Academic Theology in the Fifteenth Century. The *Sentences* Commentary of Heymericus de Campo*

Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen

University of Nijmegen

1. Introduction

In the last few decades, the philosophy and theology of Heymericus de Campo († 1460) have been the subject of growing scholarly interest.¹ This is not surprising. Heymericus was one of the most many-sided academics of the fifteenth century. He followed the tradition of late medieval Albertism, of which he was an important proponent, and pursued the *Ars generalis* of Raymundus Lullus. Heymericus's thinking was developed in close contact with Dionysius the Carthusian and Nicholas of Kues, to whose *De docta ignorantia* and *De pace fidei* he referred.²

Heymericus taught in Diest, Cologne and Louvain, where he had many students, some of whom we know by name.³ His teaching was not limited to the university, however. The *Chronicon Bethlemiticum* reports that, during the summer vacations, he gave courses on the teachings of

* I thank Guy Guldentops, Dirk-Jan Dekker and Kent Emery Jr. for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

¹ Modern research on Heymericus de Campo was begun by G. Meersseman in the 1930s and has been continued since the 1950s by R. Haubst, E. Colomer, J. B. Korolec, Z. Kaluza, P. Ladner, and R. Imbach. Especially the studies by Kaluza are important to contemporary research on Heymericus.

² Cf. R. Imbach, "Das *Centheologicon* des Heymericus de Campo und die darin enthaltenen Cusanus-Reminiszenzen: Hinweise und Materialien," *Traditio*, 39 (1983), 466–477.

³ Cf. M. J. F. M. Hoenen, "Academics and Intellectual Life in the Low Countries. The University Career of Heymeric de Campo († 1460)," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 61 (1994), 173–209.

Raymundus Lullus at the priory.⁴ Although a secular priest, his contacts with the religious orders were substantial, as many copies of his writings were kept in their libraries.⁵

The influence of Heymericus's thinking on the universities of the fifteenth century was considerable, especially through his *Tractatus problematicus*, which compares the Albertist reading of Aristotle with that of the Thomists. Parts of this treatise were taken over in the *Reparationes* at the University of Cologne. Heymericus thus shaped the minds of young students reading and interpreting the works of Aristotle. It was not for nothing that contemporary texts refer to him as the most important interpreter of Aristotle in his time: "in philosophia aristotelica nulli suo tempore secundus."⁶

Heymericus dealt with Aristotle not only in the *Tractatus problematicus*, but also in other works, which in their design closely follow the texts of the *corpus aristotelicum* as taught at the University of Cologne. Heymericus's writings are titled the *Quaestiones super libros philosophiae Aristotelis*, the *Compendium logicae*, the *Compendium naturalis philosophiae*, and the *Compendium Ethicorum*. Parts of these works were edited by Jean-Daniel Cavigioli in 1981.⁷ The modern reader is immediately struck by the fact that these works differ in format from customary

⁴ Cf. E. Persoons, "Het intellectuele leven in het klooster Bethlehem in de 15de eeuw," *Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique*, 43 (1972), 47–84, especially 58, n. 60 (with quotation from the *Chronicon*).

⁵ Cf. Z. Kaluza, "Trois listes des œuvres de Heimeric de Campo dans le 'Catalogue du Couvent Rouge' ('Rouge Cloître')," *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 17 (1973), 3–20, and L. Burie, "Proeve tot inventarisatie van de in handschrift of in druk bewaarde werken van de Leuvense theologieprofessoren uit de xv^e eeuw," in: E. J. M. van Eijl (ed.), *Facultas S. Theologiae Lovaniensis 1432–1797. Bijdragen tot haar geschiedenis*, Leuven 1977 (*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, 45), 215–272, especially 221–237.

⁶ Cf. M. J. F. M. Hoenen, "The *Reparationes librorum totius naturalis philosophiae* (Köln 1494) as a source for the late medieval debates between Albertistae and Thomistae," *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale*, 4 (1993), 307–344. The Latin quotation is taken from Johannes Trithemius, *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, Basel 1494, 111^{r-v}.

⁷ J.-D. Cavigioli, "Les écrits d'Heymericus de Campo (1395–1460) sur les œuvres d'Aristote," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 28 (1981), 289–371.

academic commentaries on Aristotle from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This is especially true for the *Quaestiones*. These are presented in a strictly logical way. Each question is answered by three propositions, subdivided into a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. Together these propositions form a syllogism.⁸ The whole conveys the impression of being a rigorously ordered summary. This impression is confirmed by an addition to the title: "... per positiones sillogisticas epylogatae," in which the word "epylogatae" means "summarized."⁹ Treating almost the entire *corpus aristotelicum*, the "quaestiones" and the different compendia complete the picture of Heymericus's understanding of Aristotle as only limitedly communicated in the *Tractatus problematicus* and the *Compendium divinorum*.¹⁰

The theological counterpart of the *corpus aristotelicum* were Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. The *Sentences* cover the entire range of theological problems in four separate books. Commenting on the *Sentences* was compulsory for students of theology in the late Middle Ages. Although, at the surface, the design of these commentaries varied, it still remained substantially the same. These commentaries enable modern scholars to accurately portray the theological positions of various authors lecturing at different medieval universities and "studia generalia."¹¹

In many of his writings, Heymericus discusses theological issues with a method different from that used by other authors. He generally does not follow the traditional forms of commentary and disputation, but rather gives preference to the method used by Proclus in his *Elementatio theolo-*

⁸ Cf. Cavigioli, "Les écrits," 316–325.

⁹ The complete title is given in Cavigioli, "Les écrits," 317. As to the translation of "epylogus" as "summary," see C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, ed. L. Favre, Nîort 1883–1887, repr. Graz 1954, 2, 275, s.v. "Epilogare" and "Epilogus," in which the following evidence is quoted (*Vita S. Drausii Episcopi*, n. 20): "paucis de pluribus sub epologo recitatis."

¹⁰ Concerning the *Tractatus problematicus* and the *Compendium divinorum*, see M. J. F. M. Hoenen, *Heymeric van de Velde. Eenheid in de tegendelen*, Baarn 1990 (Geschiedenis van de Wijsbegeerte in Nederland, 4).

¹¹ On the medieval *Sentences* commentaries, see most recently G. R. Evans (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Current Research*, 1, Leiden, Boston, Köln 2002.

gica and by Raymundus Lullus in his *Ars generalis*.¹² For that reason, Heymericus's thinking is difficult to compare with that of his contemporaries.

To understand Heymericus's theological thinking and to compare him with contemporaries, it is therefore opportune to pay due attention to his commentary on the *Sentences*. This commentary is more traditional than his other writings. It enables us to place his theological views within the context of contemporary academic discussions. Against this background, the theological position of Heymericus can be determined more easily and his new approach can be assessed more accurately.

Fifteenth-century sources attest that Heymericus wrote three different commentaries on the *Sentences*.¹³ Of these, only the *Quadripartitus Sententiarum* has survived. It is preserved in a single manuscript (Bernkastel-Kues, St. Nikolaus Hospital, Cus. 106, 13^r–22^r). The manuscript dates from the fifteenth century and was used by Nicholas of Kues, who kept it in his library. In the manuscript, the commentary is titled: *Quadripartitus quaestionum syllogistice supra quatuor libros Sententiarum a magistro Heymerico de Campo Colonie collectarum*.¹⁴

As is clear from the title and the structure of the text, this commentary is unusual: it is designed as a set of syllogisms, similar to the above mentioned *Quaestiones super libros philosophiae Aristotelis ... per positiones syllogisticas epylogatae*, preserved in the same manuscript.

Upon regarding this manuscript, the large spaces between the lines immediately catch the eye.¹⁵ These spaces are partly filled with interlinear glosses. Most of the margins are filled with notes as well, some of which are fairly extensive. It appears that the *Quadripartitus* was dictated and commented upon by the master himself, whereas a student noted the text down, leaving spaces so as to insert the commentary. This practice is known from fifteenth-century schoolbooks.

¹² Cf. E. Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues und Raimund Llull. Aus Handschriften der Kueser Bibliothek*, Berlin 1961 (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie, 11).

¹³ See below, nn. 23 and 25.

¹⁴ On its use by Nicholas of Kues, see R. Haubst, *Die Christologie des Nikolaus von Kues*, Freiburg 1956, 291.

¹⁵ Cf. K. Emery Jr. and J. P. Wawrykow (ed.), *Christ among the Medieval Dominicans. Representations of Christ in the Texts and Images of the Order of Preachers*, Notre Dame (IN) 1998 (Notre Dame conferences in medieval studies, 7), plate 72 (ms Cus. 106, 16^r).

The nature of these glosses and marginal notes vary. Some consist of only a few words, while others occupy almost half a page. As Rudolf Haubst and Kunibert Hammer first remarked, many of these notes reappear in the *Sentences* commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen, who began studying theology when Heymericus was still teaching in Cologne.¹⁶ Not only many of the notes, but also the text of the *Quadripartitus* can be found in the commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen. Basing his own work upon that of Heymericus, John extensively discussed the propositions put forward by Heymericus.¹⁷ Obviously, Heymericus's *Quadripartitus* occupied a significant place within the educational program of the theological faculty at Cologne.

Notwithstanding the importance of the *Quadripartitus* for our understanding of Heymericus and the history of late medieval Albertism, the treatise has up till now not been available to modern research. Two questions on Christology have recently been edited, but these cannot adequately represent the whole treatise.¹⁸ The present contribution tries to fill this gap, presenting a first edition of the text as preserved in manuscript Cus. 106.

The *Quadripartitus* is not easy to read. The vocabulary is unusual and the syntax is complicated, a phenomenon which can also be observed in other writings of Heymericus. This is not only a problem for the modern reader, but for Heymericus's contemporaries as well. Already in his time, Heymericus was scorned for the obscurity of his Latin.¹⁹ Since the *Quadripartitus* has survived in only one manuscript, the text cannot

¹⁶ K. Hammer, "Johannes von Mecheln, ein Theologe des 15. Jahrhunderts," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 20 (1953), 322–327, and Haubst, *Die Christologie*, 11 and 291. According to Haubst, in some questions the interlinear glosses were written by Nicholas of Kues.

¹⁷ Cf. M. J. F. M. Hoenen, "Tradition and Renewal. The Philosophical Setting of Fifteenth-Century Christology. Heymericus de Campo, Nicolaus Cusanus, and the Cologne *Quaestiones vacantiales* (1465)," in: K. Emery Jr. and J. P. Wawrykow (ed.), *Christ among the Medieval Dominicans. Representations of Christ in the Texts and Images of the Order of Preachers*, Notre Dame (IN) 1998 (Notre Dame conferences in medieval studies, 7), 462–492, especially 487–491 (Appendix III).

¹⁸ Hoenen, "Tradition and Renewal," 485–487 (Appendix II).

¹⁹ Cf. G. Meersseman, *Geschichte des Albertismus*, 2: *Die ersten Kölner Kontroversen*, Roma 1935 (*Dissertationes historicae*, 5), 100.

be compared with a second witness. This is a serious problem, since the version in manuscript Cus. 106 has obvious mistakes and some of the propositions seem disordered. In some cases, the *Sentences* commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen does help. Nonetheless, this treatise cannot be considered as a reliable witness of Heymericus's text, because it is an independent work. Given this state of affairs, the text edited here may need emendation if further witnesses should be discovered.

A study of the theological content of the *Quadripartitus* would surpass the limits of this paper. Nevertheless, in order to provide a firm basis for further research into the *Quadripartitus*, a few questions will be discussed below.

2. Authenticity

The authenticity of the *Quadripartitus* is confirmed by the title as given in manuscript Cus. 106: "a m⟨agistro⟩ h⟨eymerico⟩ de campo." In the same manuscript, several other treatises by Heymericus are preserved. Their authenticity has never been called into question.²⁰ In some of these treatises, the authorship of Heymericus is indicated in a similar manner: "m⟨agistri⟩ h⟨eymerici⟩ de campo" (25^r) and "a m⟨agistro⟩ h⟨eymerico⟩ de campo" (63^v).²¹

Additional proof for its authenticity is to be found in the famous catalogue of Rooklooster, in which the treatise is listed among the writings of

²⁰ See the description of the manuscript in J. Marx, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften-Sammlung des Hospitals zu Cues bei Bernkastel a./Mosel*, Trier 1905, 105–106. For a discussion of these treatises, see Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues*, 12–39.

²¹ These indications concern the *Quaestiones super libros philosophiae Aristotelis* (25^r–55^v), partly edited in Cavigioli, "Les écrits," 316–325, and the *Theoremata totius universi* (63^v–66^r), edited in E. Colomer, "Heimeric van den Velde entre Ramón Llull y Nicolas de Cusa," in: J. Vincke (ed.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, 21, Münster 1963 (Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, 1. Reihe, 21), 216–232, especially 229–232. According to R. Haubst, "Zum Fortleben Alberts des Großen bei Heymerich von Kamp und Nikolaus von Kues," in: H. Ostlender (ed.), *Studia Albertina*. Festschrift für Bernhard Geyer zum 70. Geburtstage, Münster 1952 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Supplementband 4), 420–447, especially 424, it is the hand of Nicholas of Kues which attributes the *Quaestiones super libros philosophiae Aristotelis* to Heymericus.

Heymericus as *Epylogus librorum Sententiarum*. According to this catalogue, copies of the work were kept in the libraries of the Augustinian Canons Regular at Eindhoven and at Louvain. The title listed in the Rooklooster catalogue refers to the typical design of the treatise, which I have already mentioned and which I will discuss in more detail further below.²²

Among the works of Heymericus listed in the Rooklooster catalogue, two other treatises are mentioned which are closely related to the *Quadripartitus*: the *Super Sententias quattuor* and the *Lectura eius* (sc. Heymerici) *super quattuor libros Sententiarum*.²³ As to the first title, it is certain that this treatise is not identical to the *Quadripartitus*. Its incipit is given in the catalogue: “ut dicit augustinus in libro de.”²⁴ This incipit differs from that of the *Quadripartitus*. According to several ancient sources, the original manuscript (autograph) was kept at the Abbey of Park (Louvain) while a copy was kept at the Priory of Bethlehem (Louvain).²⁵ In all probability, this work has been lost. There are no modern catalogues listing the incipit mentioned.²⁶ The second treatise is much more difficult to identify. There is no reason to assume that this treatise is identical either to the first treatise or to the *Quadripartitus*. It was not unusual for a medieval theologian to be the author of different commentaries on the *Sentences*,

²² Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 11, n. 18. The reserve expressed by Kaluza concerning the identity of the *Epylogus* with the *Quadripartitus* is without reason.

²³ Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 10, n. 5, and 11, n. 23.

²⁴ Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 10, n. 5.

²⁵ See Johannes Molanus (†1585), *Historiae Lovaniensium libri xiv*, in: P. F. X. de Ram, *Les quatorze livres sur l'histoire de la ville de Leuven du docteur et professeur en théologie Jean Molanus*, Bruxelles 1861 (Collection de chroniques belges inédites) (Publications de la Commission Royale d'Histoire), 1, Lib. 9, c. 15, 502: “... Heimerici de Campo circa quartum (!) Sententiarum, secundum viam Scoti (!), scriptum manu sua est in monasterio Parchensi ...” and J. N. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liège, et de quelques contrées voisines*, 1, Leuven 1765, 478^b: “*Super Sententias* (Petri Lombardi) libri iv. ou *Commentaria super Sententias*. Comm. *Ut dicit Augustinus in libro*. L'Original de cet ouvrage se conserve à l'Abbaye du Parc; il y en a aussi une copie au Prieuré de Béthléem.” Cf. Z. Kaluza, “Materiały do katalogu dzieł Heimeryka de Campo,” *Studia Mediawistyczne*, 12 (1970), 3–28, especially 9.

²⁶ Cf. *In principio. Incipit Index of Latin Texts*, Release 7, Turnhout 1999.

with different status and different titles, such as *Ordinatio* and *Lectura*. Examples of this are John Duns Scotus and Adam Wodeham.²⁷ This may have also been the case with various commentaries by Heymericus.

Variance between the *Lectura* and the *Quadripartitus* is confirmed by information given in the Rooklooster catalogue. As indicated in the catalogue, a copy of the *Lectura* existed in Eindhoven, along with a copy of the *Quadripartitus*. Both titles are mentioned separately and both bear the abbreviation “e,” which stands for the library at Eindhoven.²⁸ This can only be the case if the *Lectura* and the *Quadripartitus* are indeed different works. Unfortunately, we know nothing more about the *Lectura*. The only commentary on the *Sentences*, which has been preserved and which must be ascribed to Heymericus, is the *Quadripartitus*.

Internal evidence further corroborates the work’s authenticity. The syllogistic design of the *Quadripartitus* can be recognized in many treatises by Heymericus, not only in his commentaries on Aristotle, but also in some of his ecclesiastical writings. The second part of the treatise *Vincit veritas*, dealing with the problem of indulgences, has a design very similar to that of the *Quadripartitus*.²⁹

Upon comparing the titles of Heymericus’s works, it is striking how often the word “epylagus” (which indicates that the treatise is a summary like the *Quadripartitus*) recurs: *Summarius epylogus primae philosophiae*, *Epylogus libri Alberti Magni De laudibus Mariae*, *Summarius epylogus passionis Christi*, *Epylogus Donati*.³⁰ Clearly, Heymericus preferred to publish shortened versions of important texts, some of which were used in the educational program at Cologne.

²⁷ Cf. [C. Balić], “De Ordinatione i. Duns Scoti Disquisitio historico-critica,” in: John Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio, Prologus*, Città del Vaticano 1960 (Opera omnia, 1), 1*–329*, especially 142*–149*, and W. J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham. An Introduction to his Life and Writings*, Leiden 1978 (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 21).

²⁸ Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 11, nn. 18 and 22.

²⁹ This treatise is edited by P. Ladner, “Der Ablass-Traktat des Heymericus de Campo. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Basler Konzils,” *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte*, 71 (1977), 93–140, especially 131–139.

³⁰ Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 11, n. 12; 11, n. 14; 14, n. 44; and 15, n. 74. There are also examples from other authors. E.g. Dionysius the Carthusian composed a *Epilogatio in librum Iob*; see K. Emery Jr., *Dionysii Cartusiensis Opera selecta*, 1 A: *Studia Bibliographica*,

In addition, the trinitarian vocabulary of the *Quadripartitus* argues in favor of the work's authenticity. As many of his writings show, Heymericus used threefold formulas to express the fundamental trinitarian structure of reality. Examples can be found in his *Theoremata totius universi*, his *Sigillum aeternitatis*, and his *De signis notionalibus Trinitatis et unitatis supernae*.³¹ Similar formulas can be observed in the *Quadripartitus*: "unitas, species, ordo;" "per essentiam intime, per potentiam proxime, per praesentiam cognitive;" "ex forma, motivo et fine."

Heymericus's style is different from usual Scholastic Latin used in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Phrases are much longer and the grammar is much more complicated: words that belong together are often separated (by hyperbata), as is the case in the *Testamentum doctrinale* and the *Determinatio super peregrinatione puerorum*.³² The *Quadripartitus* has a similar style, as previously noted: the phrases are long and complicated. When one considers this and the other evidence discussed, the attribution of the *Quadripartitus* to Heymericus de Campo is beyond all doubt.

Turnhout 1991 (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 121), 221 n. 17. The treatise is edited in the *Opera omnia*, 5, Montreuil 1898, 45–80. As it appears from the subtitle, the work was written at the request of Nicholas of Kues: *Tractatulus de causa diversitatis eventuum humanorum ad instantiam reverendissimi D. Cardinalis de Cusa editus*.

³¹ Cf. Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues*, 12–39; R. Imbach, "Quelques remarques sur le traité *De sigillo eternitatis* de Heymeric de Campo," in: M. J. F. M. Hoenen and A. de Libera (ed.), *Albertus Magnus und der Albertismus. Deutsche philosophische Kultur des Mittelalters*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1995 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 48), 297–302; M. J. F. M. Hoenen, "Trinität und Sein. Der Traktat *De signis notionalibus trinitatis et unitatis supernae* und seine Bedeutung für das trinitarische Weltbild des Heymericus de Campo," in: F. Cheneval, R. Imbach and T. Ricklin (ed.), *Albert le Grand et sa réception au moyen âge. Hommage à Zénon Kaluza*, Fribourg 1998 (special issue of *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 45 [1998] 1–2), 206–263.

³² Cf. Z. Kaluza, "La voix créatrice de Dieu. Remarques sur l'*Alphabetum* de Heimeric de Campo," in: H. J. Westra (ed.), *From Athens to Chartres. Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought*. Studies in Honour of E. Jeuneau, Leiden, New York, Köln 1992 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 35), 439–468, especially 453–468, and M. J. F. M. Hoenen, "Denys the Carthusian and Heymeric de Campo on the Pilgrimages of Children to Mont-Saint-Michel (1458). With a first edition of Denys's *Epistola de cursu puerorum* and Heymeric's *Determinatio super peregrinatione multorum iuvenum*," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, 61 (1994), 387–418, especially 414–418.

3. *Date of composition*

According to the title, the *Quadripartitus* was written at Cologne (“Colonie collectarum”). There is no reason to bring this information into question. Heymericus stayed at Cologne in the period 1423–1432, and returned shortly in 1435. During his stay at Cologne, he earned his doctoral degree in theology (1428).³³ Commenting on the *Sentences* was a prerequisite for earning the degree. The *Quadripartitus* was probably composed as part of this duty.

In 1425, Heymericus became “baccalarius formatus.”³⁴ He had thus by then begun to comment upon the third book of the *Sentences*.³⁵ In Cologne, all four books of the *Sentences* were read during one academic year.³⁶ The course started in October and in May of the following calendar year, the third book was set on the agenda.³⁷ If Heymericus became “baccalarius formatus” in 1425, this means that he had started reading the *Sentences* in October 1424 and had finished it by the end of that academic year, namely in August 1425.

This gives us the dates of his reading of the *Sentences*, but does not give us the date of his writing of the *Quadripartitus*. In fact, there is no necessary temporal connection between the reading of the *Sentences* and the composition of the *Quadripartitus*. According to the statutes of the theological faculty at Cologne, the commentary on each book was to be preceded by

³³ For biographical and prosopographical information concerning Heymericus’s stay at Cologne, see G.-R. Tewes, *Die Bursen der Kölner Artisten-Fakultät bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Köln 1993 (Studien zur Geschichte der Universität zu Köln, 13), 48–49.

³⁴ Cf. Tewes, *Die Bursen*, 48–49.

³⁵ Cf. F. Gescher, “Die Statuten der theologischen Fakultät an der alten Universität Köln,” in: H. Graven (ed.), *Festschrift zur Erinnerung an die Gründung der alten Universität Köln im Jahre 1388*, Köln 1938, 43–108, especially 86: “Item ordinamus, quod facto tertio principio legens sententias bacalarius formatus habeatur et sit, lecturam tamen usque in finem completurus.”

³⁶ Cf. Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 82: “Item presentati et admissi ad lecturam libri sententiarum legant sententias per unum annum ...”

³⁷ Cf. G.M. Löhr, *Die theologischen Disputationen und Promotionen an der Universität Köln im ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1926 (Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland, 21), 8, and Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 83.

a sermon (“collatio”) and a public disputation (“principium”), in which the opinions of fellow “sententiarii” were discussed.³⁸ The “principia” and the sermons have not been preserved in the *Quadripartitus*, not even in redrafted form.³⁹ The *Quadripartitus* therefore cannot be a report of the commentary as orally delivered, at least not completely.

After the actual reading of the *Sentences*, it still took at least two years (but normally four years) before a student could apply for his degree. During this time, he was to attend various disputations in order to build up his store of theological knowledge.⁴⁰ It is possible that Heymericus during this period summarized his commentary and gave it the syllogistic form preserved in the *Quadripartitus*, perhaps as an aid to his students.

Yet, it is also possible that Heymericus did not compose the *Quadripartitus afterwards*, but quite precisely *before* the actual lecture. He may have prepared himself with a preliminary outline of the course. This possibility needs to be seriously considered. It is namely well known that students collected materials before delivering their lectures on the *Sentences*. In Oxford, students were given twelve months to make such preparations. Bologna permitted students six months of preparatory work.⁴¹ Heymericus may have initially written the outline of his commentary as a preparation, which he then dictated to his students at the beginning of his actual course. In this way, they would have had a summary at hand. They could then insert additional commentary between the lines and in the margins. This would explain the curious layout of the text as preserved in manuscript Cus. 106. As we will see, a similar procedure was used in disputations at Cologne.

³⁸ Cf. Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 82.

³⁹ Marsilius of Inghen, who read the *Sentences* in 1392–1394 at Heidelberg, redrafted his “principia” and added them as questions to his commentary. Their original form is still recognizable. Cf. M. J. F. M. Hoenen, “Neuplatonismus am Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts. Die Prinzipien zum Sentenzenkommentar des Marsilius von Inghen,” in: S. Wielgus (ed.), *Marsilius von Inghen, Werk und Wirkung. Akten des Zweiten Internationalen Marsilius-von-Inghen-Kongresses*, Lublin 1993, 165–194.

⁴⁰ Cf. Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 84.

⁴¹ Cf. V. Marcolino, “Der Augustinertheologe an der Universität Paris,” in: H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini. Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation*, Berlin, New York 1981 (Spätmittelalter und Reformation, 20), 127–194, especially 150–151.

Since no other copies of the *Quadripartitus* exist, we cannot determine the origin of the notes in manuscript Cus. 106. At the present time, there is no absolute evidence that these notes indeed refer to the lectures of Heymericus and are thus connected to the *Quadripartitus*. These notes may have been inserted afterwards by a student studying the manuscript. The *Sentences* commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen does not help in this case. Although John quotes both the *Quadripartitus* and many of the notes, his commentary results from lectures started much later, namely in 1434. By this time, Heymericus was not in Cologne, but at the Council of Basel. He returned to Cologne in February 1435.⁴² Shortly afterwards he left to fill a position at the University of Louvain. John may not only have made use of a student report of the actual course given by Heymericus, but may have also made use of notes inserted by a reader of the *Quadripartitus*. Since the exact source of John's commentary is unknown, the question remains open.

An answer might be provided by the *Super Sententias quattuor*, which is said to be the autograph in some documents.⁴³ Perhaps this text was based on the *Quadripartitus* and incorporated all the notes. However, this text has not been preserved. At the moment, it is only certain that Heymericus delivered his lectures on the *Sentences* during the academic year 1424/1425, and that the *Quadripartitus* should be dated around this time.⁴⁴

4. The title of the treatise

Quadripartitus quaestionum is an unusual title for a *Sentences* commentary. It is therefore important to examine its meaning. The most obvious interpretation of the term "quadripartitus" is that it indicates the division

⁴² Cf. Tewes, *Die Bursen*, 48 (Heymericus de Campo) and 49–50 (John Hulshout of Mechelen).

⁴³ See above, n. 25.

⁴⁴ Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues*, 12–13, and R. Haubst, *Das Bild des Einen und Dreieinen Gottes in der Welt nach Nikolaus von Kues*, Trier 1952 (Trierer Theologische Studien, 4), 58, n. 25, identify the *Quadripartitus* with the lectures delivered by Heymericus in 1424/1425, and consequently date the *Quadripartitus* 1424/1425. But there is no proof for this identification.

of the treatise into four different parts. This is the case with the term “tripartitum” in the title of the *Opus tripartitum* by Meister Eckhart: it means that the work consists of three different parts.⁴⁵ This interpretation is supported by the fact that the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (the text upon which the *Quadripartitus* indeed comments) consist of four separate books. In Cologne, these four books were read consecutively during one course.⁴⁶

Nevertheless, this interpretation faces a serious problem: the treatise of Heymericus is not divided into four easily recognizable parts. At first sight, it is very difficult to determine where the first book ends and the second begins. The same goes for the other books. There are namely no indications of the transitions between the books in the text of the *Quadripartitus* itself. Nor are the questions numbered, with the exception of the first two, which are numbered in the margin.⁴⁷

However, a comparison of the questions of the *Quadripartitus* with the text of Peter Lombard reveals that the text is closely followed. Each book is treated in four separate questions as far as books 1–3 are concerned.⁴⁸ The ordering of the questions on the fourth book is less evident.⁴⁹ The word

⁴⁵ On the *Opus tripartitum* and its design, see most recently W. Goris, *Einheit als Prinzip und Ziel. Versuch über die Einheitsmetaphysik des Opus tripartitum Meister Eckharts*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1997 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 59), 9–51.

⁴⁶ Cf. Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 83.

⁴⁷ Cf. MS Cus. 106, 13^r.

⁴⁸ The relationship between the “distinctiones” of the *Sentences* and the questions of the *Quadripartitus* is shown in the following table:

<i>Sentences</i>	=	<i>Quadripartitus</i>	<i>Sentences</i>	=	<i>Quadripartitus</i>
I, d. 1–3	=	I, q. 1	III, d. 1–14	=	III, q. 1
I, d. 4–29	=	I, q. 2	III, d. 15–22	=	III, q. 2
I, d. 30–34	=	I, q. 3	III, d. 23–33	=	III, q. 3
I, d. 35–48	=	I, q. 4	III, d. 34–40	=	III, q. 4
II, d. 1–2	=	II, q. 1	IV, d. 1	=	IV, q. 1
II, d. 3–5	=	II, q. 2	IV, d. 2–13	=	IV, q. 2
II, d. 6–11	=	II, q. 3	IV, d. 14–25	=	IV, q. 3
II, d. 16–44	=	II, q. 4			

⁴⁹ See below, 527–528 (§ 5).

“quadripartitus” thus appears to refer to the four questions in which each book is treated. However, this interpretation runs into the same problem as the first interpretation: it only becomes clear that each book is dealt with in a fourfold way when the sequence of Peter Lombard’s text is known beforehand. Certainly, this was not a problem for the medieval reader. He was familiar with the structure of the *Sentences* and therefore knew which question referred to which book. But this does not answer our question concerning the meaning of the term “quadripartitus.”

Only one other commentary on the *Sentences* presents itself as “quadripartitus.” Its author was the Dominican John Schiltl, who finished reading the *Sentences* at Cologne in 1472. The commentary covers all four books of the *Sentences*.⁵⁰ Unlike the treatise of Heymericus, it contains an account of the “principia” and is not laid out as a collection of syllogisms, although the author expresses his wish to be concise. Schiltl decided not to discuss the opinions of many other thinkers so as to finish reading the *Sentences* within one year.⁵¹

In Schiltl’s commentary, the term “quadripartitus” refers to the structuring of the text according to Peter Lombard’s four books. A similar meaning in Heymericus’s case hereby gains credibility, all the more so because both treatises were written in Cologne. This does not imply that the second interpretation of the term “quadripartitus” is invalidated. The second interpretation is namely not contrary to the first, but rather complementary: the *Quadripartitus* is a treatise about the *four* books of the *Sentences*, in which each book is treated by means of *four* questions.

Other words of the title meriting discussion are the terms “syllogistice” and “collectus.” The meaning of the first is clear for anyone who starts reading the *Quadripartitus*. Each question is divided into three different syllogisms. Again, a comparison with the *Quadripartitus* of John Schiltl is helpful. The questions in this commentary are not ordered syllogistically,

⁵⁰ The commentary has been preserved in ms Wien, Dominikanerkloster, 94. Cf. Löhr, *Die theologischen Disputationen*, 8, and F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, Würzburg 1947, 1, 242–243, n. 495: “Iste est quadripartitus Sententiarum.”

⁵¹ Cf. the quotation in Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, 242.

but have a traditional design. Thus the term “syllogistice” is not necessarily related to the term “quadripartitus,” but rather indicates the typical layout of the treatise.

The term “collectus” as used in “quaestiones collectae” means both “brought together” and “compressed.”⁵² The questions are not only written and brought together by Heymericus, but also reduced to their essentials. This is why the treatise is listed as *Epylogus* in the Rooklooster catalogue. The full title of the *Quadripartitus* may thus be translated as follows: *Quadripartite treatise containing questions on the books of the Sentences brought together and shortened through syllogisms by master Heymericus de Campo at Cologne.*

5. *The size of the Quadripartitus*

In the course of the fourth book, the *Quadripartitus* no longer follows its normal pattern. In the second question, the syllogistic form is abandoned. Each argument has only two instead of the usual three propositions. In the third question, the tripartite structure reappears, but then with four arguments instead of three as in the preceding questions.⁵³

After the third question, twelve more questions are added. This seems to bring the original plan of four questions per book into disarray. In the manuscript, the third question ends exactly at the bottom of the page due to a special maneuver of the scribe, who wrote the final argument right across the page without leaving margins.⁵⁴ This is the only occasion in which margins are used for the text itself.

The break down of the original plan and the scribal manipulation at the end of the third question raise questions as to the nature of the succeeding text. The questions following the third continue with discussing the sacraments, which is the subject matter of the fourth book of the *Sentences*. However, the sacraments are also treated in the *Decretum Gratiani*.⁵⁵ In fact, Peter Lombard actually incorporated materials, sometimes even

⁵² Cf. C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1991, 366–367, s.v. “colligo.”

⁵³ See the edition below.

⁵⁴ Cf. MS Cus. 106, 18^r.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, ed. A. Friedberg, Leipzig 1879, repr. Graz 1959.

verbatim, from the *Decretum* into the fourth book of his *Sentences*.⁵⁶ The concise nature of the questions makes it difficult to decide whether the *Sentences* or the *Decretum* are being referred to. Two further observations may help to resolve the problem.

In the title of the *Quadripartitus*, an unknown hand added above the line “et decretum” after “supra quatuor libros sententiarum.”⁵⁷ Since only one manuscript has survived, it is unclear whether this addition is part of the original title or had been added by the person who wrote the glosses and marginalia. Perhaps he came across the problem of the nature of the last twelve questions and tried to make sense of their appearance by inserting “et decretum.” To be sure, the Rooklooster catalogue does not list a commentary on the *Decretum*, but that does not mean that Heymericus did not write such a commentary in addition to his commentary on the *Sentences*.⁵⁸ The catalogue only lists the manuscripts that were preserved in a limited number of libraries.⁵⁹

More definite information is given in the *Sentences* commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen, who used the *Quadripartitus* as a basis of his work. The commentary ends by discussing the third question of the fourth book of the *Quadripartitus*.⁶⁰ The twelve questions that follow in the *Quadripartitus* are not mentioned or treated in the commentary of John Hulshout. Undoubtedly, he had a version of the *Quadripartitus* that either ended after the third question of the fourth book, or that clearly indicated where the commentary on the *Sentences* ended and the commentary on the *Decretum* began. This makes it highly plausible that the words “et decretum” were part of the original title and that the part of the *Quadripartitus* that is concerned with the *Sentences* ends with the third question of the fourth book.

⁵⁶ See Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in iv libris distinctae*, 2, Grottaferrata 1981 (Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 5), especially 578^b–580^b (Index III: Auctores et scripta, s.v. *Decretum Gratiani*).

⁵⁷ Cf. ms Cus. 106, 13^r.

⁵⁸ All the parts of the Rooklooster catalogue dealing with Heymericus are edited in Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 10–15.

⁵⁹ Cf. Kaluza, “Trois listes,” 3–8.

⁶⁰ Cf. ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 164^v.

6. *The arrangement of the Quadripartitus*

As previously noted, the arguments in the *Quadripartitus* are composed of a complicated question answered in three syllogisms. Of these syllogisms, each proposition starts at a new line in the manuscript, at least in the beginning of the treatise. Towards the end, the scribe becomes more careless, although the tripartite structure can still be discerned in most cases. The syllogistic format is not unique. As said, it was also used by Heymericus in other treatises.⁶¹

This structure is retained in the commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen. His contribution consists in the many arguments added to the question and to the single propositions of each syllogism. In the manuscript, the original propositions of the *Quadripartitus* and the text added by John Hulshout are distinguished by a difference in handwriting. The text of the *Quadripartitus* is written in a large hand, whereas the additions are in a normal-scale script. Also, the original question of the *Quadripartitus* is split into three different sub-questions, whereby the first sub-question is linked to the first syllogism, the second to the second, and the third to the third. The following example may illustrate this tripartite structure:

Heymericus de Campo, *Quadripartitus*, MS Cus. 106.

[13^r] *Questio prima:*

Vtrum signorum et rerum tam
fruibilium quam utilium doctrina
christiana

sit de deo fruibili unico, licet
personaliter trino,

John Hulshout of Mechelen, *Questiones super libris Sententiarum*, MS
Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907.

[73^r] *Questio prima:*

Vtrum doctrina christiana sit si-
gnorum et rerum tam fruibilium
quam utilium ...

[75^r] *Questio secunda:*

Vtrum deus sit fruibile unicum licet
personaliter trinum ...

⁶¹ See above, nn. 8 and 29.

[76^v] *Questio tertia:*

ex suis uestigiis et ymaginibus
inuestigabilis sapientia.

Vtrum ex suis uestigiis et ymaginibus
sit deus inuestigabilis ...

This example reveals an unnoticed aspect of the syllogistic format of the *Quadripartitus*, namely that each syllogism discusses a specific part of the question. Thus, it is easy to understand why the questions of the *Quadripartitus* are so long and complicated: they actually consist of three compressed questions.

John Hulshout's commentary also shows how the different propositions of the syllogism in the *Quadripartitus* are referred to. The first two propositions are always called "propositio(nes)," whereas the third is named "conclusio." In the margins of John's commentary, these names are further specified as "maior," "minor," and "conclusio," respectively, so as to highlight the original syllogistic structure.⁶²

Further information on the format of the *Quadripartitus* can be derived from the Cologne "quaestiones vacantes," which exhibit a similar arrangement. "Quaestiones vacantes" were weekly disputes, held on Fridays during the summer vacations, at the Faculty of Theology. Many of these disputations were preserved as student notes in the manuscripts Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek, st 688 (Georg Schwartz), and Frankfurt, Stadtbibliothek, 1690 (Servatius Fankel).⁶³ Each question of the "quaestiones vacantes" is tripartite and is answered in three syllogisms. The question and the syllogisms are both written in a large hand, and show a complex linguistic structure. Then follows a discussion between respondent and opponents, which is noted in smaller writing and is much easier to understand.⁶⁴ The graphical and literary distinction between the questions and syllogisms on the one hand, and the discussion on the other, is probably due to the former having circulated separately in a written version before the actual discussion took place.

⁶² Cf. ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 73^r ("propositio," "maior"), 74^r ("propositio," "minor"), 74^v ("conclusio").

⁶³ Cf. Löhr, *Die theologischen Disputationen*, 1–22, and Hoenen, "Tradition and Renewal," especially 463–466.

⁶⁴ Cf. the edition of one question in Hoenen, "Tradition and Renewal," 481–485.

In the actual debates as reported in the manuscripts, the propositions of each syllogism are discussed consecutively. The discussion starts with the first syllogism, referred to as “*materia prima*.” The second is named “*materia secunda*” and the third “*materia tertia*.” Occasionally, the opponents introduce additional questions, to which the respondent had to respond.⁶⁵

Given the similarity between the “*quaestiones vacantes*” and the arrangement of the *Quadripartitus* with its glosses and marginalia, it is likely that Heymericus arranged his courses on the *Sentences* as disputations. He may have used the syllogistic structure as a point of departure and discussed the different propositions during his courses. The students may then have noted his remarks in the margins and between the lines of the text of the *Quadripartitus*, as extant in manuscript Cus. 106. Eventually, these notes were to fall into the hands of John Hulshout of Mechelen.

7. *The Quadripartitus and the Sentences commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen*

As already noted, John Hulshout of Mechelen used the *Quadripartitus* as a point of departure for his commentary on the *Sentences*. He refers to the *Quadripartitus* as to the text of the “magister.” This may seem odd, since Peter Lombard is normally referred to as the “magister” in commentaries on the *Sentences*. However, a study of the relevant passages reveals that the “magister” is the author of the *Quadripartitus*, and not Peter Lombard. Two examples suffice to illustrate this. Both bear upon a theological problem with regard to which the views of Peter Lombard and Heymericus differed. The text of the *Quadripartitus* as quoted and referred to by John Hulshout is given in italics.

1. Unlike Peter Lombard, Heymericus defends the position that angels are not created as good angels.⁶⁶ This position of Heymericus in the *Quadripartitus* is referred to by John Hulshout as to the “dictum magistri.”

⁶⁵ Cf. Hoenen, “Tradition and Renewal,” 481–485. See also the fragments edited in Löhr, *Die theologischen Disputationen*, 33–84.

⁶⁶ Cf. Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, II, d. 3, c. 4 (16), Grottaferrata 1971 (*Spicilegium Bonaventurianum*, 4), 343–347.

Cf. John Hulshout of Mechelen, *Questiones super libris Sententiarum*, MS Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945 / 907, 97^r; compare the edition of the *Quadripartitus* below (543):

Originalis mundi negatio est proxime coordinabilis essentiali nature bono ...

Nec angelus in gratia creabatur in principio, nec corporalis mundi fabrica in dispositionis et ornatus complemento. Patet ex eodem fundamento ... Contra primum uidetur esse sententia multorum doctorum dicentium angelum creatum in gratia. Solutio. Hoc apparet fidelius et magis conformiter auctoritatibus sanctorum, licet aliud, quod est dictum magistri, uidetur secundum rationem probabilius ...

2. Unlike Peter Lombard, Heymericus describes the sacrament of Confirmation as “sacramentum perfectionis” (“confirmatio perfectiua”) and mentions the problem of the prefiguration of the sacrament.⁶⁷ John Hulshout attributes both points to the “magister,” who in this context can only be Heymericus.

Cf. John Hulshout of Mechelen, *ibid.*, 158^v; compare the edition of the *Quadripartitus* below (551):

Renatis ex aqua et spiritu sancto opus est perfectiua roboris fidei genite propria confirmatio propria pontificis ministerio ...

Confirmationis sacramentum est ministerio dignissimum, ob hoc non antiquitus prefiguratum. Primum patet, quia pertinet ad episcopum, qui est iherarcha militantis ecclesie. Secundum patet, quia illa fuit lex imperfecte iustitie. Igitur sacramentum perfectionis, quod est confirmatio, secundum magistrum ibi, prefigurari non debuit ...

Apparently, the commentary of John Hulshout was not a regular commentary on the *Sentences*, but a so-called “lectura secundum alium.” This means that it discussed the *Sentences* by means of an already existing commentary, in our case Heymericus’s *Quadripartitus*. This practice is not confined to the fifteenth century. Other examples can be found in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Cf. Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, IV, d. 7, c. 4 (46), 278–279.

⁶⁸ A thirteenth-century example is provided by the *Scriptum* of William de la Mare, which is based on the *Sentences* commentary of Bonaventure. For the fourteenth century, see D. Trapp, “Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century. Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore,” *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956), 146–274. A recent discussion of the

Since John Hulshout refers to the *Quadripartitus* as to the “dictum magistri,” it is impossible that the commentary attributed to John Hulshout be identical with the missing *Lectura* of Heymericus himself mentioned in the Rooklooster catalogue. A confusion with the *Super Sententias quattuor* is likewise excluded, since both texts have different incipits.⁶⁹

Towards the end of the commentary, the order of some of the propositions is different from that of the *Quadripartitus*. This is not by accident. In the *Quadripartitus*, the format breaks down in the fourth book. By changing the order, John Hulshout may have tried to preserve the logical order. It may also be that the version of the *Quadripartitus* that has survived in manuscript Cus. 106 is corrupted and that John Hulshout had an uncorrupted copy at hand. In at least one instance, his arrangement of the propositions is definitely superior.⁷⁰

The glosses and marginalia preserved in manuscript Cus. 106 reappear in the commentary of John Hulshout. To convey an impression of the nature of these glosses and the way in which they are incorporated in the text of John Hulshout, both texts are quoted in an appendix to the edition. In his commentary, John does not mark these glosses as quotations. They are brought into conformity with the rest of the text.⁷¹ Naturally,

nature of the “lectura secundum alium” is P. J. J. M. Bakker and C. Schabel, “Sentences Commentaries of the Later Fourteenth Century,” in: G. R. Evans (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Current Research*, 1, Leiden, Boston, Köln 2002, 425–464, especially 438–461.

⁶⁹ The commentary of John Hulshout begins by quoting the first proposition of the *Quadripartitus*: “Utrum doctrina christiana sit signorum et rerum ...” (ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 73^r). For further manuscript information, see A. Pattin, “Jan van Hulshout (1405–1475). Vlaams wijsgeer en theoloog van de Universiteit te Keulen,” *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 38 (1976), 104–128, especially 123.

⁷⁰ In the *Quadripartitus*, the second proposition on the sacrament of Confirmation, “Confirmationis sacramentum est ministerio dignissimum, ob hoc antiquitus non prefiguratum,” wrongly appears between the propositions on the Eucharist. In the commentary of John Hulshout, it comes after the first proposition on Confirmation, which makes more sense. The relevant passage (ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 158^v) is quoted above (532). In the edition below, I have adopted the arrangement as given by John Hulshout.

⁷¹ Commenting on the second proposition, he even inserts a “dico” between the glosses; cf. the fragment given below (557). This “dico” should be translated as “namely,” however. It does not indicate that John Hulshout is the author.

this phenomenon is related to the “lectura secundum alium,” as can be observed in the writings of other authors as well.⁷²

In the *Quadripartitus*, no authors are quoted besides Augustine and Jerome. In John’s commentary, this is different. John refers to many other sources, especially to the writings of Albert the Great.⁷³ An interesting example can be found at the beginning of his commentary, in which he discusses the first proposition of the *Quadripartitus*. After the arguments for and against, he arrives at the solution, introduced as “*solutio Alberti*.” A comparison with the text of Albert shows that the solution is taken entirely from the prologue of the *Summa theologiae*. The table below illustrates this. Quoted passages are given in italics.

Albert the Great, *Summa theologiae*, I, Prologus, ed. D. Siedler, Münster 1978 (Opera omnia, 34/1), 1^b–2^a.

John Hulshout of Mechelen, *Questiones super libris Sententiarum*, MS Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 73^f.

...

...

Solutio Alberti in prologo de mirabili scientia dei:

“Facta est” etiam in nobis alio quodam superiori eam efficiente. Est enim impressio quaedam et sigillatio divinae sapientiae in nobis, ut mens humana dei sapientis sit sigillum, impressa formis et rationibus causae primae in sapientia sua creantis et reparantis et glorificantis sua causata.

Theologia facta est in nobis alio quodam superiori causa efficiente. Est enim impressio quaedam et sigillatio diuine sapientie in nobis, ut mens humana dei sapientis sit sigillum, impressa fortius et rationibus cause prime in sapientia sua creantis, reparantis et glorificantis sua causata.

⁷² Cf. J.-F. Genest and P. Vignaux, “La bibliothèque anglaise de Jean de Mirecourt: subtilitas ou plagiat?,” in: O. Pluta (ed.), *Die Philosophie im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. In memoriam Konstanty Michalski (1879–1947)*, Amsterdam 1988 (Bochumer Studien zur Philosophie, 10), 275–301, and Z. Kaluza, “Auteur et plagiaire: quelques remarques,” in: J.A. Aertsen and A. Speer (ed.), *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter? Akten des x. Internationalen Kongresses für Mittelalterliche Philosophie der Société Internationale pour l’Etude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, 25. bis 30. August 1997 in Erfurt, Berlin, New York 1998 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 26), 312–320.

⁷³ Noticeably, John Hulshout composed so-called *Excerpta ex Alberti Magni Dictis super III et IV libris Sententiarum*. See Pattin, “Jan van Hulshout,” 123–124.

Quod dicitur Cant. viii (6): "Pone me ut signaculum super cor tuum." Quod exponens Gregorius dicit, quod "signaculum est sigillum profundatum." Propter quod Ez. xxviii (12) dicitur de angelo ceteros eccellente in sapientia: "Tu signaculum similitudinis, plenus scientia et perfectus decore." Per talem igitur impressionem factam in nobis constat, quod fit in nobis, nobis ascendentibus ad deum et ad ipsam, sicut cera ascendit ad sigillum, et non e converso. Propter quod oratione et devotione plus acquiritur quam studio. Sap. vii (7): "Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus, et invocavi, et venit in me spiritus sapientiae." Ex hoc infert Augustinus in viii De trinitate, quod quia cor hominis ascendit ad illam, necesse est, quod in sola illa cor hominis exaltetur. Alia quippe scibilia vel aequalia sunt vel inferiora cordi humano; propter quod, secundum quod in corde humano sunt, exaltationem recipiunt et nobilius esse, quam habent in seipsis, sicut nobilius est incorruptibile quam corruptibile. Sola autem illa est quae cor elevat et elevatum purificat et in aeterna fundat immortalitate. Sap. xv (3): "Nosse te est consummata iusitia, et scire iustitiam tuam et virtutem tuam radix est immortalitatis." Hinc est, quod dicit Alfarabius in libro De intellectu et intelligibili, quod omnes philosophi in intellectu adepto divino radicem posuerunt immortalitatis animae. Licet autem sic facta sit, ut dicit Dionysius de

Quare fit in nobis, nobis ascendentibus in deum et ad ipsam eternam sapientiam, sicut cera ascendit ad sigillum, et non e conuerso. Propter quod oratione magis et deuotione acquiritur quam humano studio. Unde dicitur Sap. vii: "Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus, et inuocavi, et uenit in me spiritus sapientie". Et hoc infert Augustinus viii De trinitate, quia cor hominis ascendit ad illam, quod in illa sola cor hominis exaltetur. Alia scibilia vel equalia sunt vel inferiora corde hominis. Et ideo exaltantur in homine.

Sola autem hec scientia exaltat hominem que cor eleuat, purificat et in eterna fundat immortalitate.

Hinc

dicat Dionysius de

Hierotheo, quod “patiēdo divina didicit divina,” tamen studium ad hoc cooperatur sicut dispositio in subiecto. Propter quod studium sacrarum litterarum multum commendat Hieronymus in Prologo Galeato et dicit, quod hoc commendat Paulus in discipulo suo Timotheo ...

Themotheo, *quod* solum “*patiēdo diuina didicit diuina*.” Sciendum tamen quod *studium ad eam cooperatur* uelut *dispositio* subiecti,

quia intellectus noster rationalis est et ita secundum naturam suam discursu rationali instruendus.

Per hec ad obiecta ...

Answering the first question by following the “*solutio Alberti*” is a statement to the reader: the author shows that he intends to follow in the footsteps of Albert the Great. This does not mean that John only slavishly quotes from the writings of Albert in elucidating the propositions of the *Quadripartitus*. On many occasions, he also refers to other authors.⁷⁴ John’s commentary is indeed a work in its own right, although within the theological framework developed by Albert the Great and Heymericus de Campo. That he underpins the first proposition of the *Quadripartitus* by quoting Albert the Great is therefore not to be considered as servile obedience to the Albertist school, but as an acknowledgment of the intellectual tradition to which the *Quadripartitus* of Heymericus belongs.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ The names of Avicenna and Ulrich of Strasbourg often appear.

⁷⁵ On the tradition of late medieval Albertism, see Z. Kaluza, *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris. Nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIV^e et du XV^e siècles*, Bergamo 1988 (Quodlibet, 2), and Id., “Les débuts de l’Albertisme tardif (Paris et Cologne),” in: M. J. F. M. Hoenen and A. de Libera (ed.), *Albertus Magnus und der Albertismus. Deutsche philosophische Kultur des Mittelalters*, Leiden, New York, Köln 1995 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 48), 207–295.

8. *Editorial principles*

In the edition, the part of the *Quadripartitus* that concerns the *Sentences* has been edited completely. The text is based on manuscript Cus. 106, the only textual witness that has survived. The glosses and marginalia added to the text have not been edited, since their authorship is unclear. From the example given in the Appendix, the reader may have an impression of how they appear in the manuscript.

The orthography is standardized. The syllogistic structure, according to which each proposition begins on a separate line, is retained and emended where necessary. Rejected readings are noted in the critical apparatus. Punctuation is according to modern usage.

The following signs and abbreviations have been used:

C	=	ms Bernkastel-Kues, St. Nikolaus Hospital, Cus. 106
⟨...⟩	=	words supplied by the editor
[...]	=	words that should be deleted
<i>add.</i>	=	<i>addidit</i>
<i>corr.</i>	=	<i>correxist</i>
<i>del.</i>	=	<i>delevit</i>
<i>lin.</i>	=	<i>linea</i>
<i>marg.</i>	=	<i>margo</i>
<i>om.</i>	=	<i>omisit</i>
<i>sig.</i>	=	<i>signum</i>
<i>sup.</i>	=	<i>supra</i>

APPENDIX 1

Quadripartitus questionum sillogistice supra quatuor libros sententiarum a magistro heymerico de campo colonie collectarum

⟨Liber primus⟩

5 *Questio prima: Vtrum signorum et rerum tam fruibilium quam utilium C 13^r
doctrina christiana sit de deo fruibili unico, licet personaliter trino, ex suis
uestigiis et ymaginibus inuestigabilis sapientia*

Doctrina christiana tradit credibilia homini lapso salutaria.

Gratia et gloria cum suis amminiculis sunt bona necessaria recupe-
10 rande saluti hominis.

De utriusque testamenti sacramentis ac utilibus fruibilibusque rebus
est theologia christiformis.

Proprie dictum frui est in bono cognito finaliter delectari.

Mentis humane acies inualida, per iustitiam fidei mundata, trinitatem
15 diuinarum personarum dicat naturaliter unum deum.

Qui, cum sit alpha et omega, illis tribus est personis unica fruendi
ratio.

Sicut uestigium est uestigiantis effectuale signum, sic propria similitudo
obiecti exemplaris est ymago.

2 sententiarum] et decretum *add. sup. lin. C* 5 questio prima] *in marg. C* 6 suis]
cum sig. sup. lin. C

Vnitas, species et ordo sunt uestigia creatoris in quolibet creato, preter que rationali condito inest biformis dei ymago.

Itaque iuuamur ad dei notitiam exterius per sua uestigia et interius per eius ymaginem.

Questio secunda: *Vtrum in essentie diuine simplici et incommutabili ueritate pater ingenuitus, filius unigenitus et ab utroque procedens sanctus spiritus conueniant ydemptice, licet suis differant proprietatibus notionaliter et relatiue*

Quod est nec potest non esse est simpliciter, incommutabiliter atque uere.

Principium uniuersi esse non potest quomodolibet non esse. 10

Ergo, licet Deus non sit solitarie aut singularis existentie, est tamen una simplex ueritas incommutabilis.

Principium intellectualis uite per intellectum et uoluntatem se communicat ordinata uerbi et amoris processione.

In quo processu gemino resultat originaliter primi, medii et ultimi 15 opposita correlatio.

Que in fontana dei substantia intellectualiter uiuifica patrem seu intellectum ingenuitum, filium seu uerbum unigenitum et procedentem ab hiis spiritum sanctum spiratum amorem distinguit in existentia.

Quemadmodum in deo esse claudit agere, sic unitas absolute essentie 20 comprehendit modos existendi et innotescendi, tam fontaliter quam relatiue causaliter.

Licet propria ueritas seu ratio essentie sit communicabilis et absoluta, C 13^v in hoc differens ab agendi potentia, cuius proprietas est | incommunicabilis et relatiua, tamen ubi quod est non differt ab esse, sese implicant 25 reciproce.

Igitur hec in simplici deo, fonte uiuo a se et ad se semper effuso, ydempticantur mutuo.

5 questio secunda] *in marg. C* 17–18 seu intellectum] *cum sig. sup. lin. C* 18 seu uerbum] *cum sig. sup. lin. C* 19 spiritum sanctum] *cum sig. sup. lin. C* 23 communicabilis et] *sub. lin. C* 27 semper] *propter C*

Questio tertia: Vtrum sicut diuina trinitas est essentialiter et potentialiter et presentialiter ubique et sole procedentes persone sunt missibiles gratuite, sic omnes persone tres sunt equales et similes in potentia, scientia et uoluntate distinguibilibus obiectiue

- 5 Simplici dei essentie, cui nil potest accidere, conuenit bonitas infinita sui undique diffusua.

Que causaliter attingit omnia conspectui suo prouido eternaliter pre-cognita.

- 10 Per suam essentiam intime, potentiam proxime, presentiam cognitiue se communicat deus undique incommiscibiliter et indiuiue.

Missio est notionalis ad extra persone misse a mittente processio.

Sicut dei essentiam sua notionalis uirtus implicat, sic causalem eius potentiam fontana uis fecundat.

- 15 Tunc uere deus mittitur, cum per effectum doni gratuiti procedere dinoscitur.

- Licet unitas est indistinguibilis realiter et distingui trium personarum essentia non agit nec patitur, est tamen ratio agendi hiis uniuoca, qua simul causant temporaliter: pater generat immissibiliter, filius a solo patre semper genitus quandoque mittitur simul, et ab hiis procedens sanctus
20 spiritus potest mitti cum filio dupliciter.

Possibile, scibile et uolibile uirtuosam dei essentiam respiciunt equiuoce.

- Coeterne persone sunt similes in essendi qualitate et equales in eiusdem agendi potestate, que per potentie, scientie et uoluntatis obiecta propria
25 distinguitur relatiue.

1 questio tertia] *in marg. C* 1–2 et presentialiter] *cum sig. sup. lin. C* 7 suo] *cum sig. sup. lin. C* 16 est indistinguibilis] et indistingui *C* 21 uolibile] uolubile *C* | essentiam] dei *add. C*

⟨Questio quarta⟩: *Vtrum sicut diuine potentie subsunt cuncta possibilia et sue scientie queque noscibilia, sic uoluntati sue prouide subest immobiliter quidquid futurum est euenire*

Hoc omnipotentie subicitur in quo contradictio non includitur.

Infinita dei natura est uirtus qua potest omnia.

C 14^r Pati, mentiri et quod non est iustum aut debitum fieri deum non posse, sue non derogat omnipotentie.

Quodlibet intellectuale uiuum per intelligibilis similitudinem suiipsius est motiuum.

Veritas diuine substantie est similitudo sui et aliorum omnium quodlibet intelligibilium.

Quare se et queuis alia ad rationem essendi ordinabilia intelligit lux eterna.

Intellectuale bonum omnium a se finaliter uolitum est prouidus rex eorum.

Cuius immobili beneplacito quintupliciter significabili regitur inclinatio propria cuiuslibet conditi.

C 14^v Creatura libera ab immobili prouidentia dirigitur mobiliter ac illesa sui arbitrii contingentia gubernatur dupliciter. |

⟨Liber secundus⟩

20

⟨Questio prima⟩: *Vtrum a uoluntate dei eterna temporaliter exierit mundi uniuersum, dierum in senario dispositum et ornatum*

Ab infinito puro ente ad extra causatiuo suscitabilis est ad esse possibilitium negatio.

Cui proportionatur dei potentia per intellectum et uoluntatem artificialiter ordinata.

Ab eterno dei proposito diuersitas creature simul exiit in temporum initio.

Ordinata dei potentia dumtaxat simul copulat immediate coordinata.

Ordinabilis mundi negatio est proxime coordinabilis essentiali nature bono.

Nec angelus in gratia creabatur in principio, nec corporalis mundi fabrica in dispositionis et ornatus complemento.

5 Amor diuine prouidentie suis queque nectit ordinibus, fines superiorum coniungens principiis inferiorum cum uirtutum et operum differentiis.

Cuius ordo prouidentie tam in uirtutibus quam operibus distinguitur tripartite sicut proprius modus exigit distinguibilis creature.

Corporalis mundi machina temporaliter disponit(ur) et ornatur in
10 bino triduo, quam sic discernit notionabiliter angelica contemplatio augustini testimonio.¹

(Questio secunda): *Vtrum angelos et homines innocenter conditos deformitatis ambitio fecit eque miseros*

Ymaginis diuine participia sunt ad fruendum deo condita.

15 Ad quod nequeunt proficere ex nature dono proprie.

Angelis et hominibus innocenter conditis opus erat gratia salubriter anagogica.

Superbit liberum arbitrium ambientis motu proprio peruenire quo potest peruenire per gratiam.

20 Lucifer summus angelus premium gratie beatitudinem uoluit consequi propriis uiribus.

Hic ita cum suis complicitibus ambiit equipotentiam celsitudinis deformis.

Humanus intellectus per subordinatos sui angeli deque intelligibiles
25 dios est omnium cognitiuus.

1 essentiali] essenziale C 6 coniungens] cum sig. sup. lin. C | uirtutum] complemento add. et del. C 13 ambitio] ab initio C 18–19 potest peruenire] sup. lin. C

1 Cf. Augustinus, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, iv, 28, ed. J. Zycha, Praha, Wien, Leipzig 1894 (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, 28), 126.

Hunc in prima homine naturali plenum docmate potuit sathanas instruere.

Cuius superbia uocis energia extulit eue desiderium consequi beatitudinem per scientiam, ut deus omnium.

Quod ex forma, motiuo et fine peccatum hominis et non angeli est 5
C 15^r reparabile monstrat differentem miseriam utriusque. |

<Questio tertia>: Vtrum sicut boni angeli per tres iherarchias tripliciter distincti mittuntur in humane salutis ministerium, sic angeli mali in prelatione uiciorum diuersi sinuntur hominibus adesse ad eorum exercicium

Difformes natura angeli fuerunt ab initio quadrifariam dissimiles. 10

Quorum multitudinem diuina prouidentia coniunxit in ordinem.

Qui per datam beniuolis gratiam agebatur in terna chororum iherarchia secundum suorum naturalium differentem analogiam.

Solus creator formarum et miraculorum opifex deus ministerio spirituum creatorum prouidet corporalibus. 15

Virtus et uitium meriti personalis non tollit nature ordinem concreatum angelis.

Corpora mouere ex materia preiacente, figurare, assumere, eis illabi, et uiribus ipsis affixis uti, eorum species abstrahere, nouas fingere, et per has assumptas uel non assumptas animam sensituiam dormientis uel 20 uigilantis inuiuere, fantasmatis inuentis aut fictis sensibiliter et intelligibiliter uti conuenit tam bono quam malo spiritui, formas substantiales materie aut intelligibiles intellectui increare, hiis substantialiter illabi uel contra supraue nature communis ordinem mirabiliter causare prorsus impotenti. 25

Quemadmodum spirituum bonorum iherarchia est saluti humane proportionaliter prouisiua, sic presumptuosa malorum tyrannia est cum prelatione uitiorum eidem saluti emula.

6 monstrat] cum sig. sub. lin. C 9 sinuntur] in add. sed del. C 10 difformes] difformis C 19 eorum] earum C 26 iherarchia] iherarchiam C

Exigente facultatis humane proportione uaria tam boni quam mali angeli nobis appareant in specie multipharia cognitionis propter exercitium iustorum utiliter permissa.

Sicut infima angelorum iherarchia preest toti fidelium ecclesie, sic
5 singulis hominibus presunt singuli in ministerium salutis eorundem missi, quibus et assunt demones obuui tali custodie.

⟨Questio quarta⟩: *Vtrum ut hominis peccatum quodlibet est uoluntarium, sic elicit opus bonum per adiutum gratia liberum arbitrium*

Obedientie mandato a deo per uirum mulieri tradito suasu serpentis
10 uiceuersa transgresso soluetur originalis horum iustitia suis posteris seminata.

Quomodo serpentina nostre sensualitatis illecebra per muliebrem rationis inferioris delectationem ad uirilem rationis superioris consensum perducta nascitur iniustitia nostrorum operum mortifera.

15 Quodlibet hominis peccatum est causaliter aut formaliter uoluntarium, in originale et actuale, consequenter in ueniale et mortale, rursus in paternum et filiale, seu in patrem et filium rationabiliter subdistinctum usque in generationem quartam moraliter et in omnem naturaliter.

Mortaliter peccare est dicto uel facto uel concupito ⟨a⟩ diuine ⟨uoluntatis⟩ C 15^v
20 iustitia committendo uel omittendo ⟨declinare⟩.

Quod fit, dum nostra uoluntas non concordat diuine, cui se tenetur tricausaliter conformare.

Peccatum non a deo sed a creatura bona deficienter causatum in triplex penale, septemplex capitale et secuplex irremissibile mortaliter
25 est disiunctum.

Existente libero arbitrio rationis et uoluntatis electiuo iudicio poterit hoc ex se moraliter bonum agere, quod sine fidei gubernaculo non est eterno dignum premio.

2 appareant] appaerant C 5 singuli in] cum sig. sup. lin. C 8 liberum] liberis C

10 soluetur] corr. ex soluebatur C 17 seu in patrem et filium] patrem et filium seu in

C 18 omnem] corr. ex hominem C

Dominante peccati originalis penali fomite ad peccandum ante recuperationem mortaliter, sed post hanc uenialiter obligante, preter salutaria nature et operationis amminicula requiritur salubriter liberans gratia media.

Licet incoacta uoluntas agendi quod placet siue bonum siue malum existat liberum arbitrium, quasi spontaneum de uoluntate iudicium, tamen nequit in bonum salutare nisi adiutum fide preuenientis et subsequentis formata benefico dono gratie.

⟨*Liber tertius*⟩

⟨*Questio prima*⟩: *Vtrum in tempore plenitudinis spiritus sancti gratificatio fiebat filii dei et hominis inconfusa unio faciens utriusque nature ydeomata cum suis proprietatibus communia* 10

Diuine predestinationis impleto tempore ut homo deus fieret, nectuntur gratuite, peccatum quos seiunxerat.

Hic uniuerſi circulus dumtaxat finiri debuit in arte conditoris. 15

Quem perfecit deus trinus opere appropriato sancti spiritus.

Compositio et assumptiua seu exthatica unio fiunt ex eisdem principiis ordine contrario.

Premissa dei et hominis unio non est formalis, personalis aut habitualis compositio, sed nature humane in personam diuinam exthatica assumptio. 20

C 16^r Dei per incarnationem uerbi humanatio est per assumptionem carnis mediante spiritu hominis deificatio.

Licet suppositum nature gemine prefatum eternaliter a patre et temporaliter a spiritu sancto fuerit perfecte natum, tamen est patris unigenitus et non spiritus sancti filius naturalis uel adoptiuus. 25

Qui, cum sit creator et creatura, naturaliter utriusque predicata propria recipit communiter.

3 amminicula] amminacula C 8 benefico] beneficio C 16 deus] bis C 20 in personam] bis C | exthatica] exthasica C

Vnde per prophetam² recte dicitur quod est simul in unum diues et pauper, id est, factus infectus, nouus sempiternus, passibilis impassibilis, latría et idolatria salubriter adorandus.

5 <Questio secunda>: *Vtrum originalis lapsus humani generis per uerbi incarnati, gratia et ueritate pleni, iustam mortem, unionis ypostatice salutationem, sit satisfactione condigna dumtaxat reparabilis*

In hominis assumpti anima, candori lucis eterne per spiritum sanctum unita, plenitudo gratie ueritatis resultabat immensa.

10 In quo etiam homine fuit integritas et ueritas per ipsum reparabilis creature.

Qui idcirco fuit in anima innocens et inpeccabile caput hominis, in carne nata de uirgine <habuit> sensum disciplinabilem et appetitum perpassibilem, <fuit> mortalis et immortalis quoad anime cum corpore uinculum atque uoluntatis concordis secundum se totum.

15 Peccatum instinctum nature creature potentissime contra deum uoluntarie perpetratum totamque speciem ad beatitudinem predestinatam trahens in reatum est iuste et misericorditer expiabile per satisfactionem eiusdem generis uirtuositatis contrarie.

20 Eiusmodi fuit peccatum hominis originale, per penam et uirtutum merita satisfactoris irrei, tam iure belli quam pretii, expurgandum congruissime.

25 Quomodo satisfacere, quia solus homo debuit et solus deus potuit, dei et hominis mediator christus a diabolo, peccato et pena meruit hominem liberare et eidem suoque corpori gloriam resurrectionis impetrare atque ianuam celi reserare.

11 hominis] *bis* C 17 satisfactionem] *nempe* satisfactorem? 23 christus] christi C | peccato] peccata C

2 Nempe psalmistam? Cf. Ps 48, 3 (*Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. R. Weber et R. Gryson, Stuttgart 1994, 829^a).

Quia in christo unio hypostatica uincit et preuenit naturaliter compositionem ex corpore et anima, remanet illa prior et firmior hac posteriore dissoluta.

Quod fidei fomite, caritate nos deo reconciliante, testimonio accipimus accidisse in mortis ihesu triduo. 5

Itaque per illud mortis interstitium fuit christus in sepulchro et in inferno totus personaliter, licet non totaliter, sicut tunc non fuit homo integralis.

(Questio tertia): Vtrum a gratie christi plenitudine epullulant tres uirtutes theologicæ cum quatuor uirtutibus cardinalibus a septem donis sancti spiritus et ad implendum meritorie decalogum legis diuine 10

C 16^v Descendens in mundum sol iustitiæ uenit gladium et “ignem mittere”³ ad reserandum terrestria et inflammandum celestia desideria.

Que comparantur arboribus boni et mali fructiferis, de quibus testantur euangeliste quod “arbor bona malos aut arbor mala bonos fructus nequit facere.”⁴ 15

Itaque christus nostris uitis gratiosa de suo thesauro plenitudinis profert germina salutaria implendi mandata diuine legis.

Nequienti per essentiam agere opus est potentia per habitum expedita existente forma et obiecto et fine distinguibili legitime. 20

In operatione gloriæ celestis meritoria superuestitur substantia agentis creati dei gratia uirtutum et donorum supernaturalium potestatiue et habitualiter seu efficienter et finaliter germinatiua.

Quomodo tribus uirtutibus theologicis inter se equalibus et quatuor cardinalibus illis connexis cum septem spiritus sancti donis huiusmodi uirtutes habitualiter expedientibus proficimus meritorie in uia iustitiæ salutaris. 25

1 uincit] uincis C 17 nostris] nostra C 24 equalibus] equalibet C

3 Cf. Lc 12, 49 (*Biblia sacra*, 1634^b).

4 Cf. Mt 7, 17 sqq.; Lc 6, 43 sqq. (*Biblia sacra*, 1535^b; 1618^b).

Caritas est fons aque uiue solis bonis communicabilis, que recte predicatur uirtutum forma per intentionem boni salutaris circa ordinata diligibilia.

Est et uinculum perfectionis omnes uirtutes gratuitas connectens, qua
5 timorem seruilem foris mittente et initialem cum finali et casto inducente, tenemur “ex toto corde, tota mente, anima et uirtute deum diligere,”⁵ et tam amicis quam inimicis nobis proximis sicut nobismet ipsis benefacere.

Et bipartitum caritatis mandatum⁶ distinguitur salubriter in legis perfecte decalogum tripliciter preceptorium et septiformiter prohibitorium.

10 <Questio quarta>: *Vtrum premissum uirtutum theologicarum ternarium, differentia, ordine et duratione uarium, atque uirtutum cardinalium quaternarium cum septenario donorum in uia et in patria differenter exercitium habuerit ihesus noster legifer ad instar beatorum*

Fides, que est rerum “sperandarum substantia, argumentum non appa-
15 rentium,”⁷ per dilectionem operatiua, et spes, que est future beatitudinis exspectatio circa prouenientes ex meritis et dei gratia, sunt habitus uie salutaris enigmatici per lumen future glorie totaliter euacuandi.

Caritas est habitus amoris, unicus uiatori et comprehensori communis; per auctricem sui gratiam progreditur in uiatore de perfecta dilectione
20 proximi in perfectam secundum statum uie diuinam.

Licet fides informis spem et caritatem preueniat, actu formata circulariter easdem implicat, sine qua intentionem uiatoris in auctorem salutis implicite uel explicite dirigente quemquam saluari est impossibile.

Porro, | maior horum,⁸ caritas, est plenitudo legis, qua tamquam calamo C 17^r
25 iustitie scribuntur iustorum nomina in libro uite duplicis.

Prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo et temperantia sunt uirtutes principales, quibus uiuunt utiliter uiatores et feliciter comprehensores.

21 actu] actum C

5 Cf. Dt 6, 5 (*Biblia sacra*, 243^b–244^a); Mc 12, 30 (*Biblia sacra*, 1596^b).

6 Cf. Mt 22, 38 sqq. (*Biblia sacra*, 1561^b).

7 Cf. Hbr 11, 1 (*Biblia sacra*, 1853^b).

8 Cf. 1 Cor 13, 13 (*Biblia sacra*, 1784^a).

Sapientia, intellectus, consilium, fortitudo, scientia, pietas cum timore domini sunt spiritus sancti dona, quibus reformantur proportionalia ipsis data naturalia.

In uiatore pariter et comprehensore ihesu christo fuerunt hec omnia modo beatifico. 5

Recuperande ergo humane iustitie est necessaria legis trinitas, scilicet nature, figure et gratie.

Per quas instruitur uiuendi regula apud deum et homines boni prouisiua sed inequaliter permansiua.

Morum, ceremoniarum iudiciorumque normis debitis successiue proficit salus. 10

⟨Liber quartus⟩

⟨Questio prima⟩: *Vtrum sacramentalis noue legis septenarii multiplicis gratie in lege ueteri figuraliter promisse collatiui baptismi, confirmationis et eucharistie ternarius sit per cause, signi, rei differentias christiformiter subdistinctus* 15

Vtriusque legis sacramentum est a deo datum sacre rei signum causa humiliationis, eruditionis et exercitationis institutum.

Quod per sue forme uisibilis similitudinem representat.

Quam promittit lex uetus et confert lex noua gratiam salutarem. 20

Iniustitie originaliter contracte septiformis infirmitas seu impotentia indiget tam multiplici nostri saluatoris medicina ex uirtute operati operis eius, qui non ponit obicem, sacramentaliter curatiua.

Baptismus, confirmatio, eucharistia et penitentia, insuper coniugium, ordo et unctio extrema sunt noue legis sacramenta. 25

Quorum quintum et duo prima sunt caracteris impressiua et ex hoc, nisi suaserit ignorantia, nequaquam repetenda.

2 reformantur] rationalia *add. sed del. C* 8 homines] hominis *C* 14 lege] legi *C*
21 impotentia] impatientia *C*

Per aquam tinctio corporis exterior in trinitatis fide, dudum ab apostolis in nomine christi uirtualiter et nunc formaliter inuocate, est baptisma legitimum.

⟨Est⟩ uitiorum depositione et uirtutum munere innouatium.

- 5 Cui equialet, tempore priuilegii et necessitatis, sanctificatio spiritus et lauacrum sanguinis effusi.

⟨Questio secunda⟩: *Vtrum ⟨peccatum⟩ originale, quod olim hebreis circumcisio et gentibus sacrificium abstulit, nunc non fictis christifidelibus aperiendo ianuam regni celestis baptismus christi remouet*

- 10 Itaque per hoc sacramentum induitur christus sacramentaliter a fictis et cum hoc spiritualiter a penitentibus et fidelibus, | sicut ostendunt C 17^r olim baptismus penitentiae iohannis, baptismo christi preambulus, et nunc modo baptismatis cathecismus et exorcismus, ⟨qui sunt⟩ preuii.

- Quod baptisma, licet soli sacerdotes ministrant legitime, tamen potest
15 administrari tempore necessitatis a quolibet homine seruante formam et intentionem ecclesiae catholice.

Renatis ex aqua et spiritu sancto opus est perfectiua roboris fidei genite confirmatio propria pontificis ministerio, que per crismationem exteriorum frontis caracterizat interius animam spiritu plenitudinis.

- 20 Confirmationis sacramentum est ministerio dignissimum, ob hoc antiquitus non prefiguratum.⁹

- Eucharistia sacramentum fit per sacerdotale christi sacrificium in oblatione melchisedech et manna prefiguratum panis et uini, relictis eorum accidentium subsistentia, in unitate corporis et sanguinis eiusdem ihesu
25 christi substantialiter conuersium, ac corporis eius mistici salubriter unit(iu)um.

9 remouet] remanet C 13 baptismatis] baptismati C 14 quod] bis C 20 ob] ab C 24 subsistentia] subsistentiam C

9 In the manuscript, the proposition "Confirmationis sacramentum est ... antiquitus non prefiguratum" is located between "... mistici salubriter unit(iu)um" and "ac ipsa sacrosancta ..." Cf. supra, 533, n. 70.

Ac ipsa sacrosancta eucharistia est spiritualis christifidelium esca.

Que, a malis et bonis ecclesie ministris equaliter confecta, manducatur tripliciter, scilicet sacramentaliter, spiritualiter uel utroque modo christiformiter.

(Questio tertia): *Vtrum quemadmodum penitentia est sacramentum unicum contritione, confessione et satisfactione tripartitum, ita sacramentum ordinis sit una potestas, iherarchia differentie septemplicis, a quibus dependet ministralis efficacia extreme unctionis*

Sicut penitentia, que secundum iheronimum est "secunda post naufragium tabula,"¹⁰ est noue legis sacramentum ad puritatem baptismi per contritionem, confirmationem et condignam satisfactionem penitentis reductiuum,

sic penitentia, que secundum augustinum est "quedam penitentis puniens in se quod dolet commis(is)se uindicta,"¹¹ est uirtus iustitie.

Que, sicut penitentia, concipitur a timore et ab operiente peccatorum multitudinem perficitur caritate, sine qua nil fit condigne uel meritorie, quamuis secum compatiatur peccatum ueniale elemosina, oratione dominica et ieiunio remissibile.

C 18^r Licet hec baptismalis iustitia per peccatum actuale uiolata sit a solo deo formaliter reparabilis, est tamen ab ecclesiastico iudice, clauis regni celorum, id est temporales discernendi atque ligandi soluendique ecclesie potestates, habente, per iniunctionem pene debite materialiter recuperabilis, saluo necessitatis priuilegio per quod deficiente iuris ordine potest fieri coram deo uel alio homine impii iustificatio.

5 est] et C 14 puniens] penitentis C 15 penitentia] prima C 24 uel] *add. sed del. de C*

10 Hieronymus, *Epistola 130 ad Demetriadem*, n. 9, in: *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne (PL), 22, 1115, n. 986, apud Petrum Lombardum, *Sententiae*, IV, d. 14, c. 1 (74), 315.

11 Pseudo-Augustinus, *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, 8, 22, PL 40, 1120, apud Petrum Lombardum, *Sententiae*, IV, d. 14, c. 3 (76), n. 6, 320. Cf. etiam *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, pars 2, causa 33, q. 3, *Tractatus de poenitentia*, d. 3, c. 4, 1211.

Peccata personalia post baptismum perpetrata, quamuis in igne contritionis quoad culpam et penam fortassis dimissa, sunt discreto et autentico sacerdoti hec zelari debitori, uel tempore necessitatis alteri, singulariter si sint mortalia et in summa si uenialia, ore proprio confitenda, atque
 5 <per> proportionatam ipsis penam hic publice si fuerint publica, secrete si secreta, aut deficiente sufficientie reatus arbitrio in purgatorio, corrigenda.

Que sic mortificata per penitentiam nequeunt reuiuiscere formaliter, quamuis per ingratitudinis equiualentiam redeant in recidiuante expro-
 10 brabiliter.

“Infirmatur quis ex uobis, inducat presbyteros ecclesie, et orent super eum, <ungentes eum> oleo in nomine domini, et alleuiabit eum dominus et si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei.”¹²

Differunt regum et pontificum in capite et confirmatorum in fronte
 15 atque baptizatorum in uertice crismatio, cathecumenorumque in pectore salubris oleatio in materia et forma ab huius unctionis sacrificio.

Vnde hoc sacramentum non est sicut ea que carent materia consecrata necessarium, aut sicut ea que utuntur crismate gratiosum, sed ad peccatoris salutem, uenialium a dominio fomitis relictorum remissionem,
 20 et ad corporalis infirmitatis expedientem infirmo alleuiationem specialiter institutum, secundum exigentiam uicissitudinis egritudinum legitime repetendum.

Ordo quoddam sacrum signaculum in signo exteriori datum quo spiritalis potestas traditur ordinato, id est character spiritalis, ubi fit potestatis
 25 ecclesiastice promotio.¹³

Secundum exempla christi, septem donis spiritus sancti proportionata ministeria numerantur, legitime pecunia ordinis officia indigne, licet rite ab hereticis, degradatis, prescisis et simoniaciis, exequenda.

8 mortificata] notificata C

12 Iac 5, 14–15 (*Biblia sacra*, 1864^a), apud Petrum Lombardum, *Sententiae*, IV, d. 23, c. 3 (129), n. 1, 391.

13 Cf. Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae*, IV, d. 24, c. 13 (143), n. 1, 405.

Ostiarius, lectoratus, exorcistatus, acolitus sunt quatuor minores ordines, quos in populi regalis ecclesia precedit dispositiue tonsura, ac subdiaconatus, diaconatus et presbyteratus sunt tres maiores et sacri ordines, supra quos sunt archidiaconatus et pontificatus dignitates ecclesie principales.

APPENDIX 2

1. *The glosses in the Quadripartitus*

The following fragment presents the first three propositions of the *Quadripartitus* with all the glosses added (C 13^r). The propositions are printed in capitals and in widely-spaced lines, as in the manuscript. The original distribution of the glosses is retained as much as possible. The propositions with all their glosses reappear in the commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen (see the edition in the second part of the appendix).

procedens a christo
generis humani saluatore

alias doctrina hec non
esset conformis doctori et discipulo

nisi credideritis
non intelligetis ys.

Doctrina christiana tradit credibilia homini lapso salutaria

sublevans lapsum beatitudinis
reparatum ps. gratiam et gloriam
dabit deus i. dispositionibus preuiis

necessitate finis intentionis
dei hominem ad
beatitudinem predestinantis

Gratia et gloria cum suis amminiculis sunt bona necessaria recuperande
saluti hominis

De utriusque testamenti sacramentis ac utilibus
fruibilibusque rebus est theologia christiformis

que nos beatos faciunt quia frui includitur usum cum fine

glorie amminiculis

delectationis spei et
desiderii secundum augustinum
decimo de trinitate
glorie amminiculis quia uti est
utilia i. mundum et creata in
ipso referre ad id quo
fruendum est ut invisibilis dei
per ea que facta sunt
intellecta conspiciatur et de
temporalibus eterna
capiantur hec augustinus in
de doctrina christiana minus
proprie loquens in decimo de
trinitate cum dicit quod uti
est assumere aliquid in
facultatem voluntatis
quomodo deus utitur nobis
ut suo amore nobis
misereatur et suam
bonitatem communicet

2. *The use of the Quadripartitus and the glosses by
John Hulshout of Mechelen*

The text below is a transcription of the discussion of the first three propositions of the *Quadripartitus* as they appear in the commentary of John Hulshout of Mechelen (*Questiones super libris Sententiarum*, manuscript Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907 [T].) As in the manuscript, the propositions are capitalized. Those passages in the commentary that are identical with the glosses in the *Quadripartitus* are given in italics. As can be noticed, the complete text of the *Quadripartitus* and all the glosses reappear in the commentary of John Hulshout.

T 73^r

DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA TRADIT CREDIBILIA
HOMINI LAPSO SALVTARIA.

Hec propositio ostendit dignitatem et utilitatem theologie secundum quas excellit alias scientias philosophicas quas et tangit ista propositio [excellit] in tribus: primo in auctore seu doctore a quo est, secundo in subiecto de 5 quo, tertio in fructu et bono salutari quod eius discipulus consequitur.

Primum tangitur cum dicitur “doctrina christiana,” id est: *procedens a christo*, in quo excellit alias scientias philosophicas ab homine traditas et inuentas.

Secundum tangitur cum dicitur “tradit credibilia,” quia hec scientia 10 non est de hiis que humana ratione possunt perscrutari, sed que per fidem credenda proponuntur; articuli enim fidei sunt huius scientie principia. Et ergo carens fide non potest in theologia instrui nec eam intelligere, Ysaia septimo: *Nisi credideritis non intelligetis*,¹ ex quo fides est principium omnium intelligendorum ... ex intellectu principiorum sciuntur 15 conclusiones.

Tertium tangitur cum dicitur “homini lapso salutaria.” Illa quidem credibilia que tradit sacra scriptura sunt salutaria homini lapso. Que autem illa sunt, tangetur in sequenti propositione. Huius autem ratio est

15 [...] *locus corruptus* T 18 scriptura sunt] *scripsi om.* T

1 Is 7, 9 (secundum LXX translationem) (cf. *Biblia sacra*, 1103^b).

quia *doctrina* debet esse *conformis doctore et discipulo*. Doctor enim eius est christus *humani generis saluator* et discipulus est homo per christum saluandus. Igitur doctrina debet esse tali modo ipsi homini salutaris. Confirmatur: omnis doctrina a doctore procedens in discipulus conuertit
 5 ipsum discipulum in finem intentionis ipsius docentis. Sed christus est deus homo docens nos utilia. Ergo sapientia theologica docet que sunt homini utilia. Et sic theologia sicut est a deo, ita est de deo et divinis et iterum ad deum, Ecclesiastes primo: "Ad locum unde oriuntur flumina iterum reuertuntur."² Contra primum arguitur ...

10 *GRATIA ET GLORIA CVM SVIS AMMINICVLIS SVNT*
 BONA NECESSARIA RECVPERANDE SALVTI
 HOMINIS.

T 74^f

Hec propositio subsumit que sunt illa credibilia salutaria et dicit quod sunt *gratia et gloria* cum suis amminiculis et *dispositionibus preuiis*; cuius ratio
 15 est quia solus hominis *lapsi* requirit reparationem eius et *beatificationem* taliter *reparati*. Primum facit *gratia sublevans* lapsum. Est enim sanitas anime iuxta illud psalmi "Qui sanat omnes infirmitates tuas."³ Secundum facit gloria beatificans reparatum. Hec igitur sunt bona necessaria saluti recuperande: *necessitate*, dico,⁴ *finis intentionis dei predestinantis hominem*
 20 *ad beatitudinem*. Perfectiones autem gratuite, quibus homo supernaturaliter perficitur, sunt in multiplici differentia: quedam sunt reficientes subiectum, que dicuntur fructus, quedam sanantes a malo, que dicuntur sacramenta, quedam perficientes in potentia substantiali seu actus, que dicuntur uirtutes, quedam perficientes in agere, que dicuntur dona sancti
 25 spiritus, quedam perficientes in statu finis, que dicuntur beatitudines. Homo enim sicut cetera entia non solum ordinatur in finem sue nature sed etiam in finem supernaturalem et ergo huiusmodi mediis ad talem finem mouentibus indiget. De quibus erit posterius circa tertium librum particularior disputatio. Sed quantum nunc est ad propositum, est solum

23 potential] bona T

2 Ecl 1, 7 (*Biblia sacra*, 986^b).

3 Ps 102, 3 (*Biblia sacra*, 898^a).

4 Cf. supra, n. 71.

ostendere necessitatem theologicæ scientiæ et utilitatem eius hec tradentem, de qua dicit augustinus nono de trinitate "theologia est scientia que est de rebus ad salutem hominum pertinentibus."⁵ Nam quidquid sciri potest ab hominibus in rebus humanis (ibi plurimum est supervacue aut noxiæ curiositatis), huic scientiæ non attribuitur, sed tantummodo quo fides saluberrima gignitur, nutritur et roboratur. Contra arguitur ...

T 74^v

DE VTRIVSQVE TESTAMENTI SACRIS AC VTILIBVS
FRVIBILIBVSQVE REBVS EST THEOLOGIA
CHRISTIFORMIS.

Hec conclusio sequitur ex premissis quia hec sacramenta, res utiles et fruibiles, pertinent ad gratiam et gloriam quia sacramenta *ueteris testamenti figuraliter promittunt gratiam*, quam uetus testamentum *nutu angelico prenuntiat*. Data enim est lex uetus per angelicum nutum. Sacramenta uero *noui testamenti conferunt gratiam* presentem seu *presentis iustitiæ* et hoc *per congrua simbola a christo, sole iustitiæ*, instituta. Res etiam utiles sicut, congrua amminicula consequende iustitiæ in presenti et gloriæ in futuro, *quia uti est utilia, id est mundum et creata, in ipsum referre quo fruendum est*, "ut inuisibila per ea que facta sunt intellecta conspiciantur et de temporalibus eterna capiantur" ut ait augustinus in libro de doctrina christiana.⁶ Minus proprie loquens⁷ in decimo de trinitate dicit quod "uti est assumere aliquid in facultatem uoluntatis,"⁸ quomodo deus utitur nobis ut

12 nutu] nuto T 13 nutum] uetus T 18 ut inuisibila] ut ut uisibila T 20 dicit] dicens T

- 5 Ubi? Nempe Augustinus, *De Trinitate*, xiv, 1, ed. W. J. Mountain, Opera Pars 16 / 2, Turnhout 1968 (Corpus Christianorum, Series latina, 50A), 423–424.
- 6 Augustinus, *De doctrina christiana*, I, 4, 4, ed. J. Martin, Opera Pars 4 / 1, Turnhout 1962 (Corpus Christianorum, Series latina, 32), 8, apud Petrum Lombardum, *Sententiae*, I, d. 1, c. 2, n. 5, 56. Cf. Rm 1, 10 (*Biblia sacra*, 1750^a).
- 7 Cf. Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae*, I, d. 1, c. 3, n. 1, 57: "Notandum vero quod idem Augustinus in libro x *De Trinitate*, aliter quam supra accipiens uti et frui, sic dicit ..."
- 8 Augustinus, *De Trinitate*, x, 11, 17, ed. W. J. Mountain, Opera Pars 16 / 1, Turnhout 1968 (Corpus Christianorum, Series latina, 50), 330. Cf. Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae*, I, d. 1, c. 3, n. 1, 57.

suo amore nobis misereatur et suam bonitatem nobis communicet. Res fruibiles demum que “nos beatos faciunt”⁹ quia frui concludit usum “cum fine delectationis” spei et desiderii secundum augustinum decimo de trinitate.¹⁰

De quo modo amplius in sequenti questione dicitur. De hiis ergo omnibus, ut circa maiorem dictum, est theologia; que dicitur christiformis quia a christo tradita secundum quod augustinus eam uocat doctrinam christianam sicut prehabitu est. Contra istam conclusionem arguitur

...

9 Augustinus, *De doctrina christiana*, 1, 3, 3, 8, apud Petrum Lombardum, *Sententiae*, 1, d. 1, c. 2, n. 1, 56.

10 Augustinus, *De Trinitate*, x, 11, 17, 330. Cf. Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae*, 1, d. 1, c. 3, n. 1, 57.