pointing forward to the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* rec.


7 See Plates 2 and 3. Dr Teresa Webber, Cambridge, has upon inspection of photocopies of the manuscript agreed with this dating, also suggesting the very beginning of the fourteenth century as a possible date (in conversation, Cambridge, July 2004).

8 HUNT (1991), vol. 1, p. 380. The other texts in Ox6 are treated on pp. 296–297, 299, 374 and 379–381. In BURSILL-HALL (1981) all other works in this manuscript are enumerated but the contents of fols 62–67 are passed over in silence. See also note 1.

9 See Section 2.2.1.1 above.

10 See the bibliography under the entry Eberh. Beth., *graeism*. 
The concept of *canticum* is then scrutinised further and four separate meanings of the word are distinguished (lines 12–16). This section draws on the first two paragraphs of Alan of Lille's *Expositio prosae de angelis*, which, as mentioned earlier, is also the main source for the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in *Ox6*. However, the author seems to have misunderstood Alan's text, or to have deliberately changed it, as the *Cantica canticorum* in *Ox6* are referred to as being the songs of the people of Israel on leaving Egypt, and thus apparently a representation of the joy of terrestrial beings. In Alan of Lille's text, in contrast, the Song of Songs is an example of how a *canticum* expresses the exultation of the celestial beings. The two texts nevertheless reach the same conclusion, namely that in this context the correct meaning is the fourth and final one in the account, that it denotes the joy of the mind felt by the heavenly beings.

For the second part of the prologue the commentator leaves Alan of Lille's *Expositio* as a model and continues instead with a brief account of the four traditional modes of Scriptural interpretation, tacitly borrowing his test-case word 'Jerusalem' from John Cassian (†435) (lines 18–23), perhaps mediated through Bede's (†735) *De schematibus et tropis*, the widespread medieval school-text on the art of rhetoric and interpretation of poetic figures. Again in order to recapitulate and summarise, the explanation concludes with a verse of five lines (lines 24–28) taken from *Carmen de mysteriis ecclesiae*, the didactic work by John of Garland mentioned above, which explains in hexameters a whole range of subjects concerning the Christian cult and faith, such as the liturgy of the church, the church year with its feasts, and the symbolic meaning of the church building.

Despite this pedagogical account, these four modes of interpretation are not referred to in the subsequent three commentaries of the collection. However, their inclusion here could function as a way of placing the sequence in a traditional exegetical context, constituting the framework both for the reader and for the interpretations in the commentaries.
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5.3 ON THE TEXT—THE COMMENTARY OF Ox6

Although the text in Ox6 draws heavily on Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* for many of the themes and interpretations in the exposition, his name is never mentioned in the commentary.\(^{14}\) Despite this great influence of Alan’s, the commentary in Ox6 cannot be defined as being merely an abridged version of the *Expositio prosae de angelis*, since it displays certain new and original interpretations as well as examples and additions without counterparts in the model text. The commentary of Ox6 reproduces the digression concerning the celestial hierarchies found in Alan’s *Expositio*, albeit in an abbreviated and simplified form, including only two of Alan’s five quotations ascribed to John Scottus. John Scottus is also one of the few authorities explicitly referred to in the commentary.\(^{15}\)

In order to show the nature of the differences between the commentary in Ox6 and Alan’s exposition, three passages in Ox6 will be compared below with the model text, together with comments made on the words *symbolum*, *verbum* and *agalma* in both texts. First, however, I will make a few remarks concerning the commentary technique used in Ox6 and the variants of the sequence text commented upon.

In *Expositio* Ox6 the sequence text is divided into short segments and presented as lemmata to be commented upon in a subsequent paragraph, which generally consists of a paraphrase of the lemma with brief explanations interspersed in the text. Longer comments on grammar and vocabulary and interpretations are placed in immediate conjunction with the word to which they pertain, regardless of how this may affect the syntax of the restructured passage. An example of this can be seen in the comments to the fifth lemma (lines 21–35). Here, the commentator breaks off the paraphrase after ‘AGMINA, id est consorcia, PNEUMATUM, id est spirituum’ in order to comment on the difference between the spellings *pneuma* and *neuma*. In this commentator’s characteristic manner, this definition is summarised in a mnemonic verse of two hexameter lines. After the verse the commentator resumes the prose

\(^{14}\) As mentioned above, only one manuscript, *Up1*, attributes this commentary explicitly to Alan of Lille; see Plate 1. It is therefore possible that the text in some regions circulated as an anonymous treatise.

\(^{15}\) The others are Ovid, Donatus and, erroneously, Plautus for Terence. The citation is from Terence’s *Adelphoe*, but the fact that Plautus is the subject in the preceding clause in the source text could have misled the author. All these references are found in the section on the different meanings of *verbum* (lines 267–274).
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version of the sequence with ‘PER TE, scilicet Dominum, FACTA’ only to break it up again to clarify the differences between fieri / facere and creare. The commentator then returns to the sequence concluding the whole interpretative section of the strophes with ‘DISTINCTA SUNT, id est divisa, NOVIES, id est per novenarium, quia sunt novem ordines angelorum.’

Towards the end of the commentary this structure seems to be abandoned in favour of lemmata that are incorporated directly into the commentary or the paraphrased text without being recited separately at the beginning, as can be seen for instance in the section beginning with the lemma vos per aethra (line 332), followed by comments on the word aethra. The rest of this sequence strophe (‘nos per rura dena pars electa harmoniae vota damus hyperlyrica cithara’) is treated in two different ways. The first part is incorporated directly into a paraphrase section with the addition of brief comments (lines 336–338), while the second half is recited as a lemma separated from the subsequent paraphrased version. It is noteworthy that the commentary style employed in this part shows greater similarity with that of Alan of Lille, where the sequence text is not presented separately as lemmata but incorporated directly into the commentary.

The sequence text commented upon in Ox6 displays the unusual variant ‘per quem letabunda perornantur machina mundi tota’ (line 16) for strophe 5, with the verb in the plural, which, in turn, means that tota machina mundi is viewed, not as the subject but as an ablative of attended circumstance (the subject then being festa from the preceding strophe). This is not the variant commented upon by Alan, and so the two interpretations of this line differ widely. In view of the fact that this manuscript is likely to have been produced in England, it is noteworthy that the plural perornantur is also the variant displayed in the well-known English manuscript, the Winchester troper, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 775.16

16 The only other manuscript displaying this variant, as reported in the critical apparatus in AH 53, is an eleventh-century troper from Mantua, the manuscript Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CVII. In spite of the shared reading between Ox6 and the Oxford Winchester troper it is not possible to establish a firm link between them as there are also a few differences: plangat (Bodl. 775) – pangat (the standard text; Ox6 and Verona); per que (the standard text; Bodl. 775) – per quem (Ox6 and Verona); administrancia dena (Bodl. 775) – administrancia Deo (the standard text; Ox6 and Verona; the remarks here in the critical apparatus of AH 53 regarding Bodl. 775 and the Verona manuscript are faulty); quo post (the standard text; Bodl. 775 and Verona) – ut post (Ox6); coeva (the standard text; Bodl. 775 and Verona) – celesti (Ox6). Ox6 discusses the alternative reading verbignam, which is the variant displayed by the Oxford manuscript, although the commentator of Ox6 seems to
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Another peculiar sequence variant presented in the commentary is *seraphin ardencia* (line 241) instead of the standard text *ignicoma*. It is possible that *ardencia*, which in many other commentaries is the standard interpretation of the epithet for the seraphim, is a gloss that at some stage in the tradition of this text has replaced *ignicoma*. In the critical apparatus in AH *ardencia* is not reported as a variant of the sequence text.

We will now proceed with the comparison of excerpts from the commentary of Ox6 and the corresponding sections in Alan’s *Expositio prosae de angelis*, through which both the dependence on Alan’s work and the originality of the commentary of Ox6 will become evident. The first of the three passages to be compared is found at the beginning of the long discussion of the concept of hierarchy using the quotations from John Scottus already referred to, and comprises the definition of the concept itself, which seems to be Alan’s own although he is not mentioned by name in the passage in Ox6 (lines 67–83). The definition in Ox6 is subsequently scrutinised through a word-by-word examination, the same commentary strategy later used for the definitions attributed to John Scottus. A word from the citation is placed at the beginning of each new sentence, followed by the reason why it is included as part of the definition. This results in a lucid albeit monotonous structure which facilitates an orientation in the text. In the manuscript this is helped further by the fact that the lemmata (both of the sequence and of this and the following defining quotations) are underlined. As will become clear in the comparison below, the words of the definition are more smoothly joined with their explanations in Alan’s text. In the following excerpts, similar phrases have been put in bold type-face:

follow the tradition of *terrigenam* (found in other English sources). The Verona manuscript displays the standard text here, which is *verbigena*. Textual variants in the three sequences in Ox6 shared with other English sources are discussed further in Kihlman (forthcoming 2007).

17 As the author repeats this reading in the commentary section on the lemma, it has not been emended to agree with the standard sequence text, although a remark is made in the critical apparatus.

18 Expressions conveying the same essence as this definition are found both in Alan’s *Summa quoniam homines* (see the bibliography under Alan. Ins., *quoniam homines*) and in his *Hierarchia Alani*, ed. by d’Alverny (1965), pp. 223–235.

19 On these quotations see further Dondaine (1950) and Section 3.2 above.
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Alan of Lille (page 202)20

Ierarchia est legitimum nature rationalis dominium. Secundum hanc descriptionem ierarchiam attendere possimus in tribus eternis personis, Patre scilicet et Filio et Spiritu sancto, que in creatis retinent principatum; in angelis etiam respectu hominum; in hominibus etiam respectu inferiorum. In predicta autem descriptione nihil superfluum vel diminutum repetitur. Quia sine dominio Ierarchia non est, in Ierarchie descriptione apponitur nota dominii; sed quia natura irrationalis, ut animal brutum super alia bruta quasi quoddam retinet dominium, ubi tamen ierarchie non attendimus principatum, convenient annectitur ‘nature rationalis’; sed quia natura rationalis, ut homo, frequentem sua tirannide usurpat dominium, merito adiungitur ‘legitimum’.

The abbreviated and less complex style of the text of Ox6 nevertheless conveys a meaning essentially the same as Alan of Lille’s text. In Expositio Ox6 we are presented only with the facts necessary for a basic understanding of the definition. There is, for example, no counterpart in Ox6 to the preliminary remark in Alan’s text on the three spheres of hierarchies or the (superfluous) comment on the consummate wording of the definition. Ox6 also exhibits a more restricted vocabulary—principatus, for instance, is not introduced into the account—and the syntax is likewise kept simple. For example, the difference between brute animals holding power over others by reason of their nature, and humans who have taken it illegitimately and by force, is nuanced by Alan through the use of retinet and usurpat dominium respectively, whereas in Ox6, where clarity seems to be the main priority, the same verb, habent, is used throughout (with dominium and potestatem).

It is also noteworthy that the commentator in Ox6 seems to have chosen phrases that make it possible to retain the words of the definition in their

20 All excerpts from Alan of Lille’s Expositio prosae de angelis are taken from the edition by D’ALVERNY (1965).
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‘original’ form, as can, for instance, be seen with the words *dominium* and *hierarchia*. Alan, in contrast, varies his expressions, using the phrases *sine dominio*, *nota dominii*, in descriptione ierarchie and *ierarchie principatum*. In the final sentences, *legitimum* is explained through its antonym, an exemplification of power held illegitimately. We may observe that Alan here keeps the phrase *natura rationalis* from the definition as the subject, illustrated with *ut homo*, and adds an ablative, *tyranuide*, to show the nature of the rule. In contrast, the author in Ox6 does not bring in the already defined phrase *natura rationalis* but states instead the kind of people—*reges* and *huiusmodi* (not simply any *homo*)—who sometimes hold their power contrary to the law.

The next two passages concern the descriptions of the three orders belonging to the middle hierarchy. Again, agreements between the two texts are put in bold type-face.

Alan of Lille (page 211)


**AC VIRTUS URANICA**, *id est Virtutes*. Ponitur autem hic hoc nomen ‘Virtus’ collectiue in designatione ordinis; potius tamen hoc nomen ‘Virtus’, in designatione unius de ordine quam in significatione totius ordinis sumeretur. ‘Uranica’, *id est*, celestis, ad differentiam terrestrium virtutum. ‘Ura’ autem interpretatur *ignis*, unde ‘uranicam’ prope dicitur illud quod est *igneum*, quia cum ccelum igne nature est, quod celeste est ‘uranicum’ dicitur.

Expositio Ox6 (lines 217–229)

**PRINCIPANS TURMA. Id est princi-patus**, et est ordo medius in yperphania, et commutatur hic naturalis ordo *causa metri*, ut sepe contingit. Et scendium, quod ‘turma’ potest dici de racionabilibus tantum; ‘turba’ vero de racionabilibus et irracionabilibus.

**VIRTUS URANICA.** Hic redit ad primum ordinem ypophanie. ‘Uranos’ Grece, ‘ignis’ Latin, unde ‘uranica’, *id est ignea*, et ponitur singulare pro plurali, quia virtus propter virtutes.
Although the number of verbatim correspondences in the excerpts above is limited, the author of Ox6 nevertheless follows Alan quite closely as regards content, omitting some pieces of information and adding others. The remark that the sequence does not enumerate the angelic troops according to the ‘legitimate order’, in Alan’s words, is retained in the commentary in Ox6, although the commentator in Ox6 is briefer in his remarks. The order of the angels in this account, as mentioned above, follows that of Gregory and not that of Dionysius in spite of the reference to John Scottus. As for differences in expressions, we may note that the multotiens in Alan’s text is sepe in Ox6, the aut ritmi aut metri necessitate is rendered metri causa, and there is no correspondence in Ox6 to the chiastic phrase with postponere and praeponere in Alan’s text. In Ox6 a distinctio is added regarding the differences between the words turma and turba to which there is no correspondence in Alan’s Expositio.

The fact that the order is disrupted once again, placing the Powers as the fifth order, is acknowledged only by Ox6, as is the repeated usage of the singular number for the plural. The same etymology is given in both texts for almiphona. In the explanation of the name of the Powers and its relation to the office of the order, Alan of Lille places equal focus on almiphona as on the name ‘Powers’, maintaining that by sounding holy in the minds of humans, they have the power to hinder harmful spirits, who in turn strive to prevent us from showing proper reverence towards people of higher rank. The adversas potestates in Alan’s text seem to have their counterpart in the ‘demons’ of Ox6, whose allusions the Powers help us to resist. Even though the choice of words and

---

21 This is also the case in Alan’s text (as well as in the other writers of the Porretan school using these quotations); see also Section 3.2 above.
emphases diverge, there is agreement between the two authors on the essential part, that this order possesses the capacity to make us resist evil powers.

The last comparison concerns a brief excursus made in connection with the sequence phrase *aram auream*, on the two altars mentioned in Exodus. Agreements are again shown in bold type.

Alan of Lille (page 217)

Nota in Veteri Testamento Iudeorum ritibus duo desecuisse altaria, *altare holocausti* quod *erat sub duo extra templum*, in quo *sacrifica-bantur animalia*; alius thimiama, quod erat in sanctis sanctorum, in quo offerebatur thimiama. *Per altare holocausti* intelligitur mens hominis, in qua mactando vitia per contritionem quasi animalia immolans homo Deo ad penitentiam offerit; per *altare vero aureum* in quo thimiama offerebatur, mens hominis in patria habitantis, in qua, *vitis* expurgata, quasi thimiama offerit spiritualis mensis exultationem.

Expositio Ox6 (lines 351–360)

Et sciendum secundum theologos, quod *due erant* *are in veteri testamento*: *ara olocausti et ara incensi*. *Ara olocausti* *erat extra templum* sub diem, id est sub aere, ad quam *sacrificabantur animalia*, et *per illam debemus intelligere mortificaciones viciorum in cordibus nostris*. Et dicitur olocaustum ab *‘olon’*, quod est totum, et *‘causton’*, sacrificium vel insensum [*i.e.* incensum], quasi totum insensatum [*i.e.* incensatum]. Aliam enim erat aris *in templo* et dicebatur *ara aurea*, ad quam non licuit sacerdori accedere nisi semel in anno, et tunc cum odorum entis et timiamibus et huiusmodi, et per illam debemus intelligere corda defecata a *viciis* et Spiritu sancto repleta et illuminata. Et est sensus huius versiculi talis, ut post diem iudicii vicis mortalitatis simus puri et Spiritu sancto illuminati.

The example from the commentary in Ox6 shows both its dependence on Alan's *Expositio prosae de angelis* but also its originality in terms of the rewriting, interpreting and structuring of the text. In Ox6 we note a structure which could perhaps be seen as more pedagogical: the two altars are first mentioned by their names and are thereafter treated successively, the holocaust altar first, with an added etymology, and the incense altar second. The disposition of Alan's account, however, seems rather to be based on aspect: first the locations of the two altars are treated and thereafter their respective interpretation. Alan's interpretation of the holocaust altar as the human soul in which man offers his ‘vitiia per contritionem . . . Deo ad penitentiam’ is rendered in *Expositio Ox6* as
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the ‘mortificaciones viciorum in cordibus nostris’. Alan places the incense altar in sanctis sanctorum as does Ox6, albeit in using the expression in templo.

The second time this altar is mentioned in Alan’s text it is referred to by its alternative name—the golden altar, ‘altare verum aureum in quo thimiama offerebatur’. Expositio Ox6 also introduces this appellation but names it explicitly ‘alia . . . ara . . . dicebatur ara aurea’. The golden altar is understood in Alan’s text to be the human soul, cleansed from sin—vitiis expurgata—which offers spiritual exultation as if it were incense. In Ox6 the words used are instead corda, which are ‘defecata a viciis et Spiritu sancto repleta et illuminata’. In Ox6 we also find the additional piece of information regarding the restricted access to the golden altar. This is evidently influenced by Exodus 30, 10, where it is said that ‘Aaron shall pray upon the horns thereof [that is, of the incense altar] once a year’, and by the passage in Hebrews 9, 7 where there is a reference to the rites of the old covenant and how the high priest approached the golden altar once a year, not with incense, however, but with redeeming blood. The concluding sentence of this excursus in Ox6 is a return to the sequence text summarising the meaning of the versiculus in one sentence.

As is clear from the three comparisons above, there are apparent differences in literary style, linguistic complexity and expository focus between Alan’s Expositio prosae de angelis and the commentary in Ox6. Sections of Alan’s text have been omitted both from the commentary proper and from the account of the celestial hierarchy. In the latter part only the definitions of the concept itself, of ordo and of theophania, are retained in Ox6. For the account of the three levels in the theophany, the epiphania, the hyperphania and the hypophania, the commentator in Ox6 does not retain John Scottus’s definitions as used by Alan, but concentrates solely on the descriptions of the orders in each group and their respective offices. The language and style of Ox6 is less complex, the vocabulary more basic and the syntax not as demanding as in Alan’s text. The rewritings in Ox6 produce a commentary clearly based on the Expositio prosae de angelis but accommodated and adapted for a less learned audience. This could account for the greater concern for etymologies apparent in the commentary of Ox6 and for other differences such as in the comments made on the word verbum. Here, in connection with the address to Gabriel, both the commentator of Ox6 and Alan of Lille dwell upon the word and its multiple meanings. Alan provides three profound reasons as to why the Son of God is referred to by this epithet:
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[. . . ] qui multiplici de causa Verbum dicitur. Sicut enim prolabilis verbum profertur sine omni demutatione proferenti s, sic Filius a Patre gignitur sine omni mutatione gignentis; vel ideo Verbum censetur, quia sicut verbum prolabilis interiorem mentis declarat conceptum, sic Pater quod in sua disposuerat eternitate, per Filium declaravit in tempore; vel ideo dicitur Verbum, quia sicut verbum interius, id est intellectus, procedit a mente, ita Filius per generationem procedit a Patre.22

The author of *Expositio Ox6*, however, is instead focused on the five meanings of the word as seen in various authors whose works were used in the schools (lines 267–274): it can mean speech, a saying or a phrase as in Plautus, deceit as in Ovid, or it can denote a part of speech as in Donatus. Finally, the commentator provides the understanding of *verbum* in the sequence as the Son, with a quotation of the opening words of the Gospel of St John.

For the interpretation and comments on the word *symbolum* (lines 56–63), the author of the commentary of Ox6 follows the definition given by Alan of Lille. Both the etymology and the understanding of the word differ from the later commentaries of the ‘Aristotelian tradition’, as we will see below, but they are similar to those found in another Oxford manuscript, the commentary of Ox1 (Edition 2). The interpretation here draws on the etymology of *bolos* as a portion or a part: the first example offered is that of a common meal where everyone contributes his share, and the second is that of a creed, where several portions of the Christian faith have been compiled. In *Expositio Ox6* the further meanings of *symbolum* as a sign or a mystery are added, whereas Alan instead mentions the symbolic reading of enigmatic passages in literature and Scripture.

Concerning the interpretation of the puzzling word *agalma* in the sequence, many commentaries in this study agree that it should be understood as referring to heaven. However, their opinions as to its original meaning and etymology separate them, as we will see in the expositions to follow. In *Expositio Ox6* we are offered both the interpretation inherited from Alan of Lille—that its proper meaning is ‘sheepfold’—and a definition of the word as a top, summit or a high place (*culmen*), with an etymological analysis dividing the word into *a*, without, *ge*, earth, *almus* and *maneo*, as ‘a holy abode without any earthliness’ (lines 323–329).


23 The quotation is really from Terence’s *Adelphoe*; see also note 15 above.
5.3.3 Textual problems and remarks on the edition

Since Ox6 is the unique witness to this prologue and commentary, the texts have been edited in accordance with the principles set up for editions of Category 1 texts.24 One of the guiding principles for editions of texts belonging to Category 1 is to retain as far as possible the text as transmitted in the manuscript. If an emendation is deemed necessary, for reasons of grammar, syntax, logic or content, a parallel or a related passage in the text itself should be used as a corrective whenever possible. A few such passages will be discussed here.

The first is found in the analysis of the second quotation from John Scottus and concerns the phrase ‘non ex substanticiis geniis’ as it is rendered in the present edition, occurring at lines 125 and 139 in the commentary. In the first instance I have supplied the preposition ex, even though it could be silently inferred from the previous clause, since this is the way the phrase appears at line 139 and in the other known sources for this quotation.25

There is, in addition, a more complex problem connected with this phrase. In Alan of Lille’s *Expositio*, as well as in other texts using these definitions,26 the phrase is ‘non ex substantificis geniis’. Elsewhere in these texts, this phrase appears as *per substantificas genia*, which means that these writers must have considered *genia* to be a neuter, not a masculine, noun modified by the adjective *substantificus*. For two reasons I have decided to keep *substanciis geniis* as found in the manuscript in the edition, although it cannot be ruled out with certainty that the variant in Ox6 ultimately derives from a misunderstanding of the reading *substantificis*. The first reason is that the text as presented is logical and coherent within itself, even if it does not display the same reading or meaning as in its source, Alan’s *Expositio*. The second is that in the subsequent paragraph the author of the commentary of Ox6 discusses at some length the word *genius* presented as an adjective, which seems to reflect his understanding of the word in the phrase under scrutiny here. A change of *substanciis* to *substantificis* would then result in two adjectival attributes without a noun.

A parallel albeit different case is found earlier in the same section. Here I have emended the simple *substancialis* in the manuscript to *supersubstancialis* (line 126, and again at line 159) in accordance with Alan’s text. However, the reading

---

24 See Section 4.1.1 above.
26 See the excerpts in DONDAIN (1950); see also Section 3.2 above.
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in the Expositio prosae de angelis has not been the only motive for the correction; in the subsequent distinction between the two types of origo in Ox6, at lines 160–163, the word supersubstantialis is written out in full and the inference of the distinction is that the author must have intended supersubstantialis to be read in the quotation. Hence I have judged substantialis as a scribal error and duly emended it.

Such internal evidence drawn from the discussions in the text has also led me to correct the forms neuma and mneuma to pneuma whenever reference is made to the spirits in the commentary (lines 20, 21 and 29), in accordance with the rules set out by the author himself in order to differentiate between the two words.27

At line 295 the text as it stands in the manuscript is not fully comprehensible: sophia is explained as 'sapiencia compar, id est equaliter se habens ad Patrem et ad Filium'. Wisdom is said to be equal both to the Father and to the Son. This does not make sense, as sophia is here interpreted as the Son. The explanation would thus make the Son equal to himself. Since a reference to the Holy Spirit is missing from the description of the Trinity, it seems likely that there is a lacuna. As the preceding phrases seem to initiate a certain textual pattern in considering the three persons, first pointing out to whom the text refers, then quoting the sequence text, the following conjecture (here put between angled brackets) has been placed in the critical apparatus to this line:

Et fit mencio de Patre, cum dicitur PER VOS PATRIS; de Filio, cum dicitur EIUSDEEM SOPHIA, <id est sapiencia; de Spiritu sancto, cum dicitur COMPAR QUOQUE PNEUMA>, id est sapiencia COMPAR, id est equaliter se habens ad Patrem et ad Filium, quia nulla prerogativa inter tres personas est.

This interpolation would then explain the lacuna as a saut du même au même from one instance of id est sapiencia to the next (albeit in a different case at the second instance).28

While general rules as regards orthography and spellings in the different editions are set out in Section 4.2.1, I will here add some specific remarks

---

27 Another instance where the text has been emended on grounds of content and meaning is vestra for nostra at lines 308 and 322. The agalmata cannot be referred to as ‘our’ heavenly abode; it must be ‘yours’, as in the sequence.

28 The corresponding passage in Alan’s Expositio prosae de angelis is structured very differently and cannot guide us in this matter, see Alan, Ins., expon. pros. angel., p. 214.
concerning solely the editions of the prologue *Quoniam . . . tria cantica* and the *Expositio OX6*.

The scribe uses the letters *s* and *c* indiscriminately for the *s*-sound, as with the spelling *sedentem* for *sedentem* (line 155) and *incensum* for *incensum* (line 355). The spelling of these words has not been standardised but in order to facilitate the understanding of the text they have been remarked upon in the critical apparatus.

The Latin word for 'hierarchy' is rendered as both *cherarchia* and *gerarchia* in the manuscript and, consequently, also in the edition.²⁹

²⁹ The manuscript reading *chererchia* has, in accordance with the editorial principles set up above, 4.2.1, been changed to *cherarchia* in the edition but is remarked upon in the *apparatus criticus*.
EDITION 1: Quoniam ... tria cantica

Quoniam nostra intencio est exponere ista tria cantica, primo videndum est, quid sit canticum et quid iubilus et quid ymnus. Et postea propter expositionem vocabulorum videndum est, quot modis exponatur sacra scriptura.

Ad primum dicendum est, quod canticum est exultacio mentis exterius in vocem prorumpens. Iubilus est exultacio mentis propter Deum, quia ex verbis exprimi omnino non potest nec omnino in corde taceri. Ymnus est laus Dei cum cantico facta, unde versus:

Ymnus divina laus est; sunt cantica voces leticie, que fiunt simul de celestibus ipsis.
Fertur inpleta iubilus letacio mentis.

Item ‘canticum’ pluribus modis accipitur. Dicitur autem quandoque applausus, qui fit ad laudem alicuius divitis; quandoque autem est leticia de terrenis habita; quandoque autem cantus ille, quem fecerunt filii Israelis, quando redierunt de servitute, unde Cantica Canticorum; quandoque autem canticum est mentale gaudium, quod fit de supercelestibus, et ita accipitur hic.

Ad secundum dicitur, quod quattuor modis exponitur sacra scriptura, scilicet hystoricè, allegorice, tropologicè, anagogicè; hystoricè, ut cum narramus rem, prout gesta est, ut Ierusalem est civitas terrena; allegorice, ut quando per unum aliud intelligimus vel significamus, ut per Ierusalem ecclesiam significamus; anagogicè, ut per hoc, quod dictum est vel factum, celestia significamus, ut

---

1 ista ... cantica scilicet 'Alma chorus Domini'; 'Alle caeleste' et 'Ad celebres rex'.
5 canticum ... 6 prorumpens] cfr Petr. Lamb., psalm. praefatio, PL 191, 58a.
6 Iubilus ... 7 taceri] cfr Petr. Lamb., psalm. 46, PL 191, 456a.
9 Ymnus ... 10 ipsis] cfr Eherh. Beth., graecism. 12, 235–236.
11 Fertur ... mentis] cfr Eherh. Beth., graecism. 12, 438.
12 Item ... 16 hic] cfr Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 194.
19 Jerusalem ... 23 fortis] cfr Cassian., coll. 14, 8, 4.

Fons textus: Ox6

1 Quoniam litt. prima scripta est in marg., sed spatium litterarum praebet cod.
3 exponatur] exponitur cod.
7 exprimi + non ante corr. 16 supercelestibus] supra celestibus cod.

75
Ierusalem est patria summa; tropologice, quando, quod dictum est, convertimus in mores, ut Ierusalem est mens fortis, unde versus:

Quadruplex sensus dici valet. Ystorialis est unus, sequitur post allegoria, sequenter est tropologia, dictetur post anagoge. Sicut Ierusalem polis est terrena, fidelis constans ecclesia, mens fortis, patria summa. Et cetera.

Hiis visis accedimus ad litteram.
AD CELEBRES, REX CELICE, LAUDES CUNCTA PANGAT NUNC CANORA CATERVA SIMPHONIA

Construe sic: o REX CELICE, CATERVA CUNCTA, tam homines quam angeli, PANGAT, id est canat, NUNC CANORA SIMPHONIA, id est sonora vocum concordia, que est mentis et oris, vel illa concordia, que est inter sonos plurium personarum. Et differt simphonia et armonia, quia armonia est vocis modulacio; simphonia modulacionis temperamentum, sive sit in voce sive sit in plausu. AD CELEBRES LAUDES, id est ad festivas laudes.

ODAS ATQUE SOLVAT CONCIO TIBI NOSTRA

ATQUE pro et, et NOSTRA CONCIO, id est convocacio, SOLVAT, id est quasi debitum reddat, ODAS, id est laudes vel cantus, TIBI, hoc est ad honorem tuum.

CUM IAM RENOVANTUR MICHAELIS INCLITA VALDE FESTA

CUM VALDE INCLITA FESTA, id est valde gloriosa festa, MICHAELIS, scilicet archangeli, RENOVANTUR IAM, id est annuatim quadam renovacione celebrantur.

PER QUEM LETABUNDA PERORNANTUR MACHINA MUNDI TOTA

PER QUEM, scilicet Michaelem, PERORNANTUR, id est bene ornantur, LETABUNDA, id est illa festa quadam leticia habundanter celebrata, TOTA MACHINA MUNDI, id est cum omni illo, quod continetur sub firmamento.

NOVIES DISTINCTA PNEUMATUM SUNT AGMINA PER TE FACTA
AGMINA, id est consorcia, PNEUMATUM, id est spirituum. Et sciendum, quod hoc nomen ‘neuma’ duplicem habet acceptionem, et potest cognoscere in scripcione. Quandoque autem debet scribi per ‘p’ et ‘n’ et tunc significat spiritum, secundum quod hic accipitur. Quandoque autem scribitur per ‘m’ et ‘n’ vel per ‘n’ tantum, et protendit iubilum, qui fit post antifonam. Qui quidem iubilus non potest exprimir corde et ore sed sono tantum et fit ad designandum celeste gaudium, quod non potest demonstrari corde et ore pre eius magnitudinibus sed sono vel intellectu tantum, unde versus:

Terna dat ‘hoc pneuma’ cum ‘p’ pro flamine sacro.
Prima dat ‘hec’ sine ‘p’ pro cantu, ternaque neutrum.

PER TE, scilicet Dominum, FACTA. Inproprie utitur vocabulo ‘facta’, quia aliud est fieri et aliud est creari. Fieri enim est facere vel factum esse aliquid ex preiacenti materia; creare est aliquid facere sine preiacenti materia, secundum quod Deus creavit angelos sine preiacenti materia. DISTINCTA SUNT, id est divisa, NOVIES, id est per novenarium, quia novem sunt ordines angelorum.

Nam, CUM VIS, FACIS HEC FLAMMEA PER ANGELICAS OFFICINAS

Nam, CUM VIS, FACIS HEC FLAMMEA, id est per angelicum officium, hoc est quandoque nunciat hominibus; vel aliter: FLAMMEA, id est ignea propter ardorem caritatis, quem predicant hominibus.

INTER PRIMEVA SUNT HEC, NAM CREATA TUA, CUM SUMUS NOS ULTIMA FACTURA SED YMAGO TUA

Hic ostendit quod quodammodo sancti angeli antiquiores hominibus, unde dicitur: In principio creavit Deus celum et terram. Per ‘celum’ intellige celestia, per...
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‘terram’ terestria, et sic quandam prioritatem habent angeli ante homines. Nam hic, supple agmina angelorum, sunt creataque tua, id est tua creature. Inter primeva sunt creatae tua, id est primo evo creatae, cum nos sumus factura tua ultima sed ymago tua. Ymago, quia nos imitamur Deum in iusticia et sapiencia et prudencia, quia ipse iustus est et iusticia, sic et nos iusti per iusticiam. Similitudo est in liniamentis corporis, et ymago est quantum ad animam, similitudo quantum ad corpus.

Theologia categorizent simbola hic ter tripartita per privata officina

Hic, scilicet agmina angelorum, ter tripartita, id est per novenarium disposita, per privata officina, id est per propria officia, categorizent, id est predicant, theologia simbola, id est divina mysteria.


Plebs angelica, phalanx et archangelica, <principans turma>, virtus uranica ac potestas alimphona, dominancia numina, divina et subcellia, cherubin etherea ac seraphin ardencia

Quia in sequencia fiet mencio de gerarchia, ideo videndum est, quid sit gerarchia, et unde dicatur, et quot species habeat: Gerarchia est legitimum nature racionalis dominium.

56 Quandoque ... 61 collexcio | cfr Alan. Ins., expas. pra. ang., p. 200–201.
61 simbolum ... 62 singnum | cfr Isid., orig. 6, 19, 57; cfr etiam Alan. Ins., dist. PL 210, 964c.
‘Dominium’ dicit, quia in nullo loco est cherarchia, nisi sit ibi dominium.
‘Nature racionalis’ dicit, quia bruta animalia habent dominium, quod non
dicitur cherarchia.
‘Legitimum’ dicit, quia reges et huissusmodi habent potestatem super alios, et
hi forciat non habent legitimam secundum legem. Et dicitur a ‘chere’, quod
est sacer, et ‘arcos’, quod est principatus sive dominium.

Cherarchia vero dividitur in tres species, scilicet in supercelestem et celestem
et subcelestem. Supercelesti cherarchia est summe trinitatis ypostaseos
monarchia, et est ypostasis idem quod substantia. Celesti vero cherarchia est
ordo angelicus, qui dividitur in ix ordinis; subcelesti cherarchia ut apostolatus,
archiepiscopatus et huissmodi. De supercelesti cherarchia dicit mentionem
faciendo, ubi dicitur: PER VOS PATRIS CUNCTA. De celesti cherarchia tangit, ubi
dicitur: VOS PER ETHRA. De subcelesti cherarchia tangit, ubi dicitur: NOS PER
RURA.

Sed qua dictum est, quod celesti cherarchia dividitur in ix ordinis, ideo
videndum est, quid sit ordo, vel quare dicatur ordo, et in quot species habeat
dividi.

Ordo angelicus est, ut ait magister Iohannes Scotus, [est] caractere
theophanie simplicis et non ymaginarie et reciproce uniformis scilicet spirituum
insignita multitudo. Sed videndum, quid quodlibet membrum in hac
descripcione positum operetur.

‘Multitudo’ apponitur, quia ordo angelicus non potest esse, nisi ibi sit
multitudo.

‘Spirituem’ apponitur ad differenciam hominum, quia sepe homines
contemplantur / ipsum creatorem per creaturas ipsas.

‘Insignita caractere’ quasi quodammodo sigillata signo. Caracter enim idem
est quod signum.

‘Theophanie’ apponitur et dicitur a ‘theos’, Deus, et ‘phanos’, visio sive
contemplacio, quasi Dei visio.

70 Dominium ut vid. | in supra lin. | nullo ex illo corr. cod., ut vid. | cherarchia] cherachia cod.
72 cherachia] cherachia cod. | legitimmexlegittimum corr. cod., ut vid. | Cherachia]
cherachia cod. | ypostaseos cum Alan. Ins. scriptis, apostacios cod.
88 theophanie] theophanie cod. | scilicet ut vid. quid] quod cod.; cfr lin. 127 | caractere
carecere cod. post corr. ex cararecere 97 Theophanie] theophanie cod.
‘Simplicis’ apponitur ad differenciam composite contemplacionis, quia quedam contemplacio est simplex, quedam composita. Composita contemplacio in duas dividitur species: in contemplacionem secundum sensum et contemplacionem secundum rationem. Secundum sensum fit contemplacio, quando contemplamur Deum creatorem per ipsas creaturas, id est per solem et lunam et stellae et huiusmodi. Secundum rationem fit contemplacio, quando nos contemplamur coherentiam inter materiam et formam, unde scimus, quod admisit materiam et formam, et hec contemplacio est composita. Simplex contemplacio est, que fit inter angelos, quia contemplantur Deum, prout est in maiestate sua et non per aliquas creaturas.

‘Non ymaginarie’ apponitur, quia <quedam> contemplacio est ymaginaria, quedam non ymaginaria. Ymaginaria est illa, que fit per potenciam et sapienciam et bonitatem Dei. Potencia est ipse Deus Pater. Sapiencia est Filius Dei. Bonitas est Spiritus sanctus. Per potenciam prospicimus ipsas res excistere, per sapienciam illarum ordinacionem, per bonitatem illarum divisionem, id est suum esse, quo existunt. Et sic ymaginarie contemplamur, unde dicitur: Per speculum videmus in enigmate, tune autem facie ad faciem. Et ex parte enim cognoscimus et ex parte prophetamus. Non ymaginaria est illa, que fit inter angelos, quia angelis vident creatorem facie ad faciem et non per aliquam ymaginem.

‘Reciprocse’ apponitur et tractum est a ‘speculo’, quia, sicut radii visuales exeunt ab oculo ad discernendam formam illius et postea redeunt ad ipsam rem, sic angelis vident Deum et in hoc, quod vident ipsum, vident seipsum.

‘Uniformis’ apponitur, ne putaret aliquis, quod omnes angelis non viderent ipsum creatorem uniformiter, quamvis omnes eque presencialiter. 

Et sic habemus, quid singula membra operentur in hac descriptione.

Sed, ne videatur ignotum per ignosius exponere, ideoque videndum est, quid sit theophania. Et est theophania ex consequentibus signis, non <ex> substanciis genii, mentibus ab ymaginacionibus defecatis, supersubstantialis originis pura et reciproca manifestatio. Unde videndum, quid sic singulum positum in hac descriptione operetur.

---


‘Manifestacio’ apponitur, quia ubi est theophania, ibi est manifestacio, sed
non e converso.

‘Ex consequentibus signis’ apponitur, quia quedam manifestacio fit ex
consequentibus signis et quedam non ex consequentibus signis, quia quandoque
conoscimus causam per effectum, quandoque effectum per causam. Per
effectum cognoscimus, ut quando videmus solem pati eclipsim, tunc scimus,
quod luna interponitur nobis et soli; effectum per causam, ut quando videmus
aliquid habere pulmonem, per hoe scimus esse spirabile, quia pulmo est causa
inspiracionis et respiracionis. Non ex singnis consequentibus fit illa
manifestacio, quamvis videamus aliquid fieri in illa signis consequentibus.

‘Non ex substanciis geniis’ apponitur. Genius enim dicitur deus nature et
inde dicitur ‘genius, -a, -um’, id est naturale, et ‘Genesis’ liber de natura, unde
substanca genia, id est substantia naturalia. Et notandum, quod quedam
naturalia sunt accidentalia, quedam substantiaria. Naturalia accidentalia sunt
ipsa propria ut risibile et huiusmodi. Naturalia substantiali sunt ut
substantiales differentie ut racionalius et huiusmodi.

Item notandum, quod est difference inter theophaniam theologice et
theophaniam physicam. Theophania theologice ascendit a sensu ad intelligenciam.
Theophania phisice decendit ab intelligencia ad sensum. Verbi gratia: Phisicus
discernit proprium esse / piperis desiccare, et sic habet intelligenciam sensus,
quod calde nature est, et sic apponit differentiam herbis suis. Sed tali modo
non debemus Deum contemplari per substantialis differencias aliquas, quia
nihil in Deo est, quod non sit Deus. Non opponitur.

‘Non ex substantiis geniis, mentibus ab imaginacionibus defecatis’ apponitur
ad removendam quorundam opinionem, qui dicebantur antropomorfite, qui
contemplari Deum solebant secundum lineamenta corporis, scilicet magnum et
cedentem in cathedra, vallatum exercitibus angelorum. Sed non debemus sic
Deum contemplari ex lineamentis corporis sed quodammodo simpliciter et sine
omni composizione, et ideo dicitur ‘mentibus ab imaginacione defecatis’, id est
depuratis.

---

143 propria … risibile [cfr Boeth., Porph. isag., p. 7.]
138 quamvis videamus] quando videmus cod. | illa ut vid. 145 differencia ex differencias
corr. cod. | theophania] theophonia cod. 146 theophania] theophonia cod. | phisice i.e.
147 decendit i.e. descendit 150 differencias ex differenciasi corr. cod. 152 substantiis
substancti cod.; cfr lin. 125 | defecatis] defecas cod., ut vid.; cfr lin. 126 153 antropomorfite| antropomorfanice cod. 155 cedentem i.e. sedentem
‘Supersubstancialis originis’ apponitur, quia quidam origo est substancialis, quodam supersubstancialis. Origo substancialis est causa materialis et causa formalis et huiusmodi. Origo supersubstancialis est illa, a qua omnis origo sumit originem, que est causa causalissima omnium rerum, id est ipse Deus, et ideo hoc apponitur.

‘Pura’ apponitur, quia omnis manifestacio, que est de Deo, debet esse pura, immo purissima et reciproca, ut superius dictum est.

Et sic habemus, quid sit theophania et ita sic dictum est. De cherarchia tractat magister Iohannes Scotus in quadam summa, quam composuit.

Theophania autem in tres partes sive species dividitur: in epiphaniam, in yperphaniam et yperphaniam.


Item in yperphania continentur tres ordines. Primus est, qui dicitur dominaciones, secundus principatus, tercius potestates. Et dicitur yperphania ab ‘yper’, quod est inter, et ‘phanos’, visio, quasi media visio, quia spiritus, qui in illa continentur, sunt inferiores respectu superiorum et superiores respectu inferiorum. Dominaciones dicuntur, quia ministrant hominibus quandam subieccionem habere ipsi creatori. Principatus dicuntur eo, quod ostendunt hominibus reverenciam illius Domini, quam debent Deo exhibere. Potestates dicuntur eo, quod habent potestates claudi illas insidias, quas inmundi spiritus instigant hominibus.

\[^{166}\text{quadam summa}^{\text{vide Dondaine (1950).}}\] 166 Theophania … 199 nuncius\[^{\text{cfr Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel.}, p. 206–210.}\] 177 Seraphim … est\[^{\text{cfr Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel.}, p. 208.}\]

\[^{159}\text{Supersubstancialis sum}^{\text{Alan. Ins. scripti scil. substancialis cod.; cfr etiam lin. 161–163}}\] 162 causalissima\[^{\text{casualissima cod.}}\] 166 cherarchia\[^{\text{cherarchia cod.}}\] 167 Scorus\[^{\text{scrus cod. ut vid.}}\] 168 Theophania\[^{\text{theophania cod.}}\] 170 fanos\[^{\text{fones cod., sed etiam lin. 182}}\] 171 autem\[^{\text{ut vid.}}\] 180 yperphania\[^{\text{yperphania cod.}}\] 180 yperphania\[^{\text{yperphania cod.}}\]
Item in ypophania continentur tres ordines spirituum. Et dicitur ypophania ab 'ypos', sub, et 'phanos', visio, quasi subterior Dei visio. Primus ordo est virtutes, secundus archangeli, tertiis angeli. Virtutes dicuntur eo, quod per ipsos spiritus Deus facit miracula in suis creaturis, ut cecum videre vel huissusmodi, quia licet philosophi non admittant Deum aliquid facere contra naturam, admittimus, cum contra naturam esset, ut cecus postea videat. Archangeli dicuntur spiritus illi, qui magna nunciant, quasi principales vel summi nuncii, quia per illos nunciantur hominibus magna et maxima. Angeli dicuntur aliis spiritus, qui minima nunciant hominibus, et dicitur ab 'an', quasi est sursum, et 'gelos', missus, quasi desuper missus. Archangelus dicitur ab 'arcos', princeps, et 'angelus', nuncius, quasi principalis nuncius. Et sic patet, quod ix sunt ordines spirituum, quod patet per hos versus:

Spirituum regnat in celis ordo novenus. 
Angelus est primus, archangelus estque secundus. 
Tercius est tronus, dominacio cui sociatur, 
virtus huic, ordo princeps, exinde potestas, 
octavus cherubin, ceraphin cedet ordo novenus.

Redeamus ad litteram.

PLEBS ANGELICA

Hic fit mencio de tercio ordine, qui fit in ypophania. Et nota, quod propri plebs est collexcio multorum hominum et ponitur hic transsumptive ad significandum infimum ordinem angelorum propter excellenciam aliorum ordinum. Ita dico, si aliquis sit alcior alio, quamvis sit propinquior Deo, et sic incipitur a novissimo gradu assendendo.

PHALANX ET ARCHANGELICA

---

189 ypophania3 ypophonia cod. | ypophania3 pophonhia cod. 190 phanos phonos cod. 192 ipsos| ipsas cod. 194 admittimus ex admittamus corr. cod., ut vid. | esse| esse cod. | ut cecus bis scr. cod. 195 quassod cod. 203 sociatur i.e. sociatur 205 cedet i.e. sedet 208 ypophania ypiphania cod. 212 assendendo i.e. ascending
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Nota, quod proprie 'phalanx, -gis', est exercitus equitum, et hic transsumitur ad significantum ordinem archangelorum propter excellenciam, quam habent super angelos, sicut equites super pedites.

PRINCIPANS TURMA

Id est principatus, et est ordo medius in yperphania, et commutatur hic naturalis ordo causa metri, ut sepe contingit. Et scieendum, quod 'turma' potest dici de racionabilibus tantum; 'turba' vero de racionabilibus et irrationabilibus.

VIRTUS URANICA

Hic redit ad primum ordinem ypophanie. 'Uranos' Grece, 'ignis' Latine, unde 'uranica', id est ignea, et ponitur singularre pro plurali, quia virtus propter virtutes.

AC POTESTAS ALMIPHONA

Hic est tercius ordo in yperphania, et hic mutatur naturalis ordo ut superius, et ponitur hic singularre pro plurali, quia potestas propter potestates causa metri. ALMIFONA, id est sacra sonantes. 'Almum' enim sanctum, 'phonos' sonus est. Et potestates dicuntur eo, quod faciunt nos resistere instigacionibus demonum.

DOMINANCIA NUMINA

Id est dominaciones. Hic redit ad naturalem ordinem, et est primus ordo in yperphania.

DIVINAQUE SUBCELLIA

Id est troni. Hic est tercius ordo in epiphania. Et sunt subcellia cedes iudicum proprie sicut troni, et dicitur de 'sub' et 'cella', quod est diminutivum de 'cedes' et dicitur cella quasi cedella.

217 Principans| principatus cod. 218 yperphania] ypiphania cod.; cfr lin. 181 | commutatur ut vid. 220 racionabilibus]| racionabilus cod. 223 plurali + quia potestas propter potestates causa metri ante corr. 226 yperphania] ypophania cod.; cfr lin. 180–181 subcellia i.e. subcella | cedess i.e. sedes | cedess i.e. sella | diminitivum ut vid. | cedess i.e. sedess cedella i.e. cedellae, sedellae
CHERUBIN ETHEREA

Hic est secundus ordo in epiphania. ETHEREA dicit, quia ether est limpidus et clarior ceteris corporibus, et sic ponitur ad significandam claritudinem et cinceritatem scientiae Dei.

Et SERAPHIN ardencia

Hic est primus ordo in epiphania. Ardencia dicit eo, quod ille ordo, qui dicitur seraphin, infundit cordibus hominum ardorem caritatis.

Et notandum, quod aliud est cherubin, et aliud est cherubim, et aliud est cherub. 'Cherubin' enim scriptum per 'n' significat illam multitudinem, quae est in illo ordine, et est neutri generis et pluralis numeri. 'Cherubim' vero scriptum per 'm' significat aliquos de illa multitudine ut duos vel tres, et etiam est pluralis numeri et masculini generis. 'Cherub' autem significat unum de multitudine. Similiter dicendum est de differentia inter seraphin, seraphim et seraf. 'Seraphin' est ipsa multitudine, 'seraphim' aliqui de multitudine, 'seraf' unus de multitudine. Aliter tamen dicunt quidam, quod 'cherubin' ponitur pro multitudine et 'cherubim' pro uno multitudinis, et opponunt ita in hoc versu:

-N corus angelicus, ast -m tenet angelus unus.

Sed tunc non liquet, quid est cherub. Ideo dicunt alii, quod 'cherub' et 'seraf' sunt nomina angelorum, 'cherubin' et 'seraphin' eorum multitudo.

Postea facit mentionem determinate de quibusdam spiritibus, scilicet angelis, / dicens:

O VOS, MICHAEL, CELI SATRAPA

Et interpretatur MICHAEL quis ut Deus, vel dicitur a 'mico, -cas' et 'el', quod est Deus, quasi micans ante Deum. SATRAPHA, id est principans vel princeps vel id...
est nuncius. Et dicitur ‘sasrpha’ quasi satis paratus vel apparens, unde
‘sasrapea’, id est principatus vel nunciacio. CELI, id est celestis regni.

**GABRIEL**

GABRIEL dicitur a ‘gabri’, quod est fortis, et ‘el’, quod est Deus, quasi fortitudo
Dei, vel dicitur Gabriel ethimologice quasi Gerens Ave Beate Reatum Illicitum
Eve Lavanti. **DANS VERA NUNCIA VERBI**, id est Filii.

Et notandum, quod ‘verbum’ quinque modis accipitur. Quandoque idem est
quod diecio, unde Plautus: Verbum de verbo extulit. Quandoque pro sermone,
unde est: Sis stabilis verbo. Quandoque ponitur pro decepcione, unde Ovidius:
Verba dat omnis amans. Quandoque pro una parte oracionis, sicut ponit
Donatus. Quandoque ponitur pro Filio, unde illud: *Verbum caro factum est*, et ita
accipitur hic. VERBI, id est Filii, et hac racione, quia, sicut verbum est interpres
cordis, sic Dei Filius est interpres Patris ad homines. Filius semper erat aput
Patrem, unde in evangelio: *In principio erat verbum et verbum erat apud Deum.*

**ATQUE RAPHAEL, VITE VERNULA**

RAPHAEL interpretatur medicina Dei. VERNULA, id est diminutivum de ‘verna’,
id est cliens. VITE, id est salutis.

**NOS TRANSFERTE INTER PARADISICOLAS**

Id est colentes paradisum.

Et notandum, quod super hiis nominibus, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, duplex est
opinio. Quidam enim dicunt, quod sunt nomina officiorum, et quandoque alicui
permittitur spiritui potestas fortitudinis, tunc potest dici Michael, ut quando
pugnavit cum dracone et expulit eum de terra et similiter in die iudicii detrued
eum in infernum et suos complices. Similiter quando alicui spiritui permittitur
potestas nunciandi, tunc potest dici Gabriel, unde illud: Missus est Gabriel ad
Mariam et ad Annam et ad Ioachim et ad Zachariam. Item Quandoque alicui
spiritui permittitur potestas medendi, tunc potest dici Raphael, sicut ad
Thobiam et ad Iob missus est Raphael. Quidam autem dicunt, quod sunt
nomina propria angelorum. Sed utrum sic vel sic sit, nobis est minus, dum
scitur diversorum opinio.

PER VOS PATRIS CUNCTA COMPLENTUR MANDATA, QUE DAT EIUSDEM SOPHIA

O vos angeli, CUNCTA MANDATA PATRIS COMPLENTUR PER VOS, QUE, scilicet
mandata, SOPHIA, id est Filius, EIUSEM, scilicet Patris, DAT. SOPHIA, id est
sapiencia, et ab inicio cum Deo fuit, id est Filius. Et fit mencio de Patre, cum
dicitur PER VOS PATRIS; de Fili, cum dicitur EIUSEM SOPHIA; < * * * >, id est
sapiencie COMPAR, id est equaliter se habens ad Patrem et ad Filium, quia nulla
prerogativa inter tres personas est.

Et ne aliquis crederet, quod tres essent ibi substancie, sicut et tres persone,
subiungit hoc, quod dicit:

UNA PERMANENS IN USIA

Id est permanens in una essenciali substancia.

CUI ESTIS ADMINISTRANCIA DEO MILIAM MILIA SACRA

CUI, scilicet Deo, VOS MILIAM MILIAM, id est mille milia agmina, SACRA.
Anteponitur ibi numerus finitus pro numero infinito, quia nullus est ibi
numerus quod nos. ESTIS ADMINISTRANCIA, id est famulancia.
VICES PER BIS QUINAS BIS ATQUE QUINGENTA DENA CENTENA MILLENA
ASSISTUNT IN AULA, AD QUAM REX OVEM CENTESIMAM TERRIGENAM
DRAGMAMQUE DECIMAM VESTRA DUXIT SUPER ALGAMATA

CENTENA MILLENA, id est centum milia distincta, PER BIS QUINAS VICES, id est
per x ordines, BIS ATQUE QUINGENTA DENA, id est per x milia, et ponitur aduc
numerus finitus pro infinito, ASSISTUNT IN AULA, id est in conspectu Dei in
celo apparent, AD QUAM, scilicet aulam, REX, id est Filius, ducit OVMEN
CENTESIMAM, id est hominem (et hoc intellige sic, quod decies decem
perficiunt centum, et ix angelorum et homo perficiet decimum, et sic dicitur
ovis centesima), TERRIGENAM (vel verbigenam, secundum diversam litteram. Si
‘terrigenam’, respice generacionem secundum carnem; si ‘verbigenam’, respice
/ illam, que fit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto), DRAGMAM DECIMAM. Et
notandum, quod ‘hec dragma, -me’ octava pars est uncie, pondus denarii
argentii, et dicitur denarius, quia pro x nummis imputatur, et ita DRAGMAM
DECIMAM, hoc est hominem completurum decimum ordinem angelorum.

Dragma enim dicitur denarius nummus, sicut dictum est. Ita dixi. DUXIT SUPER
VESTRA ALGAMATA, id est supra celicam celstidinem vel celi culmina.

Et notandum, quod quidam dicunt ‘hoc agalma, -tis’, id est culmen, et tunc
dicitur ab ‘a’, quod similiter sine, et ‘ge’, terra, et ‘almus, -a, -um’ et ‘maneo,
-nes’, quasi sine terreneritate alma mancio. Quidam autem ali dicunt, quod ‘hoc
agalma’ est domus pastoris vel ovile, et, quia Deus se assimulat pastori, et angeli
et homines assimulantur ovibus, autor ponit transsumptive hoc nomen ‘agalma’
ad significandum celum. Ita dicunt quidam, et est probabilis utraque opinio, et
tunc ‘agalma’ ab ‘agolo’, quod est baculus pastoralis.

Autor huius cantici apostrofat in hoc loco, id est vertit sermonem in communi
ad omnes spiritus, dicens:

VOS PER ETHRA

---

in evang. 34, 6.

308 vestra] nostra cod. | duxit ducit cod.; cfr lin. 321 310 aduc i.e. adhuc 322 vestra] nostra
cod.; cfr lin. 333—334
‘Hec ethra, huius ethre’, id est qualitas aeris, sed non ponitur hic in ista significacione sed per sincopam ‘per ethra’, id est per ethera, scilicet per celestia, scilicet date vota.

NOS PER RURA, id est per civitates et villas, id est per terrena, DAMUS VOTA, NOS, dicens, DENA PARS ELECTA, id est ad suplendum desimum ordinem a Deo electa.

ARMONIE VOTA DAMAS YPERLIRICA CITHARA

NOSTRA DEO SINT ACCEPTA AUREAM CIRCA ARAM THIMIAMATA

Et sciendum secundum theologos, quod due erant are in veteri testamento: ara olocausti et ara incensi. Ara olocausti erat extra templum sub diem, id est sub aere, ad quam sacrificabantur animalia, et per illam debemus intelligere mortificaciones viciorum in cordibus nostris. Et dicitur olocaustum ab ‘olon’, quod est totum, et ‘eleos’, gloria.
Alia enim erat ara in templo et dicebatur ara aurea, ad quam non licuit sacerdoti accedere nisi semel in anno, et tunc cum odoramentis et timiamatibus et huiusmodi, et per illam debemus intelligere corda defecata a viciis et Spiritu sancto repleta et illuminata. Et est sensus huius versiculi talis, ut post diem iudicii viciis mortalitatis simus puri et Spiritu sancto illuminati.

QUO IN CELESTI GLORIA CONDECANTEMUS ALLELUIA

QUO, id est ut, CONDECANTEMUS, id est simul cum angelis cantemus, IN CELESTI GLORIA, quando erimus in denario ordine positi, ALLELUIA. ‘Allelu’ interpretatur laudate, ‘ya’, universalis, et tunc ‘alleluia’, id est laudate universalem, id est Deum, vel ‘ya’, Dominus, unde ‘alleluia’, ut dictum est, idem est quod laudate Dominum, qui vivit et regnat per infinita seculorum secula.

Explicit tractatus trium canticorum.
6 EDITION 2. The Commentary of Ox1: the ‘glossary commentary’

This commentary is part of a large collection of commentaries to sequences for the whole liturgical year, although the beginning of the volume is now missing. I have given this text the subtitle the ‘glossary commentary’ on account of its singular twofold division, where the second part is essentially a comprehensive glossary to the sequence, which is paraphrased in the first part.

6.1 MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTION

Ox1

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 161 (S. C. 6471)

A collection of sequence commentaries

Date: mid-fifteenth century2

Provenance: England

Material: Paper

Size: 210 x 290 mm.

Folios: i + 127

Contents: Commentaries to 67 sequences

fols 95v–98v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex

fols 126r–127v: A list of temptations together with references to Biblical passage which can help in resisting them. Inc.: ‘Incipiunt temptaciones’

The beginning of the codex is mutilated and the text on fol. 1 starts in the middle of a sentence: ‘id est ista inferiora per naturam assumpta propria clemencia’. The first identified piece to be commented upon can be found on

---

1 This description is partly based on the Summary Catalogue (see the bibliography under the entry S. C.) and partly on my own observations of the manuscript. Fol. 95v of this manuscript is reproduced as Plate 4.

2 Dr Teresa Webber, Cambridge, has upon inspection of photocopies of the manuscript suggested the middle of the third quarter of the fifteenth century (in conversation, Cambridge, July 2004).
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fol. 4, the sequence *Qui regis sceptrum fortis dextra* for the third Sunday of Advent.¹ There is a colophon on fol. 125⁵ which briefly summarises the interpretative programme for the commentaries. The text is written in one column throughout the manuscript in a cursive script with many typical anglicana features such as the two-compartment *a*, the looped *d*, and the 8-shaped *g* together with the use of long *r*.¹ Typical cursive features may also be observed, such as the looped ascenders of *b*, *h* and *l* and the single-compartment *a* used alongside the two-compartment variant. The scribe uses an abbreviation mark consisting of a horizontal stroke with a small dot immediately beneath it, which is typical of fifteenth-century English manuscripts.⁵ The number of lines varies between 29 and 31. The ink is black, with initials in red. The sequences are referred to only by incipit, but the incipits are not underlined. There are a few marginal notes and catchwords.

6.2 ON THE TEXT—THE COMMENTARY OF *Ox1*

As it is quite common for the large collections of commentaries to be preceded by a prologue introducing the book of sequences at hand and providing an interpretative framework for its reading, it is not impossible to imagine that the missing folio(s) of this manuscript could have included such an introduction. However, the colophon on fol. 125⁵ provides us with some insight as to the motives of this commentator. The text of the colophon is sometimes hard to read and the syntax is wanting, but I will nevertheless print it here as far as I can decipher it, introducing some punctuation but without attempting any emendations:

Explicit liber troperii sive sequenciarum secundum usum Sarum. Construccio prout incepcio et continuacio recti ordinis expectit grammaticaliter construendi cum historiis veterris et novi testamenti in ipsis contentis una cum sensu mistico, qui triplex esse dinoscitur, scilicet allegoricus, anagogicus et tropologicus. Super hisdem historiis composicione et derivacione diccionum postremo et ultimo consequentibus. Quod [verbum quod non leg.] ymmo [verbum quod non leg].

³ AH 53, 3.
⁴ For the anglicana script, see PARKES (1969) and DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 134–141.
⁵ See PARKES (1969), comments to Plate 3 (i), and DEROLEZ (2003), p. 187. In the reproduction of fol. 95v of *Ox1* this abbreviation mark is seen for instance at lines 10, 11 and 12; see Plate 4.
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What can be inferred from this less than clear text is that an aim for the commentator seems to be a grammatical construing of the text in conjunction with stories from Scripture in the mystical sense, that is the allegorical, the anagogical and the tropological senses. In addition, the composition and derivation of words will be treated.

This twofold programme could then perhaps explain the twofold division of this and of all the commentaries in the collection; the first objective referred to in the colophon corresponds to the paraphrase section, whereas the second goal is fulfilled in the vocabulary section.

At the very beginning of the exposition, the commentator states the feast for the sequence and its subject-matter in one sentence. Thereupon follows the extensive paraphrase of the sequence text, which both construes the text and provides explanations of the words and phrases of the sequence through inserted instructive phrases generally beginning with *id est* or *scilicet*. These brief comments function on several levels. They sometimes fill the role of lexical glosses in providing synonyms, as at lines 4–5 where first the synonym *cantet* is added to *pangat* of the sequence, and *canora symphonia* is explained with the equivalent phrase *sonora concordia*. They can also supply the reader with implied words, such as the adjective *angelica* to specify the *caterva* of the sequence (line 4), or spell out the referent of pronouns as at line 9 where * quem* is said to refer to Michael. A third function of these brief elucidations is to provide the figurative reading of the sequence text, as is one of the explicit ambitions of the commentary as mentioned in the colophon. This can be seen for instance at lines 64–66 where the tenth drachma and the hundredth sheep are understood as the human race.

A few quotations and references to Scripture and the Biblical Gloss, which serve to deepen the reader’s understanding of the sequence text, are also inserted into the paraphrase. A similar function may be noted in the slightly longer comments providing background information on the subject-matter of the sequence, as can be seen in the paragraph following the sequence lemma *novies distincta*. With an explicit reference to Dionysius, the author here offers a summary note on the threefold hierarchy of the angels. This brief account includes an enumeration of the different orders in each of the three sections, although the commentator does not adhere to Dionysius’s system but follows the order of the angels as presented in the sequence (lines 12–15). The concept of ‘hierarchy’, although mentioned, is not dwelt upon further or explained, as happened in Alan’s *Expositio prose de angelis* and the commentary of Ox6. It is noteworthy that this is also the case in the other late commentaries edited here,
which gives the impression that the word is considered either as unproblematic or as presupposed knowledge on behalf of the readers.

The next brief excursus is the traditional explanation of the difference between angels and spirits (lines 20–26). It is here given without reference to a specific authority, but the same definition is found in most medieval works treating the angels. Other passages in the sequence that are accorded similarly concise explications are found for instance at lines 29–31 in connection with red tua ymago, which leads to a quotation from Genesis 1, 26, and the section dena pars elec(a (lines 68–69), which generates a comment on the role of man with respect to the angels.

The comments on cithara (lines 72–75 and 216–219) illustrate the marked difference between the two sections. In the first section, the explanation concerns the figurative reading of the instrument as representing the ten commandments, as is found in Isidore’s Etymologiae 3, 12, 7. This understanding is furthermore corroborated with two quotations from the Psalms in which the ten strings of the instrument are mentioned. The interpretation of the sperlitria cithara as representing the observance of the ten commandments is found neither in Alan of Lille’s commentary nor in the Expositio Ox6, but it is a regular feature in all the following commentaries edited here, with the exception of Expositio St2.

In the vocabulary section, the commentator is concerned only with the grammatical and etymological aspects of cithara. The word is presented in the nominative and the genitive to show how it declines. Its origin is said to be Doric and, again drawing on Isidore for information, the naming of the instrument with a derivative of a word whose literal meaning is ‘chest’, pectus, is explained through the likeness between two.

In the text, the vocabulary section is preceded by the signal ‘sequitur vocabulorum exposicio’ and is in essence a monoglot glossary in the form of a running text with etymologies and a number of more extensive explanations on certain words as regards origin, composition and usage. There are also a few differentiae separating similar or related words.

Nouns are usually presented with a form of hic to indicate gender and the first two or three forms of the paradigm to indicate declension—an example from line 93 is hec officina, -ae. First- and second-declension adjectives are given

---

6 See the source apparatus to this passage in the edition.
7 Psalms 143, 9 and 32, 2.
8 Chapter 7, Edition 3.
with their respective endings, as with *primevus*, *-a*, *-um* at line 94, while third-declension adjectives are also preceded by forms of *hic* to indicate gender, as with ‘hic celeber, hec celebris et hoc -bre’, at the opening of this new section at line 82, and ‘hic, hec, hoc compar, -paris’ at line 199. Verbs are generally given in the form of the first and second person singular, as at line 98, *categorizo*, *-as*. For this word the author, in addition to providing the lexical variants *signare vel predicare*, elaborates his elucidation to include derivations too: *hec categoria* is referred to as Aristotle’s categories or predicaments, *categorie* as accusations, and finally *categoreuma* and *sincategoreuma* as Priscian’s terms for the significative and the consignificative words in an utterance.  

The majority of the etymological interpretations of particular words and the definitions of the offices of the angelic orders are dependent on Isidore’s *Etymologiae*. Sometimes these are quoted almost verbatim from the source, which is, however, never explicitly mentioned. Other definitions of words and information on their inflection and their derivation seem to be drawn from medieval dictionaries. Several definitions are found more or less verbatim in the *Catholicon*, the Latin grammar and dictionary completed in 1286 by the Dominican John Balbus of Genoa; examples are the words *celeber* (lines 82–85), *festum* (lines 89–92), *phalanx* (lines 116–118) and *rus* (lines 207–208). For other definitions there are similarities in expression both with articles from the *Catholicon* and with the *Vocabularius opiusus et singularis unus ex diversis diligentlye theutonicatus* (c.1480) such as the above-mentioned explanation of *sincategoreuma* (lines 103–104). Although the date for the *Vocabularius opiusus* is later than a possible date of composition for the commentary of *Ox1*, the great similarities in the phrasing of the definitions are noteworthy; late medieval dictionaries were often constructed using other, earlier, dictionaries as sources to draw on, as the fifteenth-century lexicographer Firmin le Ver attests, for example, in the prologue to his Latin–French dictionary. Perhaps a similar working method...

9 Prisc., *gramm.*, 2, 15.

10 This work is available today only in incunabula and other early editions; see the bibliography under the entry Joh. Balb., *catb*.

11 See the *apparatus fontium* of the edition for these lines. The *Vocabularius opiusus* is there referred to with the abbreviation *Confl. Voc.* following the use of the *Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicus mediæ ævi* (henceforth LN) based on the explicit of the dictionary: ‘[. . . ] conflatus vocabulorum finitus et completus.’ The date for Confl. Voc. is taken from LN.

12 In the prologue to his *Dictionarius*, completed in 1440, Firmin le Ver says that he has collected the material from several places (‘congregavi, compilavi, conscripsi’). His principal sources are the *Catholicon* mentioned above, the *Magnae Derivationes* of Hugh of Pisa (†1210) and Papias’s *Elementarium* from the eleventh century (Firm., *dict.*, pp. v–xiv).
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for the *Vocabularius copiosus* could be an explanation for the agreements in expression.

The commentator of *Ox6* incorporates the same interpretation of *symbolum* as is found in Alan’s *Expositio* and in the commentary of *Ox6*, namely as a word consisting of the two parts ‘with’ and ‘part’ or ‘portion’. Adhering to the medieval tradition of the Apostles’ Creed as being composed by each apostle contributing a portion of the text, the author adds a vivid picture of the actual situation to this etymology (lines 109–112).

The word *agalma*, which in the previous commentary followed the interpretation of Alan of Lille, is here not linked to the image of the shepherd and the sheep but instead is understood as ‘heights’, presumably the heights of heaven although this is not spelt out (line 206). The commentator also adds the definition ‘quasi agens figuram alterius’ (‘as it were carrying another’s figure’), which seems to be a mixture between an actual explanation and a play on the syllables of the word (that is, *ag*, *al* and *am*); it is comparable with the interpretation found in the *Vocabularius copiosus* mentioned above.13 The commentator does not show any concern for the difference between the words *pneuma* and *neuma*, nor the difference between *facere* and *creare*, as had Alan of Lille and the commentator of *Ox6*.

The vocabulary section is also interspersed with a number of *versus memoriales* in hexameters, mainly concerning grammatical issues and the meanings of certain words. The difference between *seraphin* / *cherubin* and *seraphim* / *cherubim*, which was thoroughly treated in the commentary of *Ox6*, is here analysed in the same manner but subsumed under a broader discussion of the gender of all the angelic names including, apart from the four mentioned above, the individual names—of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael—as well as the names of the other orders (lines 163–174). This account is summarised by five hexameter lines taken from the *Doctrinale*, the versified grammar by Alexander de Villa-Dei (†1240). At lines 191–198 the commentator’s focus on grammar and lexical knowledge again comes to the fore in a discussion of the formation of the verbs *gigno*, *colo*, and *venio* and the gender of their derivations, which is followed by a summary in four hexameter lines, three of which are again drawn from the *Doctrinale*. The etymology of *satrapa* (lines 175–176) is followed by a hitherto unidentified verse that nevertheless displays great verbal similarity with the definition of *satrapa* in Firmin le Ver’s dictionary. A verse by Serlon de Wilton

13 See LN, s.v. ‘agalma’: Confl. Voc.: ‘agalmata dicitur figura quasi agens ymaginem alterius’.
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(†1181) illustrates in a similar manner the duplex meaning of the word *lira* (line 213).

6.2.1 Textual problems and remarks on the edition

As the manuscript *Ox1* is the sole known witness to this commentary, the edition of the text has been made in accordance with the principles for texts of Category 1, as described above. 14 The text of this manuscript is generally very good and no major editorial interventions have been necessary. Corrections most often concern simple scribal errors such as omitted strokes for *n* or *m*, or the tendency of the scribe to use *e* for *i* and other wavering of vocalic usage, which have been standardised in accordance with the general principles stated above. 15 A few corrections have been made following implicit source texts, as with *celebria* at line 84 or supplementing *seraphin* in the verse at line 171.

The text in the vocabulary section has been divided into paragraphs to correspond with the paragraphs in the paraphrase section. Each new main word begins a new line.

14 See Section 4.1.1 above. In the commentaries on *Ad celebres rex* in the manuscripts *Lo3, Ox3* and *Ox5* (which three manuscripts display fairly similar texts) a number of passages phrased in a similar manner as in the commentary of *Ox1* are found. Certain phrases found in these texts also occur in the sequence commentary entitled *Expositio sequentiarum secundum usum Sarum*, which is extant in many early printed works; see Chapter 2, n. 12 above. This could attest to an ‘English tradition’ among the sequence commentaries.

15 See Section 4.2.1 above.
AD CELEBRES REX CELICE et cetera.

Ista sequencia cantatur in festo Michaelis archangeli, in qua non tantum fit mencio de illo sed eciam de novem ordinibus angelorum.

Construe ergo sic: o CELICE REX, CUNCTA CATERVA, scilicet angelica, PANGAT, id est cantet, NUNC cum CANORA SYMPHONIA, id est sonora concordia, AD CELEBRES, id est festivas, LAUDES, scilicet tui, ATQUE NOSTRA CONCIO, scilicet hic in ecclesia militante, SOLVAT, id est reddat, TIBI ODAS, id est cantica laudis, CUM FESTA MICHAELIS VALDE INCLITA, id est venerabilia, NOVIES DISTINCTA.et cetera, id est similis letanti, LETABUNDA, id est perfecte ornatur.

Nota hic secundum Dionisium, quod in celo sunt tres hierarchiae, id est tres sacri principatus et potestates, et in qualibet hierarchia sunt tres ordines: in prima sunt angelii, archangelii et principatus; in secunda sunt virtutes, potestates et dominaciones; in tercia sunt throni, cherubini et seraphini.

Construe ergo sic: AGMINA, id est societates, PNEUMATUM, id est spirituum, FACTA, id est creatas, PER TE, scilicet SUNT DISTINCTA, id est divisa, NOVIES, id est per novem ordinis, ut predicetur, SED, scilicet o tu Deus, CUM VIS, id est cum placet tibi, FACIS HEC, scilicet agmina, FLAMMEA, id est que lucent ut flamma, PER ANGELICAS OFFICINAS, id est per officia angelorum. Hoc est dictum: Facis eos angelos, unde notandum est, quod angelus est nomen officii, nam ‘angelus’ Grece, ‘nuncius’ Latine. Et semper, quando mittitur, vocatur angelus, spiritus vero, quando non mittitur sed quando est permanens in sua hierarchia in celo. Et sic, quando Deus mittit suos spiritus ad terram ad alicuius

---

12 Dionisium] cfr e.g. J ohn Scot., ier. Dion., cap. 6–9, sed ordine angelorum non est secundum Dionysium sed secundum litteram sequentiae. 21 Facis ... angelos] cfr Pi. 103, 4. | angelus ... 23 angelus] cfr Ang., in psalm. 103, sermo 1, 15; cfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 8; cfr Isid., orig. 7, 5, 2; 7, 5, 6.

2 cantatur] catatur cod. 5 cantet + ad celebres id est festivas laudes ante corr. | nunc] nuc cod.
21 dictum] dicta cod.
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...tunc facit eos angelos, unde in psalmo: \textit{Qui facit angelos suos spiritus et ministros suos flammam ignis.} 

96 Nam, id est vere, HEC, scilicet agmina angelica, \textit{SUNT INTER TUA PRIMEVA CREATA}, hoc est primo a te fuerant angeli creati, CUM NOS, scilicet homines, SIMUS tua ULTIMA FACTURA, id est ultima creatura, SED, scilicet sumus, TUA YMAGO, ut patet Genesis secundo capitulo, unde ibi dicitur: \textit{Faciamus hominem ad ymaginem et similitudinem nostram.} THEOLOGA SIMBOLA, id est divini sermones scripture et dogmata divina, CATEGORIZANT, hoc est predicant et docent, HEC, scilicet agmina spirituum, scilicet esse TRIPARTITA, id est in tres partes divisa, TER, id est novies, nam ter tria efficient novem.

PLEBS ANGELICA et cetera.

Hic enim consequenter dicitur, quomodo hæc agmina sunt suis diversis nominibus ter tripartita, et ideo dicitur: o, scilicet ANGELICA PLEBS, id est multitudo angelorum, ET o ARCHANGELICA PHALANX, id est o turma archangelorum, et o TURMA PRINCIPANS, id est totaliter nominata, et o URANICA, id est celestis, VIRTUS, id est nominata virtus vel virtutes celi, et o ALMIPHONA POTESTAS, id est pulere et sancte sonans, et o NUMINA DOMINANCIA, id est o spiritus vocati dominaciones, -QUE pro et, et o DIVINA SUBCELLIA, id est o throni, quibus velud in throno suo Dominus presidens aliorum facta examinat, et ETHEREA CHERUBIN AC, pro et, et o IGNICOMA SERAPHIN, id est o seraphin ardens et splendens.

Et o MICHAEL SATRAPA, id est princeps vel prefectus, CELI, et o GABRIEL DANS, id est dicens, scilicet beate Marie, Vera NUNCIA VERBI, id est filii Dei incarnati, ATQUE pro et, et o RAPHAEL VERNULA, id est famulus, VITE, id est Dei, qui est vera et eterna vita, VOS TRANSFERTE vel conferte, id est simul ferte, gerite vel portate, NOS INTER PARADISICOLAS, id est inter habitantes paradisum.

CUNCTA MANDATA PATRIS, scilicet Dei omnipotentis, COMPLENTUR PER VOS, QUE, scilicet mandata, SOPHIA, id est sapiencia vel Filius, EIUSDEM Patris QUOQUE, pro et, et PNEUMA, id est Spiritus sanctus, COMPAR, id est equalis,

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Qui facit angelos suos spiritus et ministros suos flammam ignis.} Hbr. 1, 7; cfr etiam Ps. 103, 4. \textit{Faciamus hominem ad ymaginem et similitudinem nostram.} Gn. 1, 26.
\item Theologa \textit{theolaga} \textit{cod.} 31 \textit{predicat} \textit{cod.} 32 \textit{dicitur} \textit{decetur cod.} 36 \textit{et} \textit{e} \textit{cod.} 39 \textit{principans} \textit{principalus cod.; cfr lin. 124} \textit{subcellia i.e. subsellia | presedens cod. 46 et supra lin. 52 scilicet bis scr. cod.}
\end{itemize}
scilicet Patri et Filio, PERMANENS IN UNA USIA, id est una substancia cum Patre et Filio, DAT, id est precipit, CUI DEO vos SACRA, id est vos angeli, qui estis sacrae res sacrate et confirmate per graciem, per ruinam angelicam, ESTIS ADMINISTRANCI, videlicet MILLA MILIAM, id est infiniti (hic ponitur numeros finitus pro numero infinito), et hoc PER BIS QUINAS VICES, id est per decem, quinquaginta DENA et CENTENA MILLENIA, scilicet / angelorum, ASSISTUNT, id est astant, scilicet Deo, IN AULA, id est in celo, AD QUAM, scilicet aulam, VERBIGENA, id est Filius Dei, REX, id est qui se regem innotuit per suam passionem, resurgencem et ascensionem, prout dicit glossa super isto versu: Dominus regnavit, irascantur populi et cetera, DUXIT, id est adduxit, SUPER VESTRA AGALMATHA, id est super altitudinem vestram, CENTESIMAM OVE, -QUE pro et, et DECIMAM DRAGMAM, id est genus humanum, prout patet de humanitate Christi deitati unita, qui est super omnes choros.

VOS, scilicet angeli, scilicet entes vel existentes PER ethera, id est per celestia vel in celestibus, et NOS, scilicet mortales, DENA PARS ELECTA, scilicet a Deo ad supplecione et restaurationem lapsus angelici, scilicet existentes PER RURA, id est per mundum, DEMUS, scilicet tam verbo quam opere, VOTA, id est cantica, ARMONIE, id est dulcis modulacionis, scilicet a Deo volita et desiderata, in YPERLIRICA, id est in valde dulci, CITHARA, hoc est in observacione decem mandatorum Dei, quorum observacio super cithare dulcedinem placet sibi (de ista, scilicet cithara, loquitur psalmista, ita dicens: In psalterio decacordo psallam tibi, et alibi: In cithara decem cordarum psallite illi), UT THIMIAMATA, id est nostre oraciones, que per thimiamata designantur, SINT ACCEPTA DEO CIRCA AUREAM ARAM, id est circa seipsum, qui est vere aurae ara, ad quem omnium preces debent offerri, POST INCLITA BELLA MICHAELIS, QUO pro ut, ut CONDECANTEMUS, id est ut simul cantemus, IN CELESTI GLORIA ALLELUIA, id est laudem Dei vel canticum divine laudis. Amen.
Sequitur vocabulorum exposicio.


‘Hec officina, -e’, id est officium.

‘Primevus, -a, -um’ dicitur de ‘primus’ et ‘hoc evum, -i, -o’.

‘Theologus, -a, -um’ componitur a ‘theos’, quod est Deus, et ‘logos’, sermo, id est tractans et loquens de divinis, unde ‘hec theologia, -ie’, id est divinitas vel sermo Deo, unde ‘theologicus, -a, -um’.

‘Cathegorizo, -as’, id est signare vel predicare, et dicitur de ‘cathegoro, -as’, quod idem est, unde ‘hec cathegoria, -i e’, id est predicamentum vel predicacio, unde et hec predicamenta Aristotelis dicuntur. ‘Cathegorie’ eciam dicuntur.


accusaciones et a 'cathegoro, -as'. 'Hoc cathegoreuma, -tis', id est predicamentum vel significativum et componitur cum 'sin', quod est con, et dicitur 'hoc sincathegoreuma', id est consignificativum, unde partes oracionis alie a nomine et verbo dicuntur a Prisciano sincathegoreumata, id est consignificativa, quia cum alii et non per se in oracione signant.


'Hoc officium, -ii, -o' decomposite figure de 'officio, -cis' per contrarium, quia non officit, ymo proficit; vel 'officium' dicitur quasi 'efficium' ab efficiendo.

'Phalanx, -gis' vel 'hec falanga, -ge' lingua Macedonum dicitur legio, unde 'falangarius, -a, -um', id est legionarius vel de hac falanga existens vel ad falangam pertinens.

'Angelicus, -a, -um' nomen possessivum de 'hic angelus, -i, -o'.


101 cathegoro ex cathegoro zo corr. cod. 102 componitur | coponitur cod. 103 id est + consignativum ante corr. 108 in delevi 109 quilibet ut vid. 114 proficit | proficet cod. 117 legionarius | legeonarius cod. | hac |hec cod.
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‘Principans turma’, id est ille ordo, qui vocatur principatus. Principatus sunt hii, qui angelorum agminibus presunt, qui pro eo, quod subditos angelos ad explendum divinum officium vel ministerium <disponunt>, et ‘principatus’ vocabulum acceperunt. Nam alii sunt, qui administrant, alii, qui assistunt, sicut per Danielem dicitur: Milia milium ministribant ei et decies milies centena milia assistibant ei.

‘Virtus’, id est talis ordo angelicus. Virtutes angelice quedam ministeria habere perhibentur, pro quos signa et miracula in mundo fiunt, propter quod et virtutes dicuntur.

‘Uranicus, -a, -um’, id est celestis. Dicitur de ‘hic uranus, -i, -o’, id est celum et illud dicitur de ‘ur’, quod lingua Caldea dicitur ignis, quia igneum est.

‘Potestates’ est ille ordo angelicus, id est potestates sunt, quibus virtutes adverse subiecte, et inde potestatis nomine nuncupantur, quia maligni spiritus eorum potestate cohercentur, ne tantum mundo noceant, quantum cupiunt.

‘Almiphonus, -a, -um’ dicitur de ‘almus, -a, -um’, quod est sanctus, -a, -um, et dicitur a ‘phonus’, quod est sonus, quasi sancte sonans.

‘Dominancia’, id est dominaciones sunt hii, qui eciam virtutibus et principatibus preminent, qui pro eo, quod ceteris agminibus angelorum dominantur, dominaciones vocantur.

eloquio sedes dicuntur. Et vocantur throni, quia illis conditor presidet et per eos iudicia sua disponit.

In plurali numero nominatio ‘hec cherubin’ indeclinabile. Ex Hebreo in linguan nostram interpretantur sciencie multitudo. Sunt enim sublimiora agmina angelorum, qui pro eo, quod vicinius positi divina scienedia ceteris amplius pleni sunt, cherubin plenitudo scienedia appellantur. Ipsa sunt animalia illa duo super propiciatorium arche facta ex metallo propter quandam angelorum presenciam, in quorum medio ostenditur Deus.

In plurali numero ‘hec seraphin’ indeclinabile, id est ille ordo angelicus, qui ex Hebreo in Latinum ardentes vel incendentes interpretantur, quia inter eos et Deum nulli angeli consistunt, et ideo quanto vicinius coram Deo consistunt, tanto magis claritate divini luminis inflammantur. Unde et ipsi velant faciem et pedes sedentis in throno Dei et idcirco cetera angelorum turba videre Dei essensiam plene non valet, quoniam seraphin eam tegunt.

‘Ignicomus, -a, -um’ composite figure de ‘ignis’ et ‘hec coma’, id est habens igneas comas.

Et sciendum est, quod omnia nomina angelorum sunt masculini generis, ut ‘hic Michael’, ‘hic Gabriel’, exceptis duobus nominibus ‘cherubin’ et ‘seraphin’ terminantibus in -n, que sunt neutri generis tantum pluralis numeri et indeclinabilia, et exceptis ‘virtus’ et ‘dominacio’ et ‘potestas’. Sed ‘cherubim’ et ‘seraphim’ terminancia in -m sunt masculini generis, pluralis numeri et indeclinabilia. Versus:

Angelicum nomen dabit ‘hic’ sed dicit neutra plurali numero cherubin seraphinque beata et cherub et cherubim, cherubin, <seraphin> seraphimque atque seraph dabit -n neutro, dabit -m maris usu (id est masculini generis) hecque dabit virtus, dominacio sive potestas.
Expositio Ox1

‘Hic satrapa, -e’, id est princeps vel prefectus et dicitur satrapa quasi persona satis apta vel quasi satis rapiens, unde versus:

Est sapiens satrapa iudex quasi sat rapientes
est quoque Persarum rex vel prefectus eorum.

Gabriel Hebrayce fortitudo Dei interpretatur. Ubi enim potencia divina vel fortitudo manifestatur, Gabriel mittitur. Unde et eo tempore, quo erat Dominus nascitus et triumphantus de mundo, Gabriel venit ad Mariam, ut illum annunciatet, qui ad debellandas potestates aetas humilis venire dignatus est.

Raphael interpretatur curacio vel medicina Dei. Ubicumque enim curandi vel medendi opus in terra est, hic archangelus a Deo mittitur et inde medicina Dei vocatur. Unde ad Thobiam idem angelus missus oculus eius curacionem adhibuit, et ceccitate detersa visum eius restituit.

‘Hic, hec vernula, -le’ nomen diminutivum, id est famulus pulcher serviens, qui vernat in domo / divitum pulcritudine vestium, et dicitur de ‘verno, -as’, id est clarescere, splendere vel delectari.

‘Hic, hec paradisicola, -le’ dicitur de ‘hic paradisus, -i, -o’, et ‘colo, -is’, id est habitare: qui inhabitat paradisum. Et scindum est, quod omnia composita istorum verborum ‘gigno’, ‘colo’, ‘venio’ sunt communis generis [duorum] excepto hoc nomine ‘verbigena’, id est Filius Dei, qui est tantum masculini generis, unde versus:

Quod ‘colo’ componit, commune locare decebit
quodque facit ‘gigno’, ‘pincernaque lixaque’ iungo,


\[177\] sat scripsi metri causa, satis cod. 178 vel + per ante corr. | corum] carum cod. 184 in terra ut vid. 187 famulus + litt. pl ante corr. 192 generis ut vid., supra lin. | duorum delevi, pois duorum verbum generum scr. sed del. cod.
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non est verbigena, nisi Christus, vera sophia et ‘venio’ iungas, quod et ‘advena’ testificatur.

‘Hic, hoc, hoc compar, -paris’, id est equalis, componitur de ‘con’ et ‘par, -is’.

‘Hic verbigena, -e’ dicitur de ‘hoc verbum, -i, -o’, et ‘gigno’, id est Filius Dei, sicut predicitur.

‘Hic rus, -ris’ dicitur de ‘ruo, -is’, et est villa, terra, ager, sed proprie rura inculta, ager, qui colitur.

‘Hic citha, -the’ Dorica lingua pectus dicitur, unde ‘hec cithara, -e’, sic dicta, quia in inicio credebatur fuisse similis humano pectori, unde sicut ex pectore ita ex ipsa cantus ederetur.

Pollice tango liram, facio cum vomere liram.

‘Alleluja’, id est canticum laudis divine.
7 EDITION 3. The Commentary of St2: the ‘music commentary’

This commentary is written as an additional piece after the collection of hymn and sequence commentaries in the manuscript, and does not seem to be part of the original collection. The text is unique not only in the sense that it is as yet only known from this textual witness; it is also the only commentary to discuss music to any great extent, hence the subtitle given to this chapter.

7.1 MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTION

St2 Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB I 881

A miscellany in five parts, containing among other works commentaries to hymns and sequences, Hugh of St Cher’s exposition of the mass and the Poetria nova of Geoffrey of Vinsauf.

Date: 13th/14th century
Provenance: Weingarten (Benedictine)
Material: Parchment
Size: 200 x 150 mm.
Folios: ii + 123 + ii

Contents: 1. fols 1r–13v: A miscellaneous section. A list of incipits of sermons; a comparison between natural and divine objects. Inc.: ‘Comparatio serpentis ad quemlibet Christianum venientem ad ecclesiam’; a sermon on the Blessed Virgin. Inc.: ‘Fons ortorum puteus aquarum. Nomina plura dicit ortorum quia tres sunt orti’; notes on the Holy Communion
2. fols 14r–36v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Aristoteles dicit primo Ethicorum quod felicitas est bonum optimum’
   fols 36v–48v: Sequence commentaries

1 The description is based on the information in the manuscript catalogue, AUTENRIETH (1968), and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
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fol. 36r: Dicit Aristoteles

fols 49r–51v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex

fol. 52r–v: Red lines for musical notation

fols 53r–60v: Hugh of St Cher: Expositio Missae. Inc.: ‘Dicit apostolus ad Ephesios: Induite vos armatura Dei’; verses on vices and punishments. Inc. ‘Ypocrisis. Quod videor grata mihi dat virtus simulata’

3. fols 62r–103v: Geoffrey of Vinsauf: Poetria nova. Fol. 104r–v is blank

4. fols 105r–109r: Religious tract of which the beginning is missing. Fol. 109r is blank

5. fols 110r–123v: Fragments of a grammatical commentary. Inc.: ‘Prima causa est quia cognominis et pronominis in multis sunt communes prima ergo causa est necessitas’

The commentary on Ad celebres rex is found at the end of a large collection of sequence commentaries, but for various reasons does not appear to belong to the previous section. For one thing, it has its own integrated prologue, which does not agree with the Aristotelian methodological schema used in the prologue to the collection of commentaries in the manuscript, Dicit Aristoteles. Moreover, the commentary on Ad celebres rex is written by a different hand from the rest of the collection and is the only commentary to lack an initial letter. These observations have brought me to the conclusion that this commentary is a separate work that has been copied here on account of its belonging to the same genre as the other texts. In the light of the discussions on music in this commentary it is interesting to note that the subsequent folio, fol. 52, is ruled with red stave-lines for notation, though no music is actually written. Perhaps the scribe meant to copy the sequence with its music here to complement the earlier discussion.

The following remarks concern only fols 49r–51v. The text is written in one column throughout, comprising between 35 and 39 lines. The cursive script displays both single- and double-compartment a, and prominent loops to the right on the ascenders of the letters h, h, and l. Both straight s and f descend below the line and g is generally written with a loop on the descender which reaches well below the baseline. The Tironian et, sometimes crossed, is used. As

2 This is one of the textual witnesses collated in the edition of this prologue belonging to the ‘Aristotelian tradition’: see Section 8.2 below.

3 This is hinted at in the manuscript catalogue; Autenrieth (1968), p. 159.
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regards spelling, the scribe alternates between gn and ngn. Fol. 49r is reproduced here as Plate 5.

The text of the prologue Dicit Aristoteles in this manuscript is collated in Edition 4 below, but has not been chosen as the base manuscript for that edition. The prologue is written in a cursiva antiquior: the two-compartment a is used, the ascenders of b, h and l display prominent loops to the right. The shafts of the long s and f as well as other long downward strokes are highly accentuated and fairly broad.

7.2 ON THE TEXT—THE COMMENTARY OF St2

In certain ways, the commentary of St2 is one of the hardest texts to comprehend among this material on account of the peculiar and original definitions of musical terms especially in the latter part of the prologue. These do not seem to adhere to the standard understanding of contemporary medieval music theory as much as being a commentator’s original interpretation of certain terms, perhaps in vogue at the time. A strong predilection to form tripartite interpretations of various terms is detectable, possibly in order to reflect the Trinity.

The text opens with an integrated prologue before the actual exposition of the sequence begins (lines 1–63). In this it is similar to Alan of Lille’s Expositio prosae de angelis. Three of the four headings in the prologue section are the same questions as Alan discusses at the beginning of his Expositio, though this author provides different answers. The subject-matter is here said to be divine praise, where for Alan it is ‘spiritum increatum spiritusque creatos’. In the commentary of St2 the intention inherent in the sequence is exclusively linked by the commentator to the subject-matter: its purpose is to express this divine praise. Alan instead identifies a twofold intention on the author’s behalf, both to venerate Michael and to reveal the nature of the angels.

The commentator of St2 expounds a fourfold modus agendi for this sequence and in doing so touches implicitly upon the question of divisio textus, since his

---

4 See for instance line 17, ingnioma, and line 35, significat.
5 For cursiva antiquior, see DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 133–134.
6 These are a selection of headings belonging to the type C prologue, see Section 2.2.1.1 above.
7 Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 195.
linking of the modus agendi to different passages in the text has the effect of dividing it (lines 8–20). However, when analysed, the modus agendi seems rather to be duplex—an exhortative and a laudative mode—just as in Alan’s account, even if Alan had only identified three separate parts of the sequence. Both the first part, clangat canora, and the fourth, transfere nos, seem to be indicated by the author as being in the exhortative mode, although this specific term is not used. The second and the third parts seem both to be in the laudative mode: God is said to be praised for his acts of creation in the passage beginning ‘agmina per te facta’, and for his acts of re-creation at ‘facis hec flammea’.

In addition to these four parts, the author continues his divisio textus by identifying a further three separate sections (lines 15–20): the account of the angels and their offices, a distinction of the three hierarchies in the line ‘vices per binas’, and finally a separate part in the exhortative mode inviting us to sing praises: ‘vota demus per liricas’.

Whereas Alan discusses authorship under the heading quis auctor, this commentator seems to be more interested in the genre of the sequence itself, to judge from the question ‘in quo vel in quibus consistat sequencia sive prosa’ (lines 3–4), the answer to which occupies the largest part of this integrated prologue (lines 21–63). As a preliminary remark before the issue is discussed in full, the author first makes a distinction between prosa, as understood by the grammarians, echoing Isidore’s definition, and a prosa in the church. In describing the latter, he declares that a stropha is sung from one part of the choir and an antistropha is sung back.

A sequence, according to this author, consists of pneuma and carmen (lines 33–38). In the etymological account of the former word this author seems to be unaware of the similar word spelt neuma, or of differences in meaning between the two, which is a matter of concern for Alan of Lille and repeated by the commentator of Ox6. In the commentary of St2 the word pneuma is interpreted in the standard way as the Latin spiritus, which interpretation is then

---

8 As in Alan’s text, these modes are not explicitly cited by the commentator but are referred to in descriptive language.
9 The word used here for hierarchies is sacri principatus, which is the general interpretation of the word (Alan. Ins., expos. pros. angel., p. 202).
10 These forms are my emendations of tropha and antitropha, which are found in the manuscript. It can, however, not be ruled out with certainty that the manuscript forms are neologisms, formed after the fashion of antiphona, with tropha used to designate a sequence stropha. The term tropa is used as a synonym for sequences in the colophon of Ox1; see Section 6.2 above.
used as an explanation as to why the notes in a musical manuscript are aptly called *pneuma* (lines 39–48). Through an allusion to the definition by Peter Lombard, *pneuma* is further linked to *iubilus* as an expression of the exultant inexpressible joy.

In his development of the definition, the author claims three specific kinds of *pneuma*—‘est autem triplex pneuma’—the low, the middle and the high (lines 49–63). Sequences are said to be in the high kind, as they express the ineffable joy. Amalarius of Metz seems to have coined the similar term *neuma triplex* in his description of how troping in the form of three melismas is added to the Responsories *Descendit de caelis* and *In medio ecclesie*. Could it be that our author was aware of Amalarius’s term but adapted it to suit his own needs? In the commentary of St2 the term *triplix pneuma* seems instead to refer to different kinds of notation. According to this author, the Office of Lent is notated with the low *pneuma*, which is said to express the soul’s desire for the remission of the temporal punishment while it fears to fall in the spiritual battle, and its being is, as it were, spared on behalf of the ‘nether spring’. This cryptic passage is an allusion to the two kinds of compunction of the soul, as explained, amongst others, by Gregory the Great in his Epistle 26. The compunction arising from the fear of punishment in hell for sins committed is distinguished from the second kind, the compunction arising from love for heavenly reward, which supersedes the former. According to Gregory the two kinds of compunction are figuratively described in Joshua 15 by the upper and nether springs that Axa asks of her father as a supplementary gift to the dry and southerly lands she had received.

The three kinds of *pneuma* are said to parallel three styles found in poetry (lines 49–50). The author is probably referring to the three *characteres* poets use in their work as found in Servius’s commentary on Virgil’s *Bucolica* and repeated by Bede in his *De arte metrica*. Each kind is furthermore linked to devotion,
compunction and exultation respectively, which in turn are connected to ‘the way’, purgatory and the heavenly fatherland (lines 59–61). A fourth triad of mental, vocal and manual prayer is added, which leads the author to point out that a sequence is said to contain a twofold prayer: the pneuma alone represents the mental and the pneuma cum carmine the vocal prayer (lines 61–63).

The interest in musical terminology apparent in the introductory section is expressed again at various points in the commentary proper, most conspicuously towards the end (lines 221–234). In connection with the sequence strophe cythara yperlidica (lines 221–222) the author refers to Boethius and incorporates an adaptation of his account of the eight different musical modes. In this account the Boethian mode hypolydius is replaced with the mode yperlidicus, probably to agree with the sequence text.17 The names of the other modes also differ from the source text in that they end not in -ius but in -icus, as for instance Lidicus at line 228 and Doricus at line 229.18

In the exposition proper of the sequence (lines 64–251), the text is commented upon and paraphrased simultaneously with the presentation of the lemmata in the order in which they should be construed syntactically. Basic grammatical comments, such as the information on paradigms for nouns or verbs seen in Expositio Ox1, are not a major concern for the commentator in Expositio St2. In fact, his only comment in this category concerns the final consonant in cherubin and seraphin (lines 164–165), but the remark is laconic on the verge of being useless: to state that words of Hebrew origin ending in -n are neuter and plural but that the opposite is true for Greek is not particularly informative as he does not explain in what respect the Greek form is opposite.

The commentator offers some original interpretations for a few of the sequence strophes. The most remarkable is found at lines 112–117, regarding the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth strophes, following the numbering in AH 53. Instead of having a new sentence and a new theme begin in strophe 9, the commentator instead links it to the preceding strophe by means of the word inquam, letting ymago in strophe 8 act as the subject and

---

17 The mode hyperlydius is also mentioned in Isidore’s account of music, see Isid., orig. 3, 20, 7.
18 The forms in -icus seem to be the preferred one for these and similar words in sequences; see Elfving (1962), p. 128 and 250.
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theologica symbola in strophe 9 as the object of *kathegorizans*. As a result, mankind is preaching the theological symbols, or praises as the word *symbolum* is understood here.

In connection with this, we may note that the interpretation of *symbolum* (lines 115–117) is here ultimately based on the understanding of the word as a composite of the meanings ‘with / together’ and ‘part / portion’, as was true of Alan’s commentary as well as the texts in *Ox6* and *Ox1*. The difference is seen in the identification of the referent: in this commentary, it is said to refer to the divine praises, since in these everyone contributes whatever he is capable of.

It can furthermore be pointed out that the image of mankind being created in the image of God is not contrasted here with the creation of the angels, which is the more common point of departure for a discussion of this issue for most of the other commentators. This author rather sees ‘sed ymago tua’ as an addition pointing to the excellence of mankind in spite of being God’s last making, invoking rationality and the gifts of grace: the fact that the soul, like God, is good, just and wise, becomes the grounds for the claim of being God’s image.

Another singular interpretation, at lines 181–200, concerns the numbers of the angels as presented in the fifteenth strophe. In this commentary the preference for interpretations in groups of three again comes to the fore as the separate numbers are assigned explicitly to each of the three levels in the celestial hierarchy. The commentator seems to divide the phrases accordingly: ‘vices bis per quinas bis’, equalling the number twenty, refers to the lower hierarchy of angels, as they double the perfection of the humans in their love of God and their neighbour; ‘atque quingenta dena’, which the commentator

---

19 The standard interpretation of these two strophes in the commentary material studied here is to let the theme of man as the image of God end with strophe 8 and let a new theme begin in strophe 9, where theologica symbola acts as the subject, with the subsequent *hec* as the object. For the form *kathegorizans*, see also Section 7.2.1 below. The word *dico* is used in the same manner at lines 168, 176 and 209.


21 Admittedly, the commentator only writes the phrase in this manner once. At the first instance (line 183) I have supplied the second *bis*, since the same interpretation is made here as further down in the text, namely that it equals twenty.
equals to thousands;\textsuperscript{22} refers to the second hierarchy excelling over the first; and finally, ‘centena millena’ refers to the third and highest of the orders and represents consummate perfection.\textsuperscript{23}

The subsequent identification of man as the hundredth sheep is followed by a recapitulation of a peculiar grammatical rule saying that whatever the root of a numeral signifies in Scripture, a higher figure signifies the same (lines 201–210). This rule enables the author to link the figure ‘hundred’ to ‘ten’, denoting the fallen angels that are said to have been so numerous that they could have formed a tenth order of angels.

In his interpretation of \textit{agala} (lines 213–215) the author repeats the etymology of the word as meaning sheepfold, as we have seen in the commentaries of Alan and Ox\textit{6}. In this respect it seems to denote heaven, as the author uses the simile of the shepherd gathering his sheep in the fold. However, this author also adds the original explanation \textit{collegia}, perhaps influenced by the verb \textit{colligo} in the subsequent image of the shepherd.

There is a further peculiarity concerning the sequence text as referred to by the commentator. In the \textit{divisio textus} section there is a reference to the line ‘vota demus per liricas’ (line 20), but in the actual exposition to that passage the author instead refers to and comments upon ‘vota damus cythara yperlydica’ (lines 218–222), which is reported in the critical apparatus in AH 53 as a variant reading of ‘vota demus hyperlyrica cithara’. It is of course not possible to know for certain whether this was the exact words of the sequence text as used by the commentator or part of his paraphrase or interpretation of it, which could itself be influenced by a knowledge of other variants of the sequence.

Apart from Boethius, the only other author referred to explicitly in this text is Jerome, who is cited as the authority on the translations and meaning of \textit{pneuma} in the passage discussed above (lines 44–46). A few Biblical passages are quoted, as well as two lines from \textit{Laudes crucis attollamus}, the sequence by Adam of St Victor (lines 37–38), also cited by Alan.\textsuperscript{24} Other sources are not easily detected in this text. The \textit{distinctio} and exemplification of \textit{clango} referred to above

\textsuperscript{22} There is perhaps the possibility that the numeral 5 (\textit{v}) has been lost in the manuscript here (line 196), since the author is very specific about spelling out the result of the calculation in the previous clause. However, he could have chosen to be less specific at this instance, talking instead of ‘thousands’, wherefore my conjecture of a missing numeral has been placed in the apparatus.

\textsuperscript{23} The more common way of dividing these phrases is ‘vices per bis quinas’; ‘bis atque quingenta dena’; ‘centena millena’.

\textsuperscript{24} Alan. Ins., \textit{expos. pros. angel.}, p. 196.
The Commentary of St2

(lines 69–75) has the characteristic of a definition drawn from a dictionary, although the source has as yet not been possible to locate. The reference to Laudes crucis and the similar etymological understanding of agalma and symbolum could suggest an influence or at least a knowledge of Alan’s Expositio prosae de angelis, but this amounts to no more than tentative speculation. Like Alan (and the commentator of Ox6) this author comments on the inverted order of the angels in the sequence, referring to the Gregorian scheme for the authoritative order. Although the author of Expositio St2, like Alan, adheres to the Dionysian tradition of dividing the celestial orders in groups of three, as is clear from the above-mentioned assignment of the three numerical phrases to each, there is no definition or discussion of the concept of hierarchy, which by contrast is a salient feature in Alan’s work.

In its originality as regards the understanding and rendering of certain terms pertaining to music theory, this text presents us with difficulties when attempting to assess its intended use. It is true that some of the explanations concerning music are standard and common, as for instance the definition of symphonia (lines 79–80) and of iubilus, hymnus and canticum (lines 41–44). However, the alterations in Boethius’s scheme of musical modes and of their names suggest a greater concern on behalf of the author for adapting the theory to fit the sequence rather than using the sequence to explain the theory. The use of the term pneuma triplex and the puzzling definitions of it seem to confirm this impression. Based on the general absence of purely grammatical explanations and the higher literary style of the commentary, this text seems to be intended for a more advanced audience than many of the other commentaries in this material. The inclusion of discussions of musical terminology and theory would confirm this were it not that the interpretations are so eccentric.

7.2.1 Textual problems and remarks on the edition

As stated above, the manuscript St2 is currently the only textual witness to this commentary, which means that the text is edited in accordance with the principles for Category 1 editions described above. The text is generally fairly

---

25 Other passages that could possibly indicate such a link are for example the addition of Uriel to the other individual angelic names (lines 98–99) and the two reasons for man being the image of God (lines 112–114).
26 See Section 4.1.1 above.
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good, there is no reason to suspect any lacunas and there are no other major
textual problems found here.

In the lemmata of the sequence, the scribe sometimes refers to each word
with only the first few letters. This has not usually created a problem, as the
words are repeated in the paraphrase or in the exposition. In one case,
however, _kathegorizans_ at line 115, this abbreviation technique has made it
uncertain as to how the word should be spelt out. In this instance I have
chosen to resolve the abbreviation as a present participle, since the lexical
variant presented immediately afterwards is in this form. This is not the
standard version of the sequence text but is reported as a variant in the critical
apparatus in AH.27

In three instances the word _effectu_ appears in the manuscript, which has been
changed to _affectu_ in the edition (lines 7, 9 and 69). In all cases it has to do with
the acts of singing and praying, that should be done _cum affectu_. I have judged it
more reasonable that these acts are to be done with fervour than with effect. At
lines 7 and 9 I have furthermore changed the manuscript _canet_ to _canat_ to
conform with the accompanying _oret_. Perhaps this is a vacillation of vowels that
could be linked also to the difference in _affectu_ and _effectu_.

Two other corrections should be commented upon. The first concerns the
phrase _pneuma compunctionis_ at line 60. The manuscript reads _pneuma compassionis_,
which here seems peculiar since it refers to the _pneuma_ connected with
purgatory, in connection with which compunction seems to be a more
appropriate state of being than compassion. The second is the change of the
manuscript _potestas almiphoma_ to _potestas almiphona_ in the edition (line 146),
following the standard text of the sequence. I have here judged the manuscript
form _almiphoma_ with _m_ as a scribal error for _n_, rather than as an orthographical
rendering of the variant _almivoma_, reported in the critical apparatus of AH 53,
with an _f_-sound for the _v_.28 Since the interpretation of the epithet in _St2_
is ‘sanctum sonum exprimens’, it seems more probable that the intended form
would be with _-phona_ to correspond to _sonum_.

27 According to the apparatus in AH 53, this reading is found in seven manuscripts
deriving from modern-day Italy, England and Germany.
28 The critical apparatus in AH 53 reports the variant _almivoma_ in two manuscripts, one
from Seckau, Austria, and the other from Stavelot, Belgium. In the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ of
the sequence commentaries (see Chapter 8) _almivoma_ is the favoured variant. In the
manuscript _Ma5_ of the ‘Aristotelian tradition’ _almiphoma_ has instead been judged as an
orthographical variant for _almivoma_; see also Section 8.3.2.1 below.
AD CELEBRES et cetera.

Ad huius sequencie evidenciam quatuor proponimus inquirenda: que materia, que intencio, quis modus agendi, in quo vel in quibus consistat sequencia sive prosa.

Materia omnium sequenciarum est generaliter laus divina.

Intencio est divinas laudes exprimere et orare, ut, quod canit vel orat ecclesia, canat vel oret cum affectu.

Modus quadripartitus est. Primo orat auctor huius operis inperans ecclesie, ut canat et oret cum affectu, quod pie canit vel orat, ibi: Et CLANGAT CANORA. Secundo laudat Deum ab operibus creacionis, id est AGMINA PER TE FACTA et ibi: NOS ULTIMA FACTURA. Tercio ab operibus recreacionis, ubi ait: FACIS HEC FLAMMEA et cetera. Quod enim angelos nobis deputat ad custodiam, ad nostram utilitatem pertinet. Et quarto et ultimo tamquam non de suis presumens meritis ecclesia militans ad vindicata recurrit suffragia, hoc est ad patrocinium angelorum, dicens TRANSFERTE NOS. Distinguit eciam novem ordines angelorum, dicens PLEBS ANGELICA, ubi intelligitur inimus ordo. Sequitur autem et de aliis usque ibi: AC SERAPHIN INGNICOMA. Deinde distinguuntur tres angelorum gerarchie, id est sacri principatus trinis constantes ordinibus, ibi: VICES PER BIS QUINAS. Tandem invitamur ad divinas laudes, ibi: VOTA DEMUS PER LIRICAS.

Nunc videndum est in quo vel in quibus consistat prosa. Sed nota aliud esse prosam apud grammaticos, aliud in ecclesiasticis officiis. Est enim prosa secundum grammaticos oracio lege metri soluta, et dicitur prosa quasi profusa, id est per diversas clausulas vel sentencias explicita. Sed, prout hic accipitur, dicitur prosa quasi prosoda vel prosodia, quod interpretatur accantus a ‘pros’, quod est ad, et ‘oda’, quod est cantus, quasi in ecclesia unus chorus accantat alii per stropham et antistropham, id est per conversionem cantandi et contrariam conversionem, que fit ex adversa parte chori.

23 secundum grammaticos sfr e.g. Isid., orig. 1, 38, 1.

‘Sequencia’ dicitur a sequendo, quia exprimit eternum bravium, quod ex operibus evangelii assequemur. Inde est, quod evangelio precantatur quasi quoddam preludium mentes humanas preparans et attensas faciens ad auditendum evangelium et inplendum.

Consistit sequencia in duobus, scilicet in carmine et pneumate, quasi duplicem continens musicam, metricam sive rhythmicam; rhythmicam, ubi numerus sillabarum attenditur. Et vocalis consonancia miliciam significat Christianam, in qua nichil extra numerum, nichil absonum debet agere, quisquis se verum exhibet Christianum, quia, ‘cum vox vitam non remordet, dulcis est symphonia.’

Pneuma vero super annotationum supernum exprimit gaudium, quod iam presagat fidelis anima et illud pneumate resonat et decantat. Est enim huiaismodi pneuma, quod in prosis annotatur; idem est quod iubilus. Est enim iubilus vox confusa mentis exprimens gaudium habitum de eternis, quod nec omnino taceret potest nec penitus explicari. Ymnus vero est laus Dei cum cantico. Canticum est exultatio mentis exprimens gaudium habitum de eternis, quod nec omnino taceri potest nec penitus explicari. Notandum autem, quod ait Ieronimus super Ecclesiasten idem esse ‘rua’ apud Hebreos, quod ‘pneuma’ apud Grecos, quod ‘spiritus’ apud Latinos; et bene notule, quibus prose annotantur, dicuntur pneuma quasi spiritus, quia spirituale gaudium significat.

Est autem triplex pneuma: Est enim humile, mediocre et altum, sicut tres distinguuntur stilis sive characteribus in poemate.

Humile pneuma est, quod exprimitur desiderium, quod habet fidelis anima de amotione pene temporalis timens, ne succumbat in lucta, et quasi parcitur ens pro inferiori irriguo. Huiaismodi pneumate totum officium quadragesimale annotatur, quod palam est in tractibus, qui tunc cantantur et humanos labores resonant et dolores.

---

36 nichil ... numerum | cfr Hor., epist. 1, 18, lin. 59. 37 cum ... symphonia | Lanctus crucis attollanum, AH 54, 120. 41 Est ... explicari | cfr Petr. Lomb., psalm. 46, PL 191, 456a. | vox confusa | cfr Aug., c. adv. leg. 1, 8. 43 Ymnus ... prorumpens | cfr Petr. Lomb., psalm. praefatio, PL 191, 58a. 45 rua ... Latinos | cfr Hier., in eccles. 6, 9. 49 tres ... 50 poemate | cfr Sert., ed. 3, 1: cfr etiam Beda, metr. cap. 25. 51 desiderium ... 53 irriguo | cfr Greg. M., dial. 3, 34, PL 77, 300d–301a: Sed quia, ut dixi, duo sunt compunctionis genera, dedit ei [i.e. Axac] pater suas irriguum superius, et irriguum inferius. Irriguum quippe superius accipit anima, cum sese in lacrymis coelestis regni desiderio affligit. Irriguum vero inferius accipit, cum inferni supplicia flendo pertimescit. 53 inferiori irriguo | cfr Is. 15, 19 et Ldc. 1, 12–15.

45 idem | id est cod. 52 timens ut vid. | ens ut vid.
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49v Mediocrem pneumam est, quo exprimit ecclesia desiderium habitum de amoeonia pene purgatorii ad defunctis, qui misere carnis ergastulum evaserunt.

Altum pneumam est [ut], de quo hie agitur, quod eterne mentis gaudium representat. Est ergo pneumam devotionis quantum ad viam; est pneumam compunctionis quantum ad purgatorium; est pneumam exultationis quantum ad patriam. Item notandum, quod cum triplicem sit oratio, mentalis scilicet, vocalis et manualis, prosa duplici oracione continetur. Mentalem enim pneumam significat, vocalis vero est ipsum pneumam cum carmine.

Literam sic construe: o REX CELICE, id est o tu rex, qui regnas in eternum cum Patre et es celicus sive celestis, quia celestium mentes inhabitas et eos facis celen, id est celestes. CUNCTA CATERVA, que scilicet collectio plurium adunata singnanter dicitur. CATERVA, ubi removeatur solitudo, qui suspensa est et Deo odibilis: Ve soli, quia, cum eciderit, non habet, qui sublevet eum. CLANGAT, id est canat vel oret cum affectu, quod sonat clangor vocalis. Plus enim est clangere quam canere simpliciter. Devocionem enim importat et intentionem, quod apud Deum meretur exaudiri. Est autem clangor sive celeuma nautarum et in bello congregiencium et proprie vindemiatorum. Clangunt naute, cum ad litore se expediunt. Clangunt prelinantes, cum ad bellum se mutuo cohortantur. Clangunt vindemiatores, ut sibi gratulentur. Clangunt Christiani milites, cum ad eterna gaudia spiritualiter extolluntur.

Sequitur: AD CELEBRES LAUDES, id est ad celebrandas divinas laudes, SYMPHONIA, id est vocum concordia. Est autem triplex simphonia: Est enim instrumentum musicum, de quo nichil ad present; Est eciam mentalis et vocalis, que sic describitur et idem est quod armonia: Simphonia est plurium vocum in unum redacta concordia.

Sequitur: NOSTRA CONCIO SOLVAT ODAS. Et bene ait 'solvat'. Inportat enim debitum, quo tenemur ad Dei servicium et laudem.

Sequitur: CUM FESTA MICHAELIS, id est angelorum, INCLITA, id est gloriosa, RENOVANTUR.

57 carnis ergastulum] cfr e.g. Hier., epist. 22, 7, 4. 68 Ve … cum] cfr Eec. 4, 10. 79 Simphonia … 80 concordia] cfr Boeth., mus. 1, 3.

Nota: Michahel interpretatur quis ut Deus et est nomen tam multitudinis quam persone et exprimit divinam potencion, quasi diceretur: Quis est tam potens ut Deus? Quia, cum aliquis angelus a Deo mittitur ad alicui exsequendum, ubi est opus magnum Dei potencia, Michahel nuncupatur. Talis fuit ille angelus, qui retritus Luciferum in inferno et in reditu Christi ab inferis tamquam celestis athleta cum Christo potestates aerae expungnavit, et adhuc contra adversarium nostrum dyabolum ad custodiam nobis deputatur.

Raphahel dictus est ille angelus, qui missus ad curandum Thobiam, et huismodi angelos credimus conferendi sanitatis deputari, unde interpretatur Raphahel medicina Dei.

Gabriel vero dicitur ille angelus, qui nuncavit incarnationem beate virginis, unde interpretatur fortitudo Dei. Ubi enim maior virtus vel fortitudo elucescit quam, cum Filus Dei exinanivit semet ipsum formam servi accipiens?

Invenitur eciam hoc nomen Uriel et interpretatur ignis Dei sed non est in celebri usu.

Sequitur: PER QUE, scilicet festa, TOTA MUNDI MACHINA LETABUNDA, id est leticia plena, PERORNATUR, id est valde ornatur. AGMINA PNEUMATUM, id est angelorum, spirituum, SUNT FACTA a TE. Ecce laus ab operibus創造is. SED QUAMVIS FACIS HEC FLAMMEA, id est inflammancia nos ad amorem Dei, iuxta illud: Qui facis ministros tuos ignem urentem; vel FLAMMEA, id est nuncios, iuxta illud: Qui facis angelos tuos spiritus, et hoc: PER ANGELICAS OFFICINAS, id est per angelica officia, qui QUAMVIS HEC facias. HEC, de angelis, quod scilicet tibi serviant et ministrant, cum SUNT INTER PRIMEVA, id est a primo evo creata et ita cum racione创造is tum racione sue essenciae et vere dignae.

NAM HEC SUNT CREATA TUA, id est a te creata.

Sequitur: CUM SIMUS NOS ULTIMA FACTURA, sed, ut videatur in hoc ipso derogasse nostrae condicioni, addit quoddam, quod pertinet ad hominis excellenciam, dicens SED YMAGO TUA. Est enim hic ymago Dei racione naturalium, quia racionalis anima ut Deus, simul autem racione gratui, est a te creata.

---


---

98 ignis cum Isid. scripsi, ignitus cod. 100 letabunda] letatur cod. 104 flammea] flamea cod.
quia est bona, iusta, sapiens in suo genere, sicut Deus. YMAGO, inquam, KATHEGORIZANS, id est predicans, THEOLOGICA SYMBOLA, id est divinas laudes, que bene dicuntur symbola, quia in divina laude unusquisque pro capacitata sua quasi bolum, id est partem suam, ponit.

Sequitur: HEC, scilicet agmina, sunt TRIPARTITA TER, id est trinis ordínibus distincta, NOBIS, id est ad utilitatem nostram, quia inde ad nos mittuntur, ut instruant, quid canendum, quid eligendum, et hoc PER OFFICIA PRIVATA, id est singulis specialiter deputata, quod insinuat novem distinguens ordines angelorum ab uno inchoans sic: PLEBS ANGELICA, quasi dicat: Primus ordo distinctus ab aliis dicitur Angelus. Licet enim sit commune nomen omnium angelorum, restringitur tamen ad unum ordinem. Sicut hoc nomen 'confessor' licet sit commune confessorum et martyrum, restringitur tamen ad ipsos confessores, qui non sunt martyres. Interpretatur autem 'angelus' nuncius, quod et ordini convenit et persone. Nam quilibet angelus est Dei nuncius et minister.

Sequitur de alio ordine: PHALANX, id est colleccio, ARCHANGELICA, quasi dicat: Secundus ordo est, qui dicitur Archangelus, id est angelorum princeps. Revelant enim angeli huius ordinis inferiori ordini, quid nobis expediat. De hoc ordine Michael a quibusdam esse dicitur. Dicunt enim hoc nomen convenire uni soli persone.

Sequitur de alio ordine: PRINCIPANS TURMA, quasi dicat: Alius ordo est, qui dicitur Principatus.

Notandum tamen, quod hic ordo non est tertius sed pocius quintus, sed racione metri auctor coactus maluit servare ritnum quam ordinem. Huius autem ordinis officium est formam insinuare reverendi maiores. Proximi autem ordinis, qui dicitur Dominationes, officium est nos hortari ad reverenciæ exhibendam. Quarti autem ordinis, qui dicitur Potestates, officium est repellere demones, qui nos impediant in reverencia exhibenda et eius forma. Tercius autem ordo, qui proximo loco sequitur post archangelos, bene dicitur Virtutes eo, quod per eum Dominus virtutes et miracula operatur.

De hoc autem ordine dicitur VIRTUS URANICA, id est celestis. Nota: 'Uranos' interpretatur palatum, unde 'urania' quasi celestis, quia celum convexum est ad modum palatii.
Unus ordo designatur, ubi dicitur POTESTAS ALMIPHONA, id est sanctum sonum exprimens vel decantans.

Sequitur de sexto ordine, qui dicitur DOMINANCIA NUMINA.

De septimo autem ordine, qui dicitur Throni, sequitur: DIVINA SUBSELLIA, quasi dicat: Septimo loco sequitur ille ordo, qui dicitur subsellia sive Throni, cuius officium est nos invitare ad discernendum inter bonum et malum, unde sortitum est hoc nomen. Qui enim sibi thronum usurpat, tenetur habere discrecionem boni et mali. Dicuntur autem subsellia respectu cherubin et seraphin, qui sunt quasi prime sedes sive selle Dei, sicut sedes Dei est anima iusti.

De octavo sequitur: CHERUBIN ETHEREA, id est celestia. Interpretatur autem 'cherubin' plenitudo sciencie, nam ut ait auctoritas: Ab eo quisque denominatur ordo officio, quod plenius possedit in munere.

De nono autem et supremo ordine sequitur: SERAPHIN IGNICOMA quasi igneas comas habencia. Metaphorice 'seraphin' interpretatur ardens, cum quia ardet in amore Dei, tum quia nos facit inardescere in amore eius. Similiter cherubin denominatur a sciencia, cum quia habet plenam de Deo scienciam, tum quia mittit nos ad scientiam de divinis.

Et notandum, quod omnia nomina Hebrea in tali terminancia sunt neutri generis et pluralis numeri. Apud Grecos tamen, ut aiunt, accidit e contrario.

Sequitur: VOS, O MICHAEL, CELI SATRAPA, id est principalis minister, et GABRIEL DANS VERA NUNCIA VERBI, id est de incarnacione verbi, ATQUE o tu RAPHAEL, VERNULA, id est nuncius, VITE, id est salvatoris. VOS, dico, TRANSFERTE NOS ad celestia. Et apostrophat ad angelos, quos suos constituit advocatos.

Sequitur: PER VOS COMPLENTUR MANDATA PATRIS, quasi dicat: Vobis utitur Pater ad explenda mandata circa homines.

Sequitur: Indivisa sunt, scilicet mandata et opera trinitatis. Ideo sequitur de Filio ibi: QUE, scilicet mandata, DAT SOPHIA EIUSDEM, id est sapiencia Patris.

Sequitur et de Spiritu sancto ibi: COMPAR QUOQUE PNEUMA, id est Spiritus sanctus, scilicet qui est par et equalis Filio et Patri. PNEUMA, dico, PERMANENS cum Patre et Filio IN UNA USYA, id est in eadem essencia, CUI DEO, id est uni

---

153 discrecionem ... mal| cfr Hbr. 5, 14.  154 sedes² ... 155 iust| cfr Greg. M., in evang. 38, 2.
157 cherubin ... scien| cfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 10.  160 seraphin ... ardens| cfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 14.

Unus ut vid.| almiphona| almiphoma cod.
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Deo, qui unus est in essencia et trinus in personis, vos MILIA MILIUM rengna, id est multa rengna, id est multi angeli, in quibus rengnat Deus, ESTIS ADMINISTRANCIÆ.

Sequitur trium gerarchiarum distinctione, quorum quilibet continet tres ordines angelorum, et distinguuntur tribus numeris diversi generis.

Inferior gerarchia designatur hac voce: VICES PER BIS QUINAS <BIS>, ubi desingnatur vicenarius sive denarius duplicatus, quod bene convenit inferiori gerarchie, que duplicat denarium, quia bone voluntati addit opus; vel duplicare dicitur, quia non est contenta humana perfectione, qua scilicet a homine observatur decalogus, sed longe perfectius diligit Deum et proximum.

Secunda vero clausula secunda designatur / gerarchia, quia sicut precedentem numerus a quingenteno deno superatur, ita prima a secunda racione perfectionis exceditur gerarchia.

Per hoc, quod sequitur, CENTENA MILLENA, supreme gerarchie perfectio designatur, cui bene convenit uterque perfectionis numerus, centenarius dico et millenarius, ut hiis numeris consummata perfectio designetur.

Sic iunge litteram: o vos MILIA MILIUM rengna, vos amministratis PER VICES BIS QUINAS BIS, id est viginti, hoc quantum ad inferiorem gerarchiam, ATQUE QUINGENTA DENA, scilicet milia, et hoc quantum ad secundam gerarchiam, et CENTENA MILLENA et hoc quantum ad tertiam gerarchiam, ASSISTUNT IN AULA, hoc quantum ad triumphantem ecclesiam, AD QUAM, scilicet aulum, REX, qui est rex et sacerdos, DUXIT OVEM CENTESIMAM, id est humanum genus suo sanguine redemptum.

Sed quod dicitur ‘centesima’, proinde est ac si dicatur decima. Est enim regula, quod quicquid significat radix numeri alicuius in sacra pagina, idem significat numerus excrescens, unde per ‘ovem centesimam’ idem significatur quod per decimam, id est decimus ordo angelorum, qui cecidit, non quod decem unquam fuerint ordines, sed quia tot ceciderunt, quod posset ex eis unus ordo integrari. Quod autem dicit ‘ovem’, alludit evangelice parable, ubi legum, quomodo pastor dimissis nonaginta novem ovibus in deserto abit et quesivit centesimam, quam amiserat, quam inventam ad priorem gregem piis humeris diligit… proximum. cfr Mt. 22, 39; Mc. 12, 31; Lc. 10, 27. 199 id… genus cfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 3 et 6. 206 evangelice… 209 reportavit cfr Mt. 18, 12–13; Lc. 15, 4–6.

187 diligit… proximum cfr Mt. 18, 12; 206 evangelice… 209 reportavit cfr Mt. 18, 12–13; Lc. 15, 4–6.

183 bis2 supplers; cfr lin. 195 185 bone] boni cod. 193 consummata] consumata cod. 196 ante milia nota v i.e. quinque fortasse deest 204 angelorum… cecidit] qui cecidit angelorum ante corr.
reportavit. OVEM, dico, VERBIGNAM, id est a verbo sive a Filio genitam, id est ex aqua et Spiritu regeneratam.

Sequitur: DRAGMAMQUE DECIMAM, id est eandem ovem, que in evangelio dicitur dragma inventa, scilicet a muliere dum scopis mundaret domum, DUXIT SUPER AGALMATA, id est super collegia, VESTRA, que dicuntur agalmata, quasi caule, quia sicut in caulis pastorum colliguntur oves, ita in agalmatis angelorum angeli colliguntur. ‘Agalma’ enim interpretatur caula, ‘gerarchia’ vero sacer principatus.

Sequitur: VOS PER ETHRA, id est in celo, NOS PER RURA, id est in terra, ubi more rustico vivimus, rusticitate scilicet peccati, DAMUS DENA VOTA, id est decencia vota vel laudes armonice, id est laudis armonice. NOS, dico, PARS ELECTA. DENA vero dicitur respectu angelorum. Cum enim novem persolvunt Deo laudes, nos autem decimam utcumque persolvimus, et hoc CYTHARA YPERLIDICA, id est superiori quam sit Lidica, ut per cytharam Lidicam intelligamus laudem illam, que fit ab inferiori parte anime. Per cytharam vero iperlidicam intelligamus laudem digniorem, que fit a superiori parte anime, unde dicitur: Psallam spiritu, psallam et mente.

Et notandum, quod per hoc, quod ait YPERLIDICA, allusit ei, quod dicitur in musica Boecii, ubi agitur de tropis sive modis cantandi. Nam unus tropus est Lidicus a Lidica regione, ubi inventus est eius usus. Alius est yperlidicus, quasi super Lidicum, quia inferior est eo, et acucior. Alius dicitur Doricus, quia ipsum invenerunt Dores illi, scilicet Greci. Quartus dicitur ypodorius, quasi sub Dorio, quia miclius intensus eo. Alius dicitur Frigius, quem invenerunt Friges. Alius ypofigius, quasi sub Frigio, quia miclius intensus eo. Septimus est Mixolidius, a Mixolidia regione sic dictus. Octavus et ultimus est ypermixolidius, quasi super Mixolidium.

Sequitur extrema conclusio, ubi orat, UT NOSTRA TIMIAMATA, id est nostre oraciones et pure devociones SINT accepte DEO et hoc CIRCA AUREAM ARAM, id est circa Christum, id est sint acceptables sanctis, qui assistunt ei laudantes et glorificantes eum. Christus autem bene dicitur ara, quia super ipsum et in fide eius spiritualia munera offeruntur. / Aurea vero dicitur propter excellens donum sapiencie, quod possidet plenius omni creatura.

---


Sed quid est, quod ait POST INCLITA MICHAELIS BELLA? Per hoc innuitur illud spirituale bellum, quo adversus hostem malignum pro nobis dimicat angelus nobis ad custodiam deputatus formando in nobis scilicet merita, quibus dyabolice suggestiones repelluntur. Non enim inter ipsos angelos luctam intelligimus actualem. Legitur tamen Michahel a passione Domini Luciferum in inferno religasse, quem eciam mortuo antichristo creditur, ut ex Apocalipsi conicimus, in inferiori baratro retrusurum, ne scilicet potestate sibi ad tempus permissa ulterius abutatur.

Sequitur: QUO, id est ubi, scilicet circa aram, nos DECANTEMUS ALLELUIA, id est laudem Dei, et hoc IN GLORIA, id est in glorificazione nostra. ‘Amen’ idem vere vel sine defectu.

245 Michahel … 246 religasse] cfr Iud. 6.
8 EDITIONS 4–7. Prologues and Commentaries of the ‘Aristotelian tradition’

8.1 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The great impact of the works of Aristotle in thirteenth-century scholarship becomes evident in a group of sequence commentaries representing a common ‘Aristotelian tradition’. All manuscripts now identified as belonging to this tradition are dated to the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries, although for the time being it is not possible to date the texts themselves with certainty. Furthermore, the manuscripts all present collections of a large number of commentaries on sequences arranged according to the liturgical year, and the vast majority of them are also preceded by a prologue. The tradition seems to have flourished mainly in the southern parts of modern-day Germany and in modern Austria and Switzerland.

Three branches of the Aristotelian tradition have hitherto been identified among the texts investigated for the present work, each defined by the prologue preceding the commentary collection. These prefatory texts, here entitled Dicit Aristoteles, Vir speculativus and Sapientia vincit malitiam, also form the names of the separate branches of the tradition. The repertory of sequences commented upon in the collections varies, even within the same branch.¹

The present chapter presents the editions of these three prologues together with the commentary on Ad celebres rex from each branch, that is the commentaries of Gr1 (Edition 4), Kf4 (Edition 5) and Kf1 (Edition 6) respectively. In addition, an abbreviated commentary from this tradition found in the manuscript Mü5 is also edited (Edition 7).

The two prologues Vir speculativus and Sapientia vincit malitiam are more closely related to each other than to Dicit Aristoteles, as concerns the structure of the argumentation. Likewise, the commentaries on Ad celebres rex in Kf4 and Kf1, belonging to the Vir speculativus and Sapientia branches respectively, are also very intimately related, whereas the commentary of Gr1, from the Dicit Aristoteles branch, displays a more distinct text. Despite the close similarity between the

¹ A list of the sequence repertories in the manuscripts edited in this work is found as Appendix 3.
commentaries in Kf4 and Kf1, they nevertheless display certain differences, some very minor, that seem to belong firmly to one or other branch of the commentary.²

Here I will first briefly draw attention to certain specific traits of this tradition that separate the texts under discussion from the others edited in this work. The commentary of Mös, although part of the Aristotelian tradition, will not be included in this general survey of characteristics since it is basically a collection of certain passages taken mainly from the Vir speculativus branch of the commentary tradition.

The prologues

All three prologues consist of two separate parts. The first deals with the discipline of theology to which divine praise and, hence, sequences are said to belong. The second part is dedicated to a discussion concerning the book of sequences to be commented upon. These two parts answer to the description by Minnis of the extrinsic and intrinsic sections of a prologue.³

The discussion of the discipline of theology is held along separate lines in the three prologues, each of which will be treated more thoroughly below, but all agree upon the absolute primacy of theology over all other sciences and commend its merits and goals.

In the intrinsic parts, the book of sequences is treated from the point of view of the four causes, which is the characteristic feature in the new kind of prologue developed in the thirteenth century—the type which Minnis labelled the ‘Aristotelian prologue’.⁴ The final cause in all the prologues is declared to be knowledge of different matters, whereas the material cause is treated differently in each text. All commentators embrace the common view of the formal cause being twofold—the form of the treatise and the form of procedure. The efficient cause, the author, is in all prologues claimed to be Gregory, an attribution which is probably made in order to adhere to the old convention of regarding Gregory the Great as the organiser of liturgical—‘Gregorian’—chant.

² These two commentaries will be discussed in Sections 8.3.3 and 8.4.3 below. I have found only one manuscript that does not adhere to the expected text: this is the manuscript Go2 which presents a commentary collection preceded by Sapientia vincit malitiam. The commentary on Ad celebres rex follows the text as in Kf1 for the first quarter of the commentary and thereafter the text in Kf4.
³ MINNIS (1988), pp. 30–33. See also Section 2.2.1.1 above.
⁴ MINNIS (1988), pp. 28–29. See also Section 2.2.1.1 above.
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In the well-known introductory poem found in several chant books from the ninth and tenth centuries and opening with the lines ‘Gregorius praesul merit et nomine dignus’, Gregory is said to have composed ‘hunc libellum musicae artis’. In our texts, there seems to be an attempt to make the traditional history of liturgical chant also embrace the genre of the sequence. The attribution seems at the same time to attest to the importance awarded to the sequence and effectively serves to put this genre on a par with the old liturgical chants.

In the three prologues the attribution to Gregory is made with some variation. In both *Dicit Aristoteles* (Edition 4) and *Sapientia vincit malitiam* (Edition 6) Gregory is said to have composed the old sequences, *antiquiores sequencias* (*Dicit Aristoteles*, line 24). In *Vir speculativus* (Edition 5) he is accompanied by Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, ‘qui composuerunt sequencias de tempore pro maiori parte’ (line 92–93). These modifications of the efficient cause seem to reveal a possibility for the commentators of adhering to the tradition while still displaying an awareness that Gregory was probably not the author of all the sequences in the collection. Placing emphasis on the old sequences seems further to enable the commentators to view Gregory as the efficient cause of the genre of sequences itself.

In addition to the four causes, a number of headings from the type C prologue are also discussed in these prologues. In *Vir speculativus* the use of the book, its *utilitas*, is discussed together with the *titulus libri*, and in *Sapientia vincit malitiam* the title is treated together with the question of which part of philosophy the book belongs to—’cui parti philosophiae supponitur’. This last issue is also briefly addressed in *Dicit Aristoteles*.

The commentaries

In the commentaries on *Ad celebres rex* belonging to the Aristotelian tradition, two new themes are treated that are not discussed in the previous texts edited here. The first of these is formed around the word *perornatur* in the sequence.

---

5 The text is edited with some variants in AH 49, 1. The debate on the origins of Gregorian chant and the role of Gregory I has been long and intense. For a general survey of this tradition see HILEY (1993), pp. 503–513; for a recent contribution identifying Gregory with Gregory II, see MCKINNON (2001). For an edition and a discussion of different versions of this prologue, see STABLEIN (1968). An interesting passage linked to this issue is found in in Sicardus of Cremona’s *Mitrale*, where he writes that the Gradual, the Tract and the Alleluia were composed and brought into the Mass by Ambrose, Gregory and Gelasius; Sicard. Crem., *mitrale* 3, 3 (PL 213, 103d).

6 See Section 2.2.1.1 above.
The commentators identify and thoroughly describe five separate ways in which the world is adorned through the feast of St Michael, although the five ways are not identical in all three texts.

The second new theme is that the angels Michael, Gabriel and Raphael are allotted to separate angelic orders. Their main missions—of defeating Lucifer, announcing Christ or healing Tobias respectively—are described in the other texts too, but here the nature of these missions seems to be the defining factor for placing them in separate orders, whence Michael is said to belong to the Principalities, Gabriel to the Archangels and Raphael to the Virtues.

In addition to these new topics, other themes are here developed in new ways or expanded. The three commentaries display similar descriptions of the offices of each angelic troop, introducing Albert the Great as a new authority in these matters alongside Gregory. In quoting from Albert, a new role for the Angels as guardians of the soul is defined. The Principalities, who in the other texts have not had a well-defined area of operation, are here said to delimit the power of the earthly principalities in removing or promoting rulers. As in the previous commentaries, the Powers are here seen as restraining evil forces from doing as much harm as they wish; but they are also referred to in the sequence text with the epithet *almivoma*—understood in the texts as promoting sanctitude—an alternative reading reported in the critical apparatus in AH 53 for the usual *almiphona*.

Another theme developed in this tradition is found in the discussion of man as the image of God. In Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* two reasons for this are put forth, the first depending on the creation of man as a rational being, the second depending on the gifts of grace: that man is pious, strong and patient.7 These two reasons are repeated in different words in the commentary of *St2*.8 The commentaries in the Aristotelian tradition, though, form this discussion around the contradiction of the commonly held view of man as the image of God and Dionysius’s saying that the angel is an image of God. Three reasons are presented to prove the former: that man’s soul governs the microcosm, the human body, just as God governs the macrocosm; that man’s soul holds exemplars of everything, just as God held exemplars of the things he created at the beginning of time; and, finally, that God wanted to unite himself through Christ with human nature and not with the angelic nature.

---

Prologues and Commentaries in the Aristotelian Tradition

It seems that a remark made in the commentaries of the Vir speculativus and Sapientia branches indicates a knowledge of the variant text *Has celebres rex* discussed above. In both commentaries the authors reject the version ‘quod aliqui legunt’, namely that the *d* in *Ad* is rendered as *c*. This could probably refer to a pronunciation of *Has* without the aspirated sound.

It should finally be noted that since a complete and comprehensive catalogue of manuscripts containing medieval sequence commentaries is not yet available, it is very probable that this tradition will in future be revealed to have been larger and more influential, embracing further sub-branches than the three identified here.

9 See Section 3.1 above.
10 The passages are found in Edition 3: *Expositio Kf4*, lines 56–57, and in Edition 4: *Expositio Kf1*, lines 50–51.
11 For instance, among the sequence commentaries that I have so far located (see the list of sequence commentary manuscripts in Appendix 2), the commentary collections in the manuscripts *Bg1, Bg2, Bg3, Lü1, Ma2, Om1, St1, St3* and *Wi3* are all preceded by a prologue beginning *Gustate et videte*. The manuscript *St3* contains a commentary on *Ad celebres rex* which is not identical to the texts in any of the three sub-branches of the Aristotelian tradition identified here but nevertheless seems to be part of it as it treats some of the same themes in similar ways. Other commentary collections preceded by the same prologue text are *Gr5, Ma1* and *Sg1* (prologue beginning *Oportet in civitate*; none contains a commentary on *Ad celebres rex*). Two other manuscripts that could possibly also be part of this tradition are *Fr3* and *Fr2*. The manuscript *Fr3* contains a prologue beginning *Hoc est summum bonus* which discusses similar issues to those in the prologues edited here, but does not contain a commentary on *Ad celebres rex*. *Fr2*, which does not comment on *Ad celebres rex* either, has a very brief prologue on the causes for the sequences and contains sequences for the whole year.
8.2 THE PROLOGUE *Dicit Aristoteles* AND THE COMMENTARY OF *Gr1*

In *Dicit Aristoteles*, which is the briefest of the three prologues in the Aristotelian tradition edited here, it is claimed that theology is the highest discipline and that justice makes man happy. In the commentary five strophes from the sequence *Inga Bethel mens*, here attributed to Albert the Great, are quoted in connection with the description of the offices of the angelic troops.

8.2.1 Manuscript descriptions

The manuscripts are listed alphabetically according to their sigla. The base manuscript for the edition of *Dicit Aristoteles*, and the one from which the commentary is edited, is *Gr1*. In the *apparatus criticus* of the edition of the prologue the manuscripts are reported in the following order: *Gr1, Gr2, Mü3, St2, Kb2, Wi2, Go1* and *Sg2*.

*Go1*  
Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 2101

A manuscript in four parts containing mainly sermons and hymn and sequence commentaries.

- **Date:** 14\textsuperscript{th}/15\textsuperscript{th} century
- **Provenance:** Unknown
- **Material:** Paper (?)
- **Size:** 4°
- **Folios:** 174

**Contents:**
1. 50 fols: Sermons (14\textsuperscript{th} century)
2. 66 fols: Compendium of the books of the Old Testament and a few sermons and miracles (14\textsuperscript{th} century)
3. 45 fols: Sequence and hymn commentaries (14\textsuperscript{th} century)
   - fols 1–23: ‘Synonima’ (fragment) and a *computus*
   - fols 24–45: Sequence and hymn commentaries
   - fol. 24: *Dicit Aristoteles*
   - fols 32–33: *Commentary on Ad celebres rex*
4. 13 fols: Sermons (15\textsuperscript{th} century)

\footnote{1}{The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, WERL (1844), and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.}
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**Dicit Aristoteles and the Commentary of Gr1**

In the sequence commentary section, the text is written in a single column of 45 lines. Each new piece has a larger initial, two lines in height. There are a few marginal notes of one or a few words in length pointing out interesting passages in the commentary text. There is no rubric for the beginning of the sequence section but there is a remark in the upper margin, half of which seems to have disappeared when the page was trimmed. The last words read ‘celum et terram’.

*Gr1* Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 834

A miscellany of instructive texts.

**Date:** 14th century  
**Provenance:** St Lambrecht (Benedictine)  
**Material:** Parchment  
**Size:** 220 x 150 mm.  
**Folios:** 193  

**Contents:**  
fol. 1r–9v: Laurentius de Aquileia: Practica dictaminis  
fol. 10r: unidentified text fragment  
fol. 10v–61v: Priscianus: Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVII et XVIII. Incomplete with marginal glosses  
fol. 62r–153v: Sequence and hymn commentaries  
   - fol. 62r: *Dicit Aristoteles*  
   - fol. 83v–85v: Commentary on *Ad celebres rex*  
   - fol. 101v: The hymn commentary begins  
   - fol. 125v: A sermon. Inc.: ‘Disciplinam domini, fili mi, ne abicias’  
   - fol. 154r–193v: Memorabilia, lexicalia, etymologica, grammatica, rhetorica. Inc.: ‘Ulcus ais, pater genitor’

The following remarks concern only the sequence and hymn commentaries, which conclude with the following colophon: ‘In hoc volumine contineitur opus bonum super sequencias et ymnos et hoc per totum annum et multa bona sunt

---

2 The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, KERN (1942–1956), and my own observations of the manuscript. Fol. 62r of this manuscript is reproduced as Plate 6 and fol. 83v as Plate 7.
ibi de x preceptis in generali et in speciali et eciam de vii sacramentis aliqua utilia et questiuncule pulcherrime.' The first and last folios of this section are very dirty and damaged, which seems to suggest that they originally constituted a separate volume. On fol. 62r the word *veteratus* is written with black ink in a different hand in the upper margin. The same hand seems to be responsible for marginal notes indicating certain passages beginning on fol. 89v and onwards until the end of the sequence commentary. The margins are pricked and the pages are ruled for between 33 and 40 lines. The text is written in a textualis hand, and the scribe seems to use the horizontal stroke as a general abbreviation mark, not only for *m* and *n.* The ink is brown-black, with red ink used for the initial of each new sequence or hymn, for paragraph signs in the commentary and for underlining certain words, which can be the lemma, a source or an important concept to be commented upon. On fol. 62r it is worthy of note that the lemma to the first sequence in the collection, *Grates nunc omnes,* is omitted and the commentary on it follows immediately as if continuing the prologue. 

*Gr2* Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 1592

A miscellany of instructive texts.

**Date:** 14th century (in the colophon on fol. 123v: 1344)

**Provenance:** St Lambrecht (Benedictine)

**Material:** Parchment

**Size:** 150 x 100 mm.

**Folios:** 123

**Contents:** fols 1r–9v: Hymn commentaries. Inc.: *Sicut dicit philosophus, quod unumquodque <scire> arbitramur*

fols 10r–19r: Sequence commentaries

fol. 10r: *Dicit Aristoteles*

fol. 19v: Blank

fol. 20r: A poem in German. Inc.: ‘Man hort aby richyn’. Fol. 20v is blank

---

3 See Plate 7, line 8: *pangat*; line 11: *fuit.*

4 This peculiarity can be noted also in *Gr2* and *Wi2.*

5 The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, Kern (1942–1956), and my own observations of the manuscript.
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fols 21r–39r: Summa magistri Petri. Inc.: ‘Alter est modus literarum sive epistolarum, qui docetur in scolis’. Fol. 39v is blank
fols 40r–71v: Prosperus Aquitanus: Epigrammaticum ex sententiis S. Augustini liber unus (with glosses)
fols 72r–75v: Aurelius Clemens Prudentius: Dittochaeon (with glosses)
fols 76r–93v: John of Garland: Synonyma
fols 94r–97v: John of Garland: De verbis deponentialibus
fols 98r–102v: ‘De equivocis nominibus versus’. Inc.: ‘Quid sonat equivocum simile sub ymagine’
fols 103r–123v: Ludolfus Hildesheimensis sive de Lucowe: Flores grammaticae

In the hymn and sequence commentary section, the text is written in one column throughout in a textualis script. Black ink is used with red for initials, paragraph signs and for marking the lemmata. The margins are pricked and ruled for 39 lines. In the upper margin on fol. 1r is written: ‘Frater Clemens H. de Ubelpach comparavit me’.6 The hymn prologue includes an account of the book of hymns in a similar style to Dicit Aristoteles.

Kb2 Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 9257

Glossed Sunday and feast day Gospels and Epistles, hymns and sequences.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 210 x 140 mm.
Folios: 458

Contents: fols 1r–145r: Sunday and feast day Gospels with interlinear glosses
fols 146r–154v: Blank

6 According to the obituary of St Lambrecht, Clemens was a monk and prior there and died 3 February 1470; see PANGERL (1869).
7 The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue (see the entry Klosterneuburg Kat. in the bibliography) and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
CHAPTER 8

fols 156r–385r: Sunday and feast day Epistles with interlinear glosses
fol. 385v: Blank
fols 386r–413v: Hymns and liturgical chants with interlinear glosses
fols 413v–458r: Sequences with interlinear glosses
fol. 414r: *Dicit Aristoteles*

All the texts in this manuscript have the same layout. The main text is written with ample space between the lines to accommodate the interlinear glosses and with broad outer margins for additional comments. Among the interlinear glosses are found syntactical numbering. The interlinear glosses in the sequence section end on fol. 430v, which means that although the text of *Ad celebres rex* is included in the collection it is neither glossed nor commented. *Dicit Aristoteles* is written in a cursive script in one column of 40 lines with a large flourished initial and a large rubric in textualis formata.

*Mü3* München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 12205

A miscellany.

Date: 13th/14th century
Provenance: Raitenbuch (Canons regular)
Material: Parchment
Size: 245 x 180 mm.
Folios: 93

Contents: fols 1r–16v: Text on the Divine Office
fols 25r–36v: Sequence and hymn commentaries
fol. 29r: *Dicit Aristoteles*
fols 37r–47v: Texts on the Canon Law
fols 48r–93v: Various sermons

In the section containing hymn and sequence commentaries the text is written in a textualis script in two columns throughout. The columns comprise 54 lines.

---

8 See Section 2.2.1.3 above and 8.5.2 below.
9 The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, CCL, and my own observations of the manuscript.
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The sequence section begins with a rubric ‘Exposicio sequenciarum’ that seems to be contemporary with the text.

Sg2 Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 467

A miscellany containing inter alia sermons, Gesta Romanorum and sequence and hymn commentaries.

Date: 14th/15th century
Provenance: St Gall
Material: Paper
Size: 210 x 145 mm.
Pages: 396

Contents: pp. 3–66: Sermons
pp. 67–70: Blank
pp. 71a–92b: ‘Summa paenitentiae’. Inc.: ‘Penteas cito. Iste liber cuius subiectum est penitencia cum eius partibus per modum introductionis’ On p. 93 there is a text on why Agnus Dei is sung three times in the Mass
pp. 94–96: Blank
pp. 97–102: Versus de summa penitentiae. Inc.: ‘Penteas cito peccator cum sit misertor filius dei’
pp. 104a–111a: Sermons and Credo in German; Raimundus, De collectis concludendis et aliis dubiis
pp. 113–116: Blank. P. 117 holds various notes
pp. 118a–150b: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Sicut testatur philosophus’
pp. 150a–207a: Sequence commentaries
p. 150b–174a: Dicit Aristoteles
pp. 173a–177a: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
pp. 207a–210b: Various excerpts
pp. 211a–217b: A commentary on the hymn of John the Baptist (Nuntius celso). Inc.: In compendio theologice veritatis scribitur quod theologya sit imperatrix’
pp. 218a–225: Various excerpts

10 The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, SCHERRER (1875), and the proofs for the new manuscript catalogue in preparation by Beat von Scarpatetti, kindly made available to me by Theres Flury of the Stiftsbibliothek in St Gall, and on my own observations of the manuscript.
CHAPTER 8

pp. 226–357: *Gesta Romanorum* (selected passages)
pp. 358–373: A calendar
pp. 374–393: Notes by Gallus Kemli
pp. 394–396: Blank

In the sequence commentary section, the text is written in two columns, each consisting of around 40 lines throughout. In the upper margin on p. 150 ‘Exposiciones sequenciarum’ is written in gold. According to J. Duft the collection of sequence commentaries ‘wurde um die Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts geschrieben von P. Gall Kemly (1417–ca. 1481).’ However, based on the information in the forthcoming manuscript catalogue for St Gall, in preparation by Beat von Scarpagetti, the miscellany seems instead to have been compiled and edited by him, with additions of his own hand, as for instance the index and a few other pieces. This volume can furthermore be identified with one of the entries in Kemli’s own catalogue of his book-collection.

\(St2\) Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB I 88

This manuscript is described in Section 7.1 above.

\(Wi2\) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3946

‘Mammotrectus super Biblia’ and commentaries on sequences and hymns.

Date: 15\(^{th}\) century (fol. 193\(^v\): 1425; fol. 466\(^r\): 1424)
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 293 x 214 mm.
Folios: i + 477

\(^{11}\) DUFT (1990), p. 123. This book gives two different dates for the year of Kemli’s death. On p. 27 Kemli is said to have died around 1477, which is claimed to be the last date when it can safely be assumed that Kemli was still alive (p. 137). On p. 123, on the other hand, he is said to have died around 1481, which information is repeated on p. 127.

\(^{12}\) DUFT (1983), pp. 36–41. Gallus Kemli was an avid book-collector and later became a \textit{clericus vagans}. For more information on Kemli, see DUFT (1990), pp. 27, 123, 127 and 137–138.

\(^{13}\) The description is based on information in the manuscript catalogue, CMV, on MENHARDT (1960–1961) and on my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
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Contents:  
fols 1r–470v: Johannes Marchesinus: Mammotrectus super Biblia; commentaries on sequences and hymns  
fol. 327r–v: Dicit Aristoteles  
fols 470v–472v: Four sequences in German: 'Deynen haylant lobe syon' (Lauda Sion); 'Ir lobet allew dew vil raine' (Verbum bonum); 'Got grüss dich mutter unsers herrn' (Salve mater salvatoris); 'Aller der welt gelegenheit' (Mundi renovatio)  
fols 473r–474v: Hymns with notation  

The following remarks concern only fol. 327r–v. The text is written in a cursive script in one column of 30 lines and the rubric in textualis formata. On fol. 327r is written ‘Exposicio sequenciarum lxxvi’ in another hand. The first sequence to be commented upon, Grates nunc omnes on fol. 327v, lacks the large initial given to the other pieces as this text has been incorporated into the prologue text, as we have already seen happen in Gr1 and Gr2.

8.2.2 On the text—the prologue Dicit Aristoteles

The title given to this prologue, Dicit Aristoteles, is also the opening phrase of the text, which invokes Aristotle as the main authority in the discussion both of the standing of theology and for the causes of the work in question.

In the extrinsic part of the prologue the author first proves the supremacy of theology by claiming it as the prerequisite science for man’s happiness. This argument takes as its point of departure a quotation from Aristotle’s Magna Moralia (line 5), in which work external advantages are pronounced a necessary auxiliary for man’s happiness.14 In its transferral to the medieval Latin world the quotation has undergone an extraordinary change in that it now declares quite the opposite. In Dicit Aristoteles the necessary requirement for a happy life is not external advantage but inner goodness, which meaning is achieved through an exchange of Aristotle’s ‘external’ for ‘internal’: ‘sine bonis interioribus non contingit hominem esse felicem.’ The Latin translation of the Greek, found in the florilegium Auctoritates Aristotelis, reads ‘in bonis exterioribus’ etc. which produces a meaning identical to that in Dicit Aristoteles. One of the textual witnesses to the prologue, Mü3, seems to be aware of the original Aristotelian

14 The authenticity of Magna moralia has been questioned. In Barnes (1995), p. xxiv, it is listed as ‘spurious’.
sense and hence writes ‘sine rebus exterioribus’, but this is not in accordance with the essence of the argument in this context.

This argument is followed by a definition of justice, which is declared to be the vital component for man’s happiness. The whole passage is an adaptation of the opening section of the fifth chapter of Formula vitae honestae, a treatise by the sixth-century Spanish bishop Martin of Braga discussing the four cardinal virtues. This widely circulated text owes much to the writings of Seneca in both content and style, and was often ascribed to him during the later Middle Ages, sometimes under the title De quattuor virtutibus cardinalibus. In Dicit Aristoteles, however, the work is referred to neither as Martin’s nor Seneca’s but is instead attributed to Aristotle, according to the introductory phrase of the section in question which classifies it among his ethical works: ‘[ . . . ] justicia, quam diffinit Philosophus in moralibus’ (lines 8–9).

Towards the end of this section, in connection with man’s specific capacity for reflection, Augustine is called upon in a citation equalling those who do not consider past, present and future with brute animals. The phrase as transmitted in the manuscripts has not been found in Augustine’s writings, although an echo of it can perhaps be found in Pseudo-Augustine’s Sermones ad fratres in eremo commorantes where he speaks of how the young make for bad leadership in that they will not pay regard to the past or the future.

The intrinsic part of the prologue begins by placing the book of sequences in the realm of theology on account of its subject being divine praise (line 23). In the light of the conclusion drawn in the first section regarding the merits of theology, this placement attests to the importance and high standing awarded the sequences. Thereafter, the commentator analyses the sequences from the point of view of the Aristotelian four causes, albeit addressing only three causes.

See the bibliography under the entry Mart. Brac., form vit.

The editor of the Formula, C. Barlow, adheres to the conjecture that Martin adapted a now lost work of Seneca’s just as he did with another work of his, De ira; BARLOW (1950), pp. 146–147. According to Martin’s own preface, Formula vitae honestae was written to help instruct laymen to lead a good and honourable life (Mart. Brac., form. vit. 1, 16–22). In successive years it was translated into various vernacular languages and also used as a school-book; BARLOW (1950), p. 208. Martin’s indebtedness to Seneca has been studied by BICKEL (1905); BARLOW (1950), p. 206.

Other examples of an attribution to Aristotle for this text have not been found.

Ps. Aug., erem. 14, PL 40, 1259: ‘Juvenes ergo imprudentes, duces vel Ecclesiariam pastores constituentes non sunt; ne ipsi simul cum populo percent. Tales enim si praesunt, non solum praeterita et futura non cogitant, sed audire quod bonum est et verum aures suas obturant.’ (Emphasis added.)
here (lines 24–30); the question regarding the material cause could seem to have been answered by the fact of placing the book of sequences under theology, as this is dependent on the subject-matter.\(^\text{19}\) As was mentioned above, Gregory is here stated to be the efficient cause for the ancient sequences.\(^\text{20}\) The formal cause is, as expected, twofold: the mode of procedure is identified as being persuasive; the form of the treatise, its division, as consisting of as many parts as there are sequences. To conclude, the final cause is vaguely stated as the knowledge of that which is treated in the book, and hence the attainment of eternal bliss. Such a claim neatly proves again the importance of the book of sequences according to the preceding argument in the first part of the prologue.

8.2.2.1  *Dicit Aristoteles*: manuscript interrelations and textual problems

There are ten currently known textual witnesses for the prologue *Dicit Aristoteles*. Eight of these have been collated for the present edition, which is consequently made in accordance with the principles set out above for Category 3 editions.\(^\text{21}\) For the reasons stated there, no *stemma codicum* will be established. Still, manuscript relations will be analysed and discussed based upon agreements in errors and alternative readings in the manuscripts.

Six of the eight collated manuscripts, *Gr1*, *Gr2*, *Mi3*, *St2* and *Sg2*, are from the fourteenth century whereas two, *Kh2* and *Wi2*, are dated to the fifteenth. Only three of the manuscripts, *Go1*, *Gr1* and *Sg2*, include a commentary on *Ad celebres rex*. It is true that the manuscript *St2* also contains a commentary on this sequence but this exposition, as observed above, is not part of the large commentary collection but a unique work written in by a different hand as an additional piece.\(^\text{22}\) As regards the manuscript *Kh2*, it seems to have been planned for a commentary to *Ad celebres rex* as the sequence text is included but neither a commentary nor interlinear glosses have been written in.

*Gr1* has been chosen as the base manuscript for the edition of *Dicit Aristoteles*, for which reason the commentary text to *Ad celebres rex* is edited from the same manuscript.

In the text of *Dicit Aristoteles*, the manuscript *Gr1* displays some unique errors and textual variants but provides nevertheless the best text in comparison with

---

\(^{19}\) The manuscript *Gr2* here adds the material cause, see the *apparatus criticus* to line 23.

\(^{20}\) See above 8.1.

\(^{21}\) See Section 4.1.3 above. In addition to the eight manuscripts collated here, *Po1* and *St4* also display this text but were located too late to be incorporated into the present edition.

\(^{22}\) This commentary is edited here as Edition 3: *Expositio St2.*
the other candidates for the base manuscript, Go1 and Sg2. Some of its errors are found in the passage drawn from the moral treatise *Formula vitae honestae* by Martin of Braga (lines 9–16), which is textually problematic and will be discussed more fully below. Examples of alternative readings in Gr1 against the others are *ex cogitet* for *consideret* (line 17) and *suadet* for *persuadet* (line 27). The base manuscript further displays a few unique omissions, of which some could be intentional, as for instance at line 2 (*et bonum* is left out), whereas others have the character of a mistake, as at lines 4 and 8 (*sit magis* and *felicem* omitted respectively).

A few words should be said about the most idiosyncratic of the textual witnesses to *Dicit Aristoteles*, the Weingarten manuscript St2, which has a number of omissions, rewritten passages and many alternative readings. The opening logical argument is rendered differently, for instance, as can be seen in the critical apparatus to lines 2–4. There are also several omissions, one in the problematic passage from Martin of Braga, which could be explained as *saut du même au même* from *iustus* at line 13 to the same word at line 16, but the exclusion of these sentences could as easily be a scribe’s drastic solution to dealing with a corrupt and incomprehensible passage. This manuscript also omits the attribution to Augustine of the quotation regarding the consideration for times future, present and past at lines 18–19.

**Manuscript interrelations**

The analysis of the interrelations of the manuscripts is based on an examination of agreements in error and alternative (but discarded) readings presented in two ‘West tables’ below, one for agreements between two textual witnesses that could also be shared with others and one for agreements unique to two manuscripts. As mentioned above,23 these tables have their limitations; conclusions regarding the relationship between two textual witnesses can only be drawn after each shared error and alternative reading has been carefully examined. Such an examination is facilitated by the complete list of agreements between two manuscripts in Appendix 4a. With this *caveat* in mind, the tables taken together with the list are useful instruments for indicating possible relations between manuscripts.

---

23 See Section 4.1.3 above. In Section 4.2.3 above, alternative readings not reported in the *apparatus criticus* and hence not included in the ‘West tables’ are listed.
The manuscripts fall into two main families: one is formed by \textit{Go1} and \textit{Sg2}, which manuscripts are separated from all the others by a number of conjunctive errors and alternative readings. There is, for example, an omission on account of a \textit{saut du même au même} at line 5 from one \textit{felicem} to the next, they erroneously read \textit{despiciunt} for \textit{respiciunt} (line 19) and \textit{dictas} for \textit{causas} (line 20) as well as displaying a number of minor omissions and alternative readings (for example at lines 2, 4, 9 and 30).

Of the second family, the two fifteenth-century manuscripts, \textit{Kb2} and \textit{Wi2}, set themselves apart by twelve unique alternative readings and errors. Examples of alternative readings in \textit{Kb2} and \textit{Wi2} are for example \textit{preedit} for \textit{precellit} (line 7), a transposition at line 25 and the phrase ‘\textit{per ista scitur adaptacio}’ for ‘\textit{per istam scienciam adepcio}’ (line 30).

As for the rest of the manuscripts, there are no other two as closely linked as the pairs mentioned above. \textit{Gr1} and \textit{St2} share a few features, the most striking being an adaptation at line 30 where these two manuscripts end the text with an
ut-clause and a finite verb, reading: "et per consequens, ut per istam scienciam ad scienciam felicitatis eternae deveniamus (pervenire valeamus St2)." In addition to this, Gr1 and St2 share unique readings at line 6 and at line 23. The great number and the nature of the individual readings and adaptations in the text of St2 renders it nevertheless hard to form certain judgements regarding its relationship to other manuscripts. The shared reading at line 30, however, suggests a link between St2 and Gr1.

The manuscript Mü3 shares only one unique alternative reading with the base manuscript, the addition of *tunc* at line 11 (although Mü3 displays the preceding verb in the plural instead of the singular). With St2, Mü3 shares 3 unique variants: an omission of *quod* (line 4), *sciencias for artes* (line 7) and *quam quis for quisquis* in the passage drawn from Martin of Braga (line 11). The three manuscripts together omit *iste liber* (line 28). However, none of these agreements, with the exception of line 11, carries much weight as a conjunctive reading or error.

Gr2, finally, seems to share features both with the pair Kb2 and Wi2, and with the group consisting of Gr1, Mü3 and St2. Together with the two fifteenth-century manuscripts Gr2 reads *si for sed* (line 12) and *despicunt for non respiciunt* (line 19). With Gr1 it shares an omission of *animalia* (line 18), which seems to be a mistake. With Mü3 it erroneously reads *sectam for sectari* (line 11).

To summarise: the eight collated textual witnesses to *Dicit Aristoteles* form two primary families where Sg2 and Go1 separate themselves from the rest. In the other family, Kb2 and Wi2 form a more closely knit pair and of the other four manuscripts—that is, Gr1, Mü3, St2, and Gr2—the first three could possibly be loosely connected whereas the last, Gr2, shares features both with Kb2 and Wi2 and with the other three.

In contrast to the picture sketched above, there are two instances where alternative readings are offered by a group of manuscripts that cuts across the two primary families. The first is in the quotation drawn from Aristotle at line 5, where Gr1, St2, Go1 and Sg2 have *convenit* instead of *contingit* as printed in the edition. The context makes *contingit* the better reading, as it rules out completely the possibility of a happy man without inner goodness, whereas *convenit* would
make it possible but not appropriate. 24 The other instance is found at line 15, where the same group of manuscripts reads mala for nulla. Apart from the fact that nulla is the word used in the source, it is also judged as the better reading here as the sense must be that all verbal ambiguities are to be avoided, not just the wicked ones.

Textual problems
In spite of the brevity of this prologue, the text as transmitted in the manuscripts displays some demanding textual problems, of which the main ones are found in the passage drawn from the moral treatise by Martin of Braga. In the present edition the lines in question are 9–16, but the most problematic part begins at line 11. We can compare the corresponding section from Martin's text:

> Quisquis ergo hanc sectari desideras, time prius deum et ama deum, ut ameris a deo. Amabis enim deum, si illum in hoc imitaberis, ut velis omnibus prodesse, nulli nocere et tune te iustum virum appellabunt omnes, sequentur, venerabuntur et diligent. Iustus enim ut sis, non solum non nocebis, sed etiam nocentes prohibebis. Nam nihil nocere non est iustitia, sed abstinentia alieni est. [. . .] Ex nulla vocis ambiguitate controversiam nectas, sed qualitatem animi speculare. 25

with the text of the present edition:

> Quisquis ergo hanc sectari desiderat, Deum prius amet, ut ametur ab eo. Sed in hoc illum imitaberis, ut velis omnibus prodesse et nulli nocere. Iustus ut sis, non solum non nocebis, sed etiam nocentes prohibebis. Nichil nocere non solum est iusticia, sed abstinentia alieni. Ex nulla ambiguitate vocis controversiam nectas sed calliditatem animi sectare.

24 Contingit is also the word used in the florilegium Auctoritates Aristotelis (Auct. Arist. in the bibliography). On the difference in meaning between the Aristotelian original quotation and the Latin variant here and in Auctoritates Aristotelis, see Section 8.2.2 above. It is of course difficult to determine whether the commentators used a florilegium such as this or if they used a full translation of Aristotle's works. It is noteworthy, however, that the quotations from Aristotle in our texts are often phrased very similarly to those in Auctoritates Aristotelis, sometimes almost verbatim. Since the editor of the florilegium, J. Hamesse, shows that it must have been completed sometime between 1256 and 1325, it is not impossible that this collection could have been a source for these commentators. In any case, the many references to Aristotle in these texts attest to the same vivid interest in his works as does the making of the florilegium itself.

25 Mart. Brac., form. vit. 5.
CHAPTER 8

No manuscript offers the text exactly as printed in the edition. To produce a coherent and syntactical text it has been necessary both to adopt readings from the two primary manuscript families and to make one emendation. In the following, this passage will be analysed in conjunction with selected errors and interesting alternatives in each manuscript.

There are four possible readings as regards the initial pronoun of this passage: *quisquis* as in Martin's text is offered by Gr2 and Wi2; the manuscript Kb2 reads *quis*; *quam quis* is found in Mü3 and St2; and *si quis* is offered by Go1 and Sg2. It is interesting to note that Go1 and Sg2 place here the conditional conjunction found in the next sentence in the other manuscripts.

The variant *sectari* is offered only by the two fifteenth-century manuscripts, Kb2 and Wi2 (in Gr1, the abbreviation is difficult to interpret), although it is probable that the incomprehensible *sectam* in Gr2 and Mü3 is a result of a miscopying of this word. Even though Mü3 and St2 share readings initially in this sentence, St2 omits the word corresponding to *sectari*, which could possibly be another example of this scribe's tactic when confronted with a dubious textual passage, as touched upon above. The reading *scientiam* found in Sg2 and Wi2 could be a solution to interpreting something illegible or incomprehensible, perhaps a corruption of *sectari*.

In the next sentence, Go1 and Sg2 offer the reading 'sed in hoc illum', which has been adopted in the edition. With the exceptions of Mü3 and St2, both of which read *licet* and *sic aliquando* respectively, the other manuscripts offer a reading which retains Martin's conditional conjunction but without the main clause to correspond with it. It is noteworthy that the base manuscript, Gr1, as well as retaining the conditional conjunction also has an initial *sed*.

Misunderstandings of abbreviations seem to have generated a range of errors and alternative readings in the last sentence of this passage, the most conspicuous of which is perhaps the nonsense phrase *communis iam* for *controversiam* found in Go1 and Sg2, where it is also preceded by the addition *gracia vis*. In Gr1 the word is rendered *contrarius iam* and in Mü3 *conversa vitasset*. The verb *necto* is present only in Kb2 and Wi2. Martin's *qualitatem* is not found in this prologue but we read instead *calliditatem* in Gr2, Mü3, Kb2, Wi2, *ex calliditate* in Sg2 and Go1, and *castitate* in Gr1. A misinterpretation of the abbreviation for the word *animi* (that is, *ai* with a horizontal stroke above) could be the reason

26 The reading in Gr1, ‘quicquid habet genus sectari (?) desiderat’, does not make syntactical sense.

27 As has already been stated, St2 breaks off the quotation after nocere in this sentence and resumes it again with ‘Iustus enim secreta’ at line 16.
behind the puzzling presence of *cum* in *Go1* and *Sg2* (if the curved stroke of a cursive *a* is read as a *c* and the back stroke is taken together with the minim stroke of *i* to form *u*). In *Kh2* and *Wi2*, *animi* seems to have been replaced by the conjunctions *et* and *ac* respectively, to connect with the subsequent *secularitatem* in *Kh2* and *secularem* in *Wi2*, which is found instead of Martin’s *speculare*. In the other manuscripts, *speculare* appears as *sectari* in *Gr2* and as *solare* in *Mü3, Go1* and *Sg2*, but has been left out in *Gr1*. The solution in the edition has been to emend the reading of *Gr2* to agree with the preceding *nectas* adopted from *Kh2* and *Wi2* resulting in the phrase *animi sectare*.

An explanation both of the manuscript errors and of the range of alternative readings in this passage could be that the paraphrased passage from Martin of Braga had been faulty in the various exemplars copied by the scribes which in turn caused new errors or triggered different strategies for copying: to copy what the scribe could interpret regardless of content, as with ‘gracia vis communis iam’; to produce something new and coherent, as with *secularitatem* and *secularem* of *Kh2* and *Wi2* in the last sentence; or to leave out corrupted words or a whole passage as is perhaps the case with the omissions in *St2*. Another possibility could be that some scribes had immediate access to Martin’s text or knew it more intimately and therefore changed or attempted a correction of an erroneous exemplar in order to make it conform more with the sense of the original, as with the presence of *nectas* in *Kh2* and *Wi2* and in the retaining of the conditional conjunction discussed above.

A variety of alternative readings has also been generated in the as yet unidentified passage allegedly taken from Augustine, in which the wicked are likened to brute animals. The reason for this simile is stated in the subsequent clause, where the animals are said to be unable to fulfill the requirements for attaining eternal bliss referred to in the preceding sentence, namely to consider the present, the past and the future. Among the textual witnesses, five manuscripts offer readings in agreement with this argument, namely *non respiciunt* in *Gr1* and *St2* and *despiciunt* in *Gr2*, *Kh2* and *Wi2*. The text of the edition is that of *Gr1* and *St2* as this is the more neutral of the two possibilities in that it does not seem to imply a deliberate or conscious act of will.

Finally, *Gr2* is the single witness to ‘adpecio felicitatis eternae’ at line 30, a reading which has been adopted in the edition as the *lectio difficilior* of the
possible readings displayed in the other manuscripts. The alternative *adopció* is offered by *Go1* and *Sg2*, whereas *adaptatio* is displayed in *Kb2* and *Wt2*. *Gr1* and *St2* here share a variant different from the others in that it produces a consecutive clause with a finite verb after *consequens*, giving the meaning that the goal of this work is not the attainment of eternal bliss but merely the knowledge of it (‘ad scientiam felicitatis eternae’), which by comparison seems poor remuneration.

8.2.3 On the text—the commentary of *Gr1*

The commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in *Gr1* approaches the sequence primarily in theological and grammatical terms, whereas interpretations based on etymologies are not as prominent as in some of the other expositions presented here. In two instances the author notes and comments on the existence of transmitted variants of the sequence text even though no preference is stated (lines 201–203 and 225–226).

The structure of the commentary is formed around lemmata of the sequence text, which introduce each commentary section. The words of the lemmata are heavily abbreviated in this manuscript, mostly indicated only with the initial letter. This is of course a common abbreviation technique when the text referred to is well known, although it is not a standard method in the sequence commentaries examined for the present work. Sometimes, but by no means always, the words are written out in full in the subsequent section where the author repeats the sequence text, albeit restructured into prose and interspersed with pronouns, conjunctions, clarifying phrases, and sometimes also brief explanations and observations regarding a specific word.

In the first such section it becomes evident that the opening lines of the sequence pose problems for the readers. The alternative understanding of ‘pangat ad celebres laudes’ presented in this commentary is to take *laude* (in the

---

28 One parallel passage has been found where the same phrase is used in a similar context. The following is an excerpt of a discussion of the final cause in a sixteenth-century musical treatise by Nicolaus Wöllick: ‘De causis musicæ artis. Capitulum tertium [ . . . ] Finalis autem est felicitatis aeternæ adeptio vel ipsius animi ipsorumque spirituum recreatio’; NIEMÖLLER (1955), p. 7.

29 *Mi3* has a different reading here, consisting of a sub-clause explaining the phrase *istam scientiam*.

30 On the discussion regarding the opening words of the sequence, see Section 3.1 above.
Dicit Aristoteles and the Commentary of Gr1

ablative) together with canora symphonia even though the prepositional phrase then seems to be left incomplete (lines 4–5).

After the paraphrase of the sequence, any grammatical issues in the passage are addressed, consisting mainly of explanations of the meaning of a word and its inflection. Examples of this are found at lines 7–9, where the different significations of pango are demonstrated together with the accompanying forms for the past tense, and at lines 147–150 where the words satrapa and vernula are thoroughly explained. In one such grammatical section (lines 80–82) we find the etymological definition of the word symbolum common to all the commentaries belonging to the Aristotelian tradition, where the component sym is translated into ‘with’ and bole into ‘meaning’, sententia, producing in this commentary an understanding of the word as ‘the collected meanings of the saints’. The word agalma, spelt in various ways in the manuscript, is here given two different interpretations (lines 191–193): divine mirrors (also understood as divine speculations or meditations) or divine receptacles, but, as the author himself states, the two suggestions amount to the same meaning: the angels are called divine mirrors since they are receptive of divine illumination. This interpretation is in stark contrast to that voiced in the other commentaries of the Aristotelian tradition edited here, which follow the understanding of agalma in its literal meaning of ‘sheepfold’ as found in Alan’s text.

A third section presents the interpretation of the sequence text in theological terms. The themes expounded in this commentary are: the ways in which the world is adorned through Michael (lines 18–31); the difference between angels and spirits (lines 37–46); man or the angels as the image of God (lines 54–74); the nine orders of angels and their offices (lines 84–138); the orders to which Michael, Gabriel and Raphael belong (lines 151–157); and, finally, the number of angels in heaven (lines 170–183).

The first of these themes is developed around the sequence lines ‘laetabunda perornatur machina mundi tota’ (lines 18–31). The world, including the heavens, is said to be adorned in five ways by St Michael: through the celebration of his feast, the intervention of his prayers, the heavenly as well as the daily battle that he fights on our behalf, his guidance of souls to heaven, and, finally, on account of his daily prayers for the church and for delivering our prayers to God. For these interpretations the author makes references to Daniel 12, 1, together with the Biblical Gloss to the same passage, and to Revelation 8, 3.

The difference between angels and spirits (lines 37–46) is defined with the aid of Gregory’s Homily 34 on the Gospel according to Luke together with a
quotation from Psalm 103, 4, also in Gregory’s text, and a passage from Isaiah 6, 6.

The dichotomy between the belief that man is made in the image of God and the words of Dionysius on the angels as the images of God is resolved by concluding that man is the image of God par excellence, a statement which is subsequently strengthened by the three reasons referred to above.31 This passage (lines 54–74) is introduced by a quotation attributed to Plato stating that man ought to be the image of God with respect to the soul, an opinion to which a certain Ieremias, magister mens, is also said to adhere.32

Gregory’s Homily 34, in conjunction with the works of Albert the Great, is again drawn upon in the explanatory account of the nine orders of angels and their respective offices (lines 84–138). In the commentator’s interpretation of the names and offices of the angelic orders no mention is made of the differences in the hierarchical order as presented by Dionysius and Gregory; here, the order as presented in the sequence text is followed.33 In the interpretation of the cherubim, a quotation from Seneca seems to be wrongly attributed to Aristotle under his usual epithet Philosophus (line 134).

In this section of the commentary five strophes of the sequence Inga Bethel mens are quoted, in which the offices of the Angels, the Principalities, the Powers and the Dominions are respectively described.34 The sequence is in this commentary attributed to Albert the Great and some of the strophes echo the formulations found in his commentary on Dionysius’s Celestial hierarchy, but they also resemble passages found in Peter Lombard’s Libri quattuor sententiarum, Gregory’s Homily 34 and Jerome’s commentary on Matthew in the sections on the same subject. Paraphrases of these texts, albeit not the sequence strophes themselves, can also be found in the two commentaries of Kf4 and Kf1.

The question regarding the number of the angels is answered here by quoting the well-known line from Daniel 7, 10 about the thousands upon thousands who administer and the myriads upon myriads who assist. Alongside this, the Biblical Gloss to the same passage notes that this is man’s way of expressing the incomprehensible multitude of spirits in the heavens. The Gloss

---

31 See Section 8.1.
32 It has not been possible to identify this master, but the same name is mentioned in the two other textual witnesses to this commentary, Sg2, from the abbey of St Gall, and Go1, from the abbey of Göttweig.
33 Regarding the differences in the order of angels in the celestial hierarchy, see Section 3.1.2 above.
34 The sequence text is edited in AH 37, 117.
is likewise called upon to enlighten further the quotation from the book of Job drawn upon in the same passage.

8.2.3.1 Expositio Gr1: textual problems and remarks on the edition

The commentary of Gr1 is edited in accordance with the principles set up for Category 2 editions above.\textsuperscript{35} The text, which is edited from the representative manuscript Gr1, is found also in two other manuscripts, 3g2 and Go1. The textual tradition for this commentary contains many problematic passages and even though the text in Gr1 is generally better in comparison with 3g2 and Go1, it nevertheless displays a number of errors. Most of these, however, are in passages where it has been possible to use the other two textual witnesses as correctives.

There is one easily identifiable \textit{saut du même au même}, the missing passage of which has been supplied from the other two manuscripts (lines 57–60). Several omitted single words necessary for understanding the commentary text have likewise been inserted into the text, for example at lines 65, 69 and 151. Words left out of the lemma of the sequence text have also been inserted, but only if they are included in the subsequent paraphrased section, as at lines 10, 33 and 159.

From a number of peculiar errors it becomes apparent that the scribe of Gr1 must have had difficulty in correctly identifying the letter \textit{r} in the exemplar as it is often taken for \textit{n}, as in the abbreviation \textit{mgos} for \textit{mgros} (magistros, line 61), \textit{un} for \textit{ur} (line 102) and \textit{negere inferiores} instead of \textit{regere inferiores} (line 118).\textsuperscript{36} This could possibly also explain the \textit{unam} found in the manuscript, which has been emended in the edition to \textit{vestra} (line 175), as it seems that the scribe must have misinterpreted the abbreviation \textit{vra} with a horizontal stroke above.

At line 184 I have deleted the words \textit{vel sic}, as they do not make syntactical or logical sense in the way they are placed in the manuscript; nor are they found in the other two manuscripts containing this text. It is possible that the phrase should have been placed at line 186, introducing an alternative interpretation of \textit{rex verbigena}.

Remarks on the edition

As mentioned above, the scribe of this manuscript generally abbreviates the lemmata of the sequence by writing only the initial letter of each word. Other

\textsuperscript{35} See Section 4.1.2 above.

\textsuperscript{36} The erroneous \textit{audent} for \textit{ardent} could perhaps also be included in this category (line 138).
words are sometimes also heavily abbreviated. An example is *agalma*: at lines 190–193 the word occurs four times, in a different guise at each instance—*algmata, algal, algama* and *agal*. In the edition the word is rendered in the form *algama* as this seems to be the spelling hinted at by the scribe in three of the four instances. The word is always accompanied by a note in the critical apparatus as to its rendering in the manuscripts. The word *thymiama* is also only found in abbreviated forms, all of which omit the first *i* (lines 213–218). In the edition it is always printed *thymiamata* with a note in the apparatus on the form in the manuscript. The abbreviation *ibis* is resolved with the letter *h*, that is as *Ihesus*. 
Dicit Aristoteles in principio libro De anima, quod rerum noticiam certitudinaliter estimamus, quod honorabile et bonum, sed tamen magis illam scientiam, que est magis honorabilis et bona et felix, sicut theologa.

Quod ipsa theologa sit magis felix, patet per Philosophum, qui dicit, quod sine bonis interioribus non contingit hominem esse felicem. Theologia est bonorum interiorum, que faciunt hominem esse felicem. Ergo theologa est felix et honorabilis, et secundum hoc theologa preellit omnes alias artes.
Illud autem, quod facit hominem feli
cem, est ipsa iusticia, quam diffin
it Philosophus in moralibus dicens, quod iusticia est tacita nature convencio in
adiutorium multorum inventa. Iusticia non est nostra constitucio sed divina lex
et vinculum societatis humane. Quisquis ergo hanc sectari desiderat, Deum
prius amet, ut ametur ab eo. Sed in hoc illum imitaberis, ut velis omnibus
prodesse et nulli nocere. Iustus ut sis, non solum non nocebis, sed eciam
nocentes prohibebis. Nichil nocere non solum est iusticia, sed abstinencia alieni.

Ex nulla ambiguitate vocis controversiam nectas sed callidatem animi sectare.
Iustus enim secretae non profidit, sed tacet tacenda et loquitur loquendi. Ad

9 iusticia ... 16 loquenda] cf. Mart. Brac., form. vit. 5: Quid est autem iustitia nisi nature tacita
conventio in adiutorium multorum inventa? Et quid est iustitia nisi nostra constitutio, sed
divina lex et vinculum societatis humanae? [...] Quisquis ergo hanc sectari desideras, time
prius deum et ama deum, ut ameris a deo. Amab is enim deum, si illum in hoc imitaberis, ut
velis omnibus prodesse, nulli nocere et tunc te iustum virum appellabunt omnes, sequentur,
veraebantur et diligent. Iustus enim ut sis, non solum non nocebis, sed etiam nocentes
prohibebis. Nam nihil nocere non est iustitia, sed abstinentia alieni. [...] Ex nulla
vocabis controversiam nectas, sed calliditatem animi sectare. [...] ubi honesta causa
est iustus secretae non profidit. Tacenda enim tacita, loquendi tacitae. [...]
Dicit Aristoteles

felicitatem eternam requiritur, quod homo consideret presencia, preterita et futura, unde dicit Augustinus: Impii tamquam bruta animalia vivunt, quia presencia non respicient et futura, nec post hanc vitam requiem spectant.

His visis accedendum est ad causas libri presentis, quia dicit Philosophus, quod unumquodque scimus, dum eius causas cognoscimus; ideo causas presentis operis videamus.

Supponitur autem iste liber theologie, quia subiectum est eius laus divina. Causa efficiente est sanctus Gregorius, qui antiquiores sequencias composuit. De causa efficiente non est multum curandum, dummodo sit bona sciencia et utilis. Causa formalis est duplex: forma tractatus et forma tractandi. Forma tractandi est modus agendi, et ille est persuasivus; persuadet enim servire Deo nostro. Forma tractatus consistit in divisione libri, et dividitur iste liber in tot partes,
quot sunt sequencie. Causa finalis est cognicicio eorum, que in hoc libro pertractantur, et per consequens per istam scienciam adepcio felicitatis eternae.
Sic ordina: o REX CELICE, CUNCTA CATERVA PANGAT AD CELEBRES LAUDES, vel forte quibusdam placet, quod adtendatur per composicionem: PANGAT ergo LAUDE CANORA SYMPHONIA, illud est ablativi casus.


ODAS ATQUE <SOLVAT> CONCIO TIBI NOSTRA, CUM IAM RENOVANTUR MICHAHELIS INCLITA TOTA VALDE FESTA, PER QUEM LETABUNDA PERORNATUR MACHINA MUNDI

ATQUE, CUM IAM MICHAHELIS FESTA VALDE INCLITA, id est valde solemnia, RENOVANTUR, NOSTRA CONCIO SOLVAT, id est persolvat, TIBI ODAS, id est laudes vel carmina—hoc nomen non invenitur habere plures casus nisi ‘odas’ et ‘odis’—PER QUEM, scilicet Michaelem, TOTA MACHINA MUNDI PERORNATUR LETABUNDA.

Multipliciter autem per sanctum Michaelem perornatur machina mundi, id est tota ecclesia in singulis partibus mundi dispersa. Primo ex ipsius festi annua celebrazione. Secundo perornatur suorum suffragiorum intervencione, unde dicit in Danieli duodecimo capitulo: In tempore illo consurget Michæel princeps magnus, qui stat pro filiis populi sui vel tui. Glossa ibidem: ut salventur predestinati. Tercio perornatur ecclesia per sanctum Michaelem, quod tam de pugna celesti quam de pugna cottidiana, quam pro nobis pugnat, intelligitur. Perornatur...
eciam machina celi per eum animarum inductione, quia ipse est ductor animarum sanctarum in celum, secundum illud: Archangela Michael, constitut in principem super omnes animas suscipientias. Orat eciam cotidie pro ecclesia et oraciones nostras offert ad Deum, unde Apokalypsis octavo capitulo: Stetit

*Angelus ante altare habens thuribulum aureum et cetera et data sunt ei incensa multa, ut dare deo oracionibus sanctorum omnium super altare aureum, quod est ante thronum Domini et cetera.*

Novies distincta pneumatum sunt agmina per te facta sed, cum vis, facis hec flammea per <angelicas> officinas

O rex celice, Agmina pneumatum, id est spirituum, Facta per te sunt distincta novies, id est in novem choros, sed, cum tu vis, facis hec flammea per angelicas officinas.

Qualiter hoc sit intelligendum, exponit Gregorius in omelia, dicens: ‘Angelus’ non est nomen nature sed officii. ‘Angelus’ enim Grece nuncius dicitur esse Latine. Illi ergo celestis patrie spiritus semper quidem sunt spiritus, sed semper vocari angeli nequaquam possunt, quia tunc solum sunt angeli, dum per eos aliqua nunciantur, unde scilicet psalmus: *Qui facit angelos suos et cetera.* Ac si dicat, quia eos, quos semper habet spiritus, et cum voluerit, facit angelos, scilicet per missionem ad nos, et tunc dicuntur angeli fieri flammei, cum peccata nostra purgant et nos in caritate Dei accendunt, unde Ysayas sexto capitulo:

*Volavit ad me unus de seraphim et in manu eius calculus, id est lapis ignitus, / quem forcipe tulerat de altari et tetigit os meum et dixit: Purga peccatum tuum.* Dicam igitur: o rex celice, cum vis, facis hec flammea per angelicas officinas.

Inter primaeva sunt hec nam creatua tua, cum simus nos ultima factura sed ymago tua.
Expositio Gr1

NAM HEC, scilicet agmina, SUNT INTER PRIMEVA CREATA TUA, id est inter primas creaturas tuas, quia primo die angeli sunt creati sicut habetur ex glossa Strabi et Augustini super Genesim tercio, CUM NOS SIMUS ULTIMA FACTURA, quia sexto die creatus fuit homo, et SIMUS YMAGO TUA.

Dicit Plato, sicut Jeremias magister meus ait, in libro legis: Debet homo ad ymaginem creatoris fieri tantum secundum animam. Hic oritur questio, quomodo homo dicatur specialiter ymago Dei, quasi angelus non sit ymago Dei, <cum tamen dicat Dionissius in libro de divinis nominibus: Angelus est ymago Dei, manifestatio luminis non apparentis, speculum purum perlucidissimum et cetera. Ad hoc dicendum, quod licet angelus eciam dicatur ymago Dei,> tamen homo antonomasye, id est per excellenciam, dicitur ymago Dei, et hoc asignantur plures speciales raciones subtiles per magistros, sed tres clariores intellectu sufficiant.

Prima racio, quia sicut Deus torus in mundo ubique est vivificans et movens et gubernans omnia, sic anima in suo mundo, id est in corpore, unde Greci appellant hominem microcosmum, <id est> minorem <mundum>.

Secunda racio est, quia sicut Filius Dei est sapiencia Patris et exemplar omnium—omnia enim Pater creavit in tempore secundum ydeas in Filio ab eterno existentes—sic eciam in anima sunt similitudines omnium rerum, unde quilibet artifex <volens> aliquid operari prius in anima concipit formam, quam postea inducit in materiam.

Tercia racio est, quia licet angelus sit in pleniori cogitazone Dei secundum naturam, non tamen secundum graciam, quia homo fuit unibilis Deo, id est ut Deus uniret sibi humanam naturam. Angelus autem non fuit unibilis, unde Paulus ait: Nusquam angelos apprehendit sed semem Abrahe.

---


52 Strabii cod. | Augustinii] augustinus cod. 56 homo cum cett. scripti, hic cod. specialiter cum cett. scripti, spiritualiter Gr1 | Dei cum cett. scripti, Christi Gr1 57 cum ... 60 Dei cum cett. supplerei 60 antonomasye] antonomasye cod. 61 magistros] nnos cod. 65 id est cum cett. supplerei | mundum cum cett. supplerei 69 volens cum cett. supplerei
THEOLOICA KATEGORIZANT SIMBOLA NOBIS HEC TER TRIPARTITA PER PRIVATA OFFICIA

THEOLOICA SIMBOLA KATEGORIZANT NOBIS HEC, scilicet agmina, TER TRIPARTITA, idem est quod prius dixit ‘novies distincta’, PER PRIVATA, id est specialia, OFFICIA.


Novenariumque distinctencionem dicens:

PLEBS ANGELICA. Ibi tangitur primus chorus, scilicet angelorum. Horum speciale officium ponit dominus Albertus episcopus in quadam sequencia, dicens:

Dignitas est animarum specialis, ut earum sint custodes angeli.

PHALANX ET ARCHANGELICA. Ibi tangitur secundus chorus, scilicet archangelorum. Hii eciam habent privata officia, quia, ut dicit Gregorius: Qui minora nunciant, dicuntur angeli, qui vero summa nunciant, archangeli nuncupantur.

PRINCIPANS TURMA, id est caterva. Ibi tangitur chorus principatuum. Horum et speciale officium tangit dominus Albertus:

Habent terre personatus
limitare principatus
et iura discernere,

82 post predicamenta spatium fere 25 litteris praebet cod. 83 Novenariumque distinctencionem ut vid. 84 Horum] horum rum cod. 96 personatus cum scit scripsi, personatus cod. 97 limitare] limitate cod. 98 discernere i.e. discernere
submovere superborum
sedes ducum et bonorum
hiis datur statuere.

VIRTUS URANICA. Ibi tangitur chorus virtutum. ‘Uranica’, id est ignea, ab ‘ur’, quod est ignis, unde in Genesi ait Dominus ad Abraham quindecimo capitolo: 

AC POTESTAS ALMIVOMA, id est alma. Ibi tangit chorum potestatum, vel dicuntur ‘potestates almivome’ quasi promoventes sanctitatem. Horum officium tangit Albertus:

Potestatum est arcere
nequam omne, <ne> nocere,
quantum vellet, valeat,
scilicet demones arcere a nocumentis nostris.

DOMINANCIA NUMINA. Ibi tangit dominaciones. Horum officium est regere inferiores, unde Albertus ait:

Dominantes hii dicuntur,
quorum nutu disponuntur
actus ministrancium,

---


id est eorum, qui mittuntur ad ministrandum nobis, quia quattuor superiores chori numquam mittuntur ad nos sed illi dicuntur semper Deo assistere. Sed quinque inferiores ad nos mittuntur et illi dicuntur ministrare, ut dicit Dyonisius.

DIVINAQUE SUBSELLIA. Ibi tangit thronos, qui dicuntur eciam sella Dei, id est sedes. Horum officium ponit Gregorius, dicens: Throni dicuntur, quibus <ad> exercendum iudicium semper Deus presidet, unde psalmus: Qui sedes super thronum et indicas equitatem.

CHERUBIN ETHEREA. Hic tangit octavum chorum. ‘Cherubin’ interpretatur plenitudo sciencie et bene dicit ‘ethera’, quia ether est superior aer serenissimus, et cherubin serenissimam habet intelligenciam in divina sciencia, unde eciam Philosophus animum sapientes etheri comparat, dicens: Animus sapientis est quasi mundus super lunam; et ibi enim semper serenitas est.

AC SERAPHIN IGNICOMA, id est ignea vel quasi igne compti. Seraphin enim, ut dicit Gregorius, ardencia vel incendencia vocantur eo, quod pre ceteris in amore Dei ardent et quia alios ad karitatem accendunt.

Postquam generaliter transivit auctor omnes choros, sequenter transfert se ad angelos personales, dicens:

O Michaehel, Celi satrapa, Gabrielque vera dans verbi nuncia, atque Raphael, vite vernula et cetera.

O Michaehel, satrapa Celi, et tu Gabriel dans verbi nuncia, scilicet quando Christum nunciasti virgini gloriese Marie, dicens: Ecce, concipies in utero et paries. Atque o tu Raphael, vite vernula, vos transferete nos inter paradisicolas, id est sanctos, qui sunt incole paradisi.
‘Satrapa’, id est princeps, ut dicit glossa super primum regum. ‘Vernula’ est diminutivum a ‘verna’. ‘Verna’ id est servus. Inde vernaculaus dicitur ille servus, qui in domo patris familias est genus, unde angeli dicuntur vernule vel vernaculi, quia in domo summi patris familias, id est in celo, creati sunt.

Si autem queratur, de quibus <choris> sint predicti tres angeli, ad hoc dicendum, quod magistri nituntur probare, quod Michæel sit de choro principatum per hoc, quod dicitur in Daniele: Ego Michæel princeps magnus vester. Et iterum in Daniele duodecimo: Consurget Michæel princeps magnus. Gabriel autem dicitur de choro archangelorum eo, quod summæ nunciavit. Sed Raphæl dicitur esse de coro virtutum eo, quod miraculose redidit Tobie visum, quia virtutum est miracula supra naturam valenter operari.

Modo generaliter / includit omnia angelorum arma:

PER VOS PATRIS CUNCTA COMPLENTUR MANDATA, <QUE> DAT EUSDEM SOPHIA

PER VOS PATRIS et cetera. Per hoc pronomen ‘vos’ fit demonstracio propria ad omnes ordinis spirituum pretaxatos, non tantum ad tres predictos angelos, sicut patet ex littera sequenti. Dicamus ergo: o vos arma, CUNCTA MANDATA, PATRIS, QUE ipse DAT, COMPLENTUR PER VOS et ciam CUNCTA MANDATA, QUE EUSDEM SOPHIA, id est Filius, qui est sapientia, et CUNCTA MANDATA, QUE DAT PNEUMA, id est Spiritus sanctus. PNEUMA, dico, COMPAR utriusque, videlicet PERMANENS cum utroque IN USIA, id est substancia, CUI DEO vos arma ESTIS SACRA AMMINISTRANIA, id est sacri amministratores. Armæ, dico, enim numero MILIA MILIUM.

Dicit quedam glossa super Daniele septimo: Milia milium, id est infinita milia. Hic tangit numerum angelorum, qui expressus est in Daniele septimo. Ibi enim dicit: Milia milium ministrahant ei et decies milies centena milia assistebant ei.
VICE PER BIS QUINAS, ibi tangit illum numerum, scilicet ‘decies’, BIS ATQUE QUINGENTAS, ibi tangit hunc numerum ‘milies’, VESTRA CENTENA MILLENA, ibi tangit hunc numerum ‘centena milia’. ASSISTUNT IN AULA Deo VESTRA PER BIS QUINAS VICES, videlicet faciencia numerum denarium, ATQUE BIS QUINGENTAS VICES, id est faciencia numerum millenarium. Et dicit glossa super Danielem septimo: Non quod tantus numerus sit servorum Dei, sed quia humanus sermo exprimere non potest maiorem. Et ponitur hic numerus finitus pro infinito, quia dicitur in Iob: Numquid est numerus militum eius? Non autem simpliciter dico, quod numerus angelorum sit infinitus, sed sicut Gregorius et in glossa super Danielem: Supernorum civium numerus est infinitus nobis [est] sed Deo est finitus, nobis innumerabilis, Deo autem numerabilis.

Hii ergo Deo ASSISTUNT IN AULA, AD QUAM, scilicet aulam [vel sic] REX VERBIGENA, id est rex, qui est genitum verbum et tunc sumitur pro Filio, qui est verbum genitum a Patre. REX VERBIGENA, id est Pater generans verbum, id est Filium, DUXIT OVE M CENTESIMUM, que perdita fuit, sicut legitur ex evangelio, id est hominem, DRAGMAMQUE DECIMAM, id est hominem, qui additus novem choris angelorum dicitur facere ‘dragmam decimam’, que perdita et cetera. Quo igitur DUXIT, scilicet in aulam AD VESTRA ALGAMATA.
Expositio G\(\text{r}\)1

‘Algamata’ dicitur divina specula vel divine speculaciones, et eciam angeli
dicitur algamata, quia sunt receptibles divine illuminacionis. Quidam tamen
dicunt, quod ‘algamata’ sint divina receptacula, sed satis in idem reddit.

Nota differenciam inter ‘tragma, -me’ et ‘dragma, -tis’. Hoc est idem quod
canticum, unde in canticis: frequentate nobis dulcia cantica dragmatis.

VOS PER ETHRA

Sic ordina construccionem: NOS PARS ELECTA, id est predestinata \(<\text{ad}>\)
beatitudinem, DEMUS Deo VOTA ARMONIE PER LYRICAS CYTHARAS. Sed VOS
PER ETHRA, NOS PER RURA TERREA, id est vos in celo, nos in terra, DEMUS Deo
VOTA et cetera.

Quidam libri habent ‘decima pars electa’. Tunc iste sensus: Nos dena, id est
decima, pars electa. Vos enim estis novem chori angelorum. / Decima pars
electa a Deo et cetera sicur prius.

‘Armonia’ dicitur sonus dulcis melodie, scilicet quomodo damus vota per
lyricas cytaras. Lyra quattuor solet habere cordas et signat doctrinam quattuor
evangelistarum. Cyntara autem plures habet cordas et signat observanciam
preceptorum Domini, ad que omnes tenetur [et eciam consiliorum tenentur]
perfecte.

VOTA igitur Deo DEMUS PER LYRICAS CYTARAS, scilicet decem precepta et
eciam consilia, que habemus ex doctrina quattuor evangelistarum, studiosius
adinpleamus.

QUO POST BELLA MICHAHELIS INCLITA

QUO, id est ex quo vel ex qua re, NOSTRA TYMIAMATHA, id est nostre
oraciones, SINT ACCEPTA Deo super aram, vel circa aram, AUREAM.

191 Algamata ... 192 illuminacionis] sfr Joh. Scot., ier. Dion. 3, lin. 115–126. 192 Quidam ...
193 receptaculal] sfr e.g. Hugo S. Vict., hier. coel., PL 175, 995b: [ . . . ] divina agalmata, id est
sancta simulacra et receptacula divinitatis, et specula clarissima. 195 frequentate ... 
309. 206 Cyntara ... 207 Domini] sfr Isaak., orig. 3, 22, 7.

193 algamata] algal cod. | reddit i.e. reddit 197 ad cum cett. supplivi 203 prius cum cett. scripti,
primus cod. 207 ad que cum cett. scripti, atque cod. | et ... tenentur2 cum cett. delevi 210 consilia
cum cett. scripti, similis cod. 211 adimpleamus] adimplemus cod. 213 tymiamathal] tymathal cod.
Thymiamatha est species aromatum suaviter redolens in igne et signat oraciones sanctorum, unde psalmus ait: Fiat oratio vestra sicut incensum in conspectu tuo. ‘Aurea ara’ signat dulcissimum Dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum, super quem et propter quem oracionum nostrarum thymiamatha debemus summo Patri devocius inmolare.

Et <nota>, quod iste versus extractus est de Exodo et partim de Apokalipsi. Dicit enim in Exodo tricesimo septimo: Fecit Beselehel altare thymiamathis, et signat corpus Christi, ut dicit glossa ibidem. Collectus est iste eciam versus de Apokalipsi octavo versiculo; dicitur: Sestit angelus ante altare habens thuribulum et cetera.

Quidam libri habent ‘quod post bella Michahelis ultima’, scilicet que in fine seculi exercet cum Antichristo, quem interficiet iussu Dei.

QUO IN COEVA IAM GLORIA CONDECANTEMUS ALLELUIA

QUO, id est ex qua re, scilicet quod nostra thymiamatha erunt accepta Deo, nos et vos IN COEVA, id est in coequali, GLORIA CONDECANTEMUS, id est simul cantemus, ALLELUIA.


8.3 THE PROLOGUE \textit{Vir speculativus} and the Commentary of Kf4

The prologue \textit{Vir speculativus} and the commentary from this branch in the manuscript Kf4 constitute the texts in Edition 5. The prologue proves the excellence of science in general and of theology in particular. The commentary text displays a concern for etymologies and includes a paraphrase of the sequence text both at the beginning and at the end of each new section in the exposition. The latter paraphrase is interspersed with numerous brief explanatory phrases functioning as glosses on the sequence text.

8.3.1 Manuscript descriptions

The manuscripts are listed alphabetically according to their sigla. The base manuscript for the edition of \textit{Vir speculativus} and the manuscript from which the commentary is edited is Kf4. In the \textit{apparatus criticus} of the edition of the prologue the manuscripts are reported in the following order: Kf4, Fr1, Fr4, Kf2, Kf5, Ma4, Mi4, Ox2a, Sj2, Ox2b and Wi4.

\textit{Fr1} Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. Leonh. 91

A theological miscellany.

Date: 1356
Provenance: Leonhard-stift (Collegiate chapter)
Material: Paper
Size: 270 x 195 mm.
Folios: 373
Contents: fols 28a–84va: Henricus de Uriamaria Iunior: Questiones quarti Sententiarum
fols 84vb–91vb: On the coming of Antichrist. Inc.: ‘Hic agatur de antichristo. Antequam veniat dominus ad iudicium’
Fols 92a–105vb: Questions on the \textit{Summa} of Raymond of Pennafort. Inc.: ‘Queritur utrum circa summam reimundi primo et cetera’

\footnote{The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, POWITZ (1968), and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.}
Both the hymn and the sequence commentary sections are written in two columns throughout, consisting of around 52 lines each. The commentary is written in a cursiva antiquior, and the lemmata of the sequence are in a textualis hand.\footnote{For cursiva antiquior, see DEROLEZ (2003) pp. 133–134.}

Sequence commentaries (incomplete manuscript).

Date: Beginning of the 15th century
Provenance: Germany
Material: Paper

\footnote{The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, POWITZ (1979), and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.}
Vir speculativus and the Commentary of Kf4

Size: 285 x 210 mm.
Folios: 20
Contents: fols 1r–20v: Sequence commentaries
          fol. 1r: Vir speculativus

This manuscript is incomplete and the text ends in the first column on fol. 20v. The text is written in two columns throughout with around 48 lines to each. The commentary text is written in a neat cursive script and the lemmata of the sequences in textualis. No initials are written in.

Kf2 Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXXI b 2

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 14th/15th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 285 x 205 mm.
Folios: i + 217
Contents: fols 1r–199r: Sequence commentaries
          fol. 1r–v: Vir speculativus
          fols 99r–187v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc. ‘Venite filii audite me timorem Domini docebo vos’
          fols 188r–190r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
          fol. 190r–191v: Word list
          fols 192v–215: A vocabulary. Inc.: ‘Hoc opus attendens, ne quaquam sit reprehendens’
          fols 216r–v: Blank
          fol. 217v: Hymn fragment with glosses. Inc. ‘[F]estum nunc celebre servet gens credula’

The commentary on Ad celebres rex is in this manuscript an addition by a different hand after the collection of sequence and hymn commentaries, which ends at fol. 187v with the words: ‘[ . . . ] sufficit et cetera’. In the sequence

4 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, MENHARDT (1927), and my own observations of the manuscript.
5 Edited in AH 4, 229.
commentary section, fols 1r–190r, the text is written in a cursive script in two columns comprising between 42 and 46 lines. Black ink is used throughout with red for initials for each new piece, for framing the lemmata, for paragraph signs and for a vertical stroke through majuscules in the commentary. Fol. 190r is the last page to have been rubricated, which means that initials are missing from the following leaves. There are a few marginal notes in the first part of the manuscript, most of which indicate the references to Scripture and the Fathers.

K4
Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXXI b 4

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 14th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 292 x 215 mm.
Folios: i + 170

Contents: fol. i: A brief text on the four interpretational modes. Inc.: ‘Notandum est quod scriptura sacra iiii modis exponitur’ Fol. i is blank
fols 1r–83v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Seneca epistola xi sic ait ad Lucillum [sic] nulla sapiencia corporis aut animi vicia ponuntur’
fols 84v–86v: Blank
fols 87r–169v: Sequence commentaries
fol. 87v: Vir speculativus
fols 147v–149v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
fol. 170: Blank
fol. 170v: Enumeration of certain Biblical books with brief description of content in Latin and German

The text is written in a cursive script in two columns throughout the manuscript. The number of lines varies between 41 and 50. Brown-black ink is used in the commentary, with red for the initial of each prologue, for the initials of each new hymn or sequence, for underlining the lemmata and for paragraph signs in the commentary text. The lemmata seem to have been written in at a

6 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, MENHARDT (1927), and my own observations of the manuscript.
later stage with black ink. On fol. 122v there is a change of hands and from 123v onwards a darker ink has been used. There are a few marginal notes and corrections throughout the manuscript, made both by the first hand and by at least one other, perhaps the second hand taking over at fol. 122v. The hymn commentary ends with a colophon on fol. 83v: ‘Explicit hoc totum infunde da mihi potum.’ On fol. 168 the sequence commentary concludes in the second column with the colophon: ‘Explicit per manus duorum.’ However, a commentary on the sequence Plausu chorus has been added on fols 168v–169v by a third hand. On fol. 169v the colophon to this last piece reads: ‘Explicit sequencia de evangelistis.’ The scribe of the commentary on Ad celebres rex (the second hand in the manuscript) tends to use an abbreviation sign similar to the figure 4, usually resolved as -rum, as a general abbreviation sign. Fol. 87r is reproduced as Plate 8; fol. 147v as Plate 9.

Kf5 Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXIX d 7

Sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 215 x 140 mm.
Folios: i + 156
Contents: fols 1r–131v: Sequence commentaries
fols 1r–2r: Vir speculativus
fols 132r–156v: Blank

The text is written in two columns of 41 lines in black ink throughout. Red ink, now faded, has been added to fill the round spaces in the letters of the lemmata and to underline them on the first six folios. No initials have been written in, but space is left to accommodate them. It is written in a cursive script with looped b, d, h and l, and the descenders of s longa and f reach beneath the line, but alongside the one-compartment, the two-compartment a is also used. The

7 Several versions of this colophon is known, see Colophons de manuscrîtes, 21039–21043.
8 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, MENHARDT (1927), and my own observations of the manuscript.
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colophon to the sequence commentaries on fol. 131v reads: ‘Et sic est finis per manus Chonnradi Offinger in vigilia sancti Mathey.’

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 591

Sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 220 x 150 mm.
Folios: 73
Contents: fols 1r–65r: Sequence commentaries
fol. 1r–2r: Vir speculativus
fols 43r–46r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
fol. 65v: Blank
fols 67r–68r: Hymn texts without commentaries
fol. 68v: Unidentified text. Inc.: ‘Aristoteles in quarto ethicorum quod sapiens est maxime felix’
fol. 69v–: Unidentified text
fol. 70r: Blank
fols 70v–71r: Enumerations of various kinds. Probationes pennae
fol. 71v: The text of the sequence Summi regis archangeli
fol. 72r–: Unidentified brief textual notices amongst which is found the following: ‘Iste liber est Carthusiensis proprie Magunciam’

In the sequence commentary collection the text is written in two columns throughout consisting of around 40 lines each. The text of Vir speculativus seems to be written in a different hand from the commentaries.
**Vir speculativus and the Commentary of Kf4**

Mi#4  München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 23856\(^{11}\)

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

- **Date**: 15\(^{th}\) century
- **Provenance**: Unknown
- **Material**: Paper
- **Size**: 305 x 210 mm.
- **Folios**: 288

**Contents**:
- fols 1\(^{r}\)–110\(^{v}\): Sequence commentaries
- fol. 1\(^{r}\)–110\(^{v}\): *Vir speculativus*
- fols 111\(^{r}\)–171\(^{r}\): Hymn commentaries
- fols 172\(^{r}\)–244\(^{r}\): An exposition in German of Benedict’s Rule
- fols 245\(^{r}\)–288\(^{v}\): Gregory the Great: *Dialogorum liber primus* (incomplete)

The following remarks concern only the sequence commentary section. The text is written in a cursive script in two columns throughout with 37 lines to each. The margins are clean and do not display any notes or comments. The initial for *Vir speculativus* has not been written in but a square space of eleven lines in height has been left to accommodate it.

**Ox2**  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hamilton 17\(^{12}\) (S. C. 24447)

A codex made up of three manuscripts, all commentaries of different kinds.

- **Date**: 15\(^{th}\) century
- **Provenance**: St Peter and St Paul monastery, Erfurt (Benedictine)
- **Material**: Paper
- **Size**: 300 x 215 mm.
- **Folios**: ii + 241

**Contents**:
- 1. fols 1\(^{r}\)–65\(^{v}\): Raymond of Pennafort’s ‘Summa’ with a commentary
- 2. fols 62\(^{r}\)–124\(^{v}\): Sequence commentaries

---

\(^{11}\) The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CCL, and my own observations of the manuscript.

\(^{12}\) The description is based on the *Summary Catalogue* (S. C.) and my own observations of the manuscript.
A singular aspect of this manuscript is the fact that the first pieces in the sequence commentary are written twice, by two different hands. The first text of *Vir speculativus* is followed by the commentary on *Grates nunc omnes*. The following fols, 63r–65v, are blank. On fol. 65v there is an enumeration of the vices and sins. On fol. 66r *Vir speculativus* is written in for the second time with the collection of sequence commentaries following it. On account of this there are two sigla in the critical apparatus of *Vir speculativus* referring to the same manuscript but to different texts within it: Ox2a refers to the first text of the prologue; Ox2b to the second. In the sequence commentary section, the text is written in two columns throughout with 52 lines each when space is not left to accommodate for a lemma. Lemmata are not written in for all of the commentaries. Brown-black ink is used for the text and red ink for framing the lemmata. The prologues have a red initial.

Sf2  Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, XI 436

Two manuscripts bound in one codex, the first of which presents hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 13th / 15th century
Provenance: St Florian (Augustinian Canons)
Material: Paper and parchment
Size: 2o
Folios: 140
Contents: fols 1r–45v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Seneca ad Lucillum [sic] epistola XI sic scribit’ (15th century)

13 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CZERNY (1871), and my own observations of the microfilm copy.
Vir speculativus and the Commentary of Kf4

fols 47r–105r: Sequence commentaries (15th century)
  fol. 47r: Vir speculativus
fols 87v–88v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
fols 106r–109r: An exhortation to priests (13th century)
fols 109r–139r: Excerpts from the council of Aachen (13th century)
fols 139r–140r: Prayers

This codex is made up of two manuscripts: fols 1–105 belong to the first, which is made of paper and dated to the fifteenth century; the second comprises fols 106–140 and is made of parchment and dated to the thirteenth century. In the sequence commentary section, the text is written in two columns throughout with around 50 lines to each. The sequences are referred to with incipits and lemmata. The commentary is written in a cursiva antiquior with the lemmata in a textualis hand.14

Wi4 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 14815

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century (1st half)
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: 308 x 210 mm.
Folios: 190

Contents: fol. 1r: Hymn to the Blessed Virgin with neumes
  fols 2r–94v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘In lumine tuo’
  fol. 95r: Blank
  fols 95v–99r: Song of Songs in Latin and German
  fols 99v–105r: Blank
  fols 106r–190r: Sequence commentaries
  fol. 107r–v: Vir speculativus
  fols 158r–160r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex

14 For cursiva antiquior, see DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 133–134.
15 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CMV, on MENHARDT (1960–1961) and on my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
The commentary text in the sequence commentary section is written in a cursive script in two columns throughout. Each column holds approximately 48 lines. The lemmata of the sequences and the incipit of the prologue are written in a slightly larger textualis script. The initials of each new piece are about two lines in height whereas the large initial for the prologue is four lines. Before the prologue *Vir speculativus* a commentary on the sequence *Dilectus Deo et hominibus* has been added by another hand.

8.3.2 On the text—the prologue *Vir speculativus*

In the first part of the prologue here entitled *Vir speculativus* we are led through an extensive logical argumentation regarding the proposition borrowed from Seneca and quoted by the commentator: ‘*Vir speculativus est quasi Deus in humano corpore hospitatus*’ (lines 1–2). The argument is that it can be inferred from the proposition that a reflecting, or scientific, man is naturally virtuous, referring to *vir*, and excellent, referring to *quasi Deus*. Both conclusions are subsequently proved through syllogistic argumentation corroborated by citations from Seneca, Cicero, the Muslim philosopher Algazel (†1111), Robert Grosseteste (†1253) here called *Lincolniensis*, Aristotle and Averroes, the last two referred to with their epithets of *Philosophus* and *Commentator* respectively. In the edition, there is in this section also a reference (line 42) to the Jewish poet and neo-Platonic philosopher Avicebron (†1058), although this reference, as will be seen below, is found in a textually problematic passage.

Having proved the two conclusions, the author claims that they presuppose that the scientific man gains his perfection from his science, which should be sought after on account of the honour, joy and admiration it brings (lines 50–66).

The science to be sought above all is theology, which is said to be the head of all sciences and without which other sciences would be ‘headless’, as it were without a guiding principle (lines 67–71). Theology is subsequently divided into three specific kinds, of which the sequences, and hence the concern of the author, fall into the category consisting in praise made with a song, which serves to place the book of sequences firmly within the realm of theology (lines 72–77).

In the second, intrinsic, part of the prologue (lines 78–110), the author turns his attention to the book of sequences and considers three topics: the four
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causes of the book, its utility and its title, which combines the Aristotelian scheme with two headings from the type C prologue.\textsuperscript{16}

The material cause is said to be multiple since there are different causes in different sequences, although the material cause for this book—\textit{inproprie loqui}, in the words of the commentator—is literary composition with melodious praise (lines 82–83). The formal cause is as usual duplex, consisting of the form of the treatise, which is the division of its parts, and the form of treatment, which in this work is said to be twofold, namely the proving and exemplifying modes (lines 84–88).\textsuperscript{17} The final cause of the book, which coincides with its \textit{utilitas}, is the knowledge of its vocabulary (lines 89–90). In addition, the \textit{utilitas} of the sequences is also said to be the divine remuneration given to man on behalf of the praising of Christ (lines 97–99).

As in all prologues of the Aristotelian tradition edited here, the efficient cause is said to be Gregory, here accompanied by Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, although the commentator also states that for some sequences the authors are unknown to us.\textsuperscript{18} The author here adds a remark similar to that found in \textit{Dicit Aristoteles} to the effect that the efficient cause is of no concern as long as what is said is good and useful (lines 94–95).\textsuperscript{19}

The fact that the sequences are regarded here as being partly a teaching and learning aid for vocabulary, as is explicitly stated under the headings of the final cause and utility of the book as well as being evidenced in the numerous etymological analyses in the commentary, could suggest a less advanced audience for this commentary collection than for the expositions of the \textit{Sapientia} branch.\textsuperscript{20}

8.3.2.1 Vir speculativus: manuscript interrelations and textual problems

The edited text of \textit{Vir speculativus} has been established through a collation of all eleven currently known textual witnesses found in ten different manuscripts. Thus, the edition follows the principles set up and described above for texts

\textsuperscript{16} See Section 2.2.1.1 above.

\textsuperscript{17} In \textit{Dicit Aristoteles} the author claims only one mode for sequences, which is the persuasive (lines 26–27). In the third prologue, \textit{Sapientia vincit malitiam}, the modes are said to be laudatory and supplicatory (lines 166–167).

\textsuperscript{18} On this attribution of authorship, see Section 8.1 above.


\textsuperscript{20} A comparison between \textit{Vir speculativus} and \textit{Sapientia vincit malitiam} and the commentaries from each branch is made in Section 8.4.3 below.
belonging to Category 3. As with Dicit Aristoteles, manuscript interrelations will be discussed based upon agreements in error and alternative readings.

The two earliest manuscripts, Fr1 and Kf4, are dated to the fourteenth century. They both display texts of good quality, although they share with many other textual witnesses a few major, possibly archetypal, errors that will be discussed below. Kf2 is dated to the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and all the other witnesses—Fr4, Kf5, Ma4, Mü4, Ox2a, Ox2b, Sf2 and Wi4—belong to the fifteenth century. The sigla Ox2a and Ox2b refer to two textual witnesses found in the same manuscript, Ox2, where the prologue together with the first commentary in the collection is copied twice. All manuscripts except Fr1, Kf5 and Fr4 include commentaries on Ad celebres rex in their collection, although the commentary in Kf2, as noted above, is found at the very end of the collection and is written in by a different hand from the previous pieces.

In addition to the textual witnesses listed above, there are three other manuscripts that include parts or substantially rewritten passages of this prologue. Usually they omit the entire first part of the prologue discussing the superiority of theology and include only the latter half, treating the four causes of the book of sequences, its utility and title. On account of their abbreviated state and various other idiosyncrasies in them, these manuscripts have not been used in establishing the text of the edition.

The manuscript Kf4, which is the only one of the two earliest manuscripts to contain a commentary to Ad celebres rex, has been chosen as the base manuscript for the edition as it generally displays a text of a good quality. It has a tendency toward succinct expression, often omitting words like probatur, nota, patet, and the copula. This characteristic trait has not been retained in the edition of the prologue, where the omitted words have been supplied from readings shared by the majority of the other manuscripts. There are two slightly larger omissions in this manuscript, one at lines 64–65, which is a saut du même au même unique for Kf4, and the other at lines 96–97, an omission which it shares with Fr4 and which will be discussed further below.

21 See Section 4.1.3 below.
22 See the manuscript descriptions in Section 8.3.1 above.
23 See the manuscript descriptions in Section 8.3.1 above.
24 The manuscripts are Gr3, Sa1 and St1. Gr3 comprises only the end part of Vir speculativus dealing with the four causes; Sa1 displays the end parts of both Sapientia vincit malitiam and Vir speculativus, slightly rewritten, and, finally, St1 presents a heavily abbreviated version of the prologue Sapientia vincit malitiam, with a rewritten version of the end of Vir speculativus.
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Manuscript interrelations

The discussion regarding the interrelations of the manuscripts is based on agreements in error and alternative reading between pairs of manuscripts shown in the two ‘West tables’ found below. The first table accounts for all agreements in two manuscripts regardless of whether they are also shared by other manuscripts. The second table shows agreements unique to two manuscripts. As was mentioned in the previous section, a detected link between two manuscripts in these tables may be investigated further by examining the actual instances listed in Appendix 4b.

Table 1. Agreements in errors and alternative readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fr4</th>
<th>Kf2</th>
<th>Kf4</th>
<th>Kf5</th>
<th>Ma4</th>
<th>Mii4</th>
<th>Ox2a</th>
<th>Ox2b</th>
<th>Sf2</th>
<th>Wi4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mii4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sf2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Unique agreements in error and alternative readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fr4</th>
<th>Kf2</th>
<th>Kf4</th>
<th>Kf5</th>
<th>Ma4</th>
<th>Mii4</th>
<th>Ox2a</th>
<th>Ox2b</th>
<th>Sf2</th>
<th>Wi4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mii4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sf2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our base manuscript for this prologue, $Kf4$, shares eleven agreements in error and alternative readings (five of them unique) with $Kf5$, and seven with $Kj2$ (two of them unique), whereas the latter two have no unique errors or alternative readings in common. This could imply a dependence on $Kf4$ for both of the manuscripts independently of each other.

The manuscript $Kf4$ furthermore shares two unique omissions together with $Fr4$: one is a missing *quod* (line 82) to introduce the clause after *dicamus*, the other a more substantial omission at lines 96–97. As has been said above, $Kf4$ often omits introductory words, and the omission of *quod* can be seen as just another example of this characteristic trait. Nor is $Fr4$, a manuscript displaying numerous alternative readings, abridgements and rewritings, a stranger to omissions of the same type as are found in $Kf4$, as can be seen in the omissions of *sic dicentem* (line 10) and *ubi dicit* (line 34). The omission of *quod*, then, cannot be regarded as a conjunctive error indicating a closer link, but seems to be part of the style of each manuscript text. The longer omission at lines 96–97, which contains a recapitulation of the second question of the present work, does not alter the sense of the passage and could therefore be seen as a deliberate avoidance of repetition, thus being yet another example of the terser style of these two manuscripts. Concerning $Kf4$, however, it cannot be completely ruled out that the omission has been caused by the likeness between *dubium* and dicendum, thus being a case of *saut du même au même*. Such an alternative explanation is not possible for $Fr4$, since this manuscript transposes the words in the preceding phrase so that it ends with *respondetur*. In short, the omission, which could be explained as a chance accident in $Kf4$ and a deliberate choice in $Fr4$, cannot be used with certainty to establish a firm link between the two. Instead, in spite of the two unique errors in common, it seems that $Kf4$ and $Fr4$ are independent manuscripts.

Furthermore, $Kf4$ seems to be independent from $Fr1$, $Mi4$, $Ox2a$, $Ox2b$, $Sj2$ and $Wi4$, with which manuscripts it does not have any unique errors in common. The agreements with these, apart from the major ones to be discussed below, seem to be of minor significance. The agreements with $Fr1$ are an omission of *patet* (line 10, also shared with $Kj2$) and the reading *destructivum* in place of *destructionem* (line 19, shared also with others). With $Ox2a$ the agreement in error is *loquitur* where the text should be *dicitur* (line 69, shared also by $Kf5$). With both of these manuscripts and with $Sj2$ the base manuscript reads *moderare* for *moderari* (line 46 share also with others). In addition to this, the only other agreements between $Kf4$ and $Sj2$ are the error in the problematic
passage containing *modulose* (line 103), which will be discussed below, and the alternative reading at line 19 just mentioned. Together with Mi4, Ox2a and Ox2b, our base manuscript displays the reading *sunt* instead of *sint* (line 94, shared also with Kf5) and a missing stroke above the word *ipsa* (line 106, shared also with other manuscripts).

The two texts Ox2a and Ox2b, although found in the same manuscript, are written by two different hands and a comparison between their errors and readings (six in all but only one unique: the reading of *qui* for *que* (line 93), which could be explained as a simple miscopying or a *constructio ad sensum*) indicates that the two texts are independent.

The only firm link it is possible to establish seems to be between Ox2b and Wi4. They share 30 errors and alternative readings in all, of which 23 are unique to them, which figures clearly set them apart from the others. In addition, Wi4 seems to be independent from Sf2, with which it shares only the *liber* error at line 103 to be discussed below (an error shared by all manuscripts with the exception of Kf4). Ox2b displays three further agreements with Sf2, none of which is unique or of major significance.

**Textual problems**

In the following, a number of interesting errors in the prologue text will be discussed, which are distributed in a way that seem to indicate that they appeared early in the textual tradition. It could also be possible that they are archetypal errors that have been corrected at later stages in the transmission of the text. The first problematic passage to be discussed here is found at lines 36–37 in the edition, which read:

> Philosophia autem est rerum divinarum certa cognicio, ut patet per †Avicebron in libro de disputacionibus †.

As the *apparatus criticus* makes clear, the manuscripts offer the following readings for the phrase surrounded by *cruces*:

- *per Avicebron om. Mi4*
- Avicebron Ox2a ( abidebron) Sf2, albicebrum Kf4 Fr1 Kf5 Ma4, albitherum Kf2, albertum Ox2b Wi4
- disputacionibus| speculacionibus Kf4 Kf5, dispositionibus Ox2b Wi4
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The reading *Avicenon* is taken from Ox2a, with added support from Sf2 although the *v* is there rendered as *b*. The name of this Jewish neo-Platonic philosopher could be deemed the *lectio difficilior* of the sensible readings, that is, of the readings *Avicenon* and *Albertum*, but it could of course be questioned whether it is thereby necessarily also the correct one. Though perhaps not an immediately familiar name today, Avicenon and his theory of the universality of matter was a point many of the great philosophers and theologians of the Middle Ages discussed in their works. There is, however, no known work by Avicenon bearing any of the titles suggested by the manuscripts. In his most famous philosophical work, *Fons vitae*, there are references to two other treatises, which now seem to be lost. We can therefore not rule out completely the possibility that there once existed a work known by the name of *De disputacionibus* or one of the other suggested names composed by Avicenon.

The other recognisable name offered by some of the manuscripts is Albert, who was almost a household name in the later Middle Ages and who is also referred to in the commentary text. These facts make it even more remarkable that so many of the manuscripts would fail to read and copy the name correctly. Nor do we find a work with such a title among Albert's writings.

The origin of the quotation in question seems to be in the Greek stoic writers and can be traced back to Aristotle and to Chrysippos (third century BC). The same thought is later found in writers including Cicero and Augustine among others, and throughout the Middle Ages a range of authors

---

25 Regarding the confusion between the labial sounds represented by these letters see STOTZ (1996), vol. 3 § 227.
26 See for instance BEKKUM (1998) and PETERS (1967).
27 The works referred to are *Treatatus de esse* (Chapter 5. 8) and *Origo largitatis et causa essendi* (Chapter 5. 40). The references are to the edition by BAEUMLER (1895).
28 It is of course possible that works of Albert's have also been lost.
29 The same sentiment is expressed in different words in Arist., *eth. Gros.,* 1141 a 19–20, where he says that wisdom must be knowledge of highly precious, valuable or honoured objects. In the works of Chrysippos we find a formulation closer to our text saying, with a reference to the stoics, that wisdom is knowledge of both human and divine things; see Chrysipp. 35.
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repeat the saying, some reading sapientia and scientia for philosophia and cognitio.30 I have not hitherto been able to find the quotation in the writings of Albert the Great.

We seem to be faced with a few possible scenarios as to the origin of the problem: an archetype that had Avicebron, unrecognised by some scribes who therefore produced the other forms (and the corresponding scenario for an archetype that had Albertum); an archetype that had an abbreviation for an as yet unidentified author that was not understood by the copyists and therefore later reinterpreted into recognisable (and non-recognisable) authors’ names; or an archetype that had an unusual or mis-shapen abbreviation for Aristotle that was dissolved into the other forms and names by the subsequent scribes. The last alternative is tempting since a sentiment to the same effect is indeed found in Aristotle’s works, but the fact that the scribes rather resort to Avicebron and to Albert than to Aristotle speaks against it for two reasons: first, it seems improbable that the scribes would fail to copy such a familiar abbreviation, especially in a text which is studded with references to the Philosopher and his works; second, it seems to suggest that the quotation was not generally seen as a thought deriving from Aristotle. The possibility that Albertum is the original reading, which name was later corrupted into the other forms seems less likely, since it is a common name in the late medieval period and is also mentioned in the commentary, although it cannot be ruled out with certainty that a mis-shapen or misinterpreted abbreviation for Albert is the cause of the error.

The passage seems to have already been perceived of as problematic by some medieval scribes, as is shown by the alternative strategies presented in Mio4, where the reference to the author’s name is omitted, and Fr4, which omits not only the name itself but the entire quotation preceding it.

In the edition I have placed cruces around the problematic passage, as it is not possible to determine the correct reading at this instance with the evidence at hand. The discovery of further textual witnesses may possibly help to resolve this problem.

30 For instance in Cic., fin. 2, 12, 27: ‘Æquam igitur pronuntiabit sententiam ratio adhibita primum divinarum humanarumque rerum scientia, quae potest appellari rite sapientia, deinde adiunctis virtutibus, quas ratio rerum omnium dominas, tu voluptatum satellites et ministras esse voluisti’; in Aug., trin., 14, 1, 3: ‘Sapientia est rerum humanarum divinarumque scientia.’ It is found in Jerome’s and Hraban Maur’s commentaries on the epistle to the Ephesians. Isidore of Seville writes: ‘Philosophia est rerum humanarum divinarumque cognitio’ (Isid., orig., 2, 24).
In addition to this passage, the following problematic passages and errors in the manuscripts are worthy of separate discussion here:

35 Minor patet Mi4 Ox2a Sf2, om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kj4 Kj5 Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
83 modulosa compositum Fr4 (modolosa) Ox2a Ox2b Wi4 Ma4, melodosa compositum Fr1 Kj5, melodosa composita Kj2, melodosa (ex:medolosa corri.) propositum Kj4, melodosa compositum Ma4 Sf2, modulo hominum Mi4
103 dictamen Kj4, liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wi4
103 modulose Fr4 Kj5 Wi4, melodose Fr1 Kj2 Kj4 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2, melodose Mi4, modoloso Ox2b
104 compositum] compositus Kj2 Mi4

The distribution of errors at these instances renders it impossible to view any of them as conjunctive. They could furthermore be indicative of contamination between the manuscripts. It is also interesting to note that the two oldest manuscripts, Fr1 and Kj4, contain most of them. The working hypothesis will be that they are possibly archetypal errors or derive from the first stages in the textual transmission and were later corrected by the copying scribes.

The omission of minor patet is an error shared by a large number of manuscripts; only Mi4, Ox2a and Sf2 contain the phrase. If the phrase is omitted the syllogism will lack the supportive evidence for the minor premise, for which reason the omission is considered a proper error. Once spotted, however, it is not difficult to correct and could have been made by a copying scribe paying close attention to the text he was working on. As Mi4 and Sf2 seem to be independent, as can be inferred from the ‘West tables’ above, their readings carry weight here.

With regard to the error at line 83, the adjective modulosa as found in the manuscripts Fr4, Ox2a, Ox2b and Wi4 has been adopted in the edition. One of the determining factors for this choice of reading is the combined testimony of the independent witnesses Ox2a and Ox2b. For the related passage and hence the related error at line 103, the adverb modulose, defining the participle compositum, has been used in the edition. This reading is taken from the manuscripts Fr4, Kj5 and Wi4, of which the agreement between the independent manuscripts Fr4 and Kj5 here carries weight.31

31 It could, of course, be argued that melodosa (and consequently the adverbial form melodose) is a neologism formed on the word melodus (meaning ‘chant’ or ‘melody’) and the suffix -osus, which proliferated throughout the Middle Ages. Another possibility could be that it is a corrupt form of melodiosus, i.e. melodius and -osus. For the suffix -osus, see Stotz (1996) vol. 2, Book 6, § 81. The many forms and variants visible in the apparatus seem to reflect a general confusion regarding words of this kind and it is easy to imagine that words deriving
Regarding the errors at lines 103–104 concerning *dictamen* and *compositum*, we may note that all textual witnesses except our base manuscript read *liber* for *dictamen* and all but two read *compositum* in the following clause, which is in accordance with *dictamen* as in *Kf4*, but not with *liber*. Only *Kf2* and *Mü4* follow up their *liber* with the syntactically correct *compositus*. This is the only instance where a problematic passage is solved by favouring the reading of the base manuscript before the combined testimony of two possibly independent witnesses.\(^\text{32}\) The reason for this is that I consider it slightly more likely that the surrounding instances of the word *liber* at lines 102–104 could have affected the phrase under scrutiny here, but without a subsequent change in the participle, rather than it being an archetypal error corrected in different ways by the scribes of *Kf4* on the one hand and *Kf2* and *Mü4* on the other (or by the scribes of their exemplars). Furthermore, it could possibly be argued that the convention of titles incorporating the word *liber* induced the scribes to include it here. The point in this passage, however, seems to be that first a longer, more descriptive, perhaps even a more formal title is given—'Incipit *dictamen divinarum laudum modulose compositum'—whereas the more common *Liber sequenciarum* is offered as an alternative title.

8.3.3 On the text—the commentary of *Kf4*

Themes

All the main themes discussed in the exposition of *Gr1* (Edition 4) are included in the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in *Kf4* of the *Vir speculativus* branch, in addition to a few minor points not treated in *Gr1*, or not treated to the same degree there. In comparison with *Gr1*, two distinctive features in the commentary in *Kf4* can be noted immediately. The first is found already in the opening sentence of the commentary: the pronounced preoccupation with text division linked to the identification of textual motifs and themes, both of the sequence as a whole and in the separate strophes. Related to this trait is probably also the careful and consistent disposition of the commentary text, from *modus*, meaning rhythm, *modulus*, rhythmical measure or metre, and from *melodia* or *melodus* were easily confused.\(^\text{32}\)

In addition to the passages discussed here, the only agreements shared by *Kf2* and *Mü4* concern an omission of the phrase *et cetera* at line 31, which is also shared with a few other manuscripts, and the reading *memorari* for *memorare* at line 74.
which will be examined here. The second distinctive feature is a stronger emphasis on etymological analysis in the lexical explanations.

In the opening paragraph of the commentary the author divides the sequence into two sections based on the identification of the two main themes in the sequence text, the praises to be sung to God and the account of the angelic orders and their names (lines 1–6).

In the commentary, the author generally adheres to the following textual scheme. First we find an identification of the main theme of the sequence strophes to be commented upon in the subsequent section. If the author identifies more than one theme in these lines, the themes form part of a division textus with references to the corresponding passages in the sequence text. Second follows a paraphrase in prose of the strophes, into which a number of brief clarifying phrases are inserted, together with the supplementing of implied words. Third comes the interpretative section where the author comments on and explains the meaning of the sequence text in theological terms. Fourth are placed any grammatical and etymological explanations. Finally, the commentator returns to the sequence text, which is now given in full but still restructured into prose and more heavily interspersed with explanatory phrases and brief comments than in the initial paraphrase. These clarifications could be said to fulfil the same function as interlinear glosses on the sequence text, albeit the ‘glosses’ are in the format of a running text. The sequence is nowhere reproduced in its poetic form.

Although the six main themes included in the previous commentary in Gr1 are found in Kf4 they are nevertheless treated in a distinctively different way here. In both expositions the adornment of the world through St Michael’s feast is said to be achieved through the feast itself, through the support and assistance offered by St Michael and through his guidance of the souls to heaven (lines 22–36). But whereas in Gr1, the battle motif refers both to the war in heaven and to our daily battle fought by St Michael on our behalf, this topic is limited in Kf4 to St Michael’s fight with the dragon in heaven, with a reference to the text of Revelation. In Kf4 a quotation from Bernard of Clairvaux of the mediary who brings gifts and prayers between two lovers illustrates the interpretation of Michael as the carrier of our prayers to God (lines 29–30).

---

33 For a comparison between these inserted phrases and the interlinear glosses in another commentary of the Aristotelian tradition see Section 8.5.2 below.
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In the corresponding passage, Gr1 instead refers to a Biblical passage from Revelation 8, 3 of the angel standing before the altar.\textsuperscript{34}

Two other themes common to both commentaries are the difference between angels and spirits and the question of man as the image of God (lines 76–102). For the interpretation of ‘angel’ the commentator in Kf4 refers to Grecista, under which name Eberhard of Béthune was known, the man behind the versified grammatical treatise, Graecismus, used widely in the later Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{35} For the more comprehensive account of the difference between angels and spirits the author refers to the same passage of Gregory’s as in Gr1.

The question of which creature, angel or man, is created in the image of God is also addressed and resolved in similar ways in these two texts; the main difference lies in the authorities they draw upon. In Kf4 the issue is said to rise from the dichotomy between the quotation from Dionysius in which the angel is referred to as \textit{imago Dei}, and the passage from Genesis where man is created to God’s image (lines 85–102). In Gr1, on the other hand, it is a difference in opinion between Plato and Dionysius that forms the point of departure for the discussion.\textsuperscript{36} In the commentary of Kf4, Plato is instead referred to in the second reason, where his doctrine of ideas is used to emphasise the similarities between God and man as regards the creative process. This same passage is further elaborated with a reference to Aristotle’s \textit{De anima} in which the all-encompassing qualities of the human soul are expressed.

Other themes discussed in similar ways and using the same authorities are the assigning of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael to specific angelic troops (lines 180–186), the number of the angels (lines 214–224) and the difference between the lyre and the cithara and their respective interpretations (lines 265–269).

One of the central themes of the sequence, the hierarchy of the angelic troops, is by necessity treated in both texts but in two quite distinct ways (lines 122–149). In contrast to Gr1 where the word ‘hierarchy’ is in itself never mentioned, this concept, introduced at the beginning of the whole account, permeates the whole section in Expositio Kf4. Whereas the orders of angels in

\textsuperscript{34} In the commentary in Gr1 this motif is not as explicitly stated as a separate way of adornment of the world, but follows on from the interpretation of Michael as the guide of souls to heaven; see Edition 4: \textit{Expositio Gr1}, lines 25–31.

\textsuperscript{35} Eberhard’s grammar was awarded this name on account of one chapter where he provides etymologies for Greek and Hebrew words. For further information on this work and its impact, see Grondeux (2000). On Greek learning in the Latin West and the use of the Graecismus and other such teaching aids, see for instance Berschin (1988).

\textsuperscript{36} See Edition 4: \textit{Expositio Gr1}, lines 54–74.
Gr1 are presented one by one following the sequence text strictly, the presentation of the angelic hierarchy in Kf4 is instead structured by the Dionysian division into groups of three, although the order of the troops follows Gregory’s scheme. No comment, however, is made on the discrepancy between the order in the commentary and in the sequence, as was seen in Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* and the commentary of Ox6.

The specific offices assigned to the troops are nevertheless described with great verbal similarity in the commentaries of Kf4 and Gr1. The words echo those found in other texts discussing the same subject, such as Gregory’s Homily 34 or in the second book of Peter Lombard’s *Libri quattuor sententiarum*. The sequence strophes cited in the commentary in Gr1 are not found in Kf4, although there are great similarities in expression as regards the definitions of the angelic offices, especially of the angels, which description is here attributed to Albert the Great (line 126). Albert is furthermore referred to in the depiction of the Virtues (line 130), whereas in *Expositio Gr1* Gregory and the Biblical Gloss are cited in the corresponding passage.

In addition to the themes discussed above, the commentary of Kf4 includes interpretations of the names of the three angels of the sequence (lines 16–21). The two parables hinted at in the sequence text are here given more emphasis, and the identification *secundum theologos* of the hundredth sheep and the tenth drachma as man, is treated in a separate paragraph (lines 225–233). The word *verbigena* from the sequence is likewise more carefully explained with two alternative interpretations (lines 234–237).

Vocabulary

Differences between these two commentaries may also be seen in the vocabulary sections, as regards placement, contents and method. In Gr1 we have seen that comments on vocabulary are placed first in each commentary section. In *Expositio Kf4*, such information is instead found at the end of each expository subsection, immediately before the second paraphrase of the sequence text. The set of words explained in the two texts differs slightly. The words *drachma* and *harmonia* from Gr1 are not explained in *Expositio Kf4*, which instead includes comments on the words *ara*, *caterva*, *laetabundus*, *paradisicola* and

39 See the source apparatus to this passage in Edition 4: *Expositio Gr1* and Edition 5: *Expositio Kf4*. 
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The explanations are generally fuller and mostly furnished with etymologies as well as brief digressions on related words, as can be seen for instance in the first vocabulary section (lines 37–53), where the explanation of odus involves comments also on melodia and the analysis of laetabundus leads to a specification of the meanings of the two suffixes -bundus and -bilis, for which differentiation Eberhard of Béthune’s Graecismus is referred to. Further down in the text the author draws upon the Fathers for the various interpretations of Alleluia (lines 280–284), whereas the Biblical Gloss, so often used in the vocabulary sections in Gr1, is never cited explicitly. In addition to the etymological analyses in Expositio Kf4 the commentator offers didactic help on lexical issues in the form of mnemonic verses, such as those on pango (lines 43–44) and ara (line 279).

As far as specific words are concerned, it is noteworthy that the interpretation of the word agalma (lines 238–241), understood as ‘divine mirrors’ or ‘divine contemplations’ in the commentary in Gr1, here follows the interpretation of sheepfold, and figuratively as the heavenly kingdom, found in Alan’s Expositio and in Ox6 and St2.

8.3.3.1 Expositio Kf4: textual problems and remarks on the edition

The edition of Expositio Kf4 is made in accordance with the principles for editions of texts belonging to Category 2. As is apparent from the title, the text is edited from the representative manuscript Kf4 with the commentary on Ad celebres rex in the other manuscripts of the Vir speculativus branch—Kf2, Ma4, Ox2, Sf2 and Wi4—as correctives when the text in Kf4 is faulty in such a way that it cannot be remedied with the help of corresponding phrases or passages in the text itself.

The text of Kf4 is generally very sound and instances of necessary emendations are not numerous. An example of an error corrected with the assistance of the manuscripts from the same commentary branch is found at line 48, where constancia of the manuscript has been corrected to consonancia given in four of the other manuscripts, which also seems to be correct judging from the argumentation in the etymological analysis. Another example is found at line 97 where the manuscript reads contubernans but the reading gubernans has been adopted from four other manuscripts in order to make sense of the passage.

41 See Section 4.1.2 above.
At the beginning of the second subsection of the commentary, treating the celestial hierarchy, we encounter an error in Kf4, found also in Ma4, which seems to derive ultimately from a misunderstanding of instructions in the text as to the lemma to be written in for the subsequent section (lines 63–64). In these two manuscripts, the preceding commentary section ends with the phrase ‘sequitur sunt chorus’, of which sunt chorus seems to have been perceived as a lemma and hence written as such, relating to the next section. As other instructions for lemmata in this text are written with sequitur followed by the lemma, the reading in Kf4 and Ma4 would not be a problem if sunt chorus was a phrase from the sequence. Here, however, the lemma should be novies distincta. As such it is a simple error to emend by internal references in the text itself, as the correct phrase is found in the opening divisio textus.

The correct lemma to this section is found in one manuscript only, Sj2, in which the preceding section concludes with ‘sequitur sunt choris’. In Ox2, in which no lemmata are written, the first commentary subsection ends with ‘sequitur sunt choros angelorum’. It seems that a scribal error somewhere in the transmission of the text could lie behind these grammatically incorrect directions regarding the commentary section to follow. As the following section treats the angelic orders, it could be that an instruction to that effect—for example ‘sequitur super choros’—was misinterpreted on account of the similarity between the abbreviations for sunt and super, which in turn generated the readings of other forms of the word chorus.

In the etymological analysis of satrapa (line 188) the edition reads abba adopted from Sj2 (with added support from W74, which reads abba). In Kf4 (and in the other manuscripts) we find the form ana, which has been rejected on grounds of meaning. If the commentator wishes the word to mean ‘father’ then the Hebrew abba must have been intended.

In two cases it was necessary to go beyond the Vir speculativus branch and instead use the commentaries of the Sapientia branch in order to render the text comprehensible. The first instance is found at line 5 of the edition, where nomina has been supplied from this branch; the second is at line 30, where all manuscripts of the Vir speculativus branch read ‘porrigens illam, placans illum’ and the Sapientia branch instead reads corrigens illam for the first clause. The phrase is found in a passage paraphrasing a section from Bernard of Clairvaux’s Sermones in Cantica canticorum, in which the corresponding clause reads excitat illam.42 There seem to be two solutions that could render it possible to retain

42 Bernard., serm. sup. cant. 31, 5.
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in the edition. The first is to imply the words manum ad in the phrase, producing the meaning 'helping her'. The second is to take porrigens literally as 'offering (or presenting) her'. Neither option seems satisfactory, and so the consensus reading of the Sapientia branch has been adopted in the edition.

There are a few instances in the expository sections of the text where all manuscripts of the Vir speculativus branch display readings separate from the Sapientia branch. Two of the more interesting instances will be discussed briefly here. The first is found at lines 83–84, which is a rendering of a passage in Isaiah 6, 5–7, where a seraph is said to have taken a piece of coal from the altar with a pair of tongs and cleansed Isaiah from sins. In this passage the manuscripts of the Vir speculativus branch all display readings to the effect that the piece of coal is instead taken to, or by, the altar, and the tongs with which the piece of coal is taken, quem forcipe, have here been transformed to strength, cum fortitudine. These peculiar renditions of the Biblical text have been retained in the edition since the text is both comprehensible (though not the text of the Biblical source) and since it so clearly exhibits the consensus of the textual tradition of this particular branch of the Aristotelian tradition.

The second instance, where a minor difference in the readings separates the two branches, is found at lines 138–139, in the description of the office of the Dominions. The edition of Expositio Kf4 here reads 'ex ipsarum melioritate et disposicione'. The word melioritate is adopted from Ox2 and Wi4, which manuscripts write the word in full. The reading in the base manuscript is difficult to decipher with certainty here, but the abbreviation seems to be read as meor. In Kf2 and Ma4 the word melior is written out in full whereas the word in Sf2 is illegible. The Sapientia branch here reads 'ex ipsorum imperio et disposicione', with imperio instead of melioritate and the pronoun in the masculine.
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1 Vir … 2 hospitatus | cfr Sen., epist. 31, 11. 11 Philosophia … errantem | cfr Sen., epist. 89, 8.

Fontes textus: Kf4, Fr1, Fr4, Kf2, Kf5, Ma4, Ox2a, Sf2, Ox2b, W4
1 ante Seneca verba scribit seneca in epistolis suis vir speculativus est quasi deus in humano scr. Ox2b | Seneca … ait seneca in libro epistolarum ad lucillum sic inquit bis Fr4, om. W4 in … epistolurum| epistolurum libro quarto Kf2 | in … ait scribit in epistolurum Ma4, scribit in epistolurum Ox2b | epistolurum etymoloyarum Mi4 | sic ait om. bis Kf4 sed cfr hospitatus lin. 2 | ait dicit Kf5 | speculativus + et Fr4 | est … 2 hospitatus] in humano corpore hospitatus est quasi deus Fr4 | 2 hospitatus] sic ait Kf4 | qua + quidem W4 | Primo] primum Fr4 | tangitur om. Fr1 Fr4 | hominis| omnis Fr1 3 scientifici| scientifice Ox2b W4 | dicitur| dicit Kf2 | tangitur| tangit Fr4 | hominis| omnis Fr4 4 sublimitas| sublimitatem Fr4, stilinitas Kf5 | dicitur| dicit Kf4 Kf2 | formo duas] due inferuntur Fr4, formantur due Mi4, ponuntur due Ox2b W4 | 5 conclusiones + quorum Ma4 | sit ista] est ista Kf5, sit iste Mi4, om. Fr4 6 conclusio] est hec Ox2b W4, + est ista Kf4, + est hec Mi4, om. Fr4 7 Prima] primo W4, + conclusio Fr4 Mi4 | sic om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b W4 | mundam ex mundanam cor. Kf4, fr lin. 8 | et + naturaliter Mi4 8 vitam mundam] vitam 1 (ut vid.) mundanam Kf4 9 Ergo + naturaliter Mi4 | est virtuosus| et cetera Ma4 | Maior + est Fr4 Kf2 | Maior nota om. Mi4 | consistit| sit Mi4, est Ox2b W4 | in om. W4 10 incontaminata] contaminata Ox2b, + ut patet in ethicis sed Fr4 | patet] probatur Fr4, om. Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 | Lucilum] Lucillum codd. | sic om. Ma4 | sic dicentem om. Fr4 11 Philosophia| scienca Fr4 | facti| scienca W4 | virtutis| veritatis Fr4 | errantem| errante Ma4, hesitatem Mi4 12 Sed … vitam om. Fr1 | quia om. Mi4 | in om. Ox2a philosophiam] scieniam Fr4
Vir speculativus


Tercio ad idem: Iste naturaliter est virtuosus, qui habet in se destructionem vanarum cogitationum. Sed homo scientificus habet in se destructionem vanarum cogitationum. Ergo est naturaliter virtuosus. Maior nota, quia vane cogitaciones inducunt vicia; sic per oppositum cogitationes bone inducunt virtutes, et illud, quod destruit malas cogitaciones, hoc eciam causat bonas cogitaciones. Minor patet per Algazelem, qui dicit: Vane cogitaciones destruuntur per virtutes et sciencias.

Deinde probatur conclusio secunda, scilicet quod homo scientificus sit homo excellestissimus, et hoc sic: Iste homo est excellentissimus, qui est similis Deo. Sed homo scientificus est similis Deo. Ergo est excellentissimus. Maior nota, quia ex quo Deus est ens perfectissimum et nobilissimum, tunc illud, quod sibi

17 Scientia ... 18 magistra] cf Cic., Tusc. 5, 5. 24 Algazelem ... dicit locum non invent.
simile est, eciam erit ens excellentissimum. Minor patet in auctoritate Senece primo proposita, in qua dicit: Est quasi Deus et cetera.

Secundo ad idem: Iste homo est excellentissimus, qui cognoscit encia divina. Ergo est excellentissimus. Maior nota ex primo Ethicorum et eciam per Commentatorem tercio De anima, ubi dicit, quod perfectio humana consistit in speculacione entis primi. Minor patet, quia homo scientificus habet physiophiam. Philosophy autem est rerum divinarum certa cognition, ut patet per † Avicebron in libro de disputacionibus †.

Tercio ad idem: Iste homo est excellentissimus, qui habet in se ens nobilissimum. Sed homo scientificus est huiusmodi. Igitur et cetera. Maior nota, quia unumquodque recipit denominacionem a sibi inexistente. Minor probatur,
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quia homo scientificus in se habet scientiam. Scienza autem est res nobilissima, quod probatur sic: Cuius finis est nobilissimus, ipsum in se est res nobilissima. Sed finis scientie est quoddam nobilissimum. Ergo scientia in se est res nobilissima. Maior nota per Aristotelem secundo De anima, ubi dicit: Iustum est a fine omnia denominari. Eciam patet per Lincolniensem primo Posteriorum, ubi dicit: Secundum exigenciam finis oportet omnia moderari. Minor probatur, quia felicitas est finis scientie, sed per Aristotelem primo Ethicorum felicitas est optimum hominis secundum virtutem perfectissimam. Sic ergo sunt probate due conclusiones.

Sed omnes predicte raciones et eciam conclusiones presupponunt hoc, quod homo scientificus omnem perfectionem suam sumit a scientia, et igitur omnis

---

46 Secundum ... moderari | cf Gros., in post. analyt. 1, 2, lin. 7–8.
48 felicitas ... perfectissimam | cf Arist., eth. Gros. 1, 1098 a 15–18; Auct. Arist., p. 233 (11).
41 scientiam ... habitum (ut vid.) scientie | Fr4
42 quod ... et cetera W'4 | in se bis K'4 | est² post scientia Ox2a. 44 nota patet Fr4, om. K'4 | Aristotelem + in W'4 | ubi dicit om. M'4 45 finit.fals O2a | omnia om. M'4 | denominare K'5 | nominari Ox2b | Eciam | ut K'5 | et sic W'4 | Lincolniensem om. W'4 46 ubi dicit quod Fr4, qui dicit quod M'4 | dicit om. K'4 | exigenciam enignam Ox2a, existenciam Ox2b, exigeranciam W'4 | finis + scientie Fr4, om. M'4 Ox2a | omnia nam Fr4 | moderari | moderare K'4 Fr4 K'2 K'5 M'4 Ox2a S'2 47 Minor probatur | sed Fr4 | probatur om. K'2 | felicitas | fidelitas W'4 | sed ut patet M'4 M'4 | sed ... 50 quod ut patet decimo ethicorum quod homo scientificus est vere felix et quia Fr4 | per om. K'4 48 optimum | proprium M'4, continuum W'4 | perfectissimam K'4 K'5, perfectissimam Fr4 K'2 Ox2a S'2, perfectionum M'4, perfectiorem (ut vid.) Ox2b W'4, om. M'4 50 Sed | et K'5, + quia ista Ox2b, + quia ille W'4 | Sed ... conclusiones bis K'4 | omnes predicte om. W'4 | raciones | oraciones M'4 | eciam | due K'4, om. K'5 M'4 W'4 | presupponunt | presupponuntur K'2, per se ponunt W'4 | quod | ut S'2, + const Ox2a 51 scientificus om. Fr4 | suam om. Ox2b sumit | sumat Fr4 M'4 Ox2a S'2, firmat M'4, habet Ox2b W'4, om. K'5 | a scientia ad scientiam S'2 | et ... 54 appetenda | ipsa merito es desideranda propter multas causas Fr4 igitur | ideo K'2 | omnis | homo Ox2b W'4
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prosequens / naturalem aptitudinem scieniam desiderat ex natura, sicud eciam
dicit Philosophus in prohemio Metaphysice: Omnes homines naturaliter scire
desiderant. Ideo est notandum, quod scienca multis de causis est appetenda.

Primo enim propter honorem, qui debetur homini scientifico, quod patet per
Philosophum quarto Ethicorum, ubi dicit: Virtuti et scienca debetur laus.
Eciam patet per ipsum primo Ethicorum, ubi dicit: Cursores et pugillatores
laudamus; felicem vero nullus laudat. Super quo verbo dicit Eustracius, quod
felici, id est homini scientifico, debetur gloria et honor; laus enim datur
cursoriibus et pugillatoriibus.

Secundo scienca est appetenda propter delectaciones, quas generat, unde
Aristoteles quarto Ethicorum dicit: Philosophia mirabiles conferit delectaciones
in stabilitate et firmitate.

---

53 Omnes ... 54 desiderant] efr Arist., metaph. Moerb. 1, 980 a 21; Auct. Arist., p. 115 (1).
56 Virtuti ... laus] efr Arist., eth. Gros. 4, 1124 a 1.
57 Cursores ... 58 laudat] efr Arist., eth. Gros. 1, 1101 b 15–27.
59 felici ... 60 pugillatoriibus] efr Eustr., in eth., pp. 171–172 (ad Arist.,
eth. 1, 1101 b 10–27).
62 Philosophia ... 63 firmitate] efr Arist., eth. Gros. 10, 1177 a 25–26;

52 prosequens] persequens Fr4 Kf3 Mo4 Sj2, sequens Kf2 Oc2b Wi4 | naturalem ...
escienciam] habitudinem naturalem scieniae Mi4 | aptitudinem] habitudinem Kf4 Kf5
desiderant + hoc Mi4 | ex a Wi4 | sicud sic Kf5 Mi4, simil Mi4 | eciam om. Kf4 Kf5
53 Metaphysice om. Oc2b desiderant + et cetera Kf4 | Ideo om. Mi4 | Ideo ...
notandum om. Oc2b | est1 + igitur Mi4 | notandum] scienium Kf4 Mo4 | de modis et Kf4
55 enim] scienca est appetenda Fr4, nam Kf4 | honorem] hominem Fr1 | qui quod ut viù.
Kf4, quia Kf2, quie Kf5 | debetur ... scientifico] homini scientifico debetur honor Kf2
scientifico om. Kf4 | quod] nam Fr4, ut Kf5 Mi4, sicud Oc2a Sj2 56 Philosophum
aristotelem Fr4 | ubi dicit] quod Fr4 | Virtuti virtualum Kf3, virtute Oc2b, virtute W4
Virtuti ... scieniec] virtuoso et scientifico Fr4 | debetur] detur Kf2 57 Eciam et Fr4 | ubi
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Oc2a | laudant] laudatur Fr1, laudat Sj2 | Super] ex Mi4 | Super ... dicit] quod exponit Fr4
verbo] vero Oc2b W4, om. Fr4 Mi4 | Eustracius] Anstachius W4, + dicitur Oc2b 59 id
est] et Fr1 Fr4 Oc2b W4 | debetur ... laus] debetur laus et gloria honor K2 | enim] quoque
Ma4 | datu] debetur Fr4 Mi4 60 est om. Oc2a | unde] idea minus ut viù. Kf4
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Vir speculativus

Tercio scientia est appetenda propter ammirari, unde in prohemio Methaphysice dicitur: Propter ammirari sacerdotes in Egypto inceperunt philosophari.

Sed quia scientiarum nobilissima est ipsa theologia, que est vera sapiencia, que de se ipsa loquitur, dicens: Ego ex ore Altissimi prodigi, igitur pre aliis scienciis summe est appetenda. Ipsa enim est, qua dicitur, quod sine ipsa omnes scientia sunt azephale, id est sine capite. Ipsa enim est caput omnium, et de illa theologia est nostra principalis intencio.

Habet autem theologia tres partes principales. Quedam est theologia informativa docens hominem virtuose vivere et eternam vitam possidere. Alia est theologia hystoriace procedens et illa docet memorare res gestas, quemadmodum est biblia et evangelia, et de istis nihil ad propositum. Alia est theologia, que consistit in laude facta cum cantico, et de ista in proposito dicitur, et huic eciam subalternatur liber iste sequenciarum.
Unde circa principium istius libri queruntur tria: Primo quae sint causa; secundo quae sit utilitas libri; trecio quis sit titulus libri.

Ad primum est dicendum, quod causa materialis istius libri non est una, quia in diversis sequencis diverse sunt causa materiales, sed tamen, si volumus inproprie loqui, tunc dicamus, quod causa materialis istius libri est dictamen cum laude modulosa compositum.


Sed causa finalis est cognicio vocabulorum istius libri et coincidit cum utilitate istius libri.

Sed causa efficiens sunt quattuor doctores, scilicet Gregorius, Augustinus, Ambrosius et Ieronimus, qui composuerunt sequencias de tempore pro maiori parte.
Vir speculativus

parte, sed de aliis sequencis sunt diverse cause efficientes, que ignorantur, unde non multum est curandum, quis dicat, sed quid dicatur, dummodo dicta sint autentica et bona.

Deinde respondetur ad secundum dubium, cum queritur, que sit utilitas huius libri. Ad hoc est dicendum, quod utilitas istius libri est duplex: Quedam est cognicio vocabulorum subtilium; a lia est remuneracio divina, que datur hominibus pro laude inpensa Christo. Unde, ex quo liber iste principaliter est de laude Dei sed quia nullum bonum manet a Deo irremuneratum, ideo 100 remuneracio consequitur hunc librum.

Sed ad tercium dubium respondetur, cum queritur, quis sit tytulus libri. Dicendum: tytulus est: Incipit dictamen divinarum laudum modulose compositum. Sed tamen communi tytulo appellatur 'liber sequenciarum'. 'Sequencia' autem dicitur a 'sequor, sequeris', quia ipsa consequitur laudem et ipsam laus sequitur in divino officio, unde sequencia in divino officio cantatur ante evangelium et post Alleluia. Et evangelium est laus divina. Similiter Alleluia
est laus divina. Et ergo merito dicitur sequencia, quia consequitur laudem
divinam, scilicet Alleluia, et eciam ipsam sequitur laus divina, scilicet
110 evangelium.
AD CELEBRES, REX

Ista sequencia, que eciam cantatur in honore sanctorum angelorum, dividitur in duas: primo auctor dirigit sermonem suum ad Deum laudes sibi decantando in festivitate sancti Michaelis et aliorum angelorum; secundo exequitur pertractando choros angelorum et cum hoc <nomina> quorundam angelorum, ibi: NOVIES DISTINCTA.

Primo dicit: o celestis REX, scilicet Deus, CUNCTA CATERVA sonora PANGAT AD CELEBRES LAUDES tuas cum SYMPHONIA et NOSTRA CONCIO reddat TIBI dulces cantus, supple NUNC, quando INCLITA FESTA MICHAELIS archangeli RENOVANTUR in mundo. PER QUE FESTA TOTA MACHINA MUNDI PERORNATUR LETABUNDA.

Notandum de nominibus angelorum, quod secundum Gregorium angelis appropinquat nominia non ex eo, quod sine imposicione nominum in celesti patria cognosci non possunt, cum omnìa ibi relucant in speculo divinitatis, sed nomina specialia angelis inponuntur ex privatis officiis, que geruntur, cum ad nos mittuntur. Unde Michael hoc nomen obtinet, quod interpretatur ‘quis ut Deus’, ex eo, quia, quando aliquid mire virtutis agitur, quod nemo facere potest nisi Deus, tunc Michael mitti perhibetur. Similiter est de Gabriele, qui ‘fortitudo Dei’ dicitur, quia missus fuit ad annunciandum Christum nasciturn, quia fortis est in prelo. Similiter Raphael hoc nomen obtinuit, quod ‘medicina Dei’ interpretatur, ideo, quia ad curandum egros mittitur, ut prius tactum est.

Notandum: Dicit auctor PERORNATUR et cetera, quod tota ecclesia per sanctum Michaelem vel per eius festum perornatur quintupliciter: Primo ex ipsius festi celebritate; secundo ex sufraghii et adiutorii sui inspensione, unde dicitur in Daniele: In tempore isto consurget Michael, princeps magus, qui stabit pro filiis populi tui, id est pro hiis, qui sunt predestinati ad vitam eternam; tercio
mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michaelis, / et hoc per deportacionem nostrarum oracionem per manus Michaelis et angelorum aliorum ante conspectum Dei, unde Bernardus: Discurrat angelus inter dilectum et dilectam, vota afferens, dona referens, corrigens illam, placans illum; quarto mundus perornatur per festum Michaelis ex susceptione animarum per sanctum Michaelem, unde de ipso cantur: Archangele Dei Michael, constitui te principem super animas susciendi; quintum mundus perornatur per sanctum Michaelem et eius festum ex ipsius solemnpi victoria et pugna, de qua dicitur in Apocalypsi: Factum est praelium magnum et Michael archangels pugnabat cum dracone, quod dictum est.

Notandum circa litteram, quod ‘catherva’ idem est quod turba vel universitas et dicitur a ‘catha’ Grece, quod est universale Latine. Item ‘pango’ tria significat et secundum hoc triplex preteritum, quia aliquando idem est quod canto sicut in proposito et tunc habet ‘panxi’ in preterito; aliquando enim idem est quod promitto. Inde dicitur ‘pactum’ et tunc habet in preterito ‘pepigi’; eciam aliquando idem est quod coniungo et tunc habet ‘pegi’ in preterito. Versus:

Panxi cantavi; pepigi, dum fedus inivi;
dum quid coniunxi, potul bene dicere pegi.

Unde legitur: Ossibus et nervis compesisti me, id est coniunxisti me.


---


29 Discurrat descurrit cod. | dilectum delectum cod. 30 corrigens cum Expositio Kf1 scripti, porrigens cod. 34 de qua supra lin. 38 catha] chata cod. 41 promitto] permitto cod. 42 Versus post corr. 47 consonancia cum Kj2, Oc2, Sj2, et Wv4 scripti, constancia cod.
Littera: o CELICE REX, id est celestis rex, supple Deus, CUNCITA CATHHERVA, id est omnis turba, CANORA, id est sonora, PANGAT, id est decantat, AD CELEBRES LAUDES, id est usque AD CELEBRES LAUDES tuas (vel secundum aliam litteram legendo pro una dicciune AD CELEBRES LAUDES ita, quod d mutatur in c), SYMPHONIA, id est cum convocali consonancia, ATQUE pro et, NOSTRA CONCIO, id est turba, SOLVAT, id est redat, TIBI ODAS, id est dulces cantus, supple NUNC, CUM pro quando, VALDE INCLITA FESTA, id est valde solemnia festa, MICHAELIS / archangeli RENOVANTUR, id est quasi de novo innovantur, supple in mundo. PER QUE FESTA TOTA MACHINA MUNDI, id est tota constitucio vel compositio mundi, PERORNATUR, id est valde ornatur, supple existens LETABUNDA, id est gaudens. Sequitur super choris.

NOVIES DISTINCTA

Hic exequitur pertractando de choris angelorum, et dividitur in tres: Primo pertractat de choris angelorum; secundo de quibusdam nominibus angelorum; tercio iterum revertitur super choros angelorum. Secunda ibi: VOS O MICHAEL; tercia ibi: PER VOS PATRIS. Prima in duas: Primo pertractat creacionem angelorum; secundo pertractat numerum chororum angelorum, ibi: THEOLOGICA.

Primo dicit: o celice rex, AGMINA angelorum DISTINCTA, id est novem chori, SUNT creata PER TE. SED tu FACIS HEC AGMINA FLAMMEA PER angelica ministeria, quando tu VIS. Et HEC AGMINA angelorum SUNT INTER prima CREATA TUA, cum NOS homines SIMUS ULTIMA tua creatura, quia ultimo creasti hominem, SED tamen sumus TUA YMAGO.

Notandum circa istum versum SED CUM VIS et cetera: Secundum Greciam ‘angelus’ est nomen officii, non nature, unde angelus dicitur nuncius. Unde Gregorius: Isti celestes spiritus quidem spiritus sunt semper, sed nequaquam semper angeli vocari possunt. Cum autem ad nos mittuntur, angeli nuncupantur. Unde psalmista: Qui facit angelos suos spiritus et cetera, quia angeli,

---

77 angelus ... nature] cfr Eberh. Beth., græcism. 9, 34–36; cfr etiam Greg. M., in evang. 34, 8.
78 Isti ... 80 nuncupantur] cfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 8. 80 Qui ... spiritus] Hbr. 1, 7, sed cfr etiam Ps. 103, 4.
56 pro supra lin. 63 super] sunt cod. | choris cum Sf2 scripta, chorus cod. 64 Novies distincta cum Sf2 et W14 scripta, sunt chorus cod. 68 Patris] patres cod. 71 chori post corr. 72 hec in marg. 74 cum cum Ma4, Sf2 et W14 scripta, tamen cod. | creasti cum eet.: scripta, creatus cod.
quando ad nos mittentur, tune flammei dicuntur eo, quod a nobis scoriam peccatorum expurgant et in nobis ignem divini amoris incendunt. Unde dicit Ysaias: *Vidi et volavit angelus de seraphini ad me et tuli calkum, id est lapidem ignitum, ad altare: ‘Cum fortitudine, dicens, purgavi peccatum tuum.’*


**Prima** est, quia sicut Deus per suam potenciam in totum mundo maior, ipsum regens et gubernans, sic anima fidelis humana est in toto mundo minori, scilicet in homine, ipsum vivificans et gubernans.

**Secunda** causa est, quia in Deo secundum Platonem ante mundi creationem fuerunt raciones exemplares omnium rerum, sicut ars est in mente artificis, sic in anima humana per spiritualem receptio et similitudines omnium, unde tercio De anima dicitur: Anima est quodammodo omnia.

**Tercia** racio est, quia Deus naturam humannam sibi voluit uniri sed non naturam angelicam. Ergo et cetera.

Littera: o celice rex, AGMINA, id est chori, PNEUMATUM, id est spirituum vel angelorum, DISTINCTA NOVES, id est in novem choros vel per novenarium numerum, SUNT FACTA, id est creata, PER TE, et tu FACIS HEC, scilicet agmina.
Expositio Kf4

angelorum, FLAMMEA, id est ignea, PER angelica officia, id est per angelica ministeria, CUM pro quando, quando VIS. Et HEC, scilicet agmina, SUNT INTER PRIMEVA CREAT A TUA, id est sunt prima creatura tua, CUM NOS homines SIMUS ULTIMA tua FACTURA, id est creatura ultimo facta, SED tamen sumus TUA YMAGO, id est similitudo. Sequitur theologica.

THEOLOGICA

Hic auctor pertractat numerum chororum angelorum, dicens: Divina scriptura predicat NOBIS HEC agmina angelorum esse TRIPARTITA sive in tria agmina distincta, et hoc essent novem PER PRIVATA OFFICIA. Et tunc enumerat choros, dicens: PLEBS ANGELICA, sive chorus angelorum, supple sunt agmina angelorum, deinde PHALANX ARCHANGELICA, scilicet chorus angelorum, deinde PRINCIPANS TURMA, scilicet principatus, deinde VIRTUS URANICA, id est chorus, qui dicitur virtutes, deinde POTESTAS ALMIVOMA, id est chorus, qui dicitur potestates, deinde DOMINANCIA, scilicet chorus, qui dicitur dominaciones, inde DIVINA SUBSELLIA, id est throni, CHERUBIN ETHEREA et IGNICOMA SERAPHIN.

Notandum: Regnum celeste tamquam domus bene disposita habet patrem familias ipsum Deum, qui domum celestem in tres ierarchias distinxit. In quarum ierarchiarum qualibet sunt tres chori angelorum.

<In> infima ierarchia sunt angeli, archangeli et virtutes. Officium angelorum secundum Albertum est, quod ipsi sunt deputati in custodes animarum, unde dicit: Dignitas est specialis animarum, quod angeli sunt custodes ipsarum. Sed officium archangelorum secundum beatum Gregorium est, quod ipsi nunciant maior a, angeli vero minora, unde eciam archangelus Gabriel ad Mariam missus
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est. Officium autem virtutum secundum Albertum est, quod Deus per ipsos miracula facit, unde eciam dicuntur virtutes uranice quasi ignee, ab ‘ur’, quod est ignis. Nam sicut ignis / illuminat, sic angelice virtutes per miraculorum exececiones plurimos infideles ad cognoscedendum Deum illuminant.

In secunda hierarchia sunt tres ali chori, scilicet principatus, potestates et dominaciones. Officium potestatum est cohercere omne nocivum, ne tantum noceat, quantum velit. Unde habent cohercere demones a nocumentis nostris. Sed officium principatum est principatus terre limitare et sedes superborum dominorum destruere et bonus promovere. Sed officium dominacionum est, ut ex ipsarum melioritate et dispositione angelii inferiorum ordinum ad nobis ministrandum mittantur, unde dicuntur quasi dominantes alii.

In tercia hierarchia sunt ali chori, scilicet throni, cherubin et seraphin. Officium thronorum est, quod Deus in ipsis ad iudicandum presidet, unde psalmista: 

\[ \text{Qui sedes super thronos et iudicas equitatem.} \]


Notandum circa litteram. ‘Cherubin’ et ‘seraphin’ per -n scripta significant choris angelorum, et sunt neutri generis et pluralis numeri; sed quando scribuntur per -m, tunc significant unum angelum de illis choris et sunt masculini generis. Versus:

\[ 130 \text{Officium autem virtutum secundum Albertum est, quod Deus per ipsos miracula facit, unde eciam dicuntur virtutes uranice quasi ignee, ab ‘ur’, quod est ignis. Nam sicut ignis / illuminat, sic angelice virtutes per miraculorum exececiones plurimos infideles ad cognoscedendum Deum illuminant.} \]

\[ \text{In secunda hierarchia sunt tres ali chori, scilicet principatus, potestates et dominaciones. Officium potestatum est cohercere omne nocivum, ne tantum noceat, quantum velit. Unde habent cohercere demones a nocumentis nostris. Sed officium principatum est principatus terre limitare et sedes superborum dominorum destruere et bonus promovere. Sed officium dominacionum est, ut ex ipsarum melioritate et dispositione angelii inferiorum ordinum ad nobis ministrandum mittantur, unde dicuntur quasi dominantes alii.} \]

\[ \text{In tercia hierarchia sunt ali chori, scilicet throni, cherubin et seraphin. Officium thronorum est, quod Deus in ipsis ad iudicandum presidet, unde psalmista:} \]

\[ \text{Qui sedes super thronos et iudicas equitatem.} \]

\[ \text{Sed ‘cherubin’ interpretatur plenitudo scientiae. In ipsis enim est perfecta Dei cognicio. Ergo dicuntur etherea ab ‘ethere’, nam ether proprie est superior pars aeris semper existens serena. Inde dicuntur cherubin etherea, quia habent lucidam et serenam cognicionem Dei. Se d seraphin dicuntur quasi ac censi vel ardentes, quia in amore Dei ardent et nos ad amorem Dei incendunt et inflammant. Et ergo dicuntur seraphin ignicoma quasi compiti vel ornati igne.} \]

\[ \text{Notandum circa litteram. ‘Cherubin’ et ‘seraphin’ per -n scripta significant choris angelorum, et sunt neutri generis et pluralis numeri; sed quando scribuntur per -m, tunc significant unum angelum de illis choris et sunt masculini generis. Versus:} \]

\[ 130 \text{Officium ...} \]

\[ 131 \text{facit} \]

\[ 132 \text{miracula} \]

\[ 133 \text{miracula} \]

\[ 134 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 135 \text{per supra lin.} \]

\[ 136 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 137 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 138 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 139 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 140 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 141 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 142 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 143 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 144 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 145 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 146 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 147 \text{supra lin.} \]

\[ 148 \text{supra lin.} \]
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‘N chorus angelicus’ et cetera.


Littera: THEOLOICA SYNBOLA, id est divina scriptura sive divine sententie, KATHEGORIZANT, id est predicant, NOBIS HEC, supple agmina angelorum, TRIPARITTA TER, id est in tria sive in novem agmina distincta, PER PRIVATA OFFICIA, id est per specialia officia. Tunc enumerat choros angelorum dicens, supple chori vel agmina angelorum sunt ista, scilicet PLEBS ANGELICA, id est chorus angelorum, PHALANX <ARCHANGELICA>, id est turba angelica, id est unus <chorus> archangelorum, PRINCIPANS TURMA, id est principatus, VIRTUS URANICA sive ignea, id est virtutes, AC pro et, et POTESTAS ALMIVOMA, id est pro- / movens sanctitatem, scilicet potestates, DOMINANCIA, id est dominaciones, -QUE pro et, DIVINA SUBSELLIA, id est divine sedes, scilicet throni, et CHERUBIN ETHEREA, id est serena vel celica, AC pro et, SERAPHIN IGNICOMA, id est in amore Dei ardencia. Sequitur vos, o Michael.

VOS, O MICHAEL

Hic pertractat de quibusdam angelorum nominibus usitatis in sacra scriptura, dicens: O MICHAEL, princeps CELI, et GABRIEL, dicens, verus nuncius Dei, et o RAPHAEL, VERNULA VITE, vos transducite NOS INTER PARADISICOLAS sive in celo habitantes.

Notandum, quod auctor hos tres angeli sub specialibus nominibus ponit et maiorem mencionem de ipsis facit quam de aliis ideo, quia in sacra scriptura ipsorum nomina sunt magis nota et usitata.

Notandum: Dubitatur a quibusdam a quibusdam, in quibus choris angelorum sint hii tres angeli iam dicti, scilicet Michael et cetera. Et respondent quidam dicentes, quod

---

Michael sit de choro principatuum, et hoc videtur haberi ex illa auctoritate Danielis prius allegata, que dicit: In tempore illo consurget Michael princeps. Sed alii dicunt, quod Gabriel sit de choro archangelorum, quia ad nunciandum maiora missus est. Et dicunt ulterius, quod Raphael sit de choro virtutum, quia miraculose Tobie visum reddidit.

Notandum circa litteram: 'Satrapa' idem est quod princeps et potest ethimoloizari per adverbium 'satis' et 'abba', quod est pater, inde 'satrapa' quasi sufficiens pater vel princeps. Sed 'vernula' est diminutivum a 'verna', quod est idem quod servus, unde versus:

Non vult verna probus dominis servire duobus.

Sed 'paradisicola' componitur a 'paradiso' et a verbo 'colo' et dicitur quasi colens paradysum sive inhabitator paradisi.

Littera: O MICHAEL, supple existens SATRAPA, id est princeps, CELI, -QUE pro et, et o GABRIEL DANS, id est dicens, VERA NUNCIA VERBI, id est Filii Dei, -que pro et, et RAPHAEL VERNULA, id est minister vel famulus, VITE, VOS TRANSFERTIE, id est transducite, NOS INTER PARADISICOLAS, id est habitantes in celo. Sequitur per vos Patris.

PER VOS PATRIS

Hic auctor revertitur super choros angelorum dirigens sermonem ad ipsos, et dividitur in duas: Primo dirigit sermonem suum ad ostendendum, quomodo ipsi adinplent preceptum Dei et ministerium nostrum; secundo dirigit sermonem ad ipsos incitans et exhortans nos ad laudem Dei, ibi: VOS PER ETHERA.

Primo dicit: o vos novem chori angelorum, omnia MANDATA celestis PATRIS, scilicet Filii Dei PER VOS / COMPLENTUR, QUE, scilicet mandata, sapiencia EIUSDEMI Patris, scilicet Filius Dei, et COMPAR PNEUMA, scilicet Spiritus sanctus existens equalis Patri et Filio, PERMANENS idem cum ipsis in essencia, DAT et...
ministrat. Cui Deo sic existenti uno in essencia et trino in personis vos SACRA MILIA MILIUM ESTIS AMINISTRANCIA et CENTENA milia et eciam BIS QUINGENTA, id est mille, PER BIS QUINAS VICES, id est decies, ASSISTUNT IN AULA celesti. AD QUAM aulum Christus REX perduxit CENTESIMAM OVEM, que erat perdeperita, eciam ipsa VERBIGENA, scilicet Dei Filius, produxit DECIMAM DRAGMAM, que erat perdeperita, AD VESTRA ALGAMATA sive habitacula.

Notandum: Auctor in hiis versibus tangit numerum angelorum, qui ponitur in Daniele, ubi dicitur: Milia milium ministrabant ei; et hunc numerum ponit in primo versu, et sequitur ibidem: et decies milia centena milia assistebant ei. 'Decies milia' auctor tangit, cum dicit VICES PER BIS QUINAS BIS ATQUE QUINGENTA, quia bis quingenta faciunt mille, sed bis quinque faciunt decem, et tunc auctor ponit residuum numerum, cum addit CENTENA MILLENA.

Notandum, quod non est intelligendum, quod solum tot sint angeli in regno celesti, ut dicit Iob: Non est numerus militum eius, id est angelorum Dei, et ergo Daniel per hoc, quod posuit tam magnum numerum, voluit exprimere, quod numerus angelorum apud nos esset infinitus et indeterminatus licet apud Deum finitus et terminatus.

Notandum, quod auctor in secundo versu tangit parabolas evangelii supradictas, quorum una est de homine habente centum oves in deserto, secunda est de muliere habente decem dragmas. Tum igitur <per> ovem centesimam perditam et per dragmam decimam perditam intelligitur homo, quem ipsae Deus redemit et relinquens nonaginta novem in deserto, id est novem choros angelorum in celo, venit in hunc mundum, ut ipsum hominem perditum ad nonaginta novem oves, id est ad novem choros, reduceret. Et dicitur homo dragma decima, quia secundum theologos homo supplebit decimam partem angelorum, que cum Lucifero cececidit.

Notandum, quod Filius Dei dicitur verbigena racione nature divine, secundum quam est verbum a Patre eternaliter genitum; vel dicitur verbigena...
secundum naturam humanam, quia solo verbo et sine virili semine conceptus est et genitus, unde canitur de beata virgine, quod ipsa verbo concepit Filium.

Notandum, quod 'algama' est idem quod habitaculum et propriamente potest esse stabulum ovium, sed sumitur hic pro regno celorum, quia illud est optimum ovile, cuius opilio est optimus ille pastor, scilicet Christus, qui posuit animam pro ovibus suis.

Littera: o vos novem chori angelorum, CUNCTA MANDATA, id est omnia precepta, PATRIS, supple celestis, COMPLENTUR PER VOS, QUE, scilicet precepta, SOPHIA, id est sapiencia, EIUSDEM, supple Patris, scilicet Filius Dei, QUOQUE pro et, COMPAR PNEUMA, id est Spiritus sanctus equalis, supple existens et PERMANENS, existens in potestate Patri et Filio, PERMANENS IN USIA, id est in vera et una essencia, supple cum ipsis, DAT precepta. CUI DEO, supple existente uno in essencia et trino in personis, vos existentes SACRA MILIA MILIUM ESTIS AMINISTRANCIACIA et CENTENA MILLENA ATQUE, pro et, et BIS QUINGENTA, id est mille, PER BIS QUINAS VICES, id est decies, <ASSISTUNT IN AULA, supple celesti>. AD QUAM aulam REX, Christus, DUXIT CENTESIMAM OVEM, id est hominem perdutum, -QUE pro et, VERBIGENA, id est Filius Dei de verbo genitus, DUXIT DECIMAM DRAGMAM, id est hominem perdutum, AD VESTRA ALGAMATA, id est ovilia sive habitacula, scilicet ad regna celorum. Sequitur vos per ethra.

VOS PER ETHRA

Hic auctor dirigit sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum exhortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei, dicens sic: VOS novem chori et ELECTA PARS ARMONIE celestis et NOS debemus simul VOTA sive laudes PER LIRICAS CYTHARAS <PER ETHRA> et PER RURA terre, scilicet referendo singula singulis ita, quod angeli per ethra et nos per terram debemus laudare, ut NOSTRA THIMIAMATA et oraciones SINT ACCEPTA DEO super aureo altari, QUO <POST> INCLITA BELLA MICHAELIS, ut nos simul DECANTEMUS cum angelis ALLELUIA sive laudes Deo IN eterna GLORIA.

Notandum, quod lira est instrumentum musicum ad magis habens quattuor cordas, sed cythara habet plures cordas, sicut decem vel plures. Igitur per ‘licras cytharas’ intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debumus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum immitando.

Notandum circa hoc QUO BELLA: Tangit illud, quod prius dictum, quia, ut habetur ex Apokalipsi: Michael archangeli devincit Antichristum ipsum interficiendo, cum in celum ascendere voluerit. Et istam hystoriam auctor vocat hic BELLA INCLITA MICHAELIS.

Notandum, quod thimiamata est species aromatum. Ponitur pro oracione devota, quam offerrre debemus super aureum altare, / scilicet ante conspectum Dei.

Notandum, quod ‘ara’ (prima brevis) est stabulum porcorum, et prima longa est altare Christi. Versus:

Est ara porcorum brevis et non ara deorum.


Littera: VOS, supple novem chori et ELECTA PARS ARMONIE, id est consonantie celestis, et NOS, supple homines, demus simul VOTA, id est affectuosas laudes, PER LIRCAS CITHARAS, id est per talia instrumenta musicalia, PER ETRA, id est per ethra et est sincerop, et PER RURA terre, id est per terram, sic referendo: Vos angelis detis laudem per ethra et nos homines per terram, ut NOSTRA THIMIAMATA, id est nostre oraciones, SINT ACCEPTA, id est grata, D EO SUPER AUREAM ARAM, id est aureum altare, sc ilicet in conspectu Dei, POST INCLITA BELLA, id est gloriosa bella, MICHAELIS, QUO pro ut, nos DECANTEMUS, id est simul cum angelis canteus, ALLELUIA, id est laudem Deus, IN COEVA, id est in eterna, GLORIA.
8.4 The Prologue *Sapiensiva vincit malitiam* and the Commentary of *Kf1*

The texts in Edition 6 include the Aristotelian prologue *Sapiensiva vincit malitiam* and the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in the manuscript *Kf1*, dated to 1356. The prologue comprises numerous references to Scripture in the syllogisms proving the excellence of theology. The commentary of the *Sapiensiva* branch follows the text of the commentary in *Kf4* very closely, but many of the etymological analyses are excluded or abbreviated.

8.4.1 Manuscript descriptions

The manuscripts are listed alphabetically according to their sigla. The base manuscript for the edition of *Sapiensiva vincit malitiam*, and the one from which the commentary is edited, is *Kf1*. In the *apparatus criticus* of the edition of the prologue the manuscripts are reported in the following order: *Kf1, Go2, Gr6, Kr1, Mu2, Wi1, Er1, Mu1* and *Sg3*.

*Er1*  Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Hs. Th. 16

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>15th century (fol. 119v: 1459)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provenance:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material:</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>305 x 210 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folios:</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents:</td>
<td>fol. 1r–v: Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols 2r–119v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Venite filii audite me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols 120r–121v: Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols 122r–270v: Sequence commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols 122r–124r: <em>Sapiensiva vincit malitiam</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It is my intention to edit the complete sequence commentary collection in this manuscript at a later stage.

2 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CRAMER, and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
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fols 233v–236v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
fols 271r–273v: Blank

The text in the sequence commentary section (fols 122–270) is written in one column throughout. The full sequence text, written with around 12 lines to the page, precedes the expository text on it, with around 44 lines to the page. Each new piece has a fairly large initial with flourishes, amounting to some eight lines of commentary text in height. The initial for the prologue is larger, fourteen lines in height.

Go2 Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 325

A manuscript in three parts.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Unknown
Material: Paper
Size: ?
Folios: 295

Contents: 1. 74 fols
   fols 1r–66v: Aegidius: Postilla de tempore
   fols 67r–74v: A treatise on the mortal sins
2. 170 fols
   fols 1r–96r: Pronuntiamentum de sanctis
   fols 97r–169r: Sequence commentaries
      fols 97r–98v: Sapientia vincit malitiam
      fols 150r–153r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
3. 51 fols
   fols 1r–51v: Gesta Romanorum with a moralisation

The following remarks concern only the sequence commentary on fols 97–169. Several hands have been involved in the making of this part; the prologue and the commentary on Ad celebres rex are not written by the same hands. The text is written in two columns throughout, each of approximately 40 lines. The commentary text is written in a cursive script whereas the lemmata and the incipit of the prologue are written in a textualis hand.

3 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, WERL (1844), and my own observations of the microfilm of the manuscript.
Alan of Lille’s *Regulae theologicae* and a sequence commentary collection.

Date: Beginning of the 15th century
Provenance: Seckau (Chorherrenstift)
Material: Paper
Size: 270 x 210 mm.
Folios: 120

Contents:
- fols 1r–23v: Alanus ab Insulis: *Regulae theologicae*
- fol. 24r–v: Blank
- fols 25r–114v: Sequence commentaries
  - fols 25r–26v: *Sapientia vincit malitiam*
- fols 115r–119r: Hymn commentaries. Inc.: ‘Inventor rutili dux. Quoniam materia illius ympni de qua in hoc tractatur est ignis’
- fols 119v–120v: Blank

On fol. 23v in the section containing Alan’s text, written by a different hand from the sequence commentary, the date 1415 is written. The sequence commentary section does not seem to have been originally a separate manuscript later bound together with the text of Alan of Lille; both the quality of the paper and the ruling for the columns are the same throughout the codex. In the sequence commentary section, the text is written in two columns with 36 lines to each, in a neat semi-hybrid script with both looped and loopless b, d, h and l, though the loopless form seems to be the preferred one. The a is always single-compartment. There are no marginal glosses or additional notes. The scribe accommodated for large initials of five lines in height, but these were not written in.

A miscellany consisting mainly of commentaries.

Date: 1356
Provenance: St Paul (Benedictine)
Sapientia vincit malitiam and the Commentary of Kf1

Material: Paper
Size: 270 x 210 mm.
Folios: 151

Contents: fols 1: Unidentified text
fols 1v–83r: Hymn and sequence commentaries
fols 1v–37r: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Accedite ad eum’
fol. 37r–v: Unidentified text
fols 38r–83r: Sequence commentaries
fols 74v–76r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex
fols 84 r–114r: An exposition on ambiguous words. Inc.: ‘Iste liber cuius subiectum est exposicio diccionum equivocarum’
fol. 115r–v: Auctoritates on Deuteronomy
fols 116r–146v: A commentary on Libri quattuor sententiarum
fols 146v–149v: Unidentified text
fol. 150r–v: Sermon on St Peter and St Paul
fols 150v–151r: A hymn for St Martin with glosses. Inc.: ‘Presulem ephebatum trabeate radiatum venustemus’
fol. 151v: Blank

The hymn and sequence commentaries on fols 1v–83r are written by the same hand in two columns throughout. The number of lines varies between 50 and 72. The text is a small and neatly written cursiva antiquior with looped b, d, h and l and the two-compartment a. The f and the long s are straight and reach below the line. Black ink is used throughout. The initials for each new piece are missing, but a square space of four lines in height was left for them. There are a few marginal notes which seem to have been made by the same hand. The scribe tends to use the 9-abbreviation, -ni, also for -nus. The colophon ending the sequence commentary reads: ‘Explicit gloria super ymnos et sequencias anno domini mcccclvi, indicionex mensis octobris necnon pontificatis sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini, domini Innocencii divina providencia pape sexti anno quarto.’ Fol. 38r is reproduced as Plate 10 and fols 74v as Plate 11.

6 For cursiva antiquior, see DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 133–134.
A miscellany mainly comprising sermons and commentaries.

Date: 14th century  
Provenance: Unknown  
Material: Paper  
Size: 4"  
Folios: 210  
Contents:  
- fols 1r–94v: Sequence commentaries  
- fols 1r–2v: Sapientia vincit malitiam  
- fols 71v–73v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex  
- fols 97r–100r: Various sermons  
- fol. 100v: ‘De penitentia’  
- fols 115v–118v: Treatise on the Gospel of St John  
- fols 127r–196v: Hymn commentaries  
- fol. 196v: Mnemonic verses  
- fols 197r–198v: Blank  
- fols 199r–203r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex  
- fols 203r–210r: Blank  
- fol. 210r: Two excerpts from Gregory and Augustine respectively

The text in the sequence commentary section is written in two columns of around 43 lines each. The sequence is referred to by lemmata. Later in the manuscript, on fols 199–203, there is a second commentary on Ad celebres rex, referred to in the manuscript catalogue as ‘Psalmodium vel panegyricum angelorum’, the text of which is not the same as the commentary in the collection. This second commentary, which is not edited here, concludes with a brief summary in German of the order of the angels.

---

7 The description is based on Bibliotheca Cremifanensis. Catalogue Codicum Manuscriptorum. Auszug aus dem Katalog der P. Hugo Schmid. Alte Handschriften, cod. 11–416, which are handwritten slips made by P. Beda Lehner, a copy of which is available at the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, Collegeville, Minnesota. I have also examined the microfilm copy of the manuscript.
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Mü1 München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 11475

Hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Polling (Augustinian canons)
Material: Paper
Size: 285 x 210 mm.
Folios: 219

Contents: fols 3r–57v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: 'Super salutem et omnen pulcritudinem'
fols 58r–219v: Sequence commentaries
fols 58r–59v: Sapientia vincit malitiam
fols 170r–173v: Commentary on Ad celebres rex

The hymn and sequence texts in this manuscript are included in full before each commentary. The text is written in one column throughout, in a cursive script. Pages with commentary text contain around 48 lines of text whereas the pages with sequence text have around 15 lines, which leaves space for interlinear glosses. A number of hymns have interlinear glosses of which some are syntactical glosses in the form of Arabic numerals to help construe the words. The initial of each piece is decorated with a miniature; the initial for Ad celebres rex illustrates the theme of the sequence with a group of angels singing and playing instruments.

Mü2 München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 22405

Two collections of sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century
Provenance: Windberg (Premonstratensian)
Material: Paper
Size: 215 x 165 mm.
Folios: 271

---

8 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CCL, and my own observations of the manuscript.
9 See Sections 2.2.1.3 above and 8.5.2 below.
10 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CCL, and my own observations of the manuscript.
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Contents:
- fols 1r–114r: Sequence commentaries
  - fols 1r–3r: *Sapientia vincit malitiam*
  - fols 88r–92v: *Commentary on Ad celebres rex*
  - fols 114r–120v: Blank
  - fols 121r–141r: A commentary on the poem ‘Paeniteas cito’
  - fols 141r–166v: A commentary in German on the poem ‘Ut dimittaris aliis peccata’
  - fol. 168r–168v: A brief *vita* of a Windberg monk
  - fols 169r–271v: A second collection of sequence commentaries
  - fols 223v–225r: Commentary on *Ad celebres rex*

The two collections of sequence commentaries in this manuscript differ from each other both as regards the actual commentary texts and in the repertories of texts commented upon. However, the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* in the second collection seems to be an abbreviated version of that in the first collection. In both collections the full sequence text is given with interlinear glosses, some also in the vernacular, and with syntactical glosses in the form of Arabic numerals.\(^{11}\) In the first collection the sequence text is divided and presented in shorter segments with the corresponding commentary sections directly following beneath. In the first commentary section, fols 1–114, the text is written in one column throughout in a cursive script, although the *d* is often loopless. Each page holds around 34 lines.

\(^{11}\) See further Sections 2.2.1.3 above and 8.5.2 below.

\(^{12}\) The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, Sherrer (1875), and my own observations of the microfilm copy.
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Contents:  

- p. 1: Latin and German vocabulary 
- pp. 3–122: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Venite filii audite me’ 
- pp. 123–268: Sequence commentaries 
  - pp. 123–125: Sapientia vincit malitiam 
  - pp. 230–233: Commentary on Ad celebres rex 
- p. 272: Latin and German vocabulary 

This manuscript is very worn and in places is unreadable. The text in the sequence commentary section is mostly written in two columns, which is the case with the prologue and the commentary on Ad celebres rex, where the columns generally hold around 63 lines of text. Some pages are laid out in patterns, for example by dividing the page with a large ‘X’ or ‘S’ and writing the text in the areas created thereby; other pages have the text written in one column horizontally and in the other vertically.

Wt1  
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3818

Collections of hymn and sequence commentaries.

Date: 15th century  
Provenance: Unknown  
Material: Paper  
Size: 220 x 150 mm.  
Folios: 194  

Contents:  

- fols 1r–91r: Sequence commentaries  
- fols 1r–2r: Sapientia vincit malitiam  
- fols 62r–64r: Commentary on Ad celebres rex  
- fols 93r–194v: Hymn commentaries with a prologue. Inc.: ‘Accedite ad Deum’

This manuscript includes the full hymn and sequence texts with interlinear glosses and syntactical numbering. The commentary on each piece follows on immediately from the text in question. The sequence commentary seems to end imperfectly on fol. 91v. Fols 91v–92r present texts for the sequences Profitentes.

13 The description is based on the manuscript catalogue, CMV, and my own observations of the microfilm copy.
14 See more on this in Sections 2.2.1.3 above and 8.5.2 below.
8.4.2 On the text—the prologue *Sapientia vincit malitiam*

The Aristotelian prologue *Sapientia vincit malitiam* opens with this proposition, which is a rephrased passage from Wisdom 7, 30 and here adopted as its title. According to the author, this proposition commends theology for two reasons: its singular dignity, referred to in *sapientia*, and its salutary virtue, referred to in *vincit malitiam* (lines 1–6).

The dignity of theology, the first part of the proposition, is proved by means of an extensive logical argumentation based on seven conditions for the wise man drawn from the works of Aristotle (lines 7–79). From these the commentator forms seven reasons, stating that theology is justly called wisdom since it is able to teach, it considers both the most difficult and the most sublime things, it knows everything as much as is possible, it exposes liars, it is pure truth without falsehood and it is the science without which all other sciences would be ‘headless’, that is without a guiding principle. All seven reasons are proved through syllogisms corroborated by quotations from Scripture.

The second part of the initial proposition, the salutary virtue of theology, is addressed next (lines 80–114) by proving in the same manner how theology can remedy the two evils in man, the evil of the intellect, defined as false understandings, and the evil of the disposition of the mind—that is, man’s appetite for wicked things. In this passage the author refers amongst other works to *De pomo*, here attributed to Aristotle, regarding the perfect philosopher who is able to curb all carnal desires. Although *De pomo* was widely spread in the Middle Ages under Aristotle’s name, both in the Latin West and in the Arabic tradition, it was already then suspected that it might not be a genuine
work of Aristotle’s.\footnote{The work is written in the form of a dialogue between the dying Aristotle and his students after the model of Plato’s \textit{Phaedo}. The text may be partially based on a Greek original but the currently known versions of it all derive from an Arabic version dated to the tenth century. The Latin text, a translation from Hebrew, seems to have been produced in Sicily in 1255; \textit{Schmitt} (1985), p. 51.} This could be the reason behind the various variants for the title of the book in the manuscripts, such as \textit{De summ\textit{o bono}} in \textit{Mü1}.\footnote{See the critical apparatus to line 111.}

Once the excellence of theology has been established, the commentator proceeds by stating that theology is to be investigated before other disciplines on account of its \textit{utilitas}, its \textit{certitudo} and the \textit{nobilitas} of its causes (lines 115–161). The utility of theology, according to this author, is that this science functions as an instrument to show us both the good and the wicked in ourselves. The certainty of theology is vouched for as it derives not from syllogisms but from the authority of divine inspiration. The nobility of its causes becomes apparent when, in the examination of the four causes, the material, the efficient and the final causes all are ultimately found to rest in God. The formal cause, equated with the mode of procedure, is here said to be twofold in theology, consisting of the instructive and the supplicative, the latter being joined with the laudative mode. The last two modes are those used in hymns and sequences. The instructive mode of procedure is seen in the four senses of Scripture, which are subsequently explained through the sentence ‘David vict Goliam’, interpreted in accordance with the four senses, the names of which are also analysed etymologically.

Finally comes an examination of the causes of the book in question, that is the book of sequences, together with two headings from the type C prologue,\footnote{See Section 2.2.1.1 above.} regarding the title and the part of philosophy to which the sequences belong. The answer to the latter is here, as in the other prologues, that they belong to the discipline of theology (lines 162–170). The material cause is said to be divine praise, and, as in all three Aristotelian prologues, Gregory is professed as being the efficient cause of the sequences.\footnote{For a brief discussion on this attribution, see Section 8.1 above.} The formal cause is, as expected, claimed to be twofold: the form of the treatise, which is equalled to the division of the book into separate sequences, and the mode of treatment, which according to this author is always laudatory and supplicatory in hymns and sequences. The final cause is the knowledge of divine praise and hence that happiness towards which all arts and sciences are directed.
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8.4.2.1 Sapientia vincit malitiam: manuscript interrelations and textual problems

The text of Sapientia vincit malitiam is edited in accordance with the principles for Category 3 editions described above. As with the other prologues in the Aristotelian tradition, no stemma codicum will be constructed, though manuscript interrelations will be discussed through an analysis of agreements both in errors and in alternative readings between manuscripts, indicating possible groupings of the textual witnesses.

Twelve textual witnesses to the prologue Sapientia vincit malitiam have been located, nine of which are collated for this edition. Two of the collated manuscripts—Kf1 and Kr1—are from the fourteenth century and the other seven—Go2, Gr6, Mü2, Wi1, Er1, Mü1 and Sg3—are all dated to the fifteenth. As will become evident, the last three of these manuscripts—Er1, Mü1 and Sg3—form a group which will henceforth be referred to as ‘the pedagogical recension’ on account of certain additions, rewritings and restructurings of the text.

In addition to these textual witnesses to this prologue, there are three other manuscripts that include heavily abbreviated or rewritten variants of Sapientia vincit malitiam, and which have therefore been excluded from the edition.

The manuscript Kf1 can be dated precisely to 1356, according to the colophon, and is thus the earliest datable manuscript of this group. Since this manuscript also displays a text of exceptionally good quality and contains a commentary on Ad celebres rex, it has been chosen as the base manuscript for the edition. The idiosyncrasies of this manuscript consist mainly of alternative readings, just over twenty in number, such as fit for fuit at line 80, reading desiderabilia for desideria at line 112, or exchanging singular and plural (as at lines 49 and 162). Another possible base manuscript could have been the almost equally good Kr1, where the individual errors are mainly minor scribal errors or omissions of single words. In this case, Kf1 was chosen on grounds of legibility.

19 See Section 4.1.3 above.
20 The manuscripts Au1, An1 and Mü7 were located too late to be incorporated in this study. The prologue text in Au1 has been shown to follow the pedagogical recension.
21 The manuscripts are Sa1, Sf1 and St1. Sa1 and Sf1 both include the end part of Sapientia vincit malitiam, and Sa1 also adds the end of Vir speculativeus, slightly rewritten. St1 combines a heavily abbreviated version of Sapientia vincit malitiam with a rewritten version of the end of Vir speculativeus.
**Sapientia vincit malitiam and the Commentary of Kf1**

Manuscript interrelations

The analysis of the interrelations of the manuscripts is based on an examination of agreements in error and alternative (but discarded) readings presented in two ‘West tables’ below, the first of which shows agreements that can be shared by more than two manuscripts while the second table shows agreements unique for two textual witnesses. The list of the actual instances of agreements is found in Appendix 4c. As has been mentioned above, the nature of a relationship between two manuscripts revealed in these tables needs to be examined with the help of the list of agreements.

Table 1. Agreements in error and alternative readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Go2</th>
<th>Gr6</th>
<th>Kf1</th>
<th>Kr1</th>
<th>Mü1</th>
<th>Mü2</th>
<th>Sg3</th>
<th>Wi1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Er1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Unique agreements in error and alternative readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Go2</th>
<th>Gr6</th>
<th>Kf1</th>
<th>Kr1</th>
<th>Mü1</th>
<th>Mü2</th>
<th>Sg3</th>
<th>Wi1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Er1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kf1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The base manuscript for the edition of *Sapientia vincit malitiam, Kf1*, appears to be loosely connected with the other fourteenth-century manuscript, *Kr1*,
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although it does not share many unique agreements in error with this or any other manuscript. At one instance, line 133, Kf1 agrees with the pedagogical recension in leaving out the word *principaliter*. In the edition the word is retained as it seems to be part of the general terminology of these issues when compared, for example, with a similar phrase in Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae* I, q. 1, a. 5: ‘Secundum dignitatem vero materiae, quia ista scientia est principaliter de his quae sua altitudine rationem transcendent’. The word *principaliter* is also found in the prologue *Vir speculativus*, though not in connection with the final cause but in the discussion regarding the related issue of the *utilitas* of the work in question.\(^{22}\)

*Gr6* shares a notable characteristic with the pedagogical recension in showing a new structure for the placement of the etymologies of the names of the four interpretational modes. This suggests a relationship with the manuscripts of the pedagogical recension, though not an exclusive relationship with that recension overall.\(^{23}\) From Tables 1 and 2 above it would seem that *Gr6* is a contaminated manuscript sharing many errors and alternative readings with *Er1*, Kf1, Mü1 and Wi1, and with a slightly closer connection to the last.

*Gr6* displays furthermore a text of rather a poor quality, with nearly a hundred individual readings and errors, a figure surpassed only by another probably contaminated manuscript, *Go2*, whose number of unique alternative readings and errors exceeds a hundred. *Go2* seems to be connected primarily with Kf1, Kr1 and Mü2, but is not particularly close to Wi1 or the pedagogical recension, with which it shares the addition of *forma tractandi* after *et* at line 164.

The pedagogical recension

Of the three manuscripts belonging to the pedagogical recension, Mü1 shares readings with both Er1 and Sg3, whereas the two latter manuscripts very rarely agree against Mü1. This happens only at lines 56 and 168. The instance at line 56 concerns the phrase *sit hec*, which is omitted in Mü1 and found as a single *est* in Er1 and Sg3.\(^{24}\) The error at line 168 concerns *parte* instead of *parti*, a reading Er1 and Sg3 share with Wi1. These two instances of agreement are not significant enough to suggest a link between Er1 and Sg3 other than that of a possible common ancestor for the whole of the pedagogical recension.


\(^{23}\) There could be another link between *Gr6* and especially the manuscript Mü1 of the pedagogical recension in the reading ‘libro suo de bono’ in Gr6, where Mü1 reads ‘libro De summo bono’. See the critical apparatus to line 111.

\(^{24}\) Er1 and Sg3 also agree on reading *sit* for *sit hec* at line 40, though Mü1 is illegible here.
There are more than forty readings shared by these three manuscripts that separate them from the others. Usually the alternative readings they offer are conducive to an easier and more readily comprehensible text as far as syntactical structure and clarity of expression are concerned. Examples of such adaptations are changes of an adjective (as a predicative attribute) into an adverb:

```
90 primus] primo
123 certi] certe (not legible in Sg3; also shared with Wi1)
```

The most frequent change is a clarification effected by an addition of an implied word or of an adverb, such as:

```
15 scilicet + ipsum
105 inest + ergo
107 tamen + hoc
117 aliis + scientiis
162 causa + igitur
168 omnes + alie
```

In some cases the grammar or the syntax is changed without any necessity:

```
24 sumitur] sumuntur
48 faciendo + et
```

In the first example the number of the verb is changed although the subjects are two inanimate nouns in the singular. In the second example the addition of the conjunction equates the two gerund forms, which certainly generates a more readily comprehensible passage, although this change is as unnecessary as the former since the second gerund could be seen as an instrumental ablative.

The most salient alteration, however, is a new structure in the paragraph on the four modes of procedure (lines 142–161), in which the etymology of each name of the mode is placed immediately after the explanation of the same. In the other manuscripts, except for Gr6 which shares this modification, the last

---

25 For information on variations not reported in the critical apparatus and hence not included in this figure, see Section 4.2.3 above.

26 The actual rearrangement applies only to lines 154–158. In Sg3 the matter is further complicated by a *saut du même au même* (see the critical apparatus to line 153), which was subsequently corrected (see the critical apparatus to lines 157 and 160). The correction made by the scribe in Sg3 is difficult to account for satisfactorily in the apparatus, but there can be no doubt that the exemplar of this manuscript displayed the new structure of the pedagogical recension in this passage.
two etymologies appear together at the very end of the paragraph. Although the restructuring produces a more logical text, it has been judged unoriginal as it is hardly probable that a more logical disposition would be changed to a less logical; a transposition in the other direction seems more likely. The other manuscripts (with the exception of Mü2) have an initial sed in the last etymology, which could imply a contrasting continuation of the previous etymological analysis, but this is not strong evidence.

Within the same paragraph at lines 159–160, there is another interesting reading shared by Er1, Mü1 and Sg3 against the others. Instead of interpreting the whole word anagogicus as “ductio sursus” sive “exposicio ad supernam patriam”, as in the other manuscripts, the two words sive exposicio are in the pedagogical recension repositioned to follow immediately upon ductio as an alternative understanding of -gogos. The meaning of the whole word is then understood as ‘ductio sursus ad supernam patriam’. Though apparently clear and sensible it is somewhat simplistic and probably not original. The last phrase after sive in the majority of the manuscripts is more probably a further elaboration on and a concrete illustration of ductio sursus, so that ductio is understood as exposicio and sursus as ad supernam patriam. What is more, a simple ductio sursus seems to be the standard etymology of the term anagoge without including exposicio as the interpreted meaning.

To summarise: the close-knit group, labelled the ‘pedagogical recension’, consisting of Er1, Mü1 and Sg3, share a great number of readings between the three of them, with comparatively few readings restricted to only two. The other manuscripts—Go2, Gr6, Kf1, Kr1, Mü2 and Wi1—constitute a fairly disparate group in which no firm links seem discernible. The manuscript Gr6 shares distinctive features both with the pedagogical recension and with the other textual witnesses.

Textual problems

The textual tradition of the prologue Sapientia vincit malitiam is fairly stable in comparison with the other prologue texts belonging to the Aristotelian

---

27 The same etymological analysis is found, for example, in the prologue to Durandus of Mende’s liturgical work Rationale divinorum officiorum, where he continues the explanation and connects sursum with heaven (Guill. Durand., ration. prohemium 12). The same interpretation of ductio sursum, albeit without the etymological analysis, is also seen in Hugh of St Victor (In scripturam sacram, PL 175, 12b) and Alan of Lille (Liber sententiarum, PL 210, 236c).
tradition. There is only one particularly problematic passage, at lines 121–122, where the manuscripts offer several divergent readings. In the edition it reads:

Que quidem certitudo non consistit in silogistica demonstratione sed in auctoritate divine inspiracionis.

The main problem is found in the phrase ‘in auctoritate divine inspiracionis’. The reading of this phrase in the edition is adopted from Mü2, which is also close to the reading of Gr6, ‘in divine auctoritate inspiracione’. This version of course makes no sense, but the last ablative could be judged a mistake on account of the endings in the preceding words. Four manuscripts—Go2, Kf1, Kr1 and Wi1—share the reading ‘in auctoritatis divine inspiracione’ and the pedagogical recension—Er1, Mü1 and Sg3—has ‘in auctoritatibus divine inspiracionis’. It is not surprising that these three manuscripts share a reading that separates them from the rest, but it is noteworthy that auctoritas is in the ablative, as in Mü2.

The reading of Mü2 has been judged correct on grounds of content and identical or corresponding expressions in other medieval works discussing similar issues. In scholastic texts the word auctoritas is mainly used in two senses: in an abstract sense it refers to the reliability or credibility of an expression, and in a more concrete sense it designates the text itself, in which case it can also be used in the plural.28 This latter sense could account for the reading in the pedagogical recension, while the reading in Mü2 might adhere to the first sense. However, the expression here seems to concern the books of the Bible, which were not usually referred to as auctoritates in that sense, since the plural form is normally applied to gobbets from the Fathers, ancient philosophers and the like.

The expression seems furthermore to echo a phrase in the response section to Question 1, Article 5 in Thomas Aquinas’s Summa theologiae, in which he argues in favour of the higher dignity of divine science, partly on account of its greater level of certainty, saying that the sacra doctrina is worthier than all other sciences according to its certainty, ‘quia aliae scientiae certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanae, quae potest errare; haec autem certitudinem

28 For a fuller discussion of the concepts of auctor and auctoritas, see CHENU (1927) and CHENU (1954), pp. 106–117. I am grateful to Dr Philip L. Reynolds, Aquinas Associate Professor of Historical Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, for sharing his knowledge on this subject with me and for directing me towards this article and some examples from contemporary sources.
habet ex lumine divinae scientiae.’29 In the second section of the same response Thomas stresses the fact that theology receives its fundamentals not from other sciences but directly from God through revelation. In his work on Isaiah, in Chapter 34, we find an expression identical to the phrase in our prologue: ‘Hic confirmat omnia quae dicta sunt ex auctoritate divinae inspirationis.’30

The examples cited above and the scholastic use of the word _auctoritas_ thus seem to speak against the readings of the other manuscripts. It is noteworthy that a similar phrase is found on the following line (123)— _credere debemus auctoritati divine_—which is erroneously rendered _auctoritate divine_ in _Go2, Gr6_ and _Kf1_. Is it possible that both this and the previous error were induced by two similar phrases having an effect upon each other? Or do the errors attest to a general confusion either between the sounds represented by the letters _e_ and _i_, or between the dative and ablative cases? Five manuscripts— _Go2, Gr6, Kf1, Kr1_ and _Mü1_—read _racione_ for _racioni_ in the same line, which could be seen as supporting the latter view. In this connection the well-known tendency of word-endings to infect adjacent words in the copying process should not be forgotten.

Another possibility would be that the readings offered by _Mü2_ and the pedagogical recension is that they are corrections of a corrupt passage made in two different ways by subsequent scribes. The large number of other adaptations and clarifications in _Er1, Mü1_ and _Sg3_ could speak in favour of this hypothesis. The fourth manuscript, _Mü2_, though not part of the same textual tradition, nevertheless displays a few such pedagogical and clarifying rewritings, the most conspicuous of which is an addition to _intellectus_ at line 85.

Regardless of the true reasons behind the alternatives offered by the manuscripts, the reading of _Mü2_ has been deemed correct and thus adopted in the edition.31

---

29 Thom. Aq., _S. T._, q. 1, a. 5 (response section).
30 Thom. Aq., _expos. super Is._, 34, 13. In the twelfth century Hildegard of Bingen uses a similar expression in the sixth vision of _Scivias_, Chapter 21: ‘Qui sunt ipsis angulis ex utraque parte sui coniuncti iuxta modum testudinis: quoniam tam ueteri quam nouo testamento ex utroque latere initii sui in honore et magistratione coadunati declarantur populi, et hoc in similitudinem testudinis, quod est _in auctoritate divinae prudentiae_ bene et digne compositi ad statum accidificationis coelestis Jerusalem’ (emphasis added); Hildegard., _scivias_, 6, 21.
31 This is the only instance where a reading from _Mü2_ is adopted in the edition without further support from other manuscripts.
8.4.3 On the text—the commentary of Kf1

The text of the commentary in Kf1 is very close to the commentary text in Kf4 of the Vir speculativus branch (Edition 5). The sequence text is divided into the same six sections, and in the expository passages the same theological themes are treated with an almost verbatim likeness, often citing or referring to the same auctoritates. There are therefore no major differences between the two branches in the interpretative sections, as will be seen below, but there is more divergence in their use of and reference to the sequence text, as well as in the extent to which the vocabulary of the sequence is explained. The differences in the interpretative section mainly concern variant readings which seem to be firmly fixed to one branch or the other.

The commentary opens with a divisio textus of the sequence text as a whole, identifying the same two parts as in Kf4: the address to God and the praises sung to him and the exposition of the angels along with their names and roles. The scheme followed throughout the text of Expositio Kf1 by the commentator is also similar to that of Kf4. The six subsections in the commentary each open with an identification of the theme of the specific section of the sequence text together with an identification of any subsections. This is followed by a prose version of the text with additions of brief explanatory comments and implied words. Third comes the theological interpretation, then comments and explanations regarding the vocabulary.

One immediately noticeable difference between the two commentary branches is the treatment of the sequence text. In Kf1 the sequence text is paraphrased into prose only once and placed immediately after the divisio textus and the identification of the motif of the strophes in question, while in Kf4 (Edition 5) there are two paraphrases, at the beginning and at the end of each subsection. The paraphrase in Kf1 includes a large number of brief inserted explanatory phrases and implied words, which results in a text often identical with the second prose version in Expositio Kf4.

Two manuscripts belonging to the Sapientia branch, Wt1 and Mzi2, display a different method for the syntactical explanation of the sequence by presenting the complete sequence text together with interlinear glosses including
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syntactical numbering of the individual words of the sequence.32 As the glosses correspond to the brief inserted comments and the syntactical numbering fulfills the same function as a restructuring of the sequence into prose, this method eliminates the need for a prose version in a running text format, which is hence not present in these two manuscripts.

Even though we find the same careful division of the sections of the sequence text and the identification of the separate expository themes in Expositio Kf4 (Edition 5), there seems to be an overall tendency in Expositio Kf1 to emphasize the disposition even more, as can be seen, for instance, in the discussion of man as the image of God (lines 81–96). This part is separated from the previous discussion of the primeval angels—an independent albeit related issue—with the words nota, quod, whereas in Kf4 the commentator moves smoothly from one issue to the next without signifying the transition. Quite often, but not consistently throughout, the separate sections in Expositio Kf1 are also numbered, for example at lines 16–48, 77 and 195. Although the reiteration of notandum and nota quod makes for tiresome reading, their role in facilitating the reader’s text orientation cannot be overstated.

As regards the theological interpretations of the sequence text, there is nothing substantially different from the commentary in Expositio Kf4 (Edition 5) except for an additional sentence commenting on the sequence phrase quo post bella (lines 227–228), which shows some similarity to the corresponding passage in Gr1 (Edition 4). The commentator in Kf1 points out that the phrase refers to passages from both Exodus and Revelation, although he cites only the latter passage. Immediately after this comes the interpretation of thymiama, before the commentator returns to the motif of Michael’s war with a second comment. The Biblical sources for the phrase are also referred to in Expositio Gr1, though here both passages are cited and the explanation of thymiama has a different wording as well as placement.

Apart from this there are only a few minor differences in the interpretative sections, such as quoting the passage from Hebrews in full with a reference to Paul (lines 95–96) where in Expositio Kf4 (Edition 5) an allusion is made to the Bible text with ergo et cetera, and placing the comment on the alternative reading

32 In Wi1 the whole sequence text is found at the beginning of the commentary whereas in Mu2 it is divided into smaller parts and placed before each subsection of the commentary. Often the interlinear glosses of these two manuscripts are identical with the inserted explanations in the sequence text as found in Expositio Kf1. For ‘syntactical numbering’ see Sections 2.2.1.3 above and 8.5.2 below.
Sapientia vincit malitiam and the Commentary of Kf1

Has celebres rex at a different place in the commentary. Another small variant is that the text of Expositio Kf1 refers only to Gregory in the discussion of angels and spirits and leaves out any mention of Eberhard of Béthune. As well as these examples, one could mention the differences in reading discussed above in the quotation from Isaiah and in the description of the office of the Dominions.

The more conspicuous differences between these two commentaries are found in the vocabulary sections. It can generally be said that the text in Expositio Kf1 is more succinct in its explanations or comments on word usage, often providing the minimum necessary amount of information where the corresponding parts of Expositio Kf4 contain additional comments on alternative interpretations and on other related words. A typical example of this is found in the explanation of agalma. In Expositio Kf1 the commentator simply states that its literal meaning is sheepfold and that it should be understood here as the heavenly kingdom (line 208). Even though the commentary in Kf4 provides the same meaning and interpretation, the explanation is fuller and gives the reasoning behind it. Another example of this difference is found at the very end of the commentary: Kf1 provides two alternative meanings for Alleluia where in Expositio Kf4 three interpretations are found, with thorough etymologies for each.

Mnemonic aids in the form of verses are rarely provided by the commentator of Expositio Kf1. In this text there is only one such verse placed in the first vocabulary section, which is here limited to cover the words caterva, symphonia, oda and laetabundus, each provided with a brief etymology (lines 42–49). The hexameter verse is linked to the analysis of the last word, laetabundus, in which the difference in meaning of the three suffixes -bundus, -osus and -bilis is shown. Although the verse as such is not included in the corresponding section in the commentary belonging to the Vir speculativus branch, an alternative version of it seems to be hinted at in what could be the end of a hexameter line.

33 In both commentaries it is placed in the first subsection of the commentary—in Expositio Kf1 at the very end after the vocabulary section, lines 50–51, and in Expositio Kf4 in the second prose version of the sequence after the phrase ad celebres laudes, lines 55–56.
34 Some manuscripts belonging to the Vir speculativus branch also refer only to Gregory in this section.
35 See Section 8.3.3.1 above.
37 See Edition 5: Expositio Kf4, line 52.
A brief comparison between *Vir speculativus* and *Sapientia vincit malitiam*

Although theology is also claimed as supreme among all sciences in *Dicit Aristoteles*, the argument is not presented in the same strictly syllogistic method as in the two prologues *Vir speculativus* and *Sapientia vincit malitiam*. There is, however, a difference between the two latter texts as to the choice of authorities drawn upon in order to vouch for the truth in the premises. Both texts rely heavily on Aristotle’s works, both explicitly and implicitly: the *Metaphysics* seem to be the favoured source in *Sapientia vincit malitiam* whereas in *Vir speculativus* the *Nicomachean Ethics* are frequently referred to. In *Vir speculativus* further support is generally provided by well-known masters or school-texts, while in *Sapientia vincit malitiam* the role is filled by Scripture. This difference is noticeable already in the main proposition used as the basis for the argument: in *Vir speculativus* a statement from Seneca constitutes the focus whereas a passage from the Book of Wisdom is the point of departure in *Sapientia vincit malitiam*. In the first part of the prologue the main concern for the latter text is the nature of theology, while in the former the focus is on *homo scientificus*. Furthermore, in *Vir speculativus* we are not presented with the four levels of interpretation of Scripture, nor are the three reasons for the excellency of theology present: that its ultimate efficient, material and final cause is God. Honour, joy and admiration, the three reasons in *Vir speculativus* as to why science should be sought after, appear shallow in comparison. In *Vir speculativus* there is also more emphasis on the introduction of the book of sequences than in *Sapientia vincit malitiam*. The final cause of the book of sequences is in both prologues connected with a kind of knowledge, but the knowledge stated in *Sapientia vincit malitiam* is not grammatically orientated as in *Vir speculativus*.

Though the texts of the commentaries are generally extremely close, some divergences of the two branches may be linked to the differences identified in the prologues. In the commentary of *Kj4* in the *Vir speculativus* branch, there is a greater concern for paraphrases of the sequences text, grammatical comments and etymological analyses than in the commentary of the *Sapientia* branch.

The characters of the two texts could be suggestive of a difference in intended audience or in the milieu for their composition. The latter question is difficult to answer satisfactorily on account of the lack of known provenance for many manuscripts, especially from the *Vir speculativus* branch. Of the manuscripts whose origins are known we may note that each branch includes manuscripts from both monasteries and collegiate chapters.

Based upon the differences in grammatical and etymological comments together with the type of sources referred to in the texts, the *Sapientia* branch of
the Aristotelian tradition seems to be aimed at a slightly more advanced audience than the *Vir speculativus* branch. To draw any definitive conclusions in this regard is, however, too premature at this stage: suffice it to note these differences in quotations and authorities, in the professed final causes together with the more numerous and detailed grammatical comments and etymological analyses in the commentary linked to *Vir speculativus*.

8.4.3.1 *Expositio Kf1*: textual problems and remarks on the edition

The edition of the commentary in *Kf1* has been made in accordance with the principles set out above for Category 2 editions. The text in the representative manuscript, *Kf1*, is generally of an exceptionally good quality which in turn means that there has not been much need for editorial intervention. In three instances, at lines 16, 29 and 125, omitted words have been supplied with the help of the other manuscripts of the same tradition that comprise a commentary on *Ad celebres rex*: *Er1*, *Go2*, *Kr1*, *Mü1*, *Mü2*, *Sg3* and *Wi1*. A few simple scribal errors have been corrected at lines 10, 200 and 215.

In the etymology of *satrapa* the manuscript reading *lap* has been discarded. As the conclusion of the etymological analysis is that the word literally means *pater*, the Hebrew *abba* must have been intended, which is found in only one of the other textual witnesses, *Mü1*. In order to make this word conform with *satrapa* it seems that three manuscripts—*Kr1*, *Sg3* and *Er1*—substitute the voiceless consonant *p* for *b* writing *appa*, which is the form adopted in the edition.

38 See Section 4.1.2 above.
39 In *Wi1* this is rendered *a pa*. Compare also with the corresponding passage in Edition 5: *Expositio Kf4*, lines 187–189.
Sapiencia vincit maliciam


Primum, scilicet quod theologia merito sapiencia nominetur, potest probari septem racionibus, propter quod scienдум, quod septem sunt condiciones sapiencie seu sapientis precipue. Prima est, quod sapientis est posse docere. Secunda est ipsum sapientem difficilima cognoscere. Tercia est ipsum altissimas causas considerare. Quarta est ipsum, prout possibilis est, scire omnia. Et iste quattuor condiciones ponuntur in prohemio Methaphysice. Quinta condicio est sapientem non mentiri de his, que novit. Sexta est ipsum mencientes

Fontes textus: Kf1, Go2, Gr6, Kr1, Ma2, Wi1, Er1, Ma1, Sg3

1 Sapiencia vincit maliciam | cfr Sap. 7, 30. 9 sapienti + docere | cfr Arist., metaph. Mor. 981 b 7; cfr Aut. Arist., p. 115 (8). 10 sapientem ... cognoscere | cfr Arist., metaph. Mor. 982 a 10; cfr Aut. Arist., p. 115 (12). 11 ipsum ... omnia | cfr Arist., metaph. Mor. 982 a 8−9; cfr Aut. Arist., p. 115 (12).
Sapientia vincit malitiam

manifestare posse. Et iste due tanguntur in primo Elencorum, ubi dicitur: Duo sunt opera sapientis, scilicet non mentiri de quibus novit, et menciaientem manifestare posse. Septima condicio est, quod sine sapiencia alie scien
ci dicuntur acephale, id est sine capite, et ipsa est prima et caput aliarum
scienciarum. Illa condicio ponitur sexto Ethicorum.

Ex hiis septem condicionibus possunt formari septem raciones, per quas
probatur theologiam merito sapienciam nominari.

Prima sit hec: Ista scientia merito sapiencia dicitur, cuius proprium est posse
docere. Sed theologa est huissimod. Ergo et cetera. Maior patet ex prima
condizione sapientis. Minor probatur, quia potestas et auctoritas doctrine
sumitur a docente sive efficiente doctrinam. Sed efficiens doctrine theologice
est ipse Deus. Non enim humanitus est inventa sed per Spiritum sanctum
inspirata, unde merito Christus discipulis suis tamquam viris theologice
dicebat: Ite, docете omnes gentes.

Secunda racio sit hec: Ista scientia, que considerat difficilima, digne sapiencia
dicitur. Theologia est huiusmodi. Ergo et cetera. Maior patet ex secunda

---

27 Ite ... gentes | cfr Mt. 28, 19.
condicione sapientis. Minor probatur: Theologia enim illa considerat, que naturalem capacitatem ingenii nostri transcendunt, puta unitatem essencie et trinitatem personarum in divinis et huismodi. Unde bene dicebat Paulus: *O altitudo divinearum sapiencie et scientiae Dei. Quam investigabiles sunt vie eius.*


Quarta racio sit hec: Ista sciencia merito sapiencia dicitur, que considerat omnia, propt obbligato est. Theologia est huiusmodi. Ergo et cetera. Maior patet ex quarta condicione sapientis. Minor declaratur: Ipsa enim theologia est ista mulier, que visa est Boecio supra verticem astitisse, que capite suo celos penetrat maiestatem divinitatis perscrutando, pedibus suis terram perforat inferni penas et damnatorum cruciatus declarando, brachio suo dextro orientem attingit iustis viam iusticie et premia virtutum proponendo, brachio suo sinistro occidentem attingit injustos seu perversos a viciis declinare.
Sapientia vincit malitiam

faciendo eis penas comminando, et sic quasi omnia considerat. Item ipsa de principio omnium et modo factionis omnium pertractat.


53 Neque ... 54 fiant cfr Mt. 5, 18. 54 Celum ... mea] cfr Mt. 24, 35; cfr Mt. 13, 31; cfr Lc. 21, 33. 59 eiusdem ... 60 considerare] cfr Arist., metaph. Moerb. 1004 a 9-10; cfr Auct. Arist., p. 122 [93].

53 faciendo + et Er1 Mü1 Sg3 | et ... 49 pertractat om. Mü1 | quasi ... Item] patet theoloyam omnia scire et Sg3 | considerat om. Kr1 | Item ipsa] ipsa enim Gr6 | Item ... 49 pertractat om. Er1 | ipsa om. Go2 49 principio[ principiis Kf1 | modo] materie ut vid. Kf1 factionis] factorum W1f Sg3 | omnium: om. Gr6 50 sit hec om. Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3 | firme] fit vic Mü2 | veritatis] virtutis Go2 | nullo ... 51 falsitatis Kf1 Go2, nullius falsitatis Gr6, nulli mendacio falsitatis Kr1, nulli mendacio falsitatis Mü2, nulli falsitatis W1f, nullius falsitate mendacii Er1 Mü1, nulla falsitate mendacii (ut vid) Sg3 51 admixta non leg. Sg3 | dicitur + sed Er1 Mü1 | est + ergo Mü2 | Ergo om. Go2 | et cetera om. Sg3 52 patet] probatur Sg3 quinta] sexta Gr6, quinto Er1 | sapientis + sed Sg3 | Minor + declaratur et Go2 | probatur] eciam patet Er1 Mü1 53 Domini] christi Er1, salvatoris Sg3 | dicentis] dicantis Go2 Neque unum om. Go2 | Neque ... 54 evangelio om. Er1 Mü1 Sg3 | iota] rota Mü2, erta W1f, + id est littera aut Go2 | neque] unum Go2, ut Gr6, nec Kr1 | apex + id est ligatura unius Go2 | transibit] transit Kf1, + a lege Go2 | donec] quando Go2 54 fiant] implementur Go2, sint Gr6 | Item et Gr6 | in evangelio om. Gr6 | supra] scilicet Mü2, om. W1f Er1 Mü1 Sg3 supple que] non transibunt propter Go2, non transibunt que Gr6 | que bis Er1 55 sacre + scripture Go2 | theologie + et Go2 56 sit hec] hec est Go2, est Er1 Sg3, om. Mü1 Mü2 mendaces Er1 Mü1 Sg3 | dicetur] dicetur Mü2, + sed Gr6 Mü1 | et cetera om. Sg3 58 sapientis om. Go2 | candom] candum Gr6 59 veritatis] veritates Kf1 | cum] cuius Sg3 60 sit] sint Go2 | opposita] optima Go2, oppositum W1f | considerare Sed om. Kf1 patuit in] patet ex Mü1 Sg3 | quinta] ista Go2, supra quinta verbum sexta sc. Mü2, sexta Er1 Mü1 Sg3 61 Ergo ... pertinere] et Mü2
manifestare, et ergo ipsa de seipsa in libro Sapiencie loquitur, dicens: Superborum colla propria virtute calcavi, hoc est: Philosophorum gentilium in sua falsitate gloriam documenta mea auctoritate falsa declaravi.

Septima racio sit hec: Ista sciencia, que prima omnium scienciarum dicitur, et sine quae omnes alie scientiae acephale dicuntur et ad quam omnes alie ordinantur, merito sapiencia dicitur. Theologia est huiusmodi. Ergo et cetera. Maior patet ex septima condicione sapientis. Minor probatur: Ipsa enim prima respectu aliarum scientiarum dicitur, ita quod de ipsa dicatur illud, quod scribitur in libro Sapiencie: Primo omnium creata est sapiencia, et alibi ipsa de seipsa loquens dicit: Inter gentes primatum tenui, id est inter alie sciencias. Quod eciam alie sciencias sine theologia sint acephale, id est sine capite, et quod omnes alie ad ipsam ordinentur, patet, quia secundum Philosophum decimo Ethicorum: In speculacione primi principii, scilicet Dei gloriosi, consistit nostra felicitas, ad quam nos homines et omnes actus et habitus nostri finaliter ordinantur. Sed ipsa theologia de primo principio speculatur et ad eius
Sapientia vincit malitiam cognicionem ordinatur. Ergo merito ipsa caput aliarum scieniarum dicitur et omnes alie sine ea a cepheal nominantur. Sic patet probatum primum in proposicione assumpta tactum.

Nunc restat probare secundum, quod fuit ipsius theologia efficacia salutaris, quod tangebatur, cum dicebatur ‘vincit maliam’. Propter quod sciendum est, quod duplex est malicia in homine reperta. Una est ipsius intellectus, et est error vel falsitas in intelligendo. Alia est ipsius voluntatis sive affectus, et est appetitus ad mala prosequeunda. Modo ipsa theologia utramque maliam vincit, scilicet maliam intellectus, que est error et falsitas, et maliam affectus, que est appetitus ad mala prosequeunda.

cui visa est mulier supra verticem asitisse, ad cuius presenciam omnes muse poetice dicuntur recessisse. Hec mulier theologia est, que sua presencialia auctoritate omnes musas poeticas, hoc est omnes errores et falsitates gentilium, condemnat.

Secundum probatur, quod theologa eciam vincat maliciam appetitus, que consistit in inclinacione ad vicia et recessu a virtutibus. Probatur dupliciter.

Primo sic: Ista sciencia, que est magistra omnium virtutum, ista vincit et reprimit maliciam / appetitus in prosequendo vicia. Theologia est huiusmodi. Ergo et cetera. Maior patet de se. Minor probatur: Ipsa enim de seipsa per prophetam Iohelem sic dicit: Indicabo tibi homo, quid oporteat te facere coram Domine Deo tuo: facere iudicium et iusticiam et solicitum ambulare in conspectu Dei tui. Ipsa eciam theologa est, quam Boecius alloquitur, dicens: O omnium virtutum magistra, cur de superno cardine lapsa venisti?

probatur auctoritate Commentatoris, qui dicit, quod perfectus philosophus debet esse perfectus in omni genere virtutum. Hoc idem probatur auctoritate Philosophi in libello suo De pomo, ubi dicit: Nescitis, quia perfectus philosophus mortificavit omnia desideria carnis in commissacionibus, in ebrietatibus, in operibus venereis, que vitam apocopant atque necant? Patet igitur declarata proposicio assumpta, que fuit: Sapiencia vincit maliciam.

Licet igitur omnes sciencie appetende sint—secundum Philosophum in prohemio Methaphysice: Omnes enim homines naturaliter scire desiderant—ipsa tamen theologia pre alis appetenda est triplici ratione.

Primo racione utilitatis eius. Ipsa enim secundum beatum Gregorium quasi quoddam spectulum oculis nostre mentis opponitur, ut in ea, que in nobis feda, id est viciosa, et que pulcra, id est virtuosa, sint, aspiciamus.
Secundo racione certitudinis sue. Quæ quidem certitudo non consistit in silogistica demonstratione sed in auctoritate divine inspiracionis. Magis enim certi credere debemus auctoritati divine quam debili racioni humane.

Tercio ipsa propter causarum suarum nobilitatem alii scienciis est preappetenda.

Causa enim eius efficiens sanctus Spiritus est, per quem in doctores ecclesie est inspirata, unde secundum beatum Gregorium: Doctores sacram scripturam docentes similes sunt fistulis, que afflatum aeris a creatura racionali recipiunt et sic ex consequenti sonum faciunt. Sic doctores ecclesie non locuti sunt, nisi ut a Spiritu sancto inspirati.

Causa materialis eius est eciam ipse Deus, unde eciam 'sciencia de Deo' dicitur.

Causa finalis eius est eciam principaliter cognicio et dilectio ipsius Dei. Concurrunt igitur et coincidunt in theologia causa efficiens, materialis et finalis, que omnia Deus est, ut dictum est. Unde ipsa merito mulier ista dicitur, de qua scribitur in Apocalipsi: *Mulier amicta sole et luna sub pedibus eius et corona duodecim...*
Sapientia vincit malitiam

stellarum in capite eius. Ipsa enim theologia sole amicta est de vero sole iusticie scilicet de Deo pertractans; luna sub pedibus eius est, quia ipsa sciencias humanitas inventas puta philosophiam gentilium tamquam erroneas conculcat et condemnat; corona duodecim stellarum in capite eius est, quia auctoritate duodecim apostolorum est confirmata.

Causa autem formalis in theologia est modus procedendi suus, qui duplex est, scilicet instructivus et supplicativus et cum hoc laudativus. Modus procedendi supplicativus et laudativus in ymnis et sequenciis servatur. Modus procedendi instructivus quadruplex est, scilicet hystoricus, allegoricus, tropolycus et anagoycus. Modus procedendi hystoricus est, quando res narratur, sicut gesta est, ut cum narratur, qualiter David vicerit Goliam. Et dicitur 'hystoria' quasi 'gesticulacio', id est 'geste rei narracio'. Sed modus procedendi allegoricus est, quando illud, quod gestum est, ad Christum vel ad eius ecclesiam convertimus, ut dicendo 'David vicit Goliam', id est Christus vicit Dyabolum. Et dicitur 'allegoricus' ab 'alleos', quod est 'aligenum', et 'gore',

---
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Hicis visis ad causas libri accedamus. Causa materialis huius libri est laus divina in pertractando virtutes eius in se et in suis sanctis. Causa efficiens est sanctus.
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Ista sequencia, que in honore sanctorum angelorum canitur, dividitur in duas partes: primo autor dirigit sermonem suum ad ipsum Deum laudes sibi decantando in festivitate sancti Michahelis; secundo exsequitur pertractando choros angelorum et cum hoc nomina quorundam angelorum. Secunda ibi: NOVIES DISTINCTA.

Primo dicit sic: o CELICE REX, supple Deus, CUNCTA CATERVA, id est omnis turba, CANORA, id est sonora, PANGAT, id est decantet, AD CELEBRES LAUDES, id est usque ad celebres laudes tuas, SYMPHONIA, id est cum vocali consonancia, ATQUE / pro et, NOSTRA CONCIO, id est turba, SOLVAT, id est reddat, TIBI ODAS, id est dulces cantus, supple NUNC, CUM pro quando, VALDE id est INCLITA FESTA, id est valde gloriosa festa, MICHAELIS archangeli RENOVANTUR, id est quasi de novo celebrantur vel honorantur, PER QUEM, supple Michahelem (vel PER QUE, supple festa), TOTA MACHINA MUNDI, id est totus mundus, PERORNATUR, id est valde ornatur, LETABUNDA, id est gaudens.

<Nota> de nominibus angelorum, quia secundum beatum Gregorium angelis appropriantur nomina non ex eo, quod sine nominum inposicione in celesti patria cognosci non possint, cum omnia ibidem reluecant in speculo deitatis, sed nomina specialia angelis appropriantur ex privatis officiis, que gerunt, cum ad nos mittuntur. Unde Michahel hoc nomen optinet, quod interpretatur ‘quis ut Deus’, ex eo, quia, quando aliquid mire virtutis agitur, quod nemo facere potest nisi Deus, tunc Michahelem mittetur. Simili modo est de Gabriele, qui ‘fortitudo Dei’ dicitur ex eo, quia missus fuit beate virgini ad annunciandum Deum, qui est fortis in prelio. Similiter hoc nomen Raphahel obtinuit, quia ‘medicina Dei’ interpretatur, quia ad curandum egros mittitur, ut patet in Thobia.


Fons textus: Kf1; fontes emendationum: Er1, Go2, Kr1, Mi1, Mi2, Sg3, Wi1
1 Adj d cod., sed spatium litt. initialis praebet cod. 3 ad ipsum post corr. 9 tuas bis 10 id est cum Go2, Kr1, Mi1 et Sg3 scripsi, ex cod. 16 Nota cum Go2, Kr1 et Er1 supplevi 22 nisi cum cett. scripsi, ibi cod.
Secundo nota de hoc, quod dicit PERORNATUR, quod tota ecclesia per sanctum Michahelem vel per festum eius perornatur quintupliciter: Primo ex eius festi celebracione; secundo ex sufragii <et> adiutorii sui impensione, unde dicitur in Daniele: *In tempore illo consurget Michahel, princeps magnus, qui stabit pro filiis populi sui*, id est pro his, qui sunt predestinati ad vitam eternam; tercio mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michahelis, et hoc per deportacionem oracionum nostrarum per manus Michahelis et aliorum angelorum ante conspectum Dei, unde dicit Bernhardus: *Discurrit angelus inter dilectum et dilectam, vota offerens, dona referens, corrigit illam, placans illum*; quarto mundus perornatur per festum Michahelis ex susceptione animarum per sanctum Michahelum, unde de ipso cantatur: Archangele Michahel, constitui te principem super omnes animas susciendae; quinto mundus perornatur per sanctum Michahelum ex ipsius solemni victoria et pugna, de qua dicitur in Apokalipsi: *Factum est prelium magnum in celo. Michabul archangelus pugnabat cum dracone*, quod exposuit est.

Tercio nota circa litteram: ‘caterva’ idem est quod turba vel universitas et dicitur a ‘chata’ Grece, quod est universal. ‘Symphonia’ dicitur vocalis consonancia in instrumentis musicis et dicitur a ‘syn’, quod est con, et ‘phonos’ sonus, quasi consonancia. ‘Oda, ode’ est cantus et derivatur ab ‘odos’ Grece, quod est cantus Latine. ‘Letabundus’ per ethymologiam vocabuli dicitur similis leto quia ‘-bundus’ significat similitudinem, ‘-osus’ plenitudinem, ‘-bilis’ aptitudinem, unde versus:

-Osus plena notat, -bundus similat, -bilis aptat.

Item sciendum quod aliqui legunt hic ‘ad celebres’ per unam diccionem mutando ‘d’ in ‘e’ sed prior lectura videtur melior.

Primo dicit sic: o celice rex, AGMINA, id est turbe vel chori, PNEUMATUM, id est spirituum vel angelorum, DISTINCTA NOVIES, id est in novem choris, SUNT FACTA, id est creata, PER TE, SED tu, rex celice, FACIS HEC, supple agmina angelorum, FLAMMEA PER ANGELICAS OFFICINAS, id est per angelica ministeria, CUM pro quando, VIS. HEC, supple agmina angelorum, SUNT INTER PRIMEVA CREATA TUA, / id est prima creatura tua, CUM NOS homines SIMUS ULTIMA FACTURA, id est ultima creatura, SED, supple sumus, TUA YMAGO.

Nota circa istum versum SED CUM VIS et cetera: Secundum beatum Gregorium 'angelus' est nomen officii, non nature, unde angelus nuncius dicitur, unde dicit sanctus Gregorius: Ilii celestes spiritus semper quidem spiritum sunt, sed nequaquam semper angelii vocari possunt. Sed cum ad nos mittuntur, tunc angelii nuncupatur, unde eciam dicit psalmus: Qui angelos suos spiritus facit et ministros suos flammam ignis, quia quando angelii ad nos mittuntur, tunc flammam dicuntur, quia a nobis scoriam peccatorum expurgant et in nobis ignem divini amoris accendunt. Unde dicit Ysaias: Vidi et volavit angelus de seraphin ad me et tulit calculum, id est lapidem ignitum, de altari cum forcipe, dicens, 'purgavit peccatum tuum.'

Secundo nota de hoc, quod dicit INTER PRIMEVA, quod angelus dicitur prima creatura, quia primo die fuit creatus, unde dixit Deus: Fiat lux et facta est lux. Per lucem theologi exponunt naturam angelicam. Sed homo dicitur ultima creatura, quia sexto die de limo terre formatus est.

68 angelus... 71 nuncupantur| gfr Greg. M., in evang. 34, 8. 71 Qui... 72 ignis| Hbr. 1, 7, sed gfr etiam Ps. 103, 4. 74 Vidi... 76 tuam| gfr Is. 6, 5–7. 78 Fiat... lux| Gn. 1, 3. 79 theologi| gfr e.g. Aug., circ. 11, 9. 80 sexto... est| gfr Gn. 1, 25–27 et Gn. 2, 7.
Nota, quod homo dicitur ymage Christi iuxta illud, quod dixit Deus: *Faciamus hominem ad ymaginem et similitudinem nostram*. Sed tunc est dubium, quare homo pocius dicitur ymage Dei, cum tamen secundum Dionisium angelus eiam sit ymage Dei et manifestacio luminis non apparentis et speculum purum et perlucidissimum. Licet angelus possit dici ymage Dei, tamen antonomasice homo dicitur ymage propter tres raciones.

Prima est: Nam sicut Deus per suam potenciam est in maiori mundo, ipsum regens et gubernans, sicut anima humana est in toto mundo minori, scilicet in homine, qui microcosmus dicitur, ipsum vivificans.

Secunda causa est, quia sicut in Deo ante mundi creationem fuerunt raciones exemplares omnium rerum secundum Platonem, sicut ars est in mente artificis, sic in anima humana per spiritualenum receptionem sunt similitudines omnium, unde tercio De anima dicitur: Anima est quodammodo omnia.

Tercia racio est, quia Deus naturam humanam sibi voluit uniri, non naturam angelicam. Numquam enim semen angelorum apprehendit sed semen Abrahe, ut dicit sanerus Paulus.

**THEOLOYCA**

Hic autor pertractat numerum chororum angelorum.

Dicit sic: THEOLOYCA SIMBOLA, id est divina scriptura, KATHEGORIZANT, id est predicant, NOBIS HEC, supple agmina angelorum, TRIPARTITA TER, id est inter tria agmina distincta, id est in novem agmina, PER PRIVATA OFFICIA, id est scilicet per specialia officia. Et tunc enumerat choros angelorum dicens, supple agmina angelorum sunt: PLEBS ANGELICA, id est chorus angelorum, PHALANX ARCHANGELICA, id est chorus archangelorum, PRINCIPANS TURMA, id est principatus, VIRTUS URANICA, id est ignea et virtus, AC pro et, POTESTAS ALMIVOMA, id est promovens sanctitatem, scilicet potestates, DOMINANCIA NUMINA, dominaciones, -QUE pro et, DIVINA SUBSELLIA, id est divine sedes,

---

scilicet troni, CHERUBIN ETHEREA, id est serena et celica, AC pro et, IGNICOMA SERAPHIN, id est in amore Dei ardens.

Nota, quod regnum celeste tamquam domus bene disposita habet patrem familias ipsum Deum, qui domum celestem in tres yerarchias distinxit. In quasar yerarchiarum qualibet sunt tres chori angelorum.

In infima yerarchia sunt angeli, archangeli et virtutes. Officium angelorum est secundum dominum Albertum, quod ipsi sunt deputati in custodes animarum, unde dicit: Dignitas est specialis animarum et ipsarum angeli sunt custodes. Sed officium archangelorum secundum beatum Gregorium est, quod ipsi nunciant maora, angelis vero minora, unde eciam archangelus Gabriel ad Mariam missus. Tercio: Officium virtutum secundum dominum Albertum est, quod Deus per ippos miracula facit, unde eciam dicuntur virtutes uranice, id est ignee. Nam sicut ignis illuminat, sic angelice virtutes per miraculorum executiones plurimos infideles ad cognoscendum Deum illuminant. Et dicuntur uranice ab ‘ur’ Grece, quod est ignis Latine.

In secunda yerarchia sunt tres alii chori, scilicet potestates, principatus et dominaciones. Officium potestatum est cohercere omne nocivum et nequam, ne tantum nocent, quantum velit. Unde eciam habent <cohercere> demones a nocementis nostris. Sed officium principatum est principatus terre limitare et sedes superborum dominorum amovere et bonos promovere. Sed officium dominacionum est, ut ex ipsorum imperio et disposicione angeli inferiorum ordinum ad nobis ministrandum mittantur, unde dicuntur quasi dominantes alii.


**VOS, O MICHAEL.**

Hic autor pertractat de quibusdam nominibus angelorum in sacra scriptura usitatis.

Dicit sic: O MICHAEL, SATRAPA, id est princeps, CELI, -QUE pro et, o GABRIEL DANS, id est dicens, VERA NUNCIA VERBI, id est Filii Dei, ATQUE pro et, o RAPHAHEL VERNULA, id est minister vel famulus, VITE, VOS TRANSFERTE, id est transducite, NOS INTER PARADYSICOLLAS, id est inter habitaciones in celo.

Nota: Ab aliquibus dubitat, in quibus choris angelorum sint hii tres angeli, Michahel, Gabriel et Raphahel. Et quidam respondent dicens, quod Michahel sit de choro principatuum, et hoc nituntur probare auctoritate Danielis allegata, que est: *In tempore illo consurget Michael princeps magnus*. Sed dicunt ulterius, quod Gabriel sit de choro archangelorum, quia ad nunciandum maiora missus est. Et

---

dicunt ulterius, quod Raphael sit de choro virtutum, quia miraculose Thobie
visum reddidit.

Circa litteram sciemum: ‘Satrapa’ idem est quod princeps et potest
ethnologizari per ‘satis’ adverbium et ‘appa’, quod est pater, inde ‘satrapa’
qua sufficiens pater vel princeps. ‘Vernula’ id est quod famulus. ‘Paradysicola’
componitur a ‘paradysus’ et a verbo ‘colo, -lis’, quasi colens paradysum, id est
celum.

PER VOS PATRIS CUNCTA

Hic autor iterum revertitur super choro angelorum dirigendo sermonem suum
ad ipsos. Dividitur in duas: Primo dirigit sermonem suum ad ipsos ostendendo,
quomodo ipsi adinplient precepta Dei in ministerium nostrum; secundo dirigit
sermonem suum ad ipsos incitans et exhortans ipsos et nos ad laudem Dei.

Secunda ibi: VOS PER ETRA.

Primo dicit sic: o vos novem chori angelorum, CUNCTA MANDATA, id est omnia
precepta, PATRIS, supple celestis, COMPLENTUR PER VOS, QUE, supple precepta,
SOPHYA, id est sapiencia, EUSDEM, supple Patris, id est Filius Dei, QUOQUE
pro et, QUE, supple mandata, COMPAR PNEUMA, id est Spiritus sanctus equalis
in potestate Patri et Filio, PERMANENS IN UNA USIA, id est in una essencia, DAT,
CUI DEO, supple existente uno in essencia et trino in personis, vos existentes
SACRA MILIA MILIUM ESTIS AMINISTRANCI, <id est> ministratis et CENTENA
MILLENA ATQUE, pro et, BIS QUINTA, mille, PER BIS QUINAS VICES, id est
decies ASSISTUNT IN AULA, supple celesti. AD QUAM aulam REX, Christus,
DUXIT CENTESIMAM OVEM, id est / hominem perditum, -QUE pro et,
VERBIGENA, id est Filius Dei de verbo genitus, DUXIT DECIMAM DRAGMAM, id
est hominem perditum, AD VESTRA ALGAMATA, id est ovilia, id est ad regnum
celorum.

Nota, quod autor in hiis versibus tangit numerum angelorum, qui ponitur in
Daniele, ubi dicitur: Milia milium ministrabant ei; et hunc numerum autor ponit in
primo versu, et sequitur ibidem: et decies miles centena miles assistebant ei. 'Decies

158 miraculose … 159 reddidit} cfr Tb. 11, 7–17. 185 Milia … ci] Dn. 7, 10. 186 et … ci] 75vb

159 reddidit ex reddidit corr. cod. 161 appa cum Kr1, Er1, Sg3 scripsi, lap. cod. 173 quoque cum
Kr1, Mü1 et Sg3 scripsi, -que cod. 177 id est cum Kr1, Er1, Mü1 et Sg3 supplevit | et cum Kr1, Er1,
Mü1 et Sg3 scripsi, hoc cod. 182 vestra] vestram cod.
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milia’ autore tangit, cum dicit VICES PER BIS QUINAS, BIS ATQUE QUINGENTA, quia bis quingenta faciunt mille, sed quinque bis faciunt decem, et tunc autore ponit residuum numerum, cum addit CENTENA MILLENA.

Nota, quod non est intelligendum, quod solum tot sint angeli in regno celesti, quia, ut dicit Iob: Non est numerus militum eius, id est angelorum, et ergo Daniel per hoc, quod posuit tam magnum numerum angelorum, voluit exprimere, quod numerus angelorum apud nos esset infinitus, id est indeterminatus, licet apud Deum sit finitus et certus.

Tercio nota, quod autore in secundo versu tangit duas parabolae evangeliis sepe dictas, quarum una est de homine habente centum ovem in deserto, secunda est de muliere habente decem dragmas. Per ovem centesimam perditam et dragmam decimam perditam intelligitur homo, qui secundum Deus relinquens nonaginta novem in deserto, id est novem choros angelorum in celo, venit in hunc mundum, ut ipsum hominem ad nonaginta novem ovex, id est ad novem choros angelorum, reduceret. Et dicitur homo dragma decima, quia secundum theologos homo supplebit decimam partem angelorum, quae cum Lucifero cecidit.

Nota: Filii Dei dicitur verbigena racione nature divine, secundum quam est verbum a Patre ab eterno genitum; vel dicitur verbigena secundum naturam humanam, quia solo verbo non ex virili semine conceptus est et genitus, unde cantamus de beata virgine: verbo concepit Filium.

Nota: ‘algama, -tis’ est stabulum ovium, et sumitur hic pro regno celorum.

VOS PER ETRA

Hic autore iterum diriget sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum exhortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei.

Dicit sic: VOS, supple novem chori angelorum et ELECTA PARS ARMONIE, id est consonancie celestis, et NOS DEMUS simul VOTA, id est affectuosas laudes, PER LIRICAS CHYTARAS, id est per talia instrumenta musicalia, PER ETRA, id est per

\[191\] Non … eius| cfr Iob 25, 3. \[196\] homine … deserto| cfr Mt. 18, 12–13; Lc. 15, 3–6. \[197\] muliere … dragmas| cfr Lc. 15, 8–9. \[202\] secundum theologos| cfr e.g. Greg. M., in evang. 34, 3 et 6 et Petr. Lomb., sent. 2, 9, 6. \[200\] que … 203 cecidit| cfr 2 Pt. 2, 4; 1ud. 6. \[206\] non … semine| cfr Ambr., hymn. ‘Intende, qui regis Israel/ Veni redemptor gentium’. \[207\] verbo … Filium| ‘A solis ortus’, AH 50, 53, cum app. crit. ad 4, 4.  

\[201\] id est cum cett. scripsi, et cod. \[211\] Dei … 212 Dicit post corr. \[212\] electa| elocta cod.
ethera per sincopam, et _PER RURA TERREA_, id est per terram—referendo singula singulis sic: Vos angeli detis laudes per etra et nos homines demus laudes in terris—_QUO_, pro ut, _NOSTRA THYMIA MATA_, id est nostre oraciones, _SINT ACCEPTA_, id est grata, _DEO SUPER AUREAM ARAM_, id est super aureum altare, _POST INCLITA BELLA MICHAHELIS_, _QUO_ pro ut, _nos DECAN TEMUS_, id est simul cum angelis cantemus, _ALLELUIA_, id est laudem _Deo_, _IN COEVA GLORIA_, id est in eterna gloria.

Nota: lira est instrumentum musicum habens ad maius quattuor cordas, sed cithara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per 'liricas chytharas' intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debumus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitando.

Secundo nota, quod autor in illo versu _QUO POST BELLA_ et cetera tangit illud, quod partim dicitur in Apocalipsi et in _Exodo_: _Stetit angelus_ et cetera. Per thymiamata, quod est species aromatica, intelligitur devota oracio, quam offerre debemus super auream aram, id est mediante Dominus nostro, Ihesu Christo.

Nota de hoc, quod dicit _QUO POST BELLA_, ut traditur in _Apocalipsi_: Michael archangelus devincet AntiChristum ipsum interficiendo, cum in celum ascendere voluerit et illum victoriam autor vocat hic _BELLA INCLITA MICHAHELIS_.

Nota, quod 'Alleluia' interpretatur laudate Deum vel laus Dei et cetera.

---

215 _et cum Kr1, Er1, Mü1 et Sg3 scripsi_, id est _cod_. 217 _cetera cum Kr1 et Mü2 scripsi_, _ecciam cod_. 217 _traditur cum Er1, Mü1 et Sg3 scripsi_, _trahitur cod_. 223 _chytaras ... 224 preceptorum_ [cfr Isid., orig. 3, 22, 7. 228 _Exodo_ [cfr _Exc_. 37, 25. 231 _Michahel ... 233 voluerit_ [cfr _Apc_. 12, 7–9. 231 _traditur cum Er1, Mü1 et Sg3 scripsi_, _trahitur cod_. 256
8.5 SEQUENCE TEXT WITH GLOSES AND COMMENTARY IN Mü5: THE ‘ELEMENTARY VERSION’

This manuscript displays three levels of text simultaneously: the sequence text, an interlinear gloss and a continuous commentary. Among the interlinear glosses a special type is found consisting of Arabic numerals to indicate the order in which to construe the words in the sequence strophes. It is the only manuscript with this layout edited here, but not a unique format among the sequence commentaries. This exposition has been subtitled the ‘elementary version’ as it consists mainly of excerpts from the commentary belonging to the Vir speculativus branch, put together to form a concise and basic version of that textual tradition.¹

8.5.1 Manuscript description

*Mü5* München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 4242²

Hymns and sequences with interlinear glosses and commentaries.

Date: 15th century (on fol. 70v: 1464)
Provenance: St Moritz, Augsburg (Collegiate chapter)
Material: Paper
Size: 210 x 300 mm.
Folios: 70

Contents: fols 1r–36r: Hymn commentaries
fols 36v–37v: Blank
fols 38r–70v: Sequence commentaries
  fols 58v–59v: Commentary on *Ad celebres rex*

¹ The commentary of *Mü5* is not the only example of a basic version in the complete sequence commentary material. The manuscript Mü2—described in Section 8.4.1 above—includes a second collection of commentaries to sequences where the manuscript layout is the same as in Mü5. The abbreviated commentary text there, however, produces an ‘elementary version’ different from that in Mü5. In St1 the commentary on *Ad celebres rex* is likewise a compilation of passages from the textual traditions of the commentaries linked to Vir speculativus and Sapientia vincit malitiam.

² This description is based on the information in the manuscript catalogue, CCL, and on my own examination of the manuscript.
The hymns and sequences are arranged according to the liturgical year and all are presented with complete texts, interlinear glosses (including syntactical numerical glosses) and a running text commentary in a separate outer column sometimes spilling over into the bottom margin of the page. The first sequence commentary (on *Grates nunc omnes*) is found on fol. 38r and the last (on *Psallat ecclesia*) ends on fol. 70r. On fol. 70r the text to the sequence *De profundis tenebrarum* is written in a different hand, with some interlinear glosses and syntactical numbering but no commentary.

On the two first folios red, green and black ink is used. In the rest of the manuscript black ink is used with red for rubrics, initials and vertical strokes through initial majuscules at the beginning of a new section. The layout of the three different kinds of texts varies to a certain degree depending on the length of the texts, which could suggest that the execution of the manuscript was made one page at a time and not planned beforehand. Regarding the exposition of *Ad celebres rex*, for example, we may note that on fol. 58v, reproduced here as Plate 12, the commentary text spills over into the bottom margin of the page. On fol. 59r the commentary text ends before the scribe has reached the end of the sequence text, resulting both in a small blank space in the outer column of fol. 59r and in the last strophes of the sequence being written in a single column on half of fol. 59v (just as happened with the preceding sequence *Stirpe Maria regia*, as can be seen in Plate 12). Thus it seems that the scribe tried to include as much commentary text as possible at the beginning of each new sequence, perhaps for self-assurance that all of it would be accommodated. The sequence text is written in a semi-hybrid script with both looped and loopless ascenders of *b, d, h* and *l*, and single-compartment *a.* The continuous text-commentary is written by the same hand in the same script, albeit generally with loopless ascenders, giving an impression of being quite rapidly written.

---

3 See DEROLEZ (2003), pp. 163–175.
8.5.2 On the text—the commentary and the glosses in Mü5

The commentary

This commentary may be classified as a simple and elementary version of the expositions in Kf4 and Kf1 edited above. In fact, with only a few exceptions every line in Mü5 is copied almost verbatim from these textual traditions. Since the etymological analyses in Mü5, such as the definitions of *simphonia* (lines 28–30) and *agalma* (lines 126–129), are identical to those found in the *Vir speculativus* branch, comparisons will here be made to this commentary variant, although it cannot be judged with certainty upon which of the two branches this elementary version ultimately depends.

The ‘editor’ of Mü5 (or its exemplar) has naturally had to make a certain amount of rewriting of the expository passages adopted from the model text in order to achieve the desired brevity and concision characteristic of this commentary. This may be seen in the definition of *angelus* (lines 24–25), in the sections describing the celestial hierarchies (lines 54–73), and in the attribution of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael to separate orders in the hierarchy (lines 85–88). In these sections, the adaptations are mostly made with a ‘cut and paste’ method: certain passages are omitted and others are copied verbatim. The passage on the lowest level of the celestial hierarchy, with similar phrases in bold type-face, may serve as an example:

---

**Expositio Kf4**, lines 125–133

<In> infima ierarchia sunt angeli, archangeli et virtutes. Officium angelorum secundum Albertum est, quod ipsi sunt deputati in custodes animarum, unde dicit: Dignitas est specialis animarum, quod angeli sunt custodes ipsarum. Sed officium

**Expositio Mü5**, lines 55–60

Et in infima ierarchia tres chori angelorum sunt, scilicet angeli, archangeli et virtutes. Et angeli deputati sunt in custodiam animarum et minora nunciant; archangeli vero maiora. Sed officium virtutum est, quod per ipsas

---

4 The only exception is the added etymology for *numen* at the end of the commentary (lines 153–154), which seems to have been written by a later hand.

5 On account of the similarities in the etymological passages, references to the corresponding sections in Kf4 have been placed in the *apparatus fontium* of the edition. Certain passages in Mü5, as for instance the phrase ‘ex ipsorum imperio et disposizione’ at lines 64–65, seem to indicate a connection also with the commentary text of the *Sapientia* branch.
archangelorum secundum beatum Gregorium est, quod ipsi nunciant maiora, angeli vero minora, unde eciam archangelus Gabriel ad Mariam missus est. Officium autem virtutum secundum Albertum est, quod Deus per ipsos miracula facit, unde eciam dicuntur virtutes uranice quasi ignee, ab ‘ur’, quod est ignis. Nam sicut ignis illuminat, sic angelice virtutes per miraculorum facciones plurimos infideles excitant ad cognoscendum Deum.

One of the differences here is the omission of the authors’ names referred to in Kφ4, in this case Albert and Gregory, although their explanations are repeated in Mü5. The phrase attributed to Albert in Kφ4 regarding the status of the angels as guardians of the souls is left out in its entirety. Gregory’s specification of the differences between Angels and Archangels is included but has had to be rewritten in order to conform to the structure of the passage chosen by the editor of Mü5, that is, to deal with each group in turn: first the Angels only, then the Archangels and finally the Virtues. The mention of Gabriel being an archangel on account of his great mission is not repeated. For the explanation of the Virtues Albert’s name is again left out but the definition is retained. It is interesting to note the difference in gender of the pronoun in this sentence. In spite of the referent being virtutes the pronoun in Kφ4 is in the masculine, per ipsos, probably because the individual angels are thought of as being male regardless of the name of the order. In Mü5, on the other hand, a strict concord regarding gender is observed.

The same kind of technique applies to most of the explanatory sections. The word explanations and etymological analyses, though, are usually copied more or less verbatim from the model text. Sometimes, however, they are cut short, as can be seen in the explanation of cathegorio (line 78), where the comment regarding the use of a related word in logic is omitted (Expositio Kφ4, lines 158–159), and in the etymology for paradisiola where the alternative interpretation ‘sive inhabitator paradisi’ (Expositio Kφ4, line 193) is left out of the analysis in Mü5.

6 A few Biblical passages are referred to with the names of the books, but no authors are mentioned explicitly in Mü5.
As can be inferred from the brevity of the commentary of Mü5, several of the themes commented upon in the model texts are left out completely. Among these are the five ways the world is adorned through Michael’s feast, the difference between angels and spirits, the question of man as the image of God and the interpretation of the three angelic names Michael, Gabriel and Raphael.

The glosses

The interlinear gloss in this manuscript seems to fulfill a variety of functions. Four separate kinds of gloss seem to be represented in this commentary, each of which will be presented here with examples taken from the first few strophes of the sequence.

Lexical glosses

A great many of the glosses may be classified as lexical glosses, providing mainly synonyms to the words in the sequence.

- line 10 *pangat*: decantat
- line 11 *caterva*: id est omnis turba
- line 11 *simphonia*: id est cum vocali consonancia
- line 12 *odas*: dulces cantus

Grammatical glosses

In addition to the lexical glosses, there are also quite a few grammatical glosses, the principal function of which is to clarify the grammatical property of a word, perhaps by commenting on morphology or by providing nouns for pronouns and pronominal adverbs. Examples of this are:

- line 10 *celice*: o [indicating the vocative case]
- line 15 *quem*: scilicet Michaelem
- line 19 *vis*: id est volueris

Commentary glosses

In spite of the running text commentary in this manuscript, there are a few glosses that could be characterised as commentary glosses, which here mainly

---

7 The terminology for and definitions of the categories of interlinear gloss are borrowed from WIELAND (1983).
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interpret figurative language. Among the interlinear glosses to the first strophes of the sequence only two seem to represent this type:

line 16 **machina**: id est totus mundus
line 21 **officinas**: id est per angelica misteria

Syntactical glosses
The vast majority of the glosses are, however, syntactical glosses, that is glosses to help in structuring the phrases syntactically. This type of gloss can consist either of words or of symbols. Syntactical glosses in the form of words in Mü5 principally supply words in order to clarify the structure of the text. Examples of this kind are:

line 11 **simphonia**: scilicet et
line 20 **facis**: tu

Syntactical glosses in the form of symbols consist in this material of sets of Arabic numerals indicating how the words of the sequence should be construed, according to the commentator. Almost every word in the sequence text has been given such a numeral, which means that this type of gloss is the most frequent of all in this material. How these glosses work can be clearly seen if we compare the first few strophes of the sequence, laid out as prose:

Ad celebres, rex celice, laudes cuncta pangat sonora caterva simphonia
odas atque solvat concio tibi nostra,
cum iam renovantur Michaelis inclita valde festa,
per quem letabunda perornatur machina mundi tota.

with the same lines construed in accordance with the syntactical glosses provided by the manuscript:

Celice rex, cuncta caterva pangat sonora ad celebres laudes simphonia [the words numbered from 1 to 10]
atque nostra concio solvat tibi odas, [the words numbered from 1 to 6]
cum valde inclita festa Michaelis renovantur iam [the words numbered from 1 to 7]
per quem tota machina mundi perornatur letabunda. [the words numbered from 1 to 7]

This kind of syntactical guidance is of course more helpful the longer and more complex the phrases are. In longer clauses the numbering reaches higher than in the examples above: in the strophe addressing the Trinity towards the end of
the sequence (*Per vos patris*, etc.) the numbering includes seventeen words in one clause.

Naturally, some glosses are more difficult to categorise than others since they seem to fulfil more than one purpose. A gloss such as 'simphonia: id est cum vocali consonancia' (referred to above as a lexical gloss) could be said to have a dual function, since *vocali consonancia* provides a synonym for *simphonia*, whereas the preposition *cum* is strictly speaking a syntactical gloss supplementing a preposition that defines the understanding of *simphonia* in this phrase.

The affinity between the commentary of *Mü5* and the *Expositio Kf4* may also be seen in the interlinear glosses, although the exposition in *Kf4* does not contain interlinear glosses as such since it is a lemmatic commentary. There is, nevertheless, a striking similarity between the phrasing of the interlinear glosses in *Mü5* and that of the brief explanatory words and phrases found in the construing sections in *Kf4*. In order to facilitate a comparison between the two, these running text explanations from *Kf4* have been rewritten following the format of the interlinear glosses in the edition of *Mü5*. The examples are again taken from the first strophes.

*Expositio Kf4* (lines 53–58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>celice</td>
<td>id est celestis rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catherva</td>
<td>id est omnis turba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canora</td>
<td>id est sonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangat</td>
<td>id est decantat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canora</td>
<td>id est sonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symphonia</td>
<td>id est cum convocali consonancia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atque</td>
<td>pro et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concio</td>
<td>id est turba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solvat</td>
<td>id est redat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odas</td>
<td>id est dulces cantus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mü5* (lines 10–13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>celice</td>
<td>o; id est celestis rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caterva</td>
<td>id est omnis turba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangat</td>
<td>decantat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symphonia</td>
<td>id est cum vocali consonancia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atque</td>
<td>pro et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concio</td>
<td>id est turba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solvat</td>
<td>id est redat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odas</td>
<td>dulces cantus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5.2.1 Textual problems and remarks on the edition

The manuscript Mü5 is the only currently known textual witness to this variant of a commentary belonging to the Aristotelian tradition. Thus the edition follows the principles for Category 1 editions set out above. The text of the manuscript is very good; a few scribal errors have been corrected, such as non for nos at line 73, and in two places a word has been supplied, once following the Biblical source text (super at line 69) and the second time using the text of the commentaries in Kf4 and Kf1 as correctives (racione at line 122).

Regarding the epithet for the Powers (in the strophe beginning Plebs angelica) I have judged the spelling almiphona in the sequence text in Mü5 to be an orthographical variant for almivoma, which is the reading favoured by all manuscripts of the Aristotelian tradition for the standard almiphona. This peculiar spelling, where the ph seems to represent a pronunciation of v as an f-sound, is also found in two other manuscripts of this tradition—twice in Mü1, in the sequence text and in the commentary, and once in Er1, in which the spelling almivoma is also used. In the Aristotelian tradition the standard explanation of this epithet is that the Powers promote sanctitude, ‘id est promovens sanctitatem’ (compare Expositio Kf4, line 167–168). No explanation of this sort is found in the glosses nor in the running text commentary in Mü5, but the close dependence of this commentary upon the textual traditions of the Vir speculativus and Sapientia branches makes it highly unlikely that this would be a scribal error for almiphona.

Remarks on the edition

This edition adheres to the general principles set out above, but the layout of the manuscript deserves a few remarks in this context. The edition aims to preserve the presentation of the manuscript, with the three levels of text displayed simultaneously: the sequence text, the interlinear glosses and the continuous text commentary. The sequence text is found at the top of the page in facing strophes. The interlinear glosses are placed in the middle section, each preceded by the reference word from the sequence in bold type. When a word

---

8 See Section 4.1.1 above.
9 Orthographical variants with interchanges between f and v are displayed in other manuscripts in the Aristotelian tradition, for example in Ox2 where we find the spellings vificando for vivificando (fol. 117vo) and transverte for transfere (fol. 118vo).
10 See also the related discussion above regarding this form in the commentary of St2 in Section 7.2.1.
11 See Section 4.2 above.
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has more than one interlinear gloss, they are separated with a semicolon. The syntactical glosses in the form of Arabic numerals are treated as other interlinear glosses and placed as the first gloss to each word. A vertical line is inserted to separate the different sets of numerals (that is, when the numbering begins anew with 1).

The commentary proper is found at the bottom of the page and in certain cases continues on the subsequent page.

Textual criticism for all three kinds of text is found in a common *apparatus criticus* at the bottom of the page.

In addition to the sources for the commentary text the *apparatus fontium* contains references to corresponding sections in the commentary of Kf4.
EDITION 7: *Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5*

Ad celebres, rex celice, laudes cuncta

5

pangat sonora

4

caterva simphonia

5

odas atque solvat

5

concio tibi nostra,

4

per quem letabunda

cum iam renovantur

5

Michaelis inclita

valde festa,

5

perornatur machina

mundi tota.

Novies distincta

pneumatum sunt agmina

per te facta,

5

sed, cum vis, facis hec

flammae per angelicas

officinas.

10

Ad: 7 celebres: 8 rex: 2 celice: 1; o; id est celestis rex laudes: 9 cuncta: 3 pangat: 5; decantat sonora: 6 caterva: 4; id est omnis turba simphonia: 10; scilicet et; id est cum vocali consonancia | odas: 6; dulces cantus atque: 1; pro et solvat: 4; id estreddat concio: 3; id est turba tibi: 5 nostra: 2 | cum: 1; scilicet tunc pro quando iam: 7 renovatur: 6; id est de novo celebrantur Michaelis: 5; scilicet archangeli inclita: 3

valde: 2 festa: 4; id est gloriosa festa | per: 1 quem: 2; scilicet Michaelem letabunda: 7; scilicet existens; id est gaudens perornatur: 6; id est valde ornatur machina: 4; id est totus mundus mundi: 5 tota: 3 | Novies: 4; id est in novem choros angelorum distincta: 3 pneumatum: 2; id est spirituum vel angelorum sunt: 5 agmina: 1; o celice rex; id est chori per: 7 te: 8 facta: 6; id est creata | sed: 1 cum: 5 vis: 6; id est volueris facis: 2; tu hec: 3; scilicet agmina angelorum flammae: 4; id est ignea per: 7 angelicas: 8 officinas: 9; id est per angelica ministeria

AD CELEBRES REX CELICE

Hec sequencia canitur de sancto Michaele et aliis angelis.

Et ‘angelus’ est idem quod nuncius, et formantur nomina ex officiis, que gerunt, cum ad nos mittuntur.


1 celebres litt. le supra lin. 8 flammae] flammae cod.
Item ‘caterva’ est idem quod turba vel universitas, et dicitur a ‘catha’ Grece, quod est universale Latine.

Item ‘simphonia’ dicitur a ‘sin’, quod est con, et ‘phonos’, sonus, quasi consonancia sive concordancia sonorum, sicut habet fieri in instrumentis musicalibus.


---

Inter primeva sunt hec nam creata tua, cum simus nos ultima factura, sed ymago tua. Plebs angelica phalanx et archangelica, principans turma, virtus uranica ac potestas almiphoma, ac seraphin ignicoma.

Inter: 3 primeva: 5 sunt: 2 hec: 1; scilicet agmina nam: 1 creata: 6 tua: 4; id est prima creatura tua cum: 7 simus: 9 nos: 8; scilicet homines ultima factura: 10; id est creatura ultimo facta sed: 11 ymago: 13; scilicet nos sumus; id est tua similitudo tua: 12

Theoloyca: cathegorisant simbola nobis hec ter per tripartita per privata officia:

dominancia numina divinaque subsellia, cherubin etherea ac seraphin ignicoma.

Plebs angelica phalanx et archangelica, principans turma, virtus uranica ac potestas almiphoma, ac seraphin ignicoma.

Item in regno celesti tres ierarchie distincte sunt.

Et in infima ierarchia tres chori angelorum sunt, scilicet angeli, archangeli et virtutes. Et angeli deputati sunt in custodiam animarum et minora nunciant; archangeli vero maiora. Sed officium virtutum est, quod per ipsas mirabilia fiunt a Deo, unde eciam virtutes dicuntur uranice, ignee. Nam sicut ignis illuminat, sic angelice virtutes per miraculorum faciones plurimos infideles excitant ad cognoscendum Deum.

Item in secunda ierarchia sunt tres alii chori, scilicet potestates, principatus et dominaciones. Et officium potestatum est coercere demones a nostris
Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5

nocentis. Sed officium principatus est sedes superborum dominorum amovere et bonos promovere. Sed officium dominacionum est, ut ex ipsorum imperio et dispositione angeli inferiorum ordinum ad ministrandum nobis mittantur.


Item ‘simbolum’ dicitur a ‘sin’, quod est con, et ‘bolon’, sentencia, quasi collecta sentencia.


Item ‘cathegoriso’ est idem quod predico.

---

63 Sed ... 64 promovere] Bernard., *serm. sup. cant.* 19, 3. | sedes ... 64 amovere] *cfr* Sir. 10, 17.
63 superborum *cum* Sir. *scripsi*, supernorum *cod.* 69 super *cum* Ps. *supplevi* 73 nos] *non* *cod.* 76 custos + litt. q. *ante* corr.
Vos, o Michael, celi satrapa, atque Raphael, vite vernula,
Gabrielque vera dans verbi nuncia, transferte nos inter paradisicolas.

Item Michael, ut quidam dicunt, est in choro principatus, ut patet ex auctoritate Danielis, ubi dicitur: In tempore isto consurget Michael princeps. Et Gabriel est in choro archangelorum ad Mariam missus. Et Raphael est in choro virtutum, quia miraculose Thobie visum reddidit.

Item ‘satrapa’ est idem quod princeps, et dicitur a ‘satis’ et ‘appa’, quod est princeps vel pater.

Item ‘vernula’ derivatum a ‘verna’, quod est servus vel serva. Versus:

Non vult verna probus dominis servire duobus.

Item ‘paradisicola’ dicitur a ‘paradisus’ et ‘colo, colis’ quasi colens paradisum.

---

87 ad … missus] cfr Lc. 1, 26–33. 88 miraculose … reddidit] cfr Th. 11, 7–17. 89 Item … 
6, 24.
Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5

Per vos patris summi complementur mandata, Vices per bis quinas que dat
bis atque quingenta
eiusdem sophia cententa millena
compar quoque pneuma assistunt in aula,
una ad quam
permanens in usia,
re x ovem centesimam
cui estis administrancia
verbigena tragam a/-que decimam
Deo milia milium sacra.
vestra duxit ad algamata.

Per: 5 vos: 6 patris: 3; scilicet celestis summi: 2 complementur: 4 mandata: 1; o vos novem chori angelorum cuncta que: 7; scilicet precepta dat: 17 eiusdem: 9; scilicet Patris; scilicet Dei Filii sophia: 8; id est sapiencia compar: 11 quoque: 10; id est et pneuma: 12; id est Spiritus sanctus una: 14; id est equalis in potestate Patris et Filii permanens: 13; id est existens in: 15; scilicet et usia: 16; id est in una essencia, scilicet cum ipsis cui: 1; scilicet Deo estis: 5; scilicet Deo administrancia: 6; id est ministrantes Deo: 1 milia: 3 milium: 4 sacra: 2; scilicet vos existentes | Vices: 7; id est decies per: 4 bis: 2 quinas: 6 bis: 5 atque: 1; pro et quingenta: 3; id est mille vestra: 10 centena millena: 1 assistunt: 8 in: 9 aula: 10; scilicet celesti ad: 11 quam: 12; scilicet aulam rex: 13; id est Christus ovem centesimam: 15; id est hominem perditum verbigena: 17; id est Christus de verbo genitus tragam: 19; id est hominem perditum -que: 16 decimam: 18 vestra: 21 duxit: 14 ad: 20 algamata: 22; id est ad regnum celorum

Item quod in littera dicitur ‘centena milia’ et cetera, non est intelligendum, quod sit certus numerus angelorum Dei, sed auctor posuit tam magnum numerum, per quem voluit exprimere, quod numerus angelorum apud nos esset infinitus et indeterminatus.

Item dicitur, quod homo sit tragma decima perdita, quia secundum theologos homo suplebit decimam partem angelorum, quem cum Lucifero cecidit.

Item Christus dicitur verbigena <ratione> nature divine, secundum quod est verbum a Patre ab eterno genitum; vel dicitur verbigena secundum naturam

---


100 in supra lin. 109 1 ex7 corr. cod. 116 quod + ad ante corr. 121 decimam] decima cod. 122 racione cum Kf4 et Kf3 supplivi 123 genitum] genitum cod.
humanam, quia solo verbo non ex virili semine conceptus est et genitus, unde cantamus de beata virgine: Verbo concepit filium.

Item ‘algama, -tis’ est idem quod habitaculum, sed proprie est stabulum ovium, et sumitur hic pro regno celorum, quia id est optimum ovile, cuius opilio est optimus, ille pastor, scilicet Christus, qui posuit animam suam pro ovibus suis.

Sequentia cum glossis et expositione Mü5

Vos per ethra, 
nos per rura terrea, 
paraelecta 
armonie vota 
demus hinc per liricas citharas,
quo post bella 
Michaelis inclita 
nostra Deo 
sint accepta auream 
super aram thimiamatha,
quo in choeva iam gloria condecantemus Alleluia.

Vos: 1; scilicet novem chori angelorum per: 11 ethra: 12; id est per etherea, scilicet vos angelini nos: 2; scilicet et; scilicet homines per: 13 rura: 15; scilicet nos homines, scilicet reddenda singula singulis terrea: 14 paraelecta: 3 armonie: 10 vota: 5; id est affectuosas laudes demus: 4; scilicet sit hinc: 6 per: 7 liricas: 8 citharas: 9; id est per talia instrumenta musicalia quo: 1; id est ut post: 10 bella: 12 Michaelis: 13 inclita: 11; gloriosa nostra: 2 Deo: 9 sint: 4 accepta: 5; id est grata auream: 7 super: 6 aram: 8; id est aureum altare, scilicet in conspectu Dei thimiamatha: 13; id est nostre oraciones quo: 1; id est ut in choeva: 5 iam: 4; id est in presenti gloria: 6 condecantemus: 2; scilicet simul cum angelis Alleluia: 3; id est laudes Item lira est instrumentum musicale sed citara est instrumentum habens decem vel plures cordas. Igitur per ‘liricas citharas’ intelligitur observancia decem preceptorum Christi, secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum, decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum ymitando.

Item ‘timiamata’ est idem quod aromatica, et ponitur hic pro oracione devota, quam ofrere debemus super aureum altare, scilicet ante conspectum Dei.

Item ‘numen’ interpretatur influenzae Dei et derivatur ab antiquo verbo ‘nuo, nuiis’, quod idem est quod influo.

---


134 liricas + litt. off ante corr. ut vid. 139 sit ut vid. 150 timiamata] timeameta cod. 153 Item ... 154 influo alia manus add.
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Appendix 1. The text of *Ad celebres rex* with the variants used by the commentators

The text of *Ad celebres rex* is here reproduced from AH 53, 190 with the variants used in the commentaries placed in a critical apparatus. With the exception of the manuscript Mü5, words omitted or transposed in the commentaries are not remarked upon as the sequence text in the other manuscripts is found in the form of lemmata or paraphrases only. As regards textual variants of the sequence text I have in this appendix applied the same rule as in the editions of the commentaries: if the word is reported in the critical apparatus of AH it is regarded as part of the sequence text and hence included in the apparatus here. The spelling of a reported variant is that of the first reported manuscript. The manuscript sigla in the apparatus follow the order of editions in the present work, that is Ox6, Ox1, St2, Gr1, Kf4, Kf1 and Mü5.

1. *Ad celebres, rex caelice, laudes cuncta*

2. pangat nunc canora
caterva symphonia

3. odas atque solvat
tonio tibi nostra,

4. cum iam renovantur
Michaelis inclita
valde festa,

5. per quae laetabunda
perornatur machina
mundi tota.

6. Novies distincta
pneumatum sunt agmina
per te facta;

7. sed, cum vis, facis haec
flammee per angelicas
officinas.

8. Inter primaeva
sunt haec nam creat a tua,
cum simus nos ultima
factura, sed imago tua.

9. Theologica
categorizant symbola
nobis haec ter tripartita
per privata officia:

2. pangat] clangat St2 | nunc om. Mü5 | canora] sonora Mü5
5. quae] quem Ox6 Ox1 Gr1 Kf1 (et per que Kf1) Mü5 | perornatur] perornantur Ox6
7. cum vis] quamvis St2
8. simus] sumus Ox6
9. theologica] theloga Ox6 Ox1 | categorizant] categorizent Ox6, categorizans ut vid. St2
ter + per Mü5
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10. Plebs angelica
    phalanx et archangelica, principans
turma, virtus uranica
ac potestas almiphona,

11. dominantia
    numina divinaque subsellia,
cherubim aetherea
ac seraphim ignicoma.

12. Vos, o Michael, caeli satrapa,
    Gabrielque vera dans verbi nuntia,

13. atque Raphael, vitae vernula,
    transferte nos inter paradisicolas.

14. Per vos patris cuncta
    complentur mandata,
    quae dat
eiusdem sophia,
    compar quoque pneuma,
    una
    permanens in usia;
    cui estis administrantia
    Deo milia milium sacra.

15. Vices per bis quinas
    bis atque quingenta
dena
    centena millena
    assistant in aula,
ad quam
    rex ovem centesimam
    verbigna drachmanique decimam
    vestra duxit super agalmata.

16. Vos per aethra,
    nos per rura terrea
    pars electa nostra Deo
    harmoniae vota sint
    damus hyperlyrica cithara,

17. quo post bella
    Michaelis inelita
    nostra Deo
    sint accepta auream
    super aramque thymiamata,

18. Quo in coaeva iam gloria

19. condecantemus Alleluia.

10. almiphona[almivoma $Gr1$ $Kf4$ $Kf1$ (almiphoma) $Mü5$]
11. cherubim[cherubin $Ox6$ Ox1 $St2$ $Gr1$ $Kf4$ $Kf1$ $Mü5$ | seraphim] seraphin $Ox6$ Ox1 $St2$
    $Gr1$ $Kf4$ $Kf1$ $Mü5$
14. cuncta] summi $Mü5$
15. dena] vestra $Gr1$ $Mü5$ | verbigena] terrigenam $Ox6$, verbigenam $St2$ | super] ad $Gr1$ $Kf4$
    $Kf1$ $Mü5$
16. terrea] dena $Ox6$ Ox1 $St2$ | demus] damus $Ox6$ $St2$ | hyperlyrica] yperlidica $St2$
    hyperlyrica cithara] per lyricas cytharas $Gr1$ $Kf4$ $Kf1$, hinc per liricas citharas $Mü5$
17. Quo] ut $Ox6$ Ox1 $St2$ | super] circa $Ox6$ Ox1 $St2$ | aramque] aram $Mü5$
18. coaeva] celesti $Ox6$ Ox1
19. condecantemus] decantemus $St2$ $Kf4$ $Kf1$
Appendix 2. Sequence commentary manuscripts

Unless remarked upon in a footnote, all manuscripts in the list present collections of commentaries on sequences for the entire liturgical year. The manuscripts edited in the present work are marked with an asterisk (*) after their sigla.

An1 Ansbach, Staatliche Bibliothek, Ms. lat. 74
An2 Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 318
An2 Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek, II. 1. 2o 85
Ba1 Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, B IX 24
Ba2 Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A X 20
Ba3 Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A XI 55
Ba4 Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, A X 73
Be1 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Theol. lat. Qu. 368
B1 Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Theol. 42. Q. II. 4
B2 Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Theol. 84 Q. III. 41
B3 Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Patr. 52 Q. IV. 39
Bo1 Bonn, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, S 363
Br1 Braunschweig, Stadtbibliothek, Ms. 157
Ca1 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 314
Ca2 Cambridge, University Library, Dd. III. 87
Ca3 Cambridge, St John's College, 140
Ca4 Cambridge, Peterhouse, 255
Du1 Durham, Cathedral Library, B. IV. 30
Er* Erfurt, Bistumsarchiv, Hs. Th. 16

1 This list of the sources that I have found hitherto makes no claim to being exhaustive.
5 As reported by HUYGENS (2000), p. 414, n. 7. This manuscript is said to include ‘Hugo de S. Victore, Commentarius super hymnum “Ave maris stella.”’
6 Extracts from Alan of Lille's *Expositio prosae de angelis*; D'ALVERNY (1965), p. 187.
7 Signalled by GNEUSS (1968), p. 205.
8 An adaptation of Alan of Lille's *Expositio prosae de angelis*; D'ALVERNY (1965), p. 188.
10 As reported by HUYGENS (2000), p. 414, n. 7.
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Er2 Erfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, Ampl. Ca 12° 10

Fr1* Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. Leonh. 9
Fr2 Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. Leonh. 10
Fr3 Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. lat. qu. 22
Fr4* Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. lat. qu. 78

Go1* Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 210
Go2* Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 325
Go3 Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 427
Gr1* Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 834
Gr2 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 1592
Gr3 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 900
Gr4 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 990
Gr5 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 1072
Gr6* Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 314

Gw1 Greifswald, Geistliches Ministerium, XXIV. E. 101

Kb1 Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 633 A
Kb2 Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 925

Kf1* Klagenfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, Cart. 133
Kf2 Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXXI b 2
Kf3 Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXXI c 112
Kf4* Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXXI b 4

Kf5* Klagenfurt, Archiv der Diözese Gurk, XXIX d 7

Ko1 Köln, Historisches Archiv der Stadt, W* 8613
Ko2 Köln, Historisches Archiv der Stadt, GB 4° 12814
Ko3 Köln, Historisches Archiv der Stadt, GB 2° 196
Kt1* Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek, 299

La1 London, Lambeth Palace, 48115
La2 London, British Library, Add. 1141416
La3 London, British Library, Harley 2925
Là1 Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Theol. 2° 68
Ma1 Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 20


12 A commentary on Laude Christi debita.

13 A commentary on Ave praeclara maris stella.

14 According to the manuscript catalogue, the last piece in this manuscript is an 'Expositio sequientiae sanctorum Thebaorum martyrum'.

15 Extracts from Alan of Lille's Expositio praeae de angelis; D'Alverny (1965), p. 188.

16 A missal with brief interlinear glosses and some longer marginal comments.
## Sequence Commentary Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma2</td>
<td>Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma3</td>
<td>Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma4</td>
<td>Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms1</td>
<td>Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms2</td>
<td>Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms3</td>
<td>Melk, Stiftsbibliothek, 1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms1</td>
<td>Maria Saal, Archiv des Kollegiatstiftes, 1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi1</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 11475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi2</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 22405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi3</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 12205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi4</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 23856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi5</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 4242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi6</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 6954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi7</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 28315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Om1</td>
<td>Olomouc, Státní vědecká knihovna, M II 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox1</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 16 (S. C. 6472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox2</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hamilton 17 (S. C. 24447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox3</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. C 301 (S. C. 12158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox4</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. 343 (S. C. 2406)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox6</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 6. 8 (S. C. 8840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox7</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. C 90 (S. C. 11955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox8</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 103 (S. C. 21677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox9</td>
<td>Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa1</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa2</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa3</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po1</td>
<td>Poznan, Miejska Biblioteka Publiczna im. Edwarda Raczyńskiego, 162 II H. d. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr1</td>
<td>Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, ms I. B. 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 A commentary on *Ave praeclara maris stella*.
18 Signalled by ALLEN (1973), p. 32.
19 Signalled by D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 91, n. 82.
21 As reported by GNEUSS (1968), p. 205.
23 Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis* (fragmentary); D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 186.
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Pr2 Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, ms. IV. D. 19
Pr3 Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, ms. X. G. 18
Pr4 Praha, Archiv Pražského hradu, O LIX
Sa1 Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek Sankt Peter, cod. b. IV. 22
Sf1 Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, XI 433
Sf2* Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, XI 436
Sg1 Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 466
Sg2 Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 467
Sg3* Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 524
Sm1 San Marino (California), Huntington Library, HM 128
St1 Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB I 59
St2* Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB I 88
St3 Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB I 157
St4 Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB IV 9
Up1 Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C. 178
Va1 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica, Vat. Regin. lat. 424
Wi1* Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3818
Wi2* Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 3946
Wi3 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 4839
Wi4 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 14815
Zw1 Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek, 386

25 I thank Dr Robert Curry, Western Australian Academy of Performing Arts, for bringing this manuscript to my attention.
27 Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis*; D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 187.
28 Extracts from Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis*; D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 190.
29 Signalled by ALLEN (1973), p. 32.
30 Signalled by ALLEN (1973), p. 32, although he erroneously claims that the sequence commentaries lack a separate *accessus*.
31 An adaptation of Alan of Lille’s *Expositio prosae de angelis*; D’ALVERNY (1965), p. 189.
Appendix 3. Sequence repertories in the edited manuscripts

The manuscripts are listed according to the order of the editions in the present work. The texts edited here are in bold type.

Edition 1

Ox6
Alma chorus Domini
Alle caeleste

Ad celebres rex

Edition 2

Ox1
(The first leaves in this manuscript are missing)
Qui regis sceptr a fort i dextra
Jubilemus omnes una
Nato canunt omnia
Sonent regi nato
Caeleste organum hodie
Magnus Deus in universa terra
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Sollernne canticum
Christi hodierna
Eia recolamus
Epiphaniam Domino
Stola iucunditatis Alleluia
Sollernnitas sancti Pauli
Hac clara die turma festiva
Fulgens praeclara
Zyma vetus expurgetur
Prome casta contio
Concinat orbis cunctus Alleluia
Dic nobis quibus
Victimae paschali laudes
Iubilans concrepa
Laudes salvatoris voce
Salve crux sancta arbor digna
Rex omnipotens die hodierna
Sancti spiritus as sit nobis gratia
Sonent sacra tam turma (?)
Eia musa die quaes o
Lux iucunda lux insignis
Alma chorus Domini
Benedicta sit beata trinitas

Lauda Sion salvatorem
Jerusalem et Sion filiac
Laetabundus exsultet fidelis chorus
Quam dilect a tabernacula
Eia gaudens caterva
Sancti baptistae
Laude iucunda melos turma persona
Testamento veteri Anna
Mane prima sabbati
Nunc luce alma splendescit
Ave mundi spes Maria ave mi tis ave pia
(post misplaced according to the commentator)
A rea virga praece matris Evae
Post partum virga Maria
Ave Maria gratia plena
Laetabundus exsultet fidelis chorus Alleluia
Hac clara die turma
Ave mundi spes Maria
Hodiernae lux diei celebris
Ave praec lara maris stella
Alle caeleste
Laudes crucis at tollamus

Ad celebres rex caelece

Christo inelita candida
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Odas hae in die laetas
Congaudentes exsultemus
Laus devota mente
Clare sanctorum senatus
Alleluia nunc decantet
Organicis canamus modulis ... quique in suis
Ecce pulchra canorum resultet voce Alleluia
Mirabilis Deus in sanctis mirabilia dans
Alma cohorts una
Virginis venerandae de numero sapientium
Exsultemus in hae die
Missus Gabriel de caelis
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Verbum bonum et suave
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Edition 3

$\mu^2$ (see the \textit{Dicit Aristoteles} branch)

Edition 4: The \textit{Dicit Aristoteles} branch

\textit{Gr1}

\textbf{Dicit Aristoteles}

Grates nune omnes

\hspace{1em} (incorporated into the prologue)

\hspace{1em} Eia recolamus

\hspace{1em} Natus ante saecula

\hspace{1em} Hanc concordi famulatu

\hspace{1em} Festa Christi omnis christianitas

\hspace{1em} Dixit Dominus ex Basan

\hspace{1em} Concentu parili

\hspace{1em} Laudes salvatori voce

\hspace{1em} Agni paschalis esu

\hspace{1em} Victimae paschali

\hspace{1em} Summi triumphum

\hspace{1em} Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia

\hspace{1em} Benedicta semper sancta

\hspace{1em} Sancti baptistae

\hspace{1em} Petre summe Christi pastor

\hspace{1em} Caeli enarrant

\hspace{1em} Laus tibi Christe qui es creator

\hspace{1em} Laurenti David

\hspace{1em} Congaudent angelorum

\hspace{1em} Psallite regi nostro psallite

\hspace{1em} Stirpe Maria

\hspace{1em} Omnes sancte seraphin

\hspace{1em} Sacerdotem Christi Martinum

\hspace{1em} Laudes crucis attollamus

\hspace{1em} Sanctissimae virginis

\hspace{1em} Deus in tua virtute

\hspace{1em} Hospitati dedit aegros

\hspace{1em} Clare sanctorum senatus

\hspace{1em} Agone triumphali

\hspace{1em} Psallat ecclesia mater illibata

\hspace{1em} O beata beatorum

\hspace{1em} Exsultent filiae Sion

\hspace{1em} Verbum Rei Deo natum

\hspace{1em} Ave praeclara maris stella

\textbf{Ad celebres rex}

\hspace{1em} Haec est sancta sollemnitas sollemnitate

\hspace{1em} Laudes salvatori voce

\hspace{1em} Rex Deus Dei agne

\textit{Gr2}

\textbf{Dicit Aristoteles}

Grates nune omnes

\hspace{1em} (incorporated into the prologue)

\hspace{1em} Eia recolamus

\hspace{1em} Natus ante saecula

\hspace{1em} Hanc concordi famulatu

\hspace{1em} Johannes Iesu Christo

\hspace{1em} Festa Christi omnis christianitas

\hspace{1em} Concentu parili

\hspace{1em} Laudes salvatori voce

\hspace{1em} Agni paschalis esu

\hspace{1em} Victimae paschali

\hspace{1em} Summi triumphali

\hspace{1em} Dixit Dominus ex Basan

\hspace{1em} Caeli enarrant

\hspace{1em} Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia

\hspace{1em} Benedicta semper sancta

\hspace{1em} Sancti baptistae

\hspace{1em} Petre summe Christi pastor

\hspace{1em} Laus tibi Christe qui es creator

\hspace{1em} Laurenti David

\hspace{1em} Congaudent angelorum

\hspace{1em} Stirpe Maria

\hspace{1em} Omnes sancti seraphin

\hspace{1em} Psallite regi nostro psallite

\hspace{1em} Sacerdotem Christi Martinum

\hspace{1em} Sanctissimae virginis

\hspace{1em} Deus in tua virtute

\hspace{1em} Clare sanctorum senatus

\hspace{1em} Agone triumphali

\hspace{1em} Psallat ecclesia mater illibata

\hspace{1em} Ave praeclara maris stella

\hspace{1em} O beata beatorum

\hspace{1em} Laudes crucis attollamus

\hspace{1em} Verbum Rei Deo natum

\hspace{1em} Verbum bonum et suave

\hspace{1em} Hodierne lux diei celebris

\textit{Mii3}

\textbf{Dicit Aristoteles}

Grates nune omnes

\hspace{1em} Eia recolamus
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Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Concentu parili
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Summi triumphum
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Caeli enarrant
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Benedicta semper sancta
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Laus tibi Christe qui ex creator
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Stirpe Maria
Omnis sancti seraphin
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Clare sanctorum senatus
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Ave praeclara maris stella
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Verbum bonum et suave
Hodiernae lux diei celebris
Sanctissimae virginis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Ad celebres rex (an additional piece)

$\textit{Kb2}$

\textbf{Dicit Aristoteles}
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Concentu parili
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Laudes salvatori voce
Victimae paschali
Summi triumphum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia

\textit{Ad celebres rex} (an additional piece)
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Summi triumphum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Exsultemus et laetemur et in Deo
Gloriosa fulget dies exsultet
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Stirpe Maria
Summi regis archangele
Ad celebres rex
Virginalis turma
Omnem sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gauda Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Clare sanctorum senatus
Agone triumphali
O beata beatorum
Dilectus Deo et hominibus
Exsultent filiae Sion
Ave praeclera maris stella

W72

Dicit Aristoteles
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Summi triumphum

Dicit Dominus ex Basan
Caeli enarrant
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Benedicta semper sancta
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Stirpe Maria
Omnem sancti seraphin
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Sospitati dedit aegros
Laudes crucis attollamus
Crux fidelis inter omnes
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Clare sanctorum senatus
Agone triumphali
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Ave praeclera maris stella
Verbum bonum et suave
Hodiernae lux diei celebris

Go1

Dicit Aristoteles
Benedicta semper sancta
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dicit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Victimae paschali
Agni paschalis esu
Summi triumphum
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
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Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Laudes crucis attollamus

Ad celebres rex
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Sospitati dedit aegros
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Clare sanctorum senatus
Agone triumphali
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Ave praecelara maris stella

Ad celebres rex caelece
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Sospitati dedit aegros
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Clare sanctorum senatus
Agone triumphali
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Ave praecelara maris stella

Edition 5:
The Vir speculativus branch

Kf4
Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
Vate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Victimae paschali
Agni paschalis esu
Sumnum triumphum
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Laudes crucis attollamus
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Summi regis archangele

Ad celebres rex
Virginalis turma
Omnès sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mitrít ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Verbum bonum et suave
Lactabundus exsulter fidelis chorus
Alleluia regem regum
Salve mater salvatoris
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Sospitati dedit aegros
Plausu chorus

Fr1

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Pangamus creatoris atque

Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Virgin Mariae laudes intonent christiani
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangele

(fr1)

Summi triumphum

Virginalis turma
Omnès sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mitrít ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Exsultent filiae Sion

(f4)

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
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nate Deus omnipotentiae
Laus tibi Christe cui sapit
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salutatoris voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
(A commentary with neither incipit nor lemmata. For Peter and Paul; probably: Petre summe Christe pastor)

Kf2

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Jesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salutatoris voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Virgini Mariae laudes intonent christiani
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christe pastor
Gratuletur orbitis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psalite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangele
Iucundare plebs
Virginalis turma
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laus et gloria Deo sit
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Psalat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Verbum bonum et suave
Hodiernae lux diei celebris
Laetabundus exsultet fidelis chorus
Alleluia regem regum
Ave praeclara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris

Kf5

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Jesu Christo
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletor mundus totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psalite regi nostro psallite
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Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangeli
Virginalis turma
Omnis sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gauda Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gauda Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praecerta maris stella
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
templum renovatio nova
Virgini Mariae laudes concinat
christiani O beata
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbun Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbun bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

Mvpt
Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saccula
Hanc concordi famularu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Victimae paschali
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus agne leo
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Virgini Mariae laudes intonent christiani
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbun Dei Deo natum
Summi regis archangeli
Ad celebres rex
Virginalis turma
Omnis sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gauda Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gauda Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Ave praecerta maris stella
(Commentary on an unidentified sequence for the Blessed Virgin. No incipit)
Laetabundus exsultet fidelis chorus
Alleluia regem regum
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Sospitati dedit aegros
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\textit{Mi4}

\textbf{Vir speculativus}
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Pangamus creatoris atque
Agni paschalis esu
Grates salvatori ac regi
Victimae paschali
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mundi renovatio nova
Mane prima sabbati
Virgini Mariae laudes intonent
christiani Eva tristis
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Summi triumphum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratulateur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stripe maria
Plausu chorus
Virginalis turma
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute

Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praecella maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clara sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum

\textbf{Ox2}

\textbf{Vir speculativus}
Grates nunc omnes
(a few blank leaves)

\textit{Mi4}

\textbf{Vir speculativus}
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
(from this text forward the commentaries lack incipits)
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Victimae paschali
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Virginis Mariae
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
(with incipit)
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Gratulateur orbis totus
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
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Stirpe maria (with incipit)
Plausu chorus

Ad celebres rex
Summi regis archangele
Virginalis turma
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Sanctissimae virginis

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratulateur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
(after this commentary, there
are a few columns, partly
mutilated, with unidentified text)
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe maria
Plausu chorus

Summi regis archangele
Ad celebres rex
Virginalis turma
Omnis sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mitrit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praecelara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O bea beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Hodieuae lux diei celebris

Vir speculativus
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Mundi renovatio nova
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratulateur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
(after this commentary, there
are a few columns, partly
mutilated, with unidentified text)
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe maria
Plausu chorus
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Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tih Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe maria
Plauzu chorus

Ad celebres rex
Summi regis archangele
Virginalis turma
Ommes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Sospitati dedit aegros
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mitter ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praecella maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Laetabundus exsultet
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Nativitas Mariae
Dies laeta celebratur
Iucundare plebs
Gratulare sponsa Christi
Uterus virgineus
Ad laudes salvatoris

Edition 6:
The Sapientia vincta malitiam branch

K/f
Sapientia vincta malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula

Hanc concordi famularu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tih Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Asi paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaco ... dic Maria
Mundi renovatio nova
Hacc est sancta sollemnitatis sollemnitatum
Virgini Mariae laudes intonent christiani
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assist nos gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorum
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tih Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe maria
Plauzu chorus
Summi regis archangelle

Ad celebres rex
Ommes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Sospitati dedit aegros
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mitter ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praecella maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
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Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

Go2

Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Mundi renovatio nova
Haec est sancta sollemnitias
(a few blank leaves)
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus

Ad celebres rex
Virginalis turma
Omnes superni ordines (a hymn)
Sacerdotem Chisti Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis

Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

Gr6

Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo … dic Maria
Mundi renovatio tenuit primordia
Haec est sancta sollemnitias sollemnitatum
Virgini Mariae laudes intonet christiani
Summi triumphant
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
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Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangelae
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gaude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Virginalis turma
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria regia
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangelae

Ad celebres rex
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Laude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

Kr1
Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi fadualatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaco ... Die Maria
Mundi renovatio nova
Haece est sancta sollemmitas
Virgini Mariae laudes concinant
christiani O beata
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assis nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta

Lauds mater salvatoris
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria regia
Plausu chorus
Summi regis archangelae

Mii2
(The first of two commentary collections)
Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi fadualatu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
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Mundi renovatio nova
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo ... dic Maria
Victimae paschali laudes
Haec est sancta sollemnis sollemnitatum
Virgini Mariae laudes intonent christiani
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Petre summe Christi pastor
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor sit
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus laetabundo
Summi regis archangeli
\textbf{Ad celebres rex}

Virginalis turma
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Lauda Christo debita
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Ave praeclara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion

\textit{Wiil}

\textbf{Sapientia vincit malitiam}
Grates nunc omnes
Grates nunc omnes

\textit{(a second time, now with interlinear
glosses but no continuous commentary)}

\textit{Eia recolamus}
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Johannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatori atque
Rex Deus Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo
Victimae paschali
Mundi renovatio nova
Haec est sancta sollemnis
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus laetabundo
\textbf{Ad celebres rex}

Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Lauda Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
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Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praelucra maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Virginalis turma
Ave virginalis forma

(neither interlinear glosses nor commentary)
Gloriosa fulget dies
(interlinear glosses but no commentary)
Gratuletur orbis totus
Prae hominum natis formosam
Profitentes uniam

(the last two pieces seem to be later additions)

(The pedagogical recension)

Er1

Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulant
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christo patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex regum Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo … dic Maria
Victimae paschali
Haec est sancta sollemnitatis sollemnitatum
Virginis Mariae laudes intonet christiani
Summi triumphant
Sancti spiritus assist nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae

Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christo qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psallit regi nostro psallit
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus laetabundo
Summi regis archangela

Ad celebres rex
Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gaude Christo debita
Psallit ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praelucra maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Laudes crucis attollamus
Salve crux sancta arbor
Salve crux sancta salve
Magnificent confessio

Mi1

Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulant
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
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Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex regum Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo ... dic Maria
Mundi renovatio nova
Haec est sancta sollemnitas sollemnatum
Virgini Mariae laudes
Summi triumphum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psalite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus laetabundo
Summi regis archangele

Ad celebres rex

Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gaude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mirit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclera maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Sospirati dedit aegros
Magnum te Michaelem
Laudes crucis attollamus
Salve crux sancta arbor
Salve crux sancta salve
Magnificent confessio
Verbum Dei Deo natum

Sg3

Sapientia vincit malitiam
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famularu
Iohannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiac
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentru parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Agni paschalis esu
Pangamus creatoris atque
Rex regum Dei agne
Mane prima sabbati
Surgit Christus cum tropaeo ... dic Maria
Mundi renovatio nova
Haec est sancta sollemnitas sollemnatum
Virgini Mariae laudes
Summi triumphum
Laudes crucis attollamus
Verbum Dei Deo natum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Gratuletur orbis totus
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Grates Deo et honor
Laurenti David
Congaudent angelorum
Psalite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria
Plausu chorus laetabundo
Summi regis archangele

Ad celebres rex

Omnes sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Sanctissimae virginis
Deus in tua virtute
Gaude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mirit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclera maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Sospirati dedit aegros
Magnum te Michaelem
Laudes crucis attollamus
Salve crux sancta arbor
Salve crux sancta salve
Magnificent confessio
Verbum Dei Deo natum

Deus in tua virtute
Sequence Repertories in the Edited Manuscripts

Gaude Christo debita
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
Mittit ad virginem non quemvis
Ave praeclara maris stella
Salve mater salvatoris
Verbum bonum et suave
Clare sanctorum senatus
Virginalis turma
O beata beatorum
Exsultent filiae Sion
Sospitati dedit aegros
Magnum te Michaelum

Edition 7

Mi5
Grates nunc omnes
Eia recolamus
Natus ante saecula
Hanc concordi famulatu
Johannes Iesu Christo
Laus tibi Christe patris optimi
nate Deus omnipotentiae
Festa Christi omnis christianitas
Dixit Dominus ex Basan
Concentu parili
Laudes salvatori voce
Pangamus creatoris atque
Agni paschalis esu
Haec est sancta sollemnitatem
Victimae paschali
Magnificent confessio
Summi triumphum
Sancti spiritus assit nobis gratia
Veni sancte spiritus
Benedicta semper sancta
Lauda Sion salvatorem
Sancti baptistae
Petre summe Christi pastor
Caeli enarrant
Laus tibi Christe qui es creator
Verbum sapientiae
Laurenti David

Congaudent angelorum
Psallite regi nostro psallite
Stirpe Maria

Ad celebres rex
Grates Deo et honor
Omnis sancti seraphin
Sacerdotem Christi Martinum
Gaude Sion quod egressus
Clare sanctorum senatus
Plausu chorus laetabundo
(no commentary)
O beata beatorum
(no commentary)
Agone triumphali
Exsultent filiae Sion
Ave praeclara maris stella
Ave Maria gratia plena
Laetabundus exsultet
Hodiernae lux diei celebris
Verbum bonum et suavum
Salve mater salvatoris
Psallat ecclesia mater illibata
De profundis tenebrarum
(no commentary)
Appendix 4a. Common errors and variants: Dicit Aristoteles

In the list the manuscripts are ordered alphabetically; in the instances of agreement they are ordered as in the apparatus criticus of the edition.

**Go1 + Gr1**
- 5 contingit[ convenit Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 20 quod om. Gr1 Mii3 Go1

**Go1 + Gr2**
- 8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 Wi2 Go1 Sg2

**Go1 + Kb2**
- 8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 Wi2 Go1 Sg2

**Go1 + Mii3**
- 1 Dicit prae. sicut Mii3 Go1
- 9 dicens] dict Mii3 Go1 Sg2
- 15 sectare] solare Mii3 Go1 Sg2
- 20 quod om. Gr1 Mii3 Go1

**Go1 + St2**
- 5 contingit[ convenit Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 22 operis] libri St2 Go1 Sg2

**Go1 + Sg2**
- 2 tamen om. Go1 Sg2
- 4 ipsa om. Go1 Sg2
- 5 contingit[ convenit Gr4 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 5 Theologia ... 7 felicem om. Go1 Sg2
- (sunt du même au même)
- 8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 Wi2 Go1 Sg2
- 9 dicens] dict Mii3 Go1 Sg2
- 9 convencio] conveniens Go1 Sg2
- 11 Quisquis] si quis Go1 Sg2
- 11 sectari] scientiam Go1 Sg2
- 12 imitaberis] imitabis Go1 Sg2
- 14 iusticia om. Go1 Sg2
- 15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 15 controversiam nectas] gratia vis

**communis iam Go1 Sg2**
- + 15 callidatatem] ex calliditate Go1 Sg2
- + 15 animi] cum Go1 Sg2
- + 15 sectare] solare Mii3 Go1 Sg2
- 18 quia] et Go1 Sg2
- 19 non respicient] non despicient Go1 Sg2
- 20 causas] dictas Go1 Sg2
- 22 operis] libri St2 Go1 Sg2
- 30 adepcio] adopcio Go1 Sg2

**Go1 + Wi2**
- 8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 Wi2 Go1 Sg2

**Gr1 + Gr2**
- 18 animalia om. Gr1 Gr2

**Gr1 + Kb2**
- 18 diecit om. Gr1 Kb2 Wi2
- 30 pertractantur] tractantur Gr1 Kb2 Wi2

**Gr1 + Mii3**
- 11 desiderat] desiderant tunc Mii3, + tune Gr1
- 20 quod om. Gr1 Mii3 Go1
- 28 iste liber om. Gr1 Mii3 St2

**Gr1 + St2**
- 5 contingat[ convenit Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 6 que faciunt] quia (ut vide Gr1) facit Gr1 St2
- 15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
- 23 theologice] theologice sciencie Gr1 St2
- 28 iste liber om. Gr1 Mii3 St2
- 30 per ... 34 etern] ut per istam scientiam
- 34 ad scientiam felicitatis eterne (eterne felicitatis St2) deveniamus (pervenire valeamus St2) Gr1 St2
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Gr1 + Sg2
5 contingit convenit Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2

Gr1 + Wi2
18 dicit om. Gr1 Kb2 Wi2
30 pertractantur tractantur Gr1 Kb2 Wi2

Gr2 + Kb2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 Wi2 Go1 Sg2
12 Sed] si Gr2 Kb2 W'2
19 non respiciunt despicuint Gr2 Kb2 W'2

Gr2 + Miü3
11 sectari] sectam Gr2 Miü3

Gr2 + St2
9 quod om. Gr2 St2

Gr2 + Sg2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 W'2 Go1 Sg2

Gr2 + Wi2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 W'2 Go1 Sg2
12 Sed] si Gr2 Kb2 W'2
19 non respiciunt despicuint Gr2 Kb2 W'2

Kb2 + Miü3
1 principio om. Miü3 Kb2

Kb2 + St2
9 est om. St2 Kb2

Kb2 + Sg2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 W'2 Go1 Sg2

Kb2 + Wi2
2 certitudinaliter] rectitudinem
 naturaliter Kb2 W'2
2 quod] quia Kb2 W'2
5 Theologia] sed ipsa theologia Kb2 W'2
7 precelit] precedit Kb2 W'2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 W'2 Go1 Sg2

9 nature] tacita negando Kb2 W'2
 + 9 convencio] conveniencia Kb2 W'2
10 Iusticia + enim Kb2 W'2
11 desiderat + ille Kb2 W'2
12 Sed] si Gr2 Kb2 W'2
12 ut2 + si Kb2 W'2
18 dicit om. Gr1 Kb2 W'2
19 non respiciunt despicuint Gr2 Kb2 W'2
25 efficiente + aliarum Kb2 W'2
25 sit … 28 utilis] scienza est (sit W'2)
 utilis et bona Kb2 W'2
27 est2 om. Kb2 W'2
30 pertractantur tractantur Gr1 Kb2 W'2
30 istam scieniam] ista situr Kb2 W'2
 + 30 adepcio] adaptacio Kb2 W'2

Miü3 + St2
4 quod om. Miü3 St2
7 artes] sciencias Miü3 St2
11 Quisquis] quam quis Miü3 St2
28 iste liber om. Gr1 Miü3 St2

Miü3 + Sg2
9 dicens] dicit Miü3 Go1 Sg2
15 sectare] solare Miü3 Go1 Sg2

Miü3 + Wi2
—

St2 + Sg2
5 contingit] convenit Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
15 nulla] mala Gr1 St2 Go1 Sg2
22 operis] libri St2 Go1 Sg2

St2 + Wi2
—

Sg2 + Wi2
8 ipsa om. Gr2 Kb2 W'2 Go1 Sg2
Appendix 4b. Common errors and variants: *Vir speculativus*

In the list the manuscripts are ordered alphabetically; in the instances of agreement they are ordered as in the *apparatus criticus* of the edition.

**Fr1 + Fr4**
- 2 tangitur *om. Fr1 Fr4*
- 7 sic *om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2a W74*
- 35 Minor patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4*
  - *Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a S2*
- 46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 59 id est] et *Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b*
- 35 Minor patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*

**Fr1 + Kf2**
- 10 patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Kf2*
- 19 destructionem] destructivum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 S2*
- 31 et cetera *om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2*
- 35 Minor patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 40 inexistente] inexistenti *Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a S2 Ox2b*
- 46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 48 perfectissimam] perfectissimum *Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a S2*
- 103 tytulus + talis *Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a S2 Ox2b*
- 103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 103 modulose] melodose *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*

**Fr1 + Kf5**
- 15 Sed … 16 viciorum *om. Fr1 Kf5 Ox2a (saut du même au même)*
- 19 destructionem] destructivum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 S2*
- 33 excellentiissimus] perfectissimus *Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 S2*
- 35 Minor patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 37 Avicebron] albicebrum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf3 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 52 proseque[n] persequens *Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 83 modulosa compositum] medolosa compositum *Fr1 Kf5*
- 87 tamen] cum *Fr1 Kf5*
- 103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 108 consequitur] sequitur *Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*

**Fr1 + Ma4**
- 31 et cetera *om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 35 Minor patet *om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 37 Avicebron] albicebrum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf3 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 52 proseque[n] persequens *Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 83 modulosa compositum] medolosa compositum *Fr1 Kf5*
- 87 tamen] cum *Fr1 Kf5*
- 103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
- 108 consequitur] sequitur *Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Ma4 Ox2a S2 Ox2b W74*
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103 modulose| melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2

Fr1 + Mü4
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mü4
Ox2a Sj2
58 verbo om. Fr1 Mü4
97 Ad … libri^2 om. Fr1 Mü4 Ox2a
(junt du même au même)
103 dictamen| liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5
Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
108 consequitur| sequitur Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a

Fr1 + Ox2a
15 Sed … 16 viciorum om. Fr1 Kf5 Ox2a
(junt du même au même)
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a Sj2
33 excellentiissimus| perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2
Kf5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistentes| inexistenti Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
46 moderari| moderare Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
48 perfectissimam| perfectissimum Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
51 sumit| sumat Fr1 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
52 prosequens| persequens Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Fr1 + Wi4
7 sic om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wi4
20 Sed … 21 cogitationam om. Fr1
Ox2b Wi4 (junt du même au même)
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
59 id est| et Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wi4
72 Habet … tres| hec autem theologia
habet tres Fr1 Kf2 Wi4

Fr4 + Kf2
4 dictur| dicit Fr4 Kf2
9 Maior + est Fr4 Kf2
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
46 moderari| moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4
Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
72 Habet … tres| hec autem theologia
habet tres Fr1 Kf2 Wi4

Fr1 + Sj2
19 destructionem| destructivum Kf4 Fr1
Kf2 Kf5 Sj2
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mü4
Ox2a Sj2
33 excellentiissimus| perfectissimus Fr1
Kf2 Kf3 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistentes| inexistenti Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
46 moderari| moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
48 perfectissimam| perfectissimum Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
51 sumit| sumat Fr1 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
52 prosequens| persequens Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
103 modulose| melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Fr1 + talis
103 tytulus + talis Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen| liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5
Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Fr1 + liber
103 tytulus + talis Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen| liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5
Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
Common Errors and Variants: Vir speculativus

Fr4 + Kf4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Wf4
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2
82 quod om. Kf4 Fr4
96 cum … 97 dicendum om. Kf4 Fr4
(not sunt du même au même)

Fr4 + Kf5
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Wf4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Wf4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Ma4
28 est excellentissimus] et cetera Fr4 Ma4 Wf4
34 eciam om. Fr4 Ma4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Wf4
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2
79 libri3 om. Fr4 Ma4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Mi4
7 Prima + conclusio Fr4 Mi4
59 datu] debeat Fr4 Mi4
62 dicit om. Fr4 Mi4
72 Quedam + enim Fr4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Ox2a
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2
72 Quedam + enim Fr4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Ox2b
7 sic om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wf4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4
59 id est] et Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wf4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Sf2
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Fr4 + Wi4
7 sic om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wf4
28 est excellentissimus] et cetera Fr4 Ma4 Wf4
33 est excellentissimus] et cetera Fr4 Wf4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4
59 id est] et Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wf4
72 Habet … tres] hec autem theologia habet tres Fr4 Kf2 Wf4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b Wf4

Kf2 + Kf4
10 patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
19 destructionem] destructivum Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Sf2
30 patet om. Kf4 Kf2
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4
41 probatur om. Kf4 Kf2
46 moderari] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2
103 modulose] melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Ox2a Sf2

Kf2 + Kf5
19 destructionem] destructivum Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Sf2
33 excellentissimus] perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4
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46 moderari\] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Kf2 + Ma4
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4
Ox2a Sj2
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
46 moderari\] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
69 omnes + alc Kf2 Ma4 Ox2b
84 dictur esse\] est Kf2 Ma4
102 Sed om. Kf2 Ma4
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
103 modulose] melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2

Kf2 + Mi4
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4
Ox2a Sj2
74 memore\] memorari Kf2 Mi4
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5
Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
+ 104 compositum\] compositus Kf2 Mi4

Kf2 + Ox2a
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sj2
33 excellentissimus\] perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2
Kf5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistente\] inexistenti Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
46 moderari\] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
48 perfectissimam] perfectissimum Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
103 modulose\] melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2

Kf2 + Ox2b
33 excellentissimus\] perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2
Kf5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
40 inexistente\] inexistenti Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
52 prosequens\] sequens Kf2 Ox2b Wi4
69 omnes + alc Kf2 Ma4 Ox2b
103 tytulus + talis Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Kf2 + Sj2
19 destructionem\] destructivum Kf4 Fr1
Kf2 Kf5 Sj2
20 destructionem\] destructivum Kf2 Sj2
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Sj2
33 excellentissimus\] perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2
Kf5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistente\] inexistenti Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
46 moderari\] moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
48 perfectissimam] perfectissimum Fr1 Kf2
Ox2a Sj2
103 tytulus + talis Fr1 Kf2 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
103 modulose\] melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2
Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
110 evangelium + et cetera Kf2 Sj2

Kf2 + Wi4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5
Ma4 Ox2b Wi4
52 prosequens\] sequens Kf2 Ox2b Wi4
72 Habet … tres\] hec autem theologia
habet tres Fr4 Kf2 Wi4
103 dictamen\] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4
Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4

Kf4 + Kf5
19 destructionem\] destructivum Kf4 Fr1
Kf2 Kf5 Sj2

Kf4 + Kf5
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35 Minor patet om. *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5*
   *Ma4 Ox2b Wf4*
37 Avicebron] albicebrum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf5 Ma4*
37 disputacionibus] speculacionibus *Kf4 Kf5*
46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
52 aptitudinem] habitudinem *Kf4 Kf5*
69 dictur] loquitur *Kf4 Kf5 Ox2a*
72 theologiam] om. *Kf4 Kf5*
75 est om. *Kf4 Kf5*
94 sint] sunt *Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b*

*Kf4 + Ma4*
35 Minor patet om. *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5*
   *Ma4 Ox2b Wf4*
37 Avicebron] albicebrum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf5 Ma4*
46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
54 notandum] scendam *Kf4 Ma4*
103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4*
   *Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wf4*

*Kf4 + Mi4*
94 sint] sunt *Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b*
106 ipsam] ipsa *Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a*
   *Ox2b Wf4*

*Kf4 + Ox2a*
46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
69 dictur] loquitur *Kf4 Kf5 Ox2a*
103 modulose] melodose *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2*
   *Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
106 ipsam] ipsa *Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a*
   *Ox2b Wf4*

*Kf4 + Ox2b*
35 Minor patet om. *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5*
   *Ma4 Ox2b Wf4*
94 sint] sunt *Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b*
106 ipsam] ipsa *Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a*
   *Ox2b Wf4*

*Kf4 + Sf2*
19 destructionem] destructivum *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Sf2*
46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
103 modulose] melodose *Kf4 Fr1 Kf2*
   *Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*

*Kf4 + Wi4*
35 Minor patet om. *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4*
106 ipsam] ipsa *Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a*
   *Ox2b Wf4*

*Kf5 + Mi4*
50 eciam] om. *Kf5 Mi4 Wf4*
52 sicud] sic *Kf5 Mi4*
55 quod] ut *Kf5 Mi4*
94 sint] sunt *Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b*
103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4*
   *Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wf4*
108 consequitur] sequitur *Fr1 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2a*

*Kf5 + Ox2a*
15 Sed … 16 viciorum om. *Fr1 Kf5 Ox2a*
   *(saut du même au même)*
33 excellentissimus] perfectissimus *Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b*
46 moderari] moderare *Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2*
   *Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2*
69 dictur] loquitur *Kf4 Kf5 Ox2a*
103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4*
   *Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wf4*
108 consequitur] sequitur *Fr1 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2a*

Kf5 + Mi4
50 eciam] om. *Kf5 Mi4 Wf4*
52 sicud] sic *Kf5 Mi4*
55 quod] ut *Kf5 Mi4*
94 sint] sunt *Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b*
103 dictamen] liber *Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4*
   *Mi4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wf4*
108 consequitur] sequitur *Fr1 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2a*
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Kf5 + Ox2b
33 excellentissimus perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b 35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4 94 sint sunt Kf4 Kf5 Mi4 Ox2b 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4

Kf5 + Sf2
19 destructionem destructivum Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Sf2 33 excellentissimus perfectissimus Fr1 Kf2 Kf5 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b 46 moderari[ moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 52 prosequeb] persequens Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 SJ2 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4

Kf5 + Wi4
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Wf4 50 eciam om. Kf5 Mi4 Wi4 89 et … 90 libri om. Kf5 Wi4 (saut du même au même) 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4

Ma4 + Mi4
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 47 sed ut patet Ma4 Mi4 100 ideor] igitur Ma4 Mi4 103 Dicendum est quod Ma4 Mi4 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Ma4 + Ox2a
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 46 moderari[ moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 51 sumit] sumat Fr1 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 103 modulose melodose Kf4 Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Ma4 + Ox2b
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4 69 omnes + aliae Kf2 Ma4 Ox2b 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Ma4 + Sf2
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 46 moderari[ moderare Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 51 sumit] sumat Fr1 Ma4 Ox2a SJ2 52 prosequeb] persequens Fr1 Kf5 Ma4 Sf2 83 modulosa compositum melodosa compositum Ma4 Sf2 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Ma4 + Wi4
15 omnium om. Ma4 Wf4 28 est excellentissimus et cetera Fr4 Ma4 Wf4 35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Mi4 + Ox2a
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2

Ma4 + Ox2b
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Ox2b Wf4 69 omnes + aliae Kf2 Ma4 Ox2b 103 dictamen liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2 Ox2b Wf4 106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a Ox2b Wf4

Mi4 + Ox2a
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kf2 Ma4 Mi4 Ox2a SJ2
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46 finis om. Mü4 Ox2a
72 Quedam + enim Fr4 Mü4 Ox2a
77 dictur om. Mü4 Ox2a Sf2
97 Ad ... libri? om. Fr4 Mü4 Ox2a
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4
108 consequitur] sequitur Fr1 Kj5
Mü4 Ox2a

Mü4 + Ox2b
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kj2 Ma4 Mü4
Ox2a Sj2
77 dictur om. Mü4 Ox2a Sj2
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4

Mü4 + Wi4
40 inexistente] existenti Mü4 Wi4
50 eciam om. Kj5 Mü4 Wi4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4

Ox2a + Ox2b
33 excellentissimus] perfectissimus Fr1
Kj2 Kj5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistente] existenti Fr1 Kj2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4

Ox2a + Sf2
31 et cetera om. Fr1 Kj2 Ma4 Mü4
Ox2a Sj2
33 excellentissimus] perfectissimus Fr1
Kj2 Kj5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistente] existenti Fr1 Kj2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
46 moderari] moderare Kj4 Fr1 Fr4 Kj2
Kj5 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
48 perfectissimam] perfectissimum Fr1 Kj2
Ox2a Sj2
51 sumit] sumat Fr1 Ma4 Ox2a Sj2
55 quod] sicud Ox2a Sj2
77 dictur om. Mü4 Ox2a Sj2
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2a Sj2

Ox2a + Wi4
34 ex om. Ox2a Wi4
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4

Ox2b + Sf2
33 excellentissimus] perfectissimus Fr1
Kj2 Kj5 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b
40 inexistente] existenti Fr1 Kj2 Ox2a
Sj2 Ox2b
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kj2 Kj5 Ma4
Mü4 Ox2a Sj2 Ox2b Wi4
106 ipsam] ipsa Kj4 Ma4 Mü4 Ox2a
Ox2b Wi4

Ox2b + Wi4
3 scientiae] scientifique Ox2b Wi4
4 formo duas] ponuntur due Ox2b Wi4
6 conclusio] est hec Ox2b Wi4
7 sic om. Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b Wi4
9 consists] est Ox2b Wi4
18 inventrix] invencio Ox2b Wi4
20 Sed ... 21 cogitacionum om. Fr1
Ox2b Wi4 (saut du même au même)
APPENDIX 4b

29 sibi om. Ox2b W4√
35 Minor patet om. Kf4 Fr1 Fr4 Kf2
Kf5 Ms4 Ox2b W4√
37 Avicebron] albertum Ox2b W4√
37 disputacionibus] dispositionibus
Ox2b W4√
40 recipit + sibi Ox2b W4√
48 perfectissimam] perfectiorem (ut vid.)
Ox2b W4√
51 sumit] habet Ox2b W4√
51 omnis] homo Ox2b W4√
52 prosequens] sequens Kf2 Ox2b W4√
58 verbo] vero Ox2b W4√
59 ad est] et Fr1 Fr4 Ox2b W4√
67 ipsa om. Ox2b W4√
80 libri om. Ox2b W4√
82 dicamus] dicimus Ox2b W4√
85 parciam] precium Ox2b (ut vid.) W4√
85 forma] causa Ox2b W4√
91 doctores om. Ox2b W4√
92 de tempore om. Ox2b W4√
93 unde] sed Ox2b W4√
100 manet … Deo] irremuneratum manet
a deo Ox2b (in remuneratum) W4√
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ms4
Ms4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b W4√
106 ipsam] ipsa Kf4 Ms4 Ms4 Ox2a
Ox2b W4√
106 unde] cum Ox2b W4√

Sf2 + W4√
103 dictamen] liber Fr1 Fr4 Kf2 Kf5 Ms4
Ms4 Ox2a Sf2 Ox2b W4√
Appendix 4c. Common errors and variants: *Sapientia vincit malitiam*

The manuscripts are listed in alphabetical order, with the exception of the pedagogical recension under *Er1*, which is there listed together at the end. In the instances of agreement they are ordered as in the *apparatus criticus* of the edition.

### Er1 + Go2
- 65 sit est *Ga2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1*
- 66 alie + scientie *Ga2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1*
- 78 alie + scientie *Ga2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1*
- 85 aliarum + scieniarum *Ga2 Er1 Mü1*
- 101 tibi + o *Ga2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 142 autem om. *Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 165 sit est *Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*

### Er1 + Mü2
- 65 sit est *Ga2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1*
- 29 dicitur + sed *Mü2 Er1 Mü1*
- 35 considerat + sed *Mü2 Er1 Mü1*
- 50 sit hec om. *Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 73 alie + scientie *Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 78 alie + scientie *Ga2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1*
- 133 eius om. *Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 158 Sed] et *Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 170 Incipit om. *Mü2 Wi1 Er1*

### Er1 + Gr6
- 30 sapientis om. *Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 65 sit est *Ga2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1*
- 84 vincti] vicit *Gr6 Er1*
- 96 scilicet om. *Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1*
- 124 ipsa om. *Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 133 eciam om. *Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 147 vicerit] vicit *Gr6 Kf1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3*
- 149 ad om. *Gr6 Er1 Mü1*
- 154 humilitas + vicit *Gr6 Er1 Mü1*
- 154 superbiam + et dicitur troplolycus a tropos quod est mos (mores Gr6) vcl conversio et logos sermo quasi sermo ad mores nostros conversus *Gr6 Er1 Mü1*
- 156 tribulaciones + huius *Gr6 Mü1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 158 Sed] et *Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 170 dicendum est] dicitur *Gr6 Er1*

### Er1 + Kf1
- 124 ipsa om. *Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 133 principaliter om. *Kf1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 140 eius om. *Kf1 Er1 Mü1*

### Er1 + Kr1
- 147 vicerit] vicit *Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3*
- 165 scilicet om. *Ga2 Kr1 Er1*

### Er1 + Mü1 + Sg3
- 6 merito past] theologa (lin. 5) *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 15 scilicet + ipsum *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 16 posse om. *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 17 et ipsa] ipsa enim sapiencia *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 18 scieniarum + et ad eam omnes alie scientie ordinantur et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 18 posuit] tangitur *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 23 sapientis + et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 24 sumitur] sumuntur *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 24 sive + ab *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 30 sapientis om. *Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 32 bene dicebat] dicit *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 42 enim om. *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 48 faciendo + et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*

### The pedagogical recension
**Er1 + Mü1 + Sg3**
- 6 merito past] theologa (lin. 5) *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 15 scilicet + ipsum *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 16 posse om. *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 17 et ipsa] ipsa enim sapiencia *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 18 scieniarum + et ad eam omnes alie scientie ordinantur et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 18 posuit] tangitur *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 23 sapientis + et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 24 sumitur] sumuntur *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 24 sive + ab *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 30 sapientis om. *Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 32 bene dicebat] dicit *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 42 enim om. *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
- 48 faciendo + et *Er1 Mü1 Sg3*
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50 sit hec om. Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
53 Neque … 54 evangeliio om. Er1 Mü1 Sg3
54 supplie om. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
56 menciens| mendaces Er1 Mü1 Sg3
60 quinta| sexta Er1 Mü1 Sg3
62 et … ipsa| quare ipsa Er1 Mü1 Sg3
65 sit| est Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
68 sapientes| mendaces Er1 Mü1 Sg3
70 Primo … creat| prima omnium
71 et| item Er1 Mü1 Sg3
73 alie + scientia Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
74 est om. Er1 Mü1 Sg3
76 ipsa om. Er1 Mü1 Sg3
90 primus| primo Er1 Mü1 Sg3
91 prius| scientia Er1 Mü1 Sg3
101 et| item Er1 Mü1 Sg3
111 erat| scientia Er1 Mü1 Sg3
118 eius om. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis| auctoritate
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
124 nobilitatem + theologiam Er1 Mü1 Sg3
126 est post efficiens Er1 Mü1 Sg3
133 eius om. Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
139 ipsa + theologiam Er1 Mü1 Sg3
139 ipsa scientia| illam scientiam Er1 Mü1 Sg3
139 inventar| inventam Er1 Mü1, non leg. Sg3
139 errore| errem Er1 Mü1, non leg. Sg3
142 autem om. Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
142 in theologiam| eius Er1 Mü1 Sg3
147 viceret| vicerit Gr6 Er1 Mü1 (ut vidit) Sg3
148 geste … narracio| narratio (ut vit, Sg3) rei
geste Er1 Mü1 Sg3
153 tribulationes + huius Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
158 Sed| et Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
159 quasi … 160 exposition| sive exposition quasi duecio sursum Er1 Mü1 Sg3
162 Causa + igitas Er1 Mü1 Sg3
163 eius| dei Er1 Mü1 Sg3
165 et + forma tractandi Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
165 ista| forma tractatur Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
168 omnes + alic Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 Dicendum + est Er1 Mü1 Sg3

Er1 + Mü1 (where not Sg3)
8 propter quod| pro quo Er1 Mü1
14 dicitur| dicimus Er1 Mü1
28 hec om. Er1 Mü1
29 dicitur + sed Mü2 Er1 Mü1
34 sit hec| est Er1 Mü1
35 considerat + sed Mü2 Er1 Mü1
50 nullo … 51 falsitas| nullius falsitate
mendacii Er1 Mü1
51 dicitur + sed Er1 Mü1
52 probatur| eciam patet Er1 Mü1
65 prima … dicitur| prima est omnium
scientiarum alienarum Er1 Mü1
66 alie2 + scientiae Gr6 Er1 Mü1
78 alie + scientiae Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1
87 alienarum + scientiarum Gr6 Er1 Mü1
88 condemnaver| sed Er1 Mü1
90 Sed| om. Er1 Mü1
91 minori| minore Er1 Mü1
96 scilicet om. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
96 eciam post probatur Er1 Mü1
98 ista om. Er1 Mü1
104 supernus| summum Er1 Mü1
105 Secundo + modo Er1 Mü1
121 sue om. Er1 Mü1
123 certi| certe Wi1 Er1 Mü1
131 eius … eciam| eciam est Er1 Mü1
134 in theologiam om. Er1 Mü1
140 eius om. Kf1 Er1 Mü1
149 ad| ad Gr6 Er1 Mü1
154 humilitas + vicit Gr6 Er1 Mü1
154 superbia + et dicitur tropoloycus a
tropos quod est mos (mores Gr6) vel conversio
et logos sermo quasi sermo ad mores nostros
versus Gr6 Er1 Mü1
165 specialis om. Er1 Mü1
169 quod om. Er1 Mü1
Common Errors and Variants: Sapientia vincit malitiam

Er1 + Sg3 (where not Mü1)
40 sit hec] est Er1 Sg3
66 sit hec] est Er1 Sg3
168 part] parte Wi1 Er1 Sg3

Go2 + Gr6
65 sit] est Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
73 ordinentur] ordinantur Go2 Gr6 Mü2
83 in om. Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Mü2
115 sit] sunt Go2 Gr6
106 inesse quod] quod Kf1 Gr6 Kr1, quia Go2
117 tamen] enim Go2 Gr6 Mü2
123 auctoritate] auctoritate Kf1 Go2 Gr6
123 racioni] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
145 historicus] historicus Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1

Go2 + Kf1
14 posse om. Kf1 Go2
20 theologiam … nominari] theologiam merito sapientia denominari Kf1 (nominari) Go2
3 in om. Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Mü2
88 huiusmodi] huius Kf1 Go2
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
106 inesse quod] quod Kf1 Gr6 Kr1, quia Go2
113 venerem] venerem Kf1 Go2 Mü2 Wi1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis] auctoritate divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
123 auctoritate] auctoritate Kf1 Go2 Gr6
123 racioni] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
145 historicus] historicus Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1
146 historicus] historicus Kf1 Go2

Go2 + Kr1
5 sapiencie] sapiencia Go2 Kr1 Mü2
89 Philosophum + in Go2 Kr1 Wi1
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
106 inesse quod] quod Kf1 Gr6 Kr1, quia Go2
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis] auctoritatiss divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
123 racioni] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
137 sole] sola Go2 Kr1
138 pertractans] tractans Go2 Kr1
145 historicus] historicus Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1
147 qualiter om. Go2 Kr1
165 scilicet om. Go2 Kr1 Er1

Go2 + Mü1
65 sit] est Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
66 alie2 + scientie Go2 Er1 Mü1
73 alie + scientie Go2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1
87 aliarum + scientiarum Go2 Er1 Mü1
101 tibi + o Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
123 racioni] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
142 autem om. Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
165 et + forma tractandi Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
+ 165 ista] forma tractatus Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3

Go2 + Mü2
5 sapiencie] sapiencia Go2 Kr1 Mü2
16 est om. Go2 Mü2
18 Ethicorum] elencorum Go2 Mü2
73 ordinentur] ordinantur Go2 Gr6 Mü2
73 decimo] tercio Go2 Mü2
78 alie + scientie Go2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1
78 Sic] scit Go2 Mü2
83 in om. Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Mü2
99 reprimit + vicia et Go2 Mü2
102 conspectu + domini Go2 Mü2 Wi1
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
111 quia] quod Go2 Mü2 Wi1
113 venerem] venerem Kf1 Go2 Mü2 Wi1
114 assumpta praem. et Go2 Mü2
117 tamen] enim Go2 Gr6 Mü2
119 in] om. Go2 Mü2 Wi1
128 afflatum] afflatu Go2 Mü2

Go2 + Sg3
96 eciam om. Go2 Sg3
101 tibi + o Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
119 eaj] eo Go2 Sg3
131 eus … eciam] est Go2 Sg3
142 autem om. Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
165 et + forma tractandi Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
+ 165 ista] forma tractatus Go2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3

Go2 + Wi4
65 sit] est Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
89 Philosophum + in Go2 Kr1 Wi1
102 conspectu + domini Go2 Mü2 Wi1
111 quia] quod Go2 Mü2 Wi1
113 venerem] venerem Kf1 Go2 Mü2 Wi1
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Gr6 + Mü2
119 in una Gua Mü2 Wi1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis] auctoritatis divine inspiracione Kf1 Ga2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
Gr6 + Kr1
10 Secunda] secundum Kf1 Gr6 Wi1
83 in una. Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Mü2
106 inesse quod] quod Kf1 Gr6 Kr1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis] auctoritatis divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
Gr6 + Kg1
10 Secunda] secundum Kf1 Gr6 Wi1
117 tamen] enim Ga2 Gr6 Mü2
156 dicendo auctitale, et Ga2 Gr6 Mü2
157 devicerunt] vicerunt Gr6 Mü2
158 Sed] et Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
Gr6 + Sg3
37 considerat] considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
111 libello] libro Gr6 Mü1 Sg3
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
147 vicirvit] vicit Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3
Gr6 + Mü1
4 efficacia] efficacio Gr6 Mü1
30 sapientis om. Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
57 dicurit + sed Gr6 Mü1
65 sit] est Ga2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
96 sielciit om. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
111 libello] libro Gr6 Mü1 Sg3
123 racione] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
133 eciam om. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
147 vicirvit] vicit Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3
149 ad om. Gr6 Er1 Mü1
154 humilitas + vicirvit Gr6 Er1 Mü1
154 superbia + et dicirur tropoloycus a tropos quod est mos (mores Gr6) vel conversio et logos sermo quasi sermo ad mores nostros conversus Gr6 Er1 Mü1
156 tribulaciones + hius Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
158 Sed] et Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
Gr6 + Wi4
10 Secunda] secundum Kf1 Gr6 Wi1
10 Terea] tercium Gr6 Wi1
40 considerat] considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
47 atringit + et Gr6 Wi1
65 sit] est Ga2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
73 decimo] quarto Gr6 Wi1
77 caput … scienariam] aliarum scienariam caput Gr6 Kr1 Wi1
Gr6 + Kr1
37 considerat] considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
111 libello] libro Gr6 Mü1 Sg3
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
147 vicirvit] vicit Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3
156 tribulaciones + hius Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
158 Sed] et Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
Kf1 + Kr1
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
106 inesse quod] quod Kf1 Gr6 Kr1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis] auctoritatis divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
123 racione] racione Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
Common Errors and Variants: Sapientia vincit malitiam

128 afflatum\[ aflatu Kf1 Gr6 Kr1
145 hystoricus\[ hystoriacus Kf1 Ga2 Gr6 Kr1

\textbf{Kf1 + Mü1}
123 racioni\[ racione Kf1 Ga2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
133 principalitez om. Kf1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
140 eius om. Kf1 Er1 Mü1

\textbf{Kf1 + Mü2}
83 in om. Kf1 Go2 Gr6 Mü2
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
113 veneres\[ veneris Kf1 Go2 Mü2 Wi1

\textbf{Kf1 + Sg3}
111 suo … pomo\[ de pomo Kf1 Sg3
124 ipsa om. Kf1 Gr6 Mü2
133 principalitez om. Kf1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
145 est om. Kf1 Sg3

\textbf{Kf1 + Wi4}
10 Secunda\[ secundum Kf1 Gr6 Wi4
113 veneres\[ veneris Kf1 Go2 Mü2 Wi1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis\[ auctoritatis divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1
143 Modus … 144 laudativus om. Kf1 Wi1
(sunt du même au même)

\textbf{Kr1 + Mü1}
96 vincat\[ vicit Kr1 Mü1
123 racioni\[ racione Kf1 Ga2 Gr6 Kr1 Mü1
147 vicerat\[ vicit Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3

\textbf{Kr1 + Mü2}
5 sapienci\[ sapiencia Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
105 inesse + et Kf1 Go2 Kr1 Mü2
164 omnes om. Kf1 Mü2

\textbf{Kr1 + Sg3}
147 vicerat\[ vicit Gr6 Kr1 Er1 Mü1 (ut vid.) Sg3

\textbf{Kr1 + Wi4}
1 malicia\[ cetera Kr1 Wi1
77 caput … scienciarum\[ aliarum

\textbf{Kr1 + Mü2}
89 Philosophum\[ in Go2 Kr1 Wi1
122 auctoritate … inspiracionis\[ auctoritatis divine inspiracione Kf1 Go2 Kr1 (ut vid.) Wi1

\textbf{Mü1 + Mü2}
20 dicitor\[ sed Mü2 Er1 Mü1
35 considerat\[ sed Mü2 Er1 Mü1
50 sit hunc\[ sit Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
56 sit hunc\[ sit Mü1 Mü2
73 alie + scientie Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
78 alie + scientie Go2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1
133 eius\[ om. Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
158 sed\[ et Go2 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur\[ supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3

\textbf{Mü1 + Sg3 (where not Er1)};
(see also the pedagogical recension Er1 + Mü1 + Sg3)
45 declarando\[ declining Mü1 Sg3
60 patuit\[ in patet ex Mü1 Sg3
62 de seipsa\[ part Sapiencia Mü1 Sg3
97 quel\[ qui Mü1 Sg3
111 libello\[ libro Gr6 Mü1 Sg3
111 ubi + sic Mü1 Sg3
169 philosophic\[ + subordinatur vel Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur\[ supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3

\textbf{Mü1 + Wi4}
54 supple\[ om. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
65 sit\[ este Go2 Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
77 cognicionem\[ conditionem Wi1 Mü1
96 scilicet\[ om. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1
118 eius\[ om. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
123 certij\[ certe Wi1 Er1 Mü1
133 ecciam\[ om. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur\[ supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3

\textbf{Mü2 + Sg3}
37 considerat\[ considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
50 sit hunc\[ sit Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
67 et cetera\[ om. Mü2 Sg3
73 alie + scientie Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
133 eius\[ om. Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
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142 suus om. Mü2 Sg3
158 Sed] et Gr6 Mü2 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
170 sequenciarum + et cetera Mü2 (at vid.) Sg3

**Mü2 + Wi4**

37 consideret] considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
91 primus] prius Mü2 Wi1
102 conspectu + domini Ga2 Mü2 Wi1
111 quia] quod Ga2 Mü2 Wi1
112 mortificavit] mortificat Mü2 Wi1
113 veneris] veneris Kf1 Ga2 Mü2 Wi1
119 in\(^1\) am. Ga2 Mü2 Wi1
128 et sic] ac Mü2 Wi1
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
170 Incepit am. Mü2 Wi1 Er1

**Sg3 + Wi4**

37 consideret] considerat Gr6 Mü2 Wi1 Sg3
49 factionis] factorum Wi1 Sg3
54 supplere am. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
118 eius am. Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
133 eciam am. Gr6 Wi1 Er1 Mü1 Sg3
168 part] parte Wi1 Er1 Sg3
169 supponatur] supponitur Gr6 Mü2
Wi1 Mü1 Sg3
INDICES

Index nominum et rerum

In this select vocabulary are listed characteristic words from the edited sequence commentaries.¹ On account of the angelic theme of Ad celebres rex, the words angelus, arcbangelus and their derivatives are too ubiquitous to be incorporated here. Words from the sequence text itself are, with a few exceptions, excluded from this index. The spelling of words in this index has been standardised. References are made to lines in the editions, the texts of which are further specified with Prol. and Exp. respectively when necessary.

Abraham
accantus, -us m.
acephalus, -a, -um
adverbium, -i n.
Aegyptus
agalma, -atis n.
Albertus
algama vide agalma
Algazel
allegoria, -ae f.; -icus, -a, -um; -ce;
Alleluia
Ambrosius
anagoge, -es f.;
anagogicus, -a, -um; -ce
Analytica posteriora
anima, -ae f.

¹ The following dictionaries have been consulted: DBr, DU CANGE, L&S, La, LN, MLW, NGML and OLD.
animal, -alis m.  

antinus, -i m.  

an motto, -are  

anthropomorphita, 

Antichristus  

animal, -alis m.  

antiphona, -ae f.  

antistropha, -ae f.  

antonomas(t)ice  

Apostolica  

Aristoteles  

artem, -tis f.  

articulo, -i n.  

assisto, -ere  

au tor, -oris m.  

au toritas, -atis f.  

Augustinus  

au tor vi d auct or  

Averroes  

Avicennas (?)  

Bernardus  

Beschel  

Boethius  

bonitas, -atis f.  

cael estis, -is, -e
Index nominum et rerum

334, 361, 363; Ed. 2: 40, 67, 68, 79, 133; Ed. 3: 65, 66, 90, 143, 144, 156, 169; Ed. 4: Exp.: 23, 39; Ed. 5: Exp.: 7, 13, 53, 78, 122, 123, 204, 211, 221, 243, 251, 259, 286; Ed. 6: ProL: 155; Ed. 6: Exp.: 17, 69, 110, 111, 172, 179, 191, 213; Ed. 7: 10, 54, 103, 111

cano, -ere

Ed. 1: Exp.: 4; Ed. 2: 212; Ed. 3: 6, 7, 9, 69, 70, 120; Ed. 4: Exp.: 7; Ed. 5: Exp.: 32, 237; Ed. 6: Exp.: 2; Ed. 7: 23

canticum, -i n.

Ed. 1: ProL: 1–5, 8, 9, 12–15; Ed. 1: Exp.: 330, 367; Ed. 2: 7, 70, 80, 220; Ed. 3: 43; Ed. 4: Exp.: 195; Ed. 5: ProL: 76

canto, -are

Ed. 1: Exp.: 362; Ed. 2: 2, 5, 79; Ed. 3: 27, 54, 227; Ed. 4: Exp.: 230; Ed. 5: ProL: 106; Ed. 5: Exp.: 2, 39, 43, 293; Ed. 6: Exp.: 37, 207, 220; Ed. 7: 125

cantus, -us m.

Ed. 1: ProL: 14; Ed. 1: Exp.: 11, 30; Ed. 2: 210, 219; Ed. 3: 26; Ed. 4: Exp.: 6; Ed. 5: Exp.: 9, 48, 50, 58; Ed. 6: Exp.: 11, 45, 46; Ed. 7: 12, 31, 33

carmen, -inis n.

Ed. 3: 33, 63; Ed. 4: Exp.: 15

casus, -us m.

Ed. 4: Exp.: 5, 15

causa, -ae f.

Ed. 1: Exp.: 133, 135, 136, 162, 219, 227; Ed. 4: ProL: 20, 21; Ed. 5: Exp.: 97; Ed. 6: ProL: 11, 34, 37, 124, 161, 162; Ed. 6: Exp.: 90

causa efficiens

Ed. 4: ProL: 24, 25; Ed. 5: ProL: 91; Ed. 6: ProL: 126, 134, 163

causa finalis

Ed. 4: ProL: 29; Ed. 5: ProL: 89; Ed. 6: ProL: 133, 134, 167

causa formalis

Ed. 1: Exp.: 160; Ed. 4: ProL: 26; Ed. 5: ProL: 84; Ed. 6: ProL: 142, 164

causa materialis

Ed. 1: Exp.: 160; Ed. 5: ProL: 80, 82; Ed. 6: ProL: 131, 134, 162

causaliissimus, -a, -um

Ed. 1: Exp.: 162

certitudo, -inis f.

Ed. 6: ProL: 121, 161

character, -eris m.

Ed. 1: Exp.: 87, 95; Ed. 3: 50

cherarchia ride hierarchia

chorus, -i m.


Cicero

Ed. 5: ProL: 17

clando, -ere

Ed. 3: 9, 68–74

clangor, -oris m.

Ed. 3: 69, 71

cognitio, -onis f.

Ed. 2: 108; Ed. 4: ProL: 29; Ed. 4: Exp.: 71, 109; Ed. 5: ProL: 11, 37, 89, 98; Ed. 5: Exp.: 144, 147; Ed. 6: ProL: 77, 133,
INDICES

collectio, -onis f.  

Commentator vide Averroes

communis, -is, -e  

comparo, -are  

compono, -ere  

comportio, -onis² f.  

compositio, -onis f.  

compositus, -a, -um  

conclusio, -onis f.  

concordia, -ae f.  

condicio, -onis f.  

consequens,  

consequor, -sequi  

consonantia, -ae f.  

consortium, -i n.  

contemplatio, -onis f.  

contemplor, -ari  

creatio, -onis f.  

creator, -oris m.  

Daniel  

De anima  

De pomo  

De sophisticis elenches  

decalogus, -i m.  

² This word is marked with a ? in MLW and explained as meaning 'plena portio, summa'. Compare also the word comportionarius, -ii, 'one who shares a portion (eccl.)' in DBr.
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devotio, -onis f.

dictamen, -inis n.

differentia, -ae f.

diminutivus, -a, -um

Dionysius

doctor, -oris m.

doctrina, -ae f.

dominium, -i n.

Donatus

Dori(c)us, -a, -um

Eberhardus Bethunensis

ecclesia, -ae f.

Ecclesiastes

egyptus vide Aegyptus ens, entis n.

epiphania, -ae f.

error, -oris m.

essentia, -ae f.

essentialis, -is, -e

Ethica

etymologia, -ae f.
etymologice
etymologizo, -are

Eustratius

evangelista, -ae m.
evangelium, -ii n.
exemplar, -aris n.

Exodus

expositio, -onis f.
existo, -ere

dionysius

dictamen, -inis n. 

differentia, -ae f. 

diminutivus, -a, -um

Doctor, -oris m. 

Doctrina, -ae f. 

Dominium, -i n. 

Donatus

Dori(c)us, -a, -um

Eberhardus Bethunensis

Ecclesia, -ae f.

Ecclesiastes

Egyptus vide Aegyptus ens, entis n.

Epiphania, -ae f.

Error, -oris m.

Essentia, -ae f.

Essentialis, -is, -e

Ethica

Etymologia, -ae f.

Etymologice

Etymologizo, -are

Eustratius

Evangelista, -ae m.

Evangelium, -ii n.

Exemplar, -aris n.

Exodus

Expositio, -onis f.

Existo, -ere

Ed. 3: 59, 70, 236

Ed. 5: Prol.: 82, 103

Ed. 1: Exp.: 93, 99, 144, 145, 149, 150, 249; Ed. 4: Exp.: 194

Ed. 2: 187; Ed. 4: Exp.: 148; Ed. 5: Exp.: 189

Ed. 2: 12; Ed. 4: Exp.: 57, 126; Ed. 5: Exp.: 91; Ed. 6: Exp.: 83

Ed. 4: Exp.: 205, 210; Ed. 5: Prol.: 18; Ed. 5: Exp.: 267, 269;

Ed. 6: Prol.: 23, 24; Ed. 6: Exp.: 224, 226; Ed. 7: 147, 148

Ed. 1: Exp.: 69–71, 75

Ed. 1: Exp.: 271

Ed. 2: 216; Ed. 3: 229, 230

Ed. 5: Exp.: 77

Ed. 1: Prol.: 20, 28; Ed. 2: 7, 84; Ed. 3: 6, 8, 14, 26, 56, 198;

Ed. 4: Exp.: 19, 23, 27; Ed. 5: Exp.: 22; Ed. 6: Exp.: 126, 129, 150; Ed. 6: Exp.: 27

Ed. 3: 45

Ed. 6: Prol.: 4, 80

Ed. 2: 67; Ed. 3: 52; Ed. 5: Prol.: 29, 30, 38

Ed. 6: Prol.: 82, 85, 88, 94

Ed. 2: 160; Ed. 3: 108, 177, 178; Ed. 5: Exp.: 207, 208, 247, 249; Ed. 6: Prol.: 31; Ed. 6: Exp.: 175, 176; Ed. 7: 107

Ed. 1: Exp.: 301

Ed. 5: Prol.: 34, 48, 56, 57, 62; Ed. 6: Prol.: 18, 74

Ed. 6: Exp.: 46

Ed. 1: Exp.: 265

Ed. 5: Exp.: 188; Ed. 6: Exp.: 161

Ed. 5: Prol.: 58

Ed. 4: Exp.: 206, 210; Ed. 5: Exp.: 268, 269; Ed. 6: Exp.: 225, 226; Ed. 7: 147, 149

Ed. 3: 32; Ed. 5: Prol.: 107, 110

Ed. 4: Exp.: 66; Ed. 5: Exp.: 98; Ed. 6: Exp.: 91

Ed. 4: Exp.: 220, 221; Ed. 6: Exp.: 228

Ed. 1: Prol.: 1, 3, 17; Ed. 1: Exp.: 124; Ed. 4: Exp.: 37; Ed. 5: Exp.: 87; Ed. 6: Exp.: 41, 79

Ed. 1: Prol.: 3; Ed. 2: 81; Ed. 6: Prol.: 152, 160

Ed. 2: 67, 69, 117; Ed. 4: Exp.: 68; Ed. 5: Exp.: 63, 146, 194,
INDICES

207, 208, 245–248; Ed. 6: ProL: 156; Ed. 6: Exp.: 135, 176;
Ed. 7: 16, 72, 107, 109

exsultatio, -onis f. Ed. 1: ProL: 5, 6; Ed. 3: 44, 60

felicitas, -atis f. Ed. 4: ProL: 17, 30; Ed. 5: ProL: 47, 48; Ed. 6: ProL: 75, 168
felix, -icis Ed. 4: ProL: 3–8; Ed. 5: ProL: 58, 59

firmamentum, -i n. Ed. 1: Exp.: 19
forma, -ae f. Ed. 1: Exp.: 105, 106, 119; Ed. 2: 9; Ed. 3: 97, 137, 140;
Ed. 4: Exp.: 69,
forma tractandi Ed. 4: ProL: 26; Ed. 5: ProL: 84, 85; Ed. 6: ProL: 166
forma tractatus Ed. 4: ProL: 26, 28; Ed. 6: ProL: 165
formalis, -e vide causa formalis

Frigius vide Phrygius

gaudium, -ii n. Ed. 1: ProL: 16; Ed. 1: Exp.: 27; Ed. 3: 39, 42, 47, 58, 75

generatio, -onis f. Ed. 1: Exp.: 316

Genesis Ed. 1: Exp.: 140; Ed. 2: 30; Ed. 4: Exp.: 52, 103

Genius, -a, -um Ed. 1: Exp.: 139, 140

gerarchia vide hierarchia
glossa, -ae f. Ed. 2: 62; Ed. 4: Exp.: 22, 51, 104, 105, 147, 170, 177, 182,
222, 231

Græcismus Ed. 5: Exp.: 51
Græcsista vide Eberhardus Bethunensis

Græcus, -a, -um; -ce Ed. 1: Exp.: 222; Ed. 2: 22, 121, 210; Ed. 3: 46, 165, 230;
Ed. 4: Exp.: 38, 64; Ed. 5: Exp.: 38, 48; Ed. 6: Exp.: 43, 45, 122; Ed. 7: 26, 31

grammaticus, -i m. Ed. 3: 22, 23

Gregorius Ed. 4: ProL: 24; Ed. 4: Exp.: 37, 91, 106, 128, 137, 181;
Ed. 5: ProL: 91; Ed. 5: Exp.: 12, 78, 128, 281; Ed. 6: ProL:
118, 127, 164; Ed. 6: Exp.: 16, 67, 69, 116

Grosseteste Ed. 5: ProL: 45

harmonia, -ae f. Ed. 1: Exp.: 6, 339, 340; Ed. 2: 71; Ed. 3: 79, 219; Ed. 4:
Exp.: 198, 204; Ed. 5: Exp.: 259, 285; Ed. 6: Exp.: 212;
Ed. 7: 133

Hebraeus, -a, -um Ed. 2: 149, 156; Ed. 3: 45, 164

hierarchia, -ae f. Ed. 1: Exp.: 67, 68, 70, 72, 76–84; Ed. 2: 12, 13, 24; Ed. 3:
18, 181–197, 215; Ed. 5: Exp.: 123–125, 134, 141; Ed. 6:
Exp.: 111–113, 131; Ed. 7: 54, 55, 61, 67

Hieronymus Ed. 3: 45; Ed. 4: Exp.: 6; Ed. 5: ProL: 92; Ed. 5: Exp.: 282

historia, -ae f. Ed. 5: Exp.: 272; Ed. 6: ProL: 148
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Index nominum et rerum</th>
<th>Ed. 1:</th>
<th>Ed. 5:</th>
<th>Ed. 6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>histori(a)cus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a, -um; -ce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holocaustum, -i n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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