

The Encounter at Sens:

Peter Abelard, Judged

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty  
Of the College of Liberal Arts of St. Meinrad Seminary  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

Peter Arnold Scanlan  
May, 1964  
St. Meinrad Seminary  
College of Liberal Arts  
St. Meinrad, Indiana



## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. The Life of Abelard before the Encounter (1079-1136)	
A. Early Years	8
B. Search for Knowledge	8
C. Early Fame in Paris	11
D. The Council of Soissons	14
E. Return to Saint-Denis and Flight from there	16
F. Founding of the Paraclete	17
G. Abbot at Saint-Gildas in Brittany	19
H. Years of Obscurity	21
II. The Encounter (1136-1142)	
1. The Council of Sens	
A. Abelard's Return to Paris	22
B. Outcry of William of Saint-Thierry against Abelard	23
C. Bernard's Visits to Abelard at Paris	26
D. The Call for a Disputation	28
E. Bernard's Acceptance of the Challenge	30
F. The Setting	32
G. Bernard and the Bishops Meet on the Eve of the Council	34
H. The Day of the Council.	36
2. After the Council of Sens	
A. Bernard's Accounts of the Council in Behalf of the Bishops	39
B. Bernard's Letters to Rome	41

C. Innocent III's Two Letters of Condemnation	43
D. Abelard After the Council	44
E. Abelard Retreats to Cluny	45
III. The Meaning of the Encounter	
1. The Personal Struggle	48
2. The Theological Struggle	60
Appendix	74
Footnotes	79
Bibliography	105

# List of Abbreviations

Cottineau	Dom L. H. Cottineau, <u>Répertoire Topo-</u> <u>Bibliographique des Abbayes et Preiurés.</u>
D.H.G.E.	<u>Dictionnaire D'Histoire et de Géographie</u> <u>Ecclésiastiques.</u>
D.T.C.	<u>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.</u>
Ephem. theol. lovan.	<u>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.</u>
Gams	Pius Bonifacius Gams, <u>Series Episcoporum</u> <u>Ecclesiae Catholicae.</u>
M.G.H.	<u>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</u>
R.H.E.	<u>Révue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique</u>
R.S.P.T.	<u>Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et</u> <u>Théologiques.</u>
R.T.A.M.	<u>Revue de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale</u>

## Introduction

Peter Abelard<sup>1</sup> is well known to every student of Medieval History. But he is too often known only for his pride and audacity. His brashness before William of Champeaux, his brief love affair with Heloise and his consequent mutilation, these are the events that are readily recalled. But there is another side to this giant of the twelfth century. In other than a cursory glance at him one discovers a brilliant mind gifted with clarity of expression, a deep sincerity in his dealings with others, an acceptance of the troubles that befell him, and a great sense of humility in his last years.

The topic of this paper is what I have termed the encounter. It takes place between the years 1136 and 1142 and involves two of the greatest men of the century, Peter Abelard and St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Although this

is not the most remembered period in the life of Abelard, it is probably the most important. It centers around an event which took place in the town of Sens, France, in 1140<sup>2</sup> and is called the Council of Sens. Here it was that Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux and the most powerful of Abelard's enemies, overcame his adversary by using every means that he knew. And he knew all the means that were typical of the Church in the Middle Ages. He denounced Abelard and his theology and succeeded in getting them condemned by Rome.

Abelard's life had been a series of failings and triumphs. The encounter at Sens was the climax of all these. His condemnation here was certainly unfortunate, especially because of the means by which it was obtained. However, it was not without its advantages. It marked the last stage in the struggle between two schools of Theology, the traditional and the intellectual, a struggle in which the intellectuals were fast becoming dominant. In fact, this was to be the last great victory of the traditionalists. And although the struggle in theology was to be won by the cause Abelard advocated, he himself was not to see its triumph. It was a triumph which came after his death and which was certainly due in large measure to his teaching and writings. It is certain that those who later developed fully the intellectual approach to theology learned from this condemnation of Abelard and his theology. They saw what mistakes to avoid, for Abelard had surely made mistakes. Another advantage of Abelard's condemnation was that it was the incentive for the final stage in the gradual change of his character. It was the beginning of that peace and humility in which he would end his life under the care and guidance of Peter the Venerable at Cluny. A victory at Sens may well have precluded this spiritual victory to which his defeat led him.

Thus it is apparent that the encounter of 1136-1142 was a very meaningful period in the life of Abelard. It is meaningful not so much in itself, but in what it signified, a personal struggle on the one hand and a theological struggle on the other. In order to understand how the encounter at Sens signifies these struggles, two investigations must first be made, one into the background of the encounter and another into the encounter itself. Hence flows the plan of the first two sections of this paper. The first examines the events in Abelard's life which preceded 1136; the second endeavors to show as closely as possible what happened just before, during, and after the Council of Sens since all three of these periods go to make up the encounter. The third and final section of this paper emphasizes the two meanings to be found in the encounter. First of all, its meaning in Abelard's own personal struggle is examined. The encounter brought about a fundamental change in his character; therefore, his character previous to the encounter must be looked into as well as what change the encounter itself brought about. When the circumstances are understood, the nature of the change becomes clearer. The second point of examination in this third and final section of the paper is the meaning of the encounter as a theological struggle. The concepts of theology of the two men who faced each other at Sens were very different. To understand the issue at stake in this conflict the true meaning of Abelard's theology must be grasped. Only then can the mistakes Abelard made as well as the distinct advantages of his theology be seen in their true light. Bernard's concept of theology, when properly understood, helps to explain his opposition to Abelard's theology. It reveals how Bernard could grossly misinterpret it and treat Abelard in the way he did.

Almost any study of Peter Abelard should contain some discussion of his writings and of the history of their publication. However, since this paper deals chiefly with the events of a certain period of Abelard's life and not so much with his thought, the discussion of these two points has been relegated to two appendices.<sup>3</sup>

Knowledge of the details of Abelard's life from his birth in 1079 till around 1132 is almost entirely from his Historia Calamitatum. Hence the chief primary source for the first section of this paper is this autobiography. Muckle's edition of the work published in Medieval Studies (1950) is the most complete to date. References in this paper are taken from this edition. Also available was Migne's publication of Duchesne's edition.<sup>4</sup> Duchesne's notes on the text, which Migne included in his edition are very useful.

While the details of Abelard's life up to 1132 are numerous, very little is known about him after that date. The letters of Abelard and Heloise, which were most probably written between the time the account of the Historia ends (ca. 1132) and 1136 when we next hear of him, reveal much about his character. These letters are to be found in Migne's edition of Abelard's works.<sup>5</sup> Abelard himself writes nothing of his own history after 1132. In 1136 John of Salisbury, in his Metalogicon, tells us that Abelard was at that time again teaching in Paris.<sup>6</sup> This is the first we hear about him after he flees from the monastery of Saint-Gildas de Rhuys. In about 1139 William of Saint-Thierry wrote his refutation of Abelard's teachings<sup>7</sup> and his letter to Bernard urging him to take action against Abelard.<sup>8</sup> This is properly the beginning of the encounter.

The details of the encounter from this time up to Abelard's appeal to



Rome at the Council of Sens are drawn chiefly from several of Bernard's letters to Pope Innocent II after this council, especially his letter in behalf of the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans.<sup>9</sup> This letter describes what happened before and at the Council. Geoffrey of Auxerre, in his life of Bernard,<sup>10</sup> also gives an account of the Council. Otto of Freising is another contemporary source on the events of the Council of Sens. He writes of it in his Gesta Friderici which has been printed in vol. XX of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores.<sup>11</sup> Berenger, one of Abelard's ardent disciples wrote an apology for his master after the Council of Sens, in which he included a harsh diatribe against Bernard.<sup>12</sup> This apology supplies some information on the events of the encounter. However, it must be kept in mind that this as well as the other sources of information on the Council of Sens are very apt to be prejudiced one way or another.

Abelard's history in the period from the Council of Sens to his death two years later is supplied by Peter the Venerable, abbot of the monastery of Cluny under whose care Abelard spent these last two years of his life. Abbot Peter relates the story in letters to Pope Innocent II and Heloise.<sup>13</sup> The details of Innocent's condemnation of Abelard and his writings are found in the two rescripts of Innocent to the archbishops of Sens and Rheims and to Bernard. These are to be found in two volumes of Migne's Patrologia<sup>14</sup> and in vol. 21 of Mansi's Sacrorum Concilliorum Nova Collectio.<sup>15</sup> The first rescript is also printed in Otto of Freising's Gesta.<sup>16</sup> Three very important sources for understanding this period are Abelard's three apologies, all probably written after the Council of Sens. They do not supply any of the history of the Council or the encounter but are very important in understanding Abelard's thought and character at that time. Two of them,

the Professio Fidei, which he probably wrote in connection with his reconciliation with Bernard, and the Confessio Fidei, which he wrote to Heloise during his stay at Cluny, are found in Migne.<sup>17</sup> The third, the Apologia, of which a fragment has only recently been found by Ruf, has been published by him and Grabmann.<sup>18</sup> This was not available for use in this paper.

With regard to secondary sources the best starting points for the study of Abelard are the articles "Abélard" in the D.T.C.<sup>19</sup> and in the D.H.G.E.<sup>20</sup> The first is especially good in its information on the Council of Sens and the second on the early life of Abelard. Both together give a good general outlook on his life and the problems connected with it. Sikes's work, Peter Abailard,<sup>21</sup> is the most recent comprehensive study of the twelfth-century philosopher-theologian. This work has been used extensively in this paper. Rémusat's two volumes on Abelard, published in 1855,<sup>22</sup> is still useful on many points although it is no longer the standard work. This was not available. Volume five of the Histoire Des Conciles of Hefele-Leclercq contains a discussion of the events and meaning of the Council of Sens.<sup>23</sup> Some of its facts are now outdated, but it remains a major secondary source on the subject. Cottiaux's article in the R.H.E.<sup>24</sup> is indispensable for a study of Abelard's concept of theology. De Ghellinck's book, Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle<sup>25</sup> was also very helpful in this regard. Gilson in his History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages says that Kaiser's work, Pierre Abélard Critique (1901) is still the best starting point for studying the dispute between Abelard and Bernard.<sup>26</sup> This, however, was not available. There are numerous other works which pertain in one way or another to this paper, but which were not available. These are listed separately in the bibliography of this paper. Also in the bibliography are

those works which were used but are not mentioned in the above paragraph.

## I. The Life of Abelard before the Encounter (1079-1136)

A study of the period of Abelard's life from the year 1136 to his death, a period which I have termed the encounter, would be unintelligible both as to content and meaning without some knowledge of his history before that time. This section of the paper is not to be considered as exhaustive by any means since it is only secondary to the chief problem. It is derived for the most part from the Historia Calamitatum.<sup>1</sup>

### A. Early Years

Peter Abelard was born in Brittany in the small village of Le Pallet, about twelve miles east of Nantes, in the year 1079. It was in this land of rugged individualists that he spent his early youth. A contemporary, the Bishop Otto of Freising, says of Brittany, "in this land the clerics are witty, the artisans are ingenious, but almost all the others are ferocious fools."<sup>2</sup> Abelard's father, Berenger, was a knight but was also educated. Thus he took care that his sons be educated in letters before their instruction in the use of arms. Abelard, being the first born, received special attention; and he took to his studies with ease and delight. In fact, he soon became so engrossed with them that he relinquished to his brothers the pomp of military glory along with his inheritance and the prerogatives of the first born. He says that he wholly left the court of Mars that he might be educated as an offspring of Minerva.<sup>3</sup>

### B. Search for Knowledge

As was customary, he travelled around the provinces looking for a suitable school of dialectics and seems to have received his first philosophical schooling from Roscelin.<sup>4</sup> This teacher had been condemned for tri-theism at the Council of Soissons in 1092, but a short time later was again teaching

at Sainte-Marie de Loches where he reigned as the head of the nominalist school of thought. Abelard probably sat under him sometime between 1092 and 1100.

In about 1100 Abelard confidently went to Paris where William of Champeaux, the archdeacon there, was at the height of his glory as a teacher. William was the head of the realist school which rivaled the nominalism of Roscelin; he was also the most famous teacher of logic in all France. After listening to his lectures for some time, Abelard began to see the flaws in William's philosophy as well as to recognize his own mental superiority. He says that he disputed with his teacher often and sometimes came out on top.<sup>5</sup> This, however, raised the indignation and jealousy of his fellow students. He soon left Paris and opened a school of his own at Melun, probably around 1102. As his renown and number of pupils grew, he moved his school to Corbeil. This was closer to Paris and enabled him to more easily answer and attack William. He fell sick, however, and retreated to his home in Brittany to regain his health. This rest also provided him with the opportunity to develop his philosophical ideas.

On his return to Paris after a few years in Brittany Abelard found that William had entered the order of Canons Regular which he had established a few years before in the abbey of Saint-Victor in Paris.<sup>6</sup> Abelard comments that William's conversion didn't include his philosophical doctrines, which he obstinately clung to and which he continued to teach in the very monastery to which the cause of religion had brought him. As he had some eight years before, Abelard again began to attend William's lectures. The old differences reappeared as well as the disputes. On this occasion, however, Abelard won a great victory; for he forced William

in some public disputes to change his opinion on the nature of universals.<sup>7</sup> Soon the students of this once great, but now fallen, master began to flock to Abelard; and the very man who had succeeded William as archdeacon in the cathedral school of Paris gave this position over to Abelard that he might become one of Abelard's students. But after a few days he was removed from the office due to William's influence, while William himself with his congregation withdrew to a villa outside the city. Abelard wasted no time in setting up his school on or near the monastery of Sainte-Geneviève.<sup>8</sup> When William heard of this, he quickly returned to Paris but found that he could no longer match the drawing power of the brilliant young master on Sainte-Geneviève. Thus he retired and gave himself up completely to the monastic life at Saint-Victor. The dispute continued between Abelard with his school and what remained of William's school. But soon the young master was called home to Brittany by his mother; for, Berenger his father having entered a monastery, she had decided to enter a convent and wished to see her son before she did so.<sup>9</sup>

When he returned to Paris this time, he again found that the status of his former master had been changed. William of Champeaux had become bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne in 1113.<sup>10</sup> Thus Abelard's return to Paris must have been shortly after that, in late 1113 or in 1114.

After his return from Brittany Abelard's interest turned suddenly to theology. The reasons for this are not certain; "but for his own future this change from dialectic to theology was of vast importance: it determined the character of his writing and theology henceforward."<sup>11</sup> The man whom he chose as a teacher was Anselm of Laon, the leading theological professor of the day. Anselm had himself studied theology under St. Anselm

but had remained a strict traditionalist. The D.H.G.E. says that his teaching was very simple, an almost interlinear commentary of the text of Scripture.<sup>12</sup> Abelard was bitterly disappointed in Anselm's method and harshly criticizes its results.<sup>13</sup> He less and less frequently attended Anselm's lectures; and when his annoyed fellow students asked him how he thought he could teach theology without a master, Abelard answered that he did not see how they as learned men could accept these texts and glosses without the aid of something else. When they challenged him to do better, he accepted; and on the next day he lectured to the few who were interested on the very difficult book of the prophet Ezekiel. His use of dialectics in interpreting Scripture fascinated the students; and when he lectured the second and third time, attendance grew. Anselm was understandably disturbed by Abelard's methods and was, according to Abelard, incited to persecute him by two of his students, Alberic of Rheims and Lotulf of Lombardy. Soon the furor against Abelard became general, so he left Laon and returned to Paris.

### C. Early Fame in Paris

He was immediately offered and accepted a chair at the cathedral school at Paris. The D.T.C. asserts that he received the title of canon (without being in orders)<sup>14</sup>; but Sikes says that there is only proof that he was a canon at Tours, Chartres, and Sens.<sup>15</sup> He continued the study of the glosses of Ezechiel begun at Laon and took up other theological problems. His fame and popularity grew at an incredible rate. A contemporary, Foulques de Deuil, attests to the fact that thousands came from all nations to listen to Abelard.<sup>16</sup> Many illustrious men were numbered among his hearers. But such fame, greater than had been experienced by any

professor before this time, was not without its bad effects on a personality that was proud and assertive by nature. As his students increased so did his wealth. Believing himself unsurpassable in philosophy and theology, he advanced rash novelties in his teaching and abandoned himself to his personal inclinations. He says of this moral decline that he was doing his work while entirely engrossed in pride and luxury.<sup>17</sup> Despite this moral decline, he was known to be chaste with regard to women; but the occasion for his fall in this respect soon presented itself.

The story of Abelard and Heloise is well known. But what Otto of Freising said of the affair at the time can still be said today, for he called it an event well enough known but not well told.<sup>18</sup> Only a close study of it can reveal its true meaning and the humanistic elements involved.<sup>19</sup> This paper is not the place for such a study; thus only the general outline of the events will be given.

Abelard himself perhaps gives the best introduction to Heloise:

There was in the city of Paris a certain young girl by the name of Heloise. She was the niece of the canon Fulbert, who loved her so much the more because she had studied so diligently and had become proficient in the science of letters. She was a girl most pleasing to look at and at the same time very learned.<sup>20</sup>

From the first Abelard determined to seduce this beautiful and intelligent woman of about seventeen. When at his request some of his friends suggested to Fulbert that Abelard might be willing to take over the education of his beloved niece, the old canon jumped at the chance. Abelard's reputation both as a teacher and as a man of chastity appealed to this canon of Notre-Dame. Thus Abelard happily moved into Fulbert's house and took on the task of completing Heloise's education. He found her willing to return his affections with a love more true and sincere than his own, a love that was to have a profound effect on his life. As the love affair



developed, his philosophy and classes suffered. He began to read his old lectures in class, and all his new writings were love songs which spread far and wide the story of these two lovers. There were few that didn't know of it, and among these few was Fulbert. When he at last discovered the betrayal of this scholar and his beloved niece, he was overcome with sorrow and anger. He chased Abelard from his house; but, as Abelard says, this separation of bodies only increased their union of souls.<sup>21</sup> Heloise soon discovered that she was pregnant and, rejoicing, sent word to Abelard. He decided that it would be best for her to get away from Fulbert who had been treating her badly, and one night when the old man was gone the pair left for Brittany. There at the house of Abelard's sister, Heloise gave birth to their son whom they named Astralabe. In the meantime, Fulbert was disturbed almost to insanity over the flight of Heloise. Abelard, having returned to Paris alone, was moved by the old man's sorrow and promised to marry Heloise if Fulbert would keep the marriage a secret in order that it would be no detriment to his fame. To this Fulbert readily agreed, in fact, all too readily. Heloise strongly protested to Abelard because of the danger it would be to his career and his fame. He finally persuaded her, however; and, having intrusted Astralabe to Abelard's sister, they returned secretly to Paris and were married. It was soon evident that Fulbert had no intention of keeping the marriage a secret. And when Heloise, to defend Abelard, told others that her uncle was lying, he began to mistreat her as before. Abelard, hearing of this, again took Heloise from her uncle's house to the convent of Argenteuil, where she had been educated and cared for in her youth. Fulbert was enraged at this and soon took revenge. He bribed Abelard's servant to be away one night and hired some men who took the scholar by surprise in his bed and made him a eunuch.

To escape his shame and the compassion and attention that was then heaped upon him by his friends, he retired to the monastery of Saint-Denis.<sup>22</sup> At his request Heloise took the veil and made her profession as a nun at Argenteuil; then he himself took the religious habit at Saint-Denis.

#### D. The Council of Soissons

At Saint-Denis Abelard found the life of the monks worldly and morally low, and his criticisms very much annoyed them. Thus when his former students pleaded that the monastery allow him to teach again, the abbot, Adam, who Abelard says was worse than those over whom he ruled, gladly gave him permission to retire from the monastery and open a school. This he did in the priory of Saint-Ayoul at Provins.<sup>23</sup> From this time on it was theology that Abelard was interested in teaching, and he used his fame as a great dialectician in order to draw students to the study of the sacred science.<sup>24</sup> His fame and number of his students grew as it had at Paris a few years before. But with the admirers came his enemies, including his two foes from Laon, Alberic and Lotulph, who, Abelard says incited everyone they could against him. It was at this time that Abelard wrote his first theological treatise, De Unitate et Trinitate Divina.<sup>25</sup> His aim in this treatise on the Trinity was

to correct the faults which he had himself discovered in the method of Anselm of Laon (the method of authority alone); he sought to render intelligible the doctrine of the Trinity by citing from classical authors statements which he considered as proofs of their belief in the Trinity of Christian Theology, and by explaining through the use of dialectic the reasonableness of a faith in a triune Godhead.<sup>26</sup>

With William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon dead, it was left to Alberic and Lotulph to lead the attack on this widely read treatise and its author. So, with the aid of their archbishop, Raoul, they convinced Canon d'Urrach, Cardinal bishop of Praeneste and papal legate in France, to preside over

a council at Soissons in 1121 in order to pass judgment on Abelard's work.

The Council of Soissons<sup>27</sup> is the second of Abelard's major calamities, and like his affair with Heloise it had a tremendous effect on his life. Abelard was invited to come to the Council and to bring his treatise. Expecting a public debate, he went with confidence accompanied by some of his followers. But his enemies had so stirred up the people and clerics of the town that stones were thrown at him when he arrived, and he was accused of having taught that there are three Gods. Further, he found that those who had been his accusers were now to be his judges.<sup>28</sup> They, however, could find nothing in particular in the work to bring against him. Before the council met, Abelard publicly discussed his teachings and doctrines, and his obvious sincerity won the approval of the people and some clerics. During the council Abelard was not allowed to discuss his doctrines but was subjected to the questions of his accusers. When the council fathers met on the last day to decide what action to take, Geoffrey, Bishop of Chartres, defended him and suggested that he be allowed to defend himself before the assembly. When this proposition failed, he suggested as an alternative that Abelard be given over to his abbot at Saint-Denis and that his treatise be diligently examined by many more learned persons. To this the legate and the others agreed. Abelard's enemies hurried to remind archbishop Raoul that if Abelard left his diocese to go to Saint-Denis, Raoul would no longer have jurisdiction over the affair. Then all three of them went to the legate and asked that the book be burned and that Abelard be enclosed in another monastery. They said that the fact that Abelard had presumed to read the book publicly without the authority of either the pope or the Church was sufficient reason to condemn the treatise.

They succeeded in changing the legate's mind.<sup>29</sup> Abelard was called to reappear before the assembly, and the sentence was read. With his own hand he had to put his treatise on the Trinity into the fire; he had to publicly recite the Athanasian Creed; and he was then entrusted to the abbot of Saint-Médard.<sup>30</sup>

Despite the kindness of the monks of Saint-Médard and their attempts to console him, Abelard was bitter over his condemnation.<sup>31</sup> His fighting spirit had been aroused. This monastery seemed to him only a grim prison. He says that when the cruelty and inconsiderateness of the sentence became apparent, each of his enemies blamed the other for it, while the legate, disgusted with the envy of the French, released him from Saint-Médard and allowed him to return to Saint-Denis.

#### E. Return to St. Denis and Flight From There

By reproving the monks at Saint-Denis for their mode of life, which had not changed, he again aroused their anger; and their opportunity to strike back soon came. While reading a commentary on the Acts of the Apostles by the venerable Bede, Abelard came upon a passage which refuted the established opinion that St. Denis of Paris, who had founded the monastery of Saint-Denis, and Dionysius the Areopagite, who had been converted by St. Paul and had brought the Gospel to France, were the same man.<sup>32</sup> When he showed this passage to some of the monks, they referred him to the life of St. Denis of Paris, written by a ninth century abbot of the monastery, Hilduin.<sup>33</sup> They said that since Hilduin had travelled to Greece for his information, he was the infallible authority. Abelard, however, asserted his preference for the authority of Bede. As the news spread, the outcry against Abelard became general. Abbot Adam jumped at

the chance to attack Abelard. He summoned the monks together and told them that since Abelard was degrading the spiritual father of France as well as of the monastery, he would denounce him before the king as an enemy of the country. But Abelard, fearing the wickedness of those monks, fled to the nearby territory of an old friend, Theobald II, then Count of Blois and Chartres.<sup>34</sup> He took up residence in the priory of Saint-Ayoul in the town of Provins.<sup>35</sup> He had friends here since he had stayed at this priory when he set up his school at Provins after his first brief stay at Saint-Denis.

It happened soon afterward that Adam, the abbot of Saint-Denis, came to take care of some business with Count Theobald, who at Abelard's request asked the abbot to free him from his vows to that monastery. But not wishing Abelard's fame to bring glory to any monastery but his own, Adam refused. He also threatened both Abelard and the prior of Saint-Ayoul with excommunication.<sup>36</sup> With the bishop of Meaux,<sup>37</sup> Abelard went to Adam's successor, Suger, with the same request. After some delay and with the further support of Stephen of Garlande, the royal seneschal and a most influential man with the king, Abelard finally obtained his release from Saint-Denis, on the condition that he would go to no other monastery but would retire into solitude.<sup>38</sup> Since Abbot Adam had died in 1122, Abelard's release must have taken place in this same year or in early 1123.

#### F. Founding of the Paraclet

The place Abelard chose for his life of solitude was one he had seen before and remembered. It was on the banks of the Arduzon River in the parish of Quincey, a little south-east of the town of Nogent-sur-Seine. There on the land which some friends had given him, Abelard, after obtaining

permission from Hatto, Bishop of that diocese of Troyes,<sup>39</sup> built an oratory out of mud and reeds; and there lived with a certain cleric. This solitude, however, did not last long. Abelard himself attests to what extent his popularity among the scholars was still alive: "When the scholars had found out where I was living, they began to come from all around, leaving cities and homes to live in this place of solitude..."<sup>40</sup> Along the bank of the Arduzon they lived like a colony of hermits; and as these students flocked to him his enemies again became uneasy. Abelard says that he could not farm and that he was ashamed to beg, and thus necessity forced him to take up teaching again.<sup>41</sup> One can imagine, however, that it was with great joy that he once more established himself in his accustomed profession. And so the new community became a school. New buildings were built; and the old oratory, which could hold only a small portion of the students was replaced by a larger one of wood and stone. This Abelard named Paraclete, which name soon came to pertain to the entire community.

At Quincey Abelard's fame grew as it had on two previous occasions at Paris and at Provins. And as before his enemies were close at hand. He says that since his former enemies had not been able to silence his teaching, they had excited two well known and trusted men against him.<sup>42</sup> The reference he then makes is obviously to St. Norbert, founder of the Premonstratensian Canons, and St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux. But this is probably a mistake on the part of Abelard because it is not likely that either one of these two men were attacking him at this early date.<sup>43</sup> Abelard says that the denunciations of his enemies were so great that even some of his friends turned from him. Attacked on all sides, he became nervous and melancholy, fearing every gathering of churchmen, lest it be a council that

would condemn him.<sup>44</sup> He even considered fleeing to a non-Christian land where he felt he could better live a Christian life.

#### G. Abbot at St. Gildas in Brittany

In 1125, having received permission from the abbot of Saint-Denis, Abelard accepted the position of abbot at the monastery of Saint-Gildas de Rhys in Brittany in the diocese of Vannes.<sup>45</sup> He says that it was only because of the oppressions that faced him at the Paraclete that he accepted the position. But he soon found the monks at Saint-Gildas worse than the enemies he had left behind.<sup>46</sup> The monastery was located in a barbarous land; the language was strange to Abelard;<sup>47</sup> and the monks made no attempt to conceal their disgraceful lives. Abelard soon regretted leaving the Paraclete and saw that he was now in even greater danger than he had been before.<sup>48</sup> It seems that a neighboring tyrant had been able, because of the mismanagement of the monastery, to gain control over all the lands adjacent to Saint-Gildas and exacted very high tributes from the monks. Besides this the monks often pressed Abelard for their daily necessities, which often included the support of their concubines and children. And when he did not give them enough because of extremely low funds, they stole from him what they could. Abelard was practically in despair that he had left the Paraclete for this miserable life which seemed to be doing neither himself or others any good.

In the midst of these troubles, the Paraclete brought Abelard some consolation as it had once before. Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis, claimed the convent of Argenteuil by virtue of a grant dating from the ninth century. He presented the claim to Rome with a charge of irregularity of life against the nuns. "By action of Pope Honorius II and King Louis VI,

the convent was transferred to the ownership of Saint-Denis in 1129.<sup>49</sup> The nuns were dispersed, giving Abelard the opportunity to provide for the saying of the office which had been neglected at the Paraclete since he left and to do something for his beloved Heloise who had been prioress at Argenteuil. Thus he gave the Paraclete to her and to the nuns remaining faithful to her.<sup>50</sup> At first the group of women lived poorly, barely able to sustain themselves; but after a time the people of the district took to them and generously helped them. Abelard describes the happy result: "God knows, they have made that place more fruitful in one year than I would have been able to do in a hundred years."<sup>51</sup> Heloise seems to have been especially loved and respected by all. Abelard often returned to the Paraclete to do what he could for her and her nuns. And when rumors began to spread, probably by the monks at Saint-Gildas, that it was carnal desire and not charity that prompted these visits, he found himself on the defense again. Abelard gives a lengthy apology for these visits in the Historia, adding that they served as a welcome rest from the fury of the storm at his monastery.<sup>52</sup>

Abelard's attempts at some reform at Saint-Gildas had driven the monks to active revolt. They made many attempts on his life, putting poison in his food and even in his Mass wine. After a certain bold attempt to poison him while he was visiting a sick monk outside the abbey, he decided to withdraw from the monastery and began to live with a few others in a separate priory.<sup>53</sup> He issued a ban of excommunication, forcing some of the worst monks to promise to leave the monastery; but they went back on their word and did not leave. Soon a papal legate, sent by Pope Innocent II, backed up Abelard; and those monks were forced to leave. However, this did not bring peace; for when Abelard returned to the monastery, he found



that the monks who remained were worse than those who had left. They actually attacked him with swords, and he barely escaped with the help of some knight.<sup>54</sup>

#### H. Years of Obscurity

Abelard left Saint-Gildas probably in late 1131 or in 1132.<sup>55</sup> His activity from this time to the beginning of the encounter in 1136 is obscure, for the Historia ends at this point. To what place of refuge he went from Saint-Gildas is not certain. Wherever it was, he probably remained there until 1136 when the thread of his history is again picked up -- this time by other sources. It was during this period of obscurity that Abelard wrote the Historia Calamitatum. And when Heloise, having obtained a copy of it, wrote to Abelard, that famous series of letters between the two was begun. The story that this correspondence tells of Heloise's still violent love for Abelard and of the gradual calming of her passion through his counsel is a study in itself. It must be passed over here in order to proceed to an examination of the encounter.

## II. The Encounter (1136-1142) — Part One: The Council of Sens

### A. Abelard's Return to Paris

In the writings of John of Salisbury Abelard emerges from the obscurity into which he settled after he left Saint-Gildas in 1131 or 1132. John tells us in his *Metalogicon* that he studied under Abelard on the hill of Sainte-Geneviève in the year following the death of King Henry I of England, which would have been in 1136:<sup>1</sup>

When as a young man, I had travelled to France for the sake of learning in the year following the death of the illustrious King Henry of England, the lion of justice, I went to Abelard (*peripateticum palatinum*), which famous doctor, a wonder to all, held a school on the hill of Sainte-Geneviève. There, at his feet I received the first rudiments of his art, and with mental eagerness I accepted whatever he said.<sup>2</sup>

Here again was the Abelard of old, doing what he knew best, teaching and disputing. Here on the battleground of his earlier struggles with William he was again involved in a dispute, this time with the sect called *Cornificiens*; and again he held high the banner of logic and reason. During the preceding period of solitude he had spent much time developing his theological ideas which now flowed from him to his students. His fame and popularity had not subsided even though he had not been teaching since he left the *Papaclete*. John of Salisbury expressed this in the above quotation with three words, "*admirabilis omnibus praesidebat.*" His followers were enthusiastic; his teachings spread even farther and his renown became even greater than before.

Abelard was still an innovator; he made theological mistakes as he had before the Council of Soissons. And that is why this return to the schools of Paris can be called the beginning of the encounter; for it again put the defenders of orthodoxy up in arms. This man who mixed dialectic with

theology was becoming too popular, they thought, for his own good and for the good of the Church.

#### B. Outcry of William of Saint-Thierry against Abelard

One of the first cries of alarm was sent up by William of Saint-Thierry, a monk at the Cistercian Abbey of Signy in the diocese of Rheims.<sup>3</sup> In late 1139 or early 1140 he sent identical letters to Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, and Geoffrey of Leves, bishop of Chartres, urging them to action against Abelard and his dangerous teachings.<sup>4</sup> He says that the Faith is being compromised and that important doctrines of the Church are being attacked; but what seems to disturb William more than anything is the extent of Abelard's popularity. William is thus our witness to Abelard's popularity at this time:

Peter Abelard is again teaching and writing novelties; his books have crossed the seas and the Alps; his new ideas about the faith and new dogmas are scattered through provinces and kingdoms; they are widely preached and freely defended. They are even said to have authority in the Roman Curia.<sup>5</sup>

William says that he had happened on two books, one of which is entitled Theologia Petri Abaelardi,<sup>6</sup> and that this title made him curious to read it. While doing so, he wrote down certain statements of which he disapproved. Thirteen of these statements are included in the letter, and William says that he is sending the two books as well. In his Disputatio adversus Abaelardum,<sup>7</sup> to which the letter seems to have been a prefix, William gives a fuller expose of these thirteen statements and a refutation of each.

William's indignation at Abelard's teachings is obviously sincere. He says that he loved the man and would still wish to do so but that no compromise can be made where God is concerned. The reason for his attack is clear. William had studied under Anselm of Laon and was an ardent advocate of the traditional method of theology. "He remained a representative

of the argument of authority and the vigilant guardian of the traditional methods."<sup>8</sup> He could not see what human reason could do in that area where Scripture and the Fathers had already spoken. Thus he judges harshly Abelard's use of dialectics in theology. He says that he applies to divine Scripture what should apply to dialectics alone and thus makes himself a censor of the faith rather than its disciple.<sup>9</sup> A similar attack by William on the doctrine of William of Conches<sup>10</sup> would seem to back up the sincerity of his indignation.

William tells Bernard and Geoffrey that he has found no one to turn to but them, for Abelard fears no one but them.<sup>11</sup> Bernard, abbot of the monastery of Clairvaux,<sup>12</sup> was the most powerful churchman of the time. He had recently almost singlehandedly won the support of all of Europe for Pope Innocent II against the anti-pope, Peter Leone. He was respected by all, and his influence was especially strong in Rome. Lamenting that he could spend so little time with his beloved monks, he had his hand in almost every important Church conflict that took place. He was, like William, a traditionalist in theology and a close friend of William besides. On the other hand, it is not as easy to see why Abelard would have reason to fear Geoffrey of Leves. It will be remembered that this man stood up in Abelard's behalf at the Council of Soissons in 1121. But Geoffrey was also a friend of Bernard and, what was perhaps more important, papal legate in France at the time. Thus he too would have much influence at Rome.

There is no evidence of a reply from Geoffrey of Leves to William's letter. His feelings for Abelard probably kept him from becoming involved in the conflict. Bernard, on the other hand, did reply to William.<sup>13</sup> His letter is short and modest. He tells William that he had a chance to read

his letter and Disputatio only quickly but that he liked it and thinks him justified in his criticisms. He says that in order not to break the spirit of Lent, he will wait until after Easter to take up the matter more thoroughly.

An important sentence of Bernard's reply to William helps solve the problem of when Bernard first began to oppose Abelard. He says, "Have patience on my further silence and hesitation, for I did not know many of these things, indeed most of them, before this time."<sup>14</sup> Since Abelard was so well known in France and Bernard was in such close contact with the events of the time, it is not likely that he was unacquainted with Abelard and his doctrine before William brought it to his attention. Thus when, in the above quoted passage from his reply to William, he says that almost all these things were new to him, he is probably referring to the particular propositions listed by William and not to Abelard's teaching or popularity. Other facts would seem to bear out the likelihood that Bernard did not take an open stand against Abelard before this time. The two men had been in contact on several other occasions. Their first known meeting was in January, 1131, at Morigny.<sup>15</sup> Also, after a visit of Bernard to Heloise and her nuns at the Paraclete, Abelard had occasion to write him in defense of the substitution of supersubstantialem for quotidianum in the Lord's Prayer by those nuns.<sup>16</sup> In these two instances there is no sign of hostility or great difference of opinion. William of Saint-Thierry, in his letter to Bernard and Geoffrey, says that they who have been silent are the very ones who should be taking action;<sup>17</sup> and Abelard, in a recently discovered letter which he wrote to his followers shortly before the Council of Sens, says of Bernard, "He, for some time a hidden enemy, has up to this time pretended

to be a true friend."<sup>18</sup> From these it is safe to conclude that Bernard's hostility to Abelard and his views dates from the time after he received the letter from William of Saint-Thierry. The only opposing evidence to this conclusion is Abelard's reference in the Historia Calamitatum to Bernard and Norbert as two men who began opposing him during his years of teaching at the Paraclete.<sup>19</sup> In the face of all other evidence, it must be said that Abelard was mistaken here in his reference to Bernard, a mistake made easily enough in view of his constant mental unrest and fear of denunciation at this time.<sup>20</sup>

#### C. Bernard's Visits to Abelard at Paris

William of Saint-Thierry at this point disappears from the scene, and there is no evidence whether or not Bernard ever conferred with him on the matter before or during the Council of Sens. But with or without the advice of William, Bernard wasted no time in taking action. After Easter in the year 1140 Bernard was in Paris at the invitation of the Bishop Stephen<sup>21</sup> to address the students and priests there. His sermon, De Conversione ad Clericos is not an attack on any particular person or doctrine, but references could have been applied to Abelard and his doctrine.

Bernard took advantage of being in the city where Abelard was again teaching. Having read the books of Abelard as well as the errors and their refutation that William had sent him, he was now fully convinced that Abelard's type of theology was very dangerous and would have to be stopped. So, armed with his zeal, he secretly visited Abelard in order to change his ways. When nothing was accomplished, Bernard returned with some witnesses and invited Abelard to restrain his followers from occupying themselves with such questions. The historicity of these visits is borne out by the account

of the proceedings of the Council of Sens written by Bernard to Innocent II in behalf of the Archbishop of Sens and his suffragans.<sup>23</sup> This account relates that the meetings were conducted in a friendly and familiar manner; but it is evident that no accord was reached between the two men and that their relationship did not remain friendly for long: "Bernard encouraged many students to repudiate and reject Abelard's books which were full of poison and to abstain from that doctrine which degraded the Catholic faith."<sup>24</sup> It is clear that this vicious attack of Abelard and his doctrines followed on the failure of Bernard's attempts to reconcile Abelard in their meetings. The third biographer of Bernard, Geoffrey of Auxerre, says that Abelard made promises to Bernard during these meetings but afterward went back on his word because of his pride and the counsel of his friends.<sup>25</sup> This postulate has been called false by the majority of historians on the grounds that it is not mentioned in the accounts of the council to Innocent and that it does not fit into what followed.

It was once commonly held that this attack by Bernard at Paris was his first against Abelard. But Abelard's letter to his followers discovered by Klibansky, seems to reveal a previous attack. He says that Bernard first attacked him at Sens in the presence of the archbishop and many of Abelard's friends and then at Paris in the presence of Abelard and others, presumably the students.<sup>26</sup> Whether this attack at Sens came before or after the private meetings cannot be determined from the portion of the letter given by Muckle. Considering the spirit of the meetings, it probably occurred after them; and since the attack at Paris followed this attack at Sens, Bernard must have left Paris after the meetings and returned shortly afterward. All of this took place in the weeks after Easter which fell on

April 7, 1140.<sup>27</sup>

#### D. The Call for a Disputation

Abelard's reaction to the attacks of Bernard were only what were to be expected from such an experienced and impetuous disputer. Bernard says that Abelard, with much rage and little patience, began to attack him often.<sup>28</sup> Abelard exhibits some of this anger in the letter to his followers: "(Bernard) now spews forth so much envy because he believes that the more glory my books bring me, the more is his own glory made humble."<sup>29</sup> It seemed to him that only envy could have prompted this unschooled abbot to attack the best philosopher-theologian of the day, and he responded with the strength and vigor of his earlier battles. It would only have been natural for him as a dialectician to be anxious to take part in a public disputation in which he could defend the catholicity of his theology. "Dialectical argument was the method whereby Abailard held that heretics were to be persuaded of their errors; the same method was to be employed to silence his own detractors."<sup>30</sup>

Before Klibansky's discovery of Abelard's letter to his followers, it was commonly held that Abelard himself called for a disputation at Sens. This theory was based on what Bernard said in his letters to Rome after the Council of Sens. In a letter to Pope Innocent II in the name of the archbishop of Sens, Henry Sanglier,<sup>31</sup> Bernard says that Abelard did not cease from petitioning the archbishop of Sens until that prelate had written to the Abbot of Clairvaux and fixed a day on which the two men could dispute.<sup>32</sup> In his own letter to Pope Innocent, Bernard simply says that Abelard challenged him to single combat.<sup>33</sup> But from a study of Abelard's letter to his followers, it can be seen that it was not he but those very followers that



petitioned Archbishop Henry for a disputation at Sens. Abelard tells them that in accord with their petition, the archbishop has directed letters to Bernard telling him that if he continued his attacks, Abelard would be prepared on the octave of Pentecost to answer those accusations.<sup>34</sup> Hence Bernard, in the two passages cited from his letters, is probably more corrected where he says that Abelard himself petitioned the archbishop of Sens. For Abelard probably did make it known, at least to his friends and followers, that he was willing to defend himself; they took over from there. They chose the place and petitioned the archbishop of Sens. When Bernard in his letter to Innocent in the name of the archbishop of Sens says that it was Abelard who petitioned Henry, he could easily have been referring to Abelard's followers whom he would have judged to be representing Abelard. Thus his letter does not preclude the possibility that he knew that it was Abelard's followers who were calling for a disputation.

It should be carefully noted that Abelard and his followers were asking for a disputation at which Abelard could defend himself, not a council where he would be judged. Their selection of Sens as the site for such a disputation later becomes important in the evolution of the meeting into a council. The reason why this city was chosen is unclear. Sikes claims that the choice was due to the hostility which Bishop Stephen of Paris showed toward Abelard. He says that this hostility is evident from Abelard's letter to his followers and from Stephen's invitation to Bernard to preach to the clerics and students at Paris. He did not consider the fact, however, that in a disputation the bishop would not be judging Abelard; besides, Henry, the Archbishop of Sens, was a close friend of Bernard.<sup>35</sup>

A practical reason why this town was chosen is that it lies at almost equal distance from Paris and Clairvaux. Also, Paris came under the

archbishopric of Sens. Thus, if the bishop of Paris was absent, as seems probably since he did not later appear at the Council of Sens,<sup>36</sup> the archbishop of Sens would have jurisdiction in the affair. It appears probable from the words of Abelard's letter to his followers that Archbishop Henry chose the date of the disputation.<sup>37</sup> It seems that he was planning a display of the holy relics in his cathedral church and had invited the bishops of his own province, the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, and many distinguished men including the king of France.<sup>38</sup> He was fully aware that a disputation of such magnitude would provide additional attraction for those invited and would besides bring prominence to himself and his diocese. Therefore he wrote to Bernard telling him of the offer that Abelard had made through his students and assigning the Octave of Pentecost as the date on which the disputation would take place.

#### E. Bernard's Acceptance of the Challenge

Bernard at first refused to appear on the assigned day. A disputation such as Abelard was calling for was the last thing that he wanted. He says in his own letter to Innocent after the Council of Sens that he refused both because Abelard was so much more experienced than he in dialectics and disputation and because he did not think that human reasoning should enter into the grounds of faith, which would happen in such a disputation.<sup>39</sup> Abelard, on the other hand, readily accepted the time and place of disputation which had been worked out between his followers and Archbishop Henry of Sens. This was what he had hoped for, the opportunity to defend himself against the recent accusations of Bernard and others. It was after he learned of Henry's action that he wrote the recently discovered letter to his followers. In asking them to come to Sens to aid

him in his defense, he does not refrain from attacking Bernard.<sup>40</sup> It is possible that Abelard wrote other letters to his friends in order to gain support at the disputation and to point out Bernard's own faults and errors. And it is these letters that Bernard gives as the reason why he finally agreed to appear at Sens at the appointed time. He says that because of Abelard's letters and the rumors spread by them, all now expected the disputation and that if no one appeared to answer or contradict Abelard's doctrines, his influence would be increased both among his disciples and others. Because of this he was forced to yield to the advice of his friends and to appear at Sens.<sup>41</sup> Bernard thus implies that it was Abelard's intention to force him into agreeing to the disputation. But it is possible that Abelard did not know of Bernard's refusal. He does not mention it in the letter to his followers.

Although reluctant to enter into the dispute, once he had decided to do so, Bernard would let nothing stand in his way. He was not at all ignorant of the ways and devices of the world, and he did not hesitate to use them. As was said above, a disputation was the last thing that Bernard wanted. He thought that Abelard's writings were sufficient to condemn him and that it was not his business but the duty of the bishops to decide the matter.<sup>42</sup> So this became his plan of attack, to convert the assembly of prelates that would be at Sens for the display of relics and for the disputation into a council that would pass judgement on Abelard and his writings. His first step in effecting this was to write identical letters to the bishops of the archdiocese of Sens who would take part in the gathering. His influence among them, as well as his influence with the archbishop himself, was probably very great considering Bernard's previous relations with the archbishop and his diocese. The letter is

short but effective. Bernard speaks of how he has been provoked to defend the Faith at Sens. He says that if it were his affair alone, he could not ask for their protection; but it is their affair also, even more so than his, and thus their duty to take action in the face of such grave heresy.<sup>43</sup> Bernard further declares that he is being forced to join battle unarmed and that they should be on their guard against the craftiness of the adversary.<sup>44</sup> By thus asking the bishops for their help, he plants the seeds for a council that will pass adverse judgement on Abelard. It is due to Bernard's maneuvers that the assembly which met on the Octave of Pentecost is to this day called a council, the Council of Sens.

Bernard's second step was to try to lessen Abelard's influence at Rome, for he knew that Abelard had friends there and hoped for support from them. Thus Bernard wrote letters to some of the cardinals and to an anonymous abbot, warning them of Abelard's errors and heresies. There are ten such letters, and it was once commonly held that they were all written and sent after the Council of Sens. While it is probably true that none of them were sent before the council, d'Olwer shows that most of them were written before the council.<sup>45</sup> Thus it is evident that Bernard was exerting his own influence at Rome to counterbalance that of Abelard. Bernard, indeed, subtly reminds Innocent of this fact in his letter to him by mentioning the recent "schism of Leo."<sup>46</sup> So the man who had reluctantly accepted Abelard's challenge was now fighting with all the power at his disposal to have the game played on his own terms.

#### F. The Setting

On June 2, 1140,<sup>47</sup> the day which Henry, archbishop of Sens, had set for his exposition of relics, the little town of Sens was in a festive mood. People were crowding into it from all over Europe; and as was

customary, the local merchants took full advantage of this by declaring a public holiday. But it was not the exposition of relics alone that drew so many people. Henry had calculated well when he set the date of the dispute between Abelard and Bernard at this same time. News of the proposed disputation between two such personages had excited all.

The religious and political personality of the one and the finesse and learning of the other, joined to that which one might know about his unhappy love, created an environment capable of drawing more spectators than the presense of the bishops and even of king Louis VII and his officers who had come to venerate the relics in the newly built cathedral. Eager for the spectacle and eloquent disputes which were approaching, a multitude of students had gathered from Paris and the nearby villages.<sup>48</sup>

It was a most prominent gathering, with King Louis VII of France and his entourage heading the list. Henry, archbishop of Sens, was, of course, present with all of his suffragan bishops except those of Paris and Nevers. Samson, archbishop of nearby Rheims, with some of his suffragan bishops was there as well as many pious and wise abbots and learned clerics.<sup>49</sup> Bernard also says that the count of Nevers was there; and Otto of Freising says that Theobald, count of Palatine, and other noble men were present as well as innumerable other people.<sup>50</sup>

So on that first Trinity Sunday all the dignitaries present, as well as the commoners who could manage it, crowded into the cathedral at Sens for the ceremonial veneration of the relics. It was not until the next day, June 3, that the disputation was to take place.<sup>51</sup>

As was mentioned previously, a disputation with Abelard was the last thing that Bernard wanted. After he had accepted the offer of Archbishop Henry to come to Sens for a disputation, he had immediately set the machinery in motion that would change this gathering of prelates into a

council that would sit in judgment on Abelard and his works. It has already been shown how he sent letters to the bishops who would be present at the gathering, emphasizing that the responsibility rested on their shoulders and how he composed letters to important Roman prelates to insure their support there. When he arrived at Sens, his efforts had not decreased in the least. We learn from Berenger, in the apology which he wrote for Abelard after the Council of Sens, that Bernard spoke in public to the people at Sens, presumably against Abelard and his teachings. Berenger says, "You spoke in public to the people that they might pray to God for him; interiorly however, you were disposed to write him off from the Christian world."<sup>52</sup> This is typical of Bernard's actions in the matter, for it shows that he already considered Abelard a heretic. This would not be a disputation to study Abelard's teachings, for in Bernard's eyes Abelard had already condemned himself by his own works. He had already presented this idea to the bishops present and to some prelates at Rome, and now he was appealing to the people to recognize Abelard's guilt. This section is not the place to pass judgment on Bernard's motives, but that he wanted to have Abelard condemned is evident from his actions, especially from those that follow.

#### G. Bernard and the Bishops Meet on the Eve of the Council

That Sunday evening, after the ceremony of the exposition of relics, Bernard took the last step in forming this gathering into a council. He was determined to bring about Abelard's condemnation, and he was not over-scrupulous about the means to be used. For on this evening he not only made sure that the bishops present would sit in judgment on Abelard and his works on the following day, he also got them to decide beforehand what that

judgment would be. The occasion for this was a meal at which the prelates were in attendance. It was probably a gathering of clerics very much as one might find today after some big religious ceremony. Sikes says that it was Bernard who gathered the bishops together,<sup>53</sup> but there is no evidence to back this up. The gathering had probably already been planned, and Bernard merely used the occasion. Berenger, Abelard's apologist, gives a detailed account of this meeting. He says that after the meal Abelard's book was brought forward and that someone began to read from it in a boring manner. He describes the meeting as a drunken assembly and says that many shouted insults and jokes during the reading while others slept soundly. He then relates how, when the assembly was asked whether Abelard should be condemned, they shouted that he should, many not even knowing what they were saying.<sup>54</sup> The details of this account of the meeting are libellous and most probably false. When he wrote it, Berenger was enraged over the treatment that his master had received at Sens and was wholly intent on attacking Bernard. However, the essentials of his account of the meeting of the bishops and of their condemnation of Abelard must be accepted as founded on fact; for the bishops and Bernard himself attest to them. Bernard in his letter to Innocent after the council in the name of the archbishop of Sens says that they had condemned Abelard's errors in doctrine the day before Abelard made his appeal, that is, the day before the council. This letter also states that the condemnation was made after the errors had been read and reread in public audience and been undoubtedly proved to be heretical, both by demonstrations and by authorities cited from St. Augustine and other Fathers by the Abbot of Clairvaux.<sup>55</sup> It is plain from this that Bernard had that evening succeeded in convincing the bishops that it was their duty to sit in judgment on Abelard on the next day and besides, to

condemn him.

#### H. Day of the Council

It has been seen that Abelard's supporters had called for a disputation and that it was a disputation to which he had agreed and which he expected. Bernard tells us that Abelard brought along some of these supporters to Sens.<sup>56</sup> He probably arrived, like everyone else, on the day before the council, the day of the veneration of relics. He could not have helped but notice what was happening. There is no evidence of whether or not he had any warning about the events of that evening and the decision of the bishops; but in all probability he did, for he had friends among those bishops. On the following day he entered the cathedral church. There assembled were the king of France, the archbishops and bishops of Sens and Rheims, and, in a prominent place, his adversary the abbot of Clairvaux. Besides this were as many people of all walks of life as could manage to squeeze in. If Abelard was apprehensive, he had good reason to be. He had come to Sens to defend himself in public disputation against the attacks Bernard had made on his doctrines. Instead he found himself face to face with an assembly which had all the appearances of an ecclesiastical council about to try a case of heresy in which he was to play the part of defendant.

First of all there was the customary sermon and prayer; and it is possible that Abelard remained in the crowd during these. When they were completed, he was invited to appear before the assembly.<sup>57</sup> Having done so, he found himself confronted by Bernard who had assumed the role not of a disputer but of a prosecutor. Not certain what was about to happen, Abelard took the seat that had been assigned to him. Then Bernard began.



He said that he was going to read various propositions taken from Abelard's writing and that Abelard had the option of denying that he had written them or of accepting the authorship and either justifying them or correcting them. He then began to read the propositions and to show them to be heretical by reason and especially by the authority of the Fathers.<sup>58</sup>

These propositions, as well as the arguments against them, were most probably the same that he had presented to the bishops on the day before.

In his letter to Innocent in the name of the archbishop of Sens, Bernard says that the propositions were taken from "the book of theology of master Peter."<sup>59</sup> But in his letter to Innocent in his own name he says that he brought forth "certain propositions taken from his books."<sup>60</sup> The "book of theology" referred to in the first letter really refers to two of Abelard's works, the Introductio and the Theologia Christiana.

Up to this point Abelard was probably uncertain as to what was going to happen. But now it became all too clear. Although Bernard does not mention it in his accounts of the proceedings, he surely did not fail to remind Abelard that the council fathers, the bishops, had condemned these propositions on the previous day. Thus it was evident that Abelard was not there to argue for his doctrines in open debate. He was entirely on the defensive, with the choice of denying, correcting, or justifying his writings. He in no way intended to do either of the first two, and to attempt the third in view of the situation appeared useless. He seems to have acted suddenly and without warning. He broke the silence, which he had apparently kept since he took his place, by refusing to make a response to Bernard or the bishops, rejecting the authority of the council, and appealing to the Holy See. Bernard gives two slightly different accounts of this. In one he says that Abelard, at a loss what to do,

refused to reply, appealed to the hearing of the Holy Father, and left the assembly with all his supporters.<sup>61</sup> In the other account Bernard says that when he began to read the propositions, Abelard, unwilling to listen, got up and left, appealing from the council.<sup>62</sup> Seeing these two passages together, one can guess that Bernard read the first proposition and then stopped to ask Abelard whether he wished to reject or correct the passage. It was probably then that Abelard stood up and made his appeal. Berenger, Abelard's apologist, puts these words into his mouth at the time of the appeal, "I am a son of the Roman Church. I wish my cause to be judged as the cause of the impious: I appeal to Caesar (Act. XXV)."<sup>63</sup> Here Berenger is undoubtedly putting words into his master's mouth, but it produces the desired effect, to emphasize the solemnness and importance of the moment. Abelard had refused to abide by the rules of his adversary, Bernard. He had challenged the authority of the assembly before which he stood and appealed to the highest court in the Church, Rome.

Appeals to Rome were always delicate affairs; and the members of the assembly at Sens were probably very much surprised and annoyed at this one. The prerogatives of the Holy See were closely guarded by the pope and the Roman Curia. The council members would think twice before exceeding their authority and impinging on the jurisdiction of Rome. And yet, if they did nothing and let the Holy See handle the affair completely, their prestige would suffer a great setback and Abelard would appear as having been unjustly called before them and justified in his appeal. Their final action turned out to be a compromise between doing nothing at all and totally condemning Abelard and his doctrines. They merely restated the condemnation of those propositions from his works that they had made the day before. The archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans in the letter written for them

by Bernard emphasized the fact to Pope Innocent that it was in deference to his authority that they were doing this only and had decided nothing against the person of Abelard.<sup>64</sup> The archbishop of Sens and his suffragans, in the letter Bernard wrote for them, asks Pope Innocent to condemn those propositions which they have condemned and also all persons who obstinately maintain them. They further ask that the pope impose a silence on Abelard, suspend altogether his powers of lecturing and writing, and condemn his books as being filled with errors.<sup>65</sup> So although the bishops only condemned a few of Abelard's statements, they were asking Pope Innocent to impose a blanket condemnation on him, his works, and his followers.

## II. The Encounter (1136-1142) — Part Two: After the Council of Sens

### A. Bernard's Accounts of the Council in Behalf of the Bishops

It may seem a little strange that Bernard wrote the accounts of the Council of Sens for Archbishops Henry of Sens and Sanson of Rheims. But actually it was quite logical. It was Bernard who had written to the bishops concerning their responsibility. It had been under his initiative that the proposed disputation had been converted into a council and that the bishops had passed judgment on Abelard's teachings. And now he was determined that his efforts would not be frustrated by an appeal to Rome. At Rome, Bernard knew, Abelard had friends, even among the members of the Curia. Doubtless some of them were the teacher's former pupils. He also knew that it was possible though not probable for the Holy See to reverse the decision of the council. Thus, from Bernard's point of view there was no time to waste if a condemnation from Rome was to be assured. He probably readily offered his services to Archbishops Henry and Sanson for the writing of their accounts of the council to Pope Innocent. He wrote

one in the name of Archbishop Samson of Rheims and his suffragans, Bishop Joscelin of Soissons, Bishop Geoffrey of Châlons, and Bishop Alvisus of Arras.<sup>66</sup> This letter harshly denounces Abelard and his doctrine:

Peter Abelard is endeavouring to destroy the virtue of the Christian faith, inasmuch as he thinks that he is able to comprehend the whole that God is by his unaided human reason, he is ascending to the skies, he is descending to the depths.<sup>67</sup>

Such unfair evaluation of Abelard and his teaching is typical of all the letters that Bernard sent to Rome. This is followed by a warning that these evil doctrines have spread to Rome, even to the Curia. Then there is a short summary of the events of the council and an exhortation to Innocent to take some action to put an end to this heresy. The second letter that Bernard wrote, this time in the name of Henry, Archbishop of Sens, and his suffragans, Bishop Geoffrey of Chartres, legate of the Holy See, Bishop Elias of Orleans, Bishop Hugo of Auxerre, Bishop Otto of Troyes, and Bishop Manasses of Meaux<sup>68</sup> is longer and more detailed than the first. In fact, he says in the first that a longer and fuller account is contained in the letters of the bishop of Sens.<sup>69</sup> This letter contains a longer exposition which is just as harsh, of the dangers of Abelard and his doctrine and a much more detailed account of the council. It is also here that Innocent is requested to sentence Abelard to perpetual silence and to condemn his works and his followers. At the end of this letter it is stated that a list of propositions which were condemned at the council is also being sent.<sup>70</sup> Rivière has established that these propositions were nineteen in number.<sup>71</sup>

Leclercq claims that the treatise entitled Capitula Haeresum Petri Abaelardi<sup>72</sup> is the list of propositions that Bernard sent to Innocent with the letter in the name of the bishops of Sens. He also says that it is the

same that Bernard read to the bishops on the eve of the council, that is, those propositions containing errors and a refutation of them by passages from St. Augustine and the other Fathers.<sup>73</sup> However, on reading this work, it becomes apparent that it is not the refutation that Bernard gave at the Council of Sens, for it contains only one reference to any of the Fathers, and that to St. Gregory, not Augustine. Whereas the refutation that Bernard gave at the council made extensive use of the Fathers, especially Augustine.<sup>74</sup> Bernard's sole means of refutation in this nine-chapter work is through the Scriptures. Also, it is probable that it was written before the Council of Sens, not after; and although it may have been sent after the council as were some of Bernard's other letters against Abelard which he had written before the council,<sup>75</sup> this was not Bernard's original intention. Several facts make this apparent. First of all, it has the form of a letter, which would seem to indicate that it was sent independently of anything else. Also, it makes no mention of the Council of Sens, which it would undoubtedly have done had it been written after that event. In fact, Bernard says in the conclusion that since he could do nothing against the injury that Abelard was bringing to the faith, he thought it fitting to warn him who had the power to take action.<sup>76</sup> Thus it would appear that this treatise refuting some of Abelard's teachings was part of Bernard's pre-council activity, previously described, which was aimed at lessening Abelard's influence, especially at Rome.

#### B. Bernard's Letters to Rome

Having sent the two accounts of the council and the above mentioned treatise, Bernard did not rest from his efforts. It has already been seen that he had composed six letters to various cardinals and an abbot at Rome

and one which was to all the bishops and cardinals of the Curia. He now sent these, modifying two of them, and composed three new ones.<sup>77</sup> In all these letters he speaks with a cutting tongue of Abelard and his teachings. He reproves the cardinals for the favor that Abelard had found in the Curia, and in those letters written or revised after the council he makes it clear that they should oppose the heretic's appeal. An example of this is in the last few lines of the letter to Cardinal Gregorius Tarquinius, where he says, "Now after having disturbed and troubled the Church, he enters the Curia, not that he might express his contrition, but that he might make excuses for his sins. If you are a true son of the Church, defend her now who has borne and nourished you."<sup>78</sup>

Then in order to exert the maximum influence on Pope Innocent, Bernard wrote two letters to the pontiff in his own name. The first was probably written right after the council along with his letters in behalf of the archbishops of Sens and Rheims.<sup>79</sup> It is a lengthy letter which laments the rise of Abelard and his teachings and subtly reminds Innocent of Bernard's great share in getting rid of the anti-pope, Peter Leone. Its account of the proceedings at Sens is as valuable as that given in the letter of the archbishop of Sens, and like that letter, though not as strongly, it tells Innocent that it is his duty to put down this heresy which has arisen. Bernard's second letter to Pope Innocent is much shorter and similar in language to the first.<sup>80</sup> Leclercq holds that this letter was not sent at all, but was replaced by the longer letter.<sup>81</sup> D'Olwer agrees and adds that the smaller letter was composed before the Council of Sens.<sup>82</sup> This does not seem possible, first of all because of a sentence in the smaller letter which clearly refers to Abelard's appeal<sup>83</sup> and secondly because

Bernard says in it that he would come to Rome himself if it were not for the care of his brethren and the weak state of his health.<sup>84</sup> His activity before the council makes it apparent that he did not have weak health at that time. The letter does not give a detailed account of the council but seems to presuppose a knowledge of what has happened. Thus it was probably written and sent some weeks after the longer detailed letter with the hopes of hastening Pope Innocent's decision in the matter.

### C. Innocent II's Two Letters of Condemnation

Bernard's influence proved powerful at Rome, and his letters had their desired effect. There was not one cardinal, as far as is known, that defended Abelard. And within little over a month after the council, Pope Innocent officially condemned him. On July 16, 1140, he sent two letters, both addressed to Archbishops Henry of Sens and Samson of Rheims and their suffragans and to Bernard.<sup>85</sup> In the first letter Innocent gives a short defense of his power to condemn heresies by recalling past condemnations. He then gives evidence of Bernard's influence in the matter when he says that he laments that former heresies and other perverse teachings are again arising in the doctrine of Peter Abelard, as has been made known to him by letters and the list of propositions that were sent to him.<sup>86</sup> Finally, Innocent says that, having taken council with the cardinals, he condemns the propositions which have been sent to him and also their author and all his teachings. He also imposes perpetual silence on Abelard and excommunicates his followers and defenders.<sup>87</sup> The second letter is very short and of the same date. It authorizes the two archbishops and Bernard to have Abelard and Arnold of Brescia enclosed in separate monasteries. It further says that their books which contain errors should be burned wherever they are found.<sup>88</sup>

There is proof from a letter of Geoffrey of Auxerre that besides these condemnations, Innocent had Abelard's books publicly burned in the church of St. Peter at Rome.<sup>89</sup> Thus was Bernard's victory complete. His adversary, forbidden to teach those doctrines which Bernard feared so greatly, would be forced to spend his days in a monastery, which since Abelard was a monk, the abbot of Clairvaux thought only right.

#### D. Abelard After The Council

The council was over, and Abelard had been defeated, not in dispute, but by maneuvers and forces beyond his control. The encounter, however, was not over, for Abelard's personal struggle was still raging. For the details of what happened to him after the council, Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, is the source. The first sentence of his letter to Pope Innocent tells us that Abelard, coming from "Francia," had stopped at Cluny.<sup>90</sup> France here refers to only a small part of today's France, a part that centered around Paris. Thus, after the Council of Sens Abelard must have returned to Paris. This would only have been logical since his residence was there, and he would have to prepare for the long journey to Rome. He apparently stayed at Paris for about a month because it is at Cluny that he learns of his condemnation at Rome which was given on July, 16. It is commonly held by most historians that it was during this stay at Paris that Abelard wrote his Apologia, the work discovered in part by Ruf and Grabmann.<sup>91</sup> This is an apology for each of the propositions brought against Abelard at the Council of Sens. It begins with a list of those propositions. Then, if one is to judge from the part that has been found, follows an answer to each one individually.<sup>92</sup> Rivière says that this apology was written by the accused at a time when he believed that he



was still able to plead his case. This would indicate that it was before he knew of his condemnation at Rome, almost necessarily during his stay at Paris, that Abelard wrote this work.

#### E. Abelard Retreats to Cluny

Abelard left Paris and, as we have seen, stopped at the Abbey of Cluny. Perhaps he needed a rest -- he was sixty-one years old. Probably he was seeking some advice from a wise and holy man. Peter the Venerable tells us that, having heard from Abelard what had happened at Sens, he counselled him to go ahead with his appeal, citing the fact that Apostolic justice never failed.<sup>93</sup> Thus the news had not yet reached them of Innocent's condemnation. It soon did, however, probably in the person of Raynaud de Bar-sur-Seine, abbot of Citeaux. He came advocating a reconciliation between Bernard and Abelard. And having convinced Peter the Venerable of the desirability of such a reconciliation, they both encouraged Abelard to go with Raynaud to Bernard, adding that on the advice of Bernard and other good and wise men he should strike from his works and his teachings anything he might have written or said which was offensive to Catholic ears.<sup>94</sup> That Raynaud had been sent by Bernard to Cluny to offer reconciliation is not certain. Didier's conclusion that the offer was from Bernard seems most acceptable.<sup>95</sup> It also seems likely that it was Raynaud who brought the news of Pope Innocent's condemnation. Had Abelard not known of the condemnation, it is not likely that he would have agreed to go to Bernard, for he would still have been intent on appealing his case at Rome. But having heard the sentence of Rome, he accepted it with dignity; and with a magnificent stroke of submission and courage, in which the personal struggle of the encounter reached its climax, he agreed to go

to Bernard. Peter the Venerable says of the meeting: "Thus it was done. He went, he met peacefully with the abbot of Clairvaux, their former quarrels forgotten and Raynaud as mediator, and he returned."<sup>96</sup> Where he says "thus it was done" he is referring to the fact that agreement was made according to Peter the Venerable's suggestion that Abelard take Bernard's advice about what things he should retract from his teachings and writings.<sup>97</sup> The second of Abelard's apologies, the Professio Fidei, resulted from these negotiations. He probably wrote it immediately after his return to Cluny from the meeting with Bernard. It is not a defense of his doctrines as the Apologia had been. Rather, it is a profession of seventeen points of the Faith against which Bernard had accused him of writing in the list of propositions he had put forward at the Council of Sens. But at the same time it is a defense of his innocence, for he claims throughout that it had never been his aim to overturn the doctrines or to destroy the unity of the Faith. Even so, it was a submission; it was in accord with what he and Bernard had agreed to in the reconciliation.

Encouraged by Peter the Venerable and the other monks of Cluny, Abelard asked the holy abbot to write to Pope Innocent and request permission for him to spend the rest of his days at Cluny. His last intellectual struggle was over, and his defeat therein was now to lead him to the last stages of his own personal struggle, which was fast becoming a personal victory. He had decided to abandon the tumults of the schools and studies and to give his last years to more important things, to a contemplative life. Thus, Peter the Venerable wrote a letter to Innocent,<sup>98</sup> which was the source above for Abelard's activity after the council, and obtained permission for Abelard to remain at Cluny. From this time on, his humble devotion

astounded the abbot and the monks. Peter the Venerable relates this change in character in his letter to Heloise after Abelard's death. He says that he never saw such humility and that Abelard read much, prayed often and kept voluntary silence except when urged by the monks to speak on divine things. And after receiving permission from the pope, he said Mass as often as he could.<sup>99</sup> It was at this time that he wrote his apology to Heloise, the Confessio Fidei.<sup>100</sup> While apologetic, it clearly marks a further change from his two previous apologies. It is his own testimony of the victory of the personal struggle he had been waging.

When Abelard fell sick, Abbot Peter sent him to the priory of Saint-Marcel, a daughter house of Cluny located at Châlons-sur-Saône, where he thought the climate would be better. Here Abelard intensified his life of prayer, reading, and writing.<sup>101</sup> But his illness became worse. He made a last confession of faith, confessed his sins, received the last sacraments, and died on April 12, 1142, at the age of sixty-three.<sup>102</sup> Peter the Venerable then wrote a letter to Heloise from which the above facts about his last days are known.<sup>103</sup> Abelard's final submission to the Church and austere life at Cluny earned for him in this letter a magnificent eulogy by a very holy man.

### III. The Meaning of the Encounter -- Part One: The Personal Struggle

Thus did the encounter unfold and thus did it end. Its facts having been as closely as possible ascertained, its meaning begins to show forth. It was pointed out in the introduction that this meaning is twofold; for the encounter signifies both a personal struggle and a theological struggle. Each of these will be studied here in turn, always with a mind to the facts which have preceded.

Abelard's personal struggle was a major one. It was a struggle against his own tendencies and personality traits that threatened to destroy him; and it ended in a victory over them. The proud and roaring lion of the schools ends his life in peace as a humble monk. At first the change appears sudden and without reason; but a closer look at the facts shows this to be untrue.

From his early years Abelard's chief characteristics were undoubtedly his pride and arrogance. Much of this probably came naturally to him because of the territory in which he was born. As opposed to southern France, the north was known for the rough and self-sufficient individuals to whom it gave rise.<sup>1</sup> Otto of Freising said of Abelard that from his youth he dedicated himself to the study of letters and to other witty investigations but that he was so arrogant and confident in his own genius that he would scarcely humble himself to descend from the height of his own mind to listen to his teachers.<sup>2</sup> By itself this natural pride might have been more easily conquered, but accompanied as it was by a natural brilliance of mind, it grew to great proportions from his early years in the schools and elsewhere until his mutilation.

The advantages of his personality, the exterior qualities of his

teaching, his limpid clarity, limpidissimum fontem, as Foulques de Deuil says, the art of posing questions, the brilliance of his argumentation, his finesse in discussion, the quickness of his original spirit, all these assured a longlasting reign to this "knight of the dialectic," as Dom Tosti calls him.<sup>3</sup>

As has been seen, Abelard himself is witness to his pride and arrogance during his early years at Paris. From the Historia it is apparent that he was a man fully aware of his own intellectual powers who looked with disdain on those who dared to oppose him. His contempt and treatment of William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon were little worthy of a man with such tremendous power. His power rested in his influence over his students and followers whose number reached into the thousands. And nothing seems to have given him greater pleasure than these throngs of eager listeners who crowded to him at Paris and Melun. He speaks of his pride as prompting his move to Melun in 1102: "Presuming my own genius to be superior to the men of my age, as a young man I aspired to be the master of a school and I provided a place in which I could do so, namely the city of Melun which was then the royal place of residence."<sup>4</sup> This pride led to a moral decline which reached its low point in his determination to seduce Fulbert's niece, Heloise. He did not see how any woman could refuse a man of such great fame.<sup>5</sup>

Abelard was not without the virtues to counteract this intense pride. His family appears to have been a very religious one. His mother and father both joined religious orders, and his sister seems not to have hesitated in the least in taking him and Heloise in after their flight from Paris. And even though he had left for the schools at an early age, Abelard must have absorbed some of this virtue. It shows forth for the first time in the Historia in his pity for Fulbert's sorrow and shame. He says that he accused himself of being the cause of this sorrow and offered to marry

Heloise to mitigate it.<sup>6</sup> Already the strength of her love was a big factor in his change of character. He had gone to her with the greedy idea only of taking, and he found in her a giving and a loyalty and a true devotion which he had not counted on. Now he was ready to marry her at the risk of ruining his future career, something that would never have entered his mind a few years earlier.

Soon after his marriage with Heloise, Abelard's life became a constant series of misfortunes. In the Historia he speaks of two of these, his mutilation and his condemnation at Soissons, as remedies sent from divine providence for his incontinent living and his pride. He says that his mutilation was the remedy for his incontinence by depriving him of the means and that his condemnation at Soissons was the remedy of his pride by the humiliation of burning his book.<sup>7</sup> By the word "nolenti" in this passage, he makes it clear that at the time these misfortunes came he was not consciously aware of the good they would help to bring about. For it must be remembered that the Historia was written in that short period of peace between the time he fled from the monastery of Saint-Gildas about 1132 and the beginning of the encounter in 1136. At the time of the events themselves only the seeds of their effects were sown, effects which were to fructify fully in the reflection of later years. They were not without immediate effects, however, for again and again in this time of grave misfortunes the slow change in Abelard's character is demonstrated. He decries the loose living of the monks at Saint-Denis; and, as abbot of Saint-Gildas, his efforts at reform in that infested monastery were relentless to the point of endangering his life. When condemned at Soissons, he says, it was only between sighs and tears that he could read the creed as was demanded.<sup>8</sup> He must have been deeply moved at being treated like a heretic.

And when he went to the solitude of Quincey after leaving Saint-Denis, he seems to have enjoyed the peace and poverty of life there.

While the slow change in character was apparent during the time of misfortunes, it was overshadowed by the pride and arrogance which still predominated. After his mutilation one of the first things Abelard did was to order Heloise to take the veil at Argenteuil where she had been staying.<sup>9</sup> This selfishness shows that he did not yet realize the force of her love. She obeyed him without question or complaint. From this time, each misfortune put him on the defensive, forced him to be more self-assertive, expecting hostility wherever he went. His interior struggle became more and more intense; and the exterior agitation caused by his enemies and himself reflects the troubled state of his soul. When during his first stay at Saint-Denis he opened a school at Provins and his students again flocked to him, his enemies were there, attacking and accusing. After his condemnation at Soissons he was bitter. His fighting spirit was aroused, and he rejected the attempts of the monks at Saint-Médard to console him. Back again at Saint-Denis he antagonized the monks there about the falsity of the legend of St. Denis until he was forced to flee. For a while he seemed to have found peace in the solitude at Quincey, but soon his students flocked to him again. He says that he began to teach because of his poverty, but one wonders how he managed to get along before his students came. It is probable that he rejoiced at the chance to get back to what he loved. His staunch defense of the name Paraclete for the new Oratory at Quincey against stiff opposition is evidence of this.<sup>10</sup> But, as has been seen, with his success as a teacher always came his enemies. It seems that this time, probably due to the misfortunes

that had befallen him, he could not stand up to them; he could no longer snap back with the quick answers that used to put them in their place. He was afraid. His condemnation at Soissons had made him cautious, and he feared lest it should happen again.<sup>11</sup> When the anguish of mind this caused became too great, he fled by way of accepting the position of abbot at Saint-Gildas. But here, as has been seen, he found only cause for more anguish, for the monks became more dangerous enemies than had been those in the schools.

As was mentioned above, it was only after Abelard had fled from Saint-Gildas and spent some time in solitude that the misfortunes of the preceding years began to have their full effect. These four years of his life, from 1132 to 1136, are hidden in obscurity for a reason. Abelard wished to be left alone, especially by his students. He needed this time to think, and that he used it well is evident from the Historia which was written during this period. "When reviewing the events of his early life, he came to see in their deed the working of the finger of God."<sup>12</sup> It has been mentioned that at this time he began to see his two biggest misfortunes, his mutilation and his condemnation at Soissons, as remedies for his incontinence and his pride. A further example of his religious insights and peace at this time is his acceptance of his mutilation as a gift of God. He says:

What up to this time I had done out of the desire for money or praise I would now do, that is, study, for the love of God. Attending to that talent which had been given to me by God to be used as capital and which up to this time I had used to accumulate riches, I would now study with the intention of educating the poor. And for this reason then I knew that the hand of God had touched me so that, freed from carnal desires and withdrawn from the disturbing life of the world, I might truly become a philosopher of God rather than of the world.<sup>13</sup>

This was also the period in which the biggest part of the correspondence



between Abelard and Heloise took place. Heloise wrote the first letter, telling him of the violent passions that still raged within her and how vividly she remembered their love. She says that she only mechanically fulfills her duties as abbess at the Paraclete. Abelard accepts the task of directing by letter her and her community. His letters are only further evidence of the tremendous good this time of solitude was reaping in his character. Only now does his love become worthy of hers. He responds with peaceful and fruitful counsels until she finally conquers her passions and agrees to live according to his directions. Overwhelmed by her submission to him and united to her by a spiritual bond far stronger than any carnal union, he could refuse her nothing. At her request he wrote hymns and sermons and answered questions for the nuns at the Paraclete. He even dedicated his Hexameron to her.

Thus chastened by his misfortunes and the high and self-sacrificing love of Heloise, it would seem that Abelard had finally found the peace that he had been looking for. Evidently he thought that his troubles were over, for he returned to Paris in about 1136 and took up teaching again. And the schools had not forgotten this brilliant master. Students flocked to him as before, and his influence became even greater than it had been. During his four years of solitude he had thought about his theology as well as about himself, and now he began to teach these developed doctrines with enthusiasm, disputing in his accustomed manner and with his accustomed success. It is probably that he fell again into the pride of his earlier years, forgetting for the moment the misfortunes and reflections that had elapsed since those years. The schools could do this to him, for they were a part of himself and disputation came natural to him. No longer did

he fear his attackers. The excitement of the moment let him forget the mental anguish they had caused him at Saint-Denis and at the Paraclete. Once more he could strike back with a sharp tongue and was ready to defend his doctrines against all accusers.

Abelard's reaction to Bernard's visit to him at Paris was probably one of disinterested amusement. After all, who was this unschooled abbot to challenge the teachings of the most capable master of all Europe? But it has been seen how his attitude changed when Bernard began to publicly attack him.<sup>14</sup> His amusement turned to anger, and he longed for a disputation with this impudent monk. When his followers had arranged for such a disputation, he accepted without hesitation. He did not yet realize the tremendous power that his opponent had at hand, and which he was even then setting in motion.

Abelard went to Sens accompanied by his followers. Confident of his own ability to handle himself in a disputation, he may even have been looking forward to it. He soon found, however, that Bernard had things well under control. As the session progressed, his apprehension grew until the moment that he stood up and dramatically made his appeal. The why of this appeal poses an interesting question. Hefele is puzzled by it and blames it on a mere momentary whim. He asks, "why would he not have begun a discussion with the hope of removing, with the help of superiority of his so perceptive spirit, the condemnation which menaced him?"<sup>15</sup> Similarly Truc cannot understand the appeal. He says that Abelard had Bernard right where he wanted him and that he could have triumphed over the abbot by the superiority of his resources. "But in the place of that there is this protest, this silence, this flight which explains nothing

because it does not explain itself."<sup>16</sup> These problems, however, do not seem to hold up after a close examination of all the factors.

Two reasons which are sometimes proposed for Abelard's appeal must be dismissed from the start. Geoffrey of Auxerre in his account implies that Abelard was convinced by Bernard of his errors and appealed only to gain time.<sup>17</sup> The three apologies which Abelard wrote after the council all defend his innocence if not his doctrines and make it quite clear that he had not been convinced of his errors at the Council of Sens. Another reason for the appeal is put forward by Jeannin, who blames Abelard's physical failing for Bernard's victory at Sens. He says that this is the first sign of a malady which slowly progresses and finally ends in the death of the master.<sup>18</sup> The facts, however, do not seem to support this theory. If illness was the cause of his sudden departure, it is not likely that he would have appealed to Rome which was so far away and where he knew he would thus have to go to plead his case. Besides this, Peter the Venerable does not say that Abelard was sick when he stopped at Cluny; rather he says that he encouraged him to carry out his appeal at Rome.<sup>19</sup>

There are a number of factors which led to Abelard's sudden decision to appeal his case to Rome. And the first of these is the fact that he did not think that it should be a case at all. From the moment he realized the turn-about that Bernard had managed, the converting of the proposed disputation into a council that would sit in judgment, his apprehension began to grow. When he entered the cathedral on Monday and saw the array of prelates with Bernard at their head, his fears that what he had heard was true increased. He probably began to recall the anxieties that his enemies had used to cause him at Saint-Denis, at the Paraclete, at Saint-

Gildas; and the remembrance of these times of trouble steadily increased the agitation of his mind while he stood waiting for the preliminary ceremonies to end. When Abelard had been called to appear before the assembly and had taken his seat, Bernard stepped forward and gave him the choice of repudiating or accepting and changing the propositions which he then began to read. Abelard could not have helped but remember the treatment that he had received at the Council of Soissons when the mob had been stirred up against him by Alberic and Lotulf. Otto of Freising concurs in the opinion that this was one of the factors pushing Abelard to his sudden decision. He says, "Where (Sens) while his faith was being discussed, fearing a sedition of the people, he appealed to the court of the Apostolic See."<sup>20</sup> However, this time it was not so much a sedition of the common people as one of the people that were to pass judgment on him, the prelates, that he feared. Bernard, as had Alberic and Lotulf, was presenting Abelard's doctrine as being clearly heretical. As at Soissons Abelard was now to have no chance to defend his doctrine as he wished, as he would have in a disputation. He could only disclaim it or change it.<sup>21</sup> And this introduces another factor which contributed to his appeal. It will be remembered that the prelates in attendance had condemned, on the previous evening, these propositions that Bernard was reading. It is probable that Abelard knew of this. He had friends among the prelates who might have told him, and it is not unlikely that Bernard himself told Abelard that these propositions had already been condemned before he began reading them. Deutsch, in fact, cites this pre-council meeting as the major motivation of Abelard's appeal.<sup>22</sup>

All of these factors were weighing more and more heavily on Abelard's mind as the session progressed, as Bernard read on. His anguish increased

with each thought of the past and present. He saw every misfortune of his earlier years repeating itself. Finally it became too much for him. He stood up before his accusers and appealed to the Holy See. If we are to accept the testimony of Geoffrey of Auxerre, Abelard later told his friends that his mind was a blank at the time, his memory and all his wits having forsaken him.<sup>23</sup> This far had his anguish driven him. And Berenger seems to back up this theory, for he says, "caught between so many and such great mental torments, Abelard fled to asylum in the examinations of Rome."<sup>24</sup> Thus the suddenness of the appeal is explained by the fact that Abelard could withstand such oppression up to a certain point, and at that point he could take it no longer.

Up to this time Abelard's reaction at Sens is very similar to those at the time of his earlier misfortunes, flight from oppression which had become too great for him. This was the case in his flights from Saint-Denis from Paris, to the Paraclete from Saint-Denis, to Saint-Gildas from the Paraclete, and to solitude from Saint-Gildas. He seems for the moment to have forgotten the spiritual revival he had undergone four years earlier. These four years back in the schools seems to have erased from his memory the lessons that his misfortunes had taught him. His actions were not those of the proud and impetuous master, not of the man of virtue and wisdom who had composed the Historia and the letters to Heloise. Abelard's first apology is a part of this immediate reaction to the events at Sens. He wrote it when he had returned to Paris. In this work, as has been seen, he defends each of the nineteen propositions that had been brought against him. This energetic protest against those who had disfigured his teaching he addresses to "criminator frater Bernarde."<sup>25</sup>

One begins to wonder what happened to the Abelard that seemed to have discovered himself in the period of 1132 to 1136. His return to the schools appeared to have deprived him of the piety and peace of mind he had found in the years of solitude. But suddenly he appears again at Cluny taking up again the change of character he had seemingly abandoned in 1136. When he learned that Pope Innocent II had promulgated and ratified the condemnation of the Council of Sens, he submitted himself to this decision without hesitation. He willingly took the advice of Peter the Venerable and the abbot of Citeaux and reconciled himself with Bernard. And in accordance with this reconciliation he wrote his second apology, the Professio Fidei. The difference between this and his first apology is immediately evident. Much of the pride and indignation of his first reaction to the Council of Sens is gone. Where the first apology was a defense of these propositions which had been labelled heretical, this was an admission of those truths of the Faith to which these propositions had been said to be contrary. His submission is reflected in these words: "May fraternal charity recognize me as a son of the Church who wholly accepts whatever she accepts and rejects what she rejects and that, although unequal to others in the quality of morals, I have never broken from the unity of the faith."<sup>26</sup> But just as in his years of solitude and peace he had still exhibited pride in the Historia, so now he exhibited it in this profession of faith. He stresses that he can see nothing damnable in those doctrines which have been so violently attacked and that his accusers have exaggerated his errors and even accused him of things he had not taught or written.

It was after he had decided to leave the tumult of the schools and to spend the rest of his days at Cluny that Abelard's character developed

beyond the point it had reached in his earlier period of solitude. Peter the Venerable speaks of the devotion and humility that Abelard developed. It astounded the abbot and his monks to see this famed professor who had eagerly caused such great disturbances in the schools reduce himself to the lowest place among the monks.<sup>27</sup> At last Abelard had conquered his pride and ended his days in peace. The third apology, the Confessio Fidei, written to Heloise at this time, reflects in Abelard's own words the extent of this final stage in the development of his character. That he still feels that he was wrongly accused and condemned is clear, for he says that his accusers acted perversely and were influenced in their judgment by opinion rather than by the wisdom of experience.<sup>28</sup> It is only to be expected that remnants of so great a pride and impetuosity would still remain. But it is also evident that he is now willing to submit fully to this judgment, seeing his union with Christ and the Church as far surpassing his teachings and writings in importance. He says that he does not wish to be a philosopher if it means denying Paul, nor an Aristotle if it means cutting himself off from Christ.<sup>29</sup> He then makes a humble profession of the truths of the Catholic Faith and closes by saying that it is in this faith that he now stands firm and without fear.<sup>30</sup>

It has been the burden of this section to show that this change of character from the proud and haughty professor to the humble monk at Cluny was not as sudden as it might at first appear. Chastened by many misfortunes and the devoted love of a woman, he came to recognize his pride and underwent a spiritual revival during his short period of solitude. But this revival had nothing to feed upon; there was nothing to replace the enjoyment of the schools. So he returned to the schools and to his old faults. It took the maltreatment and defeat at Sens to make him

fully realize what he had only half arrived at during his short revival. He needed something to replace what he was leaving, and he found it in God. This condemnation forced him to remember his previous misfortunes and the fruit of his previous meditations on them. The fact that he wrote a confession of faith to Heloise is evidence that he recalled her love and the devout and encouraging words he had written to her during his period of solitude. As these things worked in his mind, other factors came into play. He was around sixty years old, and "his approaching end made him apprehensive of the final result if he remained hostile and unreconciled to the expressed authority of the Church."<sup>31</sup> Also, the sanctity of Peter the Venerable must have had a great influence on him. But the most important factor of all is the man himself. Abelard was able to recognize his faults and, after some meditation, to accept the misfortunes that befell him as gifts of God. Against great and sometimes unfair odds he fought hard for what he firmly believed to be orthodox doctrines until condemned by one whom he recognized as having the authority to judge him and his works. Others might have balked at such a condemnation, even broken from the Church. But Abelard submitted completely and ended his days in the service of God. These are the marks of a truly great man.

### III. The Meaning of the Encounter — Part Two: The Theological Struggle

Abelard may have won the personal struggle over his pride and self-assertiveness, but he was defeated, or rather overpowered, in the theological struggle. In fact, this defeat, his condemnation by the Council of Sens and the pope, was seen above to be one of the big factors that led Abelard to his personal victory. This theological struggle is an important



one; and an adequate study of it would involve close study of the theological works of both Abelard and Bernard. The scope of this paper, however, did not allow for such a study, so much of the meaning of this struggle is derived from the secondary sources which have made studies of the theologies of these two men.

To this day Abelard's status as a theologian remains a point of controversy. It was not until the middle of the last century that his place in the development of theology was recognized at all; and it was not until about fifty years ago that his place began to be correctly appraised.<sup>32</sup> Where he was once commonly denounced as an unprincipled and unscrupulous heretic, he is now more justly recognized as one of the principal innovators of a new and orthodox method in theology, later called scholasticism, whose extremes sometimes led him astray. This rehabilitation is due to a more exact knowledge of his works and when they were written and thus a deeper understanding of his theology.

Prior to the twelfth century, constant reflection on the deposit of faith had accumulated commentaries, scripture glosses, "quaestiones," and the like without number. Then, in the dawn of an intellectual rebirth, the theologians began to feel the necessity of possessing a synthesis of these multiple elements of Christian doctrine.

The doctors applied themselves to establishing a unity in the ensemble of Christian doctrine; they tried to disclose there a guiding thread and to take from that an interior order which permits the making of a hierarchy of multiple truths and of seizing them in their mutual relations.<sup>33</sup>

It is not surprising then to find Abelard among the very first to give decisive impetus to this movement toward synthesis in theology which has lasted to our own day. With Abelard, what had formerly been called "sacra doctrina" and consisted in the intelligent reading of the Bible and of the

works of the Fathers became a true science called theology. The change, however, did not come easily; for the proponents of the "sacra doctrina," the traditionalists, were not to abandon their position without a fight. And in the ensuing battle which pitted the best known champions of each camp against each other, the traditionalists came out on top.

At the point of departure of a systemization of theology there is an option in favor of some principle upon which the system will be based. For Abelard this principle was dialectic, or the use of logic. In direct opposition to the traditional theologians, such as Bernard and William of Saint-Thierry, he held that dialectics could rightfully be applied to matters of faith. This introduced into theology an intellectualism which was immediately opposed by the traditionalists who were of a mystical bent.

The mystic has no need of reasoning or of demonstration: he believes, he understands, and he understands in as much as he believes. He does not have recourse, in this original movement, to the operation of the intellect, and this operation cannot but seem as superfluous to him and quickly enough suspect.<sup>34</sup>

It was these feelings that drove Bernard to the attack and led him in many cases to misinterpret Abelard's theology.

A help in correctly understanding Abelard's theology is a recognition of the two chief factors which had led to his intellectualism. The first factor is his training in dialectic before he turned to the study of theology. He seems to have had a natural talent in the art of logic, and it has been seen how nothing gave him greater pleasure than the disputations and his fame in the schools of dialectic at Paris and Melun. It was only natural for him to apply this manner of thinking to theology. The second factor was his concern with the various heretical theologians of his day,

men such as Roscelin and Gilbert Porree. He thought it important that persons, especially scholars, in the training of whom he was involved, should be able to understand the reasons by which their own beliefs could be defended as well as those by which the heretic's beliefs could be refuted.

Abelard developed his positive system of theology in three works: the De Unitate, condemned at Soissons, the Theologia Christiana, and the Introductio. These deal with basically the same subjects and demonstrate the evolution in his thought and the constant revisions and re-evaluations he was making of it. They concern themselves for the most part with the doctrine of the Trinity. In the Sic et Non he outlines for his students his program for applying logic to theology in order to encourage them to create their own systems. The Scito Te Ipsum is important because Abelard was also a great ethical thinker, and his preoccupation with his ethics is basic to his doctrinal views.

It is true that some of Abelard's doctrines are erroneous and unorthodox, but it is also the case that he was sometimes gravely misunderstood by Bernard and other traditionalists. One of Bernard's chief complaints against Abelard was that he was a rationalist. He expresses this especially in the Capitula haeresum Petri Abaelardi where he accuses Abelard of claiming to know even the deepest things of God and to be able to give a reason for everything, even those things which are above reason.<sup>35</sup> But it is clear that Abelard was not a rationalist in this sense of the word. For this type of rationalist denies the necessity of faith. And Abelard never contemplated doing this; he never inferred that his belief followed upon his understanding of doctrine. Rather he adopts St. Anselm

of Canterbury's Credo ut intelligam and presumes an acceptance of Catholic doctrine by faith before investigation by reason. Neither does Abelard believe that he can completely comprehend the mysteries of God. He himself states in his Theologia Christiana that reason can never reach the actual facts of theology, but only as it were a certain resemblance, for it is God alone who knows the full truth of reality.<sup>36</sup> He holds that the reason can bring us to a better understanding of the mysteries of theology but makes a sharp distinction between understanding and comprehending. And this understanding leads to a faith that he calls an "existimatio" of those things that are beyond comprehension, that is, a certain resemblance or existimation of the things of God.<sup>37</sup> That Bernard misjudged the importance that Abelard attached to faith is shown by the fact that he misinterpreted this "existimatio" as meaning merely opinion.

Thus the two necessary elements of Abelard's theology are faith and reason, or understanding, which bolsters this faith; and the object of theology is a certain resemblance of the things that pertain to God. Since Abelard held that "all that which is included in the object of faith is guaranteed by revelation, and faith is not meritorious unless it is based on divine authority,"<sup>38</sup> then reason, for which Abelard used dialectic, must operate on the truths of revelation. Thus dialectic is not for him the judge of the truth of a doctrine, as Bernard claimed, but the instrument by which the pronouncements of authoritative writers are to be investigated so that their meaning may be made plain. It can show men the compelling reasonableness of orthodox theology by explaining those statements of authority which seem to disagree, by demonstrating the unsoundness of the heretic's opinions, and, through analogy, by attaining to a closer,

resemblance of the things of God. He said that it was through reason and not through compulsion that men can be brought to accept the Christian faith.<sup>39</sup>

It is then apparent that Abelard's method was not heretical, nor was it the direct source of the errors in doctrine that he made. His big problem was that he did not go far enough. While emphasizing the application of the rules of dialectic for the founding of good analogies and the coherence of the enunciations of revelation, he neglected certain important aspects of revelation and made an abstraction of certain theological matters. Being less concerned with the doctrine than with the statement of the doctrine, he failed to see its true religious signification. And when in the third book of the Introductio he seems to attempt to see the reality behind these doctrines, he is not able. This last attempt is but a small part of his theology and merely points out a trend that he might have followed to correct some of his views had his career as theologian been allowed to continue.

Two other factors that led to some of Abelard's errors and allowed for confusion in interpreting his thought were his combative spirit and his carelessness. Otto of Freising speaks of the latter where he says of Abelard, "He uncautiously mixed the science of words and names (dialectics), in which he has a natural ability, with theology."<sup>40</sup> He was not heretical in the method he proposed to use; but often, and apparently without intention, he carelessly expressed doctrines in such a way that they were clearly heretical. This was often the case in his exposition of the dogma of the Trinity, which came under heavy attack by Bernard. The other factor, Abelard's combative spirit, manifests itself in his constant attempts to perfect his concept of theology. New ideas and the attacks of his enemies

caused him to constantly correct, revise, and develop his views. He wrote and rewrote his treatises; but because of his impetuosity and stubbornness, he was never able to arrive at a definitive exposition of his position. An accurate chronology of his three chief theological works and their revisions has helped to alleviate the confusion that arises from this factor.

In examining the basis of this theological conflict and thus of Bernard's opposition to Abelard, certain theories must be put aside from the start. The first is a view propounded by Deutsch that Bernard carefully premeditated and planned his strategy to destroy the ideas and influence of a rival of whom he was jealous.<sup>41</sup> On the contrary it has been seen that Bernard's attack was a spontaneous one, chiefly in response to a letter from William of Saint-Thierry. He feared Abelard's theology as very dangerous, and his attack and strategy were sincere attempts to put an end to this danger. Neither was Bernard's attack due to a dislike for learning on his part. Bernard was a mystic, but there was no natural antagonism between the mystic and the scholastic. In fact, he often encouraged learning as a legitimate means of finding union with God.

It was mentioned in the above discussion of Abelard's theology that the real basis for this conflict was a fundamental difference in the attitudes of these two men toward the Faith. Here the difference in the methods of the two men was the chief point of opposition. From his youth Abelard had been attacking the traditionalist schools. He had especially opposed the teachings of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux which were particularly faithful to tradition. And, in the same vein, it was Abelard's method, his deviation from the traditionalist way that Bernard primarily feared. Abelard's intellectualism was totally different from the voluntarism of the abbot of Clairvaux. For Bernard based his theology on a deep

experience of the truths of the faith, aided by a mystical, ethical method of exegesis; whereas Abelard's method was dialectics and his experience of the truths of the faith somewhat shallow. Bernard approached the mysteries of God through meditation, ascetic practices, and mysticism. It is no wonder then that he and William of Saint-Thierry, who thought along the same lines, saw Abelard's theology as an attempt "to make the articles of the Creeds dependent upon human reasoning, regarding opinion as the criterion of belief and subjecting traditional theology to the solvent of logical analysis."<sup>42</sup> And this quote is only one example of the many instances of such blanket condemnation. They accused Abelard of priding himself on being able to comprehend the mysteries of God and of setting the common people to discussing these mysteries in the same manner. For these same reasons Bernard would have attacked St. Thomas Aquinas's Summa or any of the other rational treatments of the faith that followed Abelard's. He was probably led to this extreme exaggeration not only by his own conception of theology but also by the fear of a group called the Sophists who claimed that logic was capable of probing into every theological mystery. But in equating this with Abelard's theology Bernard was mistaken, as has been shown; for in this regard he misinterpreted the objects of Abelard's theology. Abelard himself attacks these very Sophists in the Theologia Christiana. On the other hand, Bernard's opposition can be justified in so far as he recognized Abelard's neglect of the experience and religious feeling that must accompany any approach to theology. For, as has been shown, Abelard failed to grasp the true significance of the doctrine of the faith, to see theology as a unified whole.

Bernard's opposition to Abelard's theology can be justified also in so far as Abelard's doctrines as well as his method were under consideration.

For in many statements of doctrine, generally through carelessness, Abelard was plainly unorthodox and in error. In attacking these, Bernard was in the right. But in the same regard, Bernard attacked many doctrines that were not erroneous but only misinterpreted by him as being such.

Thus it is evident that neither man was wholly right or wrong in his concept of theology. Abelard was the proponent of a new type of theology, one that would become predominant after his death and reach its peak in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Bernard, champion of the traditionalists, scored a momentary victory for that school by bringing about the condemnation of Abelard and his theology. But this is not important, for it did not last. What is important is that he had made apparent some of the deviations and mistakes of the innovator which otherwise may have been inherited by St. Thomas a hundred years later.

Mabillon, in his edition of the works of St. Bernard, cites some passages from Abelard's works which illustrate obvious errors that Abelard made. Then he says:

I only cite these passages to make those persons ashamed who, although they detest these errors, yet take up the defence of Abaelard against Bernard, and do not hesitate to accuse the latter of precipitation and of excess of zeal against him.<sup>43</sup>

This, however, should in no way deter the defenders of Abelard, for it is evidently an extreme, biased, and unhistorical defense of St. Bernard.

The fact is, as the account of the encounter makes clear, that Bernard was guilty of precipitation and overzealousness in his dealings with Abelard and treated the theologian unjustly. This may seem like a rash statement, especially in view of the fact that Bernard has since been canonized; and it is a statement that was not made without some hesitation. For as Didier points out, since Bernard's death a glorious halo has been placed



over the whole of his life, and it is often hard to distinguish legend from fact.<sup>44</sup> This makes it extremely difficult to establish the authentic traits of his character. It should not be surprising, although it is for some, to find that even holy men have their faults.

Those who feared the theology of Abelard knew that it would take nothing less than the power like that of Bernard to put a stop to it. And Bernard was indeed powerful. It is even said of him that from his cell at Clairvaux he ruled Christianity for almost forty years.<sup>45</sup> His important role in the victory of Pope Innocent II over the anti-pope Peter Leone and his consequent power at Rome has already been pointed out. Despite his holiness and mysticism and his variety of contacts with different types of men, Bernard was very narrow in his outlook and unable to sympathize with those who could not see things the way he saw them. This type of outlook was typical of the times, but it is hard to see how this excuses Bernard from blame as Sikes says it does. It is true that this attitude was to a large extent responsible for his success. If it were not for his single-mindedness and belief in the righteousness of his own cause, he undoubtedly would not have been able to effect so much in the face of such great difficulties. He was always zealous to defend the Church and her doctrine; and those who appeared to be her enemies, if they could not be persuaded to abandon their teaching, were to be stamped out. It has been seen that Bernard saw Abelard's theology as a definite threat and danger to the Church. Thus to him every means seemed justifiable, and his zeal and single-mindedness drove him to extreme means, means which cannot be justified by any situation. The words of Otto of Freising, although somewhat extreme, are evidence of this:

because of his zeal for the Christian religion he was somewhat of a fanatic, and from his habitual meekness was a believer; so that from the first he detested those teachers who might put too much reliance on human reason and worldly wisdom, and from the second he was ready to lend a favorable ear to any account, however much against those teachers.<sup>46</sup>

At the beginning of the encounter, when Bernard met with Abelard at Paris, the abbot's manner was probably kind; but he made it clear from the start that he wanted him to abandon his teaching all together. This was surely not the most prudent way of correcting a man of Abelard's character. When a disputation was proposed, Bernard accepted. But in no way wanting a disputation, he immediately began to arrange to have a council ready at Sens that would judge and condemn the master and his works. In accomplishing this, he presented to the council fathers certain propositions from Abelard's works which were, or seemed to be, heretical. He was asking these men to condemn the man and his whole theology without even investigating the true meaning and objects of that theology. Thus, he was depriving them of the opportunity to avoid the mistake of misjudging Abelard's theology as he in his zeal had done. When Abelard thwarted his attempt by appealing to Rome, it did not deter Bernard. He wrote scathing letters to the pope and cardinals, exerting every ounce of influence that he had with them. In exhorting them to take proceedings against Abelard, Bernard, obviously involved in the contest completely and emotionally, even lowered himself to degrading his opponent's character. One example of this is taken from his letter to Cardinal Ivo:

Master Peter Abelard, a monk without rule, a prelate without solicitude, he neither holds to any order nor is restrained by any order. He is a man contradicting himself, a Herod within, a John without. Totally ambiguous, he has nothing of the monk except name and habit.<sup>47</sup>

Such language had its effect at Rome, for within a month Innocent had

condemned Abelard, his works, and his followers. Can this be justice? Abelard had not even been given a chance to be heard in the court to which he had appealed. Only the influence of a man like Bernard could have brought about such a hasty decision.

Despite Bernard's obvious over-zealousness and despite Abelard's errors in doctrine and proud and haughty manner, such tactics as the Abbot of Clairvaux employed cannot be justified. A little prudence, patience, and level-headed thinking would probably have gotten him much farther in persuading Abelard that he had strayed from the path of orthodoxy in some of his teachings. And thus the greater part of the blame for the injustice at Sens rests on his shoulders. It was shown how Mabillon tried to justify Bernard's actions, but he failed to see what the facts point to and was most unfair to Abelard. Since the time of Mabillon, further discoveries have backed up the defenders of Abelard. Especially important among these are the Apologia, in showing how much Bernard really misunderstood Abelard's theology, and Abelard's letter to his followers before the Council of Sens. But even to-day Bernard has his extreme defenders who claim that he did what had to be done in view of the circumstances.

All this is not to say that Peter Abelard is not sometimes defended and rehabilitated in the extreme. There are those who picture him as the innocent lamb, savagely attacked and overcome by the monster of Clairvaux. Berenger was probably the first of these. In his apology for Abelard he lampoons and exaggerates the meeting of bishops on the eve of the council and savagely attacks Bernard. Perhaps this paper has given this same biased impression; it should not have. For while a greater part of the blame has been placed on Bernard's shoulders, it has also been stressed that he was sincere and that there were real dangers in Abelard's theology which needed

correcting. Abelard himself was not without some fault. The persecution complex he seems to have developed, his pride, his impetuous reaction to every attack made on him, all these factors contributed to Bernard's opposition and made a satisfactory settlement of the dispute less possible. However, because of Bernard's tactics, many of Abelard's actions, such as the call for a disputation, his appeal to Rome, his writing of the Apologia, can be justified.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that an amazing amount of good followed from the seemingly undesirable events of the encounter. One of these has already been illustrated in the impetus it gave to Abelard's final step in his attainment of peace and humility. And in the end it established the true stature of Bernard as well. For it is most probable that it was Bernard who took the initiative in arranging for a reconciliation with Abelard. Didier says that he used the abbot <sup>of</sup> Citeaux as an intermediary and compares it to a similar occasion when Bernard sent John of Salisbury to Gilbert of Porree after the Council of Rheims, six years later.<sup>48</sup> Bernard evidently felt remorse at what he had done, and this act is a sign of his holiness more than an admission of his guilt. On the side of learning, the effect of the encounter was also favorable. "The drama of Sens was the last act in the struggle between dialectician and anti-dialectician. The application of logic to theology was never again called into question."<sup>49</sup> Even his condemnation could not stop the spread of his method, which was to become, through his pupils, especially Peter the Lombard, the recognized method of the schools. Thus it is not without truth that the D.H.G.E. states that Abelard should be considered, despite his errors, as an illustrious precursor of Peter the Lombard and of St. Thomas Aquinas.<sup>50</sup> Abelard's condemnation at Sens even increased the importance of his influence

on theology for it did much to check the possible excesses to which his theology might have led.

Men learnt more of the limitations of logic and of the necessary boundaries between reason and revelation, and thus safeguarded themselves the more against rash statements and unsatisfactory conclusions.<sup>51</sup>

## Appendix

## 1. Abelard's Works and Their Dates

Abelard's three theological works are his most important. This trilogy, the De Unitate et Trinitate Divina, the Theologia Christiana, and the Introductio ad Theologiam, is chiefly concerned with an explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>1</sup> It is from these works that the meaning and method of Abelard's theology is derived. The De Unitate was most probably the work condemned and burned at the Council of Soissons in 1121. It was composed between the years 1118 and 1121.<sup>2</sup> The Theologia Christiana was written between the years 1122 and 1125. The Introductio, which represented the fullest development of Abelard's thought on theology, is the work with which Bernard was chiefly concerned in his condemnations and which he referred to as the Theologia of Abelard.<sup>3</sup> It was written and published in at least two parts, the first two books being composed in 1124-1125 and the third between 1135 and 1138.

In the Sic et Non Abelard first outlines for his students a program for applying logic to theology, and then, in the body of the work, he lists seemingly contradictory statements of Scripture and the Fathers on one hundred and fifty-eight religious questions and how they can be explained. This was written between 1122 and 1123. The Scito Te Ipsum, Abelard's Ethics, was written around 1136. The Dialogus inter Philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum is an unfinished apologetic treatise that dates from the period after the Council of Sens.

Abelard's strictly philosophical works are of much smaller volume. The most important is the Dialectica which was most probably begun before 1113 and completed before 1118.<sup>4</sup> Other philosophical works are the

Introductiones parvulorum (ca 1110-1116), Logica Ingredientibus (possibly ca 1115), and Logica nostrorum petitioni sociorum (possibly ca 1133).

Of his exegetical works the two important ones are the Expositio in Hexameron, written for Heloise and her nuns at the Paraclete after 1131, and the Commentariorum super S. Pauli Epistoram ad Romanos libri quinque, composed around 1134. The latter is important for its discussion of the doctrines connected with the Epistle. Two other works, Expositio super Psalterium and Expositio super Epistolas Pauli are both very mediocre.<sup>5</sup> The commentary on Ezechiel of which Abelard himself makes mention,<sup>6</sup> is not extant.

The Historia Calamitatum is Abelard's autobiography of the first fifty-three to fifty-seven years of his life. It must have been written between the years 1131 and 1136.<sup>7</sup> It is from this that Abelard's history up to the Council of Sens is known in some detail. It is also called his Letter of Consolation to a Friend and is listed as his first letter in most editions of his works. Whether this friend was real or fictitious has never been determined. When Heloise at the Paraclete read the Historia, she wrote to Abelard; and this was the beginning of one of the most famous correspondences in history. These letters of Abelard and Heloise cannot be dated with precision but were written after the Historia and probably before the Council of Sens. Also in this period fall: the Problemata, in which Abelard gives solutions to the problems which Heloise and her nuns at the Paraclete had sent to him; thirty-four sermons, ninety-four hymns and sequences, and six Planctus, all requested by Heloise; three short expositions on the Lord's Prayer, on the symbol of the Apostles, and on Faith; and the Carmen ad Astralabium Filium.<sup>8</sup>

Abelard is believed to have written three apologies: the Apologia directly after the Council of Sens; the Professio Fidei after and as part of his reconciliation with Bernard; and the Confessio Fidei to Heloise.

## 2. A History of the Editions of Abelard's Works

In 1616 the first edition of Abelard's works was published in Paris. For some unknown reason this was a double edition, one under the name of André Duchesne (Quercetanus) and the other under the name of Francois d'Amboise (Amboesius). The text of both editions is the same, and they differ only as to the title page and preferatory matter.<sup>9</sup> This edition is in one volume and contains the sermons, epistles, Historia, Expositio ad Romanos, and Introductio. In 1717 the Theologia Christiana was published by Martène and Durand in their Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum, vol. 5, pp. 1139-1156; and the Scito Te Ipsum was printed by Bernard Pez in the Theaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus, vol. 2, p. 262 sq. In 1831, Reinwald published the Dialogus inter Philosophum, Judaeum, et Christianum.

The first modern edition of Abelard's works was published in 1836 by Victor Cousin, Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard. This one volume contained the Dialectica and an incomplete text of the Sic et Non. With the help of Jourdain and Despois, Cousin followed up by publishing two more volumes, Petri Abelardi opera hactenus seorsim edita (1849-1859). These contained Abelard's letters, sermons, and theological works.

In 1851 Henke and Lindenkohl published the first complete edition of the Sic et Non at Marburg. In 1855 Migne incorporated this together with the above texts of Martene, Pez, and Reinwald into vol. 178 of his Patrologia. It lacks the philosophical works that appear in Cousin's work and the De Unitate et Trinitate Divina. However, it remains today the most



complete edition of Abelard's works.

Since Migne's edition some important discoveries have been made and some works reedited. The more important of these are here listed. In 1891 Remigius Stolzle discovered and published at Fribourg-en-Brisgau the Tractatus de Unitate et Trinitate Divina. Dr. Bernard Geyer discovered a set of works on logic by Abelard. He published these in vol. 21 of Beitrage zur Geschichte..., 1919-1933. The first set is called Logica Ingredientibus and the second Logica, nostrorum petitioni sociorum. In 1930 Ruf discovered and published a portion of Abelard's Apologia. It has helped in further determining his concept of theology. In the same year Ottaviano edited and published a new manuscript of the Theologia Christiana. In 1935 Ostlender reedited the Introductio and in 1939 the De Unitate. He called these the Theologia Scholarium and the Theologia Summi boni respectively. In 1945 Maurice de Gandillac published the Oeuvres choisies d'Abelard with texts and translations. In 1950 Muckle published a good edition of the Historia Calamitatum in Medieval Studies. In 1954 M. Dal Pra published Pietro Abelardo, Scritti filosofici which completed the work of Cousin and Geyer on Abelard's philosophical works. In 1956 Nicolas Haring published a newly found manuscript of the De Unitate in Medieval Studies. In the same year Rijk published the first complete edition of the Parisian manuscript of the Dialectica. This completes and corrects Cousin's 1836 edition of the work. In 1958 Minio and Paluello published a few more, previously unedited texts on logic. In 1961 Klibansky published an important discovery he made sometime earlier. It is the first part of a letter of Abelard to his disciples just before the Council of Sens. It appears in Medieval and Renaissance Studies. Muckle,

in an appendix to his edition of the Historia, has reproduced a portion of this letter.

## Footnotes--Introduction

<sup>1</sup> E. Portalié, "Abélard," D.T.C., vol. 1(1930), col. 36, gives the following variant spellings of Abélard: Abélard, Abailard, Abeillard, Abulard, and Esbaillard; in Latin Abailardus, Abaielardus, Baiolensis, Bailardus, Perpateticus Palatinus. Sikes claims that Abailard is the most suitable English spelling. It is derived from the Abailardus. Jeffery G. Sikes, Peter Abailard. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. However, I have chosen the spelling Abélard because it is more often used and because it is just as historical. Muckle, who has done notable work on Abélard, uses this spelling and defends his choice of the Latin Abaelardus from which it is derived. J. T. Muckle, "Abélard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," Medieval Studies. 12(1950), p. 173.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote ~~27~~ on the date of the Council of Sens, Chapter 2.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendices #1 and #2.

<sup>4</sup> P.L., 178, col. 113-182.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., col. 181-336.

<sup>6</sup> P.L., 199, col. 874.

<sup>7</sup> P.L., 180, col. 249-282, "Disputatio Adversus Petrum Abaelardum."

<sup>8</sup> P.L., 182, Epist. 326, col. 531-533.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.; Epist. 337 to Innocent in behalf of the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans, col. 540-542; Epist. 189 to Innocent in Bernard's own name, col. 354-357; Epist. 191 to Innocent in behalf of the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, col. 357-358.

<sup>10</sup> P.L., 185, col. 301-322.

<sup>11</sup> M.G.H., Scriptores. New York: Kraus Reprint Corp., 1963, vol. 20, pp. 338-493.

<sup>12</sup> P.L., 178, col. 1857-1870.

<sup>13</sup> P.L.: letter to Pope Innocent II, vol. 189, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV, col. 305-306; letter to Heloise, vol. 189, Liber Sextus, Epist. XXII, col. 428-429.

<sup>14</sup> P.L., 182, Epist. 194, col. 359-361; vol. 179, Epist. 457, col. 515-517, and Epist. 458, col. 517.

<sup>15</sup> Joannes Dominicus Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck - U. Verlagsanstalt, 1961, vol. 21, col. 564-565.

<sup>16</sup> M.G.H., Scriptores, vol. 20, p. 378.

- 17 P.L., 178, col. 105-108, Professio Fidei; Confessio Fidei, col. 375-378.
- 18 P. Ruf and M. Grabmann, Ein neu aufgefundenes Bruchstück der Apologia Abaelards. Munich: R. Oldenburg, 1930.
- 19 E. Portalié, "Abélard," D.T.C. vol 1(1930), col. 36-55.
- 20 E. Vacandard, "Abélard," D.H.G.E. vol. 1 (1912), col. 71-91.
- 21 Sikes, op. cit.
- 22 Ch. de Rémusat, Abélard, sa vie, sa philosophie, et sa théologie, second ed. Paris, 1855, 2 vols.
- 23 Charles Joseph Hefele, Histoire Des Conciles, translated and augmented by Dom H. Leclercq. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912. vol. 5, part 1, "Abélard et le Concile de Sens en 1140," pp. 747-790.
- 24 J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard," Révue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique. 28(1932), pp. 247-295, 533-551, 788-828.
- 25 J. de Ghellinck, S.J., Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Paris: Desclée - De Brouwer, 1948.
- 26 Etienne Gilson, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages. New York: Random House, 1955, p. 630.

## Footnotes -- Chapter I

<sup>1</sup> I used J. T. Muckle's edition of the *Historia*, "Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," *Medieval Studies*, 12(1950), pp. 163-213; see Duchesne's notes in Migne's edition of Abelard's works for helpful details (*P.L.* 178, col. 113-182).

<sup>2</sup> "Est enim praedicta terra clericorum acuta ingenia et artibus applicata habentium sed ad alia negocia pene stolidorum ferax." Ottone Episcopo et Ragewino Frisingensibus, "Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris," *M.G.H., Scriptores*, vol. 20, pp. 376.

<sup>3</sup> "Martis curiae penitus abdicarem ut Minervae gremio educarer." *Historia*, Muckle's ed., p. 175.

<sup>4</sup> It was once held in doubt that Abelard had Roscelin as a master. But the *D.H.G.E.* quotes his *Dialectica*, "fuit autem, memini, magistri nostri Roscelini tam insana sententia," vol. 1, "Abelard," col. 72. Roscelin also mentions the fact that he taught Abelard (*P.L.* 178, col. 360 C, *Epist.* XV).

<sup>5</sup> "Contra eum saepius aggrederer et nonnumquam superior in disputando viderer." *Historia*, Muckle's ed., p. 176.

<sup>6</sup> Sikes says that William took vows in 1108 and that Abelard's return to Paris must have occurred shortly after that. J. G. Sikes, *Peter Abailard*. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> "Et, quoniam de universalibus in hoc ipso praecipua semper est apud dialecticos quaestio ac tanta, ut eam Porphyrius quopue in *Isagogis* suis cum de universalibus scriberet, definire non praesumeret dicens: 'Altissimum enim est huiusmodi negotium', cum hanc ille correxerit, immo coactus dimiserit sententiam, in tantam lectio eius devoluta est negligentiam ut iam ad cetera dialecticae vix admitteretur, quasi in hac scilicet de universalibus sententia tota huius artis consisteret summa." *Historia*, Muckle's ed., p. 178.

<sup>8</sup> "...extra civitatem in monte Sanctae Genovefae scholarum nostrarum castra posui..." *Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>9</sup> "Carissima mihi mater mea Lucia repatriare me compulit, quae videlicet post conversionem Berengarii patris mei ad professionem monasticam idem facere disponebat." *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> William of Champeaux, Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne, elected 1113, died in office Jan., 1122. Gams, p. 534.

<sup>11</sup> Sikes, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>12</sup> "Son enseignement était fort simple. C'était un commentaire suivi et presque interlinéaire du texte de l'Écriture." *D.H.G.E.*, vol. 1 (1912),

col. 73.

13 "Ad quem, si quis de aliqua quaestione pulsandum accederet incertus, redibat incertior. Mirabilis quidem erat in oculis auscultantium, sed nullus in conspectu quaestionantium. Verborum usum habebat mirabilem, sed sensu contemptibilem et ratione vacuum. Cum ignem accenderet, domum suam fumo implebat, non luce illustrabat. Arbor eius tota in foliis aspicientibus a longe conspicua videbatur, sed propinquantibus et diligentius intuentibus infructuosa reperiēbatur." Historia, Mickle's ed., p. 180.

14 D.T.C., vol 1, "Abelard," col. 36.

15 Sikes, op. cit., p. 13.

16 P.L., 178, col. 371-376, Epist. XVI, Foulques de Deuil to Abelard.

17 "Cum igitur totus in superbia atque luxuria laborarem." Historia, Mickle's ed., p. 182.

18 "...occasione quadam satis nota non bene tractatus." M.G.H., Scriptores, op. cit., p. 377.

19 For a detailed study of this matter, three very good works are available: E. Gilson, Heloise et Abelard (Paris: J. Vrin, 1938); Henry O. Taylor, The Medieval Mind (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951); G. Truc, Abelard avec et sans Heloise (Paris: A. Fayard, 1956). Two less scholarly, but most enjoyable books on the topic are: Helen Waddell, a novel Peter Abelard (New York: The Viking Press, 1961); Marjorie Worthington, a biographical study The Immortal Lovers (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960).

20 "Erat quippe in ipsa civitate Parisiensi adolescentula quaedam nomine Heloisa, neptis canonici cuiusdam qui Fulbertus vocabatur, qui eam, quanto amplius diligebat, tanto diligentius in omnem qua poterat scientiam litterarum promoveri studuerat. Quae, cum per faciem non esset infima, per abundantiam litterarum erat suprema." Historia, Mickle's ed., pp. 182-183.

21 "Separatio autem haec corporum maxima erat copulatio animorum, et negata sui copia amplius amorem accendebat,..." Historia, Mickle's ed., p. 184.

22 The monastery of Saint-Denis is located in the diocese of Paris on the Seine and Rouillon Rivers. It was founded by the Benedictines in the fifth century and exercised a great influence in French politics from the ninth to the fourteenth century. Cottineau, vol. 2, col. 2650.

23 Abelard is thought to have set his school up here because when he later goes to Saint-Ayoul, he says that it is because he had stayed there before and had friends there. "Ibi autem in castro Pruvini morari coepit, in cella videlicet quadam Trecentium monachorum quorum prior antea mihi familiaris exstiterat et valde dilexerat, qui, valde in adventu meo gavisus,

cum omni diligentia me procurabat." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 198.

24 "Ubi, quod professioni meae convenientius erat, sacrae plurimum lectioni studium intendens, saecularium artium disciplinam, quibus amplius assuetus fueram et quas a me plurimum requirebant, non penitus abieci, sed de his quasi hamum quemdam fabricavi quo illos philosophico sapore inescatos ad verae philosophiae lectionem attraherem, sicut et summum Christianorum philosophorum Origenem consuevisse Historia meminit Ecclesiastica." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 191.

25 See Appendix.

26 Sikes, op. cit., p. 15. The insertion with parentheses is my own. How this rendering intelligible must be understood in Abelard's language will be discussed in the third chapter of this paper.

27 Except for a reference by Otto of Freising, Abelard himself is the only authority for the events of the Council of Soissons. Otto says of it: "Ob hoc Suessionis provinciali contra eum synodo sub praesentia Romanae sedis legati congregata, ab egregiis viris et nominatis magistris Alberico Remense et Letaldo Novariense Sabellianus haereticus iudicatus, libros quos ediderat, propria manu ab episcopis igni dare coactus est, nulla sibi respondendi facultate, eo quod disceptandi in eo peritia ab omnibus suspecta haberetur, concessa." M.G.H., Scriptores, op. cit., vol. 20, p. 377.

28 "Ille (the legate) autem statim mihi praecepit libellum ipsum archiepiscopo illisque aemulis meis deferre quatinus ipsi inde iudicarent qui me super hoc accusabant..." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 193.

29 Abelard says that the legate Conon was unlettered. This seems to be borne out by the legate's remark during the burning of the book: "ut tamen non nihil dicere videretur, quidam de adversariis meis id submurmuravit quod in libro scriptum deprenderat solum Patrem Deum omnipotentem esse. Quod cum legatus subintellexisset, valde admirans ei respondit hoc nec de puerulo aliquo credi debere quod adeo erraret, cum communis, inquit, fides et teneat et profiteantur tres omnipotentes esse." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 196. Thus it was probably not difficult for Abelard's accusers to change his mind in the matter.

30 There were errors in Abelard's theology, especially at this early stage; and we must agree with Vacandard that the condemnation did have some justification: "Mais si la passion a pu précipité la sentence de ses juges, il faut bien admettre, avec Rémusat, que la logique ne condamne pas leur jugement." D.H.G.E., vol. 1 (1912), col. 76. The means by which Abelard's condemnation was obtained, however, were certainly unjust. His accusers did not sufficiently understand Abelard's doctrines or his method. They were not able to distinguish between the good and bad points of each; thus they condemned all of his theology.

31 "Deus, qui iudicas aequitate, quanto tunc animi felle, quanta mentis amaritudine te ipsum insanus arguebam, te furibundus accusabam..." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 196.

32 Bede says that Dionysius the Areopagite was bishop of Corinth and not of Athens: "Hic est Dionysius, qui post episcopus Corinthiorum gloriose Ecclesiam rexit, multaque ad utilitatem Ecclesiae pertinentia, quae hactenus manent, ingenii sui volumina reliquit, cognomen a loco cui praeserat accipiens. Areopagus est enim Athenarum curia, nomen a Marte trahens." P.L., 92, col. 981. The Denis who founded the monastery was claimed to have been bishop of Athens, and thus was not the Areopagite.

33 P.L., 104, col. 23-50. Hilduin (d. 840) was commissioned by Louis the Pious to write a history of St. Denis. He was the first to state definitively in writing that this St. Denis and Dionysius the Areopagite were the same man.

34 Hefele-Leclercq falsely identify him as Thibaud, Count of Campagne. Histoire Des Conciles (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, Editeurs, 1912), vol. 5, part 1, p. 747. The Latin text reads, "nocte latenter aufugi, atque ad terram comitis Theobaldi..." Muckle adds in a footnote, "The count in question was Theobald II, count at that time of Blois and Chartres." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 198, n. 13.

35 See note 23 above. This priory, located in the diocese of Sens was established in 1088 by Benedictines from the monastery of St. Peter at Troyes. Cottineau, vol. 2, col. 2368.

36 Abbot Adam died in 1122 and was succeeded by Suger. Muckle, op. cit., p. 199, n. 32.

37 Burchard, Bishop of Meaux, 1120-1134. Gams, p. 575.

38 "Sed ne gloriationem suam, quam de me habebat, monasterium nostrum amitteret, concesserunt mihi ad quam vellem solitudinem transire, dummodo nulli me abbatis subjugarem; hocque in praesentia regis et suorum utrimque assensum est et confirmatum." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 199.

39 Hatto, Bishop of Troyes, 1123-1145. Gams, p. 643.

40 "Quod (that he was living at Quincey) cum cognovissent scholares, coeperunt undique concurrere et, relictis civitatibus et castellis, solitudinem inhabitare..." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 199.

41 "...pro labore manuum ad officium linguae compulsus sum." Ibid., p. 201.

42 "...quosdam adversum me novos apostolos quibus mundus plurimum credebatur excitaverunt, quorum alter Regularium Canonorum vitam, alter monachorum se resuscitasse gloriabatur." Ibid., p. 202.

43 Further discussion of this will follow in chapter 2.

44 "Deus ipse mihi testis est, quotiens aliquem ecclesiasticarum personarum conventum adunari noveram, hoc in damnationem meam agi credebam, stupefactus illico quasi supervientis ictum fulguris expectabam ut quasi



haereticus aut profanus in conciliis traheretur aut synagogis." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 203.

45 It is certain that Abelard was a priest at Saint-Gildas, for he later in the Historia tells how the monks try to poison him with the Mass wine. Muckle's ed., p. 209. He was probably not a priest at the time of his affair with Heloise, since he speaks of himself at this time as a "clericus." Ibid., p. 188. The fact that Heloise didn't use this as reason against their marriage would also be evidence of this. He was probably a priest at Paraclete because at Saint-Gildas he regrets that there is now no one at Paraclete to celebrate the office there. Ibid., p. 205. Of the possible time of his ordination Sikes says: "Their subsequent separation each to a monastery would in the eyes of the law dissolve the marriage disqualification debaring his further ordination. From this it appears likely that he received ordination as a priest after his escape from St. Denys, probably from bishop Hatto, who not only took so great an interest in him but was also his diocesan." Sikes, op. cit., p. 22.

46 "...gentibus longe saeviores atque peiores." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 203.

47 It is true that Abelard was from Brittany; but Le Pallet, his birthplace, was on the boundary line and the population there was probably mixed. Besides he only lived there in his youth.

48 "Sic ego ab uno periculo in aliud scienter me contuli, ibique ad horrisoni undas oceani, cum fugam mihi ulterius terrae postremitas non Praeberet..." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 204.

49 Ibid., p. 205, n. 64.

50 "Eoque illis adductis, ipsum oratorium cum omnibus ei pertinentibus concessi et donavi, ipsamque postmodum donationem nostram, assensu atque interventu episcopi terrae (Hatto, Bishop of Troyes), papa Innocentius secundus ipsis et earum sequacibus per privilegium in perpetuum corroboravit." Ibid., p. 205. Pope Innocent III's rescript of approval is found in P.L., col. 114.

51 "Et plus, sciat Deus, ut arbitror, uno anno in terrenis commodis sunt multiplicatae quam ego per centum si ibi permansissem." Historia, Muckle's ed., p. 205.

52 Ibid., pp. 206-209.

53 It seems that about this time a fall from a horse seriously injured Abelard's neck. "Dum autem in istis laborarem periculis, forte me die quadam de nostra lapsum equitatura manus Domini vehementer collisit, colli videlicet mei canalem confringens; et multo me amplius haec fractura afflixit et debilitavit quam prior plaga." Ibid., p. 210.

54 "Quos eam quidem non de veneno sed de gladio in jugulum meum tractantes, cuiusdam proceris terrae conductu vix evasi." Ibid., p. 210.

55 Sikes says that Pope Innocent II sent the papal legation which forced the undesirable monks to leave between October 1120 and March 1132, probably after 1131 when we know Abelard visited Innocent at Morigny. op. cit., pp. 24-25. Since we know from the Historia that Abelard fled immediately after this, it must have been in late 1131 or in 1132.

## Footnotes — Chapter II

<sup>1</sup> Henry I, King of England: born 1068, became king 1100, died Dec. 1, 1135. L'Art De Verifier Les Dates, vol. 1, pp. 799-800.

<sup>2</sup> "Cum primum adolescens admodum, studiorum causa migrassem in Gallias, anno altero postquam illustris rex Anglorum Henricus, leo justitiae, rebus excessit Humanis, contuli me ad peripateticum palatinum, qui tunc in Monte Sanctae Genovefae clarum doctor, et admirabilis omnibus praesidebat. Ibi, ad pedes ejus, prima artis hujus rudimenta accepi, et pro modulo ingenioli mei, quidquid excidebat ab ore ejus, tota mentis aviditate excipiebam." John of Salisbury, Metalogicon, Lib. II, Cap. X. P.L., 199, col. 867.

<sup>3</sup> William had become abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Thierry in 1119. However, in 1135 he gave up this charge and became a monk at Signy because of poor health, a desire for contemplation, and the counsels of St. Bernard. P. Godet, "Guillaume De Saint-Thierry," D.T.C., vol. 6<sup>2</sup>(1925), col. 1981.

<sup>4</sup> P.L., 182, col. 531-533, Epist. CCCXXVI. The date of this work has been determined from the fact that the Council of Sens took place in June, 1140. (See footnote 27 below). Bernard tells William in his reply that he will wait until after Easter to take action. (See page 25 above). Since he took action after Easter in 1140, it is presumed that he received this letter from William in late 1139 or early 1140.

<sup>5</sup> "Petrus enim Abaelardus iterum nova docet, nova scribit; et libri ejus transeunt maria transibunt Alpes; et novae ejus sententiae de fide, et nova dogmata per provincias et regna deferuntur, celebriter praedicantur, et libere defenduntur: in tantum ut in curia Romana dicantur habere auctoritatem. Dico vobis, periculose siletis, tam vobis, quam Ecclesiae Dei." Ibid., col. 531.

<sup>6</sup> William adds, "Duo autem erant libelli idem pene continentes: nisi quod in altero plus, in altero minus aliquanto inveniretur." Ibid., col. 531. These two works were the Introductio ad Theologiam and the Theologia Christiana. He also mentions the Sic et Non and the Scito Te Ipsum as probably containing similar errors.

<sup>7</sup> P.L., 180, col. 249-282.

<sup>8</sup> "Guillaume reste un représentant de l'argument d'autorité, et la gardien vigilant des méthodes traditionnelles." E. De Clerck, "Droits du démon et nécessité de la rédemption. Les écoles d'Abélard et de Pierre Lombard," R.T.A.M., 14(1947), p. 37.

<sup>9</sup> "...agens in Scriptura divina quod agere solebat in dialectica, proprias adinventiones, annuas novitates: censor fidei, non discipulus; emendator, non imitator." P.L., 182, col. 532.

<sup>10</sup> De Erroribus Guillelmi De Conchis, P.L., 180, col. 334-340.

- 11 "Vos etiam timet homo ille, et reformidet." P.L., 182, col. 531-532.
- 12 The Abbey of Clairvaux was founded in 1115. It is located in the diocese of Langres, on the Aube River in the Province of Champagne. Cottineau, vol. 1, col. 799.
- 13 P.L., 182, col. 533, Epist. CCCXXVII.
- 14 "Porro silentii ac patientiae super his meae patientiam habete: cum horum plurima et pene omnia hucusque nescierim." Ibid., col. 533.
- 15 They were both present at the blessing of the high altar of Morigny by Pope Innocent II. E. Vacandard, "Abelard," D.H.G.E., vol. 1 (1912), col. 82. Vacandard refers the reader to Chronic. Maurinac in Hist. des Gaules, t. XII, p. 80. Morigny was a Benedictine Abbey founded around 1102 by Anselle. The church was consecrated in 1119 by Pope Calixte II and visited in 1131 by Pope Innocent II. It is in the diocese of Sens, on the Juine. Cottineau, vol. 2, col. 1984.
- 16 P.L., 178, col. 335-340, Epist. X.
- 17 "Confundor, Deus scit, apud vos, cum de re communis et gravis necessitatis, silentibus vobis, et aliis, quorum erat loqui, cogor vos alloqui, nullus in hominibus, domini et patres." P.L., 182, col. 531, Epist. CCCXXVI.
- 18 "Ille quippe occultus iamdudum inimicus qui se hucusque amicum imo amicissimum simulavit..." J. T. Muckle, ed., "Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," Medieval Studies. 12(1950), pp. 163-213. In the Appendix to this article Muckle gives sections of this letter but refrains from giving it in full since Dr. Klibansky, who had discovered it twenty years earlier, intended to publish it. Since that time Klibansky has published it. "Peter Abailard and Bernard of Clairvaux. A Letter by Abailard," Medieval and Renaissance Studies. 5(1961), pp. 1-27.
- 19 See chapter I, p. 18, note 42 above.
- 20 Ibid., pp. 18-19, note 44.
- 21 Stephen of Senlis, Bishop of Paris, 1124 to his death in 1142. Gams, p. 596.
- 22 P.L., 182, col. 833-856.
- 23 "Verum dominus Clarae-Vallis, his a diversis et saepius auditis, imo certe in praetaxato magistri Petri Theologiae libro, nec non et aliis ejusdem libris, in quorum forte lectionem inciderat, diligenter inspectis, secreto prius, ac deinde secum duobus aut tribus adhibitis testibus, juxta evangelicum praeceptum, hominem convenit: et ut auditores suos a talibus compesceret, librosque suos corrigeret, amicabiliter satis ac familia riter illum admonuit." P.L., 182, col. 541, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

Bernard writes of himself in the third person in this letter as well as in letter CXCI in behalf of the Archbishop of Rheims to Pope Innocent.

24 "Plures etiam scholarium adhortatus est ut et libros venenis plenos repudiarent et rejicerent, et a doctrina quae fidem laedebat catholicam, caverent et abstinere." Ibid., col 541.

25 "Cum quo etiam, tam modeste, tamque rationabiliter egit, ut ille quoque compunctus ad ipsius arbitrium correcturum se promitteret universa. Caeterum cum recessisset ab eo, Petrum idem consiliis stimulatus iniquis, et ingenii sui viribus, plurimoque exercitio disputandi infelicitur fidens, et ingenii proposito saniori." Geoffrey of Auxerre, the third book of the life of St. Bernard. P.L., 185, col. 310.

26 "Primo quod Senoni in praesentia domini archiepiscopi et multorum amicorum meorum, quod deinde Parisius de profundo nequitiae suae coram nobis vel aliis eructiverit." Muckle, ed., op. cit., p. 213.

27 The date of the Council of Sens is a disputed topic. None of Bernard's letters, nor any of the other sources mention the date of the council or of the exposition of relics at Sens. For many years the year 1140 was commonly held by many historians. Deutsch, however, advanced some arguments in favor of 1141, Die synode zu Sens 1141 und die Verurtheilung Abalards. Berlin, 1880. Some historians agree with him, including Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire Des Conciles. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912, p. 754, note 1. The majority of the more recent historians, however, rather accept the year 1140 as the date of the Council of Sens. Sikes cites Deutsch's arguments and shows where they are wrong. J. G. Sikes, Peter Abelard. Cambridge: University Press, 1932, pp. 229-231. Among the other recent secondary sources which are important, Cottiaux and De Ghellinck also prefer the year 1140.

28 "Quod magister Petrus minus patienter et nimium aegre ferens, crebro non pulsare coepit..." P.L., 182, col. 541, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

29 "(Bernardus) in tantum nunc exarsit invidiam ut nunc scriptorum meorum titulum ferre non posset quibus gloriam suam tanto magis humiliari credidit, quanto magis me sublimari putavit." Muckle, ed., op. cit., p. 213.

30 J. G. Sikes, Peter Abailard. Cambridge: University Press, 1932, pp. 227-228.

31 Henry Sanglier, Bishop of Sens, elected Dec., 1122, died in office Jan. 10, 1142. Gams, p. 629.

32 "Quod magister Petrus minus patienter et nimium aegre ferens, crebro non pulsare coepit, nec ante voluit desistere, quoad ad dominum Clarae-Vallensem abbatem super hoc scribentes, assignato die, scilicet octavo Pentecostes, Senonis ante nostram submonuimus venire praesentiam, quo se vocabat et offerebat paratum magister Petrum ad probandas et defendendas, de quibus illum dominus abbas Clarae-Vallensis, quomodo praetextatum est, reprehenderat, sententias." P.L., 182, col. 541, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

33 "...et cum omnes fugiant a facie ejus, me omnium minimum expetit ad singulare certamen." P.L., 182, col. 355, Epist. CLXXXIX.

34 "Dominus itaque archeipiscopus iuxta petitionem vestram litteras ad eum direxerat, si in accusatione mei perseverare vellet, me paratum habere in octavis Pentecostes super his quae obiecit capitulis respondere." Muckle, ed., op. cit., p. 213.

35 It seems that Bernard had previously converted Henry from a worldly way of life. Around 1136 Henry fell back into his old ways as is evidenced by Bernard's letter to him at about that time. P.L., 182, col. 344-345, Epist. CLXXXII.

36 See note 49 below.

37 See note 34 above.

38 "Illa die vero, scilicet octava Pentecostes, convenerant ad nos Senonis fratres et suffraganei nostri episcopi, ob honorem et reverentiam sanctarum, quas in ecclesia nostra populo revelaturos nos indixeramus, reliquiarum." P.L., 182, col. 541, Epist. CCCXXXVII, Bernard to Innocent.

39 "Abnui, tam quia puer sum, et ille vir bellator ab adolescentia: tum quia judicarem indignum, rationem fidei humanis committi ratiunculis agitandam, quam tam certa ac stabili veritate constat esse subnixam." P.L., 182, col. 355, Epist. CLXXXIX.

40 See note 29 above.

41 "Ille nihilo minus, imo eo amplius levavit vocem, vocavit multos, congregavit complices. Quae de me ad discipulos suos scripserit, dicere non curo. Disseminavit ubique, se mihi die statuo apud Senonas respondurum. Exiit sermo ad omnes, et non potuit me latere. Dissimulavi primum: nec enim satis rumore populari movebar. Cedens tamen (licet vix, ita ut flerem) consilio amicorum, qui videntes quomodo se quasi ad spectaculum omnes pararent, timebant ne de nostra absentia et scandalum populo, et cornua crescerent adversario; et quia error magis confirmaretur, cum non esset qui responderet aut contradiceret, occurri ad locum et diem, imparatus quidem et immunitus..." P.L., 182, col. 355-356, Epist. CLXXXIX.

42 "Dicebam sufficere scripta ejus ad accusandum eum; nec mea referre, sed episcoporum, quorum esset ministerii de dogmatibus judicare." Ibid., col. 355.

43 "Si mea propria causa esset, posset non immerito fortassis puer sanctitatis vestrae in vestro patrocinio glorari. Nunc autem quia et vestra est, imo plus vestra; fidentius moneo, et obnixius rogo, ut amicos vos in necessitate probetis. Amicos dixerim, non nostros, sed Christi, cujus sponsa clamat ad vos in silva haeresum, et in segete errorum, quibus sub tutela et custodia vestra pullutantibus pene jam suffocatur." P.L., 182, col. 350, Epist. CLXXXVII.

44 "Nec miremini, quod ita de subito, et in arcto temporis vos invitamus: quoniam hoc quoque adversa pars in sua versutia et calliditate providit, ut improvidos invaderet, et congregari cogeret immunitos." Ibid.

45 Of the ten letters sent to the cardinals and an abbot after the council, d'Olwer says that of those written before the council, 188, 192, 193, 331 and 332 were sent without modification, while 336 and 338 were revised and sent. Three of the ten letters 333, 334, and 335 were written after the council. L. Nicolau d'Olwer, "Sur quelques lettres de saint Bernard, avant ou après le concile de Sens," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953, p. 108. Hefele-Leclercq points out that Rémusat also believed that Abelard had written some of these letters before the council. Hefele, Histoire Des Conciles, translated and augmented by Dom H. Leclercq. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912, p. 758.

46 "Leonem evasimus, sed incidimus in draconem (Abelard)..." P.L., 182, col. 354, Epist. CLXXXIX. See page 20 above for reference to the schism of Peter Leone, the anti-pope.

47 See note 37 on the date of the Council of Sens, above.

48 "La personnalité religieuse et politique de l'un, la finesse et la science de l'autre, jointes à ce que l'on savait de ses amours malheureuses, créaient une ambiance capable d'attirer plus de spectateurs que la présence des évêques ou celle même du roi Louis VII et de ses officiers venus vénérer les reliques en la cathédrale nouvellement bâtie. Avides du spectacle et des disputes éloquentes qui s'annonçaient, une multitude d'écoliers était accourue de Paris et des villes voisines." J. Jeannin, "La dernière maladie d'Abélard: une alliée imprevue de saint Bernard," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953, p. 109.

49 "Illa vero die, scilicet octava Pentecostes, convenerant ad nos Senonis fratres et suffraganei nostri episcopi, ob honorem et reverentiam sanctarum, quas in ecclesia nostra populo revelaturos nos indixeramus, reliquiarum.

"Itaque praesente glorioso rege Francorum Ludovico cum Willelmo religioso Nivernis comite, domino quoque Remensi archiepiscopo, cum quibusdam suis suffraganeis nostris, exceptis Parisiis et Nivernis, episcopis praesentibus, cum multis religiosis abbatibus et sapientibus, valdeque litteratis clericis, adfuit dominus abbas Clarae-Vallensis, adfuit magister Petrus cum fautoribus suis." P.L., 182, col 541-542, Epist. CCCXXXVII, Bernard to Pope Innocent in the name of the archbishop of Sens

50 "...denuo ad audientiam apud Senonas evocatur, praesentibus Ludewico rege Theobaldoque palatino comite et alliis nobilibus de populoque innumeris." Ottone Episcopo et Ragewino Frisingensibus, "Gesta Friderici I, Imperatoris," M.G.H., Scriptores., vol 20, p. 377.

51 This cannot be known for certain, but is implied from what Bernard says in his letter to Innocent after the council. See note 49 above. As it says there, the veneration of relics took place on the Octave of Pentecost, which was June 2. It is probable that this ceremony was an all

day affair and would not have left time for the proceedings of the council. Also, the meeting of bishops on the eve of the council would imply that they were all present on the day before.

52 "Concionabaris ad populum, ut orationem funderet ad Deum pro eo; interius autem disponebas eum proscribendum ab orbe Christiano." P.L., 178, col. 1858, "Berengarii Scholastici Apologeticus".

53 Sikes, op. cit., p. 232.

54 "Denique post prandium allatus est liber Petri, et cuīdam praeceptum est ut voce clamosa Petri opuscula personaret. At ille et Petri odio animatus, et vitis germine irrigarus, non illius qui dixit: Ego sum vitis vera (Joan. XV), sed illius qui patriarcham nudum stravī in area (Gen. IX), sonorius quam postulatum fuerat exclamavit. Post aliqua pontifices insultare, pedem pedi applaudere, ridere nugari conspiceres, ut facile quilibet judicaret illos non Christo vota persolvere, sed baccho." I have left out a long description of the drinking and carrying on. Then he continues: "Cum itaque lector in Petri satis aliquod reperiret spinetum, surdis exclamabat auribus pontificum: 'Damnatis?' Tunc quidam vix ad extremam syllabam expergefati, somnolenta voce, capite pendulo: 'Damnamus, aiebant.' Alii vero damnantium tumultu excitati, decapitata prima syllaba, '...namus inquit.' Verēnatis, sed natatio vestra procella, natatio vestra mersio." P.L., 178, col. 1858-1859, "Berengarii Scholastici Apologeticus".

55 "Caeterum sententias pravi dogmatis ipsius, quia multos infecerant, et sui contagione adusque cordium intima penetraverant; saepe in audientia publica lectas et relectas, et tam verissimis rationibus, quam beati Augustini, aliorumque sanctorum Patrum inductis a domino Clarae-Vallensi auctoritatibus, non solum falsas, sed et haereticas esse evidentissime comprobatas, pridie ante factam ad vos appellationem damnavimus." P.L., 182, col. 542, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

56 See note 49 above.

57 It is appropriate to note here that there is only one other point besides Abelard that we know of with which the Council of Sens dealt. This was a report by the superior of a church of Tournai concerning the vision of a young canon there, Henry of Tournai. It seems that a revelation was made to him by St. Eleutherus concerning the restoration of the bishopric of Tournai. The council recommended that they wait for a clearer manifestation of the will of God. An account of the revelation is to be found in the Acta Sanctorum. Here, also, is an account of its being reported at the council. The following passage is from the account.

"Concilio itaque cum religiosis viris habito, Domino nostro Samsone Remorum Archiepiscopo dominoque Bernardo Clarae-vallenses Abbate necnon aliis Episcopis et Abbatibus, pro audiendis et discutiendis libris Magistri Petri Abailardi in Octava Pentecostes cum Rege Francorum in Senonensi urbe congregatis, visionem istam scriptam transmisimus. Illi nobis mandaverunt, ut Divinae voluntatis effectum deinceps exspectaremus." Joannes Bollandus and Godefridus Henschenius, eds., "De S. Eleutherio



Episcopo Tornacensi in Belgio", Acta Sanctorum. Paris: Victorem Palme, 1865. XX, Februarius, vol. 3, p. 198.

58 "Quid multa Dominus abbas cum librum Theologiae magistri Petri proferret in medium, et quae adnotaverat absurda, imo haeretica plane capitula de libro eodem proponeret, ut ea magister Petrus vel a se scripta negaret; vel, si sua fateretur, aut probaret, aut corrigeret." P.L., 182, col. 542, Epist. CCCXXXVII, Bernard to Pope Innocent in the name of the archbishop of Sens.

59 Ibid.

60 "Itaque in praesentia omnium, adversario stante ex adverso, producta sunt quaedam capitula de libris ejus excerpta." P.L., 182, col. 356, Epist. CLXXXIX.

61 "Visus diffidere magister Petrus Abaelardus, et subterfugere, respondere noluit: sed quamvis libera sibi daretur audientia, tutumque locum et aequos gaberet judices, ad vestram tamen, sanctissime Pater, appellans praesentiam, cum suis a conventu discessit." P.L., 182, col. 542, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

62 "Quae cum coepissent legi, nolens audire exivit, appellans ab electis iudicibus, quod non putamus licere." P.L., 182, col. 356, Epist. CLXXXIX.

63 "Intra tot itaque et tantas angustias deprehensus Abaelardus ad Romani examinis confugit asylum. 'Filius sum, inquit, Romanae Ecclesiae. Volo causa mea quasi impii judicetur: Caesarem appello (Act. XXV).'" P.L., 178, col. 1861, "Berengarii Scholastici Apologiticus."

64 "Episcopi autem, qui propter hoc in unum convenerant, vestrae Reverentiae deferentes, nihil in personam ejus egerunt: sed tantummodo capitula librorum ejus, a sanctis Patribus condemnata, ne morbus serperet, medicinali necessitate abjudicaverunt." P.L., 182, col. 357-358, Epist. CXCI.

65 "Et quia multos in errorem perniciosissimum et plane damnabilem pertrahunt eas auctoritate vestra, dilectissime domine, perpetua damnatione notari, et omnes qui pervicaciter et contentiose illas defenderint, a vobis, aequissime Pater, justa poena mulctari unanimiter et multa precum instantia postulamus. Saepedicto vero Petro se Reverentia vestra silentium imponeret, et tam legendi quam scribendi prorsus interrumperet facultatem, et libros ejus, perverso sine dubio dogmate respersos, condemnaret; avulsis spinis et tribulis ab Ecclesia Dei, praevaleret adhuc laeta Christi seges succrescere, florere, fructificare." P.L., 182, col. 542, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

66 "Reverendissimo domino et charissimo Patri Dei gratia summo pontifici Innocentio, Samson Remorum Archiepiscopus, Joslinus Suessionensis, Gaufridus Catalaunnensis, Alvius Atrebatensis, voluntarium debitae subjectionis obsequium." P.L., 182, col. 357, Epist. CXCI.

67 "Petras Abaelardus christianae fidei meritum evacuare nititur, dum totum quod Deus est, humana ratione arbitratus se posse comprehendere. Ascendit usque ad coelos, et descendit usque ad abyssos." P.L., 182, col. 357, Epist. CXCI.

68 "Reverendissimo patri et domino Innocentio, Dei gratia summo Pontifici, Henricus Senonessium archiepiscopus, Gaufridus Carotensis episcopus, sanctae Sedis apostolicae famulus, Helias Aurelianensis, Hugo Autissiodorensis, Hatto Trecensis, Manasses Meldensis episcopi, devotas orationes et debitam obedientiam." P.L., 182, col. 540, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

69 "Auribus occupatis ad plurima, sermonem facimus abbreviatum de prolixo negotio, pro eo maxime, quia idipsum diffusius ac plenius continetur in litteris domini Senonensis." P.L., 182, col. 357, Epist. CXCI.

70 "Quaedam autem de condemnatis a nobis capitulis vobis, reverende Pater, conscripta transmisimus, ut per haec audita reliqui corpus operis facilius aestimetis." P.L., 182, col. 542, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

71 J. Rivi re, "Les 'capitula' d'Ab lard condamn s au Concile de Sens," R.T.A.M. 5(1933), pp. 5-22.

72 P.L., 178, col. 1053-1072.

73 Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., p. 760.

74 See page 35, note 55 above.

75 See page 32, note 45 above.

76 "Nam cum non esset quod agerem pro injuria fidei quam dolebam; operae mihi pretium arbitror, si illum monui, cujus arma potentia a Deo ad destructionem contrariarum assertionum, ad destruendam omnem altitudinem extollentem se adversus scientiam Dei, et in captivitatem redigendum omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi." P.L., 182, col. 1072, Epist. CXC.

77 See 32 note 45 above. These letters are found in P.L., 182: Epist. CLXXXVIII, to bishops and Cardinals of the Curia, col. 351-353; Epist. CXCLII, to Master Guido du Chatel, col. 358-359; Epist. CXCLIII, to Cardinal Ivo, col. 359; Epist. CCCXXXI, to Cardinal Stephen, Bishop of Palestrina, col. 536-537; Epist. CCCXXXII, to Cardinal G..., col. 537-538; Epist. CCCXXXIII, to Cardinal Gregory Tarquinius, col. 538; Epist. CCCXXXIV, to Cardinal Guy of Pisa, col. 538-539; Epist. CCCXXXV, to Cardinal Peter, col. 539; Epist. CCCXXXVI, to a certain abbot, col. 539-540; Epist. CCCXXXVIII, to Haimeric, Cardinal and Chancellor, col. 542-544.

78 "Nunc autem intrat curiam, postquam commovit Ecclesiam, et turbavit eam, non ut sanet contritiones ejus, sed ad excusationes excusandas in peccatis. Si filius ejus es, defende utrum qui te portavit, et ubera quae suxisti." P.L., 182, col. 538, Epist. CCCXXXIII.

79 P.L., 182, col. 354-357, Epist. CLXXXIX.

80 P.L., 182, col. 535-536, Epist. CCCXXX.

81 Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit., p. 758.

82 D'Olwer, Mélanges, op. cit., p. 108.

83 "Qua mente, qua conscientia recurris ad fidei defensorum, fidei persecutor? quibus oculis, qua fronte intueberis amicum Sponsi, sponsae violator?" P.L., 182, col. 536, Epist. CCCXXX.

84 "O nisi detineret me cura fratrum! o nisi me corporalis infirmitas impediret! quantum desiderarem videre amicum Sponsi pro sponsa zelantem in absentia Sponsi!" Ibid.

85 Only the first letter is given in P.L., 182. It is Epist. CXCV, col. 359-361. Both letters are found in P.L., 179: Epist. CDXLVII, col. 515-517 and Epist. CDXLVIII, col. 517. While the first letter in P.L., 182, names Samson as archbishop of Rheims, all the other available editions of the letter name Rainaldus. This latter is obviously an error for Rainaldus de Martigné died as archbishop of Rheims in 1138. The seat was then vacant for two years and Samson de Mauvoisin was consecrated archbishop in 1140. He was archbishop there at the time of the Council of Sens, as is evident by Bernard's letter to Pope Innocent in his name. Gams, p. 608.

86 "Dolemus autem quoniam, sicut litterarum vestrarum inspectione et missis a fraternitate vestra nobis errorum capitulis cognovimus, in novissimis diebus, quando instant periculosa tempora, magistri Petri Abaelardi perniciose doctrina, et praedictorum haereses, et alia perversa dogmata catholicae fidei obviantia, pullulare coeperunt." P.L., 179, col. 516, Epist. CDXLVII.

87 "Nos itaque qui in cathedra S. Petri, cui a Domino dictum est: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos (Luc. XXII), licet indigni, residere conspicimur, communicato fratrum nostrorum episcoporum cardinalium consilio, destinata nobis a vestra discretione capitula, et universa ipsius Petri dogmata, sanctorum canonum auctoritate, cum suo auctore damnavimus, eique tamquam haeretico perpetuum silentium imposuimus. Universos quoque erroris sui sectatores et defensores, a fidelium consortio sequestrandos, et excommunicationis vinculo innodandos esse censemus." Ibid., col. 517.

88 "Per praesentia scripta fraternitate vestrae mandamus quatenus Petrum Abaelardum et Arnaldum de Brixia, perversi dogmatis fabricatores, et Catholicae fidei impugnatores, in religiosis locis, ubi vobis melius visum fuerit, separatim faciatis includi, et libros erroris eorum, ubicumque reperti fuerint, igne comburi." P.L., 179, col. 517, Epist. CDXLVIII.

89 "Audiavi etiam quod damnatione Petri Abaelardi diligentia vestra desideret plenius nosse similiter veritatem, cujus libellos pia memoriae dominus Innocentius papa secundus in urbe Roma, et in ecclesia beati Petri

incendio celebri concremavit, apostolica auctoritate haereticum illum denuntians." P.L., 185, col. 595, "Epistola ad Albinum cardinalem et episcopum Albanensem. De condemnatione errorum Gilberti Porretani."

90 "Magister Petrus sapientiae vestrae, ut credo, optime notus, nuper a Francia veniens, per Cluniacum transitum fecit." P.L., 189, col. 305, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV. Cluny, being in Burgandy, was in the Empire. But because he says Abelard came to Cluny from Francia, it must refer to the Ile de France alone.

91 P. Ruf and M. Grabmann, Ein Neuaufgefundenes Bruchstück der Apologia Abaelards. Munich: R. Oldenburg, 1930.

92 "Ac primum, écrit Abélard des les premières lignes, ipsa sunt ponenda capitula que de scriptis meis adversus me videntur prolata." Rivière, op. cit., p. 16. Rivière uses the Ruf and Grabmann text to determine the number of propositions at nineteen, which were condemned by the Council of Sens and by Pope Innocent II.

93 "Quaesivimus quo tenderet. Gravatum se vexationibus quorundam, qui sibi, quod valde abhorrebat, nomen haeretici imponebant, majestatem apostolicam se appellasse, et ad eam confugere velle respondit. Laudavimus propositum, et, ut ad notum et commune refugium confugeret, admonuimus. Justitiam apostolicam, quae nulli unquam etiam extraneo vel peregrino defuit, sibi non defuturam diximus. Misericordiam ipsam, ubi ratio postularet, sibi occurruram promisimus." P.L., 189, col. 305, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV.

94 "Venit interim dominus Cisterciensis abbas, et de pace ipsius et Domini Clarevallensis, cujus causa appellaverat, nobiscum et cum ipso pariter egit. Dedimus et nos operam paci ejus, et ut ad illum cum ipso iret, hortati sumus. Addidimus hoc monitis nostris, ut se qua catholicas aures offendentia aut scripsisset aut dixisset, hortatu ejus et aliorum bonorum et sapientium, et a verbis suis amoveret, et a libris abraderet." Ibid., col. 305-306.

95 J. C. Didier, "Un scrupule identique de saint Bernard à l'égard d'Abélard et de Gilbert de la Porrée," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. p. 96.

96 "Et jactum est ita. Ivit, redit, cum domino Claraevallensi, mediante Cisterciensi, sopitis prioribus querelis se pacifice convenisse, reversus retulit." P.L., 189, col. 306, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV.

97 See note 94 above.

98 P.L., 189, col. 305-306, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV.

99 "Lectio erat ci continua, oratio frequens, silentium jure, nisi eum aut fratrum familiaris collatio, aut ad ipsos in conventu de divinis publicis sermo eum loqui urgebant. Sacramenta coelistia, immortalis Agni sacrificium Deo offerendo, prout poterat, frequentabat; imo postquam litteris et labore meo apostolicae gratiae redditus est, pene continuabat."

P.L., 189, col. 351, Liber Quartus, Epist. XXI.

100 P.L., 178, col. 375-378, Epist. XVII.

101 "Tali nobiscum vir simplex et rectus, timens Deum, et recedens a malo tali, inquam, per aliquantum temporis conversatione, ultimos vitae suae dies consecrans Deo, pausandi gratia (Nam plus solito, scabie et quibusdam corporis incommoditatibus gravatur), a me Cabilonem missus est. Nam propter illius soli amoenitatem, qua cunctis pene Burgundiae nostrae partibus praeminet, locum ei habitabilem, prope urbem quidem, sed tamen Arari interfluente provideram. Ibi juxta quod incommoditas permittebat, antiqua sua renovans studia, libris semper incumberebat, nec sicut de magno Gregorio legitur, momentum aliquod praeterire sinebat, quin semper aut oraret, aut scriberet, aut dictaret." P.L., 189, col. 351-352, Liber Quartus, Epist. XXI. Saint-Marcel was founded as a monastery in the sixth century by the holy king Gontran. It became a priory of Cluny in 1060. It is located near Châlon-sur-Saône on the Saône-et-Loire. Cottineau, vol. 2, col. 2780.

102 "Nam ad slovendum commune mortalium debitum, morbo correptus, eoque ingravescens, in brevi ad extrema perductus est. Tunc vero quam sancte, quam devote, quam catholice, primo fidei, dehinc peccatorum confessionem fecerit, quanto inhiantis cordis affectu, viaticum peregrinationis, ac vitae aeternae pignus, corpus scilicet Redemptoris Domini acceperit, quam fideliter corpus suum et animam hic et in aeternum ipsi commendaverit, testes sunt religiose fratres, et totus illius monasterii, in quo corpus S. Martyris Marcelli jacet, conventus. Hoc magister Petrus fine dies suos consummavit, et qui singulari scientiae magesterio, toti pene orbi terrarum notus, et ubique famosus erat, in illius discipulatu qui dixit: Discite a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde (Matth. XI), mitis et humilis perseverans ad ipsum ut dignum est credere, sic transivit." Ibid., col. 352.

103 P.L., 189, col. 346-353, Liber Quartus, Epist. XXI.

## Footnotes -- Chapter III

1 See Chapter I, page 8, footnote 2.

2 "Is (Abelard), inquam, litterarum studiis aliisque facetiis ab ineunte aetate deditus fuit, sed tam arrogans suoque tantum ingenio confidens, ut vix ad audiendos magistros ab altitudine mentis suae humiliatus descenderet." Ottone Episcopo et Ragewino Frisingensibus, "Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris," M.G.H., Scriptores. vol. 20, p. 376.

3 "Les avantages de sa personne, les qualités extérieures de son enseignement, sa limpide clarté, limpidissimum fontem, comme disait Foulques de Deuil, l'art de poser les questions, l'éclat de son argumentation, sa finesse dans la discussion, la promptitude de son esprit original, assurent un règne durable à ce chevalier de la dialectique, comme l'appelle dom Tosti." De Ghellinck, Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Bruges: Editions "De Tempel", 1948. p. 151. The reference in this quote is to Luigi Tosti, Storia di Abelardo e dei suoi tempi. Naples, 1851. p. 7.

4 "Factum tandem est ut, supra vires aetatis meae de ingenio meo praesumens, ad scholarum regimen adolescentulus aspirarem et locum, in quo id agerem, providerem insigne videlicet tunc temporis Meliduni castrum et sedem regiam." J. T. Muckle, "Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," Medieval Studies. 12(1950), p. 176.

5 "Hanc igitur, omnibus circumspectis quae amantes allicere solent, commodiorem censui in amorem mihi copulare et me id facillime credidi posse. Tanti quippe tunc nominis eram et iuventutis et formae gratia praeminebam ut quaecumque feminarum nostro dignarer amore nullam vererer repulsam." Ibid., p. 183.

6 "Tandem ego eius immoderatae anxietati admodum compatiens, et de dolo quem fecerat amor, tanquam de summa prodicione, me ipsum vehementer accusans, conveni hominem supplicando et promittendo quaecumque super hoc emendationem ipse constitueret, nec ulli mirabile id videri asserens, quicumque vim amoris expertus fuisset, et qui quanta ruina summos quoque viros ab ipso statim humani generis exordio mulieres deiecerint memoria retineret. Atque ut amplius eum mitigarem supra quam sperare poterat, obtuli me ei satisfacere eam scilicet quam corruperam mihi matrimonio copulando, dummodo id secreto fieret ne famae detrimentum incurrerem." Ibid., p. 185.

7 "Cum igitur totus in superbia atque luxuria laborarem, utriusque morbi remedium divina mihi gratia licet nolenti contulit, ac primo luxuriae, deinde superbiae; luxuriae quidem his me privando quibus hanc exercebam, superbiae vero quae mihi ex litterarum maxime scientia nascebatur, iuxta illud Apostoli: Scientia inflat, illius libri, quo maxime gloriabar, combustionem me humiliando." Ibid., p. 182.

8 "Ac ne ex ignorantia praetenderem excusationem, quasi qui verba illa in usu non haberem, scripturam ad legendum afferri fecerunt. Legi

inter suspiria, singultus et lacrimas, prout potui." Ibid., p. 196.

9 "In tam misera me contritione positum confusio, fateor, pudoris potius quam devotio conversionis ad monasticorum latibula claustrorum compulit; illa tamen prius ad imperium nostrum sponte velata et monasterium ingressa. Ambo itaque simul sacrum gabitum suscepimus, ego quidem in abbazia sancti Dionysii, illa in monasterio Argenteoli supradicto." Ibid., p. 190.

10 Ibid., pp. 201-202.

11 See Chapter I, page 18-19, footnote 44.

12 J. G. Sikes, Peter Abailard. Cambridge, London, 1932. p. 13.

13 "...quod hucusque pecuniae vel laudis cupiditate egeram, nunc amore Dei operam studio darem, attendens quod mihi fuerat a Domino talentum commissum ab ipso esse cum usuris exigendum, et qui divitibus maxime hucusque intenderam, pauperibus erudiendis amodo studerem, et ob hoc maxime Dominica tumultuosa vita saeculi abstractus, studio litterarum vacarem, nec tam mundi quam Dei vere philosophus dierem." Muckle, ed., Historia, p. 191.

14 See Chapter II, page 28, footnotes 28 and 29.

15 "Si même Abélard avait eu des motifs de croire que sa condamnation était décidée à l'avance, pourquoi n'aurait-il pas entamé une discussion avec l'espoir d'écarter, grâce à la supériorité de son esprit si avisé, la condamnation dont il était menacé?" Charles Joseph Hefele, Histoire Des Conciles, translated and augmented by Dom H. Leclercq. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912. vol. 5, part 1, "Abélard et le Concile de Sens en 1140". p. 755, note 1.

16 "Au lieu de cela cette protestation, ce silence, cette fuite que rien n'expliquait, qu'on ne s'explique pas." G. Truc, Abélard avec et sans Héloïse. Paris: A. Fayard, 1956. p. 62.

17 "At ille nec volens resipiscere, nec valens resistere sapientiae et spiritui qui loquebatur; ut tempus redimeret, Sedem apostolicam appellavit." P.L., 185, col. 311, Geoffrey of Auxerre, third book of the life of St. Bernard.

18 "C'était là, bien inopportunément, la première manifestation d'un mal dont nous verrons l'évolution progressive aboutir quelques mois plus tard à la mort de celui qui en était l'attristante victime." J. Jeannin, "La dernière maladie d'Abélard: une alliée imprévue de saint Bernard," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. p. 109.

19 See Chapter II, page 45, footnote 93.

20 "Ubi dum de fide sua discuteretur, seditionem populi timens, apostolicae sedis praesentiam appellavit." Otto of Freising, M.G.H.,

Scriptores, op. cit., p. 377.

21 It is true that the above speaks of the fact that he could defend it; but by this Bernard merely meant to make it conform to Bernard's concept of theology. This is clear from the fact that he had already had it condemned.

22 Hefele-Leclercq cites Deutsch's opinion, op. cit., p. 755, note 1.

23 "Nam et confessus est postea suis, ut aiunt, quod ea hora, maxima quidem ex parte memoria ejus turbata fuerit, ratio caligaverit, et interior fugerit sensus." P.L., 185, col. 311-312, Geoffrey of Auxerre, third book of the life of St. Bernard.

24 "Intra tot itaque et tantas angustias deprehensus Abaelardus ad Romani examinis confugit asylum." P.L., 178, col. 1891, "Berengarii Scholastici Apologeticus."

25 E. De Clerck, "Droits du démon et nécessité de la rédemption. Les écoles d'Abélard et de Pierre Lombard," R.T.A.M. 14(1947), p. 35, note 14. He quotes the Apologia.

26 "Agnoscat ergo fraterna charitas me qualemcumque filium Ecclesiae, cum ipsa integre cuncta quae recipit, recipere; cuncta quae respuit, respuere; nec me umquam unionem fidei scidisse, quamvis impar caeteris morum qualitate." P.L., 178, col. 105, "Professio Fidei."

27 "Cujus sanctae, humili ac devotae inter nos conversationi, quod quantumve Cluniacus testimonium ferat, brevis sermo non explicat... Mirabar saepe, et in processionibus eo me cum reliquis pro more praecedente, pene stupebam, tanti tamque famosi nominis hominem, sic seipsum contemnere, sic se abjicere posse." P.L., 189, col. 350-351, Liber Quartus, Epist. XXI, to Heloise.

28 "Aiunt enim perversi pervertenter, quorum sapientia est in perditione, me in logica praestantissimum esse, sed in Paulo non mediocriter claudicare cumque ingenii praedicent aciem, Christianae fidei subtrahunt puritatem. Quia, ut mihi videtur, opinione potius traducuntur ad iudicium, quam experientiae magistratu." P.L., 178, col. 375, Epist. XVII, Confession of faith to Heloise.

29 "Nolo sic esse philosophus, ut recalcitrem Paulo. Non sic esse Aristotiles, ut secludat a Christo. Non enim aliud nomen est sub coelo, in quo oporteat me salvum fieri (Act. IV, 12)." Ibid., col. 375-376.

30 "Haec itaque est fides in qua sedeo, ex qua spei contraho firmitatem. In hac locatus salubriter, latratus Scyllae non timeo vertiginem Charybdis rideo, mortiferos sirenarum modulos non horresco. Si irruat turbo, non quatior; si venti perflent, non moveor. Fundatus enim sum supra firmam petram." Ibid., col. 378.

31 Sikes, op. cit., p. 238.



32 The following are significant examples of this rehabilitation of Abelard's place in theology: J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard," R.H.E. 28(1932), pp. 247-295, 533-551, 788-828; J. de Ghellinck, Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Bruges: Editions "De Tempel", 1948; J.G. Sikes, Peter Abailard. Cambridge, 1932.

33 "Éprouvant la nécessité de posséder une synthèse de l'enseignement chrétien, les docteurs s'appliquent à établir une unité dans l'ensemble de la doctrine sacrée; ils essaient d'y déceler un fil conducteur, d'en dégager un ordre intérieur qui permette de hiérarchiser les multiples vérités et de les saisir dans leurs rapports mutuels." H. Cloes, "La systématisation théologique pendant la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," Ephemer. theolo. Louvan. 34(1958), p. 277.

34 "Le mystique n'a nul besoin de raisonner ou de démontrer: il croit, il voit, et il voit dès qu'il croit. Il n'a pas recours, dans ce mouvement originel, au travail de l'intelligence, et ce travail ne peut que lui sembler surérogatoire et assez vite suspect." Truc, op. cit., p. 58

35 "Qui dum cernit quae sunt in coelo sursum, et quae in terra deorsum, nihil, praeter solum Nescio, nescire dignatur; ponit in coelum os suum, et scrutatur alto Dei, rediensque ad nos refert verba ineffabilia, quae non licet homini loqui et sum paratus est de omnibus redere rationem, etiam quae sunt supra rationem, et contra rationem praesumit, et contra fidem." P.L., 182, col. 1055, Epist. CXC.

36 "Quidquid itaque in hac altissima philosophia disseremus, umbram, non veritatem esse profiteamur, et quasi similitudinem quamdam, non rem. Quid verum sit, noverit Dominus; quid autem verisimile ac maxime philosophicis consentaneum rationibus, quibus impetitur, dicturum me arbitror." Peter Abelard, P.L., 178, col. 1228 D, "Theologia Christiana", Lib. III.

37 "Sed profecto aliud est intelligere seu credere, aliud cognoscere seu manifestare. Fides quippe dicitur existimatio non apparentium, cognitio vero ipsarum rerum experientia per ipsam earum praesentiam." P.L., 178, col. 1051 D, "Introductio ad Theologiam", Lib. III.

38 "Dans l'ensemble, ce lien est très strict; tout ce qui est objet de foi est garanti par la révélation; la foi n'est méritoire que si elle se base sur l'autorité divine; sur ce point Abélard ne s'est jamais compromis comme Anselme." J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard", R.H.E. 28(1932), p. 295.

39 "Unde et sancti doctores cum ad exercitationem, ut dictum est, fidelium adeo necessarias esse haereticorum disputationes vel inquisitiones attenderent, ratione potius quam potestate eos coerceri sanxerunt, et nos tantae victoriae desiderio ad sacrae studium eruditionis sunt potissimum adhortati." P.L., 178, col. 1048 D, "Introductio ad Theologiam", Lib. III.

40 "Sententiam ergo vocum seu nominum in naturali tenens facultate, non caute theologiae admiscuit." Otto of Freising, M.G.H., Scriptores,

op. cit., vol. 20, p. 377.

41 Hefele-Leclercq cites Deutsch's view, op. cit., p. 751, note 4. He refers to Deutsch's work, Die Synode von Sens 1141 und die Verurtheilung Abalards. Berlin, 1880. pp. 4-16.

42 Sikes, op. cit., p. 240.

43 Dom J. Mabillon, ed., Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, translated and edited with additional notes by S. J. Eales. London: John Hodges, 1889. vol. 2, p. 554. That this passage is by Mabillon and not an addition by Eales is proven by the fact that it appears in Migne's edition of Mabillon's work. "Haec, inquam, ideo commemoramus, ut pudeat eos qui hos errores detestantur, quod Abaelardi causam suscipiant adversus Bernardum, quem praecipitis in Abaelardum iudicii ac nimiae impetiginis accusare porro non verentur." P.L., 182, col. 1047.

44 "On peut avancer en particulier que le prestigieux halo qui a, dès son vivant, enveloppé saint Bernard, n'a pas facilité la connaissance que nous avons de lui. Les efforts tentés pour nous restituer les traits authentiques de sa physionomie morale se sont, en bien des cas, pliés à sa légende comme à un inébranlable canon et l'on doit reconnaître que sa psychologie humaine reste encore à étudier." J. C. Didier, "Un scrupule identique de saint Bernard à l'égard d'Abélard et de Gilbert de la Porrée," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. p. 95.

45 "c'est saint Bernard celui dont on a dit que de sa cellule de Clairvaux obscure et basse à ne pouvoir s'y tenir debout, il gouverne la chrétienté pendent près de quarante." J. de Ghellinck, op. cit., p. 154.

46 "Erat enim praedictus abbas tam ex christianae religionis fervore zelotypus quam ex habituali mansuetudine quodammodo credulus, ut et magistros, qui humanis rationibus seculari sapientia confisi nimium in haerebant, abhorreret, et si quidquam ei christianae fidei absonum de talibus diceretur, facile aurem praeberet." Otto of Freising, M.G.H., Scriptores, op. cit., vol. 20, p. 376.

47 "Magister Petrus Abaelardus, sine regula monachus, sine sollicitudine praelatus, nec ordinem tenet, nec tenetur ab ordine. Homo sibi dissimilis est, intus Herodes, foris Joannes; totus ambiguus, nihil habens de monacho, praeter nomen et habitum. Sed quid ad me? Unusquisque onus suum portabit. Alium est quod dissimulare non possum, quod pertinet ad omnes qui diligunt nomen Christi." P.L., 182, col. 359, Epist. CXCI.

48 Didier, op. cit., p. 98.

49 Sikes, op. cit., p. 257.

50 "Par là il a mérité d'être considéré, malgré ses erreurs, comme un illustre précurseur de Pierre Lombard et de saint Thomas d'Aquin." E. Vacandard, "Abélard," D.H.G.E. vol. 1(1912), col. 90.

51 Sikes, op. cit., p. 257.

## Footnotes -- Appendix

1 The De Unitate is sometimes referred to as the Theologia Summi Boni; and the Introductio is then called Theologia Scholarium. Van Den Eynde uses this terminology, which he derives from Ostlender. D. Van Den Eynde, "La Theologia scholarium de Pierre Abélard," Récherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale. 28(1961), p. 225-241.

2 I have adhered to the dates of Abélard's works as given by Cottiaux, except for the dates of the Dialectica and Historia Calamitatum. Cf. notes 4 and 7 below. J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard," R.H.E. 28(1932), pp. 247-295, 533-551, 788-828.

3 "Cui Theologiae indiderat nomen?" P.L., 182, col. 541, Epist. CLXXXVIII, to the cardinals and bishops of the Curia.

4 D'Olwer claims that Cottiaux was wrong in dating the Dialectica in three different stages and that it was completed before 1118. L. Nicolau d'Olwer, "Sur la date de la Dialectica d'Abélard," Revue Moyen Age Latin. 1(1945), pp. 375-390.

5 F. Vigouroux, "Abélard," Dictionnaire de la Bible. vol. 1(1895), col. 30-31.

6 "Et consenserunt omnes in obscurissima Ezechielis prophetia. Assumpto itaque expositore, statim in crastino eos ad lectionem invitavi." J. T. Muckle, "Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," Medieval Studies. 12(1950), p. 180.

7 In the Historia Abélard mentions that Innocent II confirmed the cession of the Paraclete to Heloise... "Eoque illis adductis, ipsum oratorium cum omnibus ei pertinentibus concessi et donavi, ipsamque postmodum donationem nostram, assensu atque interventu episcopi terrae, papa Innocentius secundus ipsis et earum sequacibus per privilegium in perpetuum corroboravit." Ibid., p. 205. Innocent's letter of confirmation gives us the date for this: "IV Kal. Decembr., indict. X, Incarnationis Dominicae anno 1131." P.L., 179, col. 115. This is Nov. 28, 1131. L'Art de Verifier Les Dates Paris: Alexandre Jombert, 1783. vol. 1. Thus the Historia must have been written after this date. The encounter begins in 1136, and therefore he would not have had time to write it after that year.

8 These small works can be found in P.L., 178: col. 678-730, Problemata; col. 379-610, sermons; col. 1765-1817, hymns and sequences; col. 1817, the Planctus; col. 611-632, the three short expositions; col. 1759-1766, Carmen ad Astralabium Filium.

9 Muckle gives the different title of each edition. Muckle, ed., Historia, p. 168.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Bibliographical Sources:

Bulletin de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale. Louvain: Abbey of Mont César. 1(1929-32)-8(1958-61).

Cottineau, Dom L. H., Repertoire Topo-Bibliographique des Abbayes et Preiurés. Macon: Protat Frères, 1939. 2 vols.

Farrar, C. P. and A. P. Evans, Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources. New York, 1946.

Gilson, Etienne, History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages. New York: Random House, 1955.

Histoire de L'Eglise, vol. 13, Le Mouvement doctrinal de IX<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Aimé Forest, F. Van Steenberghen, and M. de Gandillac, eds. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1951.

Paetow, Louis John, A Guide to the Study of Medieval History. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1931.

Vacandard, E., "Abélard," Dictionnaire D'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclesiastiques. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané. vol. 1(1912), col. 71-91.

Repertoire Bibliographique De La Philosophie. Louvain: Éditions de L'institut Supérieur de Philosophie. 1(1949)-14(1962).

Révue D'Histoire Ecclesiastique. Louvain: Bureaux de La Révue, Bibliothèque de l'Université. 48(1953)-57(1962).

Révue Des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin. 37(1953)-46(1962).

Portalié, E., "Abélard," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané. vol. 1(1930), col. 36-55.

## Primary Sources:

Abelard, Peter, "Confessio Fidei," P.L., 178, col. 103-108, Epist. X, to Heloise.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letters to Heloise, P. L., 178: col. 187-192, Epist. III; col. 199-212, Epist. V; col. 225-256, Epist. VII; col. 255-326, Epist. VIII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, P. L., 178, col. 335-340, Epist. X.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Historia Calamitatum," J. T. Muckle, ed., Medieval Studies. 12(1950), pp. 163-213. Also P.L., 178, col. 113-182, Epist.I.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Introductio ad Theologiam," P.L., 178, col. 979-1112.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Professio Fidei," P.L., 178, col. 105-108.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Theologia Christiana," P.L., 178, col. 1113-1328.
- Acta Sanctorum, Joannes Bollandus and Godefridus Henschenius, eds., "De S. Eleutherio Episcopo Tornacensi in Belgio." Paris: Victorem Palmé, 1865. XX, Februarius, vol. 3, pp. 183-210.
- Bede the Venerable, "Super Acta Apostolorum Expositio," P.L., 92, col. 937-996.
- Berenger, "Berengarii Scholastici Apologeticus Contra Beatum Bernardum, Claraevallensem Abbatem, et Alios qui Condemnaverunt Petrum Abaelardum," P.L., 178, col. 1857-1870.
- Foulque de Deuil, Letter to Peter Abelard, P.L., 178, col. 371-376, Epist. XVI.
- Geoffrey of Auxerre, Third Book of the Life of St. Bernard, P.L., 185, col. 301-322.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Albinus on the condemnation of the errors of Gilbert of Porrée, P.L., 185, col. 387-396.
- Innocent II, Pope, Confirmation of the transfer of the Paraclete from Abelard to Heloise, P.L., 179, col. 114-115, Epist. LXX.
- \_\_\_\_\_, First Letter condemning Abelard, P.L., 182, col. 395-361, Epist. CXIV. Also, P.L., 179, col. 515-517, Epist. CDXLVII. Also, M.G.H., Scriptores, vol. 20, p. 378. Also, Mansi, vol. 21, col. 564.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Second Letter condemning Abelard, P.L., 179, col. 517, Epist. CDXLVIII. Also, Mansi, vol. 21, col. 565.
- John of Salisbury, "Metalogicon," P.L., 199, col. 823-946.
- Mansi, Joannes Dominicus, Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck -- U. Verlagsanstalt, 1961. vol. 21, col. 559-570.
- Otto of Freising, "Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris," M.G.H., Scriptores. New York: Kraus Reprint Corp., 1963. vol. 20, pp. 338-493.
- Peter the Venerable, Letter to Pope Innocent II, P.L., 189, col. 305-306, Liber Quartus, Epist. IV.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letters to Heloise, P.L., 189: col. 346-353, Liber Quartus, Epist. XXI; col. 428-429, Liber Sextus, Epist. XXII.

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, "De Conversione ad Clericos," P.L., 182, col. 833-856.

\_\_\_\_\_, Reply to William of Saint-Thierry, P.L., 182, col. 533, Epist. CCCXXVII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to the bishops of the Archdiocese of Sens, P.L., 182, col. 349-350, Epist. CLXXXVII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to the Bishops and cardinals of the Curia, P.L., 182, col. 351-353, Epist. CLXXXVIII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Guido of Chatel, P.L., 182, col. 358-359, Epist. CXCII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Ivo, P.L., 182, col. 359, Epist. CXCIII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Stephen, bishop of Palestrina, P.L., 182, col. 536-537, Epist. CCCXXXI.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal G..., P.L., 182, col. 537-538, Epist. CCCXXXII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Gregory Tarquinius, P.L., 182, col. 538, Epist. CCCXXXIII.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Guy of Pisa, P.L., 182, col. 538-539, Epist. CCCXXXIV.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to a certain cardinal presbyter, P.L., 182, col. 539, Epist. CCCXXXV.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to a certain abbot, P.L., 182, col. 539-540, Epist. CCCXXXVI.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Cardinal Haimeric, P.L., 182, col. 542-544, Epist. CCCXXXVIII.

\_\_\_\_\_, First letter to Pope Innocent II in his own name, P.L., 182, col. 354-357, Epist. CLXXXIX.

\_\_\_\_\_, Second letter to Pope Innocent II in his own name, P.L., 182, col. 535-536, Epist. CCCXXX.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Pope Innocent II in the name of the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, P.L., 182, col. 357-358, Epist. CXCI.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Pope Innocent II in the name of the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans, P.L., 182, col. 540-542, Epist. CCCXXXVII.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Capitula Haeresum Petri Abaelardi," sent to Pope Innocent II, P.L., 182, col. 1053-1072, Epist. CXC.

William of Saint-Thierry, "De Erroribus Guillilmi De Conchis," P.L., 180, col. 334-340.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Disputatio Adversus Petrum Abaelardum," P.L., 180, col. 249-282.

\_\_\_\_\_, Letter to Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, and Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, P.L., 182, col. 531-533, Epist. CCCXXVI.

#### Important Editions of Abelard's Works

Cousin, Victor, Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard. Paris 1836.

\_\_\_\_\_, With C. Jourdain and E. Despois, Petri Abaelardi opera hactenus seorsim edita. Paris, 1849. 2 vols.

Dal Pra, M., Pietro Abelardo, Scritti filosofici. Milan: Bocca freres, 1954. xxxvii-330p.

Duchesne, André, Petri Abelarde philosophi et theologi....et Haloissae conjugis eius...opera, etc. Paris, 1616.

Gandillac, Maurice de, Oeuvres choisies d'Abélard. Paris: Aubier, 1945. 345p.

Geyer, Bernhard, "Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften. T. I: Logica 'Ingredientibus'," Beitrage zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. 21(1919-27).

\_\_\_\_\_, "Peter Abaelards philosophische Schriften. T.II: Die Logica, nostrorum petitioni sociorum," Beitrage zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mitterlaters. 21(1923), pp. 505-648.

Haring, Nicholas M., "A Third Ms. of Peter Abelard's Theologia Summi Boni," Medieval Studies. 18(1956), p. 215-224.

Henke, E. L., and G. S. Lindenköhl, eds., Sic et Non of Abaelard. Marburg, 1851.

Klibansky, R., "Peter Abailard and Bernard of Clairvaux. A Letter by Abaelard," Medieval and Renaissance Studies. 5(1961), pp. 1-27.

Martene, dom, ed., "Theologica Christiana," Thesaurus novus anecdotorum. Paris, 1717. vol. 5, col. 1139-1156.

Migne, J. P., "Petri Abaelarde Abbatis Rugensis Opera Omnia," P.L., 178. Paris, 1855.



Minio, L., and Paluello, Abaelardus, Inedita. 1. Super Periermenias XII-XIV. 2. Sententie secundum M. Petrum. Rome: Ed. di Storia e Letteratura, 1958. xlviii-160p.

Muckle, J. T., "Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend," Medieval Studies. 12(1950), pp. 163-213.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Personal Letters Between Abelard and Heloise: Introduction, Authenticity and Text," Medieval Studies. 15(1953), pp. 47-94.

Ostlender, H., "Die Theologia scholarium des Peter Abaelard," Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters. Munster: Festgabe M. Gabmann, 1935. vol. 1, pp. 282-288.

\_\_\_\_\_, Peter Abaelards Theologia "Summi boni" zum ersten Male vollstandig herausgegeben. Munster, 1939.

Ottaviano, C., "Un brano inedito della 'Theologia Christiana' di Abelardo," Giornale crit. Filos. ital. 11(1930), pp. 326-332.

Pez, B., "Scito te ipsum," Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus. vol. 2, part 3, p. 626 sq.

Reinwald, "Dialogus inter philosophum judaeum et christianum" Abelardi. 1831.

Rijk, L. M. de, Dialectica, Petrus Abaelardus. New York: Gregory Lounz, 1957. 693p.

Ruf, P., and M. Grabmann, Ein neu aufgefundenes Bruchstück der Apologia Abaelards. Munich: R. oldenburg, 1930.

Secondary Sources -- those used for this paper.

L'Art De Vérifier Les Dates, by the Benedictine monks of the Congregation of St. Maur. Paris: Alexandre Jombert, 1783. 3 vols.

Blomme, R., La doctrine du péché dans les écoles théologiques de la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958. xii-385p. The third of the book that deals with Abelard is also in Ephem. theol. lovan. 33(1957), pp. 319-347.

Boularand, Ephrem, "Désintéressement," Dictionnaire de Spiritualité. Paris: Beauchesne. vol 3 (1957), col. 550-591.

Ceillier, Dom, Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés. Paris: Louis Vives. vol. 141(1863), pp. 317-341.

Chemu, M. D., La Théologie au douzième siècle. Paris: J. Vrin, 1957. 407p.

- Clement, Dom, Histoire littéraire de la France. Paris: Victor Palmé. vol. 12(1869), pp. 86-152.
- De Clerck, E., "Droits du démon et nécessité de la rédemption. Les écoles d'Abélard et de Pierre Lombard," R.T.A.M. 14(1947), pp. 32-64.
- Cloes, Henri, "La systématisation théologique pendant la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," Ephem. theol. lovan. 34(1958), pp. 277-329.
- Cottiaux, J., "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard," R.H.E. 28(1932), pp. 247-295, 533-551, 788-828.
- Cottineau, Dom L. H., Répertoire Topo-Bibliographique des Abbayes et Prieurés. Macon: Protat Frères, 1939. 2 vols.
- Cross, F. L., ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, "Abelard, Peter," pp. 3-4.
- Dechanet, J. M., "L'amitié d'Abélard et de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry," R.H.E. 35(1939), pp. 761-773.
- Didier, Chanoine J. C., "Un scrupule identique de saint Bernard à l'égard d'Abélard et de Gilbert de la Porrée," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. pp. 95-99.
- Gams, Pius Bonifacius, Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck -- U. Verlagsanstalt, 1957.
- Gauthier, R. A., Magnanimité. L'idéal de la grandeur dans la philosophie païenne et dans la théologie chrétienne. Paris: J. Vrin, 1951. 522p.
- de Ghellinck, J., Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Paris: Desclée - De Brouwer, 1948.
- Gilson, E., Héloïse et Abélard. Paris: J. Vrin, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955. 266p.
- Godet, P., "Guillaume De Saint-Thierry," D.T.C. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. vol. 62(1952), col. 1981-1982.
- Haskins, Charles H., The Renaissance of the XII Century. New York: Meridian Book, 1957.
- Hefele, Charles Joseph, Histoire Des Conciles, translated and augmented by Dom H. Leclercq. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912. vol. 5, part 1, pp. 747-790.
- Heitz, Th., "La philosophie de la foi dans l'oeuvre d'Abélard," R.S.P.T. Oct.(1907). pp. 703-726.

Horst, U., "Bietrage zum Einfluss Abaelards auf Robert von Melan," R.T.A.M. 26(1959), pp. 314-326.

James, Bruno S., Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1957. 183p.

Jeannin, J., "La dernière maladie d'Abélard: une alliée imprévue de saint Bernard," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. pp. 109-115.

Leclercq, Jean, L'amour des lettres et la désir de Dieu. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1957.

Mabillon, Dom John, ed., Life and Works of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, translated and edited with additional notes by Samuel J. Eales. London: John Hodges, 1889. 2 vols.

Martin, Raymond M., "Pro Petro Abelardo, un plaidoyer de Robert de Melum contre saint Bernard," R.S.P.T. 3(1923), pp. 308-333.

Nemetz, A., "Literalness and the 'Sensus litteralis'," Speculum. 34(1959), pp. 76-89.

d'Olwer, L. Nicolau, "Sur quelques lettres de saint Bernard. Avant ou après le concile de Sens," Mélanges Saint Bernard. Dijon, 1953. pp. 100-108.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Sur la date de la Dialectica d'Abélard," Révue Moyen Age Latin. 1(1945), pp. 375-390.

Paetow, Louis John, A Guide to the Study of Medieval History. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1931.

Pittenger, W. Norman, "A Note on Abelard," Anglican Theological Review. 28(1946), pp. 229-231.

Poole, Reginald L., Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. xiii-327p.

Portalié, E., "Abélard," D.T.C. vol. 1(1930), col. 36-55.

Rivière, J., "Les 'capitula' d'Abélard condamnés au Concile de Sens," R.T.A.M. 5(1933), pp. 5-22.

Robert, G., Les écoles et l'enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Paris, J. Vrin, 1909. 324p.

Sikes, Jeffery G., Peter Abailard. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U. Press, 1932. xvii-282p.

Taylor, Henry O., The Medieval Mind. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U. Press, 1951. 2 vols.

- Truc, G., Abélard avec et sans Héloïse. Paris: A. Fayard, 1956. 188p.
- Vacandard, E., "Abélard," D.H.G.E. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. vol. 1(1912), col. 71-91.
- Van den Eynde, D., "Le Theologia scholarium de Pierre Abélard," R.T.A.M. 28(1961), pp. 225-241.
- Vigouroux, F., "Abélard," Dictionnaire de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. vol. 1(1895), col. 30-31.
- Waddell, Helen, Peter Abellard, a novel. New York: The Viking Press, 1961. 277p.

Secondary Works -- those not available for this paper.

- Bertola, E., "I precedenti storici del metodo del 'Sic et non' di Abelardo," Rivista de Filosofia Neo-Scolastica. 53(1961), pp. 255-280.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Le critiche di Ablardo ad Anselmo di Laon ed a Guglielmo di Champeaux," Rivista de Filosofia Neo-Scolastica. 52(1960), pp. 495-522.
- Borst, Arno, "Abelard und Bernhard," Historische Zeitschrift. 186(1958), pp. 497-526.
- Combes, J., De S. Bernarde adversus Abellardum. Montpellier, 1860.
- Dal Pra, Mario, "Motivi dello 'scito te ipsum' di Abelardo," Acme. 1(1948), pp. 247-256.
- Delagneau, G., "Le concile de Sens de 1140. Abélard et saint Bernard," Bulletin de la société archéologique de Sens. 37(1933). pp. 80-116. Also in Révue Apologetique. 53(1931), pp. 385-408.
- Denifle, H. S., "Die Sentenzen Abaelards und die Bearbeitungen seiner Theologie." Archiv fur Literatur-und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters. 1(1885), pp. 402-469, 584-624.
- Deutsch, S. Mart., Die Synode zu Sens 1141 und die Verurtheilung Abalards. Berlin, 1880.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Peter Abalard, ein Kritischer Theologe der zwolften Jahrhunderts. Leipzig, 1883.
- Dumeige, G., "À propos d'"Abélard et son époque", " Cahiers d' Histoire Mondiale, VI/1(1960), pp. 175-178.
- Frascolla, G., Pietro Abelardo. I, Abelardo umanista e razionalista; II, Abelardo filsofo. Pesaro, 1950-1951. 2 vols.

- Gervaise, Dom, La vie de P. Abélard, abbé de Saint-Gildas de Ruis. O. de Saint-Benoit, et celle d'Héloïse son épouse. Paris, 1720.
- Geyer, Bernard, "Die Stellung Abaelards in der Universalienfrage," Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. 1(1913).
- Goldhorn, "Abalards dogmatische Hauptwerke," Révue de Théologie Historique. 2(1866), pp. 161 sq.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Abaelardi Tractatus de unitate et de Trinitate divina und Theologia. 1866.
- Hayd, J., Abalard und seine Lehre in Verhältniss zur Kirche und Dogma. Ratisbonne, 1863.
- Hommel, F., Nosce te ipsum. Die Ethik des Peter Abalard. Wiesbaden, Metopenierlag, 1947. 150p.
- Kaiser, Emile, Pierre Abélard Critique. Fribourg (Switz.), 1901.
- Landgraf, A. M., "Problem um den hl. Bernhard von Clairvaux," Cistercienser Chronik. 61(1954), pp. 1-16.
- Lasserre, P., Un conflit religieux au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Abélard contre saint Bernard. Paris, 1930.
- Ligeard, "Le rationalisme de Pierre Abélard," Récherches de Sciences Religieuses. 2(1911), pp. 386-388.
- Luddy, A. J., The Case of Peter Abelard. Dublin: M. H. Gill, 1947. ix-94p.
- McCallum, J. R., Abelard's Christian Theology. London, 1948.
- Meyer, W., "Die Anklagesätze des H. Bernhard gegen Abaelard," Nachrichten von der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen. (1898). pp. 397-468.
- Monnich, C. W., "Enige grondlijnen van Abelard's theologie," Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis. 41(1956), pp. 193-221.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Enige grondlijnen van Abelard's theologie," Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis. 42(1957), pp. 1-11.
- Moore, Philip S., "Reason in the Theology of Peter Abelard," Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. 12(1936), pp. 148-160.
- Ortuzar, M., "El ser y la accion en la dimension humana. Pedro Abelardo (1079-1142) y su Grupo," Estudios. 13(1957), pp. 431-463.

Ostlender, H., "Eine volständige Handschrift des 'Tractatus de Unitate et Trinitate divina' des Peter Abaelards," Theologische Revue. 23(1924), pp. 413-414.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Die Sentenzen bucher der Schule Abaelards," Theologische Quartalschrift. 117(1936), pp. 208-252.

\_\_\_\_\_, Peter Abaelards "Theologia" und die Sentenzenbücher seiner Schule. Breslau, 1926.

Ottaviano, C., Pietro Abelardo, la vita, le opere, il pensiero. Rome, 1931.

Oursel, Raymond, La dispute et la grâce. Essai sur la rédemption d'Abélard. Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1959. 96p.

Rémusat, Charles de, Abélard, sa vie, sa philosophie, et sa théologie. Paris, 1855. 2 vols.

Rijk, L.M. de, "Abelard als exponent van het wijsgerig leven in de twaafde eeuw," Bijdragen. 22(1961), pp. 440-449.

Rivière, J., "De quelques faits nouveaux sur l'influence théologique d'Abélard," Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastiques. 32(1931), pp. 107-113.

Rochely, Johanny de, Saint Bernard, Abélard et le rationalisme. Paris, 1867.

Schiller, J., Abaelards Ethik im Vergleich zur Ethik seiner Zeit. Munchen, 1906.

Sidorova, N. A., "Abélard et son époque," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale. 4(1958), pp. 541-552.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Réponse aux observations de M. Gervais Dumeige sur l'article 'Abélard et son Époque'," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale. VI/1(1960), pp. 179-182.

Thompson, R. J., "The Role of the Dialectical Reason in the Ethics of Abaelard," Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. 12(1937), pp. 141-148.

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

Vacandard, E., Abélard, sa lutte avec saint Bernard, sa doctrine, sa méthode. Paris, 1881.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Chronologie Abelardienne: la date du concile de Sens," Révue des Questions Historiques. 50(1891), pp. 235-245.

\_\_\_\_\_, Vie de saint Bernard. Paris: G. Gabalda, 1927. 2 vols.

Van den Bosch, A., "L'intelligence de la foi chez saint Bernard,"  
Citeaux in de Mederlanden. 8(1957), pp. 85-108.

Versiani-Velloso, Arthur, "O 'Mellifluus' e O 'Bellator'," Kriterion.  
6(1953), pp. 257-284.

Weisweiler, H., "Eine neue Bearbeitung von Abaelards 'Introductio' und der  
Summa Sententiarum," Scholastik. 9(1934), pp. 346-371.

ARCHABBEY LIBRARY



3 0764 1003 1195 5