RESEARCH ARTICLE

Where the Unity Lives

Henri de Lubac's Four Senses of Scripture Read against the Latin and Greek Shelf

ABSTRACT

Henri de Lubac's *Exégèse médiévale* (1959–64) holds that the four senses of Scripture (history, allegory, tropology, anagogy) are one: a development of the primitive pair of letter and spirit, reached by splitting the second term in three, because the spiritual sense of a Bible read between Christ's two comings "had necessarily" to divide; "each sense tends to the other as to its end". The claim is structural, and he makes it "even setting aside" the early texts, which he expects to be dispersed. This article tests the claim's textual warrant, not its necessity. A census of Migne's Latin found 269 places (266 distinct texts, one work being held in two files) where three or more of the senses are named together, 132 of them statements of theory, and de Lubac cites 96 of those for theory. The article reads the passages the census only counted, most of them untranslated, and much of his history holds. He had Aldhelm naming the canonical order, which the census missed; he had Eucherius copying Cassian and reporting allegory "added in fourth place"; and he had Jerome, whom he puts before both, stating a threefold ascent whose third sense is the beatitude to come, his own eschatological reason in a Latin text. The finding concerns the form of the warrant, and much of its evidence is de Lubac's own. Where the shelf states the four as one movement, four statements keep the classic order, history, allegory, tropology, anagogy: the feeding of readers by stages in the prologue of the *Allegoriae in universam Scripturam*, Adam Scot's near-copy of it, a cellar of four casks and Honorius's four kinds of faithful. Two depart from it: Richard of St Victor ranks tropology lowest of the three higher senses, and the same prologue, a few lines after its feeding, builds a house with anagogy as the roof and tropology as the ornament. De Lubac lists their authors among the witnesses of the classic order, notes Richard's, and quotes the house among building figures that recur "with some variants". What the reading adds is narrower. His suggestion that the classic order suits "well-balanced architecture" and the other "perhaps" the soul's ascent does not fit these fourfolds, whose grades of readers keep the classic order while the buildings vary, though Jerome's threefold ascents fit it; and the census gives the variation a measure: counting copies separately, tropology is named before allegory in 26 of the 120 statements of theory that name both. This fits de Lubac's sentence as he wrote it ("to the other", not "to the next"). It does not support reading his organism as one sequence, a reading his "temporal succession" invites, and his judgment that one order is the "true formula" rests on doctrine and frequency, not on the texts that state a movement. A further section follows the Latin narrowing of *tropologia* from figurative reading in general to the moral sense, which is visible inside Jerome, as de Lubac notes. In the Greek windows read (Migne's PG 1–82 less eleven tomes, with a few later works: about fourteen million words), three of the terms stand together twelve times and four never, and Gregory of Nyssa declines to choose between "anagogy, tropology or allegory". Migne's modern Latin sometimes supplies the "spiritual sense" itself, place by place. Whether exegesis performed the four senses on one verse, rather than stating them, was not tested beyond the two performances in hand, Cassian's Jerusalem and Eucherius's heavens and waters.

KEYWORDS Henri de Lubac · four senses of Scripture · Jerome · John Cassian · Eucherius of Lyon · Bede · Gregory the Great · Origen · Gregory of Nyssa · Richard of St Victor · tropologia · Patrologia Latina · Patrologia Graeca

PROVENANCE

Question: Wilson Pruitt (human-prompted), building on his Scriptura `sensus` study: what does the whole shelf say about the four senses of Scripture when the passages are read and not only counted, and where does Henri de Lubac's history hold? The thesis direction of the revision (the order of the movement, with the narrowing of *tropologia*) was chosen by Wilson Pruitt from the three the editor's letter left open. *Scope and hunt brief:* Claude Opus 5.5. *Orchestration:* Claude Fable 5.2. *Coding:* the Stage A coding of de Lubac's notes, the blind double coding of the 269 census formulas, and the 68 readings of Patrologia Graeca pages are readings by Claude Opus 5.5; every number from them is labelled as such. *Source search:* three instances of Claude Sonnet 5.5, one shelf each (the birth of the Latin formula; the Greek; the statements de Lubac does not cite). *Source check and draft:* Claude Opus 5.5, which re-read the passages the argument uses in their files and added Aldhelm, Gregory's *Moralia* VI and *Homilies on Ezekiel* with Rabanus's copy, Heterius on the history of Christ, the three layers of Origen on Matthew, and de Lubac's own text at the places tested. *Revision:* Claude Opus 5.5, in two rounds (the editor's letter, then the editor's second read), which added Jerome, Ambrose,

the *Allegoriae* prologue in both its files, Adam Scot, the cellar of the *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus*, Honorius, Richard of St Victor, the *Moralitates in Cantica*, John of Salisbury, Paschasius, Rufinus's Latin of Origen on Genesis, *De principiis* IV.2.6 and *Contra Celsum* I at PG 11:693, and, in the second round, de Lubac's own record of these texts at *EM* I/1 150–152, 158, 165–166 and II/2 57–58. *Quotation verification:* script: every Latin, Greek and French run was tested 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 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

Henri de Lubac's *Exégèse médiévale* is the great modern history of how the Church read its Bible between the Fathers and the end of the Middle Ages, and its subtitle names its subject: the four senses of Scripture. Its thesis is not that medieval readers listed four senses, which no one doubts, but that the four are one. In its strongest form, stated in the chapter on the names of the senses, the quadruple formula is not built by adding new senses one after another. It is a development of the formula of two terms, letter and spirit, "the essential and primitive formula", reached organically by the analysis of the second term and "its bursting into three parts". The reason is theological: "everything comes here from the hiatus" between Christ's two comings, and given that hiatus the spiritual sense of the Bible, which was an eschatological sense, "had necessarily to divide into three": into what is fulfilled in Christ and the Church, what is to be done now, and what is still awaited.[1] He makes the claim, in his words, "even setting aside the few texts that can be considered an anticipation". The fourfold is in the Fathers "at least in the implicit state", and explicitly, but "in a dispersed state".[2] At the end of the work's first volume the unity is stated outright. The doctrine of the four senses "is completed and finds its unity" in eschatology; the passage from one sense to the next is temporal, logical and living at once; "the quadruple sense unfolds an organism"; "each sense tends to the other as to its end. They are therefore several, but they are only one."[3]

De Lubac did not count. He read, and his apparatus holds thousands of hand-picked passages. A census can now be taken of the shelf he read. The Scriptura study `sensus` ran a fixed list of Latin sense terms over all 5,276 works of Migne's *Patrologia Latina* in the Corpus Corporum transcription, and a matching list over Kraken OCR of Migne's Greek, and it coded de Lubac's own notes so that his citations could be set against what the census finds.[4] This article does what the census could not: it reads the passages the census counted, most of which have no English translation, and asks of each what the senses are, in what order, whose voice states them, whether they are presented as one movement or as a list of options, and what they are said to be for.

The book under examination is de Lubac's, as Milbank's was in the first article of this journal, and it is taken

1. De Lubac, *EM* I/2 416 (ch. VI, "La formule doctrinale"), OCR of the 1959 printing: «la formule essentielle et primitive»; the four-term formula is not obtained «par allongement en série», but «par l'analyse du second terme et son éclatement en trois parties». The reason, on the same page: «Tout vient ici du hiatus» «entre les deux avènements du Christ»; «le sens spirituel de la Bible, qui était un sens eschatologique, devait nécessairement se subdiviser en trois». *EM* is in copyright; it is cited here by volume and page, and quoted in phrases.
2. *EM* I/2 416–417, the sentence running across the page: «même en faisant abstraction des quelques textes que l'on» «peut considérer comme une anticipation, ce quadruple sens est déjà chez les Pères. Il y est au moins à l'état implicite.» Explicitly, but «à l'état dispersé».
3. *EM* I/2 643 («la doctrine des quatre sens s'achève et trouve son unité»); I/2 650 («Le quadruple sens déploie un organisme»; «Chaque sens tend à l'autre comme à sa fin»; «Ils sont donc plusieurs, mais il ne font qu'un», where the OCR has «il» for *ils*).
4. The study, its scripts and its counts are at github.com/wilsonpruitt/scriptura (`studies/sensus/`), with the site scriptura.wrootpress.com. Its sections 8–16 are the census, the formulas, the comparison with de Lubac's apparatus, and the Greek, Syriac, Coptic and rabbinic counts. The counts printed in this article were re-derived from its census and ledger files on 2026-11-25 (Appendix A), not copied from its prose.

in its strongest form.[5] That form sets limits on what a reading of texts can show, and they should be stated first. Some of his sentences are genetic: the fourfold is "already in the Fathers", implicit or dispersed; it runs through the Middle Ages in "two lists of different order" with named roots. These answer to the shelf. Others are logical and theological: the spiritual sense "had necessarily" to divide; "everything comes from the hiatus"; "each sense tends to the other as to its end". No reading of texts can show that the structure was or was not necessary, and this article does not try. What a reading can test is the warrant: whether the texts that state the senses carry the form the structure gives them. That is the question here.

He also anticipates most of what a census might seem to offer against him, and each finding below that he states himself is credited to him, not offered as a correction. He expects the patristic statements to be occasional, "almost always without didacticism". He records two lists of different order throughout the Middle Ages, one rooted in Augustine and Gregory, the other in Cassian and Eucherius "and already, less systematically", Ambrose and Jerome, and he notes that one author may use both orders "a few lines apart". He shows the Fathers naming the whole second sense now anagogy, now tropology, and he quotes Gregory of Nyssa's refusal to quarrel over the names. He grants, after Origen, that one or another sense may be missing from a passage, "as St Gregory and many others were to say". And he notes that the medieval theorists, down to Nicholas of Lyra, reduce the four to the two.[6] In one place he was right where the census was wrong (section 3). He found what no vocabulary census can find, schemes carried by figures with no sense-words (section 3). And where he quotes the Greek Fathers in Greek, the Greek bears him out (section 8).

The thesis of this article concerns the form of the warrant, and most of its evidence was assembled by de Lubac himself. Where the shelf states the four as one movement, the movement does not keep one order. Four such statements keep the classic order, history, allegory, tropology, anagogy: the feeding of readers by stages in the prologue of the *Allegoriae in universam Scripturam*, Adam Scot's near-copy of it, the cellar of the *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus* and Honorius's four kinds of faithful, whose authors de Lubac lists as witnesses of that order. Two depart from it, and he records both: Richard of St Victor ranks tropology lowest of the three higher senses, and the *Allegoriae* prologue, a few lines after its feeding, builds a house with anagogy as the roof and tropology as the ornament (section 10). What the reading adds is narrower than a correction. De Lubac suggests that the classic order suits "well-balanced architecture" and the other "perhaps" the soul's ascent; on these fourfolds the grades of readers keep the classic order and the buildings vary, though Jerome's threefold ascents fit it. The census gives the variation a measure: about one in five of the statements of theory that name both name tropology before allegory. And his sentence asks for no single order. He wrote "to the other", not "to the next", and the illustrations he gives on the same pages join the senses in pairs. A unity without a single sequence is what his sentence claims and what the texts warrant. They do not warrant a reading of his organism as a ladder, which his own "temporal succession" invites; and his judgment that one order is "the true formula" rests on doctrine and on frequency, not on the texts that state a movement. A further section (section 7) follows one word through that disagreement: the Latin narrowing of *tropologia* from figurative reading in general to the moral sense, which de Lubac notes and which is visible inside Jerome.

The other findings are measures more than reversals. In the Greek windows read, three of the higher names stand together once, in Gregory of Nyssa, and four terms never (section 6). Migne's modern Latin versions of the Greek sometimes supply the Latin "spiritual sense" ready-made (section 8). Of the eleven statements of

5. "What God Does Not Do: Abelard's Actualism, Its Medieval Answer, and John Milbank's Genealogy of Possibility", JMT 1.1 (2026), which read Milbank's *Beyond Secular Order* against the Latin shelf on the same method.

6. *EM* I/2 417: «s'exprime alors comme au hasard des circonstances, presque toujours sans didactisme»; I/1 198: «Tout au long du moyen âge, donc, deux listes d'ordre différent.», with Cassian and Eucher at the head of one «et déjà, moins systématiquement, saint Ambroise et saint Jérôme»; I/1 158: «un même auteur emploie tour à tour, en deux ouvrages différents, ou même à quelques lignes de distance, les deux ordres»; I/2 418: «Pour d'autres, c'est la tropologie; Origène encore avait usé du mot dans ce sens large», and «Tous consentiraient aux réflexions que fait saint Grégoire de Nysse»; I/1 199, of Origen: «il admet qu'en certains passages de la Bible l'un ou l'autre des trois sens peut manquer : c'est ce que devaient dire après lui saint Grégoire et beaucoup d'autres»; I/2 417: «jusqu'à la fin, ses théoriciens médiévaux reconnaîtront que la formule s'en ramène tout entière à la formule des deux sens fondamentaux. Témoin Nicolas de Lyre».

theory the census found that de Lubac does not cite, four are copies of texts he does cite; the six original ones are pairs, threes and a rule of restraint, and a seventh is a fourfold sermon built from received images (section 9). Section 11 names the question this article does not answer: whether medieval exegesis performed the four senses on one verse as often as it stated them.

2. The Shelf and the Method

The census. The Latin census counts 41 frozen sense terms in five families: letter (L), allegory (A), tropology or the moral sense (T), anagogy (N), and a general spiritual family (S). A "stated formula" is a place where terms of three or more of L, A, T and N stand within sixty words. There are 269 such places in the *Patrologia Latina*, and 85 of them name all four.[7] Each was then read twice, blind, by a model working from about 1,900 characters of the Latin, and coded by kind. Of the 269, 132 are statements of theory (they say how many senses there are, or define one), 68 are lists, 62 applications of the senses to a verse, 5 quotations, and 2 false hits. Among the theory statements the most common scheme is the canonical history–allegory–tropology–anagogy (34 of 132; 66 of all 269), and the Jerusalem of Galatians 4 is the most common teaching figure (16 of the theory statements, 27 of all).[8] One work is counted twice. The *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam* is held in two TEI files of PL 112, one headed "Auctor incertus (Rabanus Maurus?)" and one "Rabanus Maurus 780-856", with the same text, and the census found the same three places in each. The 269 places are therefore 266 distinct texts, and the figures just given become 84 with all four families, 131 statements of theory, 60 applications, 33 and 63 for the canonical scheme, and 26 for the Jerusalem figure in all; the others do not change.[9] Counts below give the distinct figure where it differs.

De Lubac's apparatus. His notes were harvested and each citation coded for what he cites it for: the role (theory, example, vocabulary), the senses it names, his stance. That coding is itself a model's reading of de Lubac's notes (Claude Opus 5.5, codebook R1–R7), and every number in this article that comes from it is labelled "Stage A". By Stage A, de Lubac cites the *Patrologia Latina* 1,843 times for a theory of the senses, at 1,360 distinct places. Of the census's 132 statements of theory he cites 96 for theory and 12 for another purpose; five more (four distinct) are cited by him within ten columns, eight belong to authors he cites for theory without a column, and eleven he does not cite at all.[10]

The reading. Three instances of Claude Sonnet 5.5 then read the passages under a written brief, one shelf each: the birth of the Latin formula (Cassian, Eucherius, Augustine, Gregory, Bede and the chain after Bede), the Greek windows and Migne's facing Latin, and the eleven statements de Lubac does not cite. Every Latin and Greek run in their reports, 127 in all, was tested by script against the file named beside it. The draft re-read every passage it uses in its file, and the draft and its revision added the places named in the provenance note. The Latin of the *Patrologia Latina* is the Corpus Corporum's TEI text, normalised to classical orthography.

7. `census/formulas.tsv` (269 rows; 85 whose families include L, A, T and N). The term list was frozen by Wilson Pruitt on 2026-11-10 (STUDY §8).

8. `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv`, columns `kind`, `scheme` and `example_figure` (Jerusalem counted where the figure field contains *Jerusalem* or *Hierusalem*). The coding is a model's (STUDY §9: two blind readings by Claude Opus 5.5, kappa 0.93 on kind). Two figures in STUDY §9 are stale: the scheme count and the Jerusalem count printed there are superseded by the counts given here.

9. `census/formulas.tsv`, idno 8925 and 8928, each with rows at the prologue (no column in the file's markers), 966b and 1036b; the headers are those of the two files (`8925.xml`, `8928.xml`). In `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv` the pairs are F236/F239 (prologue, both *theory*), F237/F240 (966b, both *application*) and F238/F241 (1036b, the farthing of n. 66, coded *application* in one file and *theory* in the other: the two blind readings did not agree on one text). Counted once, by dropping 8925: 266 rows; 84 with L, A, T and N; kinds 131 theory, 68 list, 60 application, 5 quotation, 2 other; L-A-T-N 33 of 131 theory statements and 63 of 266; Jerusalem 16 and 26. In `ledger/formulas-vs-lubac.tsv` F236 and F239 are both "theory, within 10 cols", so that group falls from five to four; the 96 is unchanged.

10. Stage A: `ledger/lubac-theory-vs-census.tsv` (1,843 rows, 1,360 distinct volume–column pairs); `ledger/formulas-vs-lubac.tsv`, column `lubac`, restricted to the 132 rows of kind *theory*. The Stage A coding of de Lubac's notes is by Claude Opus 5.5 under codebook R1–R7 (`model` and `codebook` columns of `ledger/claims-all.tsv`). The ledgers are kept locally because *EM* is in copyright; their findings, not their rows, are reported here.

The Greek is Kraken OCR of Migne's pages, and the Latin printed beside it is Tesseract OCR; both are quoted as they stand, with their errors, and the notes say so. De Lubac is quoted from an OCR text of the printed volumes, in phrases.

Two rules govern what follows. Each passage is assigned a voice: the author's own position, an objection, a quoted authority, or a borrowing; chains of copying are evidence of how the formula travelled. And absence is not evidence: "not cited" is a statement about de Lubac's apparatus as the ledger records it, and "not on the shelf" about the files on this disk, not about what either man read.

3. What the Count Cannot See, and de Lubac Can

The census asks for words. De Lubac asked for schemes, and some schemes have no words. When he says a passage names three or more senses, the census lands on a stated formula only half the time: 222 of 440 citations (Stage A).[11] For the other 218 citations, at 172 places, the study re-read the columns with the census's own term list to see why. About half are a rule of the census: they would be found if broader words (*moralis*, *mysticus*, *littera*) were admitted, or the spiritual family counted as a sense, or the window widened. But at 64 places (71 citations) the columns contain fewer than three families of sense-words anywhere, and de Lubac still reads a scheme there (Stage A).[12]

What he reads there are, in part, figures. The ledger's examples, again in a model's summary of his notes, are a cellar of four casks given to Ivo of Chartres (*EM* I/2 638 n. 1), Ambrose's shadow, image and truth (*EM* II/1 493 n. 1), and Origen's three ways of cooking a sacrifice reported by Thomas the Cistercian (*EM* II/2 34).[13] Read in their files, the three come out differently. Ambrose's is what the ledger says: three stages in time, with no sense-word, "First the shadow went before, the image followed, the truth will be. The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, the truth in heaven."[14] A census that counts *allegoria* and *anagoge* passes over it, and figures of this kind are de Lubac's own contribution to the history, counted only in the ledger of his notes. The cellar is not such a figure, and its locator is a slip in one note. At *EM* I/2 638 n. 1 de Lubac prints "PL, CLXI, 707-8", where the TEI of volume 161 holds Ivo's *Decretum*; elsewhere he cites the cellar at volume 159, where it stands, in the *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus*, which he assigns to Alexander of Canterbury, and at *EM* I/1 150 he quotes it as a witness to the classic order. It names all four senses. The census found it there and coded it as theory (F013–F014), and it is read in section 10. The cooking figure is not at the column the ledger gives for Thomas, and de Lubac's sentence gives it to Origen and Bede, whose texts were not read here.[15] So the 64 places are an upper bound on figured schemes; how many rest on a slip like this one was not counted. Section 10 argues that figures are where his unity is best founded.

11. Stage A: `ledger/lubac-theory-vs-census.tsv`, rows with `senses_named` = 3+ (440), of which 222 have `census` = formula. For de Lubac's citations naming two senses or one, the census lands 66 of 698 and 89 of 689 times, as it should: it never looked for them.

12. Stage A: `ledger/lubac-theory-misses.tsv` (218 rows, 172 distinct places), `cause` = no-terms: 71 rows at 64 places. Broad terms explain 60 citations, the spiritual family 25, the sixty-word window 27, a wider window 21; 14 fall where the column is not in the TEI.

13. Stage A summaries in `ledger/lubac-theory-misses.tsv`, rows em2-p274-n01-1 (Ivo, PL 161:707), em3-p497-n01-1 (Ambrose, PL 14:1051) and em4-p038-n00-5 (Thomas the Cistercian reporting Origen, PL 206:343); printed pages from `ledger/claims-all.tsv`. All three places were read in the revision; the ledger's "Ivo" follows the volume number de Lubac prints in that one note.

14. Ambrose, *Enarrationes in XII psalmos*, on "man walks in an image", PL 14:1051C: «Primum igitur umbra praecessit, secuta est imago, erit veritas. Umbra in Lege, imago vero in Evangelio, veritas in coelestibus.»

15. *EM* I/2 637 introduces the cellar as the text of «Alexandre de Cantorbéry»: «Son texte se trouve amalgamé au livre dit» *De sancti Anselmi similitudinibus*; and n. 1 on I/2 638 reads «PL, CLXI, 707-8» in the OCR and in the page image of the printing. That is a slip in one note: *EM* I/1 150 n. 3 quotes the cellar («anagogen, id est contemplatio») at «(PL, CLIX, 707 D, 708 D)», and four further notes of *EM* I/2 cite it at PL 159:708. The TEI at PL 159:707C–708D (`10652.xml`, headed Eadmerus Cantuariensis) has the cellar; PL 161:707–708 (`10721.xml`) is Ivo's *Decretum*. Thomas the Cistercian, *In Cantica*, PL 206:343 (`11703.xml`) has no cooking figure; the three cookings occur in the same commentary at 206:139B–C and 500A as three sacrifices of charity, not as senses. *EM* II/2 34: «in clibano, in craticula, in sartagine»: «Origène» and «Bède» «enseignaient encore à y reconnaître une indication du triple sens».

A second credit is owed before the reading begins. The census reports that the canonical order is first stated by Bede.[16] De Lubac knew a second witness. Aldhelm of Sherborne, whom the Corpus Corporum dates to 709, describes in his treatise on virginity a reader who ranges over the prophets, the laws, the Gospels "set out in the mystical commentaries of the catholic Fathers", and then "arranged by the little rules of the fourfold ecclesiastical tradition, according to history, allegory, tropology, anagogy".[17] De Lubac quotes the passage (*EM* I/1 147) and uses it, with Bede, to refute a scholar who had said in 1957 that Bede knew only three senses.[18] De Lubac gives Aldhelm's dates as about 640 to 709 and Bede's as about 673 to 735, on the same page. His dates allow that Aldhelm wrote first but do not show it, since the shelf gives no date for Bede's *De tabernaculo*, and the priority is not settled here (n. 60). What the census claims, that Bede states the order first, is therefore not shown, and Aldhelm is the census's omission, not de Lubac's. The census found the passage and coded it a "list", which it is, and so it never entered the theory statements from which the census's "first statement" was drawn. Aldhelm's words matter for the argument of this article in another way, taken up in section 5: in his day the fourfold was already, in his word, a *traditio*, an ecclesiastical tradition, and it stands beside grammar and chronography as one more thing a learned reader works through.

4. Jerome, Ambrose, Cassian and Eucherius: an Ascent, Lists, and a Seam

Jerome

De Lubac puts Jerome and Ambrose, "less systematically", at the origins of the same list as Cassian and Eucherius (section 1), and of the division of the senses by body, soul and spirit he says: "Before them both, St Jerome had said it."[19] The text he quotes is the twelfth question of Jerome's letter 120, to Hedibia, which reads 1 Thessalonians 5:23, Paul's prayer that spirit, soul and body be kept whole. After a first answer, Jerome begins again: "Otherwise. We are commanded, as Solomon says, *Describe them threefold in counsel and knowledge* … Threefold is the description in our heart, and the rule of the Scriptures. The first, that we understand them according to history; the second, according to tropology; the third, according to the spiritual understanding." Each is then defined. In history "the order of what is written is kept". In tropology "we rise from the letter to greater things, and whatever was done carnally in the former people we interpret according to the moral place, and turn to the profit of our soul". In the spiritual θεωρία "we pass to higher things, leave earthly things, and discuss the beatitude of things to come and heavenly things, so that the meditation of the present life may be a shadow of the beatitude to come".[20]

16. STUDY §9 ("The canonical L-A-T-N order is first stated by Bede (*De tabernaculo*, PL 91, 410 B)"), corrected here.

17. Aldhelm, *De laudibus virginitatis* c. 4, PL 89:106C: «evangelicae relationis dicta, mysticis catholicorum Patrum commentariis exposita, et ad medullam usque spiritualiter enucleata, et quadriformis ecclesiasticae traditionis normulis secundum historiam, allegoriam, tropologiam, anagogen, digesta, solerter indagando». The list continues with histories and chronicles («nunc priscas historiographorum fabulas et chronographorum seriem») and grammar («nunc grammaticorum regulas et orthographorum disciplinas»). The date 709 is the Corpus Corporum's (`data/author-aliases.tsv`, source *cc*).

18. *EM* I/1 147: «Bède (v. 673-735)»; «saint Aldhelm de Sherborn (Salisbury) (v. 640-709)»; Aldhelm knew, «dans un ordre différent de celui qu'avait donné saint Isidore», the «quadriformis ecclesiastica traditio»; and «Il est donc doublement inexact de dire» that Bede knew only three senses. De Lubac quotes Aldhelm from the MGH, not from Migne: his n. 5 cites «MGH, À. ant., 15, 491» and his n. 6 gives only a page, «(232)». That explains why the census–ledger match did not pair the passage (Stage A codes his two PL 89 citations, *EM* I/1 157 and II/2 24, for other purposes), and probably why his text reads «nonnullis» and «indaganda» where the PL TEI has *normulis* and *indagando*.

19. *EM* I/1 194: «la formule euchérienne est bien réellement calquée sur la division tripartite de la nature humaine en corps, âme et esprit. Il en allait de même, en fait, chez Cassien. Avant eux deux, saint Jérôme l'avait dit». He quotes the letter on pp. 194–195. His n. 6 on p. 194, given a few lines earlier for Jerome's "triple science", cites «Ep. 120, ad Hebrid., q. 12 (6, 162)» (a volume and page of the edition he uses, not the PL); his n. 1 on p. 195 sets the Ezekiel sentence beside the quotation. *EM* I/1 197, of Eucherius: «Il emprunte à Jérôme la division des sens fondée sur la division tripartite de l'homme».

20. Jerome, ep. 120, q. 12, PL 22:1005: «Aliter. Praecipitur nobis, Salomone dicente: Tu autem describe ea tripliciter in consilio et scientia» «Triplex in corde nostro descriptio, et regula Scripturarum est. Prima, ut intelligamus eas juxta historiam. Secunda, juxta tropologiam. Tertia, juxta intelligentiam spiritualem. In historia, eorum quae scripta sunt, ordo servatur. In tropologia, de littera ad majora consurgimus, et quidquid in priori populo carnaliter factum est, juxta moralem interpretamur locum, et ad animae nostrae emolumenta convertimus.

Four things follow. First, this is a threefold stated as an ascent, in verbs of rising and passing over: it is a movement, not a list. Second, its middle term is *tropologia*, and it is glossed as the moral sense. Third, its last term is eschatological: the present life is a shadow of the beatitude to come. That is de Lubac's reason for the division of the spiritual sense, the gap between what is present and what is awaited, stated in a Latin text that he places before Cassian, and it counts in his favour. Fourth, the voice. The passage is introduced by "Otherwise" as a second reading of Paul's verse; two more follow ("Many simply understand this place of the resurrection … Others wish to affirm from this place a threefold substance in man"); and Jerome then returns to his own reading, given earlier in the letter, that the spirit here is the Spirit's gifts: "But we, in the present place, as we said above", take "not the substance of the Holy Spirit, which cannot perish, but his graces and gifts".[21] As an exegesis of 1 Thessalonians, then, the threefold is one reading among several and not Jerome's own. As a rule for reading Scripture it is not distanced at all: it is a precept ("we are commanded"), called "the rule of the Scriptures", and nothing in the letter withdraws it. The rule is Jerome's; its use on this verse is an alternative. Whether it is Origen's reworked was not tested.[22]

Jerome states the threefold again in his commentary on Ezekiel, as a command: "we are bidden to understand the utterances of truth, that is the holy Scriptures, threefold: first according to the letter; second, in the middle, through tropology; third, more sublimely, so as to know whatever is mystical." The middle reading is a withdrawal "from the letter, a little, to higher things", and the example is Paul's muzzled ox (1 Corinthians 9:9); the highest is "the third, sublime and sacred understanding", the great mystery of Christ and the Church (Ephesians 5:32).[23] De Lubac quotes this sentence beside the letter and cites it again as the place where *tropologia* is, "sometimes however", the middle sense (section 7). Rabanus copies it into his own commentary on Ezekiel, another link in the copying chains of section 5.[24] Here too the three are an ascent. But the top of it is not eschatological: it is Christ and the Church. Within Jerome, then, the third sense of the ascent is once the beatitude to come and once the mystery of the Church.

Ambrose

De Lubac says that Ambrose "retains above all the first Origenian scheme, but also welcomes the second", and he gives places.[25] Two are read here. In the commentary on Luke, after reading the women of Christ's genealogy, Tamar and Ruth, Ambrose concludes: "We see, then, that history, morals and mystery agree in the commemoration of the women."[26] That is a threefold applied to one passage, in the order of the first scheme

In spirituali θεωρία ad sublimiora transimus, terrena dimittimus, de futurorum beatitudine, et coelestibus disputamus: ut praesentis vitae meditatio, umbra futurae beatitudinis sit.»

21. Same question, PL 22:1005–1006: «Multi simpliciter hunc locum de resurrectione intelligunt» «Alii ex hoc loco triplicem in homine volunt affirmare substantiam» «Nos autem in praesenti loco (ut supra diximus)» «non substantiam Spiritus Sancti, quae non potest interire, sed gratias ejus donationesque accipimus».

22. That question can be answered only from de Lubac, not from the shelf. He holds that Jerome adopts, as the occasion serves, one or the other of Origen's two schemes, that he "never ceased to the end" to use Origen's writings massively "and to keep their categories", and he lists this question of the letter as the long exposition of the anthropological and scriptural trichotomy. The Greek page that bears on it is *De principiis* IV.2.4–6, read in section 6. *EM* I/1 213. The verb of the sentence on Jerome is garbled in the OCR and was read from the page image of the printing («adopte»); the rest: «suivant l'occasion, l'un ou l'autre schème»; «il n'a cessé jusqu'au bout d'utiliser les écrits origéniens d'une façon massive» «et d'en retenir les catégories». N. 4: «La trichotomie anthropologique et scripturaire est longuement exposée, Ep. 120, c. XII».

23. Jerome, *Commentaria in Ezechielem* V, on Ezek 16, PL 25:147C–148A: «Et jubetur nobis, ut eloquia veritatis, id est, Scripturas sanctas, intelligamus tripliciter. Primum, juxta litteram; secundo, medie per tropologiam; tertio, sublimius, ut mystica quaeque noscamus.» «Medie autem et juxta tropologiam, quando recedimus a littera, et paululum ad altiora conscendimus» «Extrema autem, id est, tertia et sublimis sacraque intelligentia». *EM* I/1 195 n. 1 quotes the first sentence.

24. Rabanus, *Commentaria in Ezechielem*, PL 110:683C: «et jubetur nobis ut eloquia veritatis, id est Scripturas sanctas, intelligamus tripliciter: primum juxta litteram, secundo medie per tropologiam, tertio sublimius, ut mystica quaeque noscamus.»

25. *EM* I/1 213: «Saint Ambroise» «retient surtout le premier schème origénien», «mais accueille aussi le second»; n. 2 cites *In Luc.* III, 35 («historia, mores, mysterium») and *De Isaac et anima* at PL 14:508C.

26. Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam* III.35, PL 15:1603C: «Videmus igitur mulierum commemorationi historiam, mores, mysterium convenire.» The TEI's column markers give 1603C; the number «1327» printed inside the same sentence is the Benedictine edition's page kept in the text. De Lubac cites the passage by book and section from the *Sources chrétiennes* edition.

(morals before mystery), and stated as a summary of what has just been read, not as a rule or a movement. *De Isaac et anima* gives three phrases of a verse of the Song three qualities of the Word, regal, moral and mystical, as a list.[27] The preface of the Luke commentary is a threefold of wisdom from "the philosophers of this world",[28] the parallel de Lubac calls "a search made afterwards".[29] On this reading Ambrose names the senses in threes, applied to passages, and does not state them as a movement. His shadow, image and truth (section 3) is the one place read here where he sets three stages in sequence, and it names no sense.

Cassian

Cassian's fourteenth Conference states the four senses the Middle Ages kept, and de Lubac sets it, with Eucherius, at the head of his second list. Cassian puts it in the mouth of Abba Nesteros, speaking to Cassian and Germanus. The voice is Cassian's own, staged as an elder's. The frame comes first. The knowledge of religion is twofold: "practical, that is active, which is perfected by the amendment of morals and the purging of vices", and "theoretical, which consists in the contemplation of divine things and the knowledge of the most sacred senses". The practical comes first, and without it "that theoretical purity cannot be grasped", which is reached only "after many stipends of works and labours".[30] Then the theoretical is divided: "into two parts, historical interpretation and spiritual understanding". And the spiritual understanding is divided again: "the kinds of spiritual knowledge are tropology, allegory, anagoge", with Proverbs 22:20 as warrant, "write them for yourself threefold upon the breadth of your heart".[31]

The four, then, are history plus three spiritual kinds, and the warrant for the three is a verse that says "threefold". The famous example follows: "So the four figures just named flow together into one, if we wish, so that one and the same Jerusalem can be understood in four ways: by history the city of the Jews, by allegory the Church of Christ, by anagoge that heavenly city of God which is the mother of us all, by tropology the soul of man, which is often either rebuked or praised by the Lord under this name."[32] A second warrant follows the first. Paul's four words in 1 Corinthians 14:6 (revelation, knowledge, prophecy, doctrine) are mapped one by one onto allegory, tropology, anagogy and the plain order of history, each with its own example: revelation "belongs to allegory", prophecy "means anagoge, by which the speech is carried over to things invisible and future", knowledge "is tropology", which "contains the moral understanding".[33]

The chapter divides the theoretical into two, history and spiritual understanding, and the spiritual into three. That is the shape de Lubac describes, the second term split in three, and Cassian is his best Latin text for

27. On the Song's "where do you feed, where do you rest at noon?": "*Where do you feed?* because the Word of God is regal; *where do you rest*, because moral; *at noon*, because mystical." Ambrose, *De Isaac et anima*, n. 14, PL 14:508C: «Recte dicit: Ubi pascis? quia regale est Dei Verbum: Ubi manes, quia morale: In meridiano, quia mysticum.»

28. The wisdom is "natural, moral or rational", held highest by the philosophers, and Ambrose finds it in the Old Testament, in the patriarchs' three wells and Solomon's three books. Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam*, prologue 2, PL 15:1529A: «Tria sunt enim quae philosophi mundi istius praecellentissima putaverunt, triplicem scilicet esse sapientiam, quod aut naturalis sit, aut moralis, aut rationabilis. Haec tria jam et in veteri Testamento potuimus advertere.»

29. De Lubac says that neither the number nor the order of Eucherius's senses depends on it. *EM* I/1 194: «c'était là une recherche faite après coup. Ni le nombre ni l'ordre des sens énumérés par Eucher n'en dépendent».

30. Cassian, *Collationes* XIV, c. 1, PL 49:955A: «Cujus quidem duplex est scientia. Prima practice, id est, actualis, quae emendatione morum et vitiorum purgatione perficitur; altera theorice, id est, quae in contemplatione divinarum rerum et sacratissimorum sensuum cognitione consistit.» C. 9, PL 49:965C–966A: «Absque hac namque illa quam diximus theoretica puritas non potest apprehendi, quam hi tantum, qui non aliorum docentium verbis, sed propriorum actuum virtute perfecti sunt, post multa operum ac laborum stipendia».

31. Cassian, *Collationes* XIV.8, PL 49:962B–C: «Theoretice vero in duas dividitur partes, id est, in historicam interpretationem, et intelligentiam spiritalem.» «Spiritalis autem scientiae genera sunt, tropologia, allegoria, anagoge; de quibus in Proverbiis ita dicitur, Tu autem describe tibi ea tripliciter, super latitudinem cordis tui (Prov. XXII)».

32. Cassian, *Collationes* XIV.8, PL 49:963–964A: «Igitur praedictae quatuor figurae in unum ita si volumus confluunt, ut una atque eadem Jerusalem quadrifariam possit intelligi: secundum historiam civitas Judaeorum, secundum allegoriam Ecclesia Christi, secundum anagogen civitas Dei illa coelestis quae est mater omnium nostrum; secundum tropologiam anima hominis, quae frequenter hoc nomine aut increpatur, aut laudatur a Domino.»

33. Cassian, *Collationes* XIV.8, PL 49:964A–965B: «Revelatio namque ad allegoriam pertinet, per quam ea quae tegit historica narratio spirituali sensu et expositione reserantur»; «Item prophetia, quam tertio Apostolus intulit loco, anagogen sonat, per quam ad invisibilia ac futura sermo transfertur»; «Quae ratio, ut dictum est, moralem continet intellectum.»

it. What kind of division is it? Cassian gives it two warrants, and both are numbers: Proverbs' "threefold" for the three spiritual kinds, and Paul's four words for the four. He gives no reason in the history of salvation for there being three. Yet his anagoge is defined by the future, speech "carried over to things invisible and future" (n. 33), as Jerome's third sense is the beatitude to come. So the eschatological element that de Lubac makes the cause of the split is present in Cassian as the content of one sense, not as the reason for the number. On that point Jerome's letter is closer to de Lubac than Cassian's chapter.

Two features of the chapter tell against reading its four as a single sequence. The order is not fixed: within one chapter the spiritual kinds are named tropology, allegory, anagoge, and the Jerusalem example runs history, allegory, anagoge, tropology, with the moral sense last. And the phrase that sounds like de Lubac's unity, "flow together into one", says that the four readings meet in one referent, the name Jerusalem, and it adds "if we wish". It does not say that each reading depends on the one before. The Pauline mapping is a list too: four kinds of speech, each with its text, and no dependence among them stated. The first feature is the one de Lubac himself records, two orders "a few lines apart" (section 1); section 10 measures it.

There is a movement in Cassian, and it is not in the senses. It is in the reader. The practical life comes first and is the condition of the theoretical; spiritual knowledge is a purity of heart earned by labour. The ladder is the monk's, and the senses are the rooms he can enter at the top of it. This is a real unity, and section 10 returns to it, but it is a unity of the knower's ascent, and the chapter that states the senses lays them out as kinds.

Cassian claims no Greek source for the senses; de Lubac, after Courcelle, traces the division of knowledge to Evagrius, who is not on the Latin shelf.[34] The warrant Cassian offers is scriptural, and the verse of Proverbs is shared with Jerome, Origen's *De principiis* and Rufinus's Latin of Origen on Genesis;[35] the authority he claims is the desert's, an elder of Panephysis.[36]

Eucherius

Eucherius of Lyon, who borrows from Cassian (below), prefaces his *Formulae of Spiritual Understanding* with a theory of the senses, and it is a threefold. "The body of Holy Scripture, as is handed down, is in the letter or history; the soul is in the moral sense, which is called tropic; the spirit in the higher understanding, which is called anagoge." The learned, he says, have treated Scripture "according to history, according to tropology, according to anagoge". Each has a use: history "inculcates the truth of deeds", tropology "refers the mystical understandings to the amendment of life", anagoge "leads to the more sacred secrets of heavenly figures". Then a sentence that does not join the others: "There are also some who think allegory should be added in fourth place in this kind of knowledge, claiming that it has set forth the narrative of deeds as a shadow of things to come."[37]

34. The hunter searched the whole of the fourteenth Conference for any naming of the Greeks and found one, a gloss on 1 Timothy 6:20, unrelated; the Greek-derived words (*practice*, *theorice*, *tropologia*, *anagoge*) stand in Latin dress with no author named. De Lubac's link is a modern scholar's (Courcelle, p. 218): *EM* I/1 197 n. 7, comparing Eucherius with PL 49:954–5: «L'idée venait d'Evagre», with a reference to Courcelle, p. 218. Evagrius's Greek was not searched for this article (Appendix A).

35. Proverbs for the three, Paul for the four. Jerome builds his threefold on the verse (above); Origen's *De principiis* reads it into three levels of reader (section 6); and Rufinus's Latin of Origen's seventeenth homily on Genesis reads it as "twofold and threefold", and adds the moral reading "now also" after history and the mystical sense, so that students learn "what they themselves ought to do". That is Rufinus's text, not proof of Origen's Greek. Origen, *Homiliae in Genesim* XVII, in Rufinus's Latin (the series is headed «INTERPRETE RUFINO» in the OCR of PG 12), PG 12:261–262 by the running-head map (`pg012/p-0148.txt`; Tesseract OCR): «Describe hac tibi dupliciter et tripliciter in corde tuo» (*haec*); «descripsimus, id est secundum historiam et secundum mysticum intellectum, nunc in quantum recipere locus potest, etiam moralem in eo discutere sermonem : ut Scripturam studiosi, non solum quid in aliis, vel ab aliis gestum sit, sed etiam ipsi intra sé quid gerere debeant doceantur».

36. Cassian names no Eastern master; he sets the teaching in the mouth of an elder he places among the oldest anchorites of the region of Panephysis. *Collationes* XI.3, PL 49:850A–B, on the journey to «Panephysim»: «tres senes, id est, Chaeremon, Nesteros et Joseph, anachoretae antiquissimi consistebant». Conference XIV is headed «Quae est prima abbatis Nesterotis» (PL 49:953).

37. Eucherius, *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae*, praefatio, PL 50:727C–728C: «Corpus ergo Scripturae sacrae, sicut traditur, in littera sive historia: est anima in morali sensu, qui tropicus dicitur; spiritus in superiore intellectu, qui anagoge appellatur.» «Quam tripartitam doctrinae disputationem non adeo abhorret illa nostrorum in disputatione distinctio, qua docti quique hanc coelestem Scripturarum philosophiam secundum historiam, secundum tropologiam, secundum anagogen disserendam putarunt.» «Quapropter historia veritatem

The voice is Eucherius reporting others twice over: "as is handed down", "the learned have thought", "there are also some who think". The scheme he sets out is the three, and it is a movement by analogy, body, soul and spirit, which de Lubac says he takes from Jerome (above). The fourth is reported as another party's addition, and it is allegory, the sense that de Lubac calls the sense of faith and makes the hinge of the whole. Then Eucherius uses it. His own example, "so that these things may be shown more fully by examples set beneath", runs all four: "heaven according to history is this which we look upon, according to tropology the heavenly life; the waters according to allegory baptism, according to anagoge the angels."[38] He states three and exemplifies four. De Lubac saw both halves. "The join is clumsy," he writes, "or rather it is not even attempted," though the sentence that follows "sketches a concordist attempt, rather poor"; and he takes the addition to be the moment "the whole Christian reality" enters into daylight.[39] The seam is evidence about how one early writer received the fourth sense: as an addition made by others, which he then put to use, in an order (history, tropology, allegory, anagoge) that is neither his three nor Cassian's. De Lubac says the four-term formula was not obtained "by lengthening in series", but organically, by the analysis of the second term. That is a claim about logical structure, and a seam in one witness does not refute it. What the seam shows is that the earliest Latin witness after Cassian did not receive the four as an unfolding: he received three, and a fourth reported as added "in fourth place". A further sign that the names were not yet fixed is the preface's first page, where Eucherius says that the whole of Scripture is "to be taken to the allegorical understanding", using *allegoria* for the spiritual reading as such, before he counts it as one of four.[40]

Eucherius's preface also takes over Cassian's frame almost word for word, without naming him: "all the discipline of our religion flowed from that fountain of twofold knowledge, which they called first practice, second theory", and the contemplative "is derived into two parts", historical disputation and the interpretation of spiritual understanding.[41] De Lubac says so: several of Eucherius's sentences on "the discipline of our religion" are in Cassian "almost word for word".[42]

Eucherius had readers. Heterius and Beatus, writing against Elipandus in the eighth century, copy his body–soul–spirit sentence and add one word, "angelic", to the higher understanding; Paulus Alvarus of Córdoba, in the ninth, quotes his preface by name as "blessed Eucherius, to be praised with great praise".[43] Neither takes up the appended fourth sense. What travelled from Eucherius was the threefold and its analogy.

nobis factorum ac fidem relationis inculcat. Tropologia ad vitae emendationem mysticos intellectus refert. Anagoge ad sacratiora coelestium figurarum secreta perducit. Sunt etiam qui allegoriam in hoc scientiae genere quarto in loco adjiciendam putent, quam gestorum narrationem, futurorum umbram praetulisse confirment.»

38. Eucherius, praefatio, PL 50:728B–C: «Haec vero ipsa ut subjectis plenius manifestentur exemplis, coelum est secundum historiam hoc quod intuemur, secundum tropologiam vita coelestis; aquae secundum allegoriam baptismus, secundum anagogen angeli», with Psalm 148:4 following.

39. *EM* I/1 198: «Le raccord est maladroit, ou plutôt il n'est même pas tenté, quoique la phrase qui suit esquisse une tentative concordiste, assez pauvre»; by the addition, he says, «toute la réalité chrétienne» comes into the open. The phrase «par allongement en série» is in the main text of *EM* I/2 416, quoted in the first note of this article.

40. Eucherius, praefatio, PL 50:727A: «Universam porro Scripturam tam veteris Instrumenti quam novi, ad intellectum allegoricum esse sumendum».

41. Eucherius, praefatio, PL 50:728C–D: «Omnis autem disciplina nostrae religionis ex illo duplicis scientiae fonte manavit: cujus primam practicen, secundam theoricen vocaverunt, id est actualem, et contemplativam.» Compare Cassian XIV.8, PL 49:962B: «Theoretice vero in duas dividitur partes, id est, in historicam interpretationem, et intelligentiam spiritalem.»

42. *EM* I/1 197: Eucherius's phrases on the «disciplina nostrae religionis» «se trouvent chez Cassien presque ad verbum».

43. Heterius and Beatus, *Ad Elipandum* I, c. 104, PL 96:958A: «Et anima in morali sensu qui tropicus dicitur; spiritus vero in superiore intellectu angelico, qui anagoge appellatur.» Eucherius, PL 50:728A: «est anima in morali sensu, qui tropicus dicitur; spiritus in superiore intellectu, qui anagoge appellatur.» Alvarus, ep. 5, PL 121:450D: «Recte itaque procuratum est, ut ait beatus, laude egregia praedicandus, Eucherius, ut illa eloquiorum castitas a promiscuis cunctorum oculis abdito suo quasi quodam velamine pudicitiae contegeretur». Alvarus's own reading is a pair: the silvered wings of the dove against its golden back.

5. Augustine, Gregory and Bede: Other Quartets, Optional Threes, a Table with Two Sets of Feet

Augustine's quartet that nobody kept

Augustine had a fourfold too, and it is a different one. In *De utilitate credendi*, writing to Honoratus, he says that the Old Testament "is handed down fourfold to those who wish to know it diligently: according to history, according to aetiology, according to analogy, according to allegory". He apologises for the Greek: "So that you do not think me foolish for using Greek names: first because I received it so, and I dare not pass it on to you otherwise than I received it." History is what was written or done; aetiology, why it was done or said; analogy, that the two Testaments do not contradict each other; allegory, that some things are to be understood figuratively.[44] In the unfinished literal commentary on Genesis the same four appear "handed down by certain treaters of the Scriptures", with names that "can be pronounced in Greek but in Latin must be defined", in another order: history, allegory, analogy, aetiology.[45]

So the one Latin Father on the shelf who claims a Greek source for a fourfold claims it for a fourfold that did not survive. It is a list of the interpreter's tasks (explain, give causes, show the harmony of the Testaments, find figures), each with its proof from Christ and the apostles, set out to defend the Old Testament against the Manichees. It is not ordered by depth, and it does not recur. A search of all 5,276 Latin files for *aetiolog-* and *etiolog-* finds the word in five: Augustine's two, and Cassiodorus, Isidore and Rabanus, where it is a figure of rhetoric, "the giving back of a cause".[46] De Lubac treats this quartet fully (*EM* I/1 178–181), notes that it was "often taken as source of the four senses", and records the late-medieval effort, in Alfonso Tostado, to reconcile it with the classic four (Stage A).[47] The shelf adds only the negative: no medieval Latin text on it takes the quartet up as a scheme of senses.

But one Augustinian quartet did survive, and by a route that the census could not see. The mature *De Genesi ad litteram* opens: "In all the holy books one must look at what eternal things are conveyed there, what deeds are narrated, what future things foretold, what things to be done are commanded or advised."[48] These are four kinds of content, not four senses. Bede will set this sentence under the four feet of a table, beside the four senses, and the two quartets will travel together for three centuries.

Gregory's three, when needed

Gregory the Great's letter to Leander, which prefaces the *Moralia*, is the other root de Lubac names for the Latin tradition, and its three are stated as a building. "First we lay the foundations of history; next by typical signification we raise the structure of the mind into a citadel of faith; last, through the grace of morality, we clothe the building, as with a colour spread over it." The building is a figure of dependence: foundation, walls, colour. But the sentence before it makes the three optional: "some things we pass over by historical exposition, and some by allegory we examine with typical investigation; some we discuss only by the instruments of

44. Augustine, *De utilitate credendi* 3.5, PL 42:68: «Omnis igitur Scriptura, quae Testamentum Vetus vocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifaria traditur; secundum historiam, secundum aetiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam.» «Ne me ineptum putes, graecis nominibus utentem. Primum quia sic accepi, nec tibi hoc aliter audeo intimare quam accepi.» «Secundum analogiam, cum demonstratur non sibi adversari duo Testamenta, Vetus et Novum.»

45. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus* 2.5, PL 34:222: «Quatuor modi a quibusdam Scripturarum tractatoribus traduntur Legis exponendae, quorum vocabula enuntiari graece possunt, latine autem definiri et explicari: secundum historiam, secundum allegoriam, secundum analogiam, secundum aetiologiam.»

46. Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*, ad Ps 15, PL 70:115C: «Quae figura dicitur aetiologia, id est causae redditio, quoties praemissae rei ratio decora subjungitur.» Rabanus, *Commentaria in Paralipomena*, PL 109:357A: «quae figura dicitur aetiologia, causae redditio.» Isidore, *Etymologiae*, PL 82:138D–139A: «Aetiologia est cum proponimus aliquid ejusque causam et rationem reddimus.» Rabanus's phrase is Cassiodorus's with *id est* dropped.

47. Stage A summaries of *EM* I/1 178 n. 1 (PL 42:68) and I/1 181 nn. 2–3, with an unnumbered note on Tostado, in `ledger/claims-all.tsv`.

48. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* I.1, PL 34:246–247: «In Libris autem omnibus sanctis intueri oportet quae ibi aeterna intimentur, quae facta narrentur, quae futura praenuntientur, quae agenda praecipiantur vel moneantur.»

allegorical morality; and some, examining everything at once more carefully, we search in three ways."[49] The order is history, type, morals; there is no anagogy.

The same conditional runs through the *Moralia* itself. At the opening of book VI Gregory reminds his reader that he serves the spiritual understanding, and adds that "when the use of profit requires it" he discusses the words of the history closely, and "when it is necessary, I embrace both together, so that allegory may put forth spiritual fruits which yet the truth of history produces from the root."[50] De Lubac cites this sentence for the organic unity of the senses (*EM* I/2 650 n. 5), and the image is his best: fruit from root. Gregory's grammar adds "when it is necessary". In his fortieth homily on the Gospels he goes further and reverses his own order on purpose. History must first be kept, then allegory sought; "but because allegory sometimes builds up faith, and history morality", he will speak to the faithful about allegory first.[51] The order is a teacher's order, and the teacher may change it for his hearers. De Lubac makes the same point in general: after Origen, he says, "St Gregory and many others" held that one or another sense may be missing from a passage (section 1).

Isidore states the dependence that Gregory figures. "The divine law is to be understood in a threefold way: first historically, second tropologically, third mystically … So we should hold the faith historically in such a way that we also interpret it morally and understand it spiritually."[52] Here, in a plain sentence, the later senses presuppose the first. It is a three, in the order letter, moral, mystical, which is not the order that won.

Bede's table

Bede gives the canonical order its classic image. The table of shewbread in the tabernacle has four feet. "The table has four feet, because the whole series of the divine utterances is divided in a fourfold way. For in all holy books one must look at what eternal things are conveyed there, what deeds are narrated, what future things foretold, what things to be done are commanded or advised." That second sentence is Augustine's opening of *De Genesi ad litteram*, word for word and unnamed. Then Bede begins again: "Likewise the table of the tabernacle has four feet, because the word of the heavenly oracle is usually received either by the historical understanding, or the allegorical, or the tropological, that is, the moral, or else the anagogical."[53]

So the table carries two quartets, joined by "likewise": Augustine's four kinds of content and the four senses. De Lubac saw the debt; Stage A summarises his note as "Bede takes Augustine's fourfold list as the fourfold way of understanding every word of scripture" (*EM* I/1 182 nn. 1–2).[54] What the reading adds is the form of the second sentence: "either … or … or … or else". The four are alternatives by which the oracle "is usually received",

49. Gregory I, *Moralia*, epistola ad Leandrum c. 3, PL 75:513B–C: «Sciendum vero est, quod quaedam historica expositione transcurrimus, et per allegoriam quaedam typica investigatione perscrutamur; quaedam per sola allegoricae moralitatis instrumenta discutimus; nonnulla autem per cuncta simul sollicitius exquirentes, tripliciter indagamus. Nam primum quidem fundamenta historiae ponimus; deinde per significationem typicam in arcem fidei fabricam mentis erigimus; ad extremum quoque per moralitatis gratiam, quasi superducto aedificium colore vestimus.»

50. Gregory I, *Moralia* VI.1, PL 75:730B–C: «Et tamen cum utilitatis usus postulat, subtiliter quoque 182 studeo historiae verba discutere. Cum vero necesse est, simul utrumque complector, ut spiritales fructus allegoria germinet, quos tamen ex radice historiae veritas producit.» The numeral 182 in the run is the TEI's trace of a Migne footnote. *EM* I/2 650 n. 5 quotes the second sentence (Stage A, em2-p286-n05-6).

51. Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia* II.40.1, PL 76:1302A–B: «In verbis sacri eloquii, fratres charissimi, prius servanda est veritas historiae, et postmodum requirenda spiritalis intelligentia allegoriae. Tunc namque allegoriae fructus suaviter carpitur, cum prius per historiam in veritatis radice solidatur. Sed quia nonnunquam allegoria fidem aedificat, et historia moralitatem, nos qui auctore Deo jam fidelibus loquimur, non abs re credimus si ipsum loquendi ordinem postponamus».

52. Isidore, *Sententiae* I.18, PL 83:578–579A: «Lex divina triplici sentienda est modo. Primo, ut historice: 165 secundo ut tropologice, tertio ut mystice intelligatur. Historice namque juxta litteram, tropologice juxta moralem scientiam, mystice juxta spiritalem intelligentiam. Ergo sic historice oportet fidem tenere, ut eam et moraliter debeamus interpretari et spiritaliter intelligere.» The numeral 165 is a Migne note number kept in the TEI.

53. Bede, *De tabernaculo* I.6, PL 91:410B: «Quatuor autem pedes habet mensa; quia quadriformi ratione omnis divinorum eloquiorum series distinguitur. In libris namque omnibus sanctis intueri oportet, quae ibi aeterna intimentur, quae facta narrentur, quae futura praenuntientur, quae agenda praecipiantur vel moneantur.» «Item mensa tabernaculi quatuor habet pedes; quia verbo coelestis oraculi, vel historico intellectu, vel allegorico, vel tropologico, id est, morali, vel certe anagogico solent accipi.» Augustine's sentence is quoted in n. 48.

54. Stage A, `ledger/claims-all.tsv`, em1-p188-n01-1 (Augustine, PL 34:247, *EM* I/1 182 n. 1) and em1-p188-n02-2 (Bede, PL 91:410, *EM* I/1 182 n. 2).

each then defined by its kind of speech, plain, mystical, moral or concerned with future rewards, and each with its own examples. Nothing in the passage makes one depend on another. Bede's other statement of the four, in *De schematibus et tropis*, files allegory under the tropes and says that "sometimes in one and the same thing or word" history, the mystical sense of Christ or the Church, tropology and anagoge are intimated together, as the temple is Solomon's house, Christ's body and the Church, each of the faithful, and the dwellings of joy above.[55] "Sometimes": again a possibility, not a rule. And the order differs from Cassian's: Bede puts tropology third, before anagogy, and in his commentary on the Song he repeats Cassian's Jerusalem with the moral and the anagogical swapped into that order.[56]

Bede, like Gregory, also counts three. On Sarah's three measures of flour he writes that "in Holy Scripture the sense of understanding is threefold, historical, allegorical and anagogical", and closes the passage with a test that is not a sense at all: "Let no one think he has rightly understood Scripture in which he could not find the establishing of charity."[57] On the three loaves of 1 Samuel 10 the three are tied to the history of salvation: the first reading of history, "fulfilled through the Law before his incarnation", and then the allegorical and anagogical sense which Christ himself "would open, by the act of the dispensation he had undertaken", the one fitting "the truth of present grace", the other "the beatitude of future life".[58] This is the one place in the Bede the hunt read where the senses depend on one another, and they depend on Christ: history before him, its fulfilment and its hope opened by him. De Lubac cites both passages (*EM* I/1 143 n. 1; I/1 147 n. 1).[59] They are close to his eschatological account. They are also threes.

Aldhelm's sentence (section 3) may put Bede's order in a different light. If Aldhelm wrote first, which de Lubac's dates for the two men allow but do not show, then Bede did not fix the order; he gave a received order its image and its definitions. The shelf does not settle which came first.[60] What it does show is that both men state the canonical order as something received: Aldhelm calls it a *traditio*, and Bede says the oracle is "usually" received in these four ways. Neither names a source for it, and the shelf supplies none.

The chain after Bede

From Bede the table went on by copying, and the copies are evidence of how the formula lived. Amalarius of Metz, explaining the four lessons of a baptismal liturgy, quotes it by name: "This teaching is signified by the table in the Mosaic tabernacle, which has four feet: because (as Bede in the book on the Tabernacle) the whole series of divine utterances is divided in a fourfold way."[61] Rabanus Maurus, commenting on Exodus, copies

55. Bede, *De schematibus et tropis* c. 12, PL 90:185B–C: «Nonnunquam in una eademque re, vel verbo, historia simul et mysticus de Christo vel Ecclesia sensus, et tropologia, et anagoge, figuraliter intimatur, ut: templum Domini, juxta historiam, domus quam aedificavit Salomon; juxta allegoriam, corpus dominicum». Bede names Gregory here, but only for the narrow use of *allegoria* of Christ and the Church: «sequentes exemplum doctissimi tractatoris Gregorii, qui in libris Moralibus, ea quae de Christo sive Ecclesia per figuram dicta, sive facta interpretabantur, allegoriam proprie nuncupare solebat».

56. Bede, *In Cantica* IV, PL 91:1142A: «item juxta tropologiam, id est, moralem sensum, anima quaeque sancta Jerusalem recte vocatur; item juxta anagogen, id est, intelligentiam ad superiora ducentem, Jerusalem habitatio est patriae coelestis». No Bede file on the shelf names Cassian or Eucherius (eight files searched by the hunter).

57. Bede, *Hexaemeron* IV, PL 91:168B–D: «Tria sunt autem sata ejusdem similae, quia in Scriptura sacra triplex est sensus intelligentiae, historicus videlicet, allegoricus et anagogicus»; «Neque ullatenus se Scripturam recte intellexisse quisquam putet, in qua institutionem charitatis invenire non potuit.»

58. Bede, *In Samuelem* II.2, PL 91:562A–C: «dederunt ei geminam Scripturarum interpretationem; ut post primam videlicet historiae lectionem, quae ante ejus incarnationem per legem completa est, ipse allegoricum quoque et anagogicum sensum, qui vel praesentis gratiae veritati, vel futurae vitae beatitudini congrueret, actu susceptae dispensationis aperiret.»

59. Stage A, em1-p149-n01-1 and em1-p153-n01-2 in `ledger/claims-all.tsv`.

60. The date of *De tabernaculo* is not given by any file on the shelf, so the relative priority of Aldhelm and Bede rests on Aldhelm's death-date alone, and is not settled here. De Lubac's dates, «v. 640-709» for Aldhelm and «v. 673-735» for Bede, are his (*EM* I/1 147), and they do not date the two works.

61. Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, c. 19, PL 105:1035A: «Hanc doctrinam significat mensa in tabernaculo Mosaico, quae habet quatuor pedes: quia (ut Beda in libro de Tabernaculo) quadriformi ratione omnis divinorum eloquiorum series distinguitur.»

the whole of Bede's page, Augustine's sentence and the four senses together, without a name.[62] An anonymous sermon in PL 177 abridges it: "The table has four feet, because the words of the heavenly oracle are taken either historically, or allegorically, or tropologically, or anagogically."[63] Cassian travelled the same way. Sedulius Scotus, in his collection on Paul, copies Cassian's Jerusalem clause for clause on Galatians 4, and Cassian's mapping of Paul's four words onto the four senses on 1 Corinthians 14:6.[64] De Lubac knew this chain as well: he groups Cassian's Pauline mapping with Rabanus's copy and an anonymous text in PL 59 in one note (*EM* I/1 191 n. 3, Stage A), and he cites Sedulius for the fourfold Jerusalem (*EM* I/2 646 n. 6).[65]

Two things follow from the chain. The first is that the Latin fourfold, between the fifth century and the ninth, is overwhelmingly a matter of a few texts copied: Cassian's chapter, Eucherius's preface, Bede's table. The copyists keep their source's order, Cassian's or Bede's, without remark, and none of them argues for it. The second is that the copied fourfolds are all lists. The image changes (a name read four ways, a table on four feet, and in the *Allegoriae* printed under Rabanus's name a farthing, the widow's two mites, read as "the fourfold understanding of Holy Scripture") but the logic of "either … or … or" does not.[66] The *Allegoriae* belongs to this chain only if Migne's attribution stands; de Lubac dates the work to the twelfth century (section 10), and its place here is open. What was copied as a movement in these centuries was a three, not a four: Rabanus copies Jerome's ascent on Ezekiel (section 4) and Gregory's threshold (section 10). Alcuin's confession of faith gives the logic plainly: a passage of Scripture is either historical, or allegorical, "or else composed of both", and "sometimes also a moral sense is drawn" from it.[67] The senses are properties of passages, some present here and not there.

6. The Greek: Pairs, and a Refusal

Twelve windows

If the four senses were a Greek inheritance, the Greek Fathers should state them. The Greek census, run with a term list built to mirror the Latin one, has now read Kraken OCR of Migne's Greek from PG 1 to PG 82, less eleven tomes in that range that have no scan, with a few later works: 14,060,062 words in the PG volumes, 14,387,075 in all.[68] Every statement about the Greek below is bounded by that range. It finds twelve places, on

62. Rabanus, *Commentaria in Exodum* c. 11, PL 108:147D–148A: «Quatuor autem pedes habet mensa, quia quadriformi ratione, omnis divinorum eloquiorum series distinguitur. In libris namque omnibus sanctis intueri oportet, quae ibi aeterna intimentur, quae facta narrentur, quae factura pronuntientur, quae agenda praecipiantur vel moneantur.» Where Bede has *futura praenuntientur*, the TEI of Rabanus reads *factura pronuntientur*.

63. Anonymous, *Sermones*, PL 177:1196D: «Mensa quatuor pedes habet, quia verba coelestis oraculi vel historice, vel allegorice, vel tropologice, vel anagogice accipiuntur.» The sermon reproduces Bede's definitions in other words: «Anagoge, id est ad superiora ducens, locutio est quae de praemiis futuris et de vita quae est in coelis, mysticis vel apertis verbis, disputat.»

64. Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea*, ad Gal. 4, PL 103:191A: «Quatuor figurae, ut historia, allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, hoc solo nomine quod est Hierusalem significantur. Nam secundum historiam civitas est Judaeorum; secundum allegoriam Ecclesia Christi»; ad 1 Cor 14:6, PL 103:155D: «In revelatione. In allegorico sensu, cum aliquid ex futuris revelatur»; «Aut in doctrina. Id est, in historia secundum litteram, ut est, In hoc enim vixit Christus, et mortuus est, et resurrexit, ut viventium et mortuorum dominetur, ubi nuda historia docetur.» The Jerusalem clauses are Cassian's (n. 32).

65. Stage A, `ledger/claims-all.tsv`: em1-p197-n03-4, –5 and –6 (*EM* I/1 191 n. 3: Cassian, Rabanus on 1 Corinthians at PL 112:130, and PL 59:155); em2-p282-n06-7 (*EM* I/2 646 n. 6, Sedulius, PL 103:197). De Lubac's column is 197; the Jerusalem passage in the TEI is at 103:191A.

66. *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam* (Rabanus in Migne's attribution; see section 10), PL 112:1036A–B, `8928.xml` (the same text in `8925.xml`): «Quadrans est quadripartita sacrae Scripturae intelligentia, ut in Evangelio:» [Mark 12:42, the widow's two mites] «quod sancta Ecclesia duo honorat Testamenta, in quibus quadripartita est intelligentia: historica, allegorica, tropologica, et anagogica.» The census coded this place once as theory and once, in the other file, as application (n. 9).

67. Alcuin, *Confessio fidei* III.36, PL 101:1079D–1080A: «Omnis enim divina auctoritas his modis constare videtur, ut aut historialis modus sit, qui nihil aliud nisi res gestas annuntiet, aut allegoricus, ut non illic possit ordo consistere historiae; aut certe ex utrisque compositus, ut secundum historiam et secundum allegoriam manere videatur. Nonnunquam et moralis sensus de divinis trahitur scripturis». Stage A records that de Lubac cites the same text once under the name of John of Fécamp (em4-p100-n02-3); Migne gives it to Alcuin.

68. `census/gr-formulas.tsv` (12 rows: PG 4 p. 290; PG 11 pp. 351 (two windows), 556, 559, 561; PG 13 p. 456; PG 14 p. 110; PG 21 p. 51; PG 44 pp. 191, 488; PG 61 p. 688). Word count: the `(words)` row of `census/gr-terms.tsv`, 14,387,075 over all Kraken Greek counted, of which

eleven pages, where three of the four families (letter, allegory, tropology, anagogy) stand within sixty words. Seven are Origen's, two Gregory of Nyssa's, one Eusebius's, one in the scholia on Dionysius printed under Maximus, and one in a sermon printed among Chrysostom's spuria. None names four. The hunter read each window with the pages on either side.

In every one of Origen's windows the several higher names point to one level. On the scribe of Matthew 13:52 he says that "it is above all the mark of the simple not to know how to tropologize, nor to understand the matters of the anagoge of the Scriptures", and asks for "the unfailing anagoge to the spiritual things, the history of what happened being kept"; then he sets the whole in two levels: the scribe is made a disciple "in the simpler sense" when he leaves Judaism for the Church, and "in the deeper" when, taking the introductions of the letter, "he climbs up to the spiritual things".[69] Of Moses he says that he saw "the allegories by anagoge of the histories written by him": anagoge qualifies allegory, and both stand against the histories.[70] Against Celsus, who blamed "those who tropologize and allegorize" the history of Moses, Origen answers in the same pair of verbs.[71] On Lot and his daughters he says that Celsus examined the story "neither according to the letter nor … according to the anagoge", and in the next lines calls the higher reading "the tropology of the passage": four of the census's terms on one page, naming two levels.[72] And he says the biblical histories were written "with tropology as their aim", using the word for the figurative reading in general, as Celsus uses allegory.[73] That the two verbs of the Matthew passage and the two nouns of the Lot passage name one level is this article's reading, and its reason is the sentences' own build. In the first, tropologizing and the anagoge stand together under one negation (the simple neither know how to do the one nor understand the other), and the passage then sets the whole in two levels, the simpler and the deeper. In the second, "according to the anagoge" answers "according to the wording", and "the tropology of the passage" answers "the history": one pair named twice.

The sharpest case is a passage outside the census windows, which the hunter found by searching for the formula "as to the anagoge". On the Samaritan woman, Origen reads Jesus's "you" and "we": "'You', as to the wording, the Samaritans; as to the anagoge, those who hold other opinions about the Scriptures; and 'We', as to the letter, the Jews; as to the allegory, I the Word and those formed after me."[74] Four terms, and to a reader who knows the medieval grid, perhaps four senses. But each pronoun has two referents, not four: wording and

14,060,062 in the PG volumes. The unread tomes (PG 67–69, 71–76, 78–79) are the columns absent from that file. This supersedes the "nine" of the *usus* essay §6. Not read, and relevant: the eleven tomes; Cyril of Alexandria beyond PG 70 and 77, the two tomes that the running heads (`patrologia/data/pg-heads/`) give to him; Evagrius; and two Greek texts de Lubac points to outside the range, Andrew of Caesarea («Cf., chez les Grecs, ANDRÉ DE CÉSARÉE, Sur l'Ap., prol.», *EM* I/2 416 n. 1) and Maximus, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* 37 («Quaest. ad Thal. 37 (PG, XC, 385 B)», *EM* I/1 197 n. 5).

69. Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* X.14, PG 13:867 (Kraken, origen-pg013 p-0456; OCR): «Καὶ ἰδιωτῶν γε μαλιστά ἐστι, μὴ εἰδότων τροπολογεῖν, μηδὲ συνιέντων τὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς τῶν Γραφῶν,» «ὡς εἰδέναι, τηρουμένης τῆς κατὰ τὰ γενόμενα ἱστορίας, τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ ἀπταιστον ἀναγωγὴν,» «κατὰ δὲ τὸ βαθύτερον, ὁτε, τὰς διὰ τοῦ γράμματος τῶν Γραφῶν εἰσαγωγὰς παραλαβών τις, ἀναβαίνει ἐπὶ τὰ πνευματικά, ὀνομαζόμενα βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.» Migne's facing Latin (Tesseract OCR) keeps the Greek word: «quzeque ad earum anagogen spectant, non capiunt» (*quaeque*).

70. Origen, *Comm. in Joh.* VI, PG 14:205 (Kraken, origen-pg014 p-0110; OCR): «καὶ δῆλον, ὁτι Μωσῆς ἑώρα τῶ νοῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ νόμου, καὶ τὰς κατὰ ἀναγωγὴν ἀλληγορίας τῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων παρ΄ αὐτῶ ἱστοριῶν.» Facing Latin (OCR): «liistoriarumque apud se scriptarum allegorias juxta anagogen vidisse» (*historiarumque*).

71. Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.17, PG 11:691 (Kraken, pg-011 p-0351; OCR): «Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑξῆς, κατηγορῶν τῆς Μωϋσέως ἱστορίας, αἰτιᾶται τοὺς τροπολογοῦντας καὶ ἀλληγοροῦντας αὐτήν.» «μόνοις δὲ ἆρα τοῖς τροπολογῆσαι καὶ ἀλληγορῆσαι δυναμένοις ἐγραψε». The Kraken text has for ἱστορίας. The voice in the first run is Celsus's charge as Origen reports it; in the second, Origen's answer.

72. Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV.45, PG 11:1101 (Kraken, pg-011 p-0556; OCR): «καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν Λώτ, καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας, οὐτε κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν ἐξετάσας, οὐτε κατὰ τὴν ἀναγωγὴν ἐρευνήσας,» «Τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς κατὰ τὸν τόπον τροπολογίας οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον νῦν λέγειν·» «Φέρε δὲ τὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀπεμφάσεως δι΄ ὀλίγων παραμυθησόμεθα.»

73. Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV.48–49, PG 11:1107 (Kraken, pg-011 p-0559; OCR): «καὶ ταῖς ἱστορίαις ὡς σκοπῶ τροπολογίας γεγραμμέναις, καὶ σοφώτατα οἰκονομηθείσαις·» Migne's facing Latin (OCR): «qua eo fine scripte sunt ut allegoriis explicarentur». De Lubac quotes this Greek and calls the Latin «bien traduit» (*EM* I/2 419 n. 6).

74. Origen, *Comm. in Joh.* XIII, on John 4:22, PG 14 (col. ≈446 by the facing Latin's marker; Kraken, origen-pg014 p-0219; OCR): «ὁσον ἐπὶ τῆ λέξει, οἱ Σαμαρεῖς· ὁσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆ ἀναγωγῆ, οἱ περὶ τὰς Γραφὰς ἑτερόδοξοι· τὸ δὲ» [«Ἡμεῖς»] «ὁσον ἐπὶ τῶ ῥητῶ, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὁσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆ ἀλληγορία, ἐγὼ ὁ Λόγος, καὶ οἱ κατ΄ ἐμὲ μεμορφωμένοι, τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐχοντες ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν λόγων·» The run begins after the lemma «Ὑμεῖς», which the file sets in guillemets. The facing Latin renders the two words for the letter differently: «Per voculam vos, quod ad expositionem attinet, intelliguntur Samaritani ; quantum vero ad anagogen, illi qui in Scripturis diversa a nobis sentiunt». The ledger records no citation of these columns by de Lubac.

letter are one level, anagoge and allegory another. A grid would have four referents for one word, as Cassian's Jerusalem has. Origen's sentence has two pairs.

Origen's own threefold, in the fourth book *On First Principles*, is not a grid either. One must write the meanings of Scripture "threefold" into one's soul (the same verse of Proverbs that Cassian used), "so that the simpler is built up from the, as it were, flesh of Scripture … the one who has risen a little, from its, as it were, soul; and the perfect … from the spiritual law", because "as the human being consists of body and soul and spirit, so also the Scripture".[75] The three are levels of readers, the simple, the progressing and the perfect, and a few lines later he says that some passages have no bodily sense at all. The names tropology and anagogy are not in it. It is a movement, and the movement is the reader's growth, as in Cassian.

De Lubac reads more in it. "The sequence history, moral, allegory (or anagogy), which will be that of Eucherius and Cassian, is already Origen's," he writes; Origen ties it to body, soul and spirit, whence a bodily sense for history, a psychic sense for morals, and a spiritual sense for allegory or anagogy.[76] The Greek of the next two paragraphs of *De principiis* bears him out. The middle reading, the "soul" of Scripture, has as its example Paul's muzzled ox, "written for our sakes" (1 Corinthians 9:9–10), a reading turned on the hearers' own conduct, and the same example Jerome gives for tropology "in the middle". The spiritual reading is the one that can show "of what heavenly things" the Jews according to the flesh served "a pattern and shadow", and "of what good things to come the law has a shadow".[77] So the order the Jerome–Cassian–Eucherius line keeps, the moral before the mystical, is on Origen's page, and so is an eschatological last term, the shadow of good things to come, which is the root of de Lubac's hiatus. On the Greek read here his genealogy of the order holds. What the page does not have is the names: Origen's tropology and anagogy, where he uses the words, name the one higher reading (above), and the moral meaning of *tropologia* is Latin (section 7).

Gregory of Nyssa declines to choose

The test case the census flagged is the prologue to Gregory of Nyssa's homilies on the Song of Songs, addressed to Olympias. It is the one Greek text in the windows read that sets three of the higher names side by side, and it does so to say that the difference does not matter. Whether one takes the Song's words as a parable, a dark saying or a riddle, "the contemplation through anagoge, whether one cares to call it tropology or allegory or anything else, we shall not differ about the name, only provided it has useful thoughts".[78] He goes on to show that Paul himself used several names for the same act, allegory for Abraham's two sons, "typically" for the wilderness, the muzzled ox written "for our sakes", the mirror and the riddle, and he concludes: "In all these different manners and names of the contemplation according to the mind, he points out to us one form of teaching: not to remain

75. Origen, *De principiis* IV.2.4, Greek of the *Philocalia* as printed in PG 11 (Kraken, pg-011 pp. 0187–0188; OCR): «ἵνα ὁ μὲν ἁπλούστερος οἰκοδομῆται ἀπὸ τῆς οἱονεὶ σαρκὸς τῆς Γραφῆς, οὕτως ὀνομαζόντων ἡμῶν τὴν πρόχειρον ἐκδοχήν· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ ποσὸν ἀναβεβηκώς, ἀπὸ τῆς ὡσπερεὶ ψυχῆς αὐτῆς·» «συνέστηκεν ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡ οἰκονομηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν δοθῆναι Γραφή.» The columns, PG 11:363–366, are from the running-head map (`patrologia/data/pg-heads/011.tsv`: p. 187 = cols 363–364, p. 188 = 365–366). The Latin of Rufinus, which the medievals read, could not be quoted continuously from the OCR, which interleaves it with the Greek.

76. *EM* I/1 198–199: «La séquence histoire — morale — allégorie (ou anagogie), qui sera celle d'Eucher et de Cassien, est déjà celle d'Origène. Celui-ci déjà la met en rapport avec la division tripartite de l'homme»; «d'où les noms de sens corporel pour l'histoire, de sens psychique pour la morale, et de sens spirituel pour l'allégorie (ou l'anagogie)».

77. Origen, *De principiis* IV.2.6, PG 11:367–368 by the running-head map (Kraken, pg-011 p-0189; OCR): «τῆς δὲ ὡς ἂν εἰς ψυχὴν ἀναγομένης διηγήσεως, παράδειγμα τὸ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ πρὸς Κορινθίους κείμενον.» «Πνευματικὴ δὲ διήγησις τῶ δυναμένω ἀποδεῖξαι ποίων ἐπουρανίων ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ οἱ κατὰ σάρκαΙουδαῖοι ἐλάτρευον· καὶ τίνων μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ὁ νόμος ἔχει σκιάν.» Kraken runs σάρκα and Ἰουδαῖοι together. In IV.2.4 the perfect are built «ἀπὸ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ νόμου» (pg-011 p-0187), «σκιὰν ἔχοντος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν» (p-0188).

78. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum*, prologue, PG 44:757 (Kraken, pg-044 p-0488; OCR): «ἢ ὡς παραβολὴν τὸ λεγόμενον, ἢ ὡς σκοτεινὸν λόγον, ἢ ὡς ῥῆσιν σοφῶν, ἢ ὡς τι τῶν αἰνιγμάτων. Ὧν τὴν διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς θεωρίαν, εἴτε τροπολογίαν, εἴτε ἀλληγορίαν, εἴτε τι ἄλλο τις ὀνομαίζειν ἐθέλοι, οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος διοισόμεθα, μόνον εἰ τῶν ἐπωφελῶν ἔχοι [το] νοημάτων.» Kraken has and for ἀλληγορίαν and ὀνόματος, and keeps Migne's bracket. Migne's Latin for PG 44 is not on disk.

wholly with the matter … but to cross over to the immaterial and intelligible contemplation."[79] The book, he says at the start, is a "hand-guidance" for the more fleshly "toward the spiritual and immaterial condition of the soul".[80]

This is the opposite of a grid, and it is stated in the first person, as Gregory's own position. It is also, in its way, a statement of unity: the many names are "one form of teaching", one crossing from the surface to the meaning. What it is not is a unity of four distinct senses. De Lubac cites the prologue for the "contemplation according to the mind" that Gregory practises and recommends, "pregnant with the whole Christian mystery", and he translates the sentence on the names as one to which all the Fathers "would consent".[81] The refusal is his evidence before it is this article's. In the *Life of Moses*, the other Nyssa window, the census's three terms are history, anagoge, and an adverb, "typically": "would it not be more reasonable, looking to the anagoge of the thought, even if something happened typically, to believe that the lawgiver sets out a doctrine through the events?"[82] Again two levels.

The remaining windows say the same thing in other settings. Eusebius describes the pagan theologians who "referred nothing to physical tropologies, nor allegorized the myths about the gods, but kept the histories to the wording alone": a pair, about myth.[83] The scholiast on Dionysius says that what Scripture says "symbolically or historically" holds "no bare history but a life-giving perfection", and that the Areopagite is "showing that anagoge and allegory are necessarily to be received": one reading, two names, against bare history.[84] And the sermon on the brazen serpent printed among Chrysostom's works gives a rule of restraint: "Flee the forced allegories: there is a time when the Scripture itself gives eyes to contemplation; there is a time when it itself teaches to tropologize. When, however, a bare contemplation or history lies before you, do not force the unattainable."[85]

Where the second term was split

De Lubac would not be surprised by any of this; on the names he says it himself. He calls the two-term formula "the essential and primitive formula", and he writes that for some Fathers the whole spiritual sense is anagogy, for others tropology, a word Origen "had used in this broad sense" (section 1). The windows give that account a count over the tomes read: the upper term named by several words, and in them not split into three. Gregory of Nyssa, the only Greek writer in the windows who names three of the higher names together, uses them as synonyms and says so. Origen's *tropologia* is figurative reading in general, used of pagan myth as of Moses, and in the Greek corpora the study counted no τροπολογ- stands within its 25-word window of the vocabulary of

79. Same page: «Ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τοῖς διαφόροις τρόποις τε καὶ ὀνόμασι τῆς κατὰ τὸν νοῦν θεωρίας, ἓν ὑφηγεῖται διδασκαλίας εἶδος ἡμῖν, τὸ μὴ δεῖν πάντως παραμένειν τῷ πράγματι,» «ἀλλὰ μεταβαίνειν πρὸς τὴν αὐΰλον τε καὶ νοητὴν θεωρίαν,»

80. Same prologue, PG 44:755–6 (Kraken, pg-044 p-0487; OCR): «ἀλλ΄ ἐφ΄ ὧ τοῖς σαρκωδεστέροις χειραγωγίαν τινὰ γενέσθαι, πρὸς τὴν πνευματικήν τε καὶ αὐΰλον τῆς ψυχῆς κατάστασιν,»

81. *EM* I/1 197 (OCR): «était bien réellement prégnante de tout le mystère chrétien», with n. 3, «In Cant. prooem. (PG, XLIV, 757)» (Stage A, em1-p203-n03-2). *EM* I/2 418–419: «Tous consentiraient aux réflexions que fait saint Grégoire de Nysse», followed by his French version of the passage, with n. 1, «In Cant., procem. ad Olymp. (PG, XLIV, 756-7)». The ledger's Stage A row for the earlier note did not record the later one.

82. Gregory of Nyssa, *De vita Moysis* II, PG 44:331–2 (Kraken, pg-044 pp. 0191–0192; OCR): «Πῶς ἀντινομοθετεῖ ἡ ἱστορία τῷ λόγῳ; Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐλογώτερον ἂν εἴη, πρὸς τὴν ἀναγωγὴν τοῦ νοήματος ὁρῶντας, εἰ καί τι γέγονε τυπικῶς,»

83. Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* II, proem, PG 21:91 (Kraken, pg-021 p-0051; OCR): «μηδὲν εἰς φυσικὰς ἀναφέρειν τροπολογίας, μηδ΄ ἀλληγορεῖν τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους, ἐπὶ μόνης δὲ τῆς λέξεως φυλάττειν τὰς ἱστορίας.»

84. Scholia on Dionysius, Ep. 9, printed as Maximus's, PG 4:567–8 (Kraken, pg-004 p-0290; OCR): «Οτι τὰ συμβολικῶς ἤτοι ἱστορικῶς τῇ Γραφῇ εἰρημένα οὐχ ἱστορίαν ἔχει ψιλὴν, ἀλλὰ ζωτικὴν τελείωσιν.» «Ταῦτα δέ φησι,δεικνὺς ἀναγκαίως τὴν ἀναγωγὴν καὶ ἀλληγορίαν παραλαμβάνεσθαι.» Migne's facing Latin keeps both words (OCR): «ostendens, necessario anagogen et. allegoriam admittendam esse». De Lubac cites the place (*EM* I/2 419 n. 10: «il faut nécessairement admettre l'allégorie et»). Migne's attribution is kept here.

85. Sermon *Contra Judaeos, in serpentem aeneum*, printed among the spuria in PG 61:753 (Kraken, pg-061 p-0688; OCR): «Φεῦγε τὰς βεβιασμένας ἀλληγορίας· ἔστιν ὅτε αὐτὴ η Γραφὴ δίδωσιν ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς θεωρίαν· ἔστιν ὅτε αὐτὴ τροπολογεῖν διδάσκει. Οταν μέντοι γυμνὴ ἡ θεωρία ἡ ἱστορία προκέηται, μὴ βιάζου τὰ ἀνέφικτα,» Kraken has , and for ή, ή and ἡ. The author is not identified on the page.

ethics.[86] The nearest case on this shelf runs across a page of *Contra Celsum* I. About forty words after "those able to tropologize and allegorize" (n. 71), Moses is said to have given "the multitude" of the Jews "no occasion of harm in the ethical place", and the few, who can read more intelligently, a writing not empty of θεωρία. The ethical is the level of the many there, and tropology belongs with the few.[87] A check run for this article over the Kraken text of PG 11–14 and 17 (3,636 pages) found no ἠθικ- within 200 characters of τροπολογ-, ἀναγωγ- or ἀλληγορ- on the same page, and one within 400, on that same page of *Contra Celsum*, where the pagan poets' "ethical discourses" are set beside Moses' laws.[88] The word's history is short: one pagan use in the classical corpus, a Stoic verb about Athena's attributes in Chrysippus, and 106 Christian uses, 82 of them Origen's.[89]

7. *Tropologia*: from Any Figure to the Moral Sense

The Latin word narrowed, and de Lubac says so. In Origen, he writes, *tropologia* is one of the names of the whole spiritual sense; Jerome "seems to have preferred" it in that broad sense, and he lists more than thirty places in Jerome's commentaries; "sometimes however" it is in Jerome the middle sense between the letter and the "sublime" understanding, and he cites the Ezekiel commentary. In the chapter on the two orders he warns that "one and the same word, *tropologia*, must be understood differently according to the place it occupies".[90] This section adds three things to his account: the moral gloss inside Jerome, the Latin habit of glossing the word, and one translator.

Inside Jerome. The broad sense is in Jerome's prefaces and asides. The eighth book on Isaiah returns "to discuss history and tropology together", after two books that gave "the allegory" of the fifth. The preface on Zechariah says that Origen, Hippolytus and Didymus wrote an exegesis that was "wholly allegorical", and that Jerome has "mixed the tropology of our own with the history of the Hebrews". On Habakkuk he answers a critic who will say that in expounding history he was "caught in the nets of allegory" and "mixed tropology with history". A letter closes a reading of Solomon's judgment: "Let these things be said under the cloud of allegory. For the rest, your prudence knows well that the rules are not the same in the shadows of tropology as in the truth of history."[91] In each, *tropologia* and *allegoria* name the same thing, the reading beyond the history. In the Ezekiel commentary the same word is the middle of three readings, and in the same commentary it is again the whole spiritual reading set against the history, the two "each needing the other".[92] And in the letter to

86. STUDY §14a, point 1, on `census/classical-kwic.tsv`, whose window is about 25 words on either side of the hit: no τροπολογ- hit stands near ἠθικ-. That window is the study's; it was not re-run here.

87. Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.18, PG 11:693 by the running-head map (Kraken, pg-011 p-0352; OCR), continuing a sentence begun on PG 11:691: «τῶν νομοθετουμένων Ιουδαίων διδοὺς ἀφορμὰς βλάβης ἐν τῷ ἠθικῷ τόπῳ, μήτε τοῖς ὀλίγοις καὶ συνετώτερον ἐντυγχάνειν δυναμένοις, οὐχὶ πλήρη θεωρίας ἐκτιθέμενος» (Kraken has Ιουδαίων without breathing). The census window at 691 stops before it.

88. Run on 2026-11-25 over `patrologia/raw/kraken/{pg-011,pg-012,origen-pg013,origen-pg014,pg-017}/text/`, accents and breathings folded, page by page (a match across a page break is not seen, which is why the passage of n. 87 is not counted). The one hit within 400 characters is pg-011 p-0351: «ἠθικοὺς λόγους νόμοις καὶ προστάγμασι» near «τροπολογῆσαι».

89. `census/classical-kwic.tsv`, forms beginning τροπολογ-: 107 hits, one pagan (Chrysippus, SVF II 910, `urn:cts:greekLit:tlg1264.tlg001.1st1K-grc1.910`), 106 Christian, of which Origen 82, the New Testament catenae 10, Eusebius 9, Justin 3, Clement 1, Epiphanius 1. Philo has none.

90. *EM* I/2 418: «Pour d'autres, c'est la tropologie; Origène encore avait usé du mot dans ce sens large, et il semble avoir eu les préférences, entre autres, de saint Jérôme»; n. 7 lists PL 24 and 25 places, among them «1328 D, 1418 À» in PL 25; n. 8: «Quelquefois cependant la tropologia est le sens intermédiaire entre la Zittera et la sublimis sacraque intelligentia» (*Zittera*, OCR for *littera*), citing «In Ez., 1. V, c. xvi (PL, XXV, 147-8)». *EM* I/1 169: «un même mot — tropologia — doit s'entendre différemment suivant la place qu'il occupe».

91. Jerome, *Commentaria in Isaiam* VIII, praefatio, PL 24:281A–B: «Sextus et septimus superiores libri allegoriam quinti voluminis continent, quod olim historica explanatione dictavi. Praesens opus, id est, octavus liber, ad coeptam interpretationem revertitur, ut et historiam et tropologiam juxta utramque editionem pariter disserat.» *In Zachariam*, prologue, PL 25:1418A: «sed tota eorum ἐξήγησις allegorica fuit, et historiae vix pauca tetigerunt» «historiae Hebraeorum tropologiam nostrorum miscui». *In Abacuc*, PL 25:1328C: «Ecce in historiae expositione dum nescis, allegoriae clausus es retibus, et tropologiam historiae miscuisti.» Ep., PL 22:685: «Haec sub allegoriae nubilo dicta sint. Caeterum optime novit prudentia tua, non easdem esse regulas in Tropologiae umbris, quae in historiae veritate.» Census windows: `census/formulas.tsv` F180 (22:685), F184 (24:281a), F185 (25:1328c), F186 (25:1418a); kinds in `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv`.

92. Jerome, *Commentaria in Ezechielem*, on the doors of the temple, PL 25:404B: «ut et in historia spiritualem habeas intelligentiam, et in tropologia historiae veritatem, quorum utrumque altero indiget».

Hedibia it is glossed as the moral sense: "in tropology we rise from the letter to greater things" and "interpret according to the moral place" (section 4). So the narrowing is visible inside one author, as de Lubac's notes imply; the letter makes it explicit, since its moral gloss is Jerome's own and de Lubac's note on the middle sense cites only Ezekiel. Which of these texts is earlier the shelf does not say. The census found four of the broad-sense passages and coded only the Zechariah preface as a statement of theory (F180, F184, F185, F186); de Lubac's list has two of them, Habakkuk and Zechariah.

The gloss. After Jerome, the Latin writers read in this article who define *tropologia* define it as moral. Cassian: tropology "contains the moral understanding". Eucherius: the soul is "in the moral sense, which is called tropic", copied by Heterius and Beatus. Isidore: "tropologically, according to moral knowledge". Bede: "tropological, that is, moral"; "according to tropology, that is, the moral sense" (sections 4–5). A Greek word in Latin needed a gloss; that the gloss is always the same word is this article's evidence that, for these writers, the moral meaning had become the word's fixed meaning. Gregory, the other root, does not use the Greek word in the passages read here; he says *moralitas*.

One translator. PG 13 prints Origen's commentary on Matthew in three layers on one page: the Greek, a Latin facing it, and beneath both the ancient Latin version, headed *vetus interpretatio*. On the epileptic boy of Matthew 17 the Greek says, "let us see, tropologizing, whom we can say the lunatic is". The facing Latin writes "tropologically". The ancient Latin writes: "let us see *morally* first whom we can say this lunatic to be".[93] A few pages earlier, where Origen says he has "not yet troubled to tropologize" the Transfiguration but has examined it "as to the letter", the ancient Latin has "since we have not yet touched any *moral* sense of this place, but have followed the simple understanding of the words".[94] The study's script, re-run for this article, finds the pattern across the span where the three layers stand together: the ancient translator never writes *tropologia* or *anagoge*, and writes *moral-* on fourteen of the eighteen pages where the Greek has τροπολογ-, while the facing Latin keeps *tropologia* and never writes *moral-*.[95] That is a finding about one undated translator. It is not how *tropologia* got its moral meaning: the translator never writes the word, and Jerome's letter and Cassian's chapter already gloss it as moral. What the layers show is a Latin reader of Origen taking his tropologizing as moral reading, as Jerome's letter and Cassian define the word. Rufinus's Latin of the Genesis homilies is a second witness of another kind: there the moral reading is added "now also" as a third, after history and the mystical sense, and it is not called tropology (section 4).

8. Migne's Latin and de Lubac's Greek

De Lubac read the Greek Fathers in Migne, where the Greek is printed beside a Latin version, and for most of the Greek works the Latin is not ancient: where an ancient version survives, as for Origen on Matthew, the page prints it separately (section 7). The dates of the modern versions were not established from the files for this article. The study placed 68 of de Lubac's Patrologia Graeca references on pages where Migne prints both, and had each read with the Greek and the Latin of the page and its neighbours, by Claude Opus 5.5 readers

93. Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* XIII, on Matt 17:15, PG 13:1101–2 (Kraken, origen-pg013 p-0577; OCR): «ἰδωμεν τροπολογοῦντες τίνα δυνάμεθα εἰπεῖν τὸν σεληνιαζόμενον εἶναι». Migne's facing Latin, and the *vetus interpretatio* below it (Tesseract OCR of the same page): «videamus quemnam esse lunaticum, proque eo rogantem illius patrem tropologice dicere possumus»; «videamus moraliter primum quem esse lunaticum hunc dicere possumus». Columns from the running-head map, `patrologia/data/pg-heads/013.tsv`.

94. Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* XII, on the Transfiguration, PG 13:1077–8 (Kraken, origen-pg013 p-0565; OCR): «Ἐπεὶ δὲ μηδέπω περιεργασάμενοι τροπολογεῖν τὰ Σ κατὰ τὸν τόπον, ὡς πρὸς τὸ ῥητὸν βασανίζοντες» (the Σ is a stray of the OCR). *Vetus interpretatio* (OCR): «Quia necdum moralem aliquem hujus loci contigimus sensum, sed simplicem verborum» (the next word, *intelligentiam*, is broken by the OCR).

95. `scriptura/studies/sensus/scripts/matthew_parallel.py`, run read-only on 2026-11-25 over PG 13 pp. 521–830 (293 pages; Greek 82,744 words in Kraken, facing Latin 66,451 and *vetus* 87,872 in Tesseract): Greek τροπολογ- 21, on 18 pages; facing Latin *tropolog-* 17, *moral-* 0; *vetus tropolog-* 0, *anagog-* 0, *moral-* 26, of which on 14 of the 18 pages. Page-level counts, not aligned passage by passage; the figures agree with STUDY §11.

working only from those pages; these are model readings of OCR text, and the article reports them as such. Where his point could be tested, it holds on the Greek in 43 references, holds partly in 7, and holds only on the Latin in 2; at 5 the cited column does not contain what he cites it for. Migne's Latin was judged faithful in 34 places, loose in 20, and to shift the sense in 5.[96]

His Greek is good. Where he quotes the Greek, the Greek bears him out, as at *Contra Celsum* IV.49 (n. 73) and the Dionysian scholia (n. 84). The two references that hold only on the Latin deserve care, and the reading here qualifies the study's account of both. In the *Selecta in Jeremiam* the facing Latin turns the neutral "those who hold other opinions" (τῶν ἑτεροδόξων) into "those who think perversely in faith".[97] De Lubac quotes the Latin phrase, but he also gives the Greek it translates in the same note (*EM* II/1 107 n. 1), so the reader is warned. The second case is the homily on the witch of Endor, where Origen says: "if it has something useful according to the anagoge, God knows … and if you inquire according to the history, what use to me is the history of Lot and his daughters?" Migne's Latin renders the pair as "by the mystical and hidden sense" and "by the series of the history".[98] De Lubac cites the column among "Origenian expressions passed into the Latin of Rufinus" (*EM* II/1 342 n. 4), in a note that cites the Greek homily together with *De principiis* IV, which is Rufinus's text.[99] Whether the Latin printed beside the homily is Rufinus's or a later version the files read here do not say, and the study's reading of the point as resting on the Latin is not confirmed here as a mistake of de Lubac's. What the page does show is that the Greek has neither "series" nor "mystical": it has the plain κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν and κατὰ τὴν ἀναγωγήν.

The wider pattern is the one the census predicted, but it holds place by place, not across the corpus. Migne's Latin sometimes makes the Greek "anagoge" into the Latin "spiritual sense". On Lot's daughters in *Contra Celsum* IV.45, "neither according to the letter nor according to the anagoge" becomes "with neither the literal nor the spiritual sense investigated", and the "tropology of the passage" becomes "this history taken in the tropological sense", two different Latin adjectives for two Greek near-synonyms.[100] In the Endor homily anagoge becomes the "mystical and hidden sense" (n. 98). But on Matthew X, John VI and John XIII, and in the Dionysian scholia, the facing Latin keeps *anagoge* (nn. 69, 70, 74, 84). So a reader of Migne's Latin will sometimes find the Latin "spiritual sense" in the Greek Fathers ready-made, and sometimes the Greek word in Latin letters, depending on the translator of the volume. The one place on this shelf where the three Latin senses are laid over Origen in plain Latin is the editors' own: a synopsis printed in the front matter of PG 12 opens, "The sense of Scripture is threefold: literal, moral, and mystical or allegorical", and then reads Origen's

96. `ledger/pg-greek-check.tsv`, 68 rows: column `lubac_on_greek` (holds 43, partly 7, holds-on-latin-only 2, not-found 5, n/a 11) and column `rendering` (faithful 34, loose 20, shifted 5, n/a 9). Method in STUDY §13. These are model readings, not checked passage by passage for this article except at the places quoted in nn. 97–99.

97. Origen, *Selecta in Jeremiam*, on Jer 3:6–7, PG 13:545–6 (Kraken, origen-pg013 p-0279; OCR): «τῶν ἑτεροδόξων οἱ λόγοι, καλλος ἐχοντες πιθανότητος, οὐ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐπιστροφὴν». Facing Latin (`pg013-latin.txt`, OCR): «quibus verba perverse in fide sentientium assimilantur, pulchritudinem probabilitatis, nen audientium conversionem habentis.» (*non*). *EM* II/1 107 n. 1 (OCR): «perverse in fide sentientium» «(traduisant : t@v étepoë6éuv,» where the OCR has garbled his Greek.

98. Origen, *Homilia in 1 Reg.* 28, PG 12:1014B (Kraken, pg-012 p-0524; OCR): «Εἰ μέντοι κατὰ τὴν ἀναγωγὴν ἔχει χρήσιμον, Θεὸς οἶδε, καὶ ὧ ἂν χαρίσηται τοὺς λόγους ἐκείνους ἐξετάζειν· εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ζητήσαις ἄν, τί γὰρ ὄφελός μοι ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς περὶ τοῦ Λωτ καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων αὐτοῦ;» Facing Latin (OCR of the same page): «Si sensu. mystieo, ac recondito, aliquam pre se fert utilitatem, Deus novit,» «Si vero secundum bistoriz seriem perquires,» (*mystico*, *historiae*).

99. *EM* II/1 342 (OCR): «des expressions origéniennes passées dans le latin de Rufin»; n. 4 cites «In Reg., h. 2, n. 19 (PG, XII, 1014 B). De princ., 1. 4, c. 2, n. 5 et 9 (314, 322)» (the OCR has "1." for *l.*). The study's reading (`ledger/pg-greek-check.tsv`, em3-p346-n04-4) codes the point as holding only on the Latin.

100. Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV.45, PG 11:1101, Migne's facing Latin (`pg-djvu/011.txt`, OCR): «nec litterali nec spiritali sensu investigato, illud» «nihil necesse est nunc dicere, quid hzc historia $968 sensu tropologico accepta doceat;» (*haec*; the "$968" is a page number run into the line). Greek in n. 72.

101. Editors' preface to a tome of the Benedictine Origen, reprinted in the front matter of PG 12 (`pg012-latin.txt`, OCR; no column read off a page marker): «Triplex est scripturae sensus, litteralis, moralis, et mysticus seu allegoricus,» «Hic corpus et anima unum eumdemque sensum, nempe litteralem, designant». The study names Delarue as its author (STUDY §11); the hunter reports that the passage itself cites Delarue's preface to tome IV, so its writer is probably not Delarue, which is left open here.

body and soul as "one and the same sense, namely the literal", to make his three fit.[101] That is apparatus, an editors' grid laid over Origen's pair.

9. The Eleven He Does Not Cite

Of the census's 132 statements of theory, eleven have no citation in de Lubac's apparatus at the column or within ten columns, and their authors are not among those he cites for theory without a column (Stage A). The study listed them as candidates and warned that the anonymous ones might sit in his notes under another name or edition.[102] The hunter read all eleven in context, searched the whole Latin shelf for earlier texts sharing their distinctive phrases, and checked the ledger for the same author or passage elsewhere. None is a false hit. The verdicts are in Table 1.

Census id	Author and place	Senses	Verdict
F002	Bruno the Carthusian, *Exp. in Ps.* 67:14, PL 152:957C	letter / mystical (= "anagoge")	uncited, no earlier source found
F006	Radulfus Ardens, *Homiliae*, PL 155:1899A	history or morality / allegory	uncited; image from Gregory
F022	Hildebert (attributed), sermon 70, PL 171:681A	history, allegory, tropology, anagoge	uncited; a cited twin at 171:634
F039	*Posteriores excerptiones* (Hugh?), PL 175:664B	history, allegory, tropology, anagoge	same work cited at 175:661 for another point
F080	anonymous sermon, PL 177:1196D	history, allegory, tropology, anagoge	abridges Bede's table (cited)
F094	Wolbero, *In Cant.*, PL 195:1035D	history, allegory, morality	uncited, no earlier source found
F095	Wolbero, *In Cant.*, PL 195:1036D	history, allegory, morality	uncited, no earlier source found
F097	Wolbero, *In Cant.*, PL 195:1150D	history, allegory, morality	uncited, no earlier source found
F195	anonymous (Cassiodorus?), *In Cant.*, PL 70:1077B	letter, allegory, morality, anagoge	the same sentence as Haymo, PL 117:321 (cited)
F217	Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea*, PL 103:155D	allegory, tropology, anagoge, history	copies Cassian XIV.8 (cited)
F269	Atto of Vercelli, *Exp. epist. Pauli*, PL 134:433C	allegory against history and morality	uncited, no earlier source found

Table 1: The census's statements of theory that de Lubac does not cite (Stage A), with the reading's verdicts.

Four of the eleven are explained by copying. The anonymous sermon in PL 177 abridges Bede's table, which de Lubac cites in five places (Stage A; n. 63). Sedulius on 1 Corinthians 14:6 is a four-line digest of Cassian's Pauline mapping, same words, same examples, compressed (n. 64), and de Lubac cites both Cassian's page and, for the same mapping, Rabanus and the PL 59 text (n. 65). The honeycomb sentence printed under Cassiodorus's name in PL 70 is word for word the sentence of the Song commentary printed as Haymo's in PL 117: Scripture "is understood in many ways and set out in various senses: now according to the letter, now according to allegory, now according to morality, now according to anagoge, that is the higher sense".[103] De Lubac cites the Haymo text (*EM* I/2 602 n. 1, under the name Aimon); which of the two is the original the text cannot say. The TEI file heads the work "Haymo Halberstatensis"; the Auxerre alternative is de Lubac's, who elsewhere names Aimon of Auxerre (*EM* I/2 383 and 443), and this article does not decide between them. The fourth, the *Posteriores excerptiones* on the table of shewbread, gives the four senses as the four supports by which Scripture "is raised up and lifted from earthly things"; de Lubac cites the same work three columns earlier, for the tabernacle (*EM* II/1 417 n. 7, Stage A), and the passage compresses Bede's figure.[104] So the absence of these from his notes is not a gap in his history. Each is a witness to a text he cites.

102. `ledger/formulas-vs-lubac.tsv`, kind *theory*, `lubac` = not cited (11 rows); STUDY §10.

103. Anonymous, *Expositio in Cantica*, PL 70:1077B–C: «Recte ergo divina Scriptura favus distillans vocatur, quia multipliciter intelligitur, et variis sensibus exponitur, nunc juxta litteram, nunc juxta allegoriam, nunc juxta moralitatem, nunc juxta anagogem, id est superiorem sensum.» Haymo, *Commentarium in Cantica*, PL 117:321B–C: «Recte ergo divina Scriptura favus distillans vocatur, quia multipliciter intelligitur et variis sensibus exponitur, nunc juxta litteram, nunc juxta allegoriam, nunc juxta moralitatem, nunc juxta anagogen, id est superiorem sensum.» The two differ by a comma and *anagogem/anagogen*. *EM* I/2 602 n. 1: «AIMON, In Cant.»; I/2 383: «par Aimon d'Auxerre»; I/2 443: «Aimon d'Auxerre déclare».

104. *Posteriores excerptiones* c. 11, PL 175:664A–B: «Quatuor epistylia mensae, quatuor sunt sensus Scripturae, historia, allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, quibus ipsa erigitur, et a terrenis elevatur.» The attribution to Hugh of St Victor is queried by Migne.

The other seven are the article's new texts. Six have no earlier source on the shelf; the seventh, Hildebert's sermon 70, is built from two received images and has a cited twin (below). What they show is how little of what the census calls "theory" is a grid. Bruno the Carthusian, on the dove with silvered wings and golden back in Psalm 67, reads the silver as "the understanding according to the letter, which is bright as silver", and the pale gold as "the mystical understanding, which the Greeks call anagoge", more perfect than any other gold.[105] The pair is the Greek pair, and Bruno knows its Greek name; *anagoge* names the whole higher reading, as in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, not the fourth of four. Radulfus Ardens takes Gregory's image of Scripture as a river in which the lamb may walk and the elephant swim and makes it a pair of levels: "in it the simple are fed by the outer history or morality, and the wise are exercised by the inner allegory".[106] History and morality are both outside; allegory alone is within. De Lubac cites Radulfus elsewhere for a fourfold (*EM* II/1 122 n. 1, Stage A), so this homily shows the same author working with two.

Wolbero of St Pantaleon, in Cologne, commenting on the Song, has three statements and all three are threefold, history, allegory, morality, with no anagogy. The first sorts the senses by readers: Scripture, the king's storehouse, "is divided threefold, that is into history, allegory and morality", so that "the strong might seek and the weak not shrink: many are delighted by history, many fed by allegory, some instructed by morality". But those the king admits to all his cellars pass "from historical knowledge into allegorical and from allegorical into moral".[107] The second allows the three to be taken "now separately, now together".[108] The third makes history the ground: wherever the historical is expounded, "it is resolved into one of these two parts, allegory or morality, and for the most part the understanding of one and the same history is brought back into the senses of both".[109] In one commentary, then, the three are a list for most readers, a sequence for the few, and a pair of offspring from one root. The third of these is close to de Lubac's own figure: allegory and morality both resolved out of the one history, as Gregory's fruits come from the root of history (section 10), and it is the nearest of the uncited texts to his organism. De Lubac collects Wolbero elsewhere for the shifting order of allegory and morality (*EM* I/1 167 n. 10, Stage A), which is what these passages also show.

Atto of Vercelli, on 2 Corinthians 3, gives a rule of choice and a warning against one sense: some things in the Law "are not to be examined other than as they are written down: like the Decalogue itself, which whoever examines allegorically opens the door to vices, because he destroys every advance of morality"; some are to be read only historically, and some both ways.[110] Here morality stands with the letter against allegory, which is not the order of any grid. De Lubac cites Atto for the other half of the rule, that some places must be allegorised

105. Bruno the Carthusian, *Expositio in Psalmos*, ad Ps 67:14, PL 152:957C–D: «scilicet intellectum ad litteram qui nitidus est ut argentum»; «Vos dico in pallore auri abundantes, id est in pallido auro, scilicet in mystico intellectu, quem Graeci anagogen dicunt, qui per pallidum aurum, quod reliquo omni auro perfectius est, designatur eo quod longe sit perfectior intellectu illo qui ad litteram est». De Lubac cites the same commentary for theory at PL 152:1043 (*EM* I/2 491, Stage A).

106. Radulfus Ardens, *Homiliae*, on John 16:29, PL 155:1899A: «Sed Scriptura sacra ita est temperata, quod in ea potest et parvulus ambulare, et gigas natare. In ea per exteriorem historiam vel moralitatem pascuntur rudes, et per interiorem allegoriam exercentur sapientes.» Gregory, letter to Leander, PL 75:515A: «Quasi quidam quippe est 6 fluvius, ut ita dixerim, planus et altus, in quo et agnus ambulet, et elephas natet.» The «6» is a Migne note number kept in the TEI.

107. Wolbero, *Commentaria in Canticum*, on Song 1:3, PL 195:1035D–1036A: «Haec autem in trifariam dividitur, hoc est historiam, allegoriam et moralitatem.» «Multi enim historia delectantur, plerique allegoria pascuntur, nonnulli moralitate instruuntur.» «ut videlicet de historica scientia intrent in allegoricam et de allegorica in moralem,»

108. Wolbero, PL 195:1036D–1037A: «Cum ergo haec omnia, alia quidem historialiter, alia allegorice, alia vero moraliter, nunc quidem separatim, nunc insimul, hoc eodem triplici modo legeris et intellexeris,»

109. Wolbero, on Song 4:2, PL 195:1150D–1151A: «Nam cum triplex sit sensus in toto corpore divinae Scripturae, historicus scilicet, allegoricus et moralis, ubicunque historicus exponitur, in aliquam istarum duarum partium, allegoriam scilicet aut moralitatem resolvitur, plerumque in utrarumque partium sensus, unius ejusdemque historiae redigitur intellectus, ita ut nonnunquam quod historia sonat, non nisi mystice intelligi debeat.»

110. Atto of Vercelli, *Expositio in epistolas Pauli*, ad 2 Cor 3, PL 134:433C: «Illud quoque sciendum, quia sunt quaedam in lege, quae non aliter discutienda sunt quam scripta habentur: sicut ipse Decalogus, quem qui allegorice discutit, ostium vitiis pandit, quia omnem profectum moralitatis destruit: quaedam vero sunt, quae tantum historialiter; quaedam autem utroque modo discutienda sunt.»

(Stage A records other Atto citations, among them *EM* II/2 66 n. 5).[111] The one fourfold among the seven is the sermon for St Peter in Chains printed among Hildebert's: "Sacred reading is like a four-legged table in the house of the Lord. It has history, allegory, tropology and anagoge," with a Jerusalem verse for each.[112] It is Bede's table and Cassian's Jerusalem in one sentence, and it is one of four fourfolds of the monk's day (reading, prayer, meditation, work). De Lubac cites its twin in sermon 60 six times and assigns that sermon to Peter Comestor (*EM* I/1 152 n. 10, Stage A); whether sermon 70 belongs with it was not tested.[113]

So the uncited statements do not change de Lubac's history so much as test its claim of unity. The copies confirm that the fourfold travelled as Bede's and Cassian's text. The original statements are, for the most part, pairs (Bruno, Radulfus), threes (Wolbero), and a rule of restraint (Atto), and only one is a fourfold, built from the two received images. The census counted them as theory because they name three or more terms near one another, and they do state a theory; but the theory they state is a flexible one, in which the senses are present or absent, joined or separate, as the passage and the reader require.

10. The Order of the Movement, and Where the Unity Lives

De Lubac's unity is not a fiction, and the shelf shows where it lives. Among the notes to his paragraph on the organism of the four senses (*EM* I/2 650), the early witnesses are Gregory's figures and a sentence of Heterius and Beatus. "Through the letter we tend to allegory", which he cites for each sense tending "to the other as to its end", is Gregory on the two thresholds of Ezekiel's gate.[114] Heterius and Beatus say of the creed that "the history is Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate ... It is not an allegory. It did not signify another Christ, as the patriarchs and prophets signified him".[115] Christ is the turn: the histories before him signify, his own history does not signify another, and the senses after him run inside one mystery, "because Christ has been carried over to the Church", in the Paschasius that de Lubac cites for the "passage of the one into the other".[116] Here de Lubac's eschatological reason for the split of the spiritual sense, the gap between the two comings, is closest to the texts: Bede's three loaves distinguish allegory and anagogy as present grace and future beatitude (n. 58), and Cassian's anagoge carries speech "to things invisible and future" (n. 33). The split into present and future is there in the definitions of the senses.

The four stated as one movement

The early texts state threes as a movement (Jerome, Isidore, Bede's loaves, Origen's levels), and the copied fourfolds of sections 4 and 5 are lists. The four themselves are stated as one movement on this shelf, and the

111. Atto, same work, PL 134:367D–368A: «ostenditur sacra Scriptura partim allegorice esse discutienda, partim historiae veneratio servanda.» A citation of this place at *EM* I/2 678 n. 1, reported during the search, could not be found in the ledger rows or in the OCR of *EM* (Appendix A). Stage A records Atto cited for theory at PL 134:351 (*EM* II/2 66 n. 5).

112. Hildebert (attributed), *Sermones* 70, PL 171:681A: «Lectio enim sacra est sicut mensa quadrupes in domo Domini. Historiam habet, allegoriam, tropologiam et anagogen.»

113. Sermon 60, PL 171:634B–C: «Ad hunc modum quatuor sunt in sacra Scriptura, [sicut] sunt quatuor pedes in mensa Domini, historia, allegoria, moralitas, anagoge.» Stage A, em1-p158-n10-11 (*EM* I/1 152 n. 10) and five further rows.

114. "Because we tend through the letter to allegory, we come as from the threshold that is outside to that which is inside." Gregory I, *Homiliae in Ezechielem* II.3.18, PL 76:968A: «Limen quippe Scripturae sacrae exterius, littera; limen vero ejus interius, allegoria. Quia enim per litteram ad allegoriam tendimus, quasi a limine quod est exterius, ad hoc quod est interius venimus.» Rabanus copies it in his commentary on Ezekiel, PL 110:898D–899A: «quia enim per litteram ad allegoriam tendimus, quasi a limine quod est exterius venimus». *EM* I/2 650 n. 7 cites Gregory (Stage A, em2-p286-n07-7).

115. Heterius and Beatus, *Ad Elipandum* I, PL 96:958D: «Historia est Christus Dei Filius, natus de virgine Maria, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato.» «Haec pro se stat sicut auditur. Non est allegoria. Non significavit alterum Christum, sicut patriarchae et prophetae hunc significaverunt et praedicaverunt esse venturum.» *EM* I/2 650 n. 1 (Stage A, em2-p286-n01-1).

116. *EM* I/2 650: «Le passage d'un sens à l'autre est plus précisément passage de l'un dans l'autre, devenir de l'un par l'autre»; «Translatus est Christus ad Ecclesiam», with n. 4, «PASCHASE, In Lam., l. II (PL, CXX, 119 A)». The TEI has the sentence at PL 120:1119A: «Sed quia translatus est Christus ad Ecclesiam, in ea fideles devoti sua offerunt vota». The column in the OCR of *EM* lacks a digit; the page image was not checked.

first text to read is the prologue of the *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam*, which the census codes as theory. It opens with an order of inquiry: whoever would come to know Scripture must first consider "when it weaves its narrative historically, when allegorically, when anagogically, when tropologically". It then names the four "history, allegory, tropology, anagogy" and calls them "the four daughters of mother Wisdom". Wisdom feeds her adopted sons by stages: "to beginners and the tender a drink in the milk of history; to those advancing in faith, food in the bread of allegory; to the good, who work hard at good works, fullness in the savoury refreshment of tropology; to those, finally, who are lifted from the depths by contempt of earthly things and carried to the heights by heavenly desire, the sober drunkenness of theoretical contemplation in the wine of anagogy." That is a graded ascent of four, one sense to each grade of reader. A few lines later the four become a building: "In the house of our soul history lays the foundation, allegory raises the walls, anagogy sets on the roof, and tropology paints it with various ornaments", both within, by affection, and without, by good work. The building reorders the terms. Anagogy moves to third, as the roof, and tropology to last, as the ornament, which is Gregory's colour on the walls (section 5) put on a four-storey house. De Lubac saw this: he quotes the house sentence as Adam Scot's preface, among building figures in which he finds Gregory's letter to Leander "down to the words", and he gives the same building in other orders, with "some variants".[117] And the same prologue then makes all four optional: the reader must consider "when [Scripture] wishes to be understood according to one alone, when according to two, when according to three, when according to all four together".[118]

The prologue is held twice on the shelf, in `8928.xml` under "Rabanus Maurus 780-856" and in `8925.xml` under "Auctor incertus (Rabanus Maurus?)", and the census coded it in both (section 2). Its date is open. Migne prints it among Rabanus's works; de Lubac writes that the *Allegoriae*, "long attributed to Rabanus", date "surely only from the second half of the twelfth century", that their author "has every chance of being Adam Scot himself", and also that the four-sense theory is "not, as several have believed, a sufficient sign of this late date".[119] Adam Scot's *De tripartito tabernaculo* has the feeding sentence nearly word for word, with *modo … modo* in place of the prologue's datives: Scripture, one and unchanging, "brings forth diverse understandings according to the capacity of readers", now giving beginners the milk of history, now the bread of allegory, now the solid food of tropology, now the wine of anagogy.[120] De Lubac cites the column in the same paragraph, as

117. *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam*, prologue, PL 112:849A–C, `8928.xml` (the same text in `8925.xml`): «Quisquis ad sacrae Scripturae notitiam desiderat pervenire, prius diligenter consideret quando historice, quando allegorice, quando anagogice, quando tropologice suam narrationem contexat. Has namque quatuor intelligentias, videlicet historiam, allegoriam, tropologiam, anagogiam, quatuor matris sapientiae filias vocamus» «Mater quippe Sapientia per hos adoptionis filios pascit, conferens insipientibus [incipientibus] atque teneris potum in lacte historiae; in fide autem proficientibus, cibum in pane allegoriae; bonis vero et strenue operantibus, et operibus bonis insudantibus, satietatem in sapida refectione tropologiae; illis denique qui et ab imis per contemptum terrenorum suspensi, et ad summa per coeleste desiderium sunt provecti, sobriam theoricae contemplationis ebrietatem in vino anagogiae.» «In nostrae ergo animae domo historia fundamentum ponit, allegoria parietes erigit, anagogia tectum supponit, tropologia vero tam interius per affectum quam exterius per effectum boni operis, variis ornatibus depingit.» The bracketed *incipientibus* is Migne's correction, kept in the TEI. De Lubac, *EM* II/2 57, quotes the house sentence («In nostrae ergo animae domo, historia fundamentum ponit») from Adam's «préface aux Allegoriae in universam Scripturam sacram», after calling the abbot of Kelso's letter to Adam «une paraphrase de la Lettre de Grégoire à Léandre»; in all these texts one recognizes, «jusque dans les mots, la doctrine formulée jadis par saint Grégoire». His notes give the building in other orders: Peter Comestor, «Tropologia, doma culmini superpositum»; Peter of Poitiers, «tectum tropologiae, id est moralis vel anagogici»; Alan of Lille, «prima sit historica, secunda tropologica, tertia allegorica. Prima fundamentum, secunda paries, tertia culmen» (PL 210:209C, census F146, coded L-T-A). His summary, II/2 58: «moyennant quelques variantes, avec les trois ou les quatre sens».

118. Same prologue, PL 112:850A–B: «nobis considerandum est quando secundum unam solam, quando secundum duas, quando secundum tres, quando etiam secundum omnes simul quatuor intelligi velit».

119. *EM* I/1 152: «Tel aussi l'auteur des Allegoriae in universam Scripturam, qui a toutes chances d'être Adam Scot lui-même»; n. 2: «PL, CXII, 849-50. Longtemps attribuées à Raban, ces Allegoriae ne datent sûrement que de la seconde moitié du» (the century is garbled in the OCR and was read from the page image of the printing as the twelfth) «Toutefois la théorie des quatre sens n'est pas, comme plusieurs l'ont cru, un indice suffisant de cette date tardive.» He quotes the prologue again under Adam Scot's name at *EM* II/2 37 n. 11. The decision letter cited this note as "158 n. 2"; 158 is the PDF page, and the printed page is 152 (`ledger/pages.tsv`).

120. Adam Scot, *De tripartito tabernaculo*, PL 198:630A: «diversas pro captu legentium, parit intelligentias: et modo incipientes, et teneros lacte quodam potat historiae; modo autem, in fide proficientes, pane cibat allegoriae. Modo etiam, bonis operibus strenue insudantes, solido reficit cibo tropologiae; modo denique ab imis per contemptum terrenorum suspensos, et ad summa, per coelestium desiderium, provectos,

a witness to the classic order. Which text borrows from which is not on the shelf, and nothing below depends on the prologue's date.

Other statements of the four as a movement are graded in the same way, and de Lubac has gathered nearly all of them. A chapter amalgamated into the *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus*, which de Lubac gives to Alexander of Canterbury (section 3), sets four casks in the king's cellar: "simple history, allegory, morality, anagoge", ordered from the door to the corner, each drink sweeter than the last, and poured by the cellarer to the simpler, the more capable, the more perfect and the most perfect in turn.[121] Honorius, in the *Gemma animae*, gives the four senses to "four kinds of faithful, the simple, the intelligent, the advanced, the wise", through the four lessons of Holy Saturday.[122] And Richard of St Victor ranks them. History holds the first place; "the mystical understanding is certainly threefold: the tropological holds one place, the allegorical the middle, the anagogical the highest", because tropology "deals with what anyone easily grasps" and "has settled in the lowest place".[123] In another chapter of the same work Richard states the four as one speech of one Scripture: it often happens "that one and the same Scripture, while it is expounded in many ways, says many things to us as one: morally teaching us what our beloved wishes us to do, allegorically reminding us what he has done for us by himself, anagogically setting before us what he still disposes to do with us".[124] That is de Lubac's hiatus in a sentence: what is to be done now, what has been done, what is still to come. It is one of his witnesses for the unity of the senses (*EM* I/2 650 n. 8), and for Richard's order (n. 123).

The texts de Lubac gathers in the same pages for the movement between the senses were read as well, and none states the four as a movement: Honorius on the Song gives a list,[125] the *Scala claustralium* a chain of the monk's exercises,[126] the *Moralitates in Cantica* a three,[127] and John of Salisbury the functions of the senses.[128]

in sensu anagogico, vino theoricae contemplationis inebriat.» Census F104. *EM* I/1 151 n. 10: «Trip. tab. (PL, CXCVIII, 630, 697, 743 B)», for Adam's use of the classic order, two lines before «Tel aussi l'auteur des Allegoriae» (I/1 152).

121. *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus* (TEI header: Eadmerus Cantuariensis), PL 159:707D–708B: «In hac cella quatuor habentur dolia mellifluae dulcedinis plena, quorum ista sunt nomina: simplex historia, allegoria, moralitas, anagogen, id est intellectus tendens ad superiora. Ista quidem dolia modo quo superius diximus sunt ordinata. Primo namque loco in Scriptura sacra, tanquam juxta ostium, est simplex historia, deinde allegoria, postea moralitas, novissime vero, quasi in angulo, est anagogen, id est contemplatio. Valde dulcis potus est historia, sed et dulcior in allegoria; dulcissimus vero in moralitate, longe autem incomparabiliter dulcior in anagogen, id est in contemplatione.» «simpliciores namque et rudes in fide ac ejus amore, de primo dolio solet potare, id est de historia; capaciores vero de allegoria; perfectiores autem de moralitate; perfectissimos autem de anagogen, id est de contemplatione.» Census F013–F014. De Lubac quotes the passage at *EM* I/2 637–638 (section 3), and at I/1 150 lists «Alexandre de Cantorbéry» with Honorius and Adam among the witnesses of the classic order (n. 15).

122. Honorius, *Gemma animae*, c. 104, PL 172:669B: «quatuor genera fidelium, scilicet simplices, intelligentes, provecti, sapientes, quatuor nominibus erudiuntur, videlicet per historiam, per allegoriam, per tropologiam, per anagogen erudiuntur». Census F033–F034. De Lubac does not cite the *Gemma* there, but names Honorius's liturgical writings among the witnesses of the classic order and adds «Honorius compte toujours quatre sens» (*EM* I/1 150 and n. 2).

123. Richard of St Victor, *Benjamin major*, on the table of shewbread, PL 196:199D–200A: «In Scriptura sacra primum locum tenet historia. Mystica vero intelligentia pro certo est tripertita. Tropologica tenet locum unum, allegorica medium, anagogica summum.» «Tropologia de his agit quae quisque facile capit et unde et in imo resedit.» Census F101. De Lubac, *EM* I/1 165–166, says that Richard keeps the tropology-first order «dans le Benjamin major et, sauf une exception, dans la dissertation qui» «en forme l'appendice», and his notes cite both passages read here: «Benj. maj., 1. IV, c. xiv (PL, CXCVI, 151 C)» and «PL, CXCVI, 199-200».

124. Richard of St Victor, *Benjamin major*, PL 196:151C: «Et saepe fit ut una eademque Scriptura, dum multipliciter exponitur, multa nobis in unum loquatur, moraliter nos docens quid dilectus noster facere nos velit, allegoriter admonens quid pro nobis per semetipsum fecerit, anagogice proponens quid adhuc de nobis facere disponit.» *EM* I/2 650 n. 8 cites «Benj. major., 1. IV, c. xiv (PL, CXCVI, 151 C)».

125. The nuptials are read in four senses, each in two modes. Honorius, *Expositio in Cantica*, PL 172:349A–B: «Hic liber agit de nuptiis quae fiunt quatuor modis, scilicet historice, allegorice, tropologice, anagogice. Juxta historiam fiunt nuptiae duobus modis». *EM* I/2 645 n. 1 (Stage A, em2-p281-n01-1).

126. Four degrees, reading, meditation, prayer and contemplation, are linked so that "those that go before profit little or nothing without those that follow"; de Lubac borrows the image for the unity of the senses, but the chain is of the monk's exercises, not of the senses. *Scala claustralium* (TEI header: Auctor incertus (Guigo V prior?)), PL 184:481C–D: «Hi autem gradus ita concatenati sunt, et vicaria ope sibi invicem deserviunt, quod praecedentes sine subsequentibus aut parum aut nihil prosunt: sequentes vero sine praecedentibus aut raro aut nunquam haberi possunt.» *EM* I/2 648 n. 3 (Stage A, em2-p284-n03-3).

127. The preachers pass "from history to allegory, and from allegory to morality". *Moralitates in Cantica canticorum*, PL 203:550D (TEI header: Philippus de Harveng; the Stage A summary of de Lubac's note names Luke of Mont-Cornillon): «sic ipsi rationabiles et gratos sensus proferunt, dum de historia ad allegoriam, et de allegoria transeunt ad moralitatem.» *EM* I/2 648 n. 5 (Stage A, em2-p284-n05-6).

128. Allegory builds faith, tropology morals, anagoge leads upward, and the four are joined only as many mysteries under one surface. John of Salisbury, *Polycraticus*, PL 199:666B: «Licet enim ad unum tantummodo sensum accommodata sit super ficies litterae, multiplicitas

A keyword search of the census's 68 four-family statements of theory then found no graded movement beyond the five texts above, though it searched model summaries and could miss one they do not describe.[129] On the census's own dates the five are of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, apart from the *Allegoriae*, whose date is open.

The order of the movement

Set side by side, the texts read in this article that state the senses as one movement give the following orders.

No.	Text and place	Figure of the movement	Order stated
1	Origen, *De principiis* IV.2.4–6, PG 11:363–368	levels of reader; flesh, soul, spirit	letter; "soul" (moral example); spiritual (good things to come)
2	Jerome, ep. 120 q. 12, PL 22:1005	ascent: "we rise", "we pass over"	history; tropology (moral); spiritual θεωρία (beatitude to come)
3	Jerome, *In Ezech.* V, PL 25:147C–148A	ascent: "in the middle", "more sublimely"	letter; tropology; mystical (Christ and the Church)
4	Gregory, letter to Leander, PL 75:513	building: foundation, walls, colour	history, type, morality
5	Isidore, *Sententiae* I.18, PL 83:578–579	dependence: "so ... that"	history, tropology, mystical
6	Bede, *In Samuelem* II, PL 91:562	Law, then Christ's dispensation	history; allegory and anagogy
7	Wolbero, *In Cant.*, PL 195:1036A	from cellar to cellar	history, allegory, morality
8	*Moralitates in Cantica*, PL 203:550D	passage from vessel to vessel	history, allegory, morality
9	*Allegoriae*, prologue, PL 112:849A–B	feeding by grades of reader	history, allegory, tropology, anagogy
10	*Allegoriae*, prologue, PL 112:849C	house of the soul	history, allegory, anagogy, tropology
11	Adam Scot, *De trip. tab.*, PL 198:630A	feeding by capacity	history, allegory, tropology, anagogy
12	*De S. Anselmi similitudinibus*, PL 159:707D–708B	cellar; sweeter by degrees	history, allegory, morality, anagoge
13	Honorius, *Gemma animae*, PL 172:669B	four kinds of faithful	history, allegory, tropology, anagoge
14	Richard, *Benjamin major*, PL 196:199D–200A	rank: one, middle, highest	history; tropology, allegory, anagogy
15	Richard, *Benjamin major*, PL 196:151C	what to do, what he did, what he will do	moral, allegory, anagogy

Table 2: Statements of the senses as one movement read in this article: threes (1–8) and fourfolds (9–15), with the order each states. Cassian's kinds and Jerusalem and Eucherius's example, which section 4 reads as kinds, a performance and a list, are left out.

History comes first wherever it is named, and allegory comes before anagogy wherever both are named. What moves is tropology. Among the fourfolds, four keep the classic order, tropology after allegory and before anagogy: the *Allegoriae*'s feeding, Adam, the cellar and Honorius, two of which are one sentence in two places. Two depart from it: Richard, who in both passages names tropology first, and the *Allegoriae*'s house, which puts it after anagogy. (The inquiry with which the prologue opens names the four in the house's order, but it is an order of questions, not a figure of movement.) Among the threes, Jerome, Isidore and Origen's "soul" put the moral sense second, before the mystical; Gregory's building, Wolbero and the *Moralitates* put it last; Bede's loaves name no moral sense. The base is small: four statements agree, two of them one sentence, and two texts depart, Richard's in two passages. The census's coding, which records the order in which a passage first names the senses, gives a wider measure. With the *Allegoriae* counted once and copies and repeats counted separately, allegory is named before anagogy in 67 of the 74 statements of theory that name both, and tropology before

mysteriorum intrinsecus latet. Et ab eadem re saepe allegoria fidem, tropologia mores variis modis aedificat. Anagoge quoque multipliciter sursum ducit, ut litteram non modo verbis, sed rebus ipsis instituat.» (*super ficies* so the TEI.) Census F116. De Lubac quotes the same sentences at *EM* I/1 152.

129. `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv`, kind *theory*, rows whose `scheme` contains L, A, T and N: 68 (67 distinct texts, F236/F239 being one; 26 twelfth-century, 8 thirteenth, 9 undated by the `century` column). Search, run on 2026-11-25, of `summary` and `definitions` for *ascen-, ladder, step, stage, grade, degree, climb, progress, sweeter, capacity, milk, beginner, advanced, ranked, depend-, presuppos-, chain, foundation, first place, passes from, leads from*: 11 rows, F013, F033, F034, F101, F104, F189, F202, F236, F239, F252, F253. Read: F013 (cellar), F033–F034 (Honorius), F101 (Richard), F104 (Adam), F236/F239 (*Allegoriae*) state a graded movement; F189 (Cassian), F202 (Bede, "graded fitness" in the summary), F252–F253 (Paul of Burgos, PL 113) do not: Cassian, Bede and two scholastic passages on which texts admit how many senses are false hits. So seven rows, five texts, state the four as a graded movement: the *Allegoriae* prologue (two rows, one text), Adam Scot, the cellar, Honorius's *Gemma* (two rows from one chapter) and Richard's table. A statement of ascent that the summary does not describe would be missed.

allegory in 26 of the 120 that name both.[130] The census's codes are model readings and an order of first naming is not always the order of a movement; the counts measure how often tropology is named before allegory, and they test no single passage.

None of this is new to de Lubac as a matter of history, and most of the table is his. He finds the order with allegory first "the most frequent", as the census does; he lists the authors of the four fourfolds that keep it among its witnesses, records Richard's, quotes the house with its variant buildings, and records changes of order within one chapter or paragraph, "not always with any particular intention" (nn. 117–123, 131). What the reading adds is narrower. De Lubac sets the two formulas against each other as two forms of unity. The classic order, allegory before tropology, is "the formula of the doctors", which satisfies "minds concerned with synthesis and with well-balanced architecture"; the other, tropology first, "perhaps better translates the mystical impulse by marking the degrees of the soul's ascent".[131] On these texts the forms and the orders do not line up. Among the fourfolds, the grades of readers, which are the soul's ascent if anything is, keep the classic order: the feeding, the cellar's drinkers from the simpler to the most perfect, Honorius's four kinds of faithful. The buildings vary: Gregory's three, Peter Comestor's and Peter of Poitiers' in the classic order, the *Allegoriae*'s house in neither, Alan of Lille's in the other. Among the fourfolds only Richard's ranking fits the pairing; among the threes, Origen's levels of reader and Jerome's two ascents (rows 1–3) fit it. De Lubac's "perhaps" is a suggestion, not a thesis, and the evidence against it is texts he gathered himself.

"To the other"

De Lubac judges the classic order "the true formula": "that which puts allegory immediately after history expresses the authentic doctrine at once in its fullness and its purity. It alone is adequate to the Christian mystery." The reason he gives is doctrinal: according as the moral sense "precedes or follows the allegorical sense", it is independent of the mystery of Christ or dependent on it, and only in the second case is it Christian. And he adds a measure: it is "that which is in fact the most frequent".[132] The frequency is borne out by the census. The doctrine is his, and it is not a claim this article can test. What the article can test is whether the texts that state the four as a movement carry that order as the order of the movement. Four do; two do not, and de Lubac recorded both. Richard of St Victor, one of the three twelfth-century minds he says kept an instinctive preference for the other formula, ranks tropology lowest and names it first. The *Allegoriae* prologue's house follows neither order a few lines after its feeding has followed the classic one, a change within one text of the kind he records in the Caroline Books and in Ratherius (n. 131).

His sentence on the organism does not need them to agree. "Each sense tends to the other as to its end": the sentence says *l'autre*, not *le suivant*, and its note is Gregory's threshold, "through the letter we tend to allegory", a pair. On the same pages he joins the senses by pairs: "So for anagogy and tropology", the soul entering itself and entering the heavenly Jerusalem; "so again for allegory and anagogy", the Church of time and of eternity;

130. `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv`, kind *theory*, column `scheme` (the senses "in the order the passage first names them", `ledger/FORMULAS.md` §3), counted once with F236 dropped: allegory before anagogy 67, after 7; tropology after allegory 94, before 26; tropology before anagogy 67, after 5. The 26 count copies and repeats separately: Richard and Absalon three times each; Cassian, Rabanus, Thomas the Cistercian, Paul of Burgos and the Laon school twice each; and Heterius beside the Eucherius he copies (F208, F192). Of the seven rows with anagogy named before allegory, two are Eucherius and Heterius's copy of him, whose allegory is the appended fourth (section 4), and one is the cellar's second window, which opens on *anagogen* (F014).

131. *EM* I/2 416: «Si la formule classique est celle des docteurs, de ceux qui ont mission d'enseigner, si elle satisfait davantage les esprits soucieux de synthèse et d'architecture bien équilibrée, l'autre attire davantage les contemplatifs»; «l'autre traduit peut-être mieux l'élan mystique en scandant les degrés de l'ascension de l'âme». He names Richard among three twelfth-century minds who kept «la préférence instinctive» for the threefold formula: «Richard de Saint-Victor». On changes of order, *EM* I/1 158: one author uses both orders «sans mettre toujours à ce changement aucune intention particulière»; I/1 166: «Dans un même chapitre, les Livres carolins énuméraient» first allegory, anagogy and tropology, then tropology, allegory and anagogy, and Ratherius of Verona «changeait également l'ordre à l'intérieur d'un même paragraphe». The building orders are in n. 117.

132. *EM* I/1 169 (the sentence begins on 168): «celui qui met l'allégorie aussitôt après l'histoire, exprime la doctrine authentique à la fois dans sa plénitude et dans sa pureté. Seul il est adéquat au mystère chrétien.» «C'est donc lui qui livre la formule véritable, celle qui est en effet la plus fréquente.» I/1 168: «selon qu'il précède ou qu'il suit le sens allégorique».

and the passage from one sense to another is "passage of the one into the other, becoming of the one through the other". His summary is "unity of source and unity of convergence".[133] This is a reading of de Lubac, not a correction of him. A unity of that kind does not require a single sequence of four, and the texts read here supply its warrant in the same form: pairs and threes that tend into one another (Jerome's history and tropology, "each needing the other"; Gregory's root and fruit; Richard's "many things as one"), and fourfolds whose order of statement varies. The reading that the shelf does not warrant is the stronger one, which his "succession temporelle, déroulement logique" invites: that the four form one ladder with one order. Where the time of salvation is stated, it fixes allegory (what Christ did) before anagogy (what is still to come), and the census's codes show that pair stable. It does not fix where the moral sense stands, because what is "to be done now" can be put before the mystery, as the purification of the one who reads, or after it, as its fruit in the soul; and the texts do both.

Three kinds of unity

Read across the shelf, the texts that state a movement, as distinct from a list, carry three kinds of unity, in pairs and threes as well as fours.

Figures of passage. Gregory's building (foundation, walls, colour), his root and fruit, his threshold; Wolbero's cellars; the honey in the wax of the letter in the Song commentaries. These are the figured schemes the census cannot see and de Lubac can (section 3). Most of them have two terms, or three. The movement they figure is from the letter inward, and they say little about how the spiritual sense, once reached, divides.

The reader's ascent. Cassian's practical life before the theoretical (n. 30); Origen's simple, progressing and perfect hearers (n. 75); Gregory of Nyssa's hand-guidance of the more fleshly toward the spiritual condition of the soul (n. 80); Wolbero's elect who pass from cellar to cellar (n. 107). Here the unity is a life that grows, and the senses are what a reader at each stage can receive. This is close to de Lubac's own account of tropology and anagogy as the spiritual life, and it is the deepest kind of unity on the shelf. It is also not the same thing as the formula's four: Origen's three levels and Cassian's ladder are not the four senses of one verse.

Christ as the turn between the Testaments. Bede's three loaves, Heterius's history of Christ that is not an allegory, Gregory's threshold: the texts read at the head of this section, where the split of the spiritual sense into present and future is closest to de Lubac's reason for it.

So the four are stated as one movement on this shelf, in grades of readers, a ranking and a house: the *Allegoriae* prologue, Adam Scot, the cellar, Honorius and Richard, nearly all of them gathered by de Lubac. Apart from the *Allegoriae*, whose date is open, the census dates them to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; this article draws no chronology from that. The unity they state is real, a unity of grades, of a house, of times. The graded ascents mostly keep the classic order; Richard's ranking and the house do not. De Lubac's organism is assembled from the three kinds of unity above and from these fourfolds, and his sentence on it claims a tending of each sense to another. That claim has its warrant on the shelf. A single ladder of four in one order does not.

ii. The Question Not Answered

Everything above concerns the senses as stated: what writers say Scripture's senses are. It does not show how often a writer actually reads one verse in all four senses, one after the other, as Cassian reads Jerusalem and Hildebert's sermon reads it again. De Lubac's history could be right about practice even where the statements are lists: a commentator who says "either … or" might still, verse after verse, give all four. The opposite could

133. *EM* I/2 650: «Chaque sens tend à l'autre comme à sa fin», with n. 7, «per litteram ad allegoriam tendimus»; «Succession temporelle, déroulement logique, c'est encore développement vivant.»; «Unité de source, et unité de convergence»; «Ainsi pour l'anagogie et la tropologie». I/2 651: «Ainsi encore pour allégorie et anagogie».

also be true. Two performances are in hand, and they point both ways. Cassian, who states the spiritual kinds in one order, performs Jerusalem in another (section 4). Eucherius, who states three senses and reports the fourth as others' addition, performs all four on the heavens and the waters at once (section 4). In both, what the writer does with a word differs from what he says the senses are, and in both the performance runs to four. Two cases bound nothing, and they are offered as the evidence in hand, not as a result. The census's 62 "applications" (60 distinct) are places where three or more sense-words fall near a verse, but they are not a measure of performed fourfold exegesis, because the test was a vocabulary window, not a reading of exegetical moves.[134]

The question is therefore open, and this article does not answer it. Answering it would mean coding, commentary by commentary, which senses a writer gives each verse he expounds, across the whole of a defined corpus rather than a sample: a separate and priced piece of work.

12. Conclusion

De Lubac's history of the four senses holds in most of its particulars, and in more of them than the census alone could show. The credits of section 1 stand, and three more belong with them: Aldhelm's canonical order, which the census missed and he had; Jerome's threefold with its eschatological third sense, which he quoted; and the figures that carry schemes without naming them, which no count can find. Where he quotes the Greek, he quotes it rightly, and where his point rests on a modern Latin version he sometimes says so himself.

This article tested the warrant for his structure, not its necessity, which no reading can test. The warrant is real, and it has a form. The texts that state the four as one movement (the *Allegoriae*'s feeding and house, Adam Scot, the cellar, Honorius's four kinds of faithful, Richard's ranking and his "many things as one") do not agree on its order, and de Lubac had gathered nearly all of them. History comes first and allegory before anagogy; the moral sense moves. Four of these statements keep the classic order and two depart from it, Richard's and the house, which in one prologue moves tropology from third to last within a few lines; in the threes, Jerome and Isidore put the moral sense before the mystical and Gregory's building puts it last. What the article adds is narrower: his suggested pairing of the classic order with architecture and of the other with the soul's ascent does not hold on the fourfolds, though Jerome's threefold ascents fit it, and the census gives a measure, tropology named before allegory, counting copies separately, in about one in five of the statements of theory that name both. De Lubac's sentence, "each sense tends to the other as to its end", asks for no more order than that, and his own illustrations of it run by pairs. What the shelf does not carry is a single ladder of four, or a warrant from the texts of movement for his judgment that the classic order alone is "the true formula"; that judgment is doctrine, borne out by frequency, and it is his.

Two further findings belong with this one. *Tropologia* narrowed in Latin from the figurative reading in general, which is what it is in Origen and often in Jerome, to the moral sense, which it is in Jerome's letter, in Cassian and in every Latin gloss read here; de Lubac noted the narrowing, and the article has added the gloss and its steadiness. And in the Greek windows read, the upper term is not split: Gregory of Nyssa names three of its names in order to refuse to choose, as de Lubac also saw, and Migne's modern Latin, place by place, sometimes supplies the "spiritual" and "mystical" sense that the Greek does not have. Whether medieval readers performed the four, verse by verse, as often as they stated them is a question this article leaves open.

134. `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv`, kind *application* (62 rows). The study's plan names this "stated versus performed" as a separate test requiring a coding of exegetical moves across whole commentaries (its stage C), not done.

Sources

Primary sources

Patrologia Latina, edited by J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1844–64), in the TEI transcription of the Corpus Corporum (Zurich). Files by volume, as named in the notes: Adam Scot, *De tripartito tabernaculo* (vol. 198); Aldhelm, *De laudibus virginitatis* (89); Alcuin, *Confessio fidei* (101); *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam* (112, two files); Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (105); Ambrose, *De Isaac et anima* and *Enarrationes in XII psalmos* (14), *Expositio in Lucam* (15); anonymous, *Expositio in Cantica* (70) and *Sermones* (177); Atto of Vercelli, *Expositio epistolarum S. Pauli* (134); Augustine, *De utilitate credendi* (42), *De Genesi ad litteram* and *liber imperfectus* (34); Bede, *De schematibus et tropis* (90), *De tabernaculo*, *Hexaemeron*, *In Samuelem*, *In Cantica* (91); Bruno the Carthusian, *Expositio in Psalmos* (152); Cassian, *Collationes* (49); Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* (70); *De S. Anselmi similitudinibus*, under Eadmer (159); Eucherius, *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae* (50); Gregory I, *Moralia* with the letter to Leander (75), *Homiliae in Evangelia* and *in Ezechielem* (76); Haymo (of Halberstadt or Auxerre), *Commentarium in Cantica* (117); Heterius and Beatus, *Ad Elipandum* (96); Hildebert (attributed), *Sermones* (171); Honorius Augustodunensis, *Expositio in Cantica* and *Gemma animae* (172); Isidore, *Etymologiae* (82), *Sententiae* (83); Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* (161, checked for one column); Jerome, *Epistolae* (22), *Commentaria in Isaiam* (24), *in Ezechielem*, *in Abacuc* and *in Zachariam* (25); John of Salisbury, *Polycraticus* (199); *Moralitates in Cantica canticorum*, in the volume of Philip of Harvengt (203); Paschasius Radbertus, *In Lamentationes* (120); Paulus Alvarus, *Epistolae* (121); *Posteriores excerptiones* (175); Rabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in Exodum* (108), *in Paralipomena* (109), *in Ezechielem* (110), *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam* (112); Radulfus Ardens, *Homiliae* (155); Richard of St Victor, *Benjamin major* (196); *Scala claustralium* (184); Sedulius Scotus, *Collectanea in omnes B. Pauli epistolas* (103); Thomas the Cistercian, *Commentaria in Cantica* (206, checked for one column); Wolbero of St Pantaleon, *Commentaria in Canticum* (195).

Patrologia Graeca, edited by J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1857–66), Greek text in Kraken OCR (`patrologia/raw/kraken/`), facing Latin in Tesseract OCR (`scriptura/studies/sensus/sources/editions/ocr/`) and in the archive.org djvu text of PG 11: Origen, *De principiis* (PG 11, Greek of the *Philocalia*), *Contra Celsum* (PG 11), *Homilia in 1 Reg.* 28, the *Homiliae in Genesim* in Rufinus's Latin and the editors' preface (PG 12), *Selecta in Jeremiam* and *Commentarii in Matthaeum* with the *vetus interpretatio* (PG 13), *Commentarii in Joannem* (PG 14); scholia on the Dionysian letters printed as Maximus's (PG 4); Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* (PG 21); Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum* and *De vita Moysis* (PG 44); *Contra Judaeos, in serpentem aeneum* (PG 61, among the Chrysostom spuria).

Modern works

Lubac, Henri de. *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Écriture*. 4 vols. Paris: Aubier, 1959–64. Cited as *EM* by part and page; quoted from an OCR text of the printed volumes, with three readings checked against page images of the printing.

Pruitt, Wilson, et al. *Scriptura*: studies `sensus` and `usus`, with scripts, census tables and site. github.com/wilsonpruitt/scriptura; scriptura.wrootpress.com. The counts in this article are re-derived from its files; its tables are not reproduced. The ledger of de Lubac's apparatus is kept locally because *EM* is in copyright.

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 (section 1).

Appendix A: Method and Verification

The question and the hunt. The question was put by Wilson Pruitt, who asked that the de Lubac argument of his Scriptura `sensus` study be made the fourth article of this volume. The scope and the hunt brief were written by Claude Opus 5.5, under orchestration by Claude Fable 5.2. Three instances of Claude Sonnet 5.5 searched the shelf under the brief, one shelf each: the birth of the Latin formula (24 findings), the Greek windows and Migne's facing Latin (19), and the eleven uncited statements of theory (11, with three neighbours). Each reported, for every passage, the senses in the author's words, whether they are presented as a movement or a list, what they are for, the voice, de Lubac's use of the place from the ledger, and a verbatim run. The 127 Latin and Greek runs in the three reports were tested by `scripts/check_hunts.py` against the files named beside them: 127 exact. The article was written by Claude Opus 5.5, which re-read in its file every passage the argument uses, read de Lubac's own text at the places where his claims are tested, and added Aldhelm (PL 89), Gregory's *Moralia* VI and *Homilies on Ezekiel* with Rabanus's copy, Heterius on the history of Christ, and the three layers of Origen on Matthew at PG 13:1077–8 and 1101–2. It 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 and a second read; the texts the revision added are named in the provenance box, and the places of de Lubac's text read are cited in the notes. The thesis direction of the revision was chosen by Wilson Pruitt. The translations are the author's working translations.

The shelf. Latin: the Corpus Corporum TEI of the *Patrologia Latina* (`patrologia/sources/pl/tei/`, 5,276 files), normalised by its makers to classical orthography; volume numbers from the file headers, columns from the page markers. One work, the *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam*, is held in two files (`8925.xml`, `8928.xml`) with different author headers and the same text. Greek: Kraken OCR of Migne's PG pages (`patrologia/raw/kraken/`); PG columns from the running-head maps in `patrologia/data/pg-heads/`. Facing Latin: Tesseract OCR (`scriptura/studies/sensus/sources/editions/ocr/`) and the archive.org djvu text of PG 11. De Lubac: an OCR text of the four printed volumes of *Exégèse médiévale* (`scriptura/studies/sensus/sources/exegese-medievale/text/`), quoted only in phrases; printed pages from `ledger/pages.tsv`; where the OCR is garbled (the century in *EM* I/1 152 n. 2, the verb on Jerome in I/1 213, the volume in I/2 638 n. 1) the page image of the printing (`exegese-medievale/pdf/`) was read. Kraken, Tesseract and the *EM* text are OCR and are quoted as they stand; their errors are corrected in the notes, not in the runs.

The numbers. Every count in the article was re-derived on 2026-11-25 from the study's files, not taken from its prose: `census/formulas.tsv` (269 places, 85 with all four families); `ledger/formulas-coded.tsv` (kind, scheme, figure); `ledger/formulas-vs-lubac.tsv` (de Lubac's use of the 132 theory statements); `ledger/lubac-theory-vs-census.tsv` and `ledger/lubac-theory-misses.tsv` (his 1,843 theory citations and the 218 misses); `ledger/pg-greek-check.tsv` (68 PG references); `census/gr-formulas.tsv` and `census/gr-terms.tsv` (the Greek windows and word count); `census/classical-kwic.tsv` (τροπολογ-). The revision added three computations: the order relations in the `scheme` column (n. 130), the keyword search of the 68 four-family statements of theory (n. 129), and a re-run of the study's `scripts/matthew_parallel.py`, read-only (n. 95); and one check of its own, ἠθικ- near the higher terms in Origen (n. 88). Numbers drawn from the coding of de Lubac's notes are a model's (Claude Opus 5.5, codebook R1–R7) and are marked "Stage A" where they are used; so are the 68 PG readings and the coding of the 269 formulas. The death-years marked `hand` in the study's author table were not used; the dates given are the Corpus Corporum's (Aldhelm, 709), the census's century column, or de Lubac's, and are named as such. The printed *EM* page of every citation was taken from the `page` column of `ledger/claims-all.tsv` or from `ledger/pages.tsv`, not from a ledger id, whose number is the PDF page.

The duplicate. The census counts the *Allegoriae* twice, at three places in each file (n. 9). Counted once: 269 places become 266; 85 with all four families, 84; 132 statements of theory, 131; 62 applications, 60; the

canonical scheme 34 of the theory statements and 66 of all, 33 and 63; the Jerusalem figure 16 and 27, 16 and 26; the 68 four-family statements of theory, 67; de Lubac's citations "within ten columns", 5 to 4. The 68 lists, the 5 quotations, the 2 false hits, de Lubac's 96, 12, 8 and 11, and his Stage A totals are unchanged. Where the article prints a count that changes, it gives both. The two copies of the farthing (n. 66) were coded as different kinds.

The check. `check_quotes.py` (adapted from JMT 1.3, with the Greek normalisation of `scripts/check_hunts.py`) tests every run set between guillemets against the file or files its note is mapped to in `notefiles.txt`. Source texts are NFC-normalised, TEI tags removed (both as a space and as nothing), line-end hyphens rejoined and whitespace collapsed. A run passes *exact* if it occurs as it stands; *loose* if it occurs only after folding case, accents and breathings, final sigma, u/v, i/j, ae/oe and punctuation, which is accepted only when the mapped file is OCR; a loose match against TEI fails. A run containing a guillemet fails, so that Migne's own quotation marks cannot cut a run short. The checker also requires every note marker to have one definition and every definition a marker, numbered in order of first appearance. In the final run of the second round the article has 134 notes, 112 of them quoting, with 288 runs: all 288 exact; each of the 134 markers occurs once in the prose. The checker was extended for the revision with the files of the new sources (`check_quotes.py`, dictionary `F`), and `notefiles.txt` was regenerated for the new numbering.

Corrections to the study and the census. The census's statement that the canonical order is first stated by Bede (STUDY §9) is not shown: Aldhelm states it, and the priority of the two is not settled on the shelf (section 3). STUDY §9′s counts of the commonest scheme and of the Jerusalem figure are superseded by the counts in n. 8. The *usus* essay §6 gives nine Greek windows, eight in Origen or Eusebius; through PG 82 there are twelve, eight of them in Origen or Eusebius (n. 68). The census counts one work in two files (above). The ledger's "Ivo" at PL 161:707 follows a slip in one note of de Lubac's (*EM* I/2 638 n. 1), who cites the cellar at PL 159 elsewhere (*EM* I/1 150 n. 3); the cellar is at PL 159:707–708 and is in the census as F013–F014, so at least one of the 64 "no-terms" places is a locator error (section 3). The ledger's "Thomas the Cistercian reporting Origen" at PL 206:343 does not match the column (n. 15). De Lubac's Paschasius at "119 A" (OCR) is at PL 120:1119A in the TEI (n. 116).

Not verified, or not on the shelf. Evagrius, from whom Courcelle and de Lubac derive Cassian's division of knowledge, was not searched. Andrew of Caesarea and Maximus, *Ad Thalassium* 37, to which de Lubac points, lie outside the Greek range read; so do most of the eleven unread tomes, among them parts of Cyril of Alexandria (n. 68). Migne's Latin facing Gregory of Nyssa (PG 44), Eusebius (PG 21) and the PG 61 sermon is not on disk. Whether the Latin facing the Endor homily at PG 12:1014B is Rufinus's or a later version was not established (section 8). Rufinus's Latin of *De principiis* IV could not be quoted continuously from the djvu OCR. The date of Bede's *De tabernaculo*, and so the priority of Aldhelm, is not given by any file; nor are the dates of Jerome's letter 120 or of the *vetus interpretatio* of Origen on Matthew. Which of the *Allegoriae* prologue and Adam Scot's *De tripartito tabernaculo* borrows from the other was not tested. The attribution of the Dionysian scholia in PG 4 is Migne's and was not checked against any other source. The dates of Migne's translators of the Greek and of the Benedictine preface in PG 12 were not established. Augustine's *Contra Faustum*, the probable frame of Atto's rule, is not on the shelf in a form the hunter found. Whether sermon 70 in PL 171 belongs with sermon 60, which de Lubac gives to Peter Comestor; which of PL 70:1077 and PL 117:321 is the original; and whether the Haymo of the attribution is of Halberstadt or of Auxerre, are all open. The 64 places where de Lubac reads a figured scheme, and the 68 PG readings, are model readings that were not re-read here beyond the places quoted. A citation of Atto, PL 134:367, at *EM* I/2 678 n. 1, reported during the search, was not found in the ledger or the *EM* OCR (n. 111). No passage of the Greek was checked against a critical edition.

Appendix B: Verification Table

Every note that quotes is listed with the file or files its runs were tested against. “Script” means every run in the note was found verbatim in a mapped TEI file; “script, OCR (exact)” that at least one mapped file is OCR text and every run was found in it as it stands. In the printed table “PL/” abbreviates `patrologia/sources/pl/tei/`, “KR/” `patrologia/raw/kraken/` and “SS/” `scriptura/studies/sensus/sources/`, all in the author’s home folder.

Note	Source file	Checked by
1	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
2	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
3	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
6	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
14	PL/6956.xml	script
15	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em4.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
17	PL/8342.xml	script
18	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
19	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
20	PL/7132.xml	script
21	PL/7132.xml	script
22	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
23	PL/21347.xml	script
24	PL/8910.xml	script
25	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
26	PL/6965.xml	script
27	PL/6949.xml	script
28	PL/6965.xml	script
29	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
30	PL/7530.xml	script
31	PL/7530.xml	script
32	PL/7530.xml	script
33	PL/7530.xml	script
34	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
35	SS/editions/ocr/pg012/p-0148.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg012-latin.txt	script, OCR (exact)
36	PL/7530.xml	script
37	PL/7549.xml	script
38	PL/7549.xml	script
39	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
40	PL/7549.xml	script
41	PL/7549.xml; PL/7530.xml	script
42	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
43	PL/8577.xml; PL/7549.xml; PL/9151.xml	script
44	PL/7447.xml	script
45	PL/7310.xml	script
46	PL/21404.xml; PL/8903.xml; PL/8178.xml	script
48	PL/7302.xml	script
49	PL/21427.xml	script
50	PL/21427.xml	script
51	PL/8053.xml	script
52	PL/8218.xml	script
53	PL/8463.xml	script
55	PL/8447.xml	script
56	PL/8455.xml	script
57	PL/8466.xml	script
58	PL/8459.xml	script
60	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
61	PL/8847.xml	script

Note	Source file	Checked by
62	PL/8893.xml	script
63	PL/11103.xml	script
64	PL/8761.xml	script
66	PL/8928.xml	script
67	PL/8688.xml	script
68	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
69	KR/origen-pg013/text/p-0456.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg013-latin.txt	script, OCR (exact)
70	KR/origen-pg014/text/p-0110.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg014-latin.txt	script, OCR (exact)
71	KR/pg-011/text/p-0351.txt	script, OCR (exact)
72	KR/pg-011/text/p-0556.txt	script, OCR (exact)
73	KR/pg-011/text/p-0559.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg011/p-0559.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
74	KR/origen-pg014/text/p-0219.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg014-latin.txt	script, OCR (exact)
75	KR/pg-011/text/p-0187.txt; KR/pg-011/text/p-0188.txt	script, OCR (exact)
76	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
77	KR/pg-011/text/p-0189.txt; KR/pg-011/text/p-0187.txt; KR/pg-011/text/p-0188.txt	script, OCR (exact)
78	KR/pg-044/text/p-0488.txt	script, OCR (exact)
79	KR/pg-044/text/p-0488.txt	script, OCR (exact)
80	KR/pg-044/text/p-0487.txt	script, OCR (exact)
81	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
82	KR/pg-044/text/p-0191.txt; KR/pg-044/text/p-0192.txt	script, OCR (exact)
83	KR/pg-021/text/p-0051.txt	script, OCR (exact)
84	KR/pg-004/text/p-0290.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg004/p-0290.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
85	KR/pg-061/text/p-0688.txt	script, OCR (exact)
87	KR/pg-011/text/p-0352.txt	script, OCR (exact)
88	KR/pg-011/text/p-0351.txt	script, OCR (exact)
90	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
91	PL/7170.xml; PL/7181.xml; PL/7174.xml; PL/7132.xml	script
92	PL/21347.xml	script
93	KR/origen-pg013/text/p-0577.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg013/p-0577.txt	script, OCR (exact)
94	KR/origen-pg013/text/p-0565.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg013/p-0565.txt	script, OCR (exact)
97	KR/origen-pg013/text/p-0279.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg013-latin.txt; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em3.txt	script, OCR (exact)
98	KR/pg-012/text/p-0524.txt; SS/editions/ocr/pg012/p-0524.txt	script, OCR (exact)
99	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em3.txt	script, OCR (exact)
100	~/patrologia/raw/pg-djvu/011.txt	script, OCR (exact)
101	SS/editions/ocr/pg012-latin.txt	script, OCR (exact)
103	PL/7914.xml; PL/9076.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)
104	PL/11052.xml	script
105	PL/10473.xml	script
106	PL/10558.xml; PL/21427.xml	script
107	PL/11512.xml	script
108	PL/11512.xml	script
109	PL/11512.xml	script
110	PL/9440.xml	script
111	PL/9440.xml	script
112	PL/10940.xml	script
113	PL/10940.xml	script
114	PL/21412.xml; PL/8910.xml	script
115	PL/8577.xml	script
116	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt; PL/9116.xml	script, OCR (exact)
117	PL/8928.xml; PL/8925.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em4.txt	script, OCR (exact)
118	PL/8928.xml	script
119	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
120	PL/11569.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
121	PL/10652.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
122	PL/10990.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
123	PL/11527.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt	script, OCR (exact)
124	PL/11527.xml; SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt	script, OCR (exact)

Note	Source file			Checked by
125	PL/10988.xml			script
126	PL/11276.xml			script
127	PL/11638.xml			script
128	PL/11585.xml			script
131	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt; em4.txt	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt;	SS/exegese-medievale/text/	script, OCR (exact)
132	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em1.txt			script, OCR (exact)
133	SS/exegese-medievale/text/em2.txt			script, OCR (exact)