In the last few decades, the philosophy and theology of Heymericus de Campo (†1460) have been the subject of growing scholarly interest. 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.

Heymericus taught in Diest, Cologne and Louvain, where he had many students, some of whom we know by name. 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...

---

1. Introduction

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

2. 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.


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

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.”

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 logicæ*, the *Compendium naturalis philosophiae*, and the *Compendium Ethicorum*. Parts of these works were edited by Jean-Daniel Cavigioli in 1981. The modern reader is immediately struck by the fact that these works differ in format from customary academic commentaries from earlier centuries. This is especially true when reading in a strictly logical way the compendia subdivided into a number of sections. Together these provide a good impression of being written up with the aid of an adetic technique, "logiæ," in which the author would almost the entire corpus of the compendia completely restate Aristotle as only limited passages of the *Compendium discentium*.

The theological background is fundamentally different. Lombard’s *Sententiarium* in particular was taken up and turned into an obligatory text for study and discussion. His works at the surface, the discipline which was substantially the same, in which he accurately portrays the content of Aristotle at different medieval levels.

In many of his works, Heymericus resorts to a method different from his predecessors. He follows the traditional usage of the *epilogue* and gives preference to a different style.

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*).


9 The complete title is *De praeminentiis scientiarum in qua multa sub epilogum“, ed. L. Favre, Nîort 1885. In the *Leiden Review of Medieval Studies*, 10 (1989), 11–21, in which the following comments are summarised: Heymericus sub epilogum referiert, 12.


11 On the medieval *sententiarum* and the *epiologiales* see *Preliminary Commentaries in Medieval Sentences* (Boston, Köln 2002).
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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. The whole conveys the impression of being a rigorously ordered summary. This impression is confirmed by an addition to the title: "... per positiones sillogisticas epilogatae," in which the word "epilogatae" 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-

---

9 The complete title is given in Cavigioli, "Les écrits," 317. As to the translation of "epilogus" as "summary," see C. Du Cange, Glossarium mediae et infimae latiniae, ed. L. Favre, Niort 1883–1887, repr. Graz 1954, 2, 275, s.v. "Epilogus" and "Epilogus," in which the following evidence is quoted (Vita S. Drausii Episcopi, n. 20): "paucis de pluribus sub epiloque recitatis."
10 Concerning the Tractatus problematicus and the Compendium divinorum, see M.J.F.M. Hoenen, Heymeric van de Velde. Eenheid in de tegenenden, Baarn 1990 (Geschiedenis van de Wijbegeerte in Nederland, 4).
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 Quadrupartitus Sententiarum has survived. It is preserved in a single manuscript (Bernkastel-Kues, St. Nikolaus Hospital, Cus. 101, 13⁴–22⁴). 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: Quadrupartitus quaestionum syllogisticæ supra quattuor 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 syllogisticæ epylagatae, 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 Quadrupartitus 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.

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.
For that reason, Heymeric de Campo was devoting more and more attention to his study of logic and its applications to theological issues. His views, more traditional than those of his contemporaries, were soon becoming more easily understood and appreciated.

Among the writings that he composed, three texts are of particular importance: the Quadripartitus Sententiarum a magistro, the Quadripartitus Sententiarum manuscript (Bernkastel, 1473), and the Quadripartitus Sententiarum (Cologne, 1480) of Frobenius, who kept it in his collection. The Quadripartitus Sententiarum a magistro is also an important source for understanding Heymericus's thinking on the subject of Averroism and its implications for theology and philosophy. The Quadripartitus Sententiarum a magistro is a more complete and detailed version of the Quadripartitus Sententiarum, and it is the text that Heymericus studied most closely.

The Quadripartitus Sententiarum a magistro is a crucial text that helped to shape the development of Heymericus's thought. It is also a valuable resource for understanding the history of late medieval Albertism, as it contains many of the same themes and ideas that are found in Heymericus's other works. The Quadripartitus Sententiarum a magistro is a valuable resource for understanding the history of late medieval Albertism, as it contains many of the same themes and ideas that are found in Heymericus's other works.

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. 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. 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. 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. 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, 10 (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.


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 Quadrupartitus would surpass the limits of this paper. Nevertheless, in order to provide a firm basis for further research into the Quadrupartitus, a few questions will be discussed below.

2. Authenticity

The authenticity of the Quadrupartitus 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. In some of these treatises, the authorship of Heymericus is indicated in a similar manner: “m(agistri) h(eymerico) de campo” (25r) and “a m(agistro) h(eymerico) de campo” (63r). 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.


Heymericus as Epilogue, copies of the Canons Regular and the Rooklooster catalogue have already mentioned above. Among the works of two other treatises: the Super quadrupartitus: the Super quadrupartitus: the Super quattuor libros philosophiae Aristotelis. This treatise is not in the catalogue: “ut dicitur in capite of the Quadrupartitus: the Autograph manuscript (autograph manuscript) and the copy was kept at the Huy. However, this work has been recapitulated, as already mentioned. There is no reason that the first treatise or to a theologian to the


24 See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,”

25 See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,” “See Johannes Molanus, Les quatorze livres sur le...,”

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.


with different status and different titles, such as Ordinatio and Lectura. Examples of this are John Duns Scotus and Adam Wodeham. 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. 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.

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

30 Cf. Kaluza, "Trois listes," 11, n. 12; 13, n. 14; 14, n. 44; and 15, n. 74. There are also examples from other authors. E.g. Dionysius the Carthusian composed a Epylogia in librum Iob; see K. Emery Jr., Dionysii Cartusiani Opera selecta, 1: Studia Bibliographica,
The Sentences Commentary of Heymericus de Campo

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. Similar formulas can be observed in the Quadripartitus: "unitas, species, ordo;" "per essentiam intime, potentiione proxieme, per praeexistentia cognitive;" "ex forma, motto et fine."

Heymericus's style differs from the 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 peregrinazione puororum. 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: Tractatus de causa diversitatis eventuum humanorum ad instantiam reverendissimi D. Cardinalis de Cusa editus.


3. Date of composition

According to the title, the Quadripartitus was written at Cologne ("Colonie collectorum"). 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). 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." He had thus by then begun to comment upon the third book of the Sentences. In Cologne, all four books of the Sentences were read during one academic year. The course started in October and in May of the following calendar year, the third book was set on the agenda. 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

---

34 Cf. Tewes, Die Bursen, 48–49.
36 Cf. Gescher, "Die Statuten," 82: "Item presentati et admissi ad lecturam libri sententiarum legant sententias per annum annum ...
a sermon ("collatio") and a public disputation ("principium"), in which the opinions of fellow "sententiarii" were discussed. The "principia" and the sermons have not been preserved in the Quadripartitus, not even in redrafted form. 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. 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. 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.
40 Cf. Gescher, "Die Statuten," 84.
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 Hulsbount 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. 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. 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 questionum* 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 of the treatise into four sections or “quartos.” This means that the work was divided into four parts, which is supported by the fact that it was copied in a book from which the *Quadripartitus* itself is divided into four books. In Cologne, the first two parts were taught as the course begins. The fourth part begins when the third book of the first two, where the treatise begins.

However, a corresponding paragraph is not found. The text of Peter Lombard is not treated in the same way. The *Sentences* are ordered in four separate, independent books in the order in which the questions are treated. Therefore, the treatise was not treated as one

42 Cf. Tewes, *Die Bursen*, 48 (Heymericus de Campo) and 49–50 (John Hulsbount of Mechelen).
43 See above, n. 25.
44 Colomer, Nikolaus von Kues, 12–13, and R. Haubst, *Das Bild des Einen und Dreizehen* 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.

49 See below, 527–528.
we cannot determine the precise place and date. In the present time, there is no manuscript which gives access to the libraries of Louvain and elsewhere.\footnote{Cf. Gescher, “Die Statuten,” 83.} These notes are given in the “practicum” of the Quadripartitus. These notes are not related to the notes of Heymericus de Campo in the manuscript.\footnote{Cf. ms Cas. 106, 13f.} Perhaps this text was not the original text of the notes. However, the fact that the text was copied is only certain that the text was copied during the academic year.\footnote{See below, 527–528 (§ 5).} The word “practicum” of the Quadripartitus in the title of the Opus tripartitum by Meister Eckhart: it means that the work consists of three parts.\footnote{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.} 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.\footnote{The relationship between the “distinctiones” of the Sentences and the questions of the Quadripartitus is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Quadripartitus</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Quadripartitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 1–3</td>
<td>i, q. 1</td>
<td>i, d. 1–14</td>
<td>i, q. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 4–19</td>
<td>i, q. 2</td>
<td>i, d. 15–22</td>
<td>i, q. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 30–34</td>
<td>i, q. 3</td>
<td>i, d. 23–33</td>
<td>i, q. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 35–48</td>
<td>i, q. 4</td>
<td>i, d. 34–40</td>
<td>i, q. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 1–2</td>
<td>ii, q. 1</td>
<td>ii, d. 1</td>
<td>ii, q. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 3–5</td>
<td>ii, q. 2</td>
<td>ii, d. 2–13</td>
<td>ii, q. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 6–11</td>
<td>ii, q. 3</td>
<td>ii, d. 14–25</td>
<td>ii, q. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 16–44</td>
<td>ii, q. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, 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.\footnote{The relationship between the “distinctiones” of the Sentences and the questions of the Quadripartitus is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Quadripartitus</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Quadripartitus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 1–3</td>
<td>i, q. 1</td>
<td>i, d. 1–14</td>
<td>i, q. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 4–19</td>
<td>i, q. 2</td>
<td>i, d. 15–22</td>
<td>i, q. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 30–34</td>
<td>i, q. 3</td>
<td>i, d. 23–33</td>
<td>i, q. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, d. 35–48</td>
<td>i, q. 4</td>
<td>i, d. 34–40</td>
<td>i, q. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 1–2</td>
<td>ii, q. 1</td>
<td>ii, d. 1</td>
<td>ii, q. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 3–5</td>
<td>ii, q. 2</td>
<td>ii, d. 2–13</td>
<td>ii, q. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 6–11</td>
<td>ii, q. 3</td>
<td>ii, d. 14–25</td>
<td>ii, q. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, d. 16–44</td>
<td>ii, q. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the word"quattuor", which means “four.” Perhaps this text was not the original text of the notes. However, the fact that the text was copied is only certain that the text was copied during the academic year. The word “quattuor” of the Quadripartitus is the division 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 parts. 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. However, 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. 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. The ordering of the questions on the fourth book is less evident. The word"quattuor", which means “four.” Perhaps this text was not the original text of the notes. However, the fact that the text was copied is only certain that the text was copied during the academic year.
“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 Schilt, who finished reading the Sentences at Cologne in 1472. The commentary covers all four books of the Sentences. 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. Schilt decided not to discuss the opinions of many other thinkers so as to finish reading the Sentences within one year.

In Schilt’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 Schilt is helpful. The questions in this commentary are not ordered syllogistically.

50 The commentary has been preserved in ms Wien, Dominikanerkloster, 94. Cf. Lohr, 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 relation to the term “quadripartitus” of the treatise.

The term “collectus” or “brought together” has been often and brought to the fore the essentials. This is well shown in the catalogue. The four arguments, as follows: Quadripartitus Sententiarum.

In the course of the discussion, the normal pattern. In each question.

Each argument has a title, and the third question is followed by the arguments instead of being

After the third question, it is necessary to bring the original argument, in manuscript, the thing that has been done to a special manner. The title of the question goes across the page with the part of the question which margins are.

The breakdown is determined by the end of the third question, or by the context. The question of the sacraments, which is situated.

However, the sacraments of the.

In fact, Peter Lombard.
The sentences of which each book is divided into the same problematic manner, so that each book is dealt with separately. Lombard’s text is known to d'Heem, and the medieval reader. He therefore knew which book to answer our question in each case.

Lombard presents itself as “quadrupartitus” or “quaestiones collectae” who finished reading it. This book covers all four books of the Sentences, but contains an account of the whole system of syllogisms, although d'Heem decided not to discuss them in his reading of the Sentences.

The term “quadrupartitus” refers to the structure of the treatise into four books. A similar term “syllogistique” is used by anyone who starts a sentence in a similar way, but “quaestiones collectae” is invalidly restricted to books contrary to the first, but Lombard’s speculate about the four books, each treated by means of four questions.

The term “syllogistique” is used to indicate that the arguments follow a well-defined order, in contrast to the “quaestiones collectae” of John Schiltz, which is only treated by means of four questions.

The terms “syllogistique” and “quaestiones collectae” are used to indicate that the arguments follow a well-defined order, in contrast to the “quaestiones collectae” of John Schiltz, which is only treated by means of four questions.

In the course of the fourth book, the Quadrupartitus 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.

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. 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. In fact, Peter Lombard actually incorporated materials, sometimes even

54 See the edition below.
55 Cf. ms Cus. 106, 18v.
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 quattuor libros sententiariun."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 sv libris distinctae*, 2, Grottaferrata 1298 (Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 5), especially 578b–580b (Index iii: Auctores et scripta, s.v. *Decretum Gratiani*).
57 Cf. ms Cus. 106, 13v.
58 All the parts of the Rooklooster catalogue dealing with Heymericus are edited in Kaluza, "Trois listes," 10–15.
60 Cf. ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 164v.

---

61 See above, nn. 8 and 14.
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'] Questio prima:
Vtrum signorum et rerum tam fruibilium quam utilium doctrina christiana

sit deo fruibilis unico, licet personaliter trino,

John Hulshout of Mechelen, Questions super libris Sententiarius, ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907.

[73'] Questio prima:
Vtrum doctrina christiana sit signorum et rerum tam fruibilium quam utilium...

[75'] Questio secunda:
Vtrum deus sit fruibile unicum licet personaliter trium...

61 See above, nn. 8 and 29.
[76'] Questio tertia:

ex suis uestigiis et ymaginibus
investigabilis sapientia. Vtrum ex suis uestigiis et ymaginibus
sit deus investigabilis ... 

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 vacantiales,” which exhibit a similar arrangement. “Quaestiones vacantiales” 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 (Serviatus Fankel).63 Each question of the “quaestiones vacantiales” 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, 3r (“propositio,” “maior”), 74r (“propositio,” “minor”), 74v (“conclusio”).
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 vacantiales” 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.”


Cf. John Hulshout of Mechelen, *Questiones super libris Sententiarum*, ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 97v; 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 dicensium angelum creatum in gratia. Soluto. Hoc appareat fidelius et magis conformiter aucto-ritatibus sanctorum, licet aliud, quod est *dictum magistri*, uidetur secundum rationem probabiliori …*

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.*, 158v; 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 hierarcha militantis ecclesiae. Secundum patet, quia illa fuit lex imperfecte justitie. 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


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 nature of the "lectura secundum alium" is C. van Hulshout, *Commercials on the Sentences of Thomas Aquinas* (Tijdschrift voor Filosofie, 36, 2002, 425–464, especially 443.)

69 The commentary of John Hulshout, *Quadripartitus*: "Ursula, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 97v.

70 In the *Quadripartitus* "Confirmationis sacramentum perfectionis," wrongly attributed to Heymericus, one finds a more sense. The relevant passage is above (532). In the edition of the text of John Hulshout.

71 Commenting on the above, cf. the fragment given by Hulshout.
Since John Hulshout refers to the Quadripartitus as to the "dictum ma-
gistri," 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 proposi-
tions 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 on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Current Research, 1, Leiden, Boston, Köln

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, 7r). 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 pre-
figuraturn," wrongly appears between the propositions on the Eucharist. In the com-
mentary of John Hulshout, it comes after the first proposition on Confirmation, which
makes more sense. The relevant passage (ms Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 13v) 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.
Quod dicitur Cant. v. 1: 'ut signaculum super eis, et exponens Gregorius de angelismo et sigillum. In 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. 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, 1, Prologus, ed. D. Siedler, Münster 1978 (Opera omnia, 34/1), 10–28.

John Hulshout of Mechelen, Questions super libris Sententiarum, MS Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 945/907, 73.

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

Theologia facta est in nobis alio quodam superiori causa efficiente. Est enim impressio quaedam et sigillatio divinae sapientiae in nobis, ut mens humanae dei sapientis sit sigillum, impressa formis et rationibus causae primae in sapientia sua creatis et reparatis et glorificantis sua causata.

Hulshout was a notable theologian and editor of the works of Albert the Great. His work, Questions super libris Sententiarum, is a collection of philosophical and theological questions and answers. In this particular passage, Hulshout is referring to the role of the human mind as a sign of the divine wisdom. He notes that the impression and seal of the divine wisdom are impressed on us, forming concepts and rational causes of the divine wisdom.


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 excellente in sapiencia: "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 ipsum, sicut cer e ascendit ad sigillum, et non eversus. 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 vi De trinitate, quod quia cor hominis ascendit ad illam, necesse est, quod in sola illa cor hominis exaltetur. Alia quippe scabilia vel aequalia sunt vel inferiora cordi humano; propter quod, secundum quod in corde humano sunt, exaltationem recipiunt et nobilium esse, quam habent in seipsis, sicut nobilium 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 iustitia, et scire iustitiam tuam et virtutem tuae 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 ipsum eternam sapientiam, sicut cer ascendent ad sigillum, et non eversus. Propter quod oratione magis et devotione acquiritur quam humano studio. Unde dicitur Sap. vii: "Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus, et invocavi, et venit in me spiritus sapientiae."

Et hoc infert Augustinus viii De trinitate, quia cor hominis ascendit ad illam, quod in illa sola cor hominis exaltetur. Alia scabilia vel aequalia sunt vel inferiora cordi hominis. Et ideo exaltatur in homine.

Sola autem hec scientia exaltat hominem que cor elevat, purificat et in aeterna fundat immortalitate.

Hinc

dicit Dyonisius de
Hierotheo, quod “patiendo divina
didicit divina,” tamen studium ad
hoc cooperatur sicut dispositio in
subiecto. Propret quod studium
sacrarum litterarum multum com-
mandat Hieronymus in Prologo
Galeato et dicit, quod hoc com-
mandat Paulus in discipulo suo
Timoteo ...

Themotheo, quod solum “patiendo
diuina didicit diuina.” Scindum
tamen quod studium ad eam cooper-
atur 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 state-
ment 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 slav-
ishly copied 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 intel-
lectual 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
(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.
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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
add. = addidit
corr. = correxit
del. = delevit
lin. = linea
marg. = margo
om. = omisit
sig. = signum
sup. = supra
syllogisms

a magistro

5 Questio prima: Venerabilissimae

doctrinae christianae
uestigiis et ymaginis

Doctrina christianae

Gratiae et gloriae

De utriusque t

est theologia christian

Proprie dictum fr

Mentis human

15 diuinorum person

Qui, cum sit a

tatio.

Sicut uestigium est

objecti exemplaris

2 sententiarum] et d

cum sig. sup. lin. C
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 3\textsuperscript{r}
   doctrina christiana sit de deo fruibili unico, licet personaliter trino, ex suis
   uestigiis et ymaginibus investigabilis sapientia

Doctrina christiana tradit credibilia homini lapso salutaria.
   Gratia et gloria cum suis amminiculis sunt bona necessaria recupe-
   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
10 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.

\[2 \text{ sententiarum}] \text{ et decreum } add. \sup. \lin. \ C \quad 5 \text{ questio prima}] \text{ in marg. } C \quad 6 \text{ suis}]\]
\[\text{cum sig. } add. \sup. \lin. \ C\]
Vnitas, species et ordo sunt uestigia creatoris in quolibet creato, preter que rationali condito inest biformis dei ymago.

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

Questio secunda: Vtrum in essentie divine simplici et incommutabili ueritate pater ingenitus, filius unigenitus et ab utroque procedens sanctus spiritus conveniant ydemptice, licet suis differant proprietaibus notionaliter et relatiue

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

Principium uniuersi esse non potest quomodo libet non esse.

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

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

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

Que in fontana dei substantia intellectualiter unificata patrem seu intellectum ingenitum, filium seu uerbum unigenitum et procedentem ab his spiritum sanctum spiratum amorem distinguuit in existentia.

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

Licet propria ueritas seu ratio essentiae sit communicabilis et absoluta, in hoc differens ab agendi potentia, cuius proprietas est incommunicabilis et relatiue, tamen ubi quod est non differt ab esse, sese implicant reciproce.

igitur hec in simplici deo, fonte uino a se et ad se semper effuso, ydempticantur mutuo.

quolibet creato, preter
uestigia et interius per

et incommutabili ueri-
procedens sanctus spiritus
notionaliter et rela-

et incommutabiliter atque uere.

et inexistente, est tamen
voluntatem se commu-
primi, medi et ultimi

iurifica patrem seu in-
procedentem ab

unitas absolute essentie
fons vitae quem re-
communicabilis et absoluta,
\[ \text{si est } | \text{incommunica-
esse, sese implicant} \]

ad se semper effuso,

Questio tertia: Virum sicut divina trinitas est essentialiter et potentialiter et presentaliter ubique et sole procedentes personae sunt missibles gratuiter, sic omnes personae tres sunt egales et similis in potentia, scientia et voluntate distinguibiliter objecte

5 Simplici dei essentie, cui nil potest accidere, continent bonitas infinita sui undique diffusa.

Que causaliter attingit omnia conspectui suo prouido eternaliter præcognita.

Per suam essentiam intime, potentiam proxime, presentiam cognitiue

se communicat deus undique incommiscibiliter et indiuisse.

Missio est notionalis ad extra personae misse a mittente processio.

Sicut dei essentiam sua notionalis virtus implicat, sic causalem eius potentiam fontana us fecundat.

Tunc uere deus mittitur, cum per effectum doni gratuiter procedere
dinosaur.

Licet unitas est indistinguibilis realiter et distinguere trium personarum essentia non agit nec patitur, est tamen ratio agendi his uniuoqua, qua simul causant temporaliter: pater generat inmissingibiliter, filius a solo patre
evergent genus quandoque mittitur simul, et ab his procedens sanctus

spiritus potest mitti cum filio dupliciter.

Possible, scibile et uolubile virtuosam dei essentiam respiciunt equi

uoce.

Coeterne personae sunt similis in essendi qualitate et egales in eiusdem
agendi potestate, que per potentie, scientie et uoluntatis objecta propria
distinguitur relatiue.

Ordinabilis mun bono.
Nec angelus in 1 fabrica in dispositio

5 Amor diuine prouici coniungens principi
Cuius ordo prou tripartite sicut prop
Corporalis mun
bino triduo, quam s gustini testimonio.1

(Questio secunda): mitatis ambitio fecit

Ymaginis diuine pa
Ad quod nequeu
Angelis et homin anagogica.

Superbit liberum ar
peruenire per grati
Lucifer summus
propris uiribus.
Hic ita cum suis
formis.

Humanus intellectus
dios est omnium co

1 essentiali] essentiale
add. et del. C 13 amb
1 Cf. Augustinus, De
Leipzig 1894 (Corps
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 divinitatis suisque nectit ordinibus, fines superiorum coniungens principiis inferiorum cum uruitum et operum differentiis.

Cuius ordo praevidit tam in uruitibus quam operibus distinguetur tripartite sicut proprius modus exigat distinguibilis creature.

Corporalis mundi machina temporaliiter disponentur et ornatur in bino triduo, quam sic discernit notionabiliter anglica contemplatio augustini testimonio.\(^1\)

\(\langle\text{Questio secunda}: Vitrum angelos et homines innocentem conditos deiformitatis ambitio fecit eque miseris}\)

Ymaginis divina participia sunt ad fruendum deo condita.

Ad quod nequem proficere ex nature dono proprie.

Angelis et hominibus innocentem 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 uluit consecui proprii uribus.

Hic ita cum suis complicibus ambiit equipotentiam celsitudinis deiformis.

Humanus intellectus per subordinatos sui angeli deique intelligibles radios est omnium cognitiuus.

1 essentia[| essentiale C\(^6\) coniungens cum sig. sup. lin. C | uruitum] complento add. et del. C\(^13\) ambitio ab initio C\(^18\text{--}19\) potest peruenire| sup. lin. C

Hunc in prima homine naturali plenum docmata potuit sathanas instruere.

Cuias superbia uocos energia extulit eue desiderium consequi beatitudinem per scientiam, ut deus omnium.

Quod ex forma, motiue et sive peccatum hominis et non angeli est reparable monstrat differentem miseriam utriusque.

(Questo tertia): Vtrum sicut boni angeli per tres iherarchias tripliciter distincti mittuntur in humane salutis ministerium, sic angeli mali in relatione uiciarum diversi sinuntur hominibus adesse ad eorum exercitium

Differtes natura angeli fuerunt ab initio quadrifariam dissimiles. Quorum multitudinem dieina prouidencia coniuxit in ordinem. Qui per datam beniuolis gratiam agebatur in terna chororum iherarchia secundum suorum nauralium differentem analogiam.

Sols creator formarum et miraculorum opifex deus ministerio spirituum creatorum prouidet corporalibus. Virtus et uitiunt meriti personalis non tollit nature ordinem concreatum angeli.

Corpora noue 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 sensitiuum dormientis uel uigilantis inuuiure, fantasmatibus inuentis aut fictis sensibilibus et intelligibilis uti conuenit tam bono quam malo spiritui, formas substantiales materie aut intelligibilis intellectui increare, hiis substantialiter illabi uel contra supraue nature communis ordinem mirabiliter causare prorsus impotenti.

Quemadmodum spirituum bonorum iherarchia est saluti humane proportionaliter prouisia, sic presumptuosa malorum tyrannia est cum prelatione uitiorum eodem saluti emula.
Occidit potuit sathanas

. . . egerium consequi beatitudine

. . . hominis et non angeli est 5 quique.

Quaerendus a iherarchias tripliciter di- vere angeli mali in prelacione

. . . exercitium

. . . silar tam dissimiles.

. . . nuniexit in ordinem.

. . . externa chororum iherar- 

. . . chiam analogiam.

. . . ministerio spirituum

. . . naturae ordinem concre-

. . . sare, assumere, eis illabi,

. . . nare, nouas fingere, et

. . . sitiueam dormientis uel

. . . nitatis sensibiliter et intelli-

. . . gatuis, formas substantiales

. . . substanciali illabi uel

. . . habiliter causare prorsus

. . . est salutis humane pro-

. . . tum tyrannia est cum pre-

( Questio quarta): Vt hominis peccatum quodlibet est voluntarium, sic elicit opus bonum per aditum gratia liberum arbitrium

Quedam mandato a deo per uerum mulieri tradito suauem serpentes

. . . oicevessa transgresso soluetur originalis horum iustitia suis posteris se-

. . . minat.

Quomodo serpentina nostre sensualitatis illecreba per muliebrem ra-

. . . tiones inferioris delectationem ad uirilem rationis superioris consensum

. . . perducta nascitur iustitia nostrorum operum mortifera.

. . . Quodlibet hominis peccatum est causaliter aut formaliter voluntar-

. . . ium, in origine et actuale, consequenter in ueniale et mortale, rursus in

. . . paternum et filium, seu in patrem et filium rationabili subdistinctum

. . . usque in generationem quartum moraliter et in omnem naturaliter.

. . . Mortaliter peccare est dicto uel facto uel consectetur (a) diuine (voluntatis) C 15

. . . iustitia committendo uel omitendo (declarare).

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

. . . tricausaliter conformare.

. . . Peccatum non a deo sed a creatura bona deficienter causatum in

. . . tripless penale, septemples capitale et sexoplex irremissibile mortaliter

. . . est disiunctum.

Exstente libero arbitrio rationis et voluntatis electivo iudicio poterit hoc

. . . ex se moraliter bonum agere, quod sine fidei gubernaculo non est eterno

. . . dignum premio.

Dominante peccati originalis penali fomite ad peccandum ante recuperationem mortaliter, sed post hanc uenialiter obrigante, 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 adiatum fide preueniens et subsequentis formata benefico dono gratie.

(Liber tertius)

(Questio prima): Vtrum in tempore plenitudinis spiritus sancti gratificio fiet filii dei et hominis inconfusa unio faciens utriusque nature ydeomata cum suis proprietatibus communia

Divine predestination is impleto tempore ut homo deus fieret, nectuntur gratiae, peccatum quos seiuexerat.

Hi: uniueris circulus dumtaxat finiri debuit in arte conditoris.

Quem perfecit deus trinus opere appropriato sancti spiritus.

Compositio et assumptu seu exathicca unio fiunt ex eisdem principii ordine contrario.

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

C.167 Dei per incarnationem urbi humanatio est per assumptionem carnis mediante spiritu hominis deificatio.

Licet suppos situm nature gemine prefatum eternaliter a patre et tempora liter a spiritu sanctor fuerit perfecte natum, tamen est patris unigenitus et non spiritus sancti filius naturalis uel adoptiosus.

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


Vnde per prophetae pauper, id est, factus in avaria et idolatria et idolatria salutari.

(Questio secunda): Vocem carnati, gratia et ueritatem uocat. In hominis assumpto unita, plenitude gratie.

In quo etiam hominum creature.

Quic hiccirco fuit in carne nata de virgine sanctissima, perpassibilem, fuit in carnibus uinculum atque uoluntatem.

15 Peccatum instinctum in carnes perpetrum totius hominis, in reatum est iure eisdem generis uirtutum.

Eiusmodi fuit peccatum merita satisfactoris irrationis grissimae.

Quomodo satisfacite et hominis mediator cuius est liberare et eadem suo quantum uolue uersu.

25 Ianuam celi reserare.
Peccatum instinctum nature creature potentissime contra deum voluntarie perpetramque totamque speciem ad beatitudinem predestinatam tractans in reatum est iustae et misericordi expiabile per satisfactionem eiusdem generis iiurtuosatis contrarie.

Eiusmodi fuit peccatum hominis origine, per penam et iuritutum merita satisfactoris irrei, tam iure belli quam pretii, expurgandum congruissime.

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


APPENDIX !

Vnde per prophetam recte dicitur quod est simul in unum diues et pauper, id est, factus infectus, nouus semipernus, passibilis inpassibilis, latria et idolatria salubriter adorandus.

(Questio secunda): Vtrum originalis lapsus humani generis per uerbi incarnati, gratia et uestitate pleni, iustam mortem, unionis ypostatice salutationem, sit satisfactione condigna dumtaxat reperabilis

In hominis assumpti anima, candori lucis eterna per spiritum sanctum unita, plenitude gratie uestitatis resultatam immensa.

In quo etiam homine fuit integritas et uestitas 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 uestitatis concordis secundum se totum.

15 Peccatum instinctum nature creature potentissime contra deum voluntarie perpetramque totamque speciem ad beatitudinem predestinatam trahens in reatum est iustae et misericordi expiabile per satisfactionem eiusdem generis iiurtuosatis contrarie.

Eiusmodi fuit peccatum hominis origine, per penam et iuritutum merita satisfactoris irrei, tam iure belli quam pretii, expurgandum congruissime.

Quomodo satisfacere, quia solus homo debit et solus deus potuit, dei et hominis mediator christus a diabolo, peccato et pena meruit hominem liberare et idem suoque corpori gloriam resurrectionis impetrare atque ianuam celi reserare.
Quia in christo unio hypostatica unicit et preueait 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.

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

(Questio tertia): Vrum a gratie christi plenitudine epullant tres virtutes theologice cum quatuor uirtutibus cardinalibus a septem donis sancti spiritus et ad impleendum meritorie decalogum legis diuine

C 16° Descendens in mundum sol iustitiae unum gladium et “igne mittere”3 ad reserandum terrae et inflammandum celestia desideria.

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

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

Nequenti, per essentiam agere opus est potestia per habitud expedita existente forma et fine distinguibil legiteime.

In operatione glorie celestis meritoria superuestit tur substantia agentis creati dei gratia uirtutum et donorum supernaturalium potestatie et habitualiter seu efficiente et finaliter germinatia.

Quomodo tribus uirtutibus theologice inter se equalibus et quattuor cardinalibus illis connexis cum septem spiritus sancti donis hiusmodi uirtutes habitualiter expeditiibus proficimus meritorie in uia iustitiae salutaris.

Caritas est fons uirtutum; alumnus est actus dictatur uirtutum 5 in diligibili.

Est et uinculum timorem seriuli festrinum “ex toto corporis habitur," tam amicis quam inimicis.

Et bipartitum caritatem uirtutum est perfecta decalogum tripartitum.

(Questio quarta): differentia ordine externarium cum septem donis habuerit theses nos.

Fides, que est rerum[15-17] centium, per dilectitudinem expectatio circa praeuentiam salutaris enigmatic.

Caritas est habitus habitation per auctricem sui prudentiam, proximi in perfecta.

Licet fides infirma et fructus give perquirat eam et utamibus implicite uel etiam Porro, | maior horum

25 iustitiae scribuntur in scripturis.

Prudentia, iustitia, caritas est tria uirtus, quibus uiiunt utilitas

Cf. Lc 13, 13 (Biblia sacra, 1618).

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

Cf. Mt 6, 5 (Biblia sacra, 1634).

Cf. Mt 22, 38 sqq. (Biblia sacra, 1634).

Cf. Hbr 11, 1 (Biblia sacra, 1618).
Caritas est fons aque uiue solis bonis communicabilis, que recte predicatur uirtutum forma per intentionem boni salutaris circa ordinata dilegibilis.

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

Et bipartitum caritatis mandatum distinguere salubriter in legis perfecte decalogum tripliciter preceptorium et septiformiter prohibitorium.

(Questio quarta): Vtrum premissum uirtutum theologriam ternarium, differentia, ordine et duratione uariorum, atque uirtutum cardinalium quaternarium cum septenario donorum in via et in patria differenter exercitium habuerit Ihesus noster legifer ad instar beatorum

Fides, que est rerum “sperrandum substantia, argumentum non apparuiu,” per dilectionem operativam, et spes, que est fature beatitudinis expectatio circa prouenientes ex meritis et dei gratia, sunt habitus uie salutaris enigmatici per lumen future glorie totaliter euacuandi.

Caritas est habitus amoris, unicus uiatorii et comprehensori communis; per auctricem sui gratiam progressit in uiatore de perfecta dilectione proximae in perfectam secundum statum uiue duimiamn.

Licet fides informis spem et caritatem prueeniat, actu formata circulariter easdem implicat, sine qua intentionem uiiatorii in autorem salutis implicet uel explicite dirigente quemquam salvati est impossible. Porro, | maior horum, caritas, est plenitudo legis, qua tamquam calamo C 17j

iusjustitie scribuntur iustorum nomina in libro uite duplicis.

Prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo et temperantia sunt uirtutes principales, quibus uiuunt utilior uiaiores et feliciter comprehensores.

actu] actum C

5  Cf. Dt 6, 5 (Biblia sacra, 243b–244a); Mc 12, 30 (Biblia sacra, 1596b).
6  Cf. Mt 22, 38 sqq. (Biblia sacra, 1561b).
7  Cf. Hbr 11, 1 (Biblia sacra, 1858b).
8  Cf. 1 Cor 13, 13 (Biblia sacra, 1784a).
Sapientia, intellectus, consilium, fortitudo, scientia, pietas cum timore
domini sunt spiritus sancti dona, quibus reformantur proportionalia ipsius
data naturalia.
In uiatore pariter et comprehensore Ihesu christo fuerunt hec omnia
modo beatifico.

Recuperande ergo humane iustitie est necessaria legis trinitas, scilicet
nature, figure et gratie.
Per quas instruitur uiue ndi regula apud deum et homines boni prouisiusa sed inequaliter permansiva.
Morum, ceremoniarum uidiciorumque normis debitis successiue pro-
fitic salus.

(Liber quartus)

(Questio prima): Vrum sacramentalis noue legis septenaruii multiplicis
gratia in lege ueteri figuraliter promisse collatius baptismi, confirmationis
et eucharistie ternarius sit per cause, signi, rei differentias christiformiter
subdistinctus

Vtriusque legis sacramentum est a deo datum sacre rei signum causa
humilationis, eruditionis et exercitationis institutum.
Quod per sue forme uisibilis similitudinem representat.
Quam promittit lex uetus et conferit lex noua gratiam salutarem.

Inujustitie originaliter contracte septiformis infirmitas seu impotentia in-
diget tam multiplex nostri salvatoris medicina ex uirtute operati operis
eius, qui non ponit obicem, sacramentaliter curatius.
Baptismus, confirmation, eucharistia et penitentia, insuper coagium,
ordo et uunctio extrema sunt noue legis sacramenta.
Quorum quintum et duo prima sunt caracteris impressiue et ex hoc,
nisi suaserit ignorantia, nequaquam repetenda.

Per aquam tintio c
lis in nomine christi u
legitimum.
(Est) uiorum dep
Cui equitae, tem
et lauacrums sauninis

(Questio secunda): Vt
cessio et gentibus sacrific.
anuam regni celestis b

Itaque per hoc sacra
et cum hoc spirituali
olim baptismus penite
modo baptismatis cat

Quod baptism, li
administrari tempore
intensionem ecclesie c

Renatis ex aqua et sp
confirmatio propria p
rem frontis caracteriz

Confirmationis sac
antium non prefigura

eucharistie sacra
zione melchisedech et
accidentium subsiste

christi substantialiter
unit(um).

9 remouet| remaneC 13 substantia| C
14 lege| legi C
24 substanti| C 25 substi...
Per aquam tinctio corporis exterior in trinitatis fide, dum dabo apostolis in nomine christi uirginitatem et unum formaliter invoacae, est baptismis legitimum.

(Im) uiorum depositione et uirtute munere innovantium.

Cui equiualet, tempore privilegii et necessitatis, sanctificatio spiritus et lauacrum sanguinis effusi.

(Querest secunda): Vrum (peccatum), originale, quod olim hebreis circumciso et gentibus sacrificium abstulit, nunc non fictischristis fidibus aperiendo iam niam regni celestis baptismus christus remouet

Iataque per hoc sacramentum induitur christus sacramentaliter a fictis et cum hoc spiritualiter a penitentibus et fidibus, sicut ostendunt C. 17° olim baptismus penitentie iohannis, baptismo christi preambulus, et nunc modo baptismatis cathecismus et exorcismus, (qui sunt) preuii.

Quod baptismis, licet soli sacerdotes ministrant legitime, tamen potest administrari tempore necessitatis a quolibet homine seruante formam et intentionem ecclesie catholice.

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

Confirmationis sacramentum est ministerio dignissimum, ob hoc antiquitus non prefiguraturn.

Eucharistia sacramentum fit per sacerdotale christi sacrificium in oblatione melchisedech et manna prefiguraturn panis et uini, relicta eorum accidentium substentia, in unitate corporis et sanguinis eiusdem ihesu christi substantialiter conuersium, ac corpors eius mistici salubriter unit(iu)um.


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

Que, a malis et bonis ecclesie ministris equaliter confecta, manducatur triplex citus, scilicet sacramentaliter, spiritualiter vel utroque modo christiformiter.

(Quoesto tertio): *Vtrum quemadmodum penitentia est sacramentum unicum contritione, confessione et satisfactione tripartitum, ita sacramentum ordinis sit una potestas, hierarchia differentie septemplicis, a quibus dependet ministralis efficacia extremeunctionis*

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

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

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

Licet huc baptismalis iustitia per peccatum actuale uiolata sit a solo deo formaliter reparabilis, est tamen ab ecclesiastico iudice, claves regni celorum, id est temporales discernendi atque ligandi soluendique ecclesiæ potestates, habente, per inunctionem pene debite materialiter recuperabilis, salvo necessitatis priuilegio per quod deficiente iuris ordine potest fieri coram deo uel alio homine impii iustificatio.

---


12 Iac 5, 14–15 (Biblia sacra... (129), n. 1, 391.

13 Cf. Petrus Lombardus, i
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Peccata personalia post baptismum perpetrata, quamuis in igne contrit
tenis quoad culpam et penam fortissim dimissa, sunt discreto et autentic
corderoti hec zelari debitori, uest tempore necessitatis alteri, singulariter
si sint mortalit et in summa si uenialia, ore proprio confitenda, atque
5 (per) proportionatam ipsis penam hic publice si fuerint publica, secre
et si secretae, aut deficiente sufficiente reatus arbitrio in purgatorio, corri
genda.

Que sic mortificata per penitentiam nequeunt reuiliiscere formaliter,
quamuis per ingratitudinis equivalentiam redeant in recidivante expre
brabiliter.

"Infirmarum quis ex uobis, inducat presbyteros ecclesie, et orent super eum,
(uaguentes 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
atque baptizatorum in uertice crismatio, cathecumenorumque in pectore
salubris oleatio in materia et forma ab huius uictionis sacrificio.

Vnde hoc sacramentum non est sicut ea que carent materia consecrata
necessarium, aut sicut ea que utuntur crismate gratiosum, sed ad pecc
atoris salutem, uenialium a dominio fomitis relictorum remissionem,
et ad corporalis inimicitatis expeditemt infirmo alleuationem speciali
iter institutum, secundum exigentiam uicissitudinis egritudiniu legite
mependum.

Ordo quoddam sacrum signaculum in signo exteriori datum quo spir
tualis potestas traditur ordinado, id est caracter spirituialis, ubi fit potestatis
ecclesiastice promotio.13

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

8 mortificata] notificata C

12 Iac 5, 14–15 (Biblia sacra, 18649), 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.
Ostariatus, lectoratus, exorcistatus, accolitatus 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.
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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 137). 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 alias doctrina nec non nisi credideritis
generis humani salvatore eset conformis doctori et discipulo non intelligitis.

Doctrina christiana tradit credibilia homini lapso salutaria

sufflas us lapsus beatitudinis necessitate finnis intentionis
repastus ps. gracion et gloriam del hominum ad beatarissem presentantis
debit deo i. dispositionibus precibus

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

que nos beatos faciant quia fui inchoabatur sum cum fose
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2. The use of the Quadrupartitus and the glosses by John Hulshout of Mechelen

The text below is a transcription of the discussion of the first three propositions of the Quadrupartitus 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 Quadrupartitus are given in italics. As can be noticed, the complete text of the Quadrupartitus and all the glosses reappear in the commentary of John Hulshout.

T.73

DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA TRADIT CREDIBILIA HOMINI LAPSO SALVATORIA.

Hec propositio ostendit dignitatem et utilitatem theologiae secundum quas excellit alias scientias philosophicas quas et tangit ista propositio [excellit] in tribus: primo in auctore seu doctore a quo est, secundo in subjecto de quo, terto in fructu et bono salutari quod eius discipulis 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 credibilium," quia hec scientia non est de hiis quae humana ratione possunt perscrutari, sed quae per fidem credenda proponuntur; articuli enim fidei sunt huius scientie principia. Et ergo carens fide non potest in theologica instrui nec eam intelligere, Ysaia septimo: Nisi credideritis non intelligeris, ex quo fides est principium omnium intelligendorum... ex intellectu principiorum sciantur conclusiones.

Tertium tangitur cum dicitur "hominis lapso salvatoria." Illa quidem credibilium quae tradidit sacra scriptura sunt salvatoria 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, 1103²).
quia *doctrina* debet esse *conformis doctori et discipulo*. Doctor enim eius est *christus humani generis salvator* et discipulus est *homo per christum saluandus*. Igitur *doctrina* debet esse tali modo *ipsi homini salutaris*. *Confirmatur*: omnis *doctrina a doctore procedens in discipulum convertit 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 *teologia sicut est a deo, ita est de deo et divinis et iterum ad deum, Ecclesiastes primo*: "Ad locum unde oriuntur flumina iterum reuertuntur." Tertia primum arguitur ...

---

**GRATIA ET GLORIA CVVM SVIS AMMINICVLIS SVNT BONA NECESSARIA RECUPERANDE SVNT HOMINIS.**

Hec propositio subsumit que sunt illa *credibilia salutaria* et dicit quod sunt *gratia et gloria cum suis amminiculis et dispositionibus preuisi; cuius ratio est quia solus hominis *lapsi requiris reparationem eius et beatificationem taliter reperati.* Primum facit gratia *sublevans* lapsum. Est enim sanitas anime iuxta illud psalmi "Qui sanat omnes infirmatites tuas." Secundum facit gloria beatificans reparatum. Hec igitur sunt bona necessaria saluti recuperante: *necessitate, dico,* "*finis intentionis dei predestinantis hominem ad beatitudinem.* Perfectiones autem gratiae, quibus homo supernaturaliter perficitur, sunt in multiplici differentia: quedam sunt reficientes subjectum, quod dicuntur fructus, quedam sanantem a male, quod dicuntur sacramenta, quedam reficientes in potentia substantiali seu actus, quod dicuntur irtuttes, quedam reficientes in agere, quod dicuntur dona sancti spiritus, quedam reficientes in statu finis, quod 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 disputationi. Sed quantum nunc est ad propositionem, est solum

---

2 Ecl 1, 7 (*Biblia sacra, 986b*).
3 Ps 102, 3 (*Biblia sacra, 988b*).}

---

4 *Cf. supra, n. 71.*
ostendere necessitatem theologice scientie et utilitatem eius hec tradentes, de qua dicit Augustinus nono de trinitate "theologia est scientia que est de rebus ad salutem hominum pertinentibus." Nam quidquid sciri potest ab hominibus in rebus humanis (ibi plurimum est supervacue aut noxie curiosis), huic scientiae non attribuitur, sed tantummodo quo 5 fides saluberrima gignitur, nutritur et roboratur. Contra arguitur ...
suo amore nobis misereatur et suam bonitatem nobis communicet. Res fruibilem demum quod "nos beatos faciunt" quia frui concludit usum "cum fine delectionis" spei et desiderii secundum augustinum decimo de trinitate. De quo modo amplius in sequenti questione dicetur. De his ergo omnibus, ut circa maiorem dictum, est theologia; quae dicitur christiformis quia a christo tradita secundum quod augustinus eam uocat doctrinam christianam sicut prehabitum est. Contra istam conclusionem arguitur ...