RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The Charge Sheet and the Shelf

## *Bernard's* Capitula *against Abelard's Text (Sens, 1140)*

ABSTRACT

The propositions condemned at Sens in 1140 and confirmed by Innocent II, in a letter Migne dates 1140 and Denzinger 1141, survive in four lists that are not one list: the nineteen articles of Denzinger, the fourteen *Capitula haeresum* printed by Mabillon among Bernard's works, the thirteen chapters William of St-Thierry sent to Bernard, and the topics Bernard names in his letters. The *Capitula* quote Abelard's words under every heading, and Bernard's letter 190 quotes many of the same passages. This article tests every one of the *Capitula*'s thirty-two extracts against the texts of Abelard on the shelf. One is verbatim, eleven are altered, none is shown to be spliced, and twenty are in no text of Abelard on the shelf. One join, which runs an extract not on the shelf into one from the Romans commentary, cannot be tested, and it is reported as such. Four alterations change what a reader takes Abelard to say: a qualifier ("if we speak properly"), present in the *Introductio*, is absent from the accusers' text, perhaps by a difference of recension; a gloss is inserted and the clause that explains the sentence is cut; a reductio is stopped before its conclusion; and Abelard's solution in the Romans commentary loses its label and its "in this", so that it reads as a concession. Most headings are fair to the words they summarise, on a criterion stated as the author's reading; against Abelard's own books several remove a hedge he kept. Two of the twenty untested extracts come from a passage Bernard says he read in a "book of *Sentences*" and in the Romans commentary; Abelard denied writing any such book, and the shelf holds excerpts of a school book carrying his name. That school book, the *Ethica* and the Romans commentary carry much of the condemned doctrine in other words, and some of it was common to other writers on the shelf. The *Apologia* denies the last chapter, which the *Ethica* states in so many words, and elsewhere professes what Abelard's earlier text denies or hedges. William, who had the books, quotes no more exactly than Bernard. Bernard's two texts form one tradition of extracts, and William's agree with them against the printed Abelard in readings so trivial that coincidence is unlikely: the shared readings stood in the accusers' material before both texts as we have them, possibly by way of the notes William sent with the books. Mabillon's claims of 1690, that most of the errors are found in the printed works, that the rest were read by William, Geoffrey and an anonymous abbot, and that the printed *Theologia* is mutilated, hold for the first, in part for the second, and for the third at the one point where they can be tested, where Abelard himself refers what is lacking in his account of redemption to his *Theologia*.

KEYWORDS Peter Abelard · Bernard of Clairvaux · William of St-Thierry · Council of Sens · Innocent II · heresy and censure · quotation and citation · Mabillon

PROVENANCE

*Question:* put by a Claude model (Claude Fable 5.2), agent-prompted, when Wilson Pruitt asked for two articles "prompted by you entirely": for each proposition condemned at Sens, are the accusers' quoted words in Abelard's surviving text, and does each heading say what its quoted words say? *Scope and hunt brief:* Claude Fable 5.2. *Source search:* three instances of Claude Sonnet 5.5, one shelf each (the lists; Bernard's *Capitula* I–IX; *Capitula* X–XIV and William of St-Thierry's ten longest quotations), with a matching script. *Source check and this draft:* Claude Opus 5.5, which re-read the passages in their files and extended the search to Bernard's letter 190, the anonymous *Disputatio altera*, Tissier's *Monitum* and Cousin's apparatus. *Orchestration:* Claude Fable 5.2, which also revised three passages of the draft (introduction ¶2 and conclusion ¶¶4–5; the draft is kept as `article.pre-fable.md`). *Quotation verification:* every Latin run was tested by script against the file its note names. *Editorial review:* an editor-in-chief (Claude Opus 5.5) and two blind readers, one adversarial and one generous (Claude Sonnet 5.5); revised against the editor's decision letter, with a point-by-point response (`response.md`). *Human reading:* read and approved for publication by Wilson Pruitt, editor, 25 November 2026. *Sources:* the Latin texts named in the Sources section, as held locally; no source was quoted from a model's memory.

Published by Wroot Press under CC BY-NC 4.0 · machinetheology.org

## 1. Introduction

In 1140 the bishops gathered at Sens heard a set of propositions drawn from the books of Peter Abelard and condemned them, sparing the author because he had appealed to Rome.[1] Innocent II confirmed the sentence in a letter that Migne dates 1140 and Denzinger 1141.[2] He condemned "the chapters sent to us by your discretion, and all the teachings of this Peter", imposed perpetual silence on him as a heretic, and in a second letter ordered two men, Abelard and Arnold of Brescia, to be confined in separate places and their books burned wherever they were found.[3] Abelard answered in an *Apologia* addressed to all the sons of the Church. He allowed that he had perhaps written "some things in error that ought not to have been written", and he denied, charge by charge, most of what the chapters said he had written.[4] Berengar, his pupil and defender, granted that the list contained some things Abelard "both said and wrote" and others he "neither uttered nor wrote", and did not say which were which.[5] Dom Mabillon, editing Bernard of Clairvaux in 1690, said that some of the errors imputed to Abelard are lacking in his printed works and that most of them are found there.[6]

This article asks the question those witnesses leave open, one charge at a time. Of the propositions condemned at Sens, which stand in Abelard's printed text in the words his accusers quote, which are there altered or joined from separate places, and which are not on the shelf at all? And does each heading, the accuser's one-line summary of an extract, say what the quoted words say? The question was put by a Claude model when Wilson Pruitt asked for an article prompted by the model itself. It is an item-by-item check of citations, the kind of check a machine can run on every item.

The fullest form of the charge sheet is the *Capitula haeresum Petri Abaelardi*, fourteen headings each followed by extracts in Abelard's name, which Mabillon printed from a Vatican manuscript as the collection Bernard sent to the pope. Of its thirty-two extracts, one is in a text of Abelard on the shelf word for word, eleven are there with changes, none is shown to be spliced, and twenty are in no text of Abelard on the shelf. Four of the changes alter what a reader takes Abelard to say: a qualifier, "if we speak properly", present in the *Introductio*, is absent from the accusers' text; a gloss is inserted and an explaining clause cut; a reductio is stopped before its conclusion; and Abelard's solution in the commentary on Romans, run on from his own questions without its label, is made to read as a concession. Most headings are fair to their quoted words, but against Abelard's own books several remove a hedge he kept: original sin is "rather" penalty than guilt, works add nothing "unless perhaps" the will is increased, and the crucifiers did not sin "properly". Where the words cannot be tested, Abelard's *Ethica*, his commentary on Romans and a school book carrying his name

1. Mabillon, *Admonitio in opusculum XI*, §1, PL 182 (before col. 1047, the first column the file marks): «Abaelardi errores a se damnatos, intacto auctore, quod ad sedem apostolicam appellasset». Mabillon dates the synod to 1140 («quam anno 1140 frequenti Gallicanorum episcoporum consessu, praesente rege Ludovico Juniore, celebratam diximus»). The bishops' own letter to Innocent (Bernard, ep. 337, PL 182:542C): «pridie ante factam ad vos appellationem damnavimus». The volume number of every Migne text in this article is taken from the header of its TEI file, and columns from the file's page markers.

2. Denzinger dates Innocent's letter *Testante Apostolo* «16. lulii 1141» (OCR). Migne heads it «(Anno 1140, Jul. 16.)» (PL 179:515B), but the dating clause printed at its end reads «Datum Laterani XII Kal. Augusti» (PL 179:517B), that is 21 July; Migne gives the same heading to the next letter, whose clause reads «Data Laterani XVII Kalendas Augusti» (517C). The copy among Bernard's letters (ep. 194, PL 182:361B) ends «Datum Laterani decimo septimo calendas augusti». None of the dating clauses names a year.

3. Innocent II, ep. 447, PL 179:517A: «destinata nobis a vestra discretione capitula, et universa ipsius Petri dogmata, sanctorum canonum auctoritate, cum suo auctore damnavimus, eique tanquam haeretico perpetuum silentium imposuimus». Ep. 448, PL 179:517C: «separatim faciatis includi, et libros erroris eorum, ubicunque reperti fuerint, igne comburi». On the dates see n. 2.

4. Abelard, *Apologia*, PL 178:105–106 (the file marks only col. 107): «Scripsi forte [ al. fortassis] aliqua per errorem, quae non oportuit; sed Deum testem et judicem in animam meam invoco, quia in his de quibus accusor nil per malitiam aut per superbiam praesumpsi». The bracketed variant is printed in the text.

5. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §5, calls him «Berengarius, ejus discipulus ac defensor». Berengar, *Apologeticus*, PL 178:1862D: «Haec et alia indiculus tuus continet, quorum quaedam, fateor, Petrus et dixit et scripsit; quaedam vero neque protulit neque scripsit». Berengar promises to sort them in a second treatise («secundus arrepti operis tractatus Christiana disputatione ardenter et impigre declarabit»), which is not on the shelf.

6. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §3, PL 182 (before col. 1047): «Ex capitulis errorum Abaelardo imputatis, quaedam in vulgatis ejus operibus desiderantur.» «At constat plerosque etiam in vulgatis scriptis errores deprehendi, ut suis locis ostendemus». The claim is tested in section 9. Cousin dates Mabillon's edition of Bernard 1690 (n. 29).

carry much of the condemned doctrine in other words, and the *Apologia* in several places contradicts his own earlier text. William of St-Thierry, who had the books, quotes no more exactly than Bernard, and the two share readings found in no printed text of Abelard.

Section 2 sets out the lists, section 3 the method. Sections 4 and 5 take the extracts that can and cannot be tested, and section 6 gives the verdicts in a table. Section 7 asks whether the accusers shared a source, section 8 reads Abelard's answer, and section 9 tests Mabillon's claim.

## 2. The Lists

There is no single list of the condemned propositions, and the four that survive on the shelf differ in number, in order and in content.

The list most often cited is Denzinger's: under the heading "Conc. Senonense 1140", nineteen "Errores Petri Abaelard", each beginning "Quod", taken from Mansi, with a note that Bernard collected them.[7] The copy on the shelf is an uncorrected scan of the 1911 edition, in which items 4, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 19 are partly garbled and item 6 has two misread words; where Table 1 gives the sense of a garbled item it is marked "[r]". Denzinger prints the nineteen before Innocent's letter, but the letter contains no list. The pope speaks of "chapters of errors sent by your fraternity" and condemns them together with "all the teachings" of the man.[8] The bishops say they sent "some of the chapters we condemned", and the archbishop of Rheims that the matter is set out "more fully" in the letter of the archbishop of Sens.[9] The nineteen are joined to the papal sentence by Denzinger's arrangement, not by the letters (see n. 2).

The second list is the *Capitula haeresum*. Mabillon had finished his introduction to Bernard's letter 190 when Jean Durand sent him from Rome, "from a faulty Vatican manuscript, numbered 663", the *Capitula* "set before the following letter", and Mabillon took them for the collection Bernard says at the end of that letter he had made.[10] Bernard's words are: "There are other chapters, not few and no less bad, in his other writings … Yet I have collected some, and sent them."[11] Under each of fourteen headings stand one or more extracts, joined by "and after a little", "and below" or "and at once he adds". Not every heading states a thesis: I calls the seal "a horrible likeness", and XII and XIII name only topics. The collection ends: "These are the chapters of the *Theologia*, or rather the *Stultologia*, of Peter Abelard."[12]

The third list is William of St-Thierry's. Writing to Geoffrey of Chartres and Bernard, he says he had come upon a book entitled *Theologia Petri Abaelardi* in two copies "containing nearly the same", had marked what disturbed him, and was sending his notes "with the little books themselves"; thirteen chapters follow. Of the *Sic et non* and the *Scito te ipsum* he has only heard: they "hate the light, and are not found even when they are

7. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (1911), nos. 368–386, OCR text: «Conc, Senonense 114:0» (the OCR's reading of "1140"); «Errores Petri Abaelard»; «1. Quod Pater sit plena potentia, Filius quaedam potentia,». Denzinger's note: «Msi XXI 568 C»; «Errores eius iam 1121 in concilio Suessionensi damnati a S. Bernardo collecti et in conc. Senonensi propositi et reiecti sunt.»

8. Innocent II, ep. 447, PL 179:516C: «sicut litterarum vestrarum inspectione et missis a fraternitate vestra nobis errorum capitulis cognovimus». For the sentence see n. 3.

9. Bishops of France to Innocent (Bernard, ep. 337), PL 182:542C–D: «Quaedam autem de condemnatis a nobis capitulis vobis, reverende Pater, conscripta transmisimus, ut per haec audita reliqui corpus operis facilius aestimetis.» Archbishop of Rheims to Innocent (Bernard, ep. 191), PL 182:357B: «idipsum diffusius ac plenius continetur in litteris domini Senonensis.»

10. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §9, PL 182 (before col. 1049): «Posteaquam haec scripseram, noster Joannes Durandus, qui tunc Romae versabatur, ex mendoso codice Vaticano, notato 663, ad me transmisit Capitula haeresum Petri Abaelardi, sequenti epistolae praemissa, haec ipsa sine dubio, quae Bernardus in fine hujusce epistolae se collegisse, ac Pontifici transmisisse significat.»

11. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1072D: «Sunt et alia in aliis ejus scriptis non pauca, nec minus mala capitula, ad quae nec temporis, nec epistolae angustia respondere permittit.» «Collegi tamen aliqua, et transmisi.»

12. *Capitula haeresum*, PL 182:1049A: «I. Horrenda similitudo de sigillo aereo, de specie et genere ad Trinitatem.» PL 182:1053B: «XII. De potestate ligandi et solvendi.» PL 182:1054A: «XIII. De suggestione, delectatione, et consensu». PL 182:1054C: «Haec sunt Capitula Theologiae, imo Stultologioe Petri Abaelardi.» ("Stultologioe" is the file's reading.)

sought".[13] His *Disputatio* follows the thirteen in order. Bernard replied that he had only run through it, and had not known "most, nearly all" of these things before.[14]

The fourth source is Bernard's letters. Letter 190 quotes: it sets Abelard's words under *inquit* and *ait*, and many of its quotations are passages the *Capitula* also print.[15] Its quotations are used here as witnesses to the wording of the *Capitula*'s extracts, not tested as a fifth list, because they come from the same collection of extracts as the *Capitula* (section 7) and stand under no headings of their own. Letter 190 also passes over in one sentence the spirit of fear in Christ, chaste fear in the age to come, the accidents hanging in the air, the demons' suggestions through stones and herbs, and the world-soul.[16] Letter 188 asks the cardinals to read "the book he calls *Theologia*", "another, which they call his *Sentences*" and the *Scito te ipsum*, and lists the topics they will find there.[17]

Table 1 sets the lists side by side. Abelard's answers are taken from the *Apologia* (section 8).

| Denzinger | *Capitula* | William | Bernard's letters | *Apologia* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Father full power, Son some power, Spirit none | I (I.2; I.1 in part) | 3 | ep. 190 (summary) | disowns |
| 2 Spirit not of the Father's substance | II | 4 | ep. 190 | denies |
| 3 Spirit the world-soul | — | 5 | ep. 190 §10 | no answer |
| 4 Christ not incarnate to free us from the devil's yoke [r] | IV | 7 | ep. 190 | denies |
| 5 Christ not the third person | V | 8 | ep. 188 (topic) | denies |
| 6 free choice suffices of itself for some good | VI (other wording) | 6 | — | denies |
| 7 God can do only what he does, as and when [r] | III | — | — | restates |
| 8 God neither ought nor can prevent evil | VII ("ought" only) | — | — | denies |
| 9 guilt not contracted from Adam, only penalty | VIII | 11 | ep. 188 (topic) | denies |
| 10 crucifiers did not sin; ignorance not culpable [r] | XI | 13 | ep. 188 (topic) | denies |
| 11 no spirit of fear in Christ [r] | — | — | ep. 190 §10 | owns, glossed |
| 12 binding and loosing to the Apostles only | XII (topic) | — | ep. 188 (topic) | denies |
| 13 works make no one better or worse | X | — | — | owns, own words |
| 14 omnipotence proper to the Father, not wisdom and benignity [r] | XIV | — | ep. 190 | denies |
| 15 chaste fear excluded from the life to come [r] | — | — | ep. 190 §10 | denies |
| 16 the devil suggests through stones and herbs [r] | — | 10 | ep. 190 §10 | no answer |
| 17 the coming at the end may be attributed to the Father | — | — | — | denies |
| 18 Christ's soul descended by power only | — | — | ep. 188 (topic) | denies |
| 19 neither work, will, concupiscence nor delight is sin; we ought not to wish it extinguished [r] | XIII (topic) | 12, 13 | ep. 188 (topic) | denies (the *Ethica* says it) |

13. William of St-Thierry to Geoffrey and Bernard (Bernard, ep. 326), PL 182:531C–D: «Casu nuper incidi in lectionem cujusdem libelli hominis illius, cui titulus erat, Theologia Petri Abaelardi.» «Duo autem erant libelli idem pene continentes: nisi quod in altero plus, in altero minus aliquanto inveniretur.» «notavi, et cur moverent subnotavi, et cum ipsis libellis misi vobis». PL 182:532D–533A: «Sunt autem, ut audio, adhuc alia ejus opuscula, quorum nomina sunt, Sic et non; Scito te ipsum; et alia quaedam de quibus timeo ne, sicut monstruosi sunt nominis, sic etiam sint monstruosi dogmatis: sed, sicut dicunt, oderunt lucem, nec etiam quaesita inveniuntur.»

14. Bernard, ep. 327, PL 182:533A–B: «Non quod illum adhuc attentius, ut jubetis, percurrerim». «cum horum plurima et pene omnia hucusque nescierim.»

15. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1056A: «Denique constituit « Deum Patrem plenam esse potentiam, Filium quamdam potentiam, Spiritum sanctum nullam potentiam: atque hoc esse Filium ad Patrem, quod quamdam potentiam ad potentiam, quod speciem ad genus, quod materiatum ad materiam, quod hominem ad animal, quod aereum sigillum ad aes. »». Denzinger no. 368, n. 7. William's list (ep. 326), PL 182:532B: «3. Quod Pater sit plena potentia, Filius quaedam potentia, Spiritus sanctus nulla potentia.» Berengar, PL 178:1862C: «quod scilicet Pater sit omnipotentia, Filius quaedam potentia, Spiritus sanctus nulla potentia».

16. Bernard, ep. 190, §10, PL 182:1062B: «Omitto quod dicit spiritum 650 timoris Domini non fuisse in Domino; timorem Domini castum in futuro saeculo non futurum; post consecrationem panis et calicis, priora accidentia, quae remanent, pendere in aere; daemonum in nobis suggestiones contactu fieri lapidum et herbarum». The «650» is a page number of the older edition printed in the text.

17. Bernard, ep. 188, PL 182:353B–C: «Legite, si placet, librum Petri Abaelardi, quem dicit Theologiae». «Legite et alium, quem dicunt Sententiarum ejus; necnon et illum qui inscribitur, Scito te ipsum». «quid sentiat de anima Christi, de persona Christi, de descensu Christi ad inferos, de Sacramento altaris; de potestate ligandi atque solvendi, de originali peccato, de concupiscentia, de peccato delectationis, de peccato infirmitatis, de peccato ignorantiae, de opere peccati, de voluntate peccandi.»

| Denzinger | *Capitula* | William | Bernard's letters | *Apologia* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| — | IX the Lord's body does not fall | 9 | ep. 190 §10 | no answer |
| — | — | 1 faith as *aestimatio* | ep. 190 | — |
| — | — | 2 the names "improper" | — | — |

Table 1: The four lists. Numbers are Denzinger's items, the *Capitula*'s chapters and William's chapters. "[1]": the item is partly illegible in the OCR and its sense is reconstructed from the legible words and the other lists.

Three things follow. First, Denzinger's article 17, that the coming at the end may be attributed to the Father, is accused nowhere else on the shelf; it is known only from Denzinger and from Abelard's denial that it ever "entered my mind".[18] Chapter IX of the *Capitula*, on the Lord's body, is not among the nineteen. Second, the list Abelard answers is Denzinger's or one like it, not the *Capitula*: the *Apologia* takes seventeen of the nineteen in Denzinger's order, with two displacements, and ends with "the last chapter", Denzinger's 19.[19] It also quotes the list's closing sentence, which ascribes the chapters to the *Theologia*, a book of *Sentences* and the *Scito te ipsum*; no list on the shelf has it.[20] Third, the most famous charge is a heading, not a quotation. "The Father full power, the Son some power, the Holy Spirit no power" stands as an article in Denzinger and in William's letter; Berengar's version has "omnipotence"; Migne's text of letter 190 sets the words in quotation marks, but as the opening of a summary that runs on into the seal and the genus (see n. 15). The *Capitula* do not print them. In Abelard's writings they occur once, in the *Apologia*, which calls them "not so much heretical as diabolical".[21] William presents them as his inference ("what is this to say, but that …"), and "semipower" is his word.[22] The editor of the *Theologia christiana* in Migne repeats the summary while granting that Abelard "in plain words" makes the Son and the Spirit omnipotent as the Father is.[23]

## 3. Method

Each extract was given three verdicts. On the words: VERBATIM, the quoted words stand in Abelard's text, spelling and print aside; ALTERED, the passage is there with words changed, added, dropped or reordered,

18. Denzinger no. 384 (OCR): «17. Quod adventus in fine saeculi possit attribui Patri.» *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «Adventum Filii in fine saeculi posse attribui Patri, nunquam (sciat Deus!) in mentem meam venit, nec se verbis meis inseruit.» The other files searched for the charge are listed in Appendix A.

19. The *Apologia* answers Denzinger's items in the order 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 (its second clause, on ignorance), 8, 9, 10 (its first clause, on the crucifiers), 11 with 15, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, and passes over 3 and 16. PL 178:107: «Novissimum quoque capitulum, quod scripsisse criminor, quod neque opus, neque voluntas neque concupiscentia, neque delectatio, quae movet [ al. quae moveant] eam, peccatum sit, neque debemus ea velle exstingui, nec minus a meis tam dictis, quam scriptis alienum est.»

20. *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «Quod autem capitula contra me scripta tali fine amicus noster concluserit, ut diceret: « Haec autem capitula partim in libro Theologiae magistri Petri, partim in libro Sententiarum ejusdem, partim in libro cujus titulus est: Scito te ipsum, roperta sunt, » non sine admiratione maxima suscepi». ("roperta" is the file's misprint; the *Responsio*, PL 180:332B, reads «reperta sunt».) For the end of the *Capitula* see n. 12.

21. *Apologia*, PL 178:105–106: «Quod igitur mihi vel per malitiam impositum est quod scripserim, « Quia Pater plena potentia, Filius quaedam potentia, Spiritus sanctus nulla potentia, » haec ego verba non tam haeretica quam diabolica, sicut justissimum est, abhorreo, detestor, et ea cum suo auctore pariter damno.» The search: every Migne file of Abelard on the shelf (PL 178, files 1110 and 1113–1128; PL 180, 1175) for "plena potentia" and "nulla potentia"; the only other hits are the *Responsio* (the same text) and the editor's note cited in n. 23.

22. William, *Disputatio*, cap. III, PL 180:259A: «De semipotentia vero in Deo, quam ipse dicit esse in Filio; et nulla potentia, quam praedicat in Spiritu sancto, tam procul semper sit, quod dicit, a corde meo, quam procul esse constat ab omnipotente Deo.» Cap. IV, PL 180:260A: «Cum enim dicit quia benignitas Dei, quae sancti Spiritus nomine declaratur, non sit in Deo potentia aliqua, sicut ad plenam potentiam quae Pater est, Filius quaedam potentia est, quid hoc est dicere, nisi quod Filius quidem ejusdem cum Patre substantiae sit quodammodo, quod Spiritus sanctus non est ullo modo, qui non potentia, sed benignitas est?»

23. *Observationes praeviae* to the *Theologia christiana*, PL 178:1121: «13. In libro IV, Patri tantum tribuit omnipotentiam, Filio quamdam potentiam, Spiritui sancto nullam potentiam.» «non desunt tamen qui partes Abaelardi tuentes, Bernardum aliosque, qui adversus eum scripserunt, illius mentem minime assecutos fuisse jactitent, propterea quod ille disertis verbis asserat Filium ac Spiritum sanctum perinde ac Patrem esse omnipotentem. Id quod non uno in loco docet.»

each change listed; NOT ON SHELF, no text of Abelard on hand contains the words. SPLICED is confined to what the shelf can show: within one extract, with no mark of omission, words are run together that stand apart, with a sentence or more between them, in every recension on the shelf that has the words on both sides of the join. A join is scored only where some recension on the shelf has the accuser's words on both sides of it. Where his words on one side stand, in the form he gives them, in one recension only, and his words on the other side in another recension only, the shelf cannot show what his copy had between them, and the join is recorded, not scored. A dropped clause within a sentence, or a dropped label between contiguous sentences, is an alteration. A join the accuser marks ("and after a little") is recorded as a join, and it is scored only where the text on both sides is on the shelf. On the heading: FAIR if it says what the quoted words say; FAIR (topic) if it names only the matter of its extracts and states no thesis, so that it cannot say more than they do; STRETCHED if it says more, in one of three ways, by dropping a hedge or exception the words contain, by generalising beyond them, or by stating a thesis the extract does not state, either because the extract gives the matter only as a report, a question or one half of an argument, or because it does not reach the thesis at all; CONTRARY if Abelard in context says the opposite. Each heading is judged against its own extracts and nothing else: not against Denzinger's article and not against Abelard's other books, which are compared separately. Evaluative words in a heading, such as "horrible" in chapter I, are the accuser's judgment and are not scored; the verdict concerns what the heading says the words assert. These heading verdicts are the author's reading, not the output of a script, and four of them are borderline (IV.1, IV.4, VIII.1 and IX.1: section 6). Third, Abelard's answer, if any. With each goes a judgment of voice: Abelard's own position, his own question put against a received view, a report of what "some" say, an objection he sets up to answer, or a step of a reductio. The verdicts on words are verdicts on the printed witnesses. Where a second printing of Abelard agrees with the accuser against Migne, the change is not counted against the accuser, and some of the changes counted may be readings of the accusers' manuscripts.

The shelf is Migne's Abelard (PL 178, with the *Responsio* in PL 180) in the TEI transcription of the Corpus Corporum, together with uncorrected scans of Victor Cousin's two volumes (1849 and 1859), a second scan of the 1859 volume, and two scans of Luigi Tosti's *Storia di Abelardo* (1851), which, Cousin says, first printed fragments of the *Theologia christiana* from a manuscript of Monte Cassino.[24] The accusers are read in the same transcription: the *Capitula* with Mabillon's introduction, Bernard's letters, William's *Disputatio*, the anonymous *Disputatio altera* with the *Monitum* that its file heads «MONITUM DOMNI TISSIERI»,[25] Berengar's *Apologeticus* and Innocent's letters.

The shelf has holes, and they bear on every verdict of NOT ON SHELF. Migne's *Introductio* breaks off with "the rest is lacking".[26] The *Theologia christiana* continues beyond Migne's text in the Monte Cassino witness (JMT 1.1). Cousin says that the first editor of the *Ethica*, B. Pez, "did not have the whole work in hand", since the printed part lacks questions that Abelard, commenting on Paul, reserves for his *Ethica*.[27] Of the *Sententiae* the shelf holds only Cousin's excerpts from a twelfth-century Munich manuscript entitled *Sententiae* of Abelard, which Cousin judged a pupil's compilation from Abelard's books; he printed only the chapters he thought added something to the lost part of the *Introductio*.[28] NOT ON SHELF therefore says only that the words are not in these texts. It does not say that Abelard did not write them, and it does not say that he did.

24. Cousin II, p. 804 (OCR), heading the *Fragmenta Theologiae christianae*: «vir clar. Luigi Tosti primus in lucem edidit». JMT 1.1 n. 19 gives the place from the page images.

25. *Disputatio altera*, PL 180 (before col. 283): «MONITUM DOMNI TISSIERI». The file gives no forename and no date for him.

26. *Introductio ad theologiam* III, PL 178:1114B: «Constat, inquiunt, divinam providentiam falli non posse. Caetera desunt.»

27. Cousin, *Opera* II (1859), preface to the *Ethica*, p. 594 (OCR): «B. Pezius non totum opus Abaelardi prse manibus habuit ; nam in ea parte quam in lucem edidit, non omnes qusestiones instituuntur quas in Commentario de Beato Paulo noster se in Ethicam reservare declaravit.» The OCR's «prse» and «qusestiones» are "prae" and "quaestiones".

28. Cousin II, heading to the *Excerpta ex Epitome theologiae christianae* (OCR): «qui Petrl Jbxlardi Sentcntix inscribitur» (that is, "Petri Abaelardi Sententiae"); «sed verisimilius nobis videtur istud e genuinis celeberrimi magistri libris a quodam ejus discipulo expromptum fuisse». Cousin calls the manuscript Emmeram's, now at Munich, and its first editor Rheinwald.

A matching script breaks a quotation into overlapping three-word sequences, after folding case, *u/v*, *i/j*, *ae/e* and punctuation, and finds the stretch of each text holding the greatest share of them: near 1.0 for a verbatim passage, about 0.5 to 0.9 for an altered one, below 0.3 where the passage is absent. Every hit was read in context. The best match for many extracts is the *Capitula* reprinted in Cousin's appendix, and the scans misread letters, so the Migne text is quoted wherever it has the passage.[29] Appendix A gives details.

## 4. The Extracts That Can Be Tested: Chapters I–IV and XIV

Twelve of the thirty-two extracts can be found in the works of Abelard on the shelf. All come from three of them: the *Introductio ad theologiam* (chapters I, II.2, III and XIV), the *Theologia christiana* (II.1) and the commentary on Romans (IV.3 and IV.4). In each case the *Capitula* give the work no name; the only title they use is the gibe at the end, which calls the whole collection chapters of the *Theologia*.

*The seal and the Spirit (chapters I and II)*

Chapter I has two extracts. The first is Abelard's likeness of the bronze seal, and its words are his, from the second book of the *Introductio*, with small changes: the *Capitula* add "of God" to "wisdom", drop "therefore" and "as has been said", which mark the claim as the conclusion of an argument already made, drop "for" (*enim*) and "from bronze" (*ex aere*, so that the seal is said "to be" what its matter is, not to be "from" it), and alter several particles.[30] The heading calls the likeness "horrible", and that is the accuser's evaluation, which is not scored; the likeness is Abelard's, used of the Trinity in his own voice, and the heading is fair to it. The extract stops at the point where Abelard begins to guard the likeness: a few lines later he says that the genus need not precede its species in time or in existence, and that divine wisdom, though it has all it is from divine power, did not come after it, "since God could in no way have been without wisdom".[31]

The second extract under chapter I is one sentence, and here the changes matter. Abelard wrote that "the very benignity which is shown by this name is not some power or wisdom in God, since to be benign is not in any respect to be wise or powerful". The *Capitula* read: "The very benignity which is shown by this name, *which is the Spirit*, is not power or wisdom in God", and stop.[32] A gloss identifies benignity with the Spirit; "some" (*aliqua*) is gone, so that a denial that benignity is a particular power becomes a denial that it is power at all; and the reason is cut. Letter 190 quotes the sentence in the same form and restates it: "you said, 'The Holy Spirit is not power or wisdom in God'".[33] So a sentence about the meaning of a name becomes the third clause of the article Abelard called diabolical. A few lines later Abelard says that the Spirit proceeds from Father and

29. Cousin II, Appendix, p. 765 (OCR), heading of the reprint: «Capitula errorum Petri Abaelardi quae S. Bemardus colligerat, et summo pontifici transmiserat, primum in lucem e codice Vaticano Dom Mabillon protulit, in editione operum sancti Bernardi, Parisiis, 1690». The reprint is therefore Mabillon's text, not an independent witness.

30. *Capitula*, cap. I, PL 182:1049A: «Cum sapientia Dei quaedam sit potentia, sicut aereum sigillum est quoddam aes, liquet profecto divinam sapientiam ex divina potentia esse suum habere, ad eam videlicet similitudinem, qua sigillum aereum dicitur esse quod est ejus materia». *Introductio* II, PL 178:1069D–1070A: «Cum igitur sapientia quaedam, ut dictum est, sit potentia; sicut enim aereum sigillum est quoddam aes, liquet profecto divinam sapientiam ex divina potentia esse suum habere, ad eam scilicet similitudinem qua sigillum aereum ex aere dicitur esse, quod est ejus materia». The other changes: «exigit necessario quod aes sit» for «exigit necessario ut aes sit»; «ex eo quod est homo» for «ex eo quod homo»; and a second «sed non e contrario» for «non e contrario».

31. *Introductio* II, PL 178:1070B–C: «non tamen ideo necesse est genus species suas tempore, vel per existentiam praecedere»; «divina sapientia, licet, ut dictum est, ex divina potentia omne habeat, quod est Filium ex Patre gigni, non tamen hanc illa praecesserit, cum nullatenus sine sapientia Deus esse potuerit».

32. *Introductio* II, PL 178:1072A–B: «Benignitas quippe ipsa quae hoc nomine demonstratur, non est aliqua in Deo potentia sive sapientia, cum videlicet ipsum benignum esse non sit in aliquo esse sapientem aut potentem». *Capitula*, cap. I, PL 182:1049A: «Benignitas ipsa, quae hoc nomine quod Spiritus est demonstratur, non est in Deo potentia sive sapientia». The *Theologia christiana* IV, PL 178:1299C, has the sentence with «aliqua» and without «in Deo»: «Benignitas quippe ipsa, quae hoc nomine demonstratur, non est aliqua potentia sive sapientia».

33. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1061A: «Benignitas ipsa, » inquit, « quae hoc nomine quod est Spiritus sanctus demonstratur, non est in Deo potentia, sive sapientia». PL 182:1061B: «dixisti enim, « Non est Spiritus sanctus in Deo potentia, sive sapientia. »».

Son because the good disposition to act "comes from his power and wisdom".[34] Heading I names only the seal and does not summarise this extract, so no heading verdict is given for it (Table 2). The charge it was used to support, Denzinger's first, says more than the altered sentence, and more again than Abelard's.

Chapter II, "that the Holy Spirit is not of the substance of the Father", has two extracts. The first is the only extract that stands word for word in a text of Abelard on the shelf, the fourth book of the *Theologia christiana*, and Cousin's *Introductio* has the same words.[35] It says that the Son, being begotten, is from the Father's substance; it does not say that the Spirit is not, and the heading takes the first half of the argument for the whole. The second extract is the one the heading needs: "The Spirit, though he is of the same substance with the Father and the Son ... is nevertheless not from the substance of the Father or of the Son, which would be for him to be begotten." The *Introductio* reads "is nevertheless not, *if we speak properly*, to be said to be from the substance", and both Migne and Cousin have the qualifier.[36] In the sentence before, Abelard had explained it: some doctors say the Spirit too is from the Father's substance, meaning of one substance with him, but "properly we do not say that he is from the substance of the Father: only the Son is to be so called".[37] The *Theologia christiana*, which has the first extract word for word, has neither sentence. After "from the very substance of the Father" it goes straight on: "But the Spirit is not begotten, but rather proceeds".[38] So the qualifier is absent from the accusers' text and present in the *Introductio*, and since the accusers may have had a recension that is neither of the printed two (section 7), its absence may be a reading of their copy, not an excision. To be "from the substance" in the proper sense is to be begotten; the Spirit is "of the same substance", as the extract itself says. Without the qualifier the sentence seems to deny what its first clause affirms, and Bernard read it so: "he says that the Holy Spirit ... is in no way of the substance of the Father or the Son. From where, then? Perhaps from nothing?"[39] The heading is stretched even against the accusers' own words, since the extract affirms "of the same substance". Abelard's denial in the *Apologia*, that he never wrote that the Spirit "is not of the substance of the Father", is true to the letter, given his distinction between being "of" (*de*) and "from" (*ex*) the substance.

*What God can do (chapter III)*

The five extracts of chapter III come from the third book of the *Introductio*, whose thesis the first article of this journal treated (JMT 1.1, section 3). Three differ from Abelard's text by a particle or by word order ("God can do" for "can God do").[40] The fifth, which is also the heading, drops a clause. Abelard concluded that God can do or leave undone only "those things which at some time he does or leaves undone, and only in the manner

34. *Introductio* II, PL 178:1073A–B: «bonus ipse affectus sive effectus aliud faciendi vel disponendi ex potentia ipsius, et sapientia provenit».

35. *Capitula*, cap. II, PL 182:1049B: «Cum itaque tam Filius, quam Spiritus sanctus ex Patre sit, hic quidem genitus, ille procedens; differt in eo generatio ipsa a processione, quod is qui generatur ex ipsa Patris substantia est». *Theologia christiana* IV, PL 178:1299D–1300A: «Cum itaque tam Filius quam Spiritus sanctus ex Patre sit, hic quidem genitus, ille procedens, differt in eo generatio ipsa a processione quod is qui generatur ex ipsa Patris substantia est, cum ipsa, ut dictum est, Sapientia hoc ipsum esse habeat ut sit quaedam potentia». Migne's *Introductio* II (PL 178:1072B–C) reads «sapientia, hoc est ipsum esse habeat»; Cousin's (II, p. 100–101, OCR) reads «sapientia, hoc» and, after a page break, «ipsum esse babeat», as the *Capitula* do.

36. *Capitula*, cap. II, PL 182:1049B: «Spiritus vero quamvis ejusdem substantiae sit cum Patre et Filio, unde etiam Trinitas ipsa homousion, id est unius substantiae, praedicatur, minime tamen ex substantia Patris est aut Filii, quod esset ipsum ex Patre vel Filio gigni». *Introductio* II, PL 178:1072D: «Spiritus vero quamvis ejusdem substantiae sit cum Patre et Filio, unde etiam Trinitas omousios, id est unius substantiae praedicatur, minime tamen ex substantia Patris aut Filii, si proprie loquimur, esse dicendus est, quod oportet ipsum ex Patre vel Filio gigni». Cousin II, p. 101 (OCR): «minime tamen ex sub- stantia Patris autFibi, si proprie loquimur, esse dicendus est».

37. *Introductio* II, PL 178:1072C–D: «proprie tamen non dicimus ex substantia Patris esse: solus Filius dicendus est».

38. *Theologia christiana* IV, PL 178:1300A: «Unde bene Filius ex Patre gigni dicitur, hoc est ex ipsa Patris substantia esse. Spiritus vero minime gigni, sed magis procedere». The *Introductio* at the same place (PL 178:1072C): «hoc est ex ipsa Patris substantia proprie dicitur esse. Hinc Nicaena synodus quasi exponens hanc generationem».

39. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1056A: «Dicit etiam « Spiritum sanctum procedere quidem ex Patre et Filio, sed minime de Patris esse Filiive substantia. Unde ergo? an forte ex nihilo, sicut et universa quae facta sunt?». For the *Apologia* see section 8.

40. *Capitula*, cap. III, PL 182:1049D: «Ex his itaque tam de ratione quam de scripto collatis constat, id solum Deum facere posse quod aliquando facit». *Introductio* III, PL 178:1096C: «Ex his itaque tam de ratione quam de scripto collatis, constat id solum posse facere Deum quod aliquando facit». The other three: III.1 (PL 178:1094D) has «Hac itaque ratione qua convincitur quia Deus Pater tam bonum genuerat Filium» where the *Capitula* have «Hac ratione qua convincitur quod Deus Pater tam bonum genuit Filium»; III.2 (PL 178:1095A) has «In tantum autem in omnibus quae Deus facit» where they drop «autem».

or at the time at which he does them"; the *Capitula* omit the relative clause and make "and … or" into "or … or".[41] The sense survives, since "at the time at which he does" still restricts the thesis, and Denzinger's article 7 has the same short form; the anonymous *Disputatio altera*, quoting the sentence, keeps the clause.[42] The thesis is Abelard's own conclusion, and these headings are fair.

The fourth extract is another matter. It comes from Abelard's replies to the objections, where he argues from the case of evil: if God could prevent the evils done and did not, "I do not see how he would not be consenting to sins. For who is to be called a consenter to evil, if not one through whom it could opportunely be prevented?" The *Capitula* stop at the question. Abelard answers it: since it is good, as Augustine says, that evils be done, which God orders for the best, it is not fitting that he prevent them, and so "he who can do nothing against reason is by no means to be said to consent to sins".[43] The extract is the first half of a reductio, and it leaves the reader to conclude that on Abelard's premises God consents to sin, which is the conclusion the argument exists to avoid. The completed argument supports the charge of chapter VII, that God cannot fittingly prevent such evils; the cut makes it support a worse one. The finding is the cut, and it does not depend on the wording of the premise. That wording cannot be settled: Migne's *Introductio* is corrupt at this point, Cousin's differs, and the *Capitula*'s clause reads more coherently than Migne's, so the premise is not scored as an alteration. JMT 1.1 n. 20 reads a similar sentence in the Monte Cassino fragments of the *Theologia christiana* as a difficulty put against both sides and not as Abelard's position. The two texts differ: in the *Introductio* the question is the first step of an argument that Abelard completes in his own voice, and it is the *Introductio* that the *Capitula* quote here.

*The redemption (chapter IV)*

Chapter IV, "that Christ did not take flesh to free us from the yoke of the devil", has five extracts. Three are not on the shelf and are treated in section 5. The other two come from the second book of the commentary on Romans, from the long discussion of Romans 3:26, and their voice has to be read with care. The discussion opens, under the label "QUAESTIO": "Here a very great question presents itself", and it then sets out, over two columns, the difficulties of the received account of redemption: from whom we were redeemed, by what right the devil held us, what need there was for the Son of God to suffer, and how the death of an innocent man could please God.[44] The questions are Abelard's own. He closes them in the first person, "These and the like seem to us to raise no small question about our redemption or justification through the death of our Lord Jesus Christ", and then, under the label "SOLUTIO", puts his own account in place of the received one without taking the questions back: "But it seems to us that we are justified in the blood of Christ and reconciled to God

41. *Introductio* III, PL 178:1101D: «Praedictis itaque rationibus, vel objectorum solutionibus, liquere omnibus reor, ea solummodo Deum posse facere vel dimittere, quae quandoque facit vel dimittit, et eo modo tantum vel eo tempore quo facit, non alio». *Capitula*, cap. III, PL 182:1050A: «Praedictis itaque rationibus vel objectorum solutionibus liquere reor omnibus, ea solummodo Deum posse facere, vel dimittere, vel eo modo tantum, vel eo tempore quo facit, non alio». Denzinger no. 374 (OCR): «7. Quod ea solummodo possit Deus facere vel dimittere».

42. *Disputatio altera*, PL 180:316B: «Praedictis rationibus vel objectorum solutionibus liquere omnibus reor, ea solummodo Deum posse facere, vel dimittere, quaecunque facit vel dimittit, et eo modo quo facit vel dimittit, et illo tempore quo facit tantum, non alio.» The same author quotes III.3 in Abelard's word order: «constat, id solum posse facere Deum, quod aliquando faciat».

43. *Capitula*, cap. III, PL 182:1049D, the end of the extract: «Quis enim consentire malo dicendus est, nisi is per quem etiam opportune disturbari posset». *Introductio* III, PL 178:1098A–B: «Quis enim consentire malo dicendus est, nisi is per quem illud opportune disturbari potest? Cum autem, sicut et beatus meminit Augustinus, mala etiam fieri bonum sit, quae Deus quoque optime ordinat, nequaquam ab eo ea disturbari convenit». «Cum itaque scandala, quae bonum est fieri, disturbare opportune non possit, aut omnino etiam non possit, qui nihil contra rationem potest, profecto nullatenus consentire peccatis dicendus est». Migne's first clause: «Qui etiam si mala quae fiunt disturbare ne quid etiam nisi opportune faceret, qui nisi importune facere posset»; the *Capitula*'s: «Qui si mala quae fiunt disturbare posset, nec id etiam nisi opportune faceret, qui nihil importune facere potest».

44. *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos* II, PL 178:833D: «QUAESTIO. Maxima hoc loco quaestio se ingerit quae sit ista videlicet nostra redemptio per majorem Christi». PL 178:834B: «Quod etiam jus in possidendo hominem diabolus habere poterat, nisi forte quia eum Domino permittente aut etiam tradente ad torquendum ipsum susceperat.»

45. *Romans* II, PL 178:836A, closing the questions: «Haec et his similia non mediocrem movere quaestionem nobis videntur, de redemptione scilicet vel justificatione nostra per mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.» Then: «SOLUTIO. Nobis autem videtur quod in hoc justificati

in this, that …".[45] They are his case against the received account, not an objection set up to be refuted, and in the course of them he draws conclusions of his own, as on the devil's right (section 5).

The third extract of chapter IV is taken from the questions. It asks how the Apostle can say that we are reconciled by the death of the Son, when God ought to be the angrier with man the more men sinned in crucifying his Son; and whether the death of the innocent so pleased God that he was reconciled by it. Apart from a number of small changes (among them, the *Capitula* drop "men" from the sin of the crucifixion and put its verb in the singular, and at the end write "freed from sins" where both printings of Abelard have "freed from penalties"), the words are Abelard's.[46] One sentence is replaced. Where Migne prints "For the more sins were multiplied by men, the more just it was for God to be *born* to men", Cousin's text reads "to be *angry* with men", which is what the context requires; the *Capitula* have instead "for how was it more just?": the words between the two *amplius* are gone, *quo* has become *quomodo*, and a question mark is added.[47] The question loses the claim that supported it, but that claim restated the clause just before it, that God "ought to have been the angrier with man" the more men sinned, which the *Capitula* keep, and the question presses the same difficulty at the same point. The author's judgment, and it is a judgment, is that the change leaves the sense of the extract as it was. Quoted in Abelard's name, these are his own questions, and so his voice is not misplaced. What the *Capitula* do is to quote them without the solution that follows them in the commentary: the fault is a truncation. Letter 190 introduces the same questions with "Listen to his jeers" and answers them one by one, and William quotes them as Abelard's attack on the Apostle, the two in nearly the same words ("How," *ait* in Bernard, *inquit* in William).[48] "Listen to his jeers" is a hostile framing of words that are Abelard's, not a misattribution, and both accusers read the questions, correctly, as his attack on the received account. Nor does Bernard hide the answer. He goes on to quote Abelard's positive account and to attack it: "that all that God appeared in the flesh is our instruction by his word and example … all that he suffered and died is the showing or commending of his charity towards us".[49] Those words are not on the shelf. The nearest is the SOLUTIO's "instructing us by word and example even to death", and nothing follows from the absence of the rest.

The fourth extract begins with the last of the questions, "How cruel and unjust it seems that anyone should have required the blood of the innocent as a price", and runs on, through the sentence that closes the questions, into the solution. The text is contiguous in the commentary, so the extract is ALTERED, not spliced; its

sumus in sanguine Christi, et Deo reconciliati, quod per hanc singularem gratiam nobis exhibitam, quod Filius suus nostram susceperit naturam». Cousin II, p. 207 (OCR), also prints the label: «Solulio.»

46. *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050B–C: «quanto amplius in crucifigendo Filium suum deliquerit»; «ut a peccatis jam liberari debeamus». *Romans* II, PL 178:835C–D: «quanto amplius homines in crucifigendo Filium suum deliquerunt»; «ut a poenis jam liberari debeamus». The other changes, *Capitula* first and *Romans* second (Cousin agrees with Migne in each): «Quomodo nos justificari vel reconciliari Deo per mortem Filii ejus» for «Quomodo etiam nos justificari vel reconciliari Deo per mortem Filii»; «primum praeceptum suum unius pomi gustu» for «primum ejus in paradiso praeceptum unius pomi gustu»; «nisi ex morte Christi» for «nisi per mortem Christi»; «quod in Christo commissum est» for «quod in Christum commissum est»; «in ipsum vel suos commissa» for «in ipsum vel in suos commissa»; «qui hoc peccando commisimus» for «qui peccando commisimus»; «etiam levius potuit ignoscere multo» for «illud multo levius potuit ignoscere»; «tam bonum facere» for «tantum bonum facere»; «in quo et justiores» for «In quo etiam justiores»; and «Nunquid mors innocentis Filii tantum Deo placuit» for «Nunquid mors innocentis Filii in tantum Deo patri placuit». For the replaced sentence see n. 47.

47. *Romans* II, PL 178:835C: «Quo enim amplius multiplicata sunt per homines peccata, nasci Deum hominibus amplius justum fuerat». Cousin II, p. 206 (OCR): «irasci Deura hominibus amplius justum fuerat» («Deura» is the OCR's «Deum»). *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050B: «quomodo enim amplius justum fuerat?». The clause before it stands in both: «qui tanto amplius adversus hominem irasci debuit» (*Romans* II, PL 178:835C; *Capitula*, PL 182:1050B).

48. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1069C–D: «Audite cachinnos. « Quomodo, » ait, « justificari nos vel reconciliari Deo per mortem Filii ejus dicit Apostolus». William, *Disputatio*, cap. VII, PL 180:270A: «Et in Apostolum: « Quomodo, » inquit, « Apostolus reconciliari hominem Deo per mortem dicit Filii Dei (Rom. V) , qui tanto plus adversus hominem irasci debuit».

49. Bernard, ep. 190, end of cap. VIII, PL 182:1070C–D: «Sic enim concludit tot calumnias». «Totum esse quod Deus in carne apparuit, nostram de verbo et exemplo ipsius institutionem, sive, et postmodum dicit, instructionem; totum quod passus et mortuus est, suae erga nos charitatis ostensionem vel commendationem.» Bernard's «et postmodum dicit» marks a second place. The matcher finds no stretch of any text of Abelard on the shelf with more than 4 per cent of the sentence, and the phrases «de verbo et exemplo» and «charitatis ostensionem» are not in the Romans commentary. *Romans* II, PL 178:836A, the SOLUTIO: «et in ipsos nos tam verbo quam exemplo instituendo usque ad mortem perstitit».

alterations carry the finding about Abelard's voice in chapter IV.[50] The label "SOLUTIO" is dropped. "These and the like seem to us to raise no small question about our redemption, that is, justification" becomes "raise no small question, not only about redemption but also about justification", and "seem to us" is gone. "How cruel it seems" becomes "To whom does it not seem cruel", a rhetorical question with an expected answer; both Bernard's texts read so, both printings of Abelard "How cruel".[51] And "it seems to us that *in this* we are justified in the blood of Christ … that" becomes "it seems to us that we are *nonetheless* justified". With the label gone and "in this" made "nonetheless", Abelard's account of how we are justified reads as a concession wrung from him after his own difficulties, and not as the answer that replaces the account he has questioned. The second half, that the Son bound us to himself by love through teaching and example even to death, is Abelard's own view, but not the heading's: it says how Christ freed us, from the servitude of sin, by love.[52] Neither extract states the heading's thesis. IV.3 is the case without its answer, and IV.4 an answer that does not mention the devil, so both stretch the heading.

*The omnipotence of the Father (chapter XIV)*

The last chapter returns to the first book of the *Introductio*. The extract makes "nature of subsisting" into "knowledge of subsisting" and "who" into "because", drops "God", and turns *ex se* into *a se*.[53] Letter 190 quotes the sentence from "properly" onward with "because" and without "God", which therefore belong to Bernard's collection, and with Abelard's *ex se*, so that the last change is a fault of the Vatican copy.[54] The heading, that omnipotence belongs properly to the Father, says what the words say. But the sentence itself has the Father do all things "together with the other two persons", and a little earlier Abelard says that each of the others "is of entirely the same power".[55] Omnipotence is assigned to the Father as its source, not denied to the others. Denzinger's article 14 adds what the extract does not say, that wisdom and benignity are not the Father's in the same way.

50. *Romans* II, PL 178:836A: «Haec et his similia non mediocrem movere quaestionem nobis videntur, de redemptione scilicet vel justificatione nostra per mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi. SOLUTIO. Nobis autem videtur quod in hoc justificati sumus in sanguine Christi, et Deo reconciliati, quod per hanc singularem gratiam». *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050C–D: «Haec et his similia non mediocrem movent quaestionem, non solum de redemptione, sed etiam de justificatione nostra per mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Nobis autem videtur, quod nihilo minus sumus justificati in sanguine Christi; et Deo reconciliati per hanc singularem gratiam». The other changes, *Capitula* first: «mortem Filii habuit» for «Filii sui mortem habuerit»; «suscepit» for «susceperit»; «praestitit» for «perstitit»; «nulla tolerare» for «nil jam tolerare»; «vestra reformidet» for «vera reformidet»; «tanquam homines temporis non dubitamus» for «tanquam homines temporis gratiae non dubitamus». Where Cousin's text of *Romans* agrees with the *Capitula* against Migne («astrinxit», «propter ipsum») the reading is not counted; at «in ipsa nos» (*Capitula*) Migne has «in ipsos nos» and Cousin «in ipso nos», and the place is not scored.

51. *Romans* II, PL 178:835D: «Quam vero crudele et iniquum videtur, ut sanguinem innocentis in pretium aliquod quis requisierit». Cousin II, p. 206 (OCR): «Quam vero crudele et iniquum videtur». *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050C: «Cui vero non crudele et iniquum videtur, ut sanguinem innocentis, et pretium aliquod quis requisierit». Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1070C: «Cui vero, » inquit, « non crudele et iniquum videtur, ut sanguinem innocentis in pretium aliquod quis requisierit».

52. *Romans* II, PL 178:836B: «Redemptio itaque nostra est illa summa in nobis per passionem Christi dilectio, quae non solum a servitute peccati liberat, sed veram nobis filiorum Dei libertatem acquirit».

53. *Introductio* I, PL 178:993D: «Si itaque potentiam tam ad naturam subsistendi, quam ad efficaciam operationis referamus, inveniemus ad proprietatem personae Patris proprie vel specialiter omnipotentiam attinere, qui non solum cum caeteris duabus personis Deus omnia efficere potest, verum etiam ipse solus a se non ab alio existere habet, et sicut ex se habet existere, ita etiam ex se habet posse.» *Capitula*, cap. XIV, PL 182:1054B–C: «Si potentiam tam ad notitiam subsistendi, quam ad efficaciam operationis referamus, invenimus ad proprietatem personae Patris proprie vel specialiter omnipotentiam attinere: quod non solum cum caeteris duabus personis aeque omnia efficere potest». Cousin II (OCR) reads «Deus aeque* omnia», so that «aeque» is a manuscript reading and only the loss of «Deus» is the *Capitula*'s.

54. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1059A: «sed ad proprietatem personae Patris proprie vel specialiter invenimus omnipotentiam attinere, quod non solum cum caeteris duabus personis aeque omnia efficere potest, verum etiam ipse solus a se, non ab alio existere habet: et sicut habet ex se existere, ita etiam ex se habet posse.» *Capitula*: «et sicut habet a se existere».

55. *Introductio* I, PL 178:992A: «licet unaquaeque aliarum personarum, cum sit ejusdem cum Patre substantiae, ejusdem sit penitus potentiae».

## 5. The Extracts That Cannot Be Tested: Chapters IV–XIII

Twenty extracts are in no text of Abelard on the shelf: three of the five under chapter IV, and every extract under chapters V to XIII. For each, the full quotation and several distinctive phrases from it were searched in every Migne file of Abelard and in the Cousin and Tosti scans, and the only matches were the *Capitula* themselves, reprinted in Cousin's appendix.[56] What the absence shows depends on what else can be said about each extract, and three things can.

*Bernard names a source*

For the passage on redemption Bernard says where he read it: Abelard attacks the mystery of our redemption "as I have read in a certain book of his *Sentences*, and again in a certain exposition of his on the Epistle to the Romans".[57] He then quotes the passage of which the *Capitula*'s IV.1 and IV.2 are pieces: all our doctors after the Apostles agree that the devil possessed man by right, because man freely consented to him, and that the Son of God became incarnate of necessity so that man might be freed by right; "but, as it seems to us, the devil never had any right in man, except perhaps by God's permission, as a jailer, nor did the Son of God take flesh to free man."[58] William quotes the same passage in almost the same words, telling Geoffrey and Bernard that they have it "in hand, and can read it".[59] The *Capitula* give a short and damaged form, in which "except perhaps by God's permission" has become "but he possessed him by right, permitting".[60] The heading is fair to the last clause; the fuller text shows that what the clause denies is liberation by the devil's right.

The commentary on Romans has the doctrine in other words. Among its questions it asks what right the devil could have had, and it concludes that he "acquired no right by seducing" the man, except as one to whom the Lord had handed him "as to a jailer or torturer".[61] The Munich *Sententiae* state it in the first person, "I on the contrary say, and prove by irrefutable reason, that the devil had no right over man", and give as the chief benefit of the incarnation that the Wisdom of God "enlightened us by his light and showed us his love", which is the purpose the last extract of chapter IV gives.[62] None of these is the source of the extracts. The commentary shows the doctrine to be Abelard's own, stated within his own questions (section 4). The *Sententiae* show it taught under his name, but they do not show that the words of IV.1 and IV.2 are his, for the idiom of the jailer is current on the shelf outside Abelard: a set of *Quaestiones in Epistolas Pauli*, printed in PL 175 among the

56. The searches are listed in Appendix A. The reprint is in Cousin II, Appendix (pp. 765–770), and the second scan of the same volume.

57. Bernard, ep. 190, §11, PL 182:1062C: «Mysterium nostrae redemptionis, sicut in libro quodam Sententiarum ipsius, et item in quadam ejus expositione Epistolae ad Romanos legi, temerarius scrutator majestatis aggrediens, in ipso statim suae disputationis exordio, ecclesiastieorum doctorum unam omnium de hac re dicit esse sententiam». ("ecclesiastieorum" is the file's reading.)

58. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1062D–1063A: «quod omnes doctores nostri post Apostolos in hoc conveniunt, quod diabolus dominium et potestatem habebat super hominem, et jure eum possidebat: ideo scilicet quod homo ex libertate arbitrii, quam habebat, sponte diabolo consensit.» «Sed, ut nobis videtur, » ait, « nec diabolus unquam jus aliquod in homine habuit, nisi forte Deo permittente, ut carcerarius: nec Filius Dei ut hominem liberaret, carnem assumpsit.»

59. William, *Disputatio*, cap. VII, PL 180:269C–D: «Sicut enim prae manibus habetis, et legere potestis, invadit sacramentum communis salutis». «Sed, ut nobis videtur, nec diabolus unquam in homine habuit jus aliquod, nisi forte Deo permittente, sicut carcerarius, nec Filius Dei, ut hominem liberaret, carnem assumpsit.»

60. *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050A: «Sciendum est quod omnes nostri doctores qui post Apostolos fuere, in hoc conveniunt, quod diabolus dominium et potestatem habebat super hominem, et jure eum possidebat.» «Nec diabolus unquam jus aliquod habuit super hominem, sed jure eum possidebat permittente, ut carcerarius; nec [ut eum] Filius Dei a jugo diaboli liberaret, carnem assumpsit.»

61. *Romans* II, PL 178:834B: «nisi forte quia eum Domino permittente aut etiam tradente ad torquendum ipsum susceperat». PL 178:834D: «His itaque rationibus convinci videtur quod diabolus in hominem quem seduxit nullum jus seducendo acquisierit, nisi forte, ut diximus, quantum ad permissionem Domini pertinebant, qui eum illi quasi carcerario vel tortori suo ad puniendum tradiderat». Both sentences stand within the QUAESTIO, before the SOLUTIO.

62. Cousin II, *Excerpta ex Epitome*, cap. XXIII («Cur deus homo?»), OCR: «Ego vero e contra dico, et ratione irrefragili probo, quod diabolus in hominem nuUum jus habuerit.» «quod sapientia Dei carnem de virgine assumendo sua luce nos illuminavit, dilectionem suam nobis exhibuit.» *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050D–1051A: «Puto ergo quod consilium et causa incarnationis fuit, ut mundum luce suae sapientiae illuminaret, et ad amorem suum accenderet». Bernard quotes the same words in ep. 190, PL 182:1071B–C: «consilium et causam incarnationis fuisse, ut mundum luce suae sapientiae illuminaret, et ad amorem suum accenderet.»

works of Hugh of St-Victor, says that "no injury was done to the devil, since he was only a kind of jailer".[63] The parallels show that the doctrine was taught, and with Bernard's statement that he read it in a book of *Sentences* they are consistent; they do not identify that book.

*The form of the extracts*

The extracts of chapters V to XIII share a form: "It is usually asked", "It is to be known that", "He objects", answered by "To which we say", "But we say", "We, however, say".[64] It is the form of a book of school sentences, a question, an authority or objection, and the master's answer. The Munich *Sententiae* use it; the *Ethica* and the commentary on Romans are set out otherwise.[65] The *Apologia* denies that any book of *Sentences* "written by me" exists. That fits extracts taken from someone else's record of his teaching, and it fits extracts that are his own. The form does not decide.

*Abelard's books carry the doctrine*

Chapter V, that neither God-and-man nor this person who is Christ is the third person in the Trinity, quotes a passage on a way of speaking: "When I say, Christ is the third person in the Trinity, I mean that the Word ... is the third person in the Trinity: and so I think the expression is figurative".[66] William quotes the second extract in nearly the same words, and the Munich *Sententiae* have the doctrine.[67] The question was argued outside Abelard's school as well: an anonymous *Apologia de verbo incarnato* reports "some" who conclude "that nothing that is man is God, or the third person in the Trinity", and the *Sententiae* of Peter of Poitiers put the case as a question.[68] The parallel in the Munich *Sententiae* therefore shows a doctrine taught under Abelard's name, not that these words are his. The heading is fair to the quoted words. The *Apologia* affirms Christ, the true and only Son of God, to be "the third person in the Trinity".

Chapter VI, that God does no more for the one saved, before he cleaves to grace, than for the one not saved, has three extracts. The first is a report: "So again it is usually asked what some say, namely whether all men are saved by mercy alone", with that view's consequences. The heading's words are in the second, the answer; the third is the merchant who sets out his stones for all alike.[69] The heading is fair to the second and says more than the first. Mabillon pointed to the fourth book of the commentary on Romans, and the doctrine is there: God imparts the grace of being shown the way "to the reprobate as to the elect equally". The grace that "must go

63. *Quaestiones in Epistolas Pauli*, PL 175:457D, QUAESTIO XCII: «nulla injuria facta est diabolo, quia non erat nisi tanquam carcerarius». The file's header assigns the work to Hugh of St-Victor; the file carries no editor's note on its authorship or date, and nothing is inferred here about whether it is earlier or later than Abelard.

64. *Capitula*: «Solet quaeri quid a Domino remuneretur» (X); «Sciendum est quod cum dicitur, Originale peccatum est in parvis» (VIII); «Opponit de Judaeis qui Christum crucifixerunt» (XI); «Sic iterum solet quaeri illud quod a quibusdam dicitur» (VI); «Ad quod dicimus» (IX); «Sed nos dicimus quod hoc dictum est solis Apostolis» (XII); «Nos vero dicimus» (X).

65. Cousin II, *Excerpta ex Epitome*, cap. XXIX (OCR): «quod sciUcet mures videntur rodere et in ore portare corpus iUud, quaeri solet. Sed dicimus, quod Deus iUud non dimittit ibi».

66. *Capitula*, cap. V, PL 182:1051A: «Quando dico, Christus est tertia persona in Trinitate; hoc volo dicere, quod Verbum, quod ab aeterno tertia persona in Trinitate fuit, tertia persona sit in Trinitate: et ita puto quod locutio sit figurativa.» "Third person" renders *tertia persona*, the phrase of the debate: the Word is so called here and in the Munich *Sententiae* (n. 67).

67. William, *Disputatio*, cap. VIII, PL 180:276D–277A: «Sciendum, » ait, « est quod licet concedamus quod Christus tertia sit persona in Trinitate, non tamen concedimus quod hanc persona, quae Christus est, sit tertia persona in Trinitate.» *Capitula*, cap. V, PL 182:1051A–B: «Et est sciendum, quod quamvis concedamus, quod Christus est tertia persona in Trinitate, non tamen concedimus quod haec persona, quae Christus est, si tertia persona in Trinitate.» Cousin II, *Excerpta ex Epitome*, cap. XXIV (OCR): «Quamvis enim ibi sitVerbum, quod est tertia persona in trinitate, non tamen ibi est persona per se».

68. *Apologia de verbo incarnato*, PL 177:306D (the file's header: «Auctor incertus (Joannes Cornubiensis?)»): «Dicunt quidam quod ex anima et carne Christi nihil est compositum, sicut nec ex duabus naturis. Unde consequenter adjungunt quod nihil quod est homo, est Deus, vel tertia persona in Trinitate.» Peter of Poitiers, *Sententiae*, PL 211:1174B–C: «Si secundum quod est homo est tertia persona in Trinitate, ergo secundum quod est homo est Deus». Both were found by searching every file on the shelf for «tertia persona in Trinitate».

69. *Capitula*, cap. VI, PL 182:1051B: «Sic iterum solet quaeri illud quod a quibusdam dicitur, scilicet utrum omnes homines ita sola misericordia salventur». PL 182:1051C–D: «Dicendum est ergo, quod homo per rationem, a Deo quidem datam, gratiae appositae cohaerere potest: nec Deus plus facit illi qui salvatur antequam cohaereat gratiae, quam illi qui non salvatur». PL 182:1051D: «Ita enim se gerit Deus erga homines, quemadmodum mercator qui habet pretiosos lapides venales».

before" is that same instruction, offered alike to both "with no other new grace added", and the passage calls the faith so given "the grace of God which goes before each of the elect".[70] On this point the commentary says what the heading says.

Chapter VII, that God ought not to prevent evils, quotes an analysis of consent: one consents to evil who ought and is able to prevent it and does not; "and so God is a stranger to the consent of evil, who neither ought nor is able to prevent evils".[71] The words are not on the shelf. The doctrine is the reductio of chapter III.4 completed (section 4): God cannot opportunely prevent evils that it is good should happen, and so does not consent to them.

Chapter VIII, that we contracted from Adam not guilt but penalty, quotes two sentences on original sin. The first says that "original sin is in children" is said "for the temporal and eternal penalty which is owed to them from the fault of the first parent"; the second, that "in whom all sinned" is said "because the seed-bed of all was in him who sinned", and that "it does not follow from this that all sinned who did not exist: and he who does not exist does not sin".[72] Against these words the heading is fair: the first gives the penalty, and the second denies that those who did not exist sinned. The first only implies the denial of guilt that the heading states flatly, and its verdict is borderline. The commentary on Romans has the doctrine with a hedge: when we say that men are born with original sin, "this seems to be referred rather to the penalty of sin, to which they are held liable, than to guilt of mind and contempt of God". It adds, of infants said to have sinned in Adam, that "we do not therefore grant that they sinned simply", and it glosses Romans 5:12, "in whom all the rest sinned", as "that is, incurred the penalty of sin".[73] Against the commentary, then, the heading's "not guilt, but penalty" says more than "rather … than".

Chapter IX, on the Lord's body, quotes a question about where the species are after the consecration and an answer about what happens when the host is gnawed by mice or falls from the minister's hand: it is not so in the body itself, but God makes it so in the species "to check the negligence of ministers", while he keeps his body as he pleases.[74] The Munich *Sententiae* give the same answer to the same question: God does not leave the body there to be handled by so base an animal, "but the form remains there to correct the negligence of ministers".[75] The answer is not peculiar to Abelard's school. Guitmund of Aversa, on the body of Christ, says that what seems gnawed by mice may be seen in that form "to punish or correct the negligence of ministers", and Algerus of Liège that such indignity happens "to punish or correct the negligence of ministers, because they have handled the body of the Lord unworthily".[76] The parallel in the *Sententiae* shows a common doctrine,

70. *Romans* IV, PL 178:918C–919A: «Aeque tamen Deus utrisque offert illud, et quod suum est efficit, tantumque erga utrumque operatur regni ipsius beatitudinem exponendo et promittendo, quod ad desiderium uniuscujusque accendendum sufficiat, absque nova alia gratia apposita.» «quam praeire gratiam necesse est nisi ut beatitudo illa ad quam nos invitat, et via qua pervenire possimus, exponatur atque tradatur? Hanc autem gratiam tam reprobis ipse quam electis pariter impertit, utrosque videlicet de hoc instruendo aequaliter, ut ex eadem fidei gratia, quam perceperunt, alius ad bona opera incitetur, alius per torporis sui negligentiam inexcusabilis reddatur.» «Haec itaque fides quae in isto per dilectionem operatur, in illo iners et segnis atque otiosa vacat, gratia Dei est quae unumquemque electum praevenit». Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §7, PL 182 (after col. 1047), cites the place by the page of the older edition: «in libro quarto super Epistolam ad Romanos, Abaelardus eamdem pestiferam doctrinam doceat pag. 653 et sequente».

71. *Capitula*, cap. VII, PL 182:1052A: «Ille equidem malo consentiens dicitur, qui cum debeat hoc prohibere, et possit, non prohibet». «Et ideo Deus a consensu malorum est alienus, qui nec debet, nec potest mala impedire.»

72. *Capitula*, cap. VIII, PL 182:1052B: «Sciendum est quod cum dicitur, Originale peccatum est in parvis; hoc dicitur pro poena temporali et aeterna, quae debetur eis ex culpa primi parentis». «Similiter dicitur, in quo omnes peccaverunt (Rom. V, 12) : ideo scilicet, quia seminarium omnium erat in illo qui peccavit. Non tamen inde provenit, quod omnes peccassent qui non erant: et qui non est, non peccat.»

73. *Romans* II, PL 178:866C–D: «Cum itaque dicimus homines cum originali peccato procreari et nasci, atque hoc ipsum originale peccatum ex primo parente contrahere, magis hoc ad poenam peccati, cui videlicet poenae obnoxii tenentur, quam ad culpam animi et contemptum Dei referendum videtur.» PL 178:871B: «Et notandum quod licet dicamus peccasse parvulos in Adam, ut expositum est, non ideo simpliciter annuamus eos peccasse». PL 178:861D: «in quo omnes reliqui peccaverunt, id est poenam peccati incurrerunt».

74. *Capitula*, cap. IX, PL 182:1052D: «Ad quod dicimus, quod revera non est sic in corpore, sed Deus ita in speciebus ipsis propter negligentiam ministrorum reprimendam habere facit: corpus vero suum, prout ei placet, reponit et conservat».

75. Cousin II, *Excerpta ex Epitome*, cap. XXIX, p. 580 (OCR): «Sed dicimus, quod Deus iUud non dimittit ibi, ut a tam turpi animali tractetur ; sed tamen remanet ibi forma ad negUgentiam ministrorum corrigendam.»

76. Guitmund of Aversa, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate*, PL 149:1448B: «ad negligentiam ministrorum puniendam vel corrigendam, vel certe ad fidem dilectionemve probandam»; PL 149:1448C–D: «vel ad puniendam seu corrigendam ministrorum negligentiam, vel

not that these words are Abelard's. The heading is fair to the second extract. The first, on where the species are, does not state the heading's thesis at all, and the heading says more than it (a borderline verdict). The *Apologia* does not answer the charge, and it is not among Denzinger's nineteen.

Chapter X, that a man is made neither better nor worse by works, quotes a question with an objection from authority and the answer "we say that they are rewarded eternally … nor is a man made worse or better by works, unless perhaps while he works his will is increased in some respect".[77] The heading drops the exception and so says more than the words. The *Ethica* says that God weighs "the mind rather than the action" and that the action adds nothing to merit, and the Munich *Sententiae* that "all merit consists in the will, not in the works, which are common to good and bad".[78] The last phrase is not peculiar to Abelard's school: Henry of Marcy says of the works by which merit is shown that "they are common to good and bad".[79] The *Apologia* states the same doctrine in Abelard's own name (section 8).

Chapter XI, that those who crucified Christ in ignorance did not sin, and that nothing done in ignorance is fault, quotes an objection ("He objects, about the Jews who crucified Christ … and about Eve") and an answer: those simple Jews acted not against conscience but from zeal for their law, "and therefore they did not sin".[80] The *Ethica* says the same in its own voice: on the account of sin as contempt of God, "we cannot say that they sinned in this, nor that anyone's ignorance, or even unbelief itself … is sin". It then answers the objections, that Christ prayed for his crucifiers and Stephen called it sin, by distinguishing senses. Sin "properly" is contempt of God; in a wider sense the persecutors "sinned in the deed", and they would have sinned "more gravely in fault" had they spared them against conscience.[81] The first clause of the heading is fair to the *Ethica*'s proper sense; the second, "whatever is done through ignorance", is wider than either text.

Chapter XII, on the power of binding and loosing, quotes a gloss and an answer: the saying "Whose sins you forgive" was said "to the Apostles alone, not to their successors"; and then, at once, a hedge, that if anyone says it fits their successors, it should be expounded in the manner of the authority already given.[82] The *Ethica* argues that the saying "seems to be referred to their persons, not generally to all bishops", and ends with a hedge of its own, "unless perhaps, according to what Jerome himself says, we understand this binding or loosing" as a judgment granted to all.[83] The heading names the topic only; Denzinger's article 12 states the thesis, and the extract supports it, hedge included.

Chapter XIII, on suggestion, delight and consent, quotes the doctrine that neither the suggestion nor the

ad probandam eorum qui hoc viderint, fidem, in tali specie posse videri». Algerus of Liège, *De sacramentis*, PL 180:812B–C: «ad puniendam vel corrigendam ministrorum negligentiam, pro eo quod corpus Domini indigne tractaverint». The attributions are the files' headers; their dates are not used here.

77. *Capitula*, cap. X, PL 182:1052D–1053A: «Nos vero dicimus, quod aeternaliter a Deo remunerentur, sive ad bonum, sive ad malum: nec propter opera pejor, vel melior efficitur homo, nisi dum operatur, fortassis voluntas ejus in aliquo augmentetur.»

78. *Ethica*, PL 178:638C–D: «cum ipse animum potius quam actionem in remuneratione penset, nec quidquam ad meritum actio addat sive de bona, sive de mala voluntate prodeat». Cousin II, *Excerpta ex Epitome*, cap. XXXIV, p. 589 (OCR): «Sic igitur in voluntate, non in operibus quae bonis et malis communia sunt, meritum omne consistit.»

79. Henry of Marcy (the file's header: «Henricus de Castro Marsiaco»), *De peregrinante civitate Dei*, PL 204:267B: «Sunt enim bonis et malis communia». Found by searching the shelf for «bonis et malis communia».

80. *Capitula*, cap. XI, PL 182:1053A–B: «Opponit de Judaeis qui Christum crucifixerunt, et de aliis qui martyres persequendo putabant se obsequium praestare Deo: et de Eva». «Ad quod nos dicimus, quod revera illi simplices Judaei non agebant contra conscientiam, sed potius zelo legis suae Christum persequebantur; nec putabant se male agere, et ideo non peccabant».

81. *Ethica*, cap. XIII, PL 178:653B–C: «Si quis tamen quaerat utrum illi martyrum vel Christi persecutores in eo peccarent, quod placere Deo credebant». «non possumus dicere eos in hoc peccasse, nec ignorantiam cujusquam, vel ipsam etiam infidelitatem, cum qua nemo salvari potest, peccatum esse.» Cap. XIV, PL 178:654A: «sciendum est nomen peccati diversis modis accipi; proprie tamen peccatum dicitur ipse Dei contemptus, vel consensus in malum». PL 178:657D: «Sic et illos, si persequebantur Christum vel suos, quos persequendos credebant per operationem peccasse dicimus, qui tamen gravius culpam peccassent, si contra conscientiam eis parcerent.»

82. *Capitula*, cap. XII, PL 182:1054A: «Sed nos dicimus quod hoc dictum est solis Apostolis, non successoribus eorum.» «Si quis tamen successoribus eorum convenire hoc dixerit, ad modum supradictae auctoritatis hanc quoque exponere decet.»

83. *Ethica*, PL 178:674A: «Quod itaque Dominus apostolis ait: Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis, etc., ad personas eorum, non generaliter ad omnes episcopos referendum videtur». PL 178:674D: «nisi forte juxta hoc quod ipse ait Hieronymus, hanc ligationem vel absolutionem intelligamus praedictum judicium omnibus generaliter concessum».

delight that follows is sin, "but consent alone, which is also called contempt of God, in which sin consists".[84] This is the doctrine of the *Ethica*, which says that "our sin is contempt of the Creator", and that "when we assent to this delight by consent, we sin".[85] The heading, a topic, is fair.

NOT ON SHELF, then, is neither acquittal nor conviction. For chapters IV, VI, VIII and X–XIII the doctrine the heading names stands in Abelard's own books, for IV, V, IX and X in a school book carrying his name, and only for VII is there nothing nearer than the argument of chapter III. But the words cannot be shown to be his. In IV, V, IX and X the doctrine, or the idiom that carries it, is current on the shelf outside Abelard, so the school book shows a doctrine taught under his name, not his words. And for VIII and XI his books say less than the heading.

## 6. The Verdicts

Table 2 gives the three verdicts for each extract, with its voice. "Denz." is Denzinger's article, "Will." the chapter of William's *Disputatio* that treats the same matter, and the last column records what the *Apologia* says of the charge. Full references are in the notes to sections 4 and 5; the files are listed in Appendix B.

| Extract | Denz. | Will. | Voice | Words | Heading | *Apologia* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.1 seal | (1) | III | own | ALTERED: adds "of God"; drops "therefore", "as has been said", "for", "from bronze"; particles; stops before the guard | FAIR | disowns "full power … no power" |
| I.2 benignity | 1 | IV | own | ALTERED: inserts "which is the Spirit"; drops "some"; cuts the reason | no heading (I names the seal) | disowns |
| II.1 generation | 2 | IV | own | VERBATIM (*Theologia christiana* IV; Cousin's *Introductio*) | STRETCHED: first half of the argument | denies |
| II.2 procession | 2 | IV | own | ALTERED: "if we speak properly" absent (present in the *Introductio*; perhaps a recension); "to be said to be" made "is" | STRETCHED: generalises "not from the substance" to "not of the substance", against the words' "of the same substance" | denies; true to the letter |
| III.1 | 7 | — | own | ALTERED: particles | FAIR | restates |
| III.2 | 7 | — | own | ALTERED: drops "but" | FAIR | restates |
| III.3 | 7 | — | own | ALTERED: word order | FAIR | restates |
| III.4 | 7 | — | reductio step | ALTERED: cut at the question, before the reductio's conclusion (premise not scored) | STRETCHED: half an argument | "God often prevents evils" |
| III.5 | 7 | — | own | ALTERED: drops "which at some time he does or leaves undone" | FAIR | restates |
| IV.1 the doctors | 4 | VII | report | NOT ON SHELF; fuller in ep. 190 and William | STRETCHED: a report (borderline) | denies |
| IV.2 no right | 4 | VII | own | NOT ON SHELF; damaged; doctrine in *Romans* II | FAIR | denies |
| IV.3 the questions | 4 | VII | own question | ALTERED: one sentence replaced; drops "also", "men", "in paradise", "the Father"; "sins" for "penalties"; quoted without the solution | STRETCHED: questions without the answer | denies |
| IV.4 the solution | 4 | — | own question, then own answer | ALTERED: "SOLUTIO" dropped; "in this" made "nonetheless"; "To whom … not" for "How"; "not only … but also"; "seem to us" dropped | STRETCHED: thesis not stated, since the answer does not name the devil (borderline) | denies |
| IV.5 cause of incarnation | 4 | VII | own | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in the Munich *Sententiae* | STRETCHED: generalises, a stated purpose made an exclusion | denies |
| V.1 figurative | 5 | VIII | own | NOT ON SHELF | FAIR | affirms the contrary |

84. *Capitula*, cap. XIII, PL 182:1054A–B: «Sciendum quoque quod suggestio non est peccatum illi cui suggestio fit, nec delectatio consequens suggestionem». «sed solus consensus, qui et contemptus Dei dicitur, in quo peccatum consistit.»

85. *Ethica*, PL 178:636A: «Peccatum itaque nostrum contemptus Creatoris est et peccare est Creatorem contemnere». PL 178:646A: «Cui videlicet delectationi dum assentimus per consensum, peccamus.»

| Extract | Denz. | Will. | Voice | Words | Heading | *Apologia* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| V.2 this person | 5 | VIII | own | NOT ON SHELF; William nearly the same | FAIR | affirms the contrary |
| VI.1 what some say | 6 | VI | report | NOT ON SHELF; a report and its consequences | STRETCHED: a report | denies |
| VI.2 the answer | 6 | VI | own | NOT ON SHELF; William nearly the same | FAIR | denies |
| VI.3 the merchant | 6 | VI | own | NOT ON SHELF; William shorter | FAIR | — |
| VII consent | 8 | — | own | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in *Introductio* III | FAIR | corrects |
| VIII.1 penalty | 9 | XI | own | NOT ON SHELF; *Romans* II says "rather … than" | FAIR (borderline) | affirms the contrary |
| VIII.2 seed | 9 | XI | own | NOT ON SHELF | FAIR | affirms the contrary |
| IX.1 species | — | IX | question, own answer | NOT ON SHELF | STRETCHED: thesis not stated (borderline) | — |
| IX.2 mice | — | IX | question, own answer | NOT ON SHELF; same answer in the *Sententiae*, Guitmund and Algerus | FAIR | — |
| X works | 13 | — | question, own answer | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in *Ethica* and *Sententiae* | STRETCHED: exception dropped | owns, in his words |
| XI crucifiers | 10 | XIII | objection, own answer | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in *Ethica* XIII | STRETCHED: generalises | takes one side of the *Ethica*'s hedge |
| XII.1 gloss | 12 | — | own | NOT ON SHELF | FAIR (topic) | takes one side of the *Ethica*'s hedge |
| XII.2 Apostles alone | 12 | — | own | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in *Ethica* | FAIR (topic) | takes one side of the *Ethica*'s hedge |
| XII.3 hedge | 12 | — | own | NOT ON SHELF | FAIR (topic) | takes one side of the *Ethica*'s hedge |
| XIII.1 consent | 19 | XII | own | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in *Ethica* | FAIR (topic) | denies Denz. 19, which the *Ethica* states |
| XIII.2 contempt | 19 | XII | own | NOT ON SHELF | FAIR (topic) | denies Denz. 19, which the *Ethica* states |
| XIV omnipotence | 14 | — | own | ALTERED: "nature" made "knowledge"; drops "God" | FAIR | affirms equality |

Table 2: Bernard's *Capitula haeresum*: thirty-two extracts against the texts of Abelard on the shelf. Heading verdicts are the author's reading (section 3).

Of thirty-two extracts, one is VERBATIM, eleven ALTERED, none shown to be SPLICED and twenty NOT ON SHELF. Of the eleven alterations, seven leave the sense as it was (I.1, III.1–III.3, III.5, IV.3, XIV) and four change it (I.2, II.2, III.4, IV.4). IV.3 is among the seven: its replaced sentence leaves the extract's question standing (section 4), and the questions are Abelard's own, so that quoting them without his answer is a truncation, not a change of what the words say. In two of the four the change is a cut or a lost label rather than a changed word: III.4 stops before its conclusion, and IV.4 loses its "SOLUTIO" and its "in this". Twenty headings are FAIR, eleven STRETCHED, and one extract (I.2) has no heading that summarises it. The heading verdicts are the author's reading, and four are borderline: IV.1 and IX.1, stretched only because the extract does not state the thesis; IV.4, an answer that leaves the devil unmentioned; and VIII.1, fair to words that imply what the heading states. Scored the other way, those four would give between nineteen and twenty-three FAIR. None is CONTRARY, since in no case does Abelard's text at the place quoted say the opposite of the heading; the contrary statements are in the *Apologia* (section 8).

One join cannot be scored. The *Capitula* run IV.2, the passage not on the shelf, into IV.3, the questions from the commentary on Romans, with "and after a little", as though the two stood a few lines apart in one book.[86] Since one side of the join is in no text of Abelard on the shelf, the shelf cannot say whether the formula covers a gap, and the join is recorded, not scored. If Bernard's account is right, that he read the doctrine both

86. *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050B: «carnem assumpsit. Et post pauca: Quomodo nos justificari vel reconciliari Deo per mortem Filii ejus dicit Apostolus». For Bernard's statement see n. 57.

in a book of *Sentences* and in the commentary on Romans, and if IV.1 and IV.2 come from the first, then "and after a little" joins two books and presents them as one. If the passage stood in a part of the commentary or of the *Theologia* that is not in print, the formula may be accurate.

## 7. William and the Common Source

William had the books, and he quotes Abelard at greater length than the *Capitula*. If any accuser quotes exactly, it should be he. His ten longest quotations of Abelard, fixed by the rule given with Table 3, were each tested against both recensions of the *Theologia* on the shelf, the *Introductio* and the *Theologia christiana*.[87] None is verbatim; two, from the seal passage, are altered without change of sense; five are not on the shelf; and three are spliced in the sense of section 3. On the three names he joins two sentences across sixty-six words, among them a passage of Augustine that calls God "omnipotent, not because he can do all things, but because he can effect whatever he wills".[88] On the seal he joins two sentences across a hundred and nine words, and drops the "as if" with which Abelard says philosophers speak of a species as begotten from its genus.[89] The *Theologia christiana* has neither passage, so these two rest on the *Introductio* alone. On the Spirit William's text is mixed throughout. Most of the lead-in reads with the *Introductio* against the *Theologia christiana*: the Prophet's "fitting metaphor" of the spirit of the Lord's mouth, which the *Theologia christiana* lacks; "from God the Father" and "is declared" where it has "from the Father" and "is held"; "is not … in God"; the sentence that takes God's goodness "according to the affection of charity", where the *Theologia christiana* has another; and "to extend himself". Fewer readings go with the *Theologia christiana*: the word order of "is said to have charity" and of "and joins itself to it by love", which the *Introductio* has with the same words in another order, and "from the very substance of the Father" with neither "is properly said" nor the Creed that follows in the *Introductio*.[90] His next sentence, "But the Spirit, though of the same substance …", is the *Introductio*'s, which the *Theologia christiana* does not have, and in it he lacks "if we speak properly". At the Creed, then, his words before the join stand in that form only in the *Theologia christiana*, which goes on "But the Spirit is not begotten", and his words

87. The rule: William's quotations are taken as Migne's text of the *Disputatio* sets them off in guillemets (a run ends at any inner guillemet), those he introduces as another author's are set aside, and the rest are ranked by length in words; the ten run from 288 words to 44. Set aside under the rule, among others, is a sentence of Ambrose in cap. II, introduced «beatus Ambrosius dicat contra eos qui in natura divinitatis Patris et Filii calumniabantur diversitatem, audiamus». Each quotation was run through the matcher sentence by sentence against every text of Abelard on the shelf, and the hits were read in the *Introductio* and the *Theologia christiana*.

88. William, *Disputatio*, cap. II, PL 180:250A–B: «Patris quippe nomine divinae majestatis potentia designatur, qua quidquid vult efficere potest: Filii seu Verbi appellatione sapientia Dei significatur». *Introductio* I, PL 178:989B–C, between the two: «Omnipotens vero est, non quod possit omnia facere, sed quia potest efficere quidquid vult.»

89. William, *Disputatio*, cap. III, PL 180:255B: «Et hoc est Filium de Patre esse; sive genitum esse, videlicet sicut species ex genere philosophi dicunt gigni, sive creari.» *Introductio* II, PL 178:1070B: «quod est Filium de substantia Patris esse, vel ab ipso genitum esse. Nam et species ex genere quasi gigni vel creari philosophi dicunt».

90. William, *Disputatio*, cap. IV, PL 180:258A–B: «Procedere ergo Dei est sese in aliquam rem per affectum charitatis quodammodo extendere, ut eam videlicet diligat, ac se ei per amorem conjungat.» «Unde bene sapientia, ex potentia, Filius ex Patre esse dicitur, hoc est, ex ipsa Patris substantia esse; Spiritus vero, quamvis ejusdem sit substantiae cum Patre et Filio, etiam Trinitas ipsa homousion». «minime tamen est ex substantia Patris et Filii, quod esset ipsum ex Patre Filioque gigni». William has «ac se ei per amorem conjungat» again at PL 180:260B. With the *Introductio* (PL 178:1072A–B) against the *Theologia christiana*, William, PL 180:257D–258A: «Et Propheta convenienti metaphora spiritum Domini distinguens spiritum oris ejus ipsum appellat»; «procedere ex Deo Patre et Filio, potius quam gigni, declaratur»; «non est in Deo potentia sive sapientia»; «sed haec ejus bonitas magis secundum ipsum charitatis affectum, sive effectu, accipienda est»; «sese in aliquam rem per affectum charitatis quodammodo extendere». The *Introductio*: «Et Propheta convenienti metaphora Spiritum Domini distinguens»; «procedere ex Deo Patre vel Filio potius quam gigni declaratur»; «sed ejus bonitas magis secundum ipsum charitatis effectum sive effetus accipienda est»; «sese ad aliquam rem per affectum charitatis quodammodo extendere». The *Theologia christiana* (PL 178:1299C–D): «procedere ex Patre et Filio potius quam gigni perhibetur»; «Nullus quippe in eo quod benignus est aut sapiens est aut potens, imo ipsam magis charitatis affectum sive effectum dici convenit»; «Procedere itaque Dei est esse ad aliquam rem». With the *Theologia christiana* against the *Introductio*, William: «habere charitatem dicitur, sed dilectione se in alterum extendit»; the *Theologia christiana*: «habere charitatem dicitur, sed dilectione se in alterum tendit»; the *Introductio*: «charitatem dicitur habere, sed dilectionem in alterum extendit». *Theologia christiana* IV, PL 178:1299D: «ut eam videlicet diligat, ac se ei per amorem conjungat»; for its lead-in see n. 38. *Introductio* II, PL 178:1072B: «ut eam videlicet diligat ac ei per amorem se conjungat». For the *Introductio*'s Spirit sentence see nn. 36–37.

after it only in the *Introductio*, where seventy-four words stand between, the Creed and the sentence in which "properly" only the Son is from the Father's substance. No recension on the shelf has his text on both sides of this join in one form, so under section 3 the join is recorded, not scored, as at IV.2 and IV.3. His copy agreed with neither printed recension, and William himself says that the two little books he read contained "nearly the same things, except that in one rather more was found, in the other less" (see n. 13). Near its end the passage joins two sentences across sixty-five words in the *Theologia christiana* and seventy-two in the *Introductio*, on God's benignity turned towards creatures. Both recensions have the words on both sides, and this join is scored SPLICED. William carries "God, who needs nothing", in the *Theologia christiana*'s form, across the gap from the omitted sentence into the one he keeps, and he drops "but towards creatures only". The author's judgment, and it is a judgment, is that the sense survives.[91] On the most consequential point, the qualifier on the Spirit's procession, William and Bernard agree against the only printed text that has the sentence.

| Rank and length | William, PL 180 | Opening words | Verdict against the *Introductio* and the *Theologia christiana* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (288 words) | cap. IV, 257D–258B | «Spiritus quasi a spirando dictus» | SPLICED and ALTERED: mixed throughout, the lead-in mostly with the *Introductio*, a few readings and the passage to the Spirit sentence with the *Theologia christiana*; the Spirit sentence as in the *Introductio*, without "if we speak properly"; the join at the Creed recorded, not scored (no recension has both sides in William's form); two sentences, present in both, omitted before "Tunc vero" (65 and 72 words), which is the splice |
| 2 (258) | cap. III, 254D–255C | «Sicut ex aere est aereum sigillum» | SPLICED and ALTERED: 109 words of the *Introductio* omitted; "as if" dropped (not in the *Theologia christiana*) |
| 3 (165) | cap. VI, 267A–B | «Sed quia ita non est, sed longe aliter» | NOT ON SHELF |
| 4 (115) | cap. VI, 266D–267A | «utrum omnes homines ita sola misericordia Dei salventur» | NOT ON SHELF |
| 5 (96) | cap. VII, 269C–D | «quod doctores nostri post apostolos in hoc conveniunt» | NOT ON SHELF |
| 6 (80) | cap. II, 250A–B | «Videtur nobis supra positis trium personarum nominibus» | SPLICED and ALTERED: 66 words, with Augustine, omitted (not in the *Theologia christiana*) |
| 7 (57) | cap. X, 281B | «quia facit haec per physicam rerum» | NOT ON SHELF; doctrine in the *Ethica* |
| 8 (56) | cap. III, 254D | «Sigillum aereum est aes ita formatum» | ALTERED |
| 9 (53) | cap. III, 256D–257A | «Sicut aereum sigillum de ipsa aeris substantia» | ALTERED |
| 10 (44) | cap. II, 250B–251A | «Notandum quod ista tria nomina» | NOT ON SHELF |

Table 3: William's ten longest quotations of Abelard, tested against both recensions on the shelf.

That raises the question whether they shared a source of extracts. The evidence is of three kinds.

First, Bernard's two texts belong together. The *Capitula* and letter 190 share readings that no other witness has: the gloss "which is the Spirit" in the benignity sentence, "because ... equally" for "who ... God" in chapter XIV, and, the strongest, "To whom does it not seem cruel" for "How cruel it seems", where both printings of Abelard read "How" and letter 190 marks its form as Abelard's with *inquit*. Both call the work *Stultologia*.[92] Where they differ, the error is the *Capitula*'s: "and a price" for "as a price", "he sinned" for "men sinned",

91. William, *Disputatio*, cap. IV, PL 180:258B: «Nemo enim sibi ipsi benignus esse potest; sed alteri. Tunc vero Deus qui nullius indiget, in se per benignitatem remaneret». *Theologia christiana* IV, PL 178:1300B–C: «Maxime autem Deus, qui nullius indiget, erga seipsum benignitatis affectu commoveri non potest» and, sixty-five words on, «Tunc vero in se per benignitatem remaneret». *Introductio* II, PL 178:1072D–1073A: «Maxime autem Deus cum nullius indiget, erga ipsum benignitatis affectum commoveri non potest» and, seventy-two words on, «Tunc vero in se per benignitatem remaneret». The omitted sentences carry «sed erga creaturas tantum» in both recensions (PL 178:1300C; 1073A); William's «Deus qui nullius indiget» has the *Theologia christiana*'s «qui», where the *Introductio* has «cum».

92. For the gloss, the loss of *aliqua* and *Cui vero non crudele* see nn. 32–33 and 51; for chapter XIV, n. 54. Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1061B: «Denique in primo limine Theologiae, vel potius Stultilogiae suae, fidem definit aestimationem».

"so pleased God" for "so pleased God the Father", "from himself" for "of himself", "if third" for "is third".[93] That is what Mabillon's "faulty manuscript" would lead one to expect, and it supports his identification of the *Capitula* with the chapters Bernard says he collected and sent.

Second, William's quotations agree with Bernard's against every printed text of Abelard in the passages on the Son and the Spirit. Both lack "if we speak properly", which the *Introductio*, the only printed text with the sentence, has. Both make "is not to be said to be from the substance … since that would require him to be begotten" into "is not from the substance … which would be for him to be begotten", and both have "the Trinity itself *homousion*" for "the Trinity *omousios*". Both lack "some" in the benignity sentence, which Migne's *Introductio*, Migne's *Theologia christiana*, Cousin's *Introductio* and the anonymous *Disputatio altera* all have; William himself has the word when he paraphrases the sentence a little later. In the seal passage both read "namely" (*videlicet*) for Abelard's *scilicet*, and both repeat "but" before the second "not conversely".[94] These agreements are trivial, and that is their weight: it is unlikely that two writers would independently add "itself", change *scilicet* to *videlicet*, repeat a *sed* and, in letter 190 and the *Capitula*, turn "How cruel" into "To whom … not cruel".

Third, the agreement is not complete. In the same passages William has "procession from generation" where Bernard, with Abelard, has "generation from procession", and "is declared" for "is shown"; he keeps the reason in the benignity sentence and has no gloss.[95] In the passage on the devil's right, which no text of Abelard on the shelf contains, letter 190 and William agree over some ninety words, and the *Capitula* give a shorter, damaged form. In chapter VI the central sentence is almost the same in William and the *Capitula*, but the lead-in and the simile differ.[96] And the *Capitula* have extracts on matters William does not treat: God's power (III), consent (VII), works (X), the keys (XII) and the Father's omnipotence (XIV).

The documents name a channel. William says he sent his notes "with the little books themselves" to Geoffrey and Bernard; Bernard replied that "most, nearly all" of these things he had not known until then; and in his chapter on the redemption William tells them that they have the passage "in hand, and can read it".[97] Bernard told the cardinals that the *Theologia* "is at hand", read by many in the Curia.[98] William's letter as printed among Bernard's (ep. 326) gives thirteen headings and no excerpts, and ends "But now let us come to the matter, etc.", so there is nothing in it to compare with the *Capitula* and letter 190.[99] The editors' apparatus on the shelf gives no date for ep. 326, ep. 327 or ep. 190, and so no order between William's letter and Bernard's treatise; ep. 327 says that Bernard had so far only run through William's book, not yet with the attention asked of him (see n. 14), and did not think they could meet before Easter.

The evidence supports this much. Bernard's collection was not copied from William's *Disputatio* as it stands, since it has matter William lacks and in places a longer text; nor was William's copied from Bernard's as it stands, since William has a fuller and sounder text of the redemption passage. Their shared readings came from a

93. *Capitula*, cap. IV, PL 182:1050B–C: «Nunquid mors innocentis Filii tantum Deo placuit». Bernard, ep. 190, PL 182:1070A: «Nunquid mors innocentis Filii in tantum Deo Patri placuit». For «et pretium» see n. 51, for «deliquerit» n. 46, for «a se» n. 54, for «si tertia» n. 67.

94. William, *Disputatio*, cap. III, PL 180:255A–B: «ad eam videlicet similitudinem, qua sigillum aereum ex aere dicitur esse». «exigit quod sit divina potentia, sed non e converso». *Capitula*, cap. I, PL 182:1049A: «exigit quod sit divina potentia, sed non e contrario». *Introductio* II, PL 178:1070A: «exigit quod sit divina potentia, non e contrario». William's paraphrase, n. 22. *Disputatio altera*, PL 180:284A: «Benignitas ipsa, quae nomine Spiritus sancti demonstratur, non est aliqua in Deo potentia, sive sapientia».

95. William, *Disputatio*, cap. IV, PL 180:258A: «differt in eo processio a generatione, quod is qui generatur ex ipsa Patris substantia est». PL 180:257D: «Benignitas quippe ipsa, quae hoc nomine declaratur, non est in Deo potentia sive sapientia, cum videlicet ipsum benignum esse, non sit in aliquo potentem esse, sive sapientem».

96. William, *Disputatio*, cap. VI, PL 180:267A: «Dicendum est igitur quod homo per rationem a Deo quidem datam gratiae appositae cohaerere potest; nec Deus plus facit isti qui salvatur, antequam cohaereat gratiae, quam illi qui non salvatur. Sed sicut qui lapides pretiosos exponit venales, et desiderium videntium excitat ad emendum». Cap. VI, PL 180:266D: «Quaeritur etiam, » inquit, « utrum omnes homines ita sola misericordia Dei salventur». For the *Capitula* see n. 69; for the redemption passage, nn. 58–60.

97. See nn. 13, 14 and 59.

98. Bernard, ep. 188, PL 182:353B: «ad manum est enim; cum, sicut gloriatur, a pluribus lectitetur in curia».

99. William (Bernard, ep. 326), PL 182:532A: «Haec sunt ergo capitula ex opusculis ejus collecta, quae vobis offerenda putavi». PL 182:533A: «Sed jam veniamus ad rem, etc.» Bernard, ep. 327, PL 182:533B: «Idipsum tamen ante Pascha fieri posse non arbitror».

common source, and the source may have been of two kinds: the same copies of Abelard, which in the passages on the Spirit differed from every copy that reached print, or William's own marked notes, sent to Bernard with the books, from which Bernard's excerpts could have been drawn before either text took its present form. The evidence does not show whether the shared omissions were made by an excerptor, by a scribe, or in Abelard's own earlier copies, and so it does not show that either accuser altered these sentences. It shows that, if they were altered, the alteration came before both texts as we have them, and that neither accuser checked it against another copy.

## 8. Abelard's Answer

The *Apologia* is short, and it answers a list, not a book. After a protest against those who twist what is well said, it takes the charges in Denzinger's order and gives to each a sentence or two, most of them professions of faith in the first person. Its answers are of five kinds.

Some deny that he wrote the words. The article on "full power … no power" he condemns "with its author", and on the shelf the words are not in his writings. Whoever says that he wrote that the Spirit "is not of the substance of the Father" spoke "from malice or the greatest ignorance"; he wrote that the Spirit is not, properly, "from" the substance, and is "of the same substance". The coming attributed to the Father never entered his mind; the descent "by power" is "utterly remote from my words and sense"; the last chapter is "foreign to my words and writings alike".[100] That last denial does not agree with the *Ethica*. The chapter he denies says that neither work nor will nor concupiscence nor the delight it moves is sin, "and we ought not to wish them extinguished" (see n. 19). The *Ethica* says that will and desire to do what is not lawful are "by no means to be called sin", that the man who resists desire "represses it, does not extinguish it", and that we triumph over our bad will without extinguishing it, "so that we may always have something to fight against".[101] The *Apologia* denies what the *Ethica* states in so many words.

Most answers profess the contrary faith without saying whether he ever wrote otherwise: the Son became incarnate to free us "from the servitude of sin and from the yoke of the devil"; Jesus Christ is "the third person in the Trinity", the phrase chapter V denies of "this person who is Christ"; grace goes before us, follows us and accompanies us; God often prevents evils; the power of the keys passed to all the Apostles' successors; the Father is as wise and the Son as benign as the Spirit.[102]

Two answers own the charge. The spirit of fear "was never in the soul of Christ, who had the most perfect charity", though it is not lacking in his lower members, since much that is said of Christ is to be taken of his body, the Church.[103] On works he says in his own name what chapter X says: no merit is lost if a good will is

100. *Apologia*, PL 178:105–106: «Quae si quis in meis reperiat scriptis, non solum me haereticum, verum etiam haeresiarcham profiteor.» «Quisquis etiam me scripsisse asserit quod de substantia Patris Spiritus sanctus etiam non sit, malitiae id vel ignorantiae maximae fuit.» PL 178:107: «Sic et animam Christi non per se ad inferos descendisse, sed per potentiam, omnino a meis verbis et sensu remotum est.» For the coming at the end see n. 18, for the last chapter n. 19. For the *Ethica* see n. 85.

101. *Ethica*, PL 178:638C: «Haec vero est nostra voluntas mala, de qua triumphamus, cum eam divinae subjugamus, nec eam prorsus exstinguimus, ut semper habeamus contra quam dimicemus.» PL 178:639B: «Desiderium ille reprimit, non exstinguit; sed quia non trahitur ad consensum, non incurrit peccatum. Quorsum autem ista? Ut denique pateat in talibus ipsam quoque voluntatem vel desiderium faciendi quod non licet nequaquam dici peccatum, sed ipsum potius, ut diximus, consensum.» Denzinger's item 19 (OCR) has the same clause as the *Apologia*: «nec debemus velle eam exstinguere».

102. *Apologia*, PL 178:106–107: «Solum Filium Dei incarnatum profiteor, ut nos a servitute peccati et a jugo diaboli liberaret». «Jesum Christum sicut verum et unicum Dei Filium ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitum, ita tertiam in Trinitate personam». «Ipsa quippe gratia nos praevenit ut velimus, ipsa subsequitur ut possimus, ipsa nos consociat, ut perseveremus.» «Mala Deum impedire frequenter, fateor». «Potestatem ligandi atque solvendi successoribus apostolorum omnibus, ut ipsis aeque apostolis concessam esse profiteor, et tam indignis quam dignis episcopis quandiu eos Ecclesia susceperit.» «Deum Patrem aeque sapientem, et Filium aeque benignum ut Spiritum sanctum profiteor».

103. *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «Multa de Christo dicuntur quae non tam secundum caput quam secundum corpus ipsius, quod est Ecclesia, sunt accipienda». «Hujus ergo timoris spiritum in anima Christi, qui perfectissimam habuit charitatem, nunquam fuisse credendum est, qui tamen in inferioribus membris non deest.»

hindered of its effect.[104] One answer restates. To chapter III he replies, "I believe that God can do only what it befits him to do, and that he can do many things he will never do."[105] Three charges get no answer: the world-soul, the stones and herbs, and the accidents in the air.

Where the *Apologia* professes the contrary faith, it sometimes contradicts Abelard's earlier text, and the cases are of two grades. Three are flat contradictions. The *Introductio* concluded that God can do only what he does at some time (JMT 1.1); the *Apologia* grants that he can do many things he will never do. The commentary on Romans referred original sin "rather to the penalty ... than to guilt", and glossed "in whom all sinned" as "incurred the penalty of sin"; the *Apologia* asserts that we contracted "guilt as well as penalty". And the *Apologia* denies the last chapter, which the *Ethica* states (above). Two more choose one side of a hedge the earlier text left open. The *Ethica* said of Christ's persecutors that "we cannot say that they sinned in this", sin taken properly, but allowed that they sinned "in the deed"; the *Apologia* says the crucifiers "committed a most grievous sin". The *Ethica* referred the power of forgiving to the persons of the Apostles, "not generally to all bishops", but ended "unless perhaps, according to what Jerome himself says" the binding is a judgment granted to all; the *Apologia* gives it to all their successors.[106] In neither grade does the *Apologia* say that it is changing anything, and it does not mention the earlier texts. One qualification bears on all five. "He contradicts himself" assumes that the *Apologia* is his, which the editor of the *Responsio*, the same text in PL 180, leaves open (below). If another wrote it, the contradictions are between Abelard's books and an answer made in his name.

The *Responsio* in PL 180 is the same text with variants. At the thesis on God's power it reads that God *does* only what it befits him to do, and *could* do many things he does not do.[107] Its editor heads it "rather a slanderous retraction of the errors of Peter Abelard", and allows that the errors are condemned there "whether by him or by another in his name".[108] The anonymous abbot of the *Disputatio altera* quotes another apology of Abelard's, written, Tissier says, against Bernard, in which Abelard "pursues this chapter more diffusely than the rest" and concludes that God "can do and will to do only what at some time he does".[109] That apology is not on the shelf. If the abbot's quotations are faithful, Abelard defended the thesis of chapter III at length in one apology and gave it up in the other.

Berengar adds little. In a speech he gives to Bernard, Bernard says he packed the doctrine "into a handy little index", so that readers need not travel through "the wide forests of Abelard's volumes"; Berengar answers that the index holds some things Abelard said and wrote and some he did not, and defers the sorting to a second treatise.[110]

The texts say three different things about a *Liber Sententiarum*. The *Capitula* as Mabillon prints them attribute nothing to a book of *Sentences*: they end with the *Stultologia*, and nothing follows. The *Apologia* says that "our friend" ended the chapters against him by saying they were found "partly in the book of the *Theologia* of Master Peter, partly in his book of *Sentences*, partly in the book whose title is *Scito te ipsum*", and

104. *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «nec quidquam meriti apud Deum deperire, si bonae voluntatis affectus a suo praepediatur effectu. Non enim angelus, cum a Deo missus id quod facere vult impleverit, aut anima Christi suae voluntati effectum addiderit, melior inde reputari debuit».

105. *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «Deum ea solummodo posse facere credo quae ipsum facere convenit; et quod multa facere potest, quae nunquam faciet.»

106. *Apologia*, PL 178:107: «Ex Adam, in quo omnes peccavimus, tam culpam quam poenam nos contraxisse assero». «Crucifixores Christi in ipsa crucifixione gravissimum peccatum fateor commisisse.» For the *Introductio* see JMT 1.1; for *Romans* n. 73; for the *Ethica* nn. 81 and 83.

107. *Responsio*, PL 180:330C: «Deum ea solummodo facere credo, quae ipsum facere convenit, et quod multa facere posset, quae non facit.»

108. *Responsio*, editor's heading, PL 180:329: «Haec responsio potius inscribenda fuit: Retractatio calumniosa errorum Petri Abaelardi.» «Calumniosa ergo est haec responsio, et vere docuit errores Abaelardus, qui hic, sive ab ipso, sive ab alio, ejus nomine damnantur.»

109. Tissier, *Monitum*, PL 180 (before col. 283): «et hic se inique a sancto Patre impetitum in Apologia adversus eumdem scripta mendaciter calumniatus est». *Disputatio altera*, PL 180:316B–D: «At in Apologia sua multo vehementius spiritu vertiginis abducitur, ac infelicius aegrotat. Diligentiore siquidem tractatu, et quasi viribus in unum collectis hoc capitulum caeteris diffusius exsequitur». «Si ergo id solum facere potest, quod eum facere seu velle convenit, profecto id solum facere, atque velle facere potest, quod quandoque facit; et eo modo tantum, et eo tempore similiter, quo facit».

110. Berengar, *Apologeticus*, PL 178:1862C: «Nonne caute consulteque egi, quod foedum illud sacrilegumque dogma manuali quodam indiculo complosi, ne scilicet breviter volentibus attingere summam rei, onerosum esset ire per spatiosos saltus voluminum Abaelardi.» For the concession see n. 5; for the five items, n. 15.

that Abelard received this "with the greatest astonishment, since no book called *Sentences* written by me will ever be found". That closing sentence is on none of the lists on the shelf. Bernard names the book twice: letter 188 calls it "another, which they call his *Sentences*", and letter 190 says he read the doctrine of redemption in it.[111] Three facts stand. Bernard said he had read a book called Abelard's *Sentences*; the list Abelard answered cited it as a source; and Abelard denied writing a book of that name. The denial is of authorship. It leaves room for a book of his *sententiae* written down by others, and the shelf holds excerpts of one under that name.

## 9. Mabillon's Verdict Tested

Mabillon wrote his introduction to letter 190 before the *Capitula* reached him, so that his claims concern the errors imputed to Abelard as Bernard's letters and William's work present them, not the extracts he later printed.[112] Each can be put to the shelf.

That some imputed errors are "lacking in his printed works" holds, more widely than Mabillon knew: twenty of the thirty-two extracts are in none of the printed works on the shelf. That most are nonetheless found "in the printed writings" (*plerosque*) holds for the doctrine more than for the words. Twelve extracts stand in the printed works, and for seven of the untested chapters (IV, VI, VIII, X–XIII) the *Ethica* or the commentary on Romans has the doctrine in other words. Mabillon's introduction cites the commentary for the doctrine of grace, by the page of the older edition, and the passage is where he says.[113]

That the errors no longer extant were read in Abelard's own text by William, Geoffrey and the anonymous abbot, who quote his words "both from the *Apologia* and from the *Theologia*, which do not appear in the printed works", holds for the abbot and the *Apologia*:[114] he quotes an apology that is not the one in print (section 8). William's quotations not on the shelf are real, but whether they come from the *Theologia* cannot be tested.

That the *Theologia* is "mutilated in the printed editions" Mabillon argued from Abelard's own words: in the second book of the commentary on Romans Abelard reserves things for treatment in his *Theologia* of which the printed text says nothing. The cross-reference is there. After his short account of how we are redeemed, Abelard writes, "if anything is lacking to completeness, we reserve it for the treatise of our *Theologia*"; and the printed *Introductio* has no such treatise and breaks off with "the rest is lacking".[115] What Abelard defers is "anything lacking to completeness" in his account of the *mode* of our redemption; the doctrine of IV.1 and IV.2 is already in the commentary, within the questions (section 5). So the cross-reference shows only that Abelard points to a gap at this doctrine, and the extracts missing from the shelf concern the same doctrine. Mabillon's inference, that the printed *Theologia* is incomplete, is sound at the one point where it can be tested. It cannot decide between his explanation and Bernard's own, that he read the redemption passage in a book of *Sentences*; the lost part of the *Theologia* and the book of *Sentences* may be one source or two.

That the *Capitula* come from a faulty manuscript holds, as the comparison with letter 190 shows (section 7). Mabillon's further claim that the *Capitula* "are the same chapters" that William sent to Geoffrey and Bernard

111. *Capitula*, end, n. 12; *Apologia*, n. 20, continued: «cum nunquam liber aliquis qui Sententiarum dicatur, a me scriptus reperiatur.» Bernard, ep. 188, n. 17; ep. 190, n. 57.

112. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §9; see n. 10.

113. See n. 70.

114. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §3, PL 182 (before col. 1047): «si qua amplius non exstant, ea quondam in ipso Abaelardo legisse Guillelmum Sancti-Theodorici, Gaufridum, et abbatem illum anonymum Abaelardi quondam discipulum, qui et praeceptoris sui doctrinam callebat, et verba ipsa refert, uti et Guillelmus, tum ex Apologia, tum ex Theologia Abaelardi, quae in editis non comparent».

115. *Romans* II, PL 178:836C–D: «Nunc autem succincte, quantum ad expositionis brevitatem pertinet, de modo nostrae redemptionis quod videtur nobis sufficiat. Si qua vero desunt perfectioni, Theologiae nostrae tractatui reservamus». Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §3, PL 182 (before col. 1047): «Et certe Abaelardus ipse in libro secundo commentarii super Epistolam ad Romanos, pag. 554, quaedam in Theologia sua tractanda reservat, de quibus nulla mentio est in impressis, quae sic desinunt: « Caetera desunt: » ut appareat, Theologiam in editis mutilam esse.» For the end of the *Introductio* see n. 26.

holds only in part: nine of William's thirteen have a counterpart among Bernard's fourteen (Table 1: William 3 and *Capitula* I, 4 and II, 6 and VI, 7 and IV, 8 and V, 9 and IX, 11 and VIII, 12 and XIII, 13 and XI and XIII; William 1, 2, 5 and 10 have none).[116]

Tissier, whose *Monitum* does not mention the *Capitula*, had made the same defence of Bernard: no one should be moved that the errors are not found in Abelard's recently printed works, "for the books which contained them have not been printed".[117] He also said that the teaching that grace is offered to all is not Abelard's own but common to the schoolmen and the Fathers, and that neither William nor Bernard condemned it in Abelard. The *Capitula* make that second remark untrue for Bernard: their chapter VI is headed "that God does no more for the one who is saved, before he cleaves to grace, than for the one who is not saved", and the third extract under it is a merchant offering his stones to all alike.

## 10. Conclusion

The charge sheet of Sens is four documents, and the one that quotes Abelard under every heading is a collection Bernard made for the pope, preserved in a single faulty copy. Twelve of its extracts are in the texts of Abelard on the shelf. One is verbatim, and most of the others differ by particles and word order. In four places the change alters what the reader is told. "If we speak properly" is absent from the sentence on the Spirit's procession, which the *Introductio* has with it, perhaps because the accusers' recension lacked it. "Some" and the explaining clause are gone from the sentence on benignity, and a gloss has made benignity the Spirit. A reductio on God and evil stops at its premise. And Abelard's solution in the commentary on Romans, run on from his own questions, has lost its label and its "in this", so that it reads as a concession. The questions themselves are quoted as his, and rightly; what the *Capitula* leave out is his answer. The absence of "if we speak properly" and of "some" is shared with William, and so stood in the accusers' material before both texts as we have them, whether in their copies of Abelard or in the notes William sent with the books. The cuts and joins are an excerptor's choices; the shelf cannot say whose.

Twenty extracts are not on the shelf, and they are not therefore false. Their form is that of a book of school sentences; Bernard says he read such a book under Abelard's name; the shelf holds excerpts of a book with that title teaching the doctrine of four of the untested chapters, though in those four the doctrine or its idiom is current outside Abelard as well; and the *Ethica* and the commentary on Romans teach that of most of the rest, sometimes with a hedge the heading removes. What the shelf cannot supply is the words, and so it cannot say whether they were Abelard's, a pupil's record of his teaching, or a compiler's.

On the author's reading, twenty of the thirty-two headings say what their quoted words say, and the borderline cases put the figure between nineteen and twenty-three. The eleven that say more do so by dropping an exception (works), by generalising (the Spirit's procession, ignorance, the purpose of the incarnation), or by stating a thesis the extract does not state, which it gives as a report, a question or half an argument, or does not reach (the Son's generation, God and evil, the redemption, grace, the species). None says the opposite of the passage it summarises. Set against Abelard's own books rather than against the extracts, several headings remove a hedge he kept: original sin is "rather" penalty than guilt, works add nothing "unless perhaps" the will is increased, and the crucifiers did not sin "properly" but sinned "in the deed".

The *Apologia*'s denials do not all agree with the shelf. Where it says he never wrote the article on "full power" or that the Spirit is not of the Father's substance, the texts on the shelf do not have those words, and on the Spirit they say "of the same substance"; texts not on the shelf cannot be asked. But where it denies the last

116. Mabillon, *Admonitio*, §1: «Eadem sunt capitula, quae Gaufrido Carnotensi episcopo et Bernardo direxerat Guillelmus». See Table 1.
117. Tissier, *Monitum*, PL 180 (before col. 283): «Nec quemquam moveat, quod in operibus Abaelardi nuper editis non reperiantur illi errores, nam libri illi qui hos continebant, non sunt typis excusi.» «Verum haec non Abaelardi propria est, sed scholasticorum doctorum communis, imo et Patrum». «Sane nec Guillelmus, nec S. Bernardus hanc sententiam in Abaelardo damnarunt; imo ipsi eam passim docent.»

chapter, that will, desire and delight are not sin and are not to be extinguished, the *Ethica* says it in so many words. With that denial, its statements contradict Abelard's books in two grades. That God can do many things he will never do, that original sin is guilt as well as penalty, and the denial of the last chapter flatly contradict the *Introductio*, the commentary on Romans and the *Ethica*. That the crucifiers sinned most grievously and that the keys passed to all bishops take one side of hedges the *Ethica* left open. The *Apologia* says nothing of either, and if, as the editor of the *Responsio* allows, it was made by another in Abelard's name, the contradictions lie between his books and that answer.

Two old judgments survive the test, each with a limit. Mabillon was right that the printed Abelard is incomplete and that Abelard himself pointed to a gap at the doctrine of redemption; the extracts missing from the shelf concern the same doctrine, but what Abelard deferred was anything lacking in his account of its mode. Berengar's concession, that the list held some things Abelard said and wrote and some he neither said nor wrote, fits what can be tested: twelve extracts are in his books, and four of those are changed in sense. A third judgment does not survive. Tissier held that the teaching of grace offered to all was common doctrine, which neither William nor Bernard condemned in Abelard; the *Capitula*'s chapter VI condemns it under Bernard's name. Table 2 sorts what the texts on the shelf allow to be tested, and for the twenty extracts not on the shelf it leaves open whether Abelard said them. # Sources

*Primary sources*

Abelard, Peter. *Apologia*; *Ethica seu Scito te ipsum*; *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos*; *Introductio ad theologiam*; *Theologia christiana*, with the *Observationes praeviae* of its editor. In *Patrologia Latina*, edited by J.-P. Migne, vol. 178. Paris, 1855.

———. *Responsio* (the *Apologia* in another printing, with the editor's heading). In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 180. Paris, 1855.

———. *Opera hactenus seorsim edita*. Edited by V. Cousin and C. Jourdain. Vol. 2. Paris, 1859. (*Introductio*, commentary on Romans, *Ethica* with Cousin's preface, *Excerpta ex Epitome theologiae christianae* [the Munich *Sententiae*], and in an appendix the *Capitula errorum* reprinted from Mabillon.) Vol. 1. Paris, 1849.

[Anonymous abbot.] *Disputatio altera adversus Abaelardum*, with the *Monitum* of Tissier. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 180. Paris, 1855.

Berengar. *Apologeticus contra beatum Bernardum*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 178. Paris, 1855.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Epistolae* 188, 190 (*Tractatus de erroribus Abaelardi*), 191, 194, 326 (William of St-Thierry to Geoffrey of Chartres and Bernard), 327, 337. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 182. Paris, 1854.

*Capitula haeresum Petri Abaelardi*, with Mabillon's *Admonitio in opusculum XI*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 182. Paris, 1854.

Denzinger, H., and C. Bannwart, eds. *Enchiridion symbolorum*. 11th ed. Freiburg, 1911. Nos. 368–387.

Innocent II. *Epistolae* 447–448. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 179. Paris, 1855.

*Other texts on the shelf cited for parallels*

Algerus of Liège. *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 180. Paris, 1855.

[Anonymous.] *Apologia de verbo incarnato*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 177. Paris, 1854.

Guitmund of Aversa. *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in Eucharistia*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 149. Paris, 1853.

Henry of Marcy. *De peregrinante civitate Dei*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 204. Paris, 1855.

Peter of Poitiers. *Sententiae*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 211. Paris, 1855.

*Quaestiones in Epistolas Pauli*. Among the works of Hugh of St-Victor, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 175. Paris, 1854.

Tosti, Luigi. *Storia di Abelardo e dei suoi tempi*. Naples, 1851.

William of St-Thierry. *Disputatio adversus Petrum Abaelardum*. In *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 180. Paris, 1855.

*Earlier article in this journal*

"What God Does Not Do: Abelard's Actualism, Its Medieval Answer, and John Milbank's Genealogy of Possibility". *Journal of Machine Theology* 1, no. 1 (2026). Cited as JMT 1.1.

## Appendix A: Method and Verification

The question and the hunt. The question was put by Claude Fable 5.2 at Wilson Pruitt's request for articles of the model's own choosing, and the same model wrote the brief for the search. Three instances of Claude Sonnet 5.5 searched the shelf under that brief: one built the concordance of the lists and Abelard's answers; one tested every extract of *Capitula* I–IX; one tested *Capitula* X–XIV and the ten longest quotations in William's *Disputatio*, which in revision were fixed by the rule in n. 87 and re-tested against both recensions. Each reported, for every extract, the accuser's Latin, the verdicts, the locus, the source's Latin, its voice and a working translation. All 178 Latin lines in their reports were tested by script against the files named. This article was then written by Claude Opus 5.5, which re-read each passage the argument uses in its file and extended the search to letter 190 as a witness to the extracts, to the anonymous *Disputatio altera* and Tissier's *Monitum*, to the editor's *Observationes* before the *Theologia christiana*, and to Cousin's apparatus and his excerpts from the Munich *Sententiae*. Claude Fable 5.2 revised three passages of the draft (provenance box). The article was then reviewed by an editor-in-chief (Claude Opus 5.5) and two blind readers (Claude Sonnet 5.5), and revised by Claude Opus 5.5 against the editor's decision letter; `response.md` answers it point by point. The translations are the author's.

The shelf. Migne's texts in the TEI transcription of the Corpus Corporum (Zurich): Abelard, PL 178, files 11110 and 11113–11128 (the *Apologia* is 11113, the *Ethica* 11116, *Romans* 11117, the *Introductio* 11123, the *Theologia christiana* 11128), and the *Responsio*, PL 180, file 11175; the accusers in files 11207 (*Capitula* and *Admonitio*), 11191 (ep. 190), 21392 (Bernard's other letters), 11165 (William), 11166 (*Disputatio altera*), 11106 (Berengar) and 11142 (Innocent II). Volume numbers are those of each file's header; columns are those of the files' page markers. Where a file marks only some columns (the *Apologia* marks only col. 107; Mabillon's *Admonitio* only cols. 1047 and 1049) the notes say so. Archive.org text layers of Cousin's volumes of 1849 and 1859, a second scan of the 1859 volume, and two scans of Tosti (1851): uncorrected OCR, quoted as it stands. Denzinger (1911): uncorrected OCR, quoted as it stands; items 4, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 19 are partly illegible (item 19 begins «fis) ' ^ °P"^ ^ voluntas»), item 6 is legible but for two misread words («perse», «ino:»), and where Table 1 gives the sense of an illegible item it is marked "[r]".

The matcher. `scripts/locate.py` folds case, the spellings *u/v*, *i/j*, *ae/e* and *oe/e*, and punctuation; breaks the quotation into overlapping three-word sequences; and, for each file, finds the window of text containing the largest number of distinct sequences. It reports the share found (coverage) and the window. For every extract the full quotation was run, and for the extracts not on the shelf several distinctive phrases were searched by regular expression in each file as well: among them "tertia persona", "figurativa", "mercator", "pretiosos lapides", "cohaereat", "debeat hoc prohibere", "seminarium", "Originale peccatum", "negligentiam ministrorum", "a muribus", "remuneretur", "Solet quaeri quid", "obsequium", "zelo legis", "simplices Jud", "ligaveris", "praesenti Ecclesia", "suggestio non est", "carcerarius", "jure eum possidebat" and "luce suae sapientiae". Denzinger's article 17 was searched for in the *Capitula*, letter 190, Bernard's other letters, William, Berengar and Innocent ("adventus", "in fine saeculi", "adventum Filii"). For the comparison of accusers, each extract of the *Capitula* was run in the same way against letter 190, William and the *Disputatio altera*, and against the Munich *Sententiae* as excerpted by Cousin.

The check. `check_quotes.py` tests every Latin run in the article, the text set between guillemets, against the file its note names: TEI files with tags removed and whitespace collapsed, OCR files with whitespace collapsed. Runs in the body and in the tables are tested against the files of the notes cited on the same line. It also checks that every note marker has one definition and every definition a marker, and that notes are numbered in order of first appearance. A failing run is searched in every file, so that a wrong attribution shows as such. Because the revision renumbered the notes, the script's table of notes and files was rebuilt from the new numbering. In the final run the article had 117 notes, 113 of them quoting Latin, with 346 Latin runs; all 346 passed. No run is transcribed from a page image.

Readings settled in the files. Several points were settled only by returning to the files, and the article follows the files. The *Capitula* end with the *Stultologia* and carry no note on a book of *Sentences* (section 8). The *Capitula*'s "of God" in I.1 does not turn a general statement into one about God, since the context in the *Introductio* is already divine wisdom. Cousin's texts of the commentary on Romans and of the *Introductio* are in the volume of 1859, not that of 1849. The Munich *Sententiae* do not contain the quoted words of any extract, but they contain the doctrine of chapters IV, V, IX and X. The readings *aeque* (XIV) and *hoc ipsum* (II.1) are in Cousin's *Introductio* and are not counted against the accuser. A sentence William quotes in cap. II («dico genitum») is Ambrose's, not Abelard's (n. 87). William's Spirit passage was compared with the *Theologia christiana* as well as the *Introductio* (section 7). Letter 190 was used as a witness to the wording of the extracts, and the *Disputatio altera* and Tissier's *Monitum* were read for the evidence they give.

Not available. The Vatican manuscript 663 from which Mabillon printed the *Capitula*; Mansi's collection, from which Denzinger and Migne take the documents of Sens; Rheinwald's full edition of the Munich *Sententiae* (Cousin printed only excerpts); Pez's edition of the *Ethica* and the fragment of its second book that Cousin mentions; the polemical apology of Abelard quoted in the *Disputatio altera*; the lost first quire of the *Disputatio altera* (Tissier); Berengar's promised second treatise; any critical edition of the *Theologia*, the *Ethica* or the *Sententiae*. Names and dates given without a note are taken from the editors' apparatus cited in the notes.

## Appendix B: Verification Table

Every note that quotes Latin is listed with the file or files its runs were tested against. "Script" means that every run in the note was found verbatim in one of the files named; "script (OCR)" that at least one file is an uncorrected OCR text and the runs were tested against it as it stands. "PL/" abbreviates the directory of the Migne TEI files (patrologia/sources/pl/tei in the author's home folder), "editions/" the directory of the Cousin and Tosti scans (milbank-reverse/source/abelard-editions), and "constance/" the directory holding the Denzinger scan (milbank-reverse/source/constance). Notes 56, 97, 112, 113 quote no Latin and have no row: they refer to other notes or to the searches listed in Appendix A.

| Note | Source file | Checked by |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | PL/11207.xml; PL/21392.xml | script |
| 2 | constance/denzinger-1911.txt; PL/11142.xml; PL/21392.xml | script (OCR) |
| 3 | PL/11142.xml | script |
| 4 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 5 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11106.xml | script |
| 6 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 7 | constance/denzinger-1911.txt | script (OCR) |
| 8 | PL/11142.xml | script |
| 9 | PL/21392.xml | script |
| 10 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 11 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 12 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 13 | PL/21392.xml | script |

| Note | Source file | Checked by |
|---|---|---|
| 14 | PL/21392.xml | script |
| 15 | PL/11191.xml; PL/21392.xml; PL/11106.xml | script |
| 16 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 17 | PL/21392.xml | script |
| 18 | constance/denzinger-1911.txt; PL/11113.xml | script (OCR) |
| 19 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 20 | PL/11113.xml; PL/11175.xml | script |
| 21 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 22 | PL/11165.xml | script |
| 23 | PL/11128.xml | script |
| 24 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 25 | PL/11166.xml | script |
| 26 | PL/11123.xml | script |
| 27 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 28 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 29 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 30 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 31 | PL/11123.xml | script |
| 32 | PL/11123.xml; PL/11207.xml; PL/11128.xml | script |
| 33 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 34 | PL/11123.xml | script |
| 35 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11128.xml; PL/11123.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 36 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11123.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 37 | PL/11123.xml | script |
| 38 | PL/11128.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 39 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 40 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 41 | PL/11123.xml; PL/11207.xml; constance/denzinger-1911.txt | script (OCR) |
| 42 | PL/11166.xml | script |
| 43 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 44 | PL/11117.xml | script |
| 45 | PL/11117.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 46 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11117.xml | script |
| 47 | PL/11117.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt; PL/11207.xml | script (OCR) |
| 48 | PL/11191.xml; PL/11165.xml | script |
| 49 | PL/11191.xml; PL/11117.xml | script |
| 50 | PL/11117.xml; PL/11207.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 51 | PL/11117.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt; PL/11207.xml; PL/11191.xml | script (OCR) |
| 52 | PL/11117.xml | script |
| 53 | PL/11123.xml; PL/11207.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 54 | PL/11191.xml; PL/11207.xml | script |
| 55 | PL/11123.xml | script |
| 57 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 58 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 59 | PL/11165.xml | script |
| 60 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 61 | PL/11117.xml | script |
| 62 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt; PL/11207.xml; PL/11191.xml | script (OCR) |
| 63 | PL/11066.xml | script |
| 64 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 65 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 66 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 67 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11207.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 68 | PL/11094.xml; PL/11777.xml | script |
| 69 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 70 | PL/11117.xml; PL/11207.xml | script |
| 71 | PL/11207.xml | script |

| Note | Source file | Checked by |
|---|---|---|
| 72 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 73 | PL/11117.xml | script |
| 74 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 75 | editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 76 | PL/10305.xml; PL/11158.xml | script |
| 77 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 78 | PL/11116.xml; editions/operahactenusseoooabeluoft.txt | script (OCR) |
| 79 | PL/11664.xml | script |
| 80 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 81 | PL/11116.xml | script |
| 82 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 83 | PL/11116.xml | script |
| 84 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 85 | PL/11116.xml | script |
| 86 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 87 | PL/11165.xml | script |
| 88 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 89 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 90 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11128.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 91 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11128.xml; PL/11123.xml | script |
| 92 | PL/11191.xml | script |
| 93 | PL/11207.xml; PL/11191.xml | script |
| 94 | PL/11165.xml; PL/11207.xml; PL/11123.xml; PL/11166.xml | script |
| 95 | PL/11165.xml | script |
| 96 | PL/11165.xml | script |
| 98 | PL/21392.xml | script |
| 99 | PL/21392.xml | script |
| 100 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 101 | PL/11116.xml; constance/denzinger-1911.txt | script (OCR) |
| 102 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 103 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 104 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 105 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 106 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 107 | PL/11175.xml | script |
| 108 | PL/11175.xml | script |
| 109 | PL/11166.xml | script |
| 110 | PL/11106.xml | script |
| 111 | PL/11113.xml | script |
| 114 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 115 | PL/11117.xml; PL/11207.xml | script |
| 116 | PL/11207.xml | script |
| 117 | PL/11166.xml | script |

Table 4: Notes quoting Latin, with the files tested.