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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The subject of this thesis is a Medieval Scholastic manuscript (MotB 465) of ‘collationes’ ascribed to one ‘Frater Petrus,’ apparently a member of a religious community, perhaps a Dominican or Franciscan. Each collatio in general consists of a condensed mnemonic exegesis of a thema, a verse or so taken from the mass reading for a given day. A very significant portion of this consists in connecting aspects of the thema’s meaning to other parts of scripture. These connections are given with indications as to the interpretive relationship between the elements, but with room left for the reader to elaborate on the lesson to be drawn from the connection. There are four collations whose themata are not taken from the Mass reading, but chosen for their value in providing some sort of unity to the collection as a whole. Thus, at the very beginning there are two ‘prohemial’ collations, explaining how the collationist and the church must ask God for wisdom, and one general collation of Advent that discusses the Christ the Son’s offer to take human flesh, and one at the end as a sort of complementary directive for preaching.

The purpose of this thesis is to explain the sequence of these collations, and to give an indication of their relationship to liturgical books. Chapter One will give background information on Petrus and the time period. Chapter Two is concerned with the four non-festal collations. It will give summaries of them and explain their role in the sequence of the collations, and will also use them to show the author’s heavy reliance on the Liturgy of the Hours in the Breviary for scriptural quotations. Chapter Three is concerned with the sequence of the festal collations, and will attempt to identify and explain the many potential
sources of confusion in the relationships between the collations, their first index, and the liturgical year, primarily as seen in the Lectionaries contained in missals. The two appendices are primarily concerned with this chapter. Chapter Four will give a transcription and translation of the third non-festal collation with notes.

Format

The general format of Petrus’ *collationes* follows that of the scholastic sermon which was developed in the Twelfth Century, as opposed to the patristic homily, whose form prevailed in the first millennium. The Scholastic format, as described by Siegfried Wenzel, was in greatest prominence from the Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Century, during which time it is found in the majority of sermons and exegetical treatises on the Bible. During this time, many manuals, called *artes predicandi*, were written to instruct in the construction of this type of writing.\(^1\) As Daniel Nodes shows, MotB 465 follows the guidelines for the composition of collations described in the *ars* of the Franciscan Geraldus de Piscario (fl. 1330): Geraldus distinguishes in his *ars* between the *sermo* and the *collatio*, which are two subsets of what Wenzel calls the ‘scholastic sermon.’ Geraldus says that the *collatio* has a more rigid structure of three subdivisions of each of the three divisions, and that the sermon has more room for variation.\(^2\) As our collations are indeed very rigid in structure, with two\(^3\) out of 145 that has a structure (2 divisions with 4 subdivisions each) that results in 8 rather than 9 subdivisions, it is safe to say that what Petrus has done fits well with Geraldus’ definition of a *collatio*. Furthermore, Geraldus says that sermons may explain the “proof

\(^{1}\) Wenzel, *Medieval Artes Predicandi*, xv-xvii.

\(^{2}\) Wenzel, “A Note on the Collatio in Late Medieval Preaching,” 240.

\(^{3}\) Wenzel, “Collatio,” 240.
texts,”⁴ (brief citations from other places in scripture added to illustrate the lessons), while collations may not. This, as mentioned above, is true of the collations in MotB 465. The first line of the *collatio* is normally the *thema*—the selected part of the Mass reading. This is followed by a statement of how it is to be interpreted, with reference to an *auctoritas*, and then the collationist divides the *thema* into three parts. This sparse opening is also an element that Geraldus says is characteristic of a collation.⁵

Each of the three divisions of the principle *thema* is presented in sequence, and then each is explained with reference to other scriptures. Then there will be an extended discussion of each. These in turn consist of a statement of what is notable about the section, which will in turn be subdivided into three ways in which this thing of note is true. Both the division and the subdivision may be stated in several ways. Each of these aspects of the subdivision will then be supported by scriptures, in accordance with Aquinas’ affirmation that every mystical interpretation must be supported by the literal sense (i.e. the sense intended by the author) somewhere else.⁶

**Numbering**

The collection is meant to contain 150 *collationes* to span a whole year, organized by the liturgical calendar. Out of these, the collations for Advent through Easter, roughly the first 60, are reproduced in a single manuscript in the Universitätsbibliothek in Uppsala, Sweden (C191), and are bound in with the works of others such as Peter Abelard. It appears that the complete collection of Petrus’s collations was intended to total 150. This is

---


⁵ Nodes, 6.

⁶ *Summa Theologiae*, I.1,10 ad 1.
corroborated by the work I have done in comparing the \textit{themata} in the text with the \textit{thema} summaries in the first index. Unfortunately, there are errors in the numbering in some places, particularly toward the end, and different rubricators have different methods of marking the beginning of a collation, which makes it surprisingly difficult to find what the actual number is.

On folio 114, the number goes up (to 84) without the beginning of a new collation. (-1) On folio 143, a new collation begins without the number going up. (It stays at 106.) (+1) On folios 174 and 201, the numbers go up 3 (to 128 and 149) at the beginning of a collation. (-4) The numbering on folios 176 to 183 is very muddy. This section contains the beginnings of five collations, and manages to end up where it is supposed to, namely five ahead of where it started, with the sequence (129), [nothing], 122, 121, 131, 122, 123, 124, 134. (Even) On folio 189, the number goes up 2 (to 138) at the start of a new collation. (-1)

If we add all of this up, we get 150-1+1-4-1=145. This is corroborated by the fact that there are five \textit{themata} in the index of \textit{themata} that are absent from the text. Thus it appears from the index that Petrus did actually write 150, but that only 145 are reproduced in our manuscript.

\textit{Dating}

The date of our manuscript is constrained on one side by the presence of Arabic numerals. It uses them for the collation numbers from Collation 33-61, and in a few other places throughout, (9, 29) and sometimes in mixture with the roman numerals (C5—105, dominica 4a—quarta\textsuperscript{7}). Our manuscript thus uses the Arabic numerals primarily for the collation numbers, while holding more strictly to the Roman numerals for determining the

\textsuperscript{7} The numerals used are often not so recognizable as these.
feast day, and in this way, he reflects what would eventually become the custom of the
Roman Missal, which exclusively uses Roman numerals with ‘dominica’, ‘festa’, etc., and
offers Arabic on the days of the month or chapter numbers. This could indicate that he was
looking at a missal, or more likely that he was thinking of a missal.

It appears that Arabic numerals began to come into wider use in the West in the
Thirteenth Century, and they became more commonly used until the Sixteenth Century when
the use became more standardized. Because our scribe does not seem to have a strong sense
of when to use them (aside from not using them where the missal doesn’t) it seems likely that
our manuscript was written toward the beginning of this period, perhaps in the Fourteenth
Century. Furthermore, the manuscript does not contain the Feasts of Trinity or Corpus
Christi, which were ordered for the whole Church in the first half of that century. Another
important piece of evidence for the date of the manuscript is that the Uppsala manuscript,
which seems to be later, is dated 1376, thus corroborating the rest of what we have said.

**Purpose**

There are many different ways in which the word *collatio* was used in the Middle
Ages. It is often used synonymously with *sermo*. However, in certain scenarios, there is a
discernable difference. There is a tendency to use the word *collatio* for addresses given to

---


Corpus Christi was ordered in 1264 by Urban IV, but its spread was impeded by his death. It was ordered again in 1311 by Clement V and was generally accepted by the first quarter of that century. However, our collationist
does not observe many ferial feasts (Christmas, Holy Thursday, Whitmonday), and thus may have passed over
Corpus Christi even if he had celebrated it. Because of all of this, the more helpful is Trinity Sunday, which
was ordered by John XXII (1316-1334).

10 Following from Wenzel, “Collatio.”
clergy, for shorter addresses, and for addresses given in the afternoon rather than the morning. As mentioned before, certain writers of *artes predicandi* distinguish between the two, and it seems that Petrus is following the approach that Geraldus lays out. This is true both in what Geraldus says about what a collation is, and in other aspects of the address, such as the rhyming parallelisms. Geraldus furthermore speaks of *sermones* and *collationes* synonymously at times, in spite of the fact that he distinguishes between them, which means that it is not inconsistent with his approach that some of Petrus’ collations are called *sermones*. Interestingly, one author\(^ {11} \) speaks of how a collation is expanded into a *sermo*, which seems to indicate that it is smaller, and which is perhaps even closer to the use intended for Petrus’ collations.

Petrus’ intention seems to be to provide a resource for preachers. This is supported by the simple fact that the collations are composed in scholastic Latin, and by the existence of an *ars predicandi* that “criticized the use of [the sort of rhymes described by Geraldus that we find in Petrus’s collations] when preaching to the people but accepted their use for addresses to the clergy.”\(^ {12} \) The collations correspond to the Mass readings of the liturgical year, which makes one think that perhaps they have some relation to the Mass sermons. However, they are too condensed to constitute the sermons themselves, as a significant portion of each of them is involved with relating truths to scriptures and scriptures to other scriptures, without much discussion. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that they were each strictly intended to be the basis for a sermon, because there are two indices in the back that allow one two locate an individual collation by its number, or an individual subdivision—

\(^ {11} \) The author of *Nota pro arte*. Wenzel, “Collatio,” 241.

\(^ {12} \) English Dominican Thomas Whaley's. Nodes, 15.
part of the *thema*—by its subject matter. Thus it seems likely that the preacher might have used the collations for the day as a starting point for his sermon, expanded upon its scriptural comparisons, and added insights from other collations as they seemed helpful. This would be consistent with the idea laid out in *Nota pro arte* that a collation could be expanded into a sermon, and with the existence of two indices allowing the reader to find a specific collation or part of a collation, which indicates that the collations are not intended simply to be used each by itself.

It is interesting that there are multiple collations for each day. It is tempting to try to explain this by saying that one could be used for the Sunday, and another could be used on a day of the week that took its propers from the Sunday. However, this seems unlikely, as there are, for instance, two collations for Holy Thursday, the propers of which would not be transferred anywhere. Moreover, medieval uses often had ferial readings.\(^{13}\) Thus it is likely that the larger numbers of collations are intended to provide a greater fullness to the work done that day rather than to provide in some way for multiple sermons.

*Petrus*

There are of course many medieval brothers named Petrus, and it is difficult to connect our Petrus to a known figure with any certainty. However, I can provide some candidates. The *Fabricius Bibliotheca* lists a Petrus de Andria (or Adria), OP who wrote, among other things, “Collationes Dominicales et Festivae,”\(^{14}\) which would be a good description of Petrus’ work. The *Bibliotheca* says that this Petrus was a secretary to Thomas

---


Aquinas, and that his “Collationes Dominicales et Festivae” were at one point attributed to Aquinas. The *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* lists a Petrus de Scala,\(^{15}\) who wrote “Sermones de tempore et de sanctis per annum.” This seems to be perhaps a somewhat less good description of our work, as none of the collations in MotB 465 are for Saints days, whereas *festivae* can refer relatively naturally to things like Holy Thursday. It appears that the Dominican Rite went through a period of standardization in the Thirteenth Century where it became more like the use of the Roman Curia, as the Franciscan already was, so there is nothing in that regard that would detract from the possibility of Petrus being a Dominican. However, I was unable to find a description of when the two orders came closer to the Roman use at what times and in what ways. Therefore it would be valuable for someone to check their lectionaries, which could prove very helpful. Of further interest concerning these two Petri is that they are often linked to each other where their names appear. One of de Scala’s works is also attributed to de Andria, and they are both listed as assistants to Thomas Aquinas on his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.\(^{16}\)

---


CHAPTER TWO

Non-Festal Collations

Four of Frater Petrus’ collations have no specific feast attached to them, and thus do not fit into the schema of the rest of the work except as a sort of frame. Three of these are at the beginning, and one at the end. The first two have the same \textit{thema}, and are labelled as \textit{collationes prohemiales}. The third is labelled \textit{collatio generalis de adventu}, and the last has no label. This chapter will first discuss the potential connections between the \textit{themata} and other parts of these four collations with the breviary, contending that the collationist is remembering some of the verses from the divine office, and then explain what these four collations contain, what their roles are in the work as a whole, and what they tell us about the work.

\textit{Themata and Breviary}

\textit{Collationes I, II}

The first two collationes share a \textit{thema} which is ostensibly taken from Wisdom 9. However, it seems rather clear that the author remembered the words of this particular scripture from Matins. The first collation opens by giving the \textit{thema} thus: “\textit{da mihi domine sedium tuarum assistricem sapientiam et sequitur post pauca ut mecum sit et mecum laboret}.” (The second ends at “\textit{sit}.”) The vulgate can give us something similar, but only if one skips from verse four to verse ten:

4 \textit{da mihi sedium tuarum assistricem sapientiam}, et noli me reprobare a pueris tuis: 5 quoniam servus tuus sum ego, et filius ancillæ tuæ; homo infirmus, et exigui temporis, et minor ad intellectum judicii et legum. 6 Nam etsi quis erit consummatus inter filios hominum, si ab illo abfuerit sapientia
In the Roman Lectionary, in the month of August, at the end of the two middle Sunday Matins lectiones, are the following responsories:


The first responsory here is therefore composed of a condensation of verse 10 followed by part of verse 4 and some more of verse 10. The second is verse 4 and some of 5 followed by part of verse 10.

Both responsories contain the entire thema. It is possible that Petrus had both of these in mind, and that he was thinking of the sequence either of the second responsory and its

---

1 They are also the responsories of the last and first lectiones of the Thursdays and Fridays, respectively, of the same month.
versicle, or of the first versicle followed by the second versicle. Both of these options do a much better job of explaining why the collationist would make such an association and, therefore, such a jump, and the first makes the jump a great deal smaller, than if it were a quote written down from the Bible. In addition, both of these contain the inserted ‘Domine’, and thus fit the text better. Furthermore, there is other evidence that suggests that someone else was also thinking of this responsory.

In the index of our manuscript, these two collations are both listed as “Emitte, Domine, sedium tuarum”. It is not clear why this would have been done, but since the vulgate text reads “mitte”, rather than “emitte”, the responsories go further toward an explanation. Perhaps a scribe miscopied it because they were thinking of the responsory, or perhaps they wished to catalogue it in a way that recalled the responsory.

The question naturally arises whether this is in fact intended to fit into the calendar with the rest of the collations. It seems that it is not, first of all because of the title. Since it is from August, it is about three months before the next thema, which is a significantly longer distance than the separation of at most one week in the rest of the work. Since it is from the Breviary rather than the missal, it is unlike the vast majority of themata in the work, but the following thema (for the Collation III) is a thema taken from the Breviary that certainly was taken from a liturgically appropriate day, so it is tempting to try to fit the first thema into a similar explanation. However, it makes sense to take a ‘general Advent’ thema from Advent, but there is no particular reason to take a ‘proemial’ thema from any particular season. Thus this thema was likely chosen simply on account of its fittingness: There is a long tradition of asking for divine help at the beginning of a work, and divine wisdom is particularly helpful to a teacher.
Collatio III

*Quis ibit nobis, et dixi: ecce ego mitte me.* This *thema* is simpler to explain than the other two because it has a season attached to it. It is labelled as an Advent collation, and if we look in the Roman Breviary, the third lection of Matins for the Friday of the first week of Advent begins thus: “*Et audivi vocem domini dicentes: Quem mittam: et quis ibit nobis? Et dixi: Ecce ego, mitte me.*” It is thus also near the beginning of the lection, and is really the first thought of the lection, such that the collationist refers back to the part before where he started. This is perhaps why he thought to write about it, as the beginning of a lection is more likely to stay in the mind.

This collation has a couple other features as well that seem to indicate that the collationist was copying from a breviary: Later, he quotes Jeremiah 1: “*ad omnia que mittam te dicit dominus ibis ne timeas et que mandavero tibi loqueris ad eos*”. Once again, he quotes a text that matches better to the Breviary than to the Vulgate, and furthermore, he misattributes it in a way that can be explained by the breviary. The Vulgate here reads: “*7 Et dixit Dominus ad me: Noli dicere: Puer sum: quoniam ad omnia quæ mittam te ibis, et universa quæcumque mandavero tibi loqueris. 8 Ne timeas a facie eorum.*” Once again, this is a situation where it is close enough that one could imagine that the collationist was paraphrasing. However, in the Roman Breviary, on the feast of John the Baptist (June 24), we have a text that matches what the collationist has written exactly, as the second antiphon of Matins. The supposition that this is what the collationist had in mind is strengthened by the fact he misattributes the passage as being from Jeremiah 2 rather than 1.

There are several potential ways in which the breviary could have caused the collationist to make this mistake: First, as mentioned above, it is the antiphon for the second
psalm of the office, which could possibly have caused the confusion if he were paying sufficiently little attention. Second, the Psalm is actually Psalm 2, which could have contributed to this. The most likely reason, however, is that the second lection from the same office is the part of Jeremiah 1 from which the antiphon is taken. This lection matches the vulgate text quoted above, so it is not likely that the collationist was quoting from this lection, but was rather using it to remember the source. The first lection of this office is the beginning of Jeremiah up to the place where the second lection starts. Therefore, it seems likely that the collationist either was actually citing it as the second lection, or, more likely, that he assumed that the second lection was a new chapter.

Similarly, toward the end of the lection, he quotes Psalm 110(111): “redemptionem misit dominus populo suo mandavit in eternum testamentum suum.” Once again, the text is slightly different from the vulgate text, with the insertion of the word ‘Dominus’. Once again, we can see the collationist’s exact text if we go to the Roman Breviary. In this case, this text acts as the antiphon to the Psalm from which it is taken, when that psalm appears as the second Psalm of Vespers on Christmas. This seems to be a more appropriate source from which to quote in preparation for Advent than the feast of John the Baptist, but they are similar in that they are both births.

*Collatio CL*

*Finem loquendi omnis pariter audiamus, deum time et mandata eius observa hoc est omnis homo.* This *thema*, like the first, is a responsory for the “summer histories” in August. It is thus tempting to say that perhaps the first and last *themata* are taken from the same liturgical setting, and thus perhaps to try to narrow down the location of the author to places
that are known to have this responsory. However, there are problems with this idea, and it is unclear that this *thema* was taken from the breviary at all.

First of all, the responsory starts in the middle of the *thema*, at “*deum time*”. The responsory does end in the same place as the *thema*, whereupon it is followed by “*timentibus deum nihil deest et his qui eum diligunt in veritate. hoc...*” This is some amount of encouragement, but certainly not a confirmation, because it requires the first five words be retrieved from somewhere else. Second, this particular responsory is not in the ordinary Breviarium Romanum at all I think, but is in The Breviary of York, probably among other places. This could be explored further to see if there is a correlation, but in this particular case, it is far from conclusive, as the *thema* does not fit well with the responsories.

Furthermore, the verse can also appear many other locations, such as the feast of the Holy Trinity, where the same responsory appears, the feast of St. Sylvester, where the entire passage appears, and the Ember Saturday of Lent, where a different responsory appears: “*R. Deum time, et mandata eius observa; * Hoc est omnis homo. V. Qui habet mandata mea, et servat ea, ille est qui diligsit me. * Hoc est. Gloria. R. Deum time*” The feast of the Holy Trinity postdates our manuscript, but the responsory is found in the same place (the first Sunday after Pentecost) in at least one breviary that omits Trinity. This breviary is new

---

[2] See Can 006416, Debra Lacoste (Project Manager and Principal Researcher) and Jan Koláček (Web Developer), Cantus: A Database for Latin Ecclesiastical Chant -- Inventories of Chant Sources, available from <http://cantus.uwaterloo.ca/id/006416>, [April 11, 2017]. This site is a database of chants in manuscripts, which can be searched by text, feast, etc.


enough (1493) that it seems that it ought to have Trinity, so it is difficult so say what can be
taken from this. The Breviary of Lyon seems to be the best option, as it has the opening of
Ecclesiastes as a lection, and thus contains the entire text off the thema. However, to narrow
it down to this particular breviary, one would have to prove that Petrus did not have access to
the book of Ecclesiastes outside of the breviary, which seems unlikely. Thus there are
several liturgical possibilities for this thema, but none seemed particularly convincing.

Of course all of this does not mean that the collationist was making liturgical
associations based on the verses he used and their liturgical contexts, but merely that he was
remembering them because of his familiarity with the divine office. This is likely first of all
because it does seem that the collationist is quoting many verses from memory, as he often
gives attributions that are just a little off. (E.g., 1 for 2, Proverbs for Wisdom, 24 for 34, etc.)
Furthermore, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Frater Petrus had significant portions of
the office memorized, since even in the modern era, many older monks can be seen praying
the office without books. Some (not all) of the liturgical contexts actually help to explain
these misattributions, and the larger liturgical context supports the idea that he is doing this
from memory.

Function

Collatio I

The first collation is on an appropriate theme for the beginning of such a work, the
supplication of wisdom by the collationist. In this process, he also sets up the theme of the
second collation, the church’s supplication that divine wisdom be made incarnate. He

7 Catholic Church. 1780. Breviarium sanctae Lugdunensis ecclesiae, primae Galliarum Sedis. Parisiis: Typis
P.G. Simon ... A.M. Lottin.
paraphrases Boethius in his explanation of why he is beginning with the collationist’s invocation: “In omni enim principio inuocandum est omnium rerum principium sine quo nullium rite fundatur exordium uel initium.”

He goes on to divide the *thema* into three parts. Thus we have: 1. *Domine*: the collationist invokes the Lord because the Lord is the fount, medium, and end of all wisdom. 2. *Da michi sedium tuarum assistricem sapientiam*: The collationist invokes the Lord for understanding of the divine, desire for the eternal, and ability in doing good deeds. 3. *Ut mecum sit et mecum laboret*: The collationist invokes the Lord in order that he might not fall short of his end.

The threefold division of this part is notable in that it gives a glimpse of how Petrus conceives of his task: *Mecum ergo collaboret [sapientia] tripliciter: primo in collationum istarum brevi et perfunctoria compilatione; secundo in compositarum meritoria predicacione; tertio in predicatorum excitatoria operatione.*

Thus the collationist sees his role first as “the brief and routine compilation of the collations.” The product of this is presumably what we have in the manuscript. The words *compilatio* and *collatio* both imply a bringing together, and that is indeed what the bulk of each collation is: the bringing together of different scriptures. *Perfunctoria* seems a little strange, but perhaps refers to following the rigid structure of the *collatio*.

He next says that his role is to preach the things brought together. Thus perhaps he would expand upon the connections made in the *collatio* when he would preach on them. It seems likely that they would need to be expanded first of all because he himself says they are short, and second because there is so little explicit commentary on the verses contained in the collations.

---

8 Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy* III.p9: “inuocandum, inquam, rerum omnium patrem, quo praetermisso nullum rite fundatur exordium.”
Third, he says that his role is the “arousing operation of the things preached.” This is perhaps an action simultaneous with the second action, as operatio can mean the delivery. Alternatively, this could be the delivery and the predicatio could be the making of the sermon from the collatio. However, one could perhaps also argue that operatio refers to the preacher setting an example in his own life of the truths he has preached.

This collation thus gives several hints as to the nature of the work. The reference to Boethius and the invocation of God’s help at the beginning of a work indicates that he does think of the 150 collations in some way as a unified work that has a proper order. This is corroborated by the way that he talks about his desire to bring the work to its completion. Furthermore, we have an image of the collationist afterward using the collations for preaching. All of this is perhaps a little difficult to reconcile with the index that allows one to go through and pick out any thema or any threefold division of a part of a thema. However, one can imagine that the preacher might base his sermon on one of the collations, and then want to expand it by connecting it to other collations that were relevant to the topic, which would help to lend a continuity to the sermons over the course of the year. This collation could be seen as perhaps more an instruction to those who would use the book than as a part of it that they would use to instruct.

*Collatio II*

The collationist next takes a turn toward the topic at hand: Advent. The second collation in MotB 465 is labelled as another proemial collation. However, in the Uppsala manuscript, it is labelled as the first collation of Advent. However this discrepancy came about, the confusion is understandable, because although it has the same thema as the first collation, it leads very nicely into the second. This collation interprets the thema as the cry
of the church asking for the incarnation of divine wisdom, and the third is about divine wisdom answering that call. The *thema* is divide differently in this collation than in the first:

1. *Da michi domine sapientiam*: The church asks for wisdom: for uncreated wisdom, the creator of beings; for incarnate wisdom the caretaker of the dying; for inspired wisdom that inhabits the saints.  
2. *Sedium tuarum assistricem*: This highlights the high quality of the wisdom, which inhabits the heart of the father, the womb of the virgin, and the mind of (inter alios?) the mother.  
3. *Ut mecum sit*: The church asks for wisdom as help in temptation, as guide in travel, and as counsellor in trouble. This collation connects the work of the collationist to the work of the church, and expresses the church’s cry for the savior, and thus leads us into the next collation.

**Collatio III**

The third collation is a very appropriate introduction to Advent. Its *thema*, as mentioned is taken from Matins on the first Friday of Advent: *quis ibit nobis et dixi ecce ego mitte me*. The collationist takes Isaiah’s conversation with the Lord in a vision and makes it into a conversation among the trinity. Thus his division is [Father:] *Quis ibit nobis?* [Son:] *ecce ego* [Son:] *mitte me*. The Father’s question can be seen as a perfect response to the request made in the previous *thema*. The Father asks who will go in order to live with men, to preach and acquire souls, and to suffer on the cross. The son identifies himself, the way that directs wanderers, the truth that corrects the erring, and the life that gives life to the dying. The Son follows this by offering to be sent as the preacher of all purity, the curer of all infirmity and the redeemer of all captivity.

In introducing this final part, the collationist makes a comparison that requires some explanation. He compares the Son’s offer here to Jonah’s offer to be thrown into the sea.
This works very nicely, as the Gospel (e.g. Matt. 12.39) itself compares Christ’s time in the tomb to Jonah’s in the fish. The collationist fills this in by comparing the world to the sea. However, there is a problem. Petrus quotes Jonah’s offer: “‘Tollite et mittite me in mare’ et sequitur ‘propter me hoc tempestas orta est.’”\(^9\) Thus he has to explain what it means that the storm of sin is arisen on account of the Son. He explains that it is “contra attributum filii” that sin arose. That is to say, Adam sinned in desiring knowledge too greatly, and it is the particular attribute of the Son—divine wisdom—to desire knowledge.

This collation does not do as much to explain the purpose of the work, but it does a very good job of preparing for Advent, by examining the immanent coming of the savior from the divine side of the situation. After this, every collation has a feast assigned to it until we come to the last one.

*Collatio CL*

The final collation attempts to sum up the entirety of what the rest have said, and therefore, we might say, the entirety of what the church has to say. “finem loquendi omnis pariter audiamus: deum time et mandata eius observa hoc est omnis homo.”\(^10\) His division is not explicitly laid out, but the parts can be determined from their subject matter: 1. *Deum time*: Through an initial fear is the soul freed from sin; through a filial fear is the soul opened to love and grace; through a chaste and reverential fear is the soul made blessed. 2. *Mandata eius observa*: Those who keep his commandments merit divine protection, divine love, and the promise of eternal life. 3. The third part is the rest of the quote, which the collationist takes to mean that these things are sufficient because they drive man to do what God

---

\(^9\) Jonah 1.12

\(^10\) Ecclesiastes 12.13
requires, what brings about his salvation, and what the whole scripture directs. This ending is helpful in that it shows an aspect of the collationist’s understanding of what he is doing: He is showing what it is to which the scripture as a whole points, by showing the connections between the various parts. It can also serve as a reminder, to someone who might be using the work, of what should be the foremost in his mind when he is preaching.
CHAPTER THREE
Petrus’ Lectionary

The purpose of this chapter is to establish what the text of our manuscript gives us of the lectionary that Petrus was using, and in the process to create an accurate and complete list of Petrus’ *collationes* and their *themata*. There are two sources in the manuscript that contain this information. The first is the *collationes* themselves, and the second is the first index in the manuscript. Both are incomplete in some regard, but together, they contain basically all of the information. They do not contain the complete *themata* of the chapters that are missing from the body of the work, but they contain a recognizable portion of every *thema*. Thus Appendix A is a chart correlating the two, with the page range, collation number, feasts, and *thema* from the body of the text, and with collation numbers and *thema* incipits/summaries from the index. In addition, there are scriptural references for the verses of the *thema*, or of the portion of the *thema* that is available. The feasts are determined based on the collation headings and the page headings if these are present and agree. If they are not, or if they differ from the Roman Lectionary, there will be a note in this chapter laying out the evidence and explaining what has been put into the chart. For instance, the feast can be determined from the feasts before and after it, with reference to the Roman lectionary. These will be placed in brackets. Because the index skips a number every time that it skips a collation, its numbers will be the organizational canon of the chart.

The Roman Lectionary referred to is from the Roman Missal published at Milan in 1474, republished by the Henry Bradshaw Society. This was chosen based on the close correspondence of its reading to those presented in the *thema*. For the sake of comparison,
I have printed a chart showing how the *themata* compare with this missal and several other Pre-Tridentine Missals compare in Advent. The other missals are those of Toledo (1512), Augsburg (1555), York (compilation from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century), Prague (1498), Aquileia (1578). The areas that differ from the *themata* have been shaded. As is clear from the chart, the Roman missal matches significantly better with the *themata* than the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Rom</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Ebo</th>
<th>Prag</th>
<th>Aq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romans 13:11</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 21:27</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna I</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans 15:12</td>
<td>Dna II*</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 11:3</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 11:10</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna II</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipians 4.5-6</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:26</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 4.4-5</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 4.5</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
<td>Dna III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 3.4</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Dna IIII</td>
<td>Sab. III</td>
<td>Sab. III</td>
<td>Sab. III</td>
<td>Sab. III</td>
<td>Sab. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 1.2</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1.14</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
<td>Nativitate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The feast here is marked as the Sunday after Christmas in its heading, but the page heading, the placement, the Roman missal, and all the other missals all indicate that it is the second Sunday of Advent.

Table 1: Comparison of Missals in Advent

The Roman Missal continues to be very close throughout the year, as can be seen in Appendix B, which prints the reference for the Epistle and the Gospel for each of the feasts that Petrus refers to next to the reference of Petrus’ *themata*.

Festal Aberrations

As mentioned before, the first three collations are not for a specific feast day. The first two are proemial, and the third is a general collation for advent. Similarly, the final collation is apparently intended as a conclusion. Thus I have said that they have no feast.
The portion of the collection that corresponds to specific days begins with Collation Four and Five.

Collation Six is marked in its heading as the Sunday after Christmas, but everything else (the page heading, the sequence, the placement of the *thema* in the Roman lectionary) indicates that it is the second Sunday in Advent. From Collation Seven to Collation 13, the feasts are correct.

The two collations (14& 15) that are for Christmas are labelled as “*in nativitate domini sermo primus [et] tertius,*” but there is no *sermo secundus.* Both *themata* are taken from the principle Mass, so there is no question of trying to connect them to specific Christmas Masses. One could argue that the second *sermo* was left out of both the text and the index, but that is unlikely, as it would result in 151 collations. These, along with the two for Pentecost, (82&83) are the only collations labelled ‘*sermo.*’ All four of these are about the average length of one of the collations in the manuscript,¹ and as mentioned above, *sermo* and *collatio* are known to have been used interchangeably at times. Most of the collations after this point are labelled properly until we come to Collation 145.

Collation 145, “*cum eiecta esset turba intravit iesus et tenuit manum eius,*” (Matt. 9.25) is labelled as the Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost in its heading, but the page says the Twenty-fourth. The Twenty-third matches the Roman Missal, and the heading offers less room for confusion than the page. Furthermore, Collation 144 “*ecce princeps unus accessit et adoravit eum*” (Matt. 9.18) is from the same passage, and is labelled as the Twenty-third in both places, so I have gone with that. The rest of the feasts appear to be correct.

¹ The first collation starts at the beginning of folio 2, and the last folio to be fully used up is folio 203. Folio 203-folio 2=201 folios =402 pages. There is about one column on folio 204, and about three missing on folios 173 and 174, which brings us to 401 pages. 401 pages / 145 collations=about 2.75 pages/collation. Collation 14 is just under that, and Collation 15 is exactly that. Collation 82 is about 2.25, and Collation 83 is about 2.5.
Numerical Aberrations

The *thema* summary in the index for Collation 123 reads “*fructus spiritus est carnis*” rather than “*caritas.*” The collation is not in the body of the manuscript, but this is a disagreement with the text of scripture. It does match the Roman Missal once it is amended. However, this is also one of the places where the numerator gets off track. The *thema* before this reads “*spiritu ambulate et desideria carnis non perficietis caro enim concupiscit adversus spiritum et spiritus adversus carnem,*” summarized “*spiritu ambulate etc.*” Thus it is possible that someone saw ‘*spiritus*’ and ‘*carnis*’ in the *thema* for 122, and perhaps was using the same exemplar that produced “*fructus spiritus est carnis*” in the index, and thought that 123 had already been copied. Furthermore, these two *themata* come from the same reading, (Galatians 5) the epistle for the 14th week after Pentecost. This is probably the chief cause of the confusion, as it explains why someone might write *carnis* in the fruit of the spirit. It also gives an additional reason for someone who knew that Collations 122 and 123 were from the same reading to assume that the next *thema* should be from the gospel rather than the epistle again.

The next *thema* that is in the index but not the text has a similar explanation. Index Number 126 has a *thema* abbreviated as “*magnificabant dominum,*”2 which in the scripture immediately precedes the *thema* that follows, “*propheta magnus surrexit in nobis et quia deus visitavit plebem suam,*” abbreviated “*propheta magnus.*” While it is possible that there was some confusion over *magnus* and *magnificabunt*, it is more likely that confusion arose from the part of the *thema* that we have lost. Obviously it would be difficult to divide “*magnificabunt dominum*” into three parts. The whole verse is “*Acceptit autem omnes timor:*

---

2 Luke 7.16
et magnificabant Deum, dicentes: Quia propheta magnus surrexit in nobis: et quia Deus visitavit plebem suam.” It seems likely that the *thema* went at least as far as *magnus* or *surrexit*, although it could possibly have ended at *dicentes*. Thus there was likely some overlap between the two collations, which can explain relatively well why one might have been omitted.

There is an empty space of a little over two and a half columns from partway down 173rb to the bottom of 174vb. There is a change of scribe and the label skips from 125 to 128; however, the index number goes from 127 to 128, thus coming back on track. It seems likely that for some reason this second scribe was asked to start writing at 128 and had to start before the work up to that point was finished. He left a bit more space than was necessary, which likely prompted the numerator to check his numbers with the exemplar, and to come back to the correct number.

The most confusing section of the numeration is between 129 and 136, although there are actually no collations missing here, and the numbering is correct at the beginning and the end. The *thema* for 130 is “obsecro vos ego vinctus in domino ut digne ambuletis vocatione qua vocati estis,” abbreviated “obsecro vos vinctus”. The text is for the 17th Sunday after Pentecost, but has the same opening (*obsecro vos*) as the text for the 16th Sunday. This is perhaps the source of the confusion. The numerator did not put any number on it at all, perhaps because he thought it was from the previous week and therefore out of order.

After this, he is consistently off by one or ten or a combination of both: Collation 131 is labelled as 122 (folio 179) and 121 (folio 180); 132 as 131 (folio 181) and 122 (folio 182); 133 as 123 (folio 183); and 134 as 124 (folio 184) and 134 (folio 185). Collation 135 has no label, and at 136 he returns to the correct number. There are no two *themata* in this section.
that come from the same passage. The eight *thematata* consist of four Gospel texts each followed immediately by an epistle text. It seems that there are two errors at play here that compounded as the rubricator went on. The first wrong number (122 for 131) is off by nine, and thus if a numerator looked back at it, he could potentially think that he was off by either one or ten and attempt to correct by means of that, thus causing more confusion. This confusion would be augmented if the numerator thought that 130 and possibly something else was out of order. Eventually someone looked at the exemplar in order to make a good correction.

After this, the numbering is immediately offset again. Collation 137, which has the *thema* “*nolite inebriari vino in quo est luxuria set implemini spiritu sancto,***” abbreviated “*nolite inebriari vino,***” follows upon 136 but is labelled as 138. This is likely due to some residual confusion from the previous section combined with the fact that Collation 138, abbreviated “*rogabat iesum ut descenderet,***” is missing from the body of the text. Collation 139, “*induite vos armaturam dei ut possitis stare adversus insidias diaboli,***” is labelled correctly. The numbering proceeds correctly until Collation 146.

Collations 147 and 148 are missing from the body of the text. This is attributable to the fact that 146 and 147 share a *thema*, “*deo placentes in omni opere bono fructificantes et crescentes in scientia dei***” both abbreviated as “*deo placentes, etc.’*** Furthermore, 148 has a *thema* with a similar beginning, abbreviated as “*gratias agentes deo etc.***”, which could perhaps have been confused with the two before it. Furthermore, all three are from the same passage, (Colossians 1) the epistle for the 24th Sunday after Pentecost, which according to the index has four collations. Collations 149 and 150 are labelled correctly.
I have been offering explanations of how all of these could have been accidentally omitted. However, there is an alternate and related explanation. The final page of the manuscript that has Latin on it is 208v. The index of divisions (the second index) ends on this page after the v/u section with the words: “Et sunt in universo quadrigente et xlii distinctiones post divisiones et divisionum per auctoritates probationes. Explicit liber.” The next page does not have lines drawn on it, and thus it is perhaps part of the binding and not original to the manuscript. Thus it is possible that the scribes saw that they did not have enough space left and omitted some collations intentionally, selecting specific ones that they thought could more suitably be omitted.

The five omitted collations are 123, 126, 138, 147, and 148; three from gospels and two from epistles, respectively. The thema for 123 is the only thema on the gospel for week 14, which has two themata for its epistle. The thema for 126 is one of two gospel themata for week 15, which also has an epistle thema. The thema for 138 is the only gospel thema for week 20, which has one epistle thema. The thema for 147 and 148 are both from the epistle for week 24, which has three epistle themata and one gospel thema. Thus while weeks 15 and 24 have been cut down to one gospel and one epistle, week 14 has been cut down to two epistles, and week 20 has been cut down to one epistle. Three gospels and two epistles have been cut out, which is as close as one could get to cutting things out proportionally to the total number.³ However, there is no reason to think that this was intentional. It would be more likely that there would be a thematic reason for cutting them out.

³ There are 22 themata from Luke, 25 from Matthew, 6 from Mark, and 16 from John, and thus 71 gospel themata. The first three collations, the last collation, and Collation 20 have Old Testament themata. 150 Collationes -69 Gospel themata -5 OT themata =76 Epistle themata. 3/5 is closer to 76 out of 145 than 2/5 is.
Six *themata* are misreferenced in the text. The *thema* for Collation 108, “*vocavit eum et ait illi quid hoc audio de te redde rationem villicationis tue*” (Luke 16.2) is marked as Luke 17. The *thema* for Collation 111 “*hec omnia operatur unus atque idem spiritus dividens singulis(?) prout vult*” (I Cor. 12.11) is marked as 1 Cor 7. The *thema* for Collation 112, “*duo homines ascenderunt in templum ut orarent*” (Luke 18.10) is marked as Luke 13. The *thema* for Collation 113, “*deus propitius esto mihi peccatori*” (Luke 18.13) is marked as Luke 13. The *thema* for Collation 115, “*ego sum minumus*” (1 Cor. 15.9) appears to be marked as “Cor. 7.”

Two *themata* (after the *thema* for the first two collations, which has already been discussed in chapter one) have differences in the index that are perhaps worthy of note. The *thema* for Collation 45 reads *Sciat unusquisque vas suum possidere in sanctificatione et honore non in passione desiderii* in the body of the work, whereas the index says *sciat unusquisque vestrum, etc.* The Vulgate here reads: “*ut sciat unusquisque vestrum vas suum possidere in sanctificatione, et honore,*”\(^4\) so the difference can probably be attributed to a combination of the scribe’s knowledge of the actual verse, and perhaps some misreading of an abbreviation, or difference in the exemplar.

The *thema* for Collation 134 reads *deponentes omnem mendacium,* whereas the index says *deponentes omnem malitiam.* The text in the body of the work matches the Vulgate.\(^5\) It makes sense that the *themata,* as we have observed them to be, would be more accurate in the body than in the index first of all because they are abbreviated in the index, and second

\(^4\) 1 Thess 4.4  
\(^5\) 1 Peter 2.1
because the person copying the actual collation has a great deal more context, which involves
a great amount of repetition of the *thema* in part or in whole.

The *thema* for Collation 141 “*qui cepit in vobis opus bonum ipse perficiet*” (Phil. 1.6)
is marked as Eph 2. However, the Pre-Tridentine Roman Missal used in this thesis, mis-
references the reading for the Twenty-Second Sunday after Pentecost, Phil. 1.6-11, as a
reading from Ephesians, which seems to indicate that Petrus was using a missal from a
textual tradition that is closely related to this missal.

Collation 101 (marked as 102) begins at the very bottom of folio 137ra. The
rubricator did not realize that it was there. Presumably he missed it as a result of its position
at the very bottom of the column combined the hole in the parchment in the column next to
it. In addition, Collations 100 and 101, being about 2.25 and 2 pages, respectively, are both
shorter than average, allowing the rubricator to think that they were one long collation.

Collatio 61 is marked in its page heading as “*in cena domini*”. However, this
marking is above the end of Collation 60, which is certainly for Maundy Thursday, as its
*thema* (John 13.10 “*qui lotus est non indiget nisi ut pedes lavet sed est mundus totus*”) is
taken from the Last Supper narrative in John, and as it is marked as such in other places.
Furthermore, although there is no opening rubrication for 61, there is a large red “*P*” to start
off the collation: “*pascha nostrum immolatus est christus itaque epulemur*” (1 Cor. 5.7).
Furthermore, this (1 Cor. 5.7-8) is, as one would expect, the epistle in the Roman Missal for
the Pascha, thus it is printed in the Appendices as a Pascal collation.

Collations 72 and 73 are both labelled in their page heading as coming from the Fifth
Sunday after Easter. Their opening headings label them respectively as “Fifth Sunday” and
“iterum in die penthecoste”. However, in the scripture, the thema for 72, “omne donum perfectum desursum est descendens a patre luminum” (James 1.17) comes before the thema for Collation 71, “suscipite insitum verbum quod potest salvare animas vestras.” (James 1.21) which is marked as the Fourth Sunday after Easter, and matches the Roman Missal in that regard. This in itself would not be a problem, except that the thema for Collation 74, “si quis putat se religiosum esse non refrenans linguam suam set seducens cor suam huius vana est religio” (James 1.26) which is also marked as the Fifth Sunday, comes after the reading for the Fourth Sunday. It is possible that the reading for the Fifth Sunday would have skipped over James 1.21 from James 1.17 to James 1.26, but it seems significantly less likely that the reading for the Fifth Sunday would have contained portions from both before and after the reading for the Fourth Sunday. The Roman Missal prints the thema from Collation 72 in the reading for the Fourth Sunday.

The thema for Collation 73, “ille arguet mundum de peccato et de iudicio et de iustitia” John 16:8, is perhaps less certain. This thema, as mentioned above, is marked in its opening rubrication as “item in die penthecoste,” and is marked in its heading as “Fifth Sunday.” In the Roman Missal, it goes in the Gospel reading with the thema of Collation 74 on the Fourth Sunday. There are three points within the manuscript that favor the idea that this collation might be mislabeled.

The first reason it might be mislabeled is its position. Because Collation 72 was likely mislabeled, it seems more likely that Collation 73 was mislabeled with it. Furthermore, there are at least two epistle readings for the Fourth Sunday already, and no gospel reading. This would be the only instance in the manuscript of the gospel (thema) for a

---

6 Or ‘item’
feast coming before the epistle. Furthermore, it would the gospel \textit{thema} would be between two epistle \textit{themata} from the same day. Finally, it would create the only instance of a day that has an epistle but no gospel. There are two instances of days that have only one reading, and they follow upon one another directly, such that there is still an epistle reading followed by a gospel reading. Furthermore, it is not clear that they are labeled correctly. That section (Collations 84-85) is already irregular because it has a \textit{thema} taken from a reading from a relatively minor feria: The Monday after Pentecost (Whitmonday) was perhaps determined to merit one collation and no more, and so its epistle was perhaps substituted for the epistle \textit{thema} allotted to the next Sunday. However, the source of this \textit{thema}, \textit{“filium suum unigenitum misit deus in mundum ut vivamus per eum,”} (1 John 4.9) in the Roman Missal actually falls on the next Sunday, so it is possible that there is an error here as well. This supposition would be supported by the tendency to have at least an epistle and a gospel \textit{thema} for each feast. According to this interpretation, Petrus would have thought of this more as a rule, and did not deviate from it, whereas the scribes thought of it as a tendency, and occasionally excised the only gospel \textit{thema}, or the only epistle \textit{thema}, or messed up the heading such that it appeared that a day only had one \textit{thema}. However, the \textit{thema} for Collation 84 is the one that is most likely to differ from the Roman Missal of those that appear to, especially since it is claiming to be a feria.

The second and third reasons are much simpler: The second is that if the \textit{thema} for Collation 73 were for the Fifth Sunday, it would create either a reading that lasted from John 8-28, or a similar reading with a large gap. Both of these are possible but not particularly likely. The third reason is that there was clearly already some confusion at play here, as the collation heading does not match the page heading. This in of itself is interesting, as the
manuscript does something very similar to what it did around Christmas. In both cases, the rubricator writes a heading that belongs three feasts later. (This is only true if we accept that Collation 73 should be for the Fifth Sunday.) For what it is worth, Christmas and Pentecost are the only places where collations are referred to as “sermo,” but this is likely a coincidence. For all of these reasons, I have placed Collations 72 and 73 on the Fourth Sunday, but have marked them with an asterisk.

In general it seems that the first index and the Roman Missal are both more reliable than the secondary scribes, that is, the rubricators and numerators. There is of course a danger in relying too much on these, particularly the Missal, as it stands outside of the text, and yet in each case of an apparent conflict, the evidence points in the direction of a copy error, or a hasty judgement. For instance, the Collation that is marked as the second feria after Pentecost appears to have the correct verse for this day, namely John 3.16, because it contains some of the words of that verse along with the label “John 3.” However, what it actually has is 1 John 4.9, the verse for the following Sunday, mislabeled as John 3, and thus the rubricator, matching the reference to the missal, called it Whitmonday. Thus this apparent contradiction between the Missal and the collations actually shows a reliance on the Missal.

Similarly, the appendix is much more reliable than the numbers written on the top. This is more obvious because the index is directly tied to the rest of the book. Because the scribes write the collations in order, but occasionally skip one, it is rather simple to follow along in the index and connect the thema summaries with the themata. The index does occasionally skip a thema, but it is invariably a thema duplicated with the one before it, and the index always skips a number when it does this, which keeps it aligned. Thus the lesson
of this chapter is that in dealing with MotB465, one must rely on the standards upon which the document’s creators were relying.
CHAPTER FOUR

Sample Collation

For the class associated with this document, I made the following transcription and translation of Collation 3, which will help the reader to have a better sense of what the Petrus’ writing is like, and to have a better understanding of how this collation fits into the whole.

Collatio III

[4Ra] Collatio generalis de aduentu domini

Quis ibit nobis et dixi ecce ego mitte me. Due proposiciones ponuntur in hoc verbo. Vna interrogatiua et alia responsiua et potest esse prima propositio interrogativa tocius trinitatis de persona incarnanda consiliantis licet consilium proprie dictum non cadat in deum eo quod consiliari est nature ignorantis. Secunda vero proposicio responsiua potest esse filli se ad incarnandum liberaliter offerentis. Dicat ergo beata trinitas inquiringo quis ibit nobis et respondat filius se ad incarnandum liberaliter offerendo, ecce ego mitte me, et sic in hoc verbo notantur tria

Primo in patre questionem proponente notatur interrogacio tocius trinitate

Secundo in filio ad questionem respondente notatur distinctio personalis nobilitatis

Tertio in eodem filio se ad incarnandum offerente conditio liberalitatis

---

1 Collatio generalis de aduentu domini: G Iterum collatio de aduentu in prima dominica: U

2 Isaiah 6.8

3 Patre questionem proponente: G propositione querente: U
Sic ergo primo de persona incarnanda propositio questionalis cum dicitur *quis ibit nobis* unde potest dicere beata trinitas filio illud genesis xxiii: *Visne ire cum homine isto*, et filius potest respondere hoc quod sequitur *ego vadam*.\(^4\) Visne ire, id est vis vniri tibi hunc hominem in tuo supposito\(^5\)

Et ideo\(^6\) secundo notatur in filio respondent e distinctio personalis cum additur in persona filii *ecce ego*, unde Ysaias lii: *Ego ipse qui loquebar ecce assum*.\(^7\)

Et ideo tertio descriptur in filio se ad incarnandum offerente condicio electionis\(^8\) [4Rb] liberalis unde subinfertur\(^9\) *mitte me*, unde tunc poterat dicere filius alius duabus personis illud Joneas ii: *Tollite et mittite me in mare et sequitur propter me hoc tempestas orta est*,\(^10\) quod dicit filius\(^11\) mittite me ad incarnandum in mare seculi fluctuantis quia propter me orta est tempestas.\(^12\) principium peccati incarnacionis\(^13\) remedium expositentis, unde dicit *propter me* id est contra attributum filii. Adam enim inordinate concupiuit sapientiam quod est

---

\(^4\) Genesis 24.58

\(^5\) *Supposito* for υποστασις, i.e. person of the trinity.\(^6\) Visne...ideo: G om.: U

\(^6\) Visne...ideo: G om.: U

\(^7\) Isaiah 52.6

\(^8\) Electionis: G om.: U

\(^9\) Subinfertur: G subinfert: U

\(^10\) Jonah 1.12 (not 2) Jonah asking to be thrown into the sea is an excellent choice for comparison to Christ asking to become man, because Christ’s three days in the tomb are compared in the gospel to Jonah’s three days in the whale (e.g. Matt. 12.39), and thus it is a good extension of this to compare the sea to the world and Jonah’s request to Christ’s.

\(^11\) Filius: G om.: U

\(^12\) orta est tempestas: G tempestas orta est: U

\(^13\) Incarnacionis remedium: G remedium incarnacionis: U
attributum filii et est una de congruentiis quare magis decuit filium quam aliam personam incarnari\textsuperscript{14} ut qui inordinate concupierat sapientiam repararetur per veram sapientiam

Circa primam partem ubi\textsuperscript{15} de persona incarnanda proponitur propositio questionalis cum dicitur \textit{quis ibit nobis}. Et quis iret nisi filius cui maxime competit incarnari ut qui erat in divinitate dei\textsuperscript{16} fiet in humanitate virginis filius.\textsuperscript{17} Ivit ergo iste filius tripliciter

Primo de celo in mundum ut cum hominibus conversaretur

Secundo ibat\textsuperscript{18} in mundo predicans per mundum ut animas lucretur

Tertio ibat\textsuperscript{19} de mundo ad celum dum in crucis patibulo moreretur

Primo dico quod ibat de celo in mundum cum hominibus conversando, unde lucas xxiii:\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Iesus autem appropinquans ibat cum illis}. Bene dicit \textit{appropinquans} quia fuit nobis factus propinquus et generis affinitate et loci propinquitate\textsuperscript{21} homo cum hominibus conversando, unde lucas xxiii:\textit{ Iesus autem transiens per medium illorum ibat}\textsuperscript{22}

Secundo dico quod ivit per mundum hominibus predicando, unde dici sibi potuit [5Va] a deo patre illud Jeremias ii: \textit{ad omnia que mittam te dicit dominus ibis ne timeas}\textsuperscript{23} et que

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] Quam aliam personam incarnari: G incarnari quam aliam personam: U
\item[15] Er. in filii responsiva: U
\item[16] Dei filius: G filius dei: U
\item[17] Virginis filius: G filius virginis: U
\item[18] Ibat: G om.: U
\item[19] Ibat: G om. U
\item[20] Luke 24.15
\item[21] Propinquitate: U vicinitate
\item[22] Luke 4:30 Because of the insertion of “Iesus,” the text here matches the Magnificat antiphon for the Monday in the third week of Lent rather than the vulgate.
\item[23] Eos: U
\end{footnotes}
mandavero tibi loqueris ad eos$^{24,25}$ unde Lucas xiii: *ibat per civitates et castella docens et iter faciens in ierusalem.*$^{26}$

Tertio iuit de mundo$^{27}$ in cruce pro hominibus moriendo, unde Jeremia xvo: *Quis miserabitur tui ierusalem, aut quis contristabitur super te aut quis ibit ad rogandum pro pace tua.*$^{28}$ Et quis nisi filius qui in agonia tristabatur$^{29}$ et pendens in cruce pro salute fidelium precabatur, unde potest exponi illud ecclesiastes xii: *Ibit homo in domum eternitatis*$^{30}$ quia christus moriens iuit in domum immortalitatis. Et sequitur *rumpetur funis argenteus et uitta aurea*$^{31}$ et *conteretur ydria super fontem.*$^{32}$ Funis$^{33}$ argenteus fuit ruptus in morte. Vitta vero aurea fuit vnio divinitatis cum humanitate. Que nunquam fuit soluta; tunc super$^{34}$ fontem sancte crucis contrita fuit ydria$^{35}$ corporis.

$^{24}$ Eos: G illos: U

$^{25}$ Jeremiah 1.7-8 Not 2. Furthermore, it does not match the vulgate text very well, but corresponds perfectly to an antiphon in the Roman breviary for the feast of John the Baptist.

$^{26}$ Luke 13.22

$^{27}$ In celum: U

$^{28}$ Jeremiah 15.5

$^{29}$ Tristabatur: G contristabatur: U

$^{30}$ Ecclesiastes 12.5

$^{31}$ Recurrat: Vulgate

$^{32}$ Ecclesiastes 12.6

$^{33}$ funis: U Fluminis: G cf. Vulgate

$^{34}$ Super: G; supra?: U

$^{35}$ Er. sancte crucis: G
Circa secundam partem vbi in filii responsiua notatur distinctio personalis cum additur ecce ego, quis es domine quia dicis ecce ego ipse\textsuperscript{36} respondet Ioannes xiii: *Ego sum via veritas et vita*\textsuperscript{37} dicat ergo mitte me quia ego\textsuperscript{38}

Ego sum via dirigens vagabundos

Ego sum veritas corrigens errabundos

Ego sum vita uiuificans moribundos

Primo ergo dicat filius *ego sum via* per quam obliquata regulantur, unde Ysaias xlviii: *Ego dominus docens te Vitalia et gubernans te in via.*\textsuperscript{39} Non [5Vb] solum autem est\textsuperscript{40} via dirigens verum etiam ianua\textsuperscript{41} intraducens, unde Ioannes x: *Ego sum hostium*\textsuperscript{42} per me si quis introierit saluabitur.\textsuperscript{43}

Secundo dicat *ego sum veritas* per quam falsitas\textsuperscript{44} verificatur, unde Ioannes xviii: *Ego ad hoc natus sum, ut testimonium perhibeam*\textsuperscript{45} veritati.\textsuperscript{46} Iterum Ioannes xvi: *Ego veritatem dico uobis expedit uobis ut ego uadam.*\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{36} Ipse: G; et: U

\textsuperscript{37} John 14.6

\textsuperscript{38} Quia ego: G; om.: U

\textsuperscript{39} Isaiah 48.17

\textsuperscript{40} Est: G; te in: U

\textsuperscript{41} Ianua: G; ianuam: U

\textsuperscript{42} Hostium: G; ostium: U

\textsuperscript{43} Per me...salvabitur: G; etc.: U

\textsuperscript{44} Falsitas: G; falsificata: U

\textsuperscript{45} Testimonium perhibeam: G, perhibeam testimonium: U

\textsuperscript{46} John 18.37

\textsuperscript{47} John 16.7
Tertio dicat *ego sum vita* per quam mortificata suscitantur, unde Ioannes xi: *Ego sum resurrectio et vita, omnis qui viuit et credit in me non morietur*\(^{48}\) *in eternum*,\(^{49}\) iterum Ioannes x: *Ego ueni ut vitam habeant et abundantius*\(^{50}\) *habeant*.\(^{51}\)

Circa tertiam partem vbi describitur in filio se ad incarnandum offerente condicio liberalis cum subditur *mitte me*, vbi\(^{52}\) notandum quod filius missus est\(^{53}\) propter tria sicut ipse dixit Ysaias lxi: *ad annunciandum pauperibus misit me primum ut mederer contritos corde secundum et predicarem clausis et captuis*\(^{54}\) *apertionem*\(^{55}\) tertium est ergo misus tripliciter\(^{56}\)

Primo ut predicator omnis puritatis\(^{57}\)

Secundo ut medicus et curator omnis infirmitatis

Tertio ut redemptor omnis captiuitatis

Primo ergo dicat filius patri *mitte me* predicatorem ut predicem gentibus\(^{58}\) ueritatem, vnde potest dicere filius illud Ieremias xxvi: *In veritate misit me ad vos dominus ut loquerer in auribus vestris omnia verba hec*.\(^{59}\) Et pater illud filio ezekiel ii: *Ecce ego mitto te ad filios*

---

\(^{48}\) Omnis...morietur: G; et usque: U

\(^{49}\) John 11.25-26

\(^{50}\) Abundantius: G; perfectius: U

\(^{51}\) John 10.10

\(^{52}\) Ubi: G; om.: U

\(^{53}\) Missus est: G; est missus: U

\(^{54}\) Me primum...captivis: G; etc. usque: U.

\(^{55}\) Isaiah 61.1

\(^{56}\) Tripliciter: G; om.: U

\(^{57}\) Puritatis: G; veritatis: U

\(^{58}\) Gentibus: G; ignorantibus: U

\(^{59}\) Jeremiah 26.15
israel gentes apostatrices,\textsuperscript{60} unde mattheus xv: Non sum missus nisi ad oues que perierunt domus israel.\textsuperscript{61}\textsuperscript{62}

Secundo dicat patri mitte me\textsuperscript{63} ut medicum et curatorem ut ferram infirmantibus sanitatem vt dicere possit illud thobias xii: Dominus misit me ut curarem te,\textsuperscript{64} et in psalmo: misit verbum suum et sanavit eos et eripuit eos de intericionibus eorum,\textsuperscript{65}\textsuperscript{66} et ad romanos viii: Quod impossibile erat legi in qua infirmabamur deus misit filium suum\textsuperscript{67} in similitudinem carnis peccati et de peccato dampnauit peccatum.\textsuperscript{68}\textsuperscript{69}

Tertio dicat patri mitte me ut redemptorem ut soluam omnem captiuitatem, vnde\textsuperscript{70} psalmum: redemptionem misit dominus populo suo mandavit in eternum testamentum suum,\textsuperscript{71}\textsuperscript{72} et ad galatios iii: At ubi venit plenitudo temporis misit deus filium suum factum ex

\begin{itemize}
\item[{\textsuperscript{60}}}Ezekiel 2.3
\item[{\textsuperscript{61}}}Matthew 15.24
\item[{\textsuperscript{62}}}Que…israel: G; etc.: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{63}}}Mitte me: G; om.: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{64}}}Tobit 12.14
\item[{\textsuperscript{65}}}Psalm 106(107).20
\item[{\textsuperscript{66}}}Et sanavit…eorum: G; etc.: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{67}}}Misis filium suum: G; filium suum misit: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{68}}}Romans 8.3
\item[{\textsuperscript{69}}}Peccati…peccatum: G; etc.: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{70}}}In: U
\item[{\textsuperscript{71}}}Psalm 110(111).9 This also matches more closely (because of the insertion of dominus) to an antiphon in the Roman Breviary (for Christmas) than to the vulgate text.
\item[{\textsuperscript{72}}}Mandavit…suum: G; etc.: U
\end{itemize}
muliere, factum sub lege, ut eos qui sub lege erant redi\textsuperscript{73} meret ut\textsuperscript{74} adopcionem filiorum recipimus.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{73} Er. perent: G

\textsuperscript{74} Misit deus filium suum factum ex muliere…ut:G; etc. usque ut: U

\textsuperscript{75} Galatians 4.4-5
Translation

General Collation on the Advent of the Lord

Who will come to us? And I said “Behold, I will, send me.” Isaiah 6. Two sentences are placed in this selection, one asking and one answering, and the first sentence can be the question of the whole Trinity taking counsel concerning the person to be incarnate, although council properly speaking does not take place in God as that which is council of an ignorant nature. But the second sentence can be the answer of the Son freely offering himself to be incarnate. Therefore the blessed Trinity speaks asking “who will go from us?” and the Son responds freely offering himself “Behold I will, send me,” and thus in this selection three things are noted:

First in the Father asking the question is noted the desire of the whole trinity

Second in the Son answering the question is noted the distinction of his personal nobility

Third in the same Son offering himself to be incarnate is the state of freedom

Thus therefore first is the proposition of the question concerning a person to be incarnate, when it is said, “Who will go from us?”, whence the blessed Trinity can say to the Son this, in Genesis 24: “Do you wish to go with this man?” and the Son can answer with what follows: “I will go”. “Do you wish to go,” that is “do you wish to unite this man to yourself in your hypostasis?”

And therefore second the distinction of the person is noted in the Son answering, when it is added in the person of the Son, “Behold I will,” whence Isaiah 52: “I myself who speak, behold I am here.”

And third the state of free choice is described in the Son offering himself to be incarnate, on account of which “send me” is added, whence then the Son could speak to the two other persons what Jonah 2 says: “Take me and throw me into the sea” and it continues “on
account of me is this storm arisen,” because the Son says “Take me and throw me to be incarnate into the sea of the tossing world, because on account of me is this storm arisen.

The beginning of sin is the remedy of the incarnation setting out, whence he says “on account of me,” that is “against the attribute of the Son.” For Adam inordinately desired wisdom, which is the attribute of the Son, and this is one of the similarities by which it was more fitting that Son than another person be incarnate in order that he who inordinately desired wisdom might be repaired through true wisdom.

About the first part where the question concerning the person to be incarnate is asked, when it says: “Who will go from us?” And who would go except the Son for whom it was most appropriate to be incarnate, in order that he who was in divinity the Son of God might be in humanity the Son of the virgin. The Son went therefore in three ways:

First from heaven into the world in order that he might live with men.

Second he went about in the world preaching through the world that he might acquire souls.

Third he went from the world to heaven once he had died on the scaffold of the cross.

First I say that he went from heaven into the world to live with men, whence comes Luke 24: But Jesus coming closer went with them. “coming closer” is well said, because he was made close to us, by a closeness of both birth and space, a man living among men, whence comes Luke [4]: But Jesus, passing through the midst of them, left.

Second I say that he went through the world to preach to men, whence God the Father could say this of himself in Jeremiah [1]: “To all to whom I sent you,” says the Lord, “go, do not be afraid, and tell them what I commanded you,” whence comes Luke 13: He went through the cities and towns teaching and journeying to Jerusalem.
Third he went from the world dying on the cross for men, whence comes Jeremiah 15: *Who will have mercy on you Jerusalem, or who will mourn over you, or who will go to ask for your peace?* And who except the Son who in agony mourned and who hanging on the cross prayed for the salvation of the faithful, whence this part of Ecclesiastes 12 can be added: *The man went into the house of eternity,* because Christ dying went into the house of immortality. And it follows: *the silver rope will be broken, and the golden ribbon, and the water jars will be smashed over the fountain.* The silver rope was broken in death. But the golden ribbon was the union of divinity with humanity, which was never dissolved; therefore over the fountain of the holy cross was the worn out jar of the body.

About the second part where in the Son’s answer must be noted the distinction of the person, when “behold I will” is added, which is you Lord, because you say “Behold, I will.” He himself answers in John 14: *I am the way and the truth and the life.* Therefore he says “send me” because “I:

“I am the way, directing the wanderers
I am the truth, correcting those who err
I am the life, giving life to the dying.

First therefore the Son says “I am the way” through which bent things are straightened, whence Isaiah 48: *I am the Lord, teaching you what is profitable and guiding you on the way.* But not only is he the way directing, but also the door leading in, whence John 10: *I am the door, if anyone enter through me he will be saved.*

Second he says “I am the truth” through which falsehood is verified, whence John 18: *I was born for this, that I might give testimony to truth.* And again in John 16: *I tell you the truth, it is good for you that I leave.*
Third he says “I am the life” through which the dead are aroused, whence John 11: *I am the resurrection and the life, everyone who lives and believes in me will not die forever,* and again in John 10: *I come that you might have life and have it more abundantly.*

About the third part, where the state of freedom was demonstrated in the Son offering himself to be incarnate, when “Send me” is added, where it should be noted that the Son was sent for three things, as he himself says in Isaiah 61: *He sent me* first for announcing to the poor, second that *I might heal the contrite of heart,* third that *I might preach deliverance to the shut in and captive.* Therefore he was sent in three ways:

First as a preacher of all purity,

Second as a physician and healer of all infirmity

Third as a redeemer of all captivity

First therefore does the Son say to the Father “Send me,” a preacher that I might preach truth to the peoples, whence the Son can say this in Jeremiah 26: *In truth the Lord sent me to you that I might speak all these words in your ears.* And the Father can say this to the Son in Ezekiel 2: “Behold I send you to the sons of Israel an apostate people, whence Matthew 15: *I am not sent except to the sheep that perish of the house of Israel.*

Second he says to the Father “Send me” as a physician and healer that I might bring health to the sick, as this could be said in Tobit 12: *The Lord sent me that I might heal you,* and in the Psalm: *He sends his word and heals those and pulls them out from their destruction,* and in Romans 8: *God sent his son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and by sin he condemned sin, which was impossible for the law under which we were weakened.*

Third he says to the Father “Send me” as a redeemer that I might unbind every captivity, whence the Psalm: *The Lord sent redemption to his people. He commanded his covenant*
forever, and in Galatians 4: *But when the fullness of time came, God sent his son, made from a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem those who were under the law so that we might receive adoption as sons.*
APPENDIX A

Petrus Collationes Sequence

Here I have catalogued all of the themata and their summaries with the numbers given in both the index and the body, and with the feast. The feasts are generally indicated by the first letter of the Latin words that Petrus uses, although for some I have used numbers. Thus N is Nativitas, DNO is Dominica Nativitatis Octava (the Circumcision), Pa is Pasca, P is Pentecost. 70 is Septuagesima. Q is Quadragesima. Numbers after the letter indicate, the second, third, fourth, etc. Sunday after that day. In general, the Octave is the first Sunday after, but sometimes, as Christmas, it is not, and thus the first (and only) Sunday after Christmas has three letters.
Non occidit non peregrinus non falsum testimonium discerens

Vade ostende tibi secretum et alter munus tum

Vindicatum et ego reddam
degenerantes se infra eorum et eorum cum

degenerantes se infra eorum et eorum cum

Vindicatum et ego reddam
degenerantes se infra eorum et eorum cum

Vindicatum et ego reddam

Impete Vultus auge

Impete Vultus auge

Inpleat Vultus auge

Impete Vultus auge

Impete Vultus auge

Impete Vultus auge

Impete Vultus auge
nullius est non indiget
acchile et manchucae
propert sepsiasm homo etc.
diete filio syron etc.
[immilliatam semetipsam]
humiliatam semetipsam
et
abraham patris vester
qui ex vobis arguerat me
christus politex
christus politex
est perennis hic et ca
jerusalem etc.
beatus venter quod te
amplius in directione
tegit eos iesus etc.

passcha nostrum immolatus et christus ligatus epilfirm
nullius est non indiget ut pedes lavet sed est
acchile et manchucae foc et corset consus quod pro
seus super astraam
beatus filio syron etc. die post saecula
immilliatam semetipsam focet operandus subinde ad
abraham patris vester et ex vobis arguerat me
christus politex
christus politex
est perennis hic et ca
jerusalem etc.
beatus venter quod te
amplius in directione
tegit eos iesus etc.

61. Pascha nostrum immolatus et Christus ligatus epilfirm
62. nullius est non indiget ut pedes lavet sed est
63. acchile et manchucae focet consus quod pro
64. seus super astraam
65. beatus filio syron etc. die post saecula
66. immilliatam semetipsam focet operandus subinde ad
67. abraham patris vester et ex vobis arguerat me
68. christus politex
69. christus politex
70. est perennis hic et ca
71. jerusalem etc.
72. beatus venter quod te
73. amplius in directione
tegit eos iesus etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Verse 1</th>
<th>Verse 2</th>
<th>Verse 3</th>
<th>Verse 4</th>
<th>Verse 5</th>
<th>Verse 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scriptures**:

- *Acts 1:7-8*
- *John 16:28-29*
- *James 1:21*
- *James 1:17*
- *Mark 1:6-7*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Gal. 5:22</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Gal. 5:16-17</th>
<th>109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>imagines Jesu Christi</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10:3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Carissim Bank

etiam concipisti adversum Spiritum et Spiritus adversus

spiritus etque adversus cun. non potest et caro

etiam concipisti adversum Spiritum et Spiritus adversus

spiritus etque adversus cun. non potest et caro
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>MRM 1474</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5r-6r</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Rom. 13.11</td>
<td>Rom. 13.11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v-9v</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Rom. 15.12</td>
<td>Rom. 15.4-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v-12r</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Mat. 11.3,10</td>
<td>Mat. 11.2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12r-13v</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Phil. 4.5-6</td>
<td>Phil. 4.4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v-14v</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>John 1.26</td>
<td>John 1.19-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v-16v</td>
<td>11,12</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1 Cor. 4.4-5</td>
<td>1 Cor. 4.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v-18r</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Heb 1.2</td>
<td>Heb 1.1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18v-20v</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>John 1.14</td>
<td>John 1.1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v-21v</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>DNO</td>
<td>Gal. 4.7</td>
<td>Gal. 4.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v-23r</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Titus 2.11</td>
<td>Titus 2.11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23v-24v</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Luke 2.21</td>
<td>Luke 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v-25v</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Is. 60.1</td>
<td>Is. 60.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v-27r</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mat. 2.2</td>
<td>Mat. 2.1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27r-28r</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>Rom. 12.2</td>
<td>Rom. 12.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v-32r</td>
<td>24,25</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Rom. 12.10,12</td>
<td>Rom. 12.6-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r-33v</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>John 2.7</td>
<td>John 2.1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v-35v</td>
<td>27,28</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Rom. 12.18</td>
<td>Rom. 12.16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v-37v</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Mat. 8.4</td>
<td>Mat. 8.1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v-39v</td>
<td>30,31</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Rom. 13.9</td>
<td>Rom. 13.8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v-41r</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Mat. 8.23</td>
<td>Mat. 8.23-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41v-42r</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Col. 3.13-14</td>
<td>Col. 3.12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v-45v</td>
<td>34,35</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Mat. 13.25</td>
<td>Mat. 13.24-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v-47r</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 Cor. 9.24,25</td>
<td>1 Cor. 9.24-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v-48v</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mat. 20.4</td>
<td>Mat. 20.1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48v-50r</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2 Cor. 12.2-3</td>
<td>2 Cor. 11.19-12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r-51r</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Luke 8.5</td>
<td>Luke 8.4-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51r-52r</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 Cor. 13.12</td>
<td>1 Cor. 13.1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v-55v</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2 Cor. 6.3</td>
<td>2 Cor. 6.1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r-56v</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Mat. 4.11</td>
<td>Mat. 4.1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56r-59r</td>
<td>44,45</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1 Thes. 4.3-5</td>
<td>1 Thes. 4.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59r-60v</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Mat. 17.7</td>
<td>Mat. 17.1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60v-62r</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Eph 5.2</td>
<td>Eph 5.1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63v-64v</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Gal. 4.26</td>
<td>Gal. 4.22-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64v-66r</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>John 6.9</td>
<td>John 6.1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66v-69v</td>
<td>51,52</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Heb. 9.11</td>
<td>Heb. 9.11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69v-72r</td>
<td>53,54</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>John 8.46,56</td>
<td>John 8.46-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72r-75r</td>
<td>55,56</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Phil. 2.8</td>
<td>Phil. 2.5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75r-77r</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Mat. 21.5</td>
<td>Mat. 26.1-27.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77r-81v</td>
<td>58,59</td>
<td>Q6F5</td>
<td>1 Cor. 11.24,28</td>
<td>1 Cor. 11.20-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81v-83r</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Q6F5</td>
<td>John 13.10</td>
<td>John 13.1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse range</td>
<td>page no.</td>
<td>column</td>
<td>scripture reference</td>
<td>scripture reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83r-86v</td>
<td>61,62</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>1 Cor. 5.7</td>
<td>1 Cor. 5.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86v-87r</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Pφ</td>
<td>Mark 16.6</td>
<td>Mark 16.1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87r-89v</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Pa1</td>
<td>1 John 5.7-8</td>
<td>1 John 5.4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89v-91v</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pa1</td>
<td>John 20.19</td>
<td>John 20.19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91v-92r</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Pa2</td>
<td>1 Pet. 2.21</td>
<td>1 Pet. 2.21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92r-94v</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Pa2</td>
<td>John 10.14</td>
<td>John 10.11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94v-95v</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Pa3</td>
<td>1 Pet. 2.7</td>
<td>1 Pet. 2.11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95v-97v</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pa3</td>
<td>John 16.22</td>
<td>John 16.16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97v-100r</td>
<td>70,71,72*</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>James 1.17,21</td>
<td>James 1.17-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100r-102r</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>Pa4</td>
<td>John 16.8</td>
<td>John 16.5-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102r-103r</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Pa5</td>
<td>James 1.26</td>
<td>James 1.22-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103r-106r</td>
<td>75,76</td>
<td>Pa5</td>
<td>John 16.28</td>
<td>John 16.23-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106r-109v</td>
<td>77,78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Acts 1.7-8,11</td>
<td>Acts 1.1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109v-110v</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mark 16.19</td>
<td>Mark 16.14-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110v-111r</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>A0</td>
<td>1 Pet. 4.7-8</td>
<td>1 Pet. 4.7-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111r-112r</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>A0</td>
<td>John 15.26</td>
<td>John 15.26-16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112r-113r</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Acts 2.4</td>
<td>Acts 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115v-116v</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td>1 John 4.9</td>
<td>John 3.16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119v-120v</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1 John 3.16</td>
<td>1 John 3.13-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121r-124v</td>
<td>89,90</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1 Pet. 5.6,8</td>
<td>1 Pet. 5.6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126v-128r</td>
<td>92,93</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Ro. 8.20,21</td>
<td>Ro. 8.18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131r-132r</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>1 Pet. 3.9</td>
<td>1 Pet. 3.8-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132r-133r</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Mat. 5.20</td>
<td>Mat. 5.20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133r-136r</td>
<td>98,99</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Ro. 6.6</td>
<td>Ro. 6.3-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136r-138r</td>
<td>100,101</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Mark 8.2-3</td>
<td>Mark 8.1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138r-140r</td>
<td>102,103</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Ro. 6.22</td>
<td>Ro. 6.19-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140r-144r</td>
<td>104,105,106</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Mat. 7.15-16,19,21</td>
<td>Mat. 7.15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144r-146v</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Ro. 8.12-13</td>
<td>Ro. 8.12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147r-149r</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>P9</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10.12-13</td>
<td>1 Cor. 10.6-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151v-152r</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>P10</td>
<td>1 Cor. 12.11</td>
<td>1 Cor. 12.2-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154r-156v</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 Cor. 15.9</td>
<td>1 Cor. 15.1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156v-159v</td>
<td>115,116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mark 7.32,33</td>
<td>Mark 7.31-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159v-160r</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 Cor. 3.4-5</td>
<td>2 Cor. 3.4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164r-166r</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gal. 3.19</td>
<td>Gal. 3.16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168v-169r, Index</td>
<td>122,123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gal. 5.16-17,22</td>
<td>Gal. 5.16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169r-171v</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mat. 5.28</td>
<td>Mat. 6.24-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171v-172v</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gal. 6.9</td>
<td>Gal. 5.25,6.1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174r-176r</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eph. 3.17-18</td>
<td>Eph. 3.13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178v-179v</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eph. 4.1</td>
<td>Eph. 4.1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179v-181v</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mat. 22.35-36</td>
<td>Mat. 22.35-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181v-183v</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 Cor. 1.5,7</td>
<td>1 Cor. 1.4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183v-184v</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mat. 9.7</td>
<td>Mat. 9.1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184v-186v</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eph 4.25</td>
<td>Eph 4.23-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186v-189v</td>
<td>135,136</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mat. 22.4,12</td>
<td>Mat. 22.2-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189v-190r</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Eph. 5.18</td>
<td>Eph. 5.15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>John 4.47</td>
<td>John 4.46-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190r-192v</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Eph 6.11</td>
<td>Eph 6.10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192v-193v</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mat. 18.27</td>
<td>Mat. 18.23-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193v-194r</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Phil. 1.6</td>
<td>Phil. 1.6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194r-195r</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mat. 22.15</td>
<td>Mat. 22.15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195r-196r</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Phil. 3.17</td>
<td>Phil. 3.17-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196r-199r</td>
<td>144,145</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mat. 9.18,25</td>
<td>Mat. 9.18-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199r-201v, Index</td>
<td>146,147,148</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Col. 1.10,12</td>
<td>Col. 1.9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201v-202r</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mat. 24.27-28</td>
<td>Mat. 24.14-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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