Editing fluid texts: the case of the sequence commentaries
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If I’m allowed to exaggerate – just slightly – I would say that the genre of the sequence commentary is totally unexplored territory. There are practically no editions of texts and no translations, which in turn means that there are no studies of the genre itself; its historical and cultural contexts are still to be mapped out. The first step in this work is of course to make texts available, to produce good, that is, sound critical editions.

Introduction to the genre of sequence commentaries

The sequence itself is a medieval invention. As a textual genre it is a piece of liturgical poetry, to be sung in Mass after the Alleluia and before the reading of the Gospel. Its history goes back to the ninth century, reaching its peak sometime in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. After this time, it did not develop much stylistically – even though sequence texts were of course still being written, for instance by Thomas Aquinas who in the thirteenth century authored the famous Lauda Sion salvatorem. However, at the council of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century, the number of sequences allowed in the liturgy were reduced to a bare minimum; only four pieces were retained of the many thousands texts produced.1

What about the sequence commentary then? As already confessed, the statement in the introduction is a bit drastic. There are a few editions, as can be seen in the Appendix to this article.2 The first, the edition of Alan of Lille’s commentary, is at the same time the first known example of the genre and the first such text to have been edited. In the same decade it was followed by the edition by

---

1 It is impossible here to mention even the most important studies on the sequence; research on the genre is vast. Instead I would like to refer the reader to the excellent overview of the genre and the bibliography provided in Lori Kruckenberg, ‘Sequenz’, Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik begründet von Friedrich Blume, viii (Kassel, 1998), cols 1282–1286. Mention must also be made of the editions of the circa 4,500 sequence texts that can be found in Analecta hymnica, ed. Guido M. Dreyes, Clemes Blume and Henry M. Bannister, 55 vols (Leipzig, 1899–1922; repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1961).

2 The description of the genre of the sequence commentary is based on my own survey of a large number of manuscript. A list of manuscript and a brief account of the genre can be found in Erika Kihlman, Expositiones sequentiarum. Medieval Sequence Commentaries and Prologues. Editions with Introductions (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2006).
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R.B.C. Huygens of two commentaries on *Ave maris stella*. These texts – the first exponents of a genre that would become large and thriving in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries – are available in very fine editions, but they are not representative for the sequence commentary genre at large.

For, sequence commentaries are in general anonymous compositions and gathered together in large collections, with commentaries on sequences for the whole liturgical year. My doctoral thesis, also in the list of editions in the Appendix, includes editions of seven anonymous commentaries on the same sequence, in order to make possible a comparison between various traditions and versions. So, editions exist, but not enough to reflect the circa one hundred and thirty manuscripts still extant today. My part of the Ars edendi programme, therefore, consists in the editing of a complete collection of commentaries.

What are the characteristics of the sequence commentaries? Until now I have only mentioned in passing that they are late medieval, generally anonymous and found in large collections. I should also add that they flourished especially in central Europe and England where also many printed versions are found, even before 1500. In fact, the printing of sequence commentaries predates by many years the printing of works more well-known to us today, for instance Piers Plowman or the Prick of Conscience. The sequence commentary manuscripts look different, as will be evident in the following examples. There are manuscripts that incorporate the whole sequence text as the manuscript in Figures 1 and 2. In Figure 1 we see the beginning, which is the sequence text itself preceding the commentary (the sequence here is *Verbum Dei Deo natum*). In Figure 2, the recto side of the next leaf, it is hard to tell where the sequence text ends and the commentary begins (marked here with an arrow). Usually there is a more marked difference between sequence and commentary as in Figure 3. Often interlinear glosses are added as in the example in Figure 4. Other manuscripts give just the lemma, the first few words of the sequence, before heading straight on to the commentary as in Figure 5. The arrow indicates where the new sequence commentary begins. Space has been reserved here for a large initial for the new commentary, although this initial has not been written in. In the preceding commentary you can see the lemmas for individual strophes. This layout is the most common among the sequence commentary manuscripts.

So, In what respect can they be labelled ‘fluid texts’? The theoretical and methodical implications concerning fluid texts and their editing have been actively discussed by John Bryant, editor of Herman Melville’s work. In Bryant’s words a fluid text is:

> any literary work that exists in more than one version. It is fluid because the versions flow from one to another. Truth be told, all works – because of the nature of texts and creativity – are fluid texts.³

Although Bryant labours his point that practically all texts are in essence fluid, he leaves ancient and medieval texts out of the discussion, together with the particular circumstances that come with their preservation and transmission. In fact, when discussing layouts of editions and the impossibility of a true synoptic reading of texts, he argues that the editor does well to create a linearity in their editions since ‘variants and versions are not synchronous at all; they are sequential and grow in linear fashion.’ So, Bryant’s fluidity is linear, the flow moves in one direction: authorial draft, to manuscript and authorial revisions, to fair copy, to proofs, print, translations and adaptations (see Figure 6; this is of course a simplification of the scheme of events). Classical and medieval authors were not privileged to the same kind of control over their works. Once handed over to be copied, the process of, so to speak, ‘pure’ copying started but also that process which enabled revisions and re-writings, which could indeed produce synchronous versions and variants of an author’s work. Figure 7 is a (simplified) schematic image of this process.

Let us now turn to the sequence commentaries and examples of the kind of fluidity we meet in this material. Two main textual traditions are possible to discern, called the ‘English’ and the ‘Aristotelian’ respectively. The commentaries can be grouped together in such traditions on account of similarities in the sequence repertory but mostly because of their similarity in expository approach and character in the commentaries themselves.

Today’s focus will be on examples taken from the commentary labelled the Aristotelian, whose textual witnesses date from the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. The commentaries of this tradition all display typical scholastic features, such as particular attention to the structure and division of both the sequence text and the commentary, together with a strong concern for etymological analyses and derivational exercises. In the prologues, introducing the collections, we find numerous quotations from the works of Aristotle and a generous use of scholastic terminology and logical argumentation. They treat the same themes of the sequence in similar, sometimes identical, manner, and with the same kind of critical tools and drawing on the same authorities. The tradition, however, can be further divided into separate sub-branches. These sub-branches are identified both from distinct prologue texts – the incipit of these prologues have been used to name each branch – and from the commentary texts themselves. As we will see shortly, the texts of some of the branches are closer to each other than others. And this is one of the instances where the concept of a fluid text is brought to the fore.

**Example 1**

We will be looking first at a passage from the commentary on the angelic sequence, *Ad celebres rex*, from four Aristotelian sub-branches, named in order
Sapientia vincit malitiam, Vir speculativus, Dicit Aristoteles and Gustate et Videte, according to their respective prologue incipits. The passage we will examine first, deals with the ways in which the world is adorned through Saint Michael’s feast, which is approaching. The thematic agreements between the branches are shown in Figure 8. The different colours indicate themes commented upon and, as can be seen, the first three, Sapientia, Vir speculativus and Dicit Aristoteles, bring up the same five themes albeit in a different order in Dicit Aristoteles, whereas the Gustate text only comments on two of these.

Agreements of verbal similarities, coloured in green, are shown in Figure 9. Here, only exact agreements have been marked. Immediately noticeable are the almost identical texts of Sapientia and Vir speculativus. If a more allowing attitude is adopted when making comparisons, that is, allowing for synonyms, alternative endings and expressions et cetera, the green colour takes over almost completely (Figure 10).

Example 2
Our second example is a passage from the same commentary as before, taken from the Sapientia and the Vir speculativus branch and another version belonging to the same tradition – a much abbreviated adaptation of the common text of the two branches, here denoted only with its manuscript siglum, Mü4242. In this manuscript, reproduced in Figure 4, there are three textual levels: sequence text, interlinear glosses and commentary text. In Figure 11 the sequence text is found at the top, the interlinear glosses beneath and the commentary text at the very bottom. The other two texts come from lemmatic manuscripts, that is, manuscripts that only refer to the sequence with a lemma, which is why we are presented with a prose paraphrase of the sequence strophes in question (instead of the sequence text) before the commentary proper begin. Into the paraphrase, explanations and interpretations of individual words of the sequence have been inserted, marked with purple in the Sapientia column. As can be seen many of these appear verbatim in the abbreviated version. The Vir speculativus branch is particular in that it includes two paraphrases: first a paraphrase to open the commentary section and then a longer to conclude it. The brief one leaves out the explanations we see in the Sapientia version. But, if we move the longer paraphrase section from Vir speculativus up front, a different picture emerges (Figure 12). The interlinear glosses in the abbreviated version, to the far right, are in many cases identical to the interspersed explanations in both the longer commentaries.

If we compare only the extracts from Sapientia and Vir speculativus, Figure 13, we see that just as in the previous example, the two texts are almost identical. But, and this is an important but, there are a few individual traits that are constant in all manuscripts belonging to each sub-branch. One I have already mentioned, that is the duplicate paraphrase passages in Vir speculativus. This branch is also more concerned with etymological analyses and word explanation. For instance, in this passage, the commentator includes a differentia,
explaining the difference between *ara* with a long first vowel, meaning an altar for the gods, and *ara* with a short, which means hog-stye, which in some cases would be crucial knowledge. This is not found in the *Sapientia* version. Neither is the threefold analysis of the word *Alleluia*, complete with references to the Church Fathers, Gregory, Jerome and Augustine. The commentator in *Sapientia* presents just one, the most traditional one. This in turn seems to reflect the stance taken by the commentators in the prologues. In *Vir speculativus*, one of the main motivating forces behind the commentary collection is said to be to explain the difficult words.

**Textual production and editorial implications**

Let us briefly go back to the question of how versions of texts come into being. Especially interesting of course concerning the abbreviated version, the one I sometimes refer to as the ‘Reader’s digest of sequence commentaries’. Of course, by introducing it as an ‘abbreviated adaptation’ my bias is already revealed, but it could of course be possible to imagine a concise exposition that later becomes expanded and added to. In this case, though, a closer analysis of the text seems to reveal that it is a medieval case of ‘cut and paste’. The relationship between the longer texts, however, is not as easy to analyse. By what means would we be able to identify one as the original version, the fountainhead for the whole tradition? Here, I believe, we have to content ourselves with the fact that there are a number of commentary texts – there are a few more not brought into the discussion here – that are related to one another in ways that we cannot, for the time being, account for. The versions of the ‘common text’ – if we can speak of that in this case – must be studied and analysed both separately and in comparison with the others. For, the differences between the versions, the changes made – whoever made them and whenever they were made – were intentional. They are not mistakes in the copying process, but they are there for good reasons. The adaptations, revisions, omissions and additions are both tokens of the pliability of the genre, and important clues to us when assessing the cultural, spiritual and scholarly contexts for these collections.

What, then, are the options for an editor of fluid texts? One could, of course, think of many ways to present a fluid text, but here, we will just look at two examples. The first example is the 1937 edition of the medieval Latin translations of the writings of pseudo-Dionysios Areopagita. The works of pseudo-Dionysios were highly sought after throughout the Middle Ages and several translations were made from the Greek (Figure 14). The edition includes also a modern French translation. The method is quite straightforward: each translation has its own line and you follow the one you are interested in and can easily compare it with the others and with one Greek text (we will allow ourselves to forgo a discussion of the fluidity of that particular text). It is synoptic to the minutest level – the individual word. Although clear and intuitively understandable and readable it requires pages – lots of them.

The second example comes from John Bryant’s own edition of Melville’s
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Typee. Bryant, who discusses the advantages and the disadvantages of both printed and digital media, proposes the use of both for a good fluid text edition; the printed book accompanied by almost endless versions of the text, just a mouse-click away. The book, however, should of course also reflect the fact that it is a fluid text edition; Bryant is strongly opposed to eclectic editions and proposes instead a two-fold text. First a reproduction of the manuscript with a careful and complete transcription, where all changes are accounted for, Figure 15. Next, a base version – more or less a diplomatic edition of the manuscript – upon which, other revisions are mapped, that is they are marked out with footnotes that refer to the so-called revision narrative, a separate section where the revisions are explained in full text, without abbreviations or code language, and the impact of the changes are analysed (Figure 16).

On account of the limitation of a printed book, the printed fluid text edition would have to be highly selective and pedagogical, whereas the electronic version could function as an almost limitless archive of versions. A screen-shot of the electronic edition of the same text is reproduced as Figure 17. In this edition the reader can choose which versions and which texts should be shown in the drop-down menus at the top (Figure 18): the manuscript, the transcription, the base version, or revision sites showing changes in manuscript, in print, in both or differences between manuscript and the first printed edition. In Figure 18, a setup corresponding to the printed edition has been chosen, that is the manuscript and the transcription of it. Figure 19 shows the manuscript together with the base version, which could be described as a clean reading text and Figure 20 gives one of the revision sites. The revised passages appear in different colours corresponding to changes made in the manuscript and changes made in the printed edition. These coloured phrases are clickable and we can follow the sequence of changes, that is the order in which the changes were made as identified by the editor, and in the narrative section we get a full analysis of each change (Figure 21). Of course the reader could use any combination of versions, or open several windows and have them tiled on the screen, all depending on the reader’s purpose with his or her studies.

Principles for an edition of a sequence commentary collection

What principles, then, should be applied in an edition of the fluid texts discussed here today? What would be the preferred method for a collection of sequence commentaries? As John Bryant himself willingly admits, a fluid text edition of his type does not make for a pleasurable clear-text reading – it is focused, not on the text, or texts, themselves, but on the changes between texts. I believe that there is a lot to be said for the kind of fluid text editions that Bryant proposes: the completeness and accuracy of it, the flexibility and openness of the content, and the possibility for a reader to check and follow every footstep of the editor. However, for the edition I am preparing, which in essence will be the editio princeps of a representative of an unexplored genre, I believe that it is necessary, at least to some degree, to pay heed to ‘a pleasurable reading
experience', of course without forgoing the demands of critical principles and editorial rigour that should be expected in any edition.

So, as antiquated and unimaginative, not to say right out dull, as it might seem now after examining Bryant’s digital edition, I have nevertheless opted for an old-fashioned, printed book. And, through the tyranny of the editor, I will award a single version from the Aristotelian tradition the status as the base version and let its text – uninterrupted – fill the pages with the conventional apparatuses at the bottom of the page, the way we have become accustomed to read critically edited texts. Nevertheless, agreeing wholeheartedly with Bryant that the study of the changes is vital in a fluid text tradition, I am currently trying out different solutions for a type of edition and layout that can account for at least one or two other versions of text, individual examples of such an edition could be included in an appendix of the traditional edition, either an elaborated version of a synoptic edition as we’ve seen earlier today or a base version with an *apparatus versionum*. In such an appendix a revision narrative or, perhaps better in this case, a version-narrative, in the manner of Bryant would be valuable to include.

But let us go back to the main pages of the edition and consider for a few moments what will be found there. As said earlier, the Aristotelian is the largest of the sequence commentary traditions identified, wherefore I have chosen to edit in its entirety the collection of commentaries from one of its branches, the so-called *Sapientia*-branch, represented in thirteen manuscripts – the Aristotelian branch itself answers for around sixty of all identified manuscripts. The main reason for my choice is that this branch generally presents longer, and more substantial expositions than the others. As seen from the examples above, this branch is very close to the one named *Vir speculativus*, their main differences can be found in the length of the etymological analyses and in the number of prose paraphrases of the sequence text.

The manuscripts of the *Sapientia*-branch, like all other branches of this tradition, resist the making of a stemma codicum. They show evident traces of contamination. Furthermore, the choice of including the full text of the sequence – with syntactical numbering and interlinear glosses – or to opt for the prose paraphrase instead, renders it practically impossible to attempt a traditional analysis of the manuscripts. So, with an error stemmatics method ruled out I have instead been working with something I call the ‘representative manuscript’, that is a ‘lead manuscript’ for the edition, chosen on account of its quality and age. The aim of the edition is not to re-create an author’s presumed original or even an archetype of the commentary, but to present a correct and readable text, as close as possible to a version found in an extant manuscript. It is not treated as a ‘best manuscript’ in the tradition of Bédier, as not only obvious errors are corrected but also suspect or singular readings, that is readings which the base manuscript does not share with any other manuscript. A consensus – or near-consensus reading – in the other manuscripts will then
function as correctives.

In addition, I have also analysed parts of the *Sapientia* manuscript in the manner Eva Odelman will describe in her contribution, that is identifying independent manuscripts by the use of so-called ‘West tables’. The method basically involves making lists of agreements in errors between two manuscripts. The number of instances are then transferred to a table where it is easy to see which manuscripts agree in error and which do not. The theory is, in simple terms, that if two manuscripts never agree in error they represent two separate branches and hence their agreements in readings carry weight when establishing the text. In practice it becomes error stemmatics without a stemma. Such tables were possible to produce for the prologue texts, which have proven to be more stable than the actual commentaries. From the West table for the *Sapientia*-branch, I have therefore a good overview of the inter-relationship between manuscripts and if there is no consensus reading to guide I take recourse to a reading shared by two independent manuscripts.

I will end these *prolegomena* with a phrase from John Bryant, who reminds us of the obvious, that which we all know and always become aware of when embarking on an editorial project:

> Each literary work will necessarily dictate the peculiar features of its fluid-text edition. Indeed, editing any particular fluid text will require an imaginative rather than formulaic approach in order to lure reader into textual fluidities and facilitate their reading.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Bryant, p. 143.
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A fluid text: simplification of Bryant’s example

Figure 6

A fluid text: medieval example

Figure 7
Sapientia
Secundo nota de hoc, quod dicit PERORNATUR, quod tota ecclesia per sanctum Michaeli vel per festum eius perornatur quinquupliciter. Primo ex eis festit celebracione, secundo ex sufragio et adiutorii suis innovazione, unde dicitur in Daniele: In tempore illo consurget Michael, princeps magnus, qui stabilis pro fills populi sui, id est pro his, qui sunt predestinati ad vitam eternam; tercio mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michaelis, et hoc per sufragio et adiutorii sui innovazione, unde dicitur in Danieli duodecimo capitulo: In tempore illo consurget Michael, princeps magnus, qui stabilis pro fills populi sui, id est pro his, qui sunt predestinati ad vitam eternam; quartio mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michaelis ex susceptione animarum per sanctum Michaeli, unde de ipso cantatur: ‘Archangele Dei Michael, constitui te principem super omnes animas susciptendas.’ Quinto mundus perornatur per sanctum Michaeli in eius festum ex ipius solenni victoria et pugna, de qua dicitur in Apocalipsi: Factum est precum magnum et Michael archangels pugnabat cum dracone.

Dicit Aristoteles

Nota: auctor dicit, quod tota machina letetur de sufragis sanctorum angelorum, unde dicitur in Danieli: ‘Stetit Michael’ pro fills tuis, id est salvandis. Item Michael archangelus est princeps animarum, unde de eo cantit ecclesia: ‘Archangele Michael constitui te principem super omnis animas.’

Gustate et videte
Nota: auctor dicit, quod tota machina letetur de sufragis sanctorum angelorum, unde dicitur in Danieli: ‘Stetit Michael’ pro fills tuis, id est salvandis. Item Michael archangelus est princeps animarum, unde de eo cantit ecclesia: ‘Archangele Michael constitui te principem super omnis animas.’
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Sapientia

Secundo nota de hoc, quod PERORNATUR, quod tota ecclesia per sanitatem Michaelem vel per festum eius persona sub quo conseurgit Michaelis, princeps magnus, quia stabit pro filis populi sui, id est pro his, qui sunt praestantissimi ad vitam eterna, tertia mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michaeleth, et hoc per deportacionem orationum nostrarum per manus Michaelis et aliorum angelorum ante conspectum Dei. unde dicit Bernardus: Discurrit angelus inter dilectum et dilectam, vota offerens, dona referens, corrigens illam, placans illum; quarto mundus perornatur per festum Michaeleth ex susceptione animarum per sanctum Michaelem, unde de eo cantatur: Archangele Michahel, constitui te principem super omnes animas suscipiendas, quinta mundus perornatur per sanctum Michaelem et eius festum ex ipsius solemnpi victoria et pugna, de qua dicitur in Apocalypsi: Factum est prelium magnum et Michael archangelus pugnabat cum dracone.

Vr speculativus

Notandum, hic auctor PERORNATUR et cetera, quod tota ecclesia per sanctum Michaelem vel per eius festum persona sub quo conseurgit Michaelis, princeps magnus, qui stabit pro filis populi sui, id est pro his, qui sunt praestantissimi ad vitam eterna, tertia mundus perornatur per festum sancti Michaeleth, et hoc per deportacionem orationum nostrarum per manus Michaelis et aliorum angelorum ante conspectum Dei. unde dicit Bernardus: Discurrit angelus inter dilectum et dilectam, vota offerens, dona referens, corrigens illam, placans illum; quarto mundus perornatur per festum Michaeleth ex susceptione animarum per sanctum Michaelem, unde de eo cantatur: Archangele Michahel, constitui te principem super omnes animas suscipiendas.

Dicit Aristoteles

Multipliciter autem per sanctum Michaelem perornatur machina mundi, id est tota ecclesia in singulis partibus mundi dispersa. Primo et eius festi annua celebratione. Secundo perornatur suorum suffragiorum intervenzione, unde dicit in Daniele: In tempore illo consurgerit Michael princeps Dei, qui stabit pro filis populi sui vel ful. Glossa ibidem: ut salverent predestinati. Tercio perornatur ecclesia per sanctum Michaelem, quod tam de pugna celi quam de pugna cotidiana, quam pro nobis pugnat, intelligitur. Perornatur eam machinam celci per eum animarum inductione, quia ipse est ducor animarum sanctarum in celum, secundum illud: Archangele Michael constituit te principem super omnes animas suscipiendas. Quarto dicit ecclesia pro accesso et oraciones nostras offert ad Deum, unde Apokalypsi octavo capitulo: Stetit angelus ante altare habens thuribulum aureum et celsa et data sunt ei incensa multa, ut daret deo oracionibus sanctorum omnium super altare aureum, quod est ante thronum.

Nota: auctor dicit, quod tota machina letetur de suffragis sanctorum angelorum, unde dicitur in Daniele: In tempore illo consurgerit Michael princeps Dei, qui stabit pro filis populi sui vel ful. Glossa ibidem: ut salverent predestinati. Tercio perornatur machina celci per eum animarum inductione, quia ipse est ducor animarum sanctarum in celum, secundum illud: Archangele Michael constituit te principem super omnes animas suscipiendas.
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Vir speculativus

Secundo nota de hac, quod dicit

PERORNATUR, quod tota ecclesia per sanctum Michaelis vel per

testum eius personalium

quinque dupliciter. Primo ex eius festo celebracione, secundo ex susdito

e loco et adulatione sub interpretatione, unde
dicitur in Daniele. In tempore illa

consurgit Michaelis, princeps

magnus, qui stabit pro filiis populi

suoi, id est pro his, qui sunt

predestinati ad vitam eternam. Ter
cio mundus perornatur per

festo sancti Michaelis, et hoc

per deportacionem orationum

nostarum per manus Michaelis et

angelorum aliorum ante

conspectum Dei, unde Bernardus:

Discurrit angelus inter dilectum et
dilectam, vota afferens, dona

referens, corrigens illam, placans

illum; quartum mundus perornatur

per festum Michaelis ex

susceptione animarum per

sanctum Michaelis, unde de
eo cantitur: Archangelus Dei

Michael, constituit te principem

super omnes animas suscipiendas.

Dicit Aristoteles

Multipliciter autem per sanctum

Michaelis personalum

machi mundi, id est tota

ecclesia in singulis partibus

mundi dispersa. Primo ex ipsius festo

celebracione, secundo ex susdito

et adulatione sub interpretatione, unde

dicitur in Daniele. In tempore illa

consurgit Michaelis, princeps

magnus, qui stabit pro filiis populi

suoi, id est pro his, qui sunt

predestinati ad vitam eternam. Ter
cio mundus perornatur per

festo sancti Michaelis, et hoc

per deportacionem orationum

nostarum per manus Michaelis et

angelorum aliorum ante

conspectum Dei, unde Bernardus:

Discurrit angelus inter dilectum et
dilectam, vota afferens, dona

referens, corrigens illam, placans

illum; quartum mundus perornatur

per festum Michaelis ex

susceptione animarum per

sanctum Michaelis, unde de
eo cantitur: Archangelus Dei

Michael, constituit te principem

super omnes animas suscipiendas.

Gustate et videte

Nota: Dicit auctor, quod tota

machina letetur de suffragiis

sanctorum angelorum, unde

dicitur in Danielis: 'Videte Michaelis

pro filiis suis, id est salvandis. Item

Michaelis archangelus est

principes angelorum. Unde de sa

cant ecclesia: 'Archangelus Michaelis

constituit te principem super omnes

animas suscipiendas.'
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Sapientia

VOS PER ETRA

hic autor itum dirigat sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum exhortatis nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei. Dicit sec. Vos, supple novem choros angelorum et electa pars armigone, id est consonancie celestis, et nos diem simul vota, id est affectus subs laudes, per urcas citharas, id est per talia instrumenta musica, per etra. Id est per ethera per sincopam, et per rura terrea, id est per terram—referredo singula anguic, id est Nos angelici delis laudes per etra et nos homines demus laudes in terris—quo, pra ut, nostra thimiamata, id est nostre oraciones, sint accepta, id est grata. Deus super auream aram, id est super aurum altare, post incita bella Michaelis, quo pro ut, nos decanem, id est simul cum angelis cantemus. Alleluia, id est laudem Deo, in coeva gloria, id est in eterna gloria.

Nota: lira est instrumentum musica, habens ad maus quattuor cordas, sed cithara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per ‘liricas citharas’ intelligitur observatio dem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debeatus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observante et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitando.

Secundo nota, quod autur in illo versu quo post bella et cetera tangit illud, quod partim dictur in Apocalypsi et in Exodo: Stetit angelus et cetera. Per thimiamata, quod est praevar."
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Sapientia

VOS PER ETRA.

Hic autor iterum diriget sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum extortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei.

Dicit sic: Vos, supple novem choros angelorum et electa pars armone, id est consonantia celestis, et nos demum situli vota, id est affectuosa laudes, per liricas chytaras, id est per fala instrumenta musica, per etra, id est per ethera per sincoparum et per lira terrea, id est per terram—referendo singula singulorum sic: Vos angel dedit laudes per etra et nos homines demus laudes in terra—quod pro ut, nostra thimiamata, id est nostra oraciones, sint accepta, id est gratia. Deo super aureum aram, id est super aureum altarum, post inculita bella Michaelis, quod pro ut, nos decantemus, id est Ira est instrumentum musicum habens ab malis quattuor cordas, sed cithara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per Iras chytaras intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitantem.

Secundo nota, quod autem in illo versu quo post bella et cetera tangit illud, quod partim dicitur in Apocalypsi et in Exodo: Stetit angelus et cetera. Per thymienota, quod est speciali

Vir speculativus

VOS PER ETRA.

Hic autor diriget sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum extortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei, dicens sic: Littera: Vos, supple novem choros angelorum et electa pars armone, id est consonantia celestis, et nos, supple homines, demus simul vota. Id est affectuosa laudes, per liricas chytaras, id est per fala instrumenta musica, per etra, id est per ethera et et simoce deo. Id est per ethera et et simoce deo terrea, id est per terram, sic: referendo: Vos angel dedit laudes per etra et nos homines per terram. Ut nostra thimiamata, id est nostra oraciones, sint accepta, id est gratia. Deo super aureum aram, id est super aureum altarum, post inculita bella Michaelis, quod pro ut, nos decantemus, id est Ira est instrumentum musicum habens per ilios quattuor cordas, sicut decem vel plures. Igitur per Iras chytaras intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitantem.

Notandum, quod Ira est instrumentum musicum habens ab malis quattuor cordas, sed cithara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per Iras chytaras intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitantem.


Nota: Ira est instrumentum musicum habens ab malis quattuor cordas, sed cithara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per Iras chytaras intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum, decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitantem.
The Aristotelian Tradition: Case Study 2

Sapientia

VOS PER ETRA

Hic auter iterum dirigit sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum exhortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei.

Notandum, quod 'ira' est instrumentum musicum ad maius quattuor cordas, sed citara habet plures cordas, ut decem vel plures. Igitur per 'liricas citharas' intelligitur observacio decem preceptorum secundum doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum. Debemus igitur laudare Deum decem decem precepta eius observando et doctrinam quattuor evangelistarum imitando.

Notandum circa hoc QUO BELLA: Tangit illud, quod prius dicitur, qua, ut habetur ex Apokalipsi: Michael archangelus devincet Antichristum ipsum interficiendo, cum in celum ascendere voluerit et illam victoriam autem vocat hic BELLA INCLITA MICHAELIS.

Nota: 'Alleluia' interpretatur laudate Deum vel laus Dei et cetera.

Erika Kihlman

Vir speculativus

VOS PER ETRA

Hic auter dirigit sermonem suum ad novem choros angelorum exhortans nos cum ipsis ad laudem Dei, dicens sic:

Nota, quod 'Alleluia' interpretatur laudate Deum vel laus Dei et cetera.

Figure 13
Figure 14

Extract from Dionysiac : recueil donnant l'ensemble des traductions latines des ouvrages attribué au Denys de l'Aréopag, 2 vols (Paris 1937)
transported to the stream which flowed perhaps two
hundred yards from the house. On arriving up{on} My
appearance upon the verandah in front of the habitation
drew together quite a crowd of the natives, who now
all the while
stood looking on & conversing a lustily with one another,
like a group of village idlers gathered about the door
• of tavern door of a village when the equipage of some
• distinguished traveler is brought round previous to his taking
his departure. As soon as I clasped my arms about the
neck of the devoted fellow, & he tossed off with me.

Screen from the electronic edition of Typee (John Bryant)
Figure 18

Screen from the electronic edition of Typee (John Bryant)

Leaf 1 (recto)  
Page 1  
line 89.12 to 90.04

transported to the stream which flowed perhaps two hundred yards from the house. On arriving up{on} My appearance upon the verandah in front of the habitation drew together quite a crowd of the natives, who now stood looking on & conversing with one another, like a group of village idlers gathered about the door of tavern door of a village when the equipage of some distinguished traveler is brought round previous to his taking his departure. As soon as I clasped my arms about the neck of the devoted fellow, & he jorged off with me.

Editing fluid texts: the case of the sequence commentaries 26
transported to the stream which flowed perhaps two
hundred yards from the house. ¶ Our
appearance upon the verandah in front of the habitation
drew together quite a crowd of the natives, who now
stood looking on & conversing in the most animated manner with one another,
like a group of gossipping idlers gathered about the
door of a village tavern when the equipage of some
distinguished traveler is brought round previous to his
departure. As soon as I clapped my arms about the
neck of the devoted fellow, & he jogged off with me,
the crowd composed chiefly of young girls & stripling boys

Screen from the electronic edition of Typee (John Bryant)
Figure 20

Screen from the electronic edition of Typee (John Bryant)

1. transported to the stream which flowed perhaps two
2. hundred yards from the house. 1 Our
3. appearance upon the verandah in front of the habitation
4. drew together quite a crowd of the natives, who now
5. stood looking on & conversing in the most animated manner with one another;
6. like a group of gossiping idlers gathered about the
7. door of a village tavern when the equipage of some
8. distinguished traveler is brought round previous to his
9. departure. As soon as I clasped my arms about the
10. neck of the devoted fellow, & he jogged off with me,
11. the crowd composed chiefly of young girls & strapping boys
Figure 21

Screen from the electronic edition of Typee (John Bryant)

1. transported to the stream which flowed perhaps two
2. hundred yards from the house. ¶ Our
3. appearance upon the veranda in front of the habitation
4. drew together quite a crowd of the natives, who now
5. stood looking on & conversing in the most animated manner with one another,
6. like a group of gossiping idlers gathered about the
7. door of a village tavern when the equipage of some
8. distinguished traveler is brought round previous to his
9. departure. As soon as I glanced my arms about the
10. neck of the dervish fellow, & he rigged off with me,
11. the crowd composed chiefly of young girls & stripping boys
12. followed after, shouting & exulting in infinite glee &
13. accompanied us to the banks of the stream. ¶ On
14. gaining it, first first washing up to his hips in the

Revision Site 10ms2e2

Sequence

1. the natives, who now stood looking on & conversing handsomely with one another
2. the natives, who now stood looking on & conversing [1] in
   the most animated manner with one another
3. the natives, who now stood looking on all the while &
   conversing in the most animated manner with one another
4. the natives, who now stood looking on all the while &
   conversing in the most animated manner with one another
5. the natives, who now stood looking on [1] & conversing in
   the most animated manner with one another
6. the natives, who now stood looking on and conversing with
   one another in the most animated manner [10ms2e2]

Narrative

Initially, HM wrote “who now stood looking on & conversing
handsomely with one another” [step 1]. In a proofreading phase he
thought better of “handsomely” and changed it to “in the most animated
manner” [step 2]. Probably at the same time he also inserted “all the
while” above “looking on” [step 3] in order to stress the occurrence of
activities. Since HM supplied no note, the phrase’s intended
position in the sentence is just a guess. In the pencil subtype, HM or
Gansevoort underlined “with one another” in pencil [step 4] possibly
to indicate that the phrase is a bit redundant in light of “all the while.”
HM may have then returned to the manuscript and deleted instead
to cancel “all the while” [step 5].

Gansevoort’s light pencil underlining of “with one another”
might also have been his indication that the clause should be