CHAPTER 4

THE YOUNG HELOISE AND LATIN RHETORIC: SOME PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON THE "LOST" LOVE LETTERS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

John O. Ward and Neville Chiavaroli[1]

Assuming that the "epistolae duorum amantium" are indeed the letters of Abelard and Heloise, this essay argues that studies in the trivium *meant for Heloise a passport to an intellectually fulfilling life involving sex and children but not marriage, a package that Abelard could not comprehend.*

In chapter 3 of this volume and in his book *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: The Perception of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France,* the historian Constant Mews has effected a revolution in our study of the "real" Heloise. The identification he has made between the "epistulae duorum amantium" published by Ewald Könsgen in 1974[2] and the letters exchanged by Abelard and Heloise at the height of their passion[3] is the greatest challenge to students of Heloise since Jean de Meun put the letters later edited by J. Monfrin, J. T. Muckle, Eric Hicks, and others into vernacular circulation. If Mews is right, historians now have a unique opportunity to peer more securely than ever before into the deep obscurity of the "real" Heloise. Indeed, in the case of these "lost" *litterae,* some acceptable model of "reality" is the simplest way to explain a collection of texts that would otherwise be an insuperable puzzle.[4] As one reads slowly through them again in Könsgen's edition, it becomes more and more difficult to explain them in the terms usually appealed to by proponents of inauthenticity. They are neither uniform nor uniformly elegant for stylistic or didactic purposes of the period. The manuscript from which Johannes de Vepria made his extraordinary extracts clearly saw no scholastic or didactic usage, and it is clear from his own choice of extract that although initially interested in *salutatio* formulas and other possibly useful turns of phrase, he soon became caught up in the storyline revealed by the letters themselves.[5] So it is with us, and this chapter is an attempt to explore the next stage in our discussion of these *litterae,* once we have accepted, as I think we must, the case Mews presents for their "authenticity" as a set of extracts made in the

fifteenth century from a now-lost manuscript copy made perhaps by Heloise herself of an exchange between herself and Abelard, originally committed to wax tablets in the second decade of the twelfth century. The manuscript, which would have kept alive for Heloise the emotional dimensions of her only passionate love affair, in the end must have seemed to serve little purpose; perhaps she gave it to her friend Bernard of Clairvaux, who placed it in the library at Clairvaux, where it lay for three centuries until Johannes de Vepria chose to look through it as a candidate for extracting and, perhaps, disposal.[6]

Mews has chosen to draw a line between these *litterae,* "as a ('real') record of her [Heloise's] dialogue with her teacher [Abelard]," and a comparable "Regensburg exchange, an exercise in verse composition by the teacher but taken up by a female student, turned into an elaborate literary negotiation about the conduct of a relationship that was eventually terminated by the young woman concerned."[7] The Regensburg verses, along with others that may be placed alongside them,[8] no doubt assisted immeasurably the practice of working out emotional relationships in writing.[9] It is important to remember that our first practitioners of sophisticated literary writing in the Middle Ages are exactly those who suffered from many constraints upon their ability to mix face to face with those selected for the literary exercise of amorous epistolary "play."[10] Nevertheless, the Regensburg verses display exactly that uniformity and didactic suitability that led not only to their preservation but set them apart from the de Vepria collection.[11] In some senses they "legitimate" the practice evident in the originals from which the de Vepria collection has been drawn: the letter is a trace of the writer, the bed will reveal all, the exchanges are written on (wax) tablets and conveyed by messengers, devotion matches absence, from time to time some hesitation as to what to write is displayed and a measure of uncertainty as to the real attitude of the writer is expressed; responses are deemed inadequate and excuses for not writing are feigned; there is a perceived need for restraint, and threats from rumor, jealousy, and popular disclosure are ever-present.[12] The presiding deity of rhetoric, Mercury,[13] clearly provides the discourse in which those who do not and indeed cannot consummate their "real" relationships—despite the stated fact that love [*dilectio*] "consists not in words but in gracious deeds" [non constat verbis . . . sed benefactis][14]—can sublimate and play while learning and acquiring facility in the essential learned language of the time and its equally essential canon of precedents in classical literature (works by Ovid and Lucan as well as Cicero's *De amicitia* for example).

Mews draws a fundamental distinction between the literary text that is indicative of (at most) a relationship of actual/real-life, or imagined, *amicitia* based on the rhetorical triad of *ars, imitatio,* and *exercitatio*[15] and the text that is indicative of a relationship of actual/real-life *amicitia* but reinforced by the actual/real-life "*amor* the bed reveals"[16]—the "green sofa and the excitement" so to speak.[17] It is not simply a matter of collapsing all relationships of the second sort into the first, because even the second sort of relationship has to be situated in a context of literacy ("*littera*-cy"): the de Vepria *litterae* excerpts are an arena for self-development in relatively systematic thought and expression, a pioneering translation of evolving real-life emotions into "*littera*-cy" form, and the product must not be confused with the "set-piece" rhetoric of the schools/*scriptoria,* later to be codified into the *artes poetriae.* It is not that real-life situations do not underline or give relevance to the latter form of composition, or that "*littera*-cy" generated by passionately held convictions does not have much rhetorical art;[18] rather it is a question of balance: how much art, how much real life enmeshed with that art?[19]

The striking feature of the de Vepria *litterae* excerpts is their unshowiness, their "*littera*-cy" rather than their "literariness." At times their language is so minimal, so idiomatic, in comparison with their freight of meaning, that it is hard to imagine their use for any would-be *dictator,* or collector of fine prose/verse.[20] This circumstance, combined with the other arguments for "authenticity" expertly assembled by Mews, is the initial challenge to scholars, who must now work slowly through the collection, building up a picture of the real-life relationship represented and integrating it into the established picture indicated well enough lately by, among others, M. T. Clanchy and John Marenbon.[21]

Mews comments particularly on the *salutatio* formulae in the de Vepria excerpts, and this is indeed an intriguing feature that, it seems, first attracted the attention of Johannes de Vepria. The *salutationes* here are pioneering in their prosiness,[22] as Catullus' verse was pioneering in a different way, in its development "of a new kind of poetry."[23] Implicit in Mews's discussion is the fact that this very "prosiness" preserves more of the real-life relationship than would be the case in more polished literary or poetic efforts. The general absence in the de Vepria excerpts of any dominant dictaminal flavor or pattern as far as the body of each *littera* is concerned can only reinforce this view, even if it raises important questions about the kind of "dictamen" or "composition" that was taught in the second decade of the twelfth century in Paris, for these excerpts seem to have functioned for Heloise (and possibly for Abelard) in the way that John of Salisbury records Bernard of Chartres' *declinationes/collationes*—and indeed his grammatical teaching in general—to have functioned.[24] Evenings were devoted to recalling, putting into practice the lessons of the day (exposition and imitation of selected classical Latin writers), the aim of the whole being to acquire facility in expressing thought in the best classical manner (prose and verse), without resorting to plagiarism and the borrowing of wholesale "patches" [*panni*]. Although the lost love-letters from which the de Vepria excerpts are drawn were in part necessitated by distances that separated the writers, it also seems plausible that they were part of a *collatio*-type practice whereby texts read and issues discussed together could be rehearsed and aired. There are indications that Cicero's *De amicitia* was thus read and discussed, together with Ovid's poetry and much scripture;[25] it seems that philosophical terminology also formed part of the day's debate.[26] Some of the verse in the collection is sufficiently jejune as to suggest *collatio*-type practice.[27] The didactic reality that lies behind the de Vepria excerpts can be of much interest only in so important a transitional and so ill-documented an age.

Mews is also concerned with the ideas and vocabulary of the letters, partly to support his views about authenticity but partly also to rehabilitate Heloise as a (moral) philosopher. Indeed, the picture of Heloise that emerges coincides strikingly with that found by the historian C. Stephen Jaeger, in his recent *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe 950–1200,*[28] to be characteristic of the "preliterate," oral, charismatic age of cathedral-school learning that flourished down to the end of the eleventh century and was extinguished by the very literate, scholastic attitudes that Mews documents as first coming to the fore in Abelard's own writings after about 1120.[29] Jaeger's ideas, indeed, may help us flesh out the *in tempore* context for the de Vepria excerpts.

If we subject to renewed study the Ovidian humanism of the second half of the eleventh century and the first decade or so of the twelfth, the period may be considered a liminal one, between the literary world of the courtier-bishop that stressed

morals, ethics, language, and learning for life and the scholastic, post-Abelardian world, nostalgic for the lost oral charisma of the prescholastic age and enmeshed in a form of textual literacy that placed learning and philosophy within a systematic procedural world that, while not without oral features, lay beyond the reach of court and society in general. This divorce between life and learning was eventually, in the mature university age of the thirteenth century, to deal a fatal blow to the Ovidian and Ciceronian humanism of the earlier age. That Jean de Meun had to take up the cudgel for this kind of humanism, in the vernacular, or that the compiler of the Benediktbeuern manuscript of the *Carmina Burana* had to use primarily twelfth-century materials, is indicative.[30]

Brian Stock puts the transition from the "oral" to the "literate" in the period thus:

> If we take as our point of departure the admittedly arbitrary date of the year 1000 A.D., then it is arguable that there were both oral and written traditions operating simultaneously in European culture, sometimes working together, sometimes working in separate spheres of thought and action. However, from about the second half of the eleventh century, a widespread transformation began to take place. Oral traditions did not simply decline, although that happened to some degree as the force of the written word became progressively stronger. Instead, they realigned themselves so as to be able to function in relation to a reference system based upon texts. . . . The spoken and the written were therefore drawn into closer interdependence than they had been at any time since the end of the ancient world.[31]

The literary texts that derive from this transitional period do not inform as we expect such texts to. Jaeger speaks of the "silence that enfolds most of the life of the cathedral schools prior to the 12th century": " . . . something was going on at the early cathedral schools that is not transmitted clearly by the sources or set in intelligible structures by current frames of explanation." Whether monastic or secular, the educational culture of the eleventh century is "a charismatic culture. It cannot be assessed by weighing and measuring its documentation, which by its very nature it tends not to produce." "Education becomes [in the eleventh century] a process of transmitting personal qualities through the charismatic effect of a well-disciplined, well-'composed' teacher." There is an emphasis on the etiquette of behavior, on the court as the theatre of activities, on oral, face-to-face, culture; on *conversatio, mores.* The discipline of manners is linked to eloquent speech, and classical models function to open up new ways of thinking about important contemporary issues (for example in Alcuin's pioneering use of the *De inventione* in his *Dialogus de rhetorica,* written some two centuries prior to the year 1000).[32] There are looser links between letters and conduct in ecclesiastical education, but cathedral-school education produced "men who would work well at court and in the episcopate and serve the *utilitas ecclesie et rei publicae.*" Dignity, gravity, and eloquence are the qualities Fulbert of Chartres himself displays; they are not characteristics of the texts he discusses. It is the person of the teacher, not the nature of the text, that is persuasive.[33] We are in a milieu in which the ruling *disciplina* is the *cultus virtutum:* the formation of character, the cult of personality, the courtier-philosopher, elegance of manners, friendship. "Teaching by example became the dominant pastoral duty in the new houses of canons regular that burgeoned after the second half of the eleventh century." "The schools nourished an ideal of amiability, charm, good humour, mutual love and respect in the shared life of student and teacher. Administrative service was the context in which these 'virtues' became effec-

tive." "Monastic writers became the policemen of virtue." Onulf of Speyer rejected rhetoric in favor of *mores.* Poetry became the "end point and fulfillment of studies." Orpheus and the skill of poetry transforms "an entire society from savage inhumanity to courteous sociability," much as the *quidam vir magnus et eloquens* transformed humankind from savagery to civilization in the *De inventione* proem, a key text for the eleventh century.[34]

From the second quarter of the twelfth century onward, literate modes of thought gained important ground. The cultural consequences were considerable. "Texts [argues Jaeger] represent the rigidifying of thought, which develops in the living dialogue through assertion, challenge, and response. Writing everything down mummifies thought and threatens the death of the mind." "By the early twelfth century, the 'discipline of manners' has been largely displaced at the schools and replaced by definitions and systematising, frameworks of argumentation and harmonising of inconsistencies." The world of Bernard of Chartres and his evening *declinationes* and *collationes* was passing. "The humanists of the 12th century wrote out of nostalgia, not out of the vaulting self-confidence of an age of Renaissance. Their works are shoring to stave off the inevitable collapse of a culture passing out of existence." By the twelfth century "[m]agisterial authority ha[d] shifted away from men and into texts."[35]

Gerald Bond's recent *The Loving Subject: Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France* is also pertinent here. During the period from about 1075 to 1125, a new discourse of *amor/amicitia* developed, laced with antique literary exemplary forms, to accommodate a new urge to reflect on the self in fictive and semifictive forms. Whether in the form of wax tablets or booklets, much of this discourse has been preserved to this day,[36] and in many cases the motive seems to have been the prospect of literary fame and social distinction.[37] Within this discourse, the fictive form or "persona" and the "real" person behind the form are elided into the one, often to the detriment of the latter.[38] Protestations of rustic inexpertise, an incipient exploration of systematic dictaminal form, an urge toward preservation of text and hence literary survival, and a fascination with the implications of Ciceronian friendship theory (*amor/amicitia*),[39] the *fedus amicitiae,*[40] and the centrality of the epistolary genre,[41] for the spicing of lived relationships that could not partake physically of such intimacy characterize the early (monastic) phase of the literacy development Bond discusses.[42] It requires no great imaginative leap to see much of this as underlying the various phases of correspondence between Abelard and Heloise, toward the end of the period of which Bond writes. By the end of Bond's period, the constraints of the monastic world are being lifted and practitioners of the *studium litterarum* are gathering to share in the ferment of early cathedral-school teaching that characterized the Paris of the first three decades of the twelfth century.[43]

These quotations and suggestions from both Jaeger and Bond, strung together inadequately thus, are not meant to be more than an informal, impressionistic sketch into which we are invited to place the figure of Heloise as revealed in the de Vepria excerpts. The oral/charismatic/ethics-oriented cultural world of the prescholastic age in Europe underwent massive strains toward the end of the eleventh century, as paradigm after paradigm was subjected to new pressures and found wanting: the conventional priesthood of the "old world," with its married clergy or clerical concubinage and lay patronage buckled in the crises of the *pataria* and the Investitures Controversy; apocalyptic tensions and changing conceptions of evil, guilt, and penance eventually produced the crusading movement and a more sharply defined image of the witch;

notions of the devil and sin were subjected to new analysis; the wandering preachers who preached apocalypticism toward the end of the century and their critics developed at the turn of the twelfth century the full-blown image of the heresiarch; and a fervor of new research and new methodological concepts were worked out for the *artes* and the theological truths they were thought to illuminate.[44]

Women came to share in these developments. While the prescholastic courtier-culture could boast only an exceptional woman, Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, the late eleventh century saw a startling rise in the visibility of women who demanded an educational and literary culture in which they could participate.[45] Contemporaries were amazed at the ability with which an intellectual like Robert of Arbrissel could draw women from a variety of backgrounds—whether aristocratic families or brothels—into his orbit.[46] Robert's successors, Tanchelm and Henry of Le Mans, also developed a special relationship with women.[47] A tantalizing fragment suggests that the wives and daughters of the charismatic scholar Manegaldus (Manegold of Lautenbach) participated as teachers in the scriptural (and artistic?) studies of the time,[48] perhaps as *magistrae* among the canonesses (like the later Tengswich,[49] who challenged the authority of Hildegard of Bingen). Bond's discussion of "changes in the conception of the private secular self that took place in French elite culture around the turn of the twelfth century" has already been mentioned.[50] The geographical focus of this culture is French, but the ruling language idiom is Latin interlarded with classical, particularly Ovidian, overtones. Women play an important role, both *in tempore,* it seems, and as literary images. Heloise, by way of her initial education at the monastery of Argenteuil,[51] must have been put into contact with such a cultural phenomenon, interlarded as it was with ethical themes drawn from Cicero (especially the *De amicitia*), St. Jerome, the scriptures, and comparable texts.[52]

At the climax of this poetic, ethical, oral-charismatic cultural phase in Western history, we are invited by the de Vepria collection and by the narrative of the *Historia calamitatum* to picture a young woman, late teens, mid-twenties perhaps, *non infima in facie,* making her way to the same foyer of schools, teachers, and clashing ideas that drew Abelard from remoter Brittany, the same that educated Robert of Arbrissel. Who knows what Heloise's intentions must have been, whose support/advice she relied upon, what domestic tragedies may have had a bearing on her decision to take up residence with her adulatory uncle (and guardian) Fulbert in the cloister or cathedral close of Nôtre-Dame-de-Paris on the Île-de-la-Cité in Paris.[53] What myriad of unrecorded, stray, personal contacts, textual fragments, and images were to join with the rude tenements, hay-strewn "streets," underpopulated (by our standards) meadows and pastures, oddly grand temples to God, occasional lay forts and residences, in founding a young woman's postmonastic *vita nuova* in Paris?[54] That Heloise had her own ambitions and contacts within this small-scale and intense intellectual urban environment we can infer from the trouble they seem to have caused her correspondent in the de Vepria collection. It is attractive to see her as someone whose intelligence and linguistic skills had opened up a crucial literary world to explore and plumb for moral and ethical guidance in life.[55] Heloise may have been different from Abelard in that her cultural ambitions were probably moral and behavioral rather than textual and procedural. She perhaps did not see her gender, her sexuality, as the looming obstacle that it ultimately became; it was precisely this situation that ushered her into a much more intense phase in the quest for ethical guidance and behavioral relevance from the immense store of literature and learning that was agitating the age in a unique manner.

Heloise's particular disappointment, increasingly apparent in the de Vepria collection, seems to have centered around her partner's inability to sense the continuum between life, love, lust, body, gender, learning, and literature with which she seems to have started her academic life. She, who wanted to see the ingredients of this continuum as all part of the same package, is confronted with a partner who can only categorize and place things in separate boxes: Heloise as wife, or nun, or scholar, or student, or mother; Heloise as his partner, or someone else's, or God's or Christ's.[56] Whatever the great project was that drew her to the intellectual foyer of Paris in the early twelfth century, it came unstuck; the intellectual partnership with Abelard, extraordinarily illuminated in both sets of correspondence that have come down to us, died—or was conventualized—at least twice, and Heloise, was left without child, without partner, without the varying and electrifying personal and intellectual contacts and opportunities of the open world of dusty, littered pathways, bridges, and schools that she was forced to abandon when Abelard conventualized her (at Argenteuil).

With the demise of Heloise's great project comes also the deaththroes of the oral ethical/intellectual vitality that marked the prescholastic age. A world recognizable to us is born, a world in which women are marginalized or banished from an intellectual milieu that is increasingly patriarchal, increasingly textual. If we accept Mews's reconstruction of Heloise, we have restored to us not only a set of lost love letters but a lost chapter in the complicated *longue durée* of letters, life, and learning, a chapter that can only reinforce our ability to discern difference within that shell of sameness that stems from our inevitable tendency to background the cultural preoccupations of our own day.

The "Lost" Love Letters and the *Historia calamitatum*

In pursuing the image of Heloise in the de Vepria collection and that presented to us by Abelard in hindsight mode in his *Historia calamitatum,* with its vantage point of a thoroughgoing apologetic program, we notice an intriguing gap opening up. To explain what drew him to Heloise in the first place, Abelard alleges *carnales illecebras, immunditia, superbia, luxuria,* etc. on his own part—"in huius itaque adolescentule amorem totus inflammatus" as he admits he became, and a desire on the part of Fulbert, "qui eam . . . in omnem qua poterat scientiam litterarum promoveri studuerat," "ut amplius semper in doctrinam proficeret [Heloissa] litteratoriam."[57] Even if this were the truth, we are left with the problem of Heloise's motives. Was she alone in being a woman in the Paris scholastic milieu, or was she motivated by much the same urges that drew other would-be *scholares* to Paris? Accustomed as we are to view her as exceptional and tragic, we may have occluded the dimensions of the liminal environment of the time, an environment in which, perhaps, gender barriers may have been relaxed. Was there already a gender divide in the schools of Paris, with Abelard in the schools, and Heloise at home "guarded" by her uncle, or was Heloise shopping around this early supermarket of learning more or less as her companion males were?[58] The former seems to be what Abelard himself implies: in his famous phrases he tells us that there was a young female (adolescent) with a great reputation for her abundant knowledge of literature who lived with an uncle keen to advance her learning in letters. He felt she *could be got* to agree to his advances [*mihi consensuram*] *because* she had a desire for and loved learning and literature. His first idea seems to have been

some sort of exchange of letters [*jocundis colloquiis*][59] but what actually occurred was in accordance with another, or parallel, *proposal,* to set up an *occasionem* [arrangement] that might be appropriate [*familiarem*] for "domestica et cotidiana conversatione," to write to her and thus to initiate an exchange of letters. He creates the impression that Heloise was at home with Fulbert and that some casual contact was needed to set up some familiarity and that he could "draw her into an agreement for a relationship with him" only by "domestica et cotidiana conversatione"—this with a young woman with a national [*in toto regno*] reputation for her literary skills! It requires the intervention of friends (of Fulbert's) and an agreement with Fulbert himself before Abelard's plot could come to fruition and the protected and vulnerable girl be "seduced," as it were.[60] Clearly, although Fulbert's house, with Heloise in it, was near to the schools Abelard frequented, contact could be made only via Fulbert and by Abelard moving into his house.

There are some difficulties with this story as Abelard presents it. We are told, for example, that he had not hitherto mixed scholarship with the company of noble women, nor had he talked much with lay women, and he had certainly not frequented prostitutes.[61] Yet he also tells us that Heloise was well known in "France" (i.e., the area around the Île-de-la-Cité) for her learning—and Peter the Venerable later corroborates this, saying that in his youth he "used to hear of a woman, not yet despatched from the entrapments of the secular world, who gave maximum attention to the study of literary knowledge and secular wisdom—a very rare thing—and could not be dissuaded from so useful a proposal [*propositum*] of instruction in the arts."[62] How could such a reputation be consonant with the picture of a vulnerable teenager sitting at home in the guardianship of her uncle, and what does Peter mean by referring to learning the arts as a "useful proposal"? Should we infer that Heloise had a larger vocational purpose in seeking fluency in the major language of communication of the day?[63] How many other women so sought to advance their vocational prospects at the time? On the other hand, if Heloise *were* but one of a number of females studying in the schools of Paris at the time, would she have drawn the attention of Abelard and Peter the Venerable and caused them to remark her learning and gender? We must recall the extremely small-scale nature of the "Paris" academic world at the time: "Abelard had ample opportunity to encounter Heloise in the course of his comings and goings. He may well have passed the girl while surrounded by a throng of students debating earnestly, for he often taught in the open air, like Aristotle himself; or on his way to class; or on a feast-day, when masters and students mingled in the overcrowded cathedral."[64] It is time to look again at the general context for Heloise's early life and studies.

The view that Fulbert himself entrusted Heloise to Argenteuil as a *puellula* for the purposes of education is unfounded.[65] If, as seems possible, even probable, Heloise was of local subaristocratic stock[66] from the region around Paris, a placement at Argenteuil would have conformed to a widespread pattern recently elucidated by the historians Penelope D. Johnson[67] and Bruce L. Venarde.[68] From the latter's graph it seems that the number of foundations and refoundations of monasteries for women increased massively in the period from about 1100 to 1175 (the lifetime of Heloise), reaching a peak of nearly seventy new houses per decade in France and England, about four times the previous peak around A.D. 640 to 720 (of about seventeen houses per decade).[69] The later peak was never to be attained again (despite a peak of some forty houses per decade between 1175 and 1275). In what Venarde calls his "central tier"—"the arch-

dioceses of Reims, Rouen, Sens, Tours, and Lyon and the dioceses of Metz, Toul, and Verdun"—the phenomenon is most advanced: between 1101 and 1150, some 111 new foundations are recorded, compared with thirty-one for the northern tier (which peaked later, between 1151 and 1200, at eighty-seven houses) and sixty-six for the southern tier (at its peak).[70] "The appearance of new nunneries . . . was not simply a result of population expansion" argues Venarde.[71] Nor was it "simply a reflection or imitation of male-centered reform monasticism."[72] The generating circumstances, in fact,[73] touch upon aristocratic patronage and eremitical fever,[74] but "the initiative of men and women of the lower nobility . . . were key instigators of the multiplication of nunneries."[75] From just such a family, we may suppose, Heloise derived her origins, and it seems most natural to suppose that she was sent to Argenteuil—a seventh-century foundation, but one renewed about A.D. 1000 by royal favor, the Queen Mother Adelaide playing a key role[76]—by her parents or, if her father was by then deceased, by her mother, just as Guibert of Nogent's mother, herself by then a nun at—or near—Saint-Germer-de-Fly, entrusted her son to that local monastery.[77] Abelard, although he is keen to mention his own relatives in far-off Brittany and takes Heloise there to have their child,[78] seems unaware of any of her relatives living within a day's ride of Paris, which supports the possibility that her father had died or left the family and the mother retired to a local monastery by the time of Heloise's affair with Abelard.[79]

The custom of one or both parents of aristocratic or subaristocratic stock in this period taking their daughter as a very young girl [*puellula* or *parvula*] to a female monastic foundation to be raised until old enough to take vows is well attested;[80] not uncommonly, such girls often married later in life.[81] Parental motives varied: to preserve an inheritance, to create a spiritual link thought to be of benefit to a local family's social and spiritual standing, to provide for a girl with a handicap, to avoid the crippling expense of a dowry, because the support of a family's children was beyond the parents' means, because a girl wished to remain a virgin or feared unwanted male advances, or was orphaned, or else that the girls in question might receive "a better schooling than they could obtain in the world."[82] Social mobility, too, was a factor: "the urge for upward social mobility made monastic institutions seem particularly attractive and enhanced the appeal of professing in a house where one would associate with daughters, wives, and widows of the nobility. This was particularly true for women from the lower knightly and bourgeois families, which in the central middle ages were aspiring to better things."[83] Some nunneries, indeed, seem to have operated almost as a kind of "family house."[84]

We do not know at what age Heloise entered Argenteuil, nor what degree of personal choice was involved. Nevertheless, it is important to see her "oblation" as part of a widespread social trend of the time; in the same way, her later entry into the same monastery as a married woman was equally precedented.[85] Indeed, the image of Heloise "farewelling the world" and entering a strictly cloistered nunnery may be misplaced.[86] Similarly, the image of notorious moral laxity in many nunneries of the time may be exaggerated.[87] Our understanding of the monastic world Heloise entered (twice) needs to be carefully etched in: women in early twelfth-century convents may have enjoyed a curious combination of spiritual asceticism and worldliness that puzzles us today with our notion of a strict opposition between "the world" and "the cloister."[88] Heloise's position in a nunnery such as Argenteuil cannot have been as untypical or as isolating as readers of her later correspondence may imagine. Indeed, the

notion of Heloise as "unsuited" to monastic claustration as it was then envisaged is an odd one. What she may have grieved was the loss of her son and of a life of intellectual, social, and sexual concubinage with a learned and challenging cleric in exciting times; the kind of clerical concubinage Heloise may have aspired to was rapidly becoming out of date in the wake of the Gregorian reform movement, but this is easier to see with hindsight. Presumably the attraction of this kind of lifestyle led her to abandon Argenteuil and live in Paris with her uncle, where she might have thought to advance in some way an already firm command of the Latin language.[89] To see her as Fulbert's pawn in both her original placement at Argenteuil and in her later departure from it may well be to impose an unnecessarily patriarchal frame on things.[90]

Thus Heloise, exceptional both in her learning and her gender, may have frequented the Parisian schools of her day—Peter the Venerable, as we have seen, speaks of the combination of learning and femininity as if it was something one would normally expect to be "dispatched from the world!" Abelard seemingly unused to consorting with noble or lay women, was seduced by Heloise's appearance and reputation into devising a scheme whereby he would have unique access to her.[91] He thus fell in love with her apparently before any actual sign from her that she was of similar heart.

A gloss on the *De inventione,* representing either the lectures of William of Champeaux or similar teaching at Laon in connection with the activities of masters Ralph and Anselm of that school, seems to hint that in some circles, at least, the seduction of Heloise was punishable because she was a nun.[92] It seems unthinkable that Abelard deliberately obscured Heloise's situation before his relationship with her—and in any case Peter the Venerable explicitly says that Heloise at the time was "not yet dispatched from secular ties"—but the reference only serves to underline the obscurity of Heloise's early status and studies at Paris.[93] What light do the "lost" love letters throw on this?

Appendices A and B present a detailed reading of the de Vepria collection on the assumption that they do represent the wax-tablet exchanges between Heloise and Abelard around 1116 to 1118. Nevertheless, while stressing that only a careful personal inspection of these *litterae* excerpts in the context of the *Historia calamitatum* can provide the reader with a basis for assessing their authenticity, one group of excerpts may serve to illustrate the integration proposed here.[94]

Letter 84 (M) is a highly significant remnant of a letter that raises the question of the kind of mutual relationship Heloise envisaged for herself and Abelard at the mature phase of their relationship. In letter 76 (M) we saw Heloise describe herself as "certe sodalitatis amica." In letter 84, in a crescendo of her musical prose, and after a dense *salutatio* offering her beloved "gaudium cum salute" and "gaudium . . . per evum," she goes back to the beginning of their relationship [? post mutuam nostre visionis allocucionisque noticiam] and, reversing the implication of *HC* M 290, claims that *she* chose Abelard from thousands [*teque solum elegi ex milibus*][95] in order to make a *pignus,* which, when achieved, would enable her to end her cares for the future. This could be an extraordinary statement, for it can mean that Heloise was (perhaps) an orphan (or person deprived of a father?) and without the normal aristocratic ways of securing a stable marital arrangement in life (dowry?), and, with her intellectual interests, perhaps indisposed to the normal marital patterns of her class. These were her "cares," and the way she chose to resolve them was, in an exact reversal of the pattern Abelard alludes to when *he* claims that he chose to seduce Heloise to solve *his* problems, to form a *pignus* with a man of her choice and suitable to her ambitions, penchants, and talents.[96] The word "pignus" is a curious one to use, as it quite normally

in classical Latin referred to "children as the guarantee of the reality of a marriage."[97] What relationship was there in Heloise's mind between *pignus* and *conubium?* We are required to believe from the *Historia calamitatum* that Heloise was at the time adamantly opposed to marriage and the bringing up of children—although it is not unlikely that her own and even Abelard's views on these matters underwent changes later in life, as Juanita Ruys seeks to show in chapter 14 in this volume. The possibility of clerical concubinage at this time has been canvassed and rejected as an adequate answer to the question of what Heloise wanted out of her relationship with Abelard.[98] Whether concubinage was any more acceptable to the life of a cleric and a philosopher in the second decade of the twelfth century in Paris, it does seem valid to claim that Heloise

> played ideals of aloof and dignified scholarship against the riot and indignity of a household because she feared the deindividualization of a woman in marriage. As she saw it, a wife can only be a sexual distraction, a mother and a domestic worker, and never a lover, a friend or a fellow-scholar. . . .
>
> What Heloise really wants from Abelard, as becomes entirely clear from her letters, is an intellectual and emotional communion—"unitas mentium," to use Egbert's phrase. Such relationships are not founded upon obligation, and she is prepared to waive her rights over Abelard's means and his household in order to ensure that their relationship remains pre-eminently a disinterested one. In parallel with the popes, theologians and lawyers who taught that marriage was essentially and sacramentally a consensual matter even at the expense of destablilizing it in practice, Heloise insisted that only the purity of her motives could justify her relationship with Abelard, even if that obliged her to sacrifice her own security within it.[99]

Such a statement is consonant with the picture that emerges from letter 84, and from, for example, the odd slip in gender from *Quis* to *Quae/Que* evident in most manuscripts of the *Historia calamitatum* at M 475. Indeed, Heloise in letter 84 goes on to say that Abelard was as natural a habitat for her as shady groves were for birds, streams for fish, mountains for stags.[100] She then shifts gear oddly and writes: "hactenus mecum mansisti [Abelard], mecum viriliter bonum certamen certasti, sed nondum bravium accepisti." This is the passage that the historian Peter Dronke[101] uses, perhaps influenced by the appearance of the word *bravium* in the *Carmina Burana,* to argue that the relationship between M and V was not consummated, while that between Heloise and Abelard was.[102] This is hard to follow, and unnecessary. The *certamen* could just as easily be the bed (as it was in marital encomiastic literature), and in any case it is clear that *bravium* is not to be so lightly interpreted.[103] Both *certamen* and *bravium* in the scriptural references cited by Könsgen mean the good fight of the faithful and the reward is heavenly.[104] Ascetic overtones are clear. In secular usage, however, the word *bravium* or *brabe[i]um* means the prize won in athletic games.[105] The passage that would have followed the word *bravium* in letter 84 has been omitted by the medieval editor. We can only suppose that in Heloise's eyes the word meant fulfillment of the relationship she had in mind, in the way she wanted it fulfilled. It is time, she says, to move on from the master/pupil relationship to a fuller relationship: that "prologum, quem composuisti michi [the prologue (for our life together), which you composed for me, . . . I will repay] cum graciarum actione [cf. *actio HC* M 390], cum amoris servitute"—with the *Charites,* or Graces, or young and beautiful attendants upon Venus, who were in antiquity worshipped in the same temple as the nine Muses.

The *salutatio* of Abelard's reply (#85 [V]) proposes a unity between himself and Heloise that is broken only by the notion of his greeting "the best part of his body considered in a divided sense" (i.e., her). There follows a paragraph in which *he* laments *his* failure to supply words to match *her* deeds [*beneficium*].[106] Words such as 'segnities'[107] and 'pre nimia mentis alienatione' hint at the kind of quasi-estrangement that might have followed their agreement to disagree on the issue of marriage, and the last sentence [ignis noster . . . vincat] can not only be taken appropriately with *HC* M 564–66 but alludes to letter 84 [in which: *certamen* = #85: *concertacio*].

With Heloise's letter 86 (M) we have the kind of letter that might have matched that phase in the couple's lives referred to in *HC* M 383–390. Indeed, the *salutatio* may be close to the *cum summa exultatione* of *HC* M 392–93: "to the bottomless fount of sweetness, that part of his soul which has been individuated [an allusion to the *salutatio* of letter 85] gives him the possibility that after the worries of Martha and the fecundity of Leah, he will possess the best part of Mary."[108] What can this refer to other than that Heloise expects a period of time as mother and housewife, but, following that, a continuation of her life (with Abelard) as an intellectual? What follows could easily be taken as an exultant, passionate prologue of affection that would have preceded the communication of her pregnancy, had not the medieval editor effected an omission at this point. After the omission, we have a heartfelt wish expressed for something "si salva gracia dei posset fieri": "before God none can lie, and with him as my witness there is nothing on earth I would desire more [than to bear your child]. Your *affectus* ["desire," "fondness," "disposition to love me"—always her word][109] makes me fat [= pregnant?], but your love [*amor*] can never fill me (compare the comparable use of 'implet' in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* XI.265). My salvation/welfare [*salus*] is your life, you are all I desire, my every good thing. Farewell half of my heart and the burning fire of complete happiness and love."

Letter 87 (V), a competent effort in elegiacs, offers the *amor* that letter 86 says will never "fill" Heloise (however much "*affectus*" "fattens" her). It is based on nice plays on the shortness and length of time balanced against the brevity of the lovers' moments together:

> The year that has passed, since first love bound us together has been both brief and long: when I think back over the beauty (of which I can never have enough) of your form, and that goodness which is so characteristic of you, it seems I have had but an hour of familiarity with you [in Classical Latin *notitia* can imply carnal knowledge][110]—though each thought of you [*nova cura* = Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.43: *formosae cura puellae*] is a fresh one to my longing—and when I think back how rare have been those moments of contact between us, countless years run by me, for each day without you seems like thirty years [a generation?].[111]

Thus Abelard commemorates for Heloise the first anniversary of their mutual love, perhaps during those painful days of separation following the birth of Astrolabe and the secret marriage (*HC* M 564–66). Certainly such a supposition fits the feeling expressed in letter 87: ll. 23ff. that the new year of their relationship will require a new path, a path in which "*amor*" will not be wounded by anything "*amarus*": their recent bitter recriminations and differences must be replaced by a new constraint on Abelard's part [ad nutus domine me cohibebo mee], and nothing "*amarus*" must wound any further Heloise's soft body [corpus . . . tenerum]. Alluding perhaps to *HC* M 355:

carmina . . . amatoria, Abelard says that there should be no "*carmina dura*" [songs lamenting a lover's intransigence, Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.19: *durae limen amicae?*], that he should be forgiven the wounding things he wrote to her in the past (l. 33).[112] In a rare moment of genuine regret, he wishes that he could retract what he had said: when he calls to mind his *dilecta*'s tears [*lacrimas* = *HC* M 554: *lacrimans*], he cannot hold back his own: "you should accept it when someone confesses his errors, accept it and do not recall other grounds for blame; accept it, for I pray that you do, O dearest, with unceasing tears: I will beg it even on bended knees." A hint at Heloise's fears may be contained in the last couplet, coming after this extended plea: "may the day that dawns for me be my last if there is any woman I would place before you."

Such a poetic apology may well be a generalized exercise between invented/fictive *personae,* or it may be what Abelard himself, compelled to correspond with Heloise because of their decision to live separately and conceal the marriage he forced upon her, and deeply ruing the precipitous course of the past year, chose to set down in the literary form they had come to love to devise for each other.[113]

The end of the correspondence is signaled by two letters, both by Heloise, and each in their way terminal. Letter 112 (M) is a strange and forced composition, which can only be taken as an attempt by Heloise to reformulate their epistolary relationship in terms appropriate to monastic "censorship" and monastic friendship: her letter is addressed in formal but relatively neutral terms to "the most noble and learned master," whose condescending act of correspondence [*nobilitas* writing to *parvitas*] produces ecstasy and elevation to the "third heaven" (a biblical reference) in the writer.[114] Appropriate reference to the recipient's philosophic and poetic studies is matched with an equally appropriate reference to the writer's new vocation [sitire deum et illi adherere soli necessarium est omni viventi], and the letter ends with a curiously wordy and formal attempt to place their relationship in terms that might have seemed uncontroversial to a monastic superior. Is Heloise now trying to set up a situation for correspondence closer to that which obtained between Baudri of Bourgeuil and Constance of Le Ronceray?[115] This latter correspondence had its wax tablets,[116] its year-long relationship,[117] its hyperbole,[118] its reading and re-reading of *litterae,*[119] its "*foedus amoris,*"[120] its "*verus amor,*" "*immemor,*"[121] and related language of emotional attachment. It is a far cry from the de Vepria fragments, embedded dramatically as they seem to be in the traumas and processes of urban life outside the monastery, but it may have represented to the tortured Heloise some appropriate formula for the changed future that lay ahead for her relationship with her (former?) husband. As such, it may not have lasted long, for letter 112a seems to say that there cannot be love without exercise of it: "I am tired now, I cannot reply to you, because you take amiss what I write in good faith, and by doing this you make my mind sad. Farewell." It is a portentous fragment,[122] and an appropriate one to end the collection—though someone (Heloise?) actually has rounded the assemblage out with a pretty piece (#113 [V]), presumably by Abelard, celebrating his falling for Heloise (and hence, perhaps, from period I in Appendix C). It contains some characteristic touches: Abelard has never been "conquered" before (*HC* M 70–71), Heloise's *forma, genus,*[123] *mores, honores* fill the streets of Paris;[124] it is only Heloise who gives Abelard his Latin eloquence [*facundum me sola facis*]. The physical passion hinted at in ll. 11–12 match *HC* M 332–46 and the "hindrances" to consummation [fortuna pudorque . . . et populi murmura] are appropriate to the conditions under which the couple fell into physical passion. It is a far more pleasant "end piece" than letter 112a would have been.

Certainly, by 1129[125] when Heloise and her companions, ejected from Argenteuil, went to the Paraclete, Abelard was frequently in his former wife's presence again, and remained so on and off until his removal to Paris and the composition of the *Historia calamitatum* (ca. 1132), which seems to have so aroused Heloise.[126] The celebrated letters that followed Heloise's reaction indicate a considerable break in their correspondence prior to the *Historia calamitatum,* and prior to about 1129, after which correspondence would have seemed less crucial in light of Abelard's frequent presence at the Paraclete.[127] Those letters numbered 87–113 that date from the period following Heloise's removal to Argenteuil must come from the earlier years. What seems to have aroused Heloise when she received the *Historia calamitatum* was not so much that she had had neither news of nor visits from Abelard in the years from about 1118 to 1132, but rather the fact that this self-conscious correspondence, this time with another, aroused in her the vivid and nostalgic memory of their earlier correspondence, and she felt Abelard's epistolary loyalty should be to her, not to a nameless friend. Hence her request for a resumption of the correspondence.[128] Indeed, we may imagine Heloise in her early days at Argenteuil, reading and rereading their earlier correspondence,[129] as she waited for the visits [letter 110: quam iocunda michi sit . . . persone tue presencia], which Abelard himself later admitted he paid to her at Argenteuil in those early days,[130] visits that, as he admits, involved renewed sexual encounters with his wife.

Whether the de Vepria collection can bear the "interpretations" hinted at here and in appendices A and B is more important than the actual details of the interpretations. Acceptance of Mews's proposition opens the letters up to *some* process of identification with established texts and fixed points in the reconstructed lives of the two lovers. We have above, and in appendices A and B, simply made an essay in this direction, and, though a close fit between the de Vepria collection and the later letters is disappointingly difficult to establish, and although there are other collections of similar letters also from the twelfth century,[131] we believe that there is enough of a fit to support Mews's view of the matter. In time we may come to know more.

Heloise and the *Trivium*

In discussions of the lives and learning of Abelard and Heloise, notions of rhetoric are often vaguely expressed. In his recent *Abelard: A Medieval Life,* for example, the historian M.T. Clanchy speaks of "the rhetoric of the classical authors (Virgil, Cicero, Ovid, and so on),"[132] of Abelard and Heloise as "trained in Latin rhetoric," for whom "writing anything down made the author adopt a particular literary stance and speak with an artificial voice,"[133] and of "the rhetoric of letter-writing (the *ars dictaminis* or 'art of dictation')," which he says "was taught along with Latin in the classroom."[134] Such vague and inaccurate blurrings of reality will not do if we wish to understand what elements of the *trivium* were current in Abelard's day, what he learned and taught, what Heloise learned (and where), how these aspects differed—if they did—from what was elsewhere and otherwise taught and learned.[135]

"Rhetoric" in the sense of (Latin) "composition," that is, style and (vaguely) sentence and paragraph structure, was certainly acquired from reading the classical, late classical, and patristic *auctores* intensively (John of Salisbury's depiction of the teaching of grammar by Bernard of Chartres in *Metalogicon* 1.24 remains canonical here).[136] It was reinforced by continuous and sensitive readings of the scriptures themselves. Such

training inculcated not only the Latin periodic sentence, the singsong rhymed prose of the monasteries, and an acquaintance with the *colores* or figures of speech and thought taught in the fourth book of the *Ad Herennium* and brought into recent focus by Marbod of Rennes' pioneering *De ornamentis verborum,* but it also equipped the student with a thousand snatches of past prose to weave into (but not to substitute for) his own compositions.[137] This acquaintance would have come to the student under the heading of "grammar" rather than rhetoric—a circumstance brought home to us by the initial lack of interest in the *Ad Herennium* in early studies in the art of rhetoric and by the impoverished nature of those early commentaries on book IV of the *Ad Herennium* when interest in that text did, finally, manifest itself.[138] As Clanchy stresses, the training in discourse imparted by such instruction was important to contemporaries of Abelard and Heloise "because it was the only way they knew to give their thoughts lasting shape."[139] At its most advanced level, such training inculcated a level of Latin rhetorical and poetic skill that enabled a blurring of the lines that divided fictive creation from reality, desire from eloquence, and permitted "literary exchange" to "become the ultimate object of all drives, sexual as well as religious."[140] As Marbod of Rennes himself wrote, "you who want to write . . . should strive to reproduce gender, age, emotion, and social status as they are distinct in reality."[141] Thus it is not unreasonable to suppose that when Abelard and Heloise decided to set up their early literary correspondence, their aim was "to be penfriends and have fun, like Lady Constance and Baudri of Bourgeuil,"[142] that is, to rehearse and practice their literary capacities in the "learned language," much as the author of the *Ad Herennium* advised when he asserted that skill in all the parts of rhetoric can be obtained "arte, imitatione, exercitatione,"[143] that is by knowing the rules of the art, by imitating the best authors (and the rules), and by frequent practice. If the result was a blurring of fiction and reality that has bedeviled the modern student ever since, the credit should go to those masters of literary composition in the half century that divides the birth of Abelard from the writing of the *Historia calamitatum,* the masters who believed "that the material world (including discourse) contained powers which could be extracted for human use through *studium,*" who brought "the mutual reinforcement between *ars* ("training") and *natura* ("native ability") in the theories of Pseudo-Cicero [the *Ad Herennium*] and Horace . . . [to] . . . a new level of abstraction," who, finally, achieved "the mastery of the Ciceronian ornamentation of discourse, . . . a synthesis rather than a simple digest, of rhetorical theories and the educational systems built around them," a synthesis founded on "the well-known idealization of the civic self in the figure of the orator, which found its most permanent form in the complex articulation of an elite-educational system founded on the [Graeco-Roman] *ars rhetorica.*"[144]

Rhetoric in the sense of the doctrines expounded (for example) in the *De inventione* of Cicero (and to a lesser extent in the parallel *Ad Herennium*), however, was a different matter. Now we are unsure as to the exact motivation for the intense study of what seems to be a thoroughly outmoded system of Greco-Roman rhetorical theory in Abelard's day,[145] a study that was to reach a magnificent climax in the *Ad Herennium* commentary of a certain Magister Alanus,[146] but the evidence is clear that this learned system of ancient theory was as zealously studied in Abelard's day as the poetical and compositional theories so stunningly illustrated by Baudri of Bourgeuil and Marbod of Rennes. The system was learned directly from the Greco-Roman technical texts themselves, in particular the Greek-influenced *De inventione* of Cicero and the somewhat more Romanized and almost contemporary anonymous work known as

the *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* together with some lesser texts from the collection known as the *rhetores latini minores.*[147] Such we know from—at least—the famous collections of texts known as the *Heptateuchon* of Thierry of Chartres.[148] We can be fairly sure that Abelard had studied at least parts of this theoretical curriculum very carefully,[149] although whether by the time of his initial exchange of *litterae* with Heloise (A.D. 1116/1117) or not is unclear.[150]

What is clear, for Abelard and his contemporaries, is the absorption of rhetoric into dialectic. William of Champeaux's lectures on rhetoric were, in fact, dialectical in orientation,[151] and even in a work such as the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury, aimed it seems at the elite in the world, references to rhetoric rarely intrude upon the dialectical or grammatical subject matter of the book[152]: dialectic, the art of discussing the different subject matters of the *artes,* matters of general significance in life and topics subject to probability-oriented rather than certainty-oriented reasoning, was the legacy of the schools to the intelligent society of Abelard's day.

What therefore can we say of contemporary studies of the *trivium* and its role in the de Vepria collection? What *in tempore* reality, in this regard, do these epistolary texts mask, preserve, enrich, and transform? The arsenal of trivial texts and readings that informed the learning experience underlying the wax tablets on which these two people, *mulier* and *vir,* Heloise and Abelard impressed their versions of it seems to have been required to function in a white[153] heat that at once outmodes and surpasses the intellectual world of the Loire monasteries.[154] We are puzzled by the absence of any set curriculum in the readings and studies that produced the de Vepria collection, and by the distance between what appears to have fueled the *litterae* and the ever-present disputation in dialectic that seemed to have dominated the schools during Abelard's early teaching days in Paris.[155] We have Ovid but no Priscian, the *De amicitia* but not the *De inventione,*[156] *salutatio* formulas, and *Reimprosa* but little else from the developing dictaminal curriculum of the day. We find snippets of rational philosophy and an intensified ransacking of patristic and classical ethical literature for guidance on the more complicated aspects of life (should a man marry, can one philosophize and "carnalize"?) but little to help us answer fundamental questions. What drew Abelard and Heloise together initially? What were her motives? Where else, with whom, and in what manner had she been pursuing her postmonastic career and literary studies? Was she seeking an acquaintance with dictaminal skills, and if so, with what ultimate career in mind? Was she conscious of the prevailing theory and practice of learned *amicitia,* seeking to place herself in its midst, rather like—and more successfully than—the more aspiring of her Italian Renaissance successors?[157]

We can only guess at the answers to these questions. The Könsgen source annotations[158] and list of proverbial expressions[159] reveal a pattern of reading consistent with the idea of private tutorship in grammar and the auctores, together with wide-ranging discussions of contemporary moral issues based on readings in scriptures and patristic writings. From an initial glance at Könsgen's extensive and careful annotations,[160] the major works likely to have been read or seemingly reflected would appear to be:

Baudri of Bourgeuil:	*Carmina.*
Bible:	Acts, Apocalypse, Song of Songs, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Daniel, Deuteronomy, Ecclesiasticus, Ephesians, Esther, Exodus, Ezekiel, Genesis, Hebrews, Isaiah,

	Job, Joel, Joshua, John, Jonah, Judges, Judith, 3 Kings, Luke, Matthew, Proverbs, Psalms, Romans, Ruth, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Wisdom.
Boethius:	*Consolatio, De arithmetica.*
Cicero:	*De amicitia, Epistulae, De officiis, Tusculanae disputationes.*
Claudian:	*In Rufinum.*
Ennodius:	*Opuscula.*
Gregory the Great:	*Homiliae in evangelium, Cura pastoralis.*
Horace:	*Carmina, Epistulae, Saturae.*
Isidore:	*Etymologiae.*
Jerome:	*Epistulae.*
Juvenal	
Lucan:	*Pharsalia.*
Marbod of Rennes:	*Carmina amatoria.*
Ovid:	*Ars amatoria, Epistulae, Fasti, Heroides, Metamorphoses, Pontica, Remedium Amores, Tristia.*
Persius:	*Saturae.*
Plautus:	*Stichus.*
Pliny:	*Historia naturalis.*
Prudentius:	*Apotheosis.*
Statius:	*Thebias, Silvae.*
Terence:	*Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton Timorumenos, Hecyra.*
Vergil:	*Ecloga, Georgica, Aeneis.*

There is little that is exceptional here, but the interweaving of the texts with the processes of life and its dilemmas must be considered unique in the annals of humanism.

If we look closely at one of the pieces in the de Vepria collection, we shall see how a distinctive pattern arises out of mutual textual readings. Letter 45 has one of the longest, if not the longest, *salutationes* in the collection, a litany of isocolon [*conpar, Ad Her.* 4.20.27], homoeoptoton [*similiter cadens, Ad Her.* 4.20.28], and asyndeton [*dissolutum, Ad Her.* 4.30.41] based on allusions to the Bible and Ovid.[161] The biblical overtones continue to provide the fabric of the richly balanced [voluntatem . . . effectus/per litteras . . . per corporalem . . . presenciam/spiritu et mente . . . corpus stolidum et inutile/fortuna deposuit . . . consolacio . . . restituit (etc.)] and rhyming [discedente . . . mente/patrie . . . inutile/abscencia . . . sciencia . . . secreta (etc.)] prose. Heloise's ability to work phrases from the Bible into her own literary construction is suddenly balanced by a series of secular allusions (unfortunately truncated by the medieval editor): "I [Heloise] cannot deny you [Abelard] any more than could Byblis her Cauno, Oenone her Paris, Briseis her Achilles." We are suddenly thrust into the "real life of the schoolroom," but when we refresh our memory of Heloise's allusions, there is a chilling "reality" about the fictions of the classical schoolroom. The Byblis of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* IX.453ff. has used the *eloquentia* of the wax tablet [563–64: plena . . . cera manum, 570: *tabella,* 586: *tabellis,* etc.] to propose a love to Byblos (her brother) that was as passionate as it was forbidden; it is a reminder that Heloise, especially in Fulbert's household, was a kind of sister to Abelard, but one unable to restrain her passionate erotic emotions, emotions she too committed to wax tablets. As in letter 84, there is a hint that Heloise initiated the relationship, and although Abelard's initial reception of such "overtures" was warm, he ultimately claimed, as Byblis claimed

of Cauno's response to her own passions [623–24: non hoc . . . Deo, sed victa libidine], that he was drawn by lust rather than love.[162] Oenone, too, in Ovid's *Heroides* (V.79ff.), draws a contrast between the rustic love that bound Paris to her before he entered upon the paths of fame, glory, and tribulation that took him from the flocks of Mt. Ida to the palaces of Priam and Troy and his later aristocratic loves. Briseis, also, in *Her.* III.75ff., draws a contrast between her own humble love service and Achilles' aristocratic expectations (71ff.), although in the case of *Her.* III, the fiction would suggest that Fulbert had other, more aristocratic marital plans (*Her.* III.20) for Heloise (whose former attachments [Argenteuil? a former betrothed?], like Briseis' former brothers and husband, lost in the Trojan wars, were abandoned in circumstances beyond her control), which she would have resisted out of loyalty to Abelard, who would then be pictured as Achilles, refusing to play ball with Agamemnon/Fulbert (that is, refusing to proceed with Fulbert's plans for the educational enrichment of his ward [*HC* M 321–22], just as Achilles refused to go along with his expected role in the battles against Troy until Briseis were restored to him). Yet the fiction of *Her.* III is more complicated: Achilles is portrayed (ll. 22 and 25) as sluggish in his claim to have Briseis restored, even opposed: Briseis (portrayed in the Latin *Iliad* as "well-proportioned in her figure, amiable in her manners and fascinating in her looks")[163] portrays herself as a pawn in the negotiations between Agamemnon and the Greek leaders, and sees suspicions in regard to her having succumbed in bed to Agamemnon as the obstacle impeding Achilles' reclaiming of her.[164] The notion of Heloise/Briseis as a pawn in the hands of males (Fulbert, Abelard/Achilles, Agamemnon) joins with that of jealousy on the part of the male,[165] and a relationship (Briseis and Achilles) based on the passion of the female, and without much to do with formal marital ties, to form an appealing combination.

Even the parting touch, the reference to Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos*[166] or "The Self-tormenter,"[167] is suggestive. Heloise refers to the pleasure Antiphila (the girl) received when Clinia was restored to her, not the other way around, even though the context demands that Heloise give *gaudia* to Abelard. In the *Heauton Timorumenos* Clinia (the male) is described as falling in love with "filiam . . . virginem" and treating her almost as a wife—"prope ut pro uxore haberet."[168] It is made clear in the play that Antiphila [Heloise] is a simple, natural girl, with none of the contrived arts of the society female.[169] It is stated further that in the case of girls like Antiphila [Heloise] *formae* match *mores,* that Antiphila [Heloise] is a perfect match of *ingenium* and *oratio,* and that she has only to want to pass her time with a particular man whose *mos* resembles most her own, and the man is devoted to her at once, with the happy outcome that both are truly bound together and no calamity can befall their *amor.*[170] Antiphila [Heloise] replies to this estimation of her talents and prospects with the humble sentence: "nescio alias: mequidem semper scio fecisse sedulo, ut ex illius commodo meum compararem commodum": "I'm not sure about the rest, but I have certainly always done my best to see that my interests are his." Her beloved, Clinia, then claims that only Antiphila has brought him back "in patriam," linking up with the "patrie" and "ne tardas venire" of letter 45.

There is an intriguing play between various realities, textual and otherwise, in letter 45, and a pointedness about the classical literary allusions that suggests an intelligent, well-stocked mind. Our modern ignorance of the conditions for such writing should not lead us to trivialize it by placing it in the category either of the lifeless school exercise or in the category of the true-to-life narrative *relatio.* There is an in-

triguing space somewhere between these two poles in which we must place such curious attempts to work out a troubled but tolerably "real" relationship in a discourse selected because of its rich tradition, its availability, and its capacity to permit exploration and resolution of conflict. In terms of the present enquiry, we need to note the way in which such "real life" concerns guided and animated not only curriculum reading of the *auctores* in grammar in the monastery, under a tutor, and perhaps also (if vestigially) in the developing cathedral school studies of the day, but also motivated the *collationes* or *imitationes* that followed such reading in the account left to us of Bernard of Chartres' grammatical teaching, in the pages of John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon.*

The hints at some knowledge of dialectical terms and ethical problems debated in the schools have been already touched upon, but the relationship between the de Vepria collection and the teaching of technical rhetoric requires further comment. Important developments were taking place in Paris and the surrounding schools during the lifetimes of Abelard and Heloise as far as the teaching of technical rhetoric, that is, the rhetorical doctrines of the Roman republican treatises, Cicero's *De inventione,* and the (anonymous) *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* was concerned.[171] While Abelard seems to have been involved in these developments,[172] there is little trace of them in the de Vepria collection (though Heloise is not unfamiliar with the *De inventione*).[173] What we find in the earlier collection is an emphasis on compositional, grammatical, ethical humanism, with an evident concern for the developing niceties of dictaminal etiquette, such as, for example, in the elaborate *salutationes.*

Although letter practice doubtless preceded letter theory,[174] dictaminal rules and dictaminal model letter collections were very much in vogue by the time that Heloise and Abelard responded to a growing contemporary fascination with Cicero's *De amicitia* and the examination and "publication" of personal emotional experiences and fell themselves into epistolary dialogue in the middle years of the second decade of the twelfth century.[175] Not only were the Italian rule books beginning to penetrate north of the Alps, but contemporaries were already putting together outstanding collections of actual letters for later use as models, as is clear from the remarks of I. S. Robinson on the literature of the investiture controversy and its preservation in primarily German dictaminal collections made during the half century following the outbreak of the controversy itself: "it was the preoccupation with the *clausula* and the rhyming prose in the twelfth century German schools which ensured the survival of many polemical works."[176] Although, according to Constable,[177] the *ars dictaminis* "of the *dictatores,* especially at Bologna, . . . was hardly felt north of the Alps before 1150," "many of its constitutive elements had been developed much earlier," for example, "the fourfold division so characteristic of its method—*exordium . . . narratio . . . petitio . . . conclusio.*"[178] An initial glance at the dictaminal elements present in the de Vepria collection suggests the dimensions of the relationship between epistolary practice in the period and the formulated rules that were to become dominant in the schools by the second half of the twelfth century.

The very preservation of his collection clearly reflects de Vepria's interest in *dictamen* rather than love letters per se. The accompanying texts contained in the manuscript which preserves them is abundant evidence of the primary concern of the copyist: Cassiodorus' *Varie,* collected letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, Ennodius, Cyprian, Transmundus, and John of Limoges and model letters of Carolus Virulus. (The two exceptions are William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum Anglorum* and Cicero's *De officiis*).[179]

But if their survival reflects late fifteenth-century interest in Latin composition, the letters themselves obviously reflect the concerns of the correspondents, although the main themes discernible are possibly sharpened by the selectivity of their transcriber. One of these concerns the very medium they were employing: the letter, its composition, nature, and role in their relationship. The heightened sensitivity of the writers toward the letter as a genre is a valuable witness to the importance of epistolary composition at a time when and in an area where the manuals of the *ars dictaminis* were just beginning to emerge from the Italian schools.[180]

Although the de Vepria collection predates the circulation of such manuals in France, it nevertheless reflects many of the characteristics that would become stock features of dictaminal literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This is so even at a terminological level, with the words *dictamen/dictare* and their derivatives occurring in several places: *novus dictandi fervor* (#33); *quid dictem?* (#66); *ut tales litteras dictare queam; qua dictaminis dulcedine te alloquar, dilectissime?;* and *in ipso doloris cursu dictavi—et utinam non dictassem* (both in #75).[181] In all these occurrences, the term is used in the sense that will become standard in subsequent manuals: formal, artistic, prose Latin composition. That is, the term *dictamen/dictare* comes to connote the entire mental and physical process involved in literary composition, not just the restricted sense of the English word "dictation."[182]

The collection also shows a predilection for the general maxims or proverbs that, as part of the *captatio benevolentia* or *exordium* of the letter, would become a standard feature of many of the theoretical texts.[183] This interest is especially prominent in the early thirteenth-century manual entitled *Candelabrum* by Bene da Firenze, where 168 such *sententie* are gathered and arranged in alphabetical order.[184]

The close link between epistolary practice and rhetorical teaching also can be discerned in the de Vepria letters. In letter 23, for instance, which has already been noted for its rhetorical elements, the woman[185] relates her inner debate over how she should compose a letter of thanks to her teacher/lover. The recourse to the form of the *controversia* is obvious, and she seems to draw attention to it herself when she resumes the letter in her own voice: *hac hortaminis et dehortaminis alternacione suspensam* [suspended between this alternating encouragement and discouragement," or, less literally, "caught between these pros and cons].[186] Significantly, the internal debate is not whether she should write back but whether she is capable of doing so appropriately; that is, "appropriately" with respect to the conventions of the *littere graciarum*. Indeed, the description of the required method of writing such a letter reads like a textbook prescription: "For anyone who assumes to praise anything at all must ultimately divide it into parts and with the utmost care weigh the qualities of each individual part, honouring each one according to its merit with a suitable tribute of praise; otherwise he harms the object of praise whoever [. . .] lessens its elegance with an excessive description."[187] While we are not aware of parallels in twelfth-century dictaminal texts, an early thirteenth-century dictaminal collection, the *Boncompagnus* of Boncompagno da Signa, provides a comparable compositional method. As part of his model letters, the author provides several paired examples of *suasiones* and *dissuasiones* that might be used to argue opposite points of view with respect to certain topics: ecclesiastical elections, the merits of the various religious orders, and the choice of marriage partner. An example of the latter is: "An argument-for based on commendation of character, physical beauty, and nobility" and "An argument-against based on unfit character, physical deformity, and humble birth." Such paired models form the outline for potential debates and reveal the rhetorico-legal basis of much of dictaminal literature.[188]

Another feature of the correspondence that exemplifies a specific dictaminal precept is its anonymity—nowhere do the writers' names appear. This of course may be a result of editorial censuring on the part of de Vepria, but the most obvious site for names, the salutations, appear by and large intact.[189] More likely, then, the discretion was on the part of the correspondents themselves, eager to conceal their identities should their tablets end up in the wrong hands. We get a sense of this concern in letter 69 when the woman writes: "Let not jealous eyes read these verses, I ask: / I do not want hearts full of guile to know them."[190] Similarly, in letter 101 the man makes a virtue of necessity by suggesting that such caution is both inherently and circumstantially advisable: "If you care to note, I am now speaking to you more cautiously, and approaching you more cautiously; shame tempers love, modesty checks love, lest it collapse in its boundlessness. This way we can fulfil our sweet desires and gradually diminish the report which has arisen about us."[191] Such discretion would eventually be held up as a basic principle of writing love letters, as the following passage from Boncompagno's treatise on the subject reveals: "And it should be noted that both women and men, whatever their order or condition, should obscure the salutation of love-letters of this kind in such a way that if the letter should come into the hands of others, they would not be easily recognised."[192] What we have instead of names in the salutations are periphrastic phrases describing the particular qualities of the writer and addressee: "to her heart's love" (#1), "from her only one" (#4). Such periphrastic phrases derive from the epithets that regularly accompanied the names of the salutation formulas. Common practice throughout medieval letter writing, such epithets generally exalted the addressee while humbling the writer, and they quickly became a standard feature of the dictaminal manuals. Boncompagno would even dedicate a small treatise to listing all the terms that could suitably describe people of various ranks and offices.[193]

The primary dictaminal interest of the de Vepria collection, however, lies in its salutations. This holds not only for de Vepria himself, who began his transcription by focusing on them before being drawn into copying out substantial parts of the actual letters, but to the correspondents themselves. Their salutations are frequently the subject of discussion in their letters. They are varied, often elaborate and interactive, and at times quite innovative. They reveal not only an abiding concern with epistolary form but constitute an important means of relating through "epistolary play." Above all, they reflect the important role attributed to the letter in their relationship.

The anatomy of the medieval letter salutation has been thoroughly described by Lanham.[194] Its three components are the *intitulatio* [sender's name and/or attributes], the *inscriptio* [recipient's name and/or attributes], and the *salutatio* proper [the actual greeting]. Each element has its own grammatical case—dative for the addressee, nominative for the sender, and accusative for the greeting—which is dependent on an elided verb (normally "to send," "offer," or "wish").[195] Obviously important from a practical perspective (who is writing to whom?), the salutation was possibly more important from the point of view of protocol (what is the respective rank and importance of the correspondents?). Accordingly, definitive rules governed both the attributes of the correspondents and the relative positions of their names, as the following prescription from one of the earliest surviving manuals reveals: "If an inferior should write to a superior, the higher person is placed first, the lower next. If a superior to an inferior, the same applies. If an equal to an equal, either of the two can be placed first or second, according to the writer's preference. Moreover, the salutation

should represent the person and the rank through different qualities, there being one for superiors, one for inferiors, and another when we greet equals."[196] Any deviation from these conventions inevitably carried significative force. A salutation was denied, for example, enemies or infidel. Curiously, it also could be denied a superior through the conceit of humility and reverence.[197] But whatever the motivation, such divergence from standard salutatory practice was instantly recognized and noted.

The writers in the de Vepria correspondence reveal themselves to be acutely aware of the importance of the salutation, not only in terms of getting it right but also making sure it reflects their feelings for the other. The woman is especially sensitive to this. In letter 5, for example, she writes: "May the Bestower of every art and the most bountiful Giver of human talent fill the depths of my breast with the skill of the art of philosophy, in order that I may greet you in writing, most beloved, in accordance with my will."[198] Her wish is surprisingly specific—not for eloquence in general but for the dictaminal ability to greet appropriately. In other letters, she is troubled and frustrated by her inability to do so: "For a long time, and with a blazing struggle of heart and body, I have considered how I should address you, my graceful jewel, but the difficulty of expected failure has so far defied the intention of my feeling."[199] In the end, she decided to extend the metaphor of fire to the salutation and resort to a rhetorical topos for the greeting in order to resolve her predicament: "To one deserving to be embraced with the ardor of a special love, from the fire of love for you: may you gather as many greetings as flowers which perfume the delightful season."[200] Such protestations of inadequacy are manifestly rhetorical. Elsewhere, for instance, she negotiates the "salutation block" just as elegantly and ingeniously: "I send you the salutation which I would like sent to me. / I know of nothing more salutary than this."[201] And the salutation of letter 45, which Peter Dronke singled out for particular attention, demonstrates beyond doubt that the woman had a firm grasp of both the conventions and poetic potential of the salutation: "To her house of cedar, from the ivory statue on which the whole house rests: the whiteness of snow, gleam of the moon, radiance of the sun, splendour of stars, perfume of roses, beauty of lilies, softness of balm, fertility of the earth, serenity of the sky, and whatever sweetness is embraced in their circumference."[202]

Being the most regulated part of the letter, the salutation clearly provided the best opportunity to "bounce off" those principles and to play with the conventions of epistolary style. The necessity for allusive identifications in letters of love thus had a twofold function: first, it concealed the identities of the correspondents (unfortunately from posterity as well as from contemporary readers); and second, it provided an opportunity for imaginative and affectionate circumlocutions and metaphors that constituted a lover's code. At their most elemental, admittedly, such phrases can be somewhat trite: "To her heart's love, more sweetly scented than any spice" (#1), "From one whose life without you is death" (#2), "To one who is sweeter every day, loved now as much as possible, and always to be loved more than everything, From her only one" (#4). But as the writers warm to the task and the challenge, their allusions become more imaginative and elaborate: "To the sweetest protector of her soul, planted at the root of her caring love, from one in whose love you are firmly established and in whose honeyed taste of love you are well founded" (#23, woman); and, in response to her imagery, "To the soul, brighter and dearer to me than anything the earth has produced, from the flesh, which that same soul causes to breathe and move" (#24, man). In so doing, the salutation is instilled with much more meaning than a simple

formulaic structure; it comes to symbolize the writers' intellectual and emotional engagement with each other, it heightens the excitement of their epistolary relationship (what if someone should "crack the code?"), and it teasingly challenges the other to do better. In other words, it becomes part of the lovers' game.

The inclusion of a greeting, in the form of a verbal offering or benevolent wish for the other, was a fundamental part of the salutation. Its omission was always pointed, and usually implied disfavor or ostracism, as many *dictatores* expressly remarked.[203] However, in correspondence between lovers, such transgressions, while noted, seem to have acquired a different meaning. In letter 95, for example, the woman's failure to offer a greeting as part of the salutation triggers the following response from the man: "To half my heart and part of my soul. I send what I am: yours, as long as I live. Farewell, even though you sent no greeting to me."[204] The man's own greeting, however, would have revealed that the reproach was good-natured. Perhaps with this in mind, a few letters later (#109) the woman teasingly suggests that a formal greeting is not necessary since they can readily meet—and then she provides one: "Since each of us is presently able to come into the sight of the other, my letter does not need a greeting. Nevertheless I want you to be well, clothed with the grace of the virtues, covered with the jewels of wisdom, endowed with integrity of character, and decorated with the adornment of complete composure."[205] And in one letter the man employs *salve,* the characteristic term of the salutation, in the closing formula: "Farewell, and make sure that you compare no mortal with me, for I will tenaciously persist with the same intention toward you. Greetings, my most beloved, and keep me in your memory as forever yours."[206] The novelty does not go unnoticed, and with an epistolary wink, the woman replies in her own salutation: "Greetings to you too, most beloved, worthy of every delight!"[207]

The salutations of the de Vepria correspondence are noteworthy for their variation. Lanham has identified three main types of greeting formula used in medieval correspondence: (1) an accusative phrase containing a wish/hope or a promise/pledge; (2) *quicquid* phrases: as in letter 18: *quidquid amans amanti* [sc. *mittit, optat,* etc.]; (3) and infinitive phrases, as in letter 9: *sic pugnare ut vincat, sic currere ut comprehendat.*[208] All three types occur regularly in the correspondence, with the woman clearly favoring the accusative phrase, while the man uses all three types more or less equally. More important, the writers show a preference for a particular type of greeting in certain phases of their correspondence.[209] While such responsiveness and sensitivity to the other's lead might be expected on a thematic level, it is remarkable to find it on a formal one.[210] Again, it suggests that these writers were extraordinarily sensitive to the form and conventions of the letter and that it constituted a common interest and concern, both at an explicit level and an unspoken formal one.

Some letters omit a reference to the writer/sender altogether. It is a device employed by both writers, initially by the woman (letters 3, 5, 9, 25, and 27), before the man takes up the lead at letter 28 and thereafter employs it regularly. Only near the end, however, does he call attention to the artifice:

> My sun and my serene day, my light, greetings.
> You are my sweetness, without you nothing is sweet.
> If you should ask who sends words so sweet to you:
> He who is yours does so, whose life you remain,
> Whose drink has been tears with you away,
> Whose food has been mixed with grief and sighs.[211]

The absence of the sender's attributes from its usual place—immediately before the greeting—would have been as conspicuous as the omission of a greeting. The man thus plays the epistolary equivalent of the lover's game of "guess who?" teasingly asking his recipient to guess his identity, before alluding to it for her. The fact that she would have known from the start from whom the wax tablet had come is beside the point, for pretending is all part of the game.

Some letters even lack a salutation altogether, a flagrant impropriety in any other epistolary situation.[212] Letter 13 from the woman is the first one to lack a salutation, although the ellipses in Könsgen's text suggest that either he or de Vepria thought that it had been lost. However, as the letter reveals, the omission was intentional and strategic: "Since the grateful benevolence of my mind, of its own accord and out of duty always bound to you, could not send all the greetings which it wished, it remains silent over the many, lest by listing some it might seem to offend them all."[213] While the man makes no direct reference to her innovation, the fact that his own reply also lacks a salutation (the first of his letters to do so) suggests that he had noted it and acknowledged it through imitation. This will set the pattern whereby the omission of the salutation by one is often imitated by the other (usually the man, as in letters 13–14, 29–30, 32–33, and 66–67), as if the harmony of their relationship is measured by the formal harmony of their correspondence.

On the other hand, several letters consist of the salutation alone (letters 15, 65, 70, 97, and 99 by the man; 81, 92, and 95 by the woman). Such contentless letters may also be readily interpreted as a further part of the lover's game, ways of displaying affection and eliciting charming responses, such as: "Indeed your words are few, but I made them many by re-reading them often. Nor do I measure how much you say, but rather how fertile is the heart from which it comes. Farewell, sweetest."[214] At times, the salutation also is used to signify estrangement, mock or otherwise. This is made more poignant by a combination of linguistic and formal features. One of the man's letters begins by adopting an unprecedented deferential tone: "To his reverend lady, from her humble servant: his devoted service."[215] Then, in a thoroughly scholastic manner, he provides a gloss of his own salutation, explaining the cool formality of his greeting: "For this is how I must now address your ladyship: no longer saying 'you,' but 'Madam,' not 'sweet' nor 'dear' but 'lady,' because I am not as familiar as before and your ladyship is too much a stranger to me."[216] Since this tone lasts just one letter, it is probably just part of the lovers' game rather than a sign of an actual breach; it is a subtle and highbrow way of saying "I haven't heard from you for a long time."[217]

Arguably the most important principle of medieval dictaminal theory, however, one whose transgression was at least as provocative as omitting a greeting, was the order of names/attributes in the salutation.[218] The five salutations, all by the woman, in which she places her own attribute before the man's, contrary to her usual practice and the conventional social order, therefore carry special meaning. These are:

From an equal to an equal . . . [#18: *Par pari*]
From a lover to a lover . . . [#48 and #84: *Amans amanti*]
From beloved to beloved . . . [#62: *Dilecta dilecto*]
From faithful to faithful . . . [#100: *Fidelis fideli*]

The convention that the woman is breaking here is not a social one, however, since whenever the man writes to the woman, he always places her first. Evidently, in the

case of letters between lovers, different rules applied.[219] Given that another of the medieval letter writer's overriding concerns (apart from observing salutation etiquette) was the "capturing of goodwill" [*captatio benevolentie*], to which a special part of the letter was assigned, the placing of the lover's name/attributes first is perhaps not so surprising when seen as a gesture of deference and ingratiation.

Thus the woman contravenes a specific convention of love-letters in placing her own name first. It is significant that she uses the same word to describe him as she does herself, but on its own this apparently does not justify the rearrangement; on the one occasion that the man applies the same attribute to himself as to her (#68: *Dulcissime dulcissimus* ["Sweetest to sweetest"]), he retains the conventional order between lovers. Rather, in the woman's hands, the device is used to make a point of their parity. While the use of the same attribute might temper to some extent the impact of the innovation and its implication of precedence, these salutations remain striking assertions of the equality of their relationship, rendered through lexical, syntactic, and formal means. Indeed, the very words that herald the innovation—*par pari*—suggest an allusion to the precept of Adalbertus cited earlier, as if the woman is subtly pointing out that since they *are* equals, she can happily choose the order *iuxta placitum scriptoris.*

On the whole, the woman appears most aware of and imaginative in her use of the salutations, even though she also most often expresses her own sense of compositional inadequacy. In letter 49, for instance, she claims: "It is very rash of me to send studied phrases to you . . . ; unless I knew the unfailing friendship of true love to be implanted in you, I would not presume to send you inelegant letters of such unrefined style."[220] Elsewhere: "If a droplet of knowability had trickled down to me from the honeycomb of wisdom, I would try with every effort of my mind to portray in the jottings of my letter various things with a fragrant nectar for your nourishing love."[221] Coming after her description of herself as *tocius expers pericie* [devoid of every skill] in the salutation, such claims of incompetence begin to sound distinctly rhetorical. The man, on the other hand, comes close to such self-doubts only once, in letter 75, when he writes: "Therefore who am I or what quality is there in me that I could compose such a letter which would prove me worthy of your golden breast, your ivory arms, your milk-white neck?"[222] But this comes only after he has made similar disclaimers for Cicero and Ovid, so that such a protest seems more literary posturing than genuine complaint. In general, he simply shares with her a sense of frustration over the inadequacy of words and a letter to convey one's true feelings.[223]

Yet the letter—and its composition—remained a crucial part of their relationship, even, perhaps especially, when that relationship was threatened. Letter 58 heralds a major (although temporary, it turns out) rift between the two, and the subsequent letters reveal the extent of their falling out:

> [Woman]: Take your complaints away from me, I will not hear your words any more. For where I expected many good things to be of benefit to me, there emerged instead tearful sighs of the heart.
>
> [Man]: Certainly if anyone examined your words more thoroughly, he would find them to be not those of a lover but of one seeking estrangement. Nowhere in them do I detect a tender heart, but rather I perceive a cruel breast and one impregnable to love.[224]

Despite such inflammatory words, the woman somehow manages to avoid responding in kind. Instead, she steers their letters toward the subject of composition and her claims of incompetence, although it is difficult not to detect an underlying sarcasm: "If such cleverness of expression were within me that I could respond prudently to your words, I would reply to you however gracefully I could with a willing spirit. But nevertheless, although I am not capable of doing so satisfactorily, I shall reply as best I can and within the limits of my small learning."[225] The man accepts her lead and, adopting the tone of the teacher, initially provides a critique of her letter, before succumbing to the language of the lover eager for reconciliation: "The letter which you sent had a logical and orderly arrangement, and it contained mature judgements. Certainly I have never seen anything more fittingly set out. God willing, I shall keep aside for you, sweetest, many very sweet and joyful hours."[226] Significantly, the pedagogical dimension of their relationship proves to be a point of stability amid the emotional turmoil, for only following its reestablishment is emotional harmony restored. Such a central role for the letter is suggestive of a relationship founded initially on training in Latin composition and evidently one in which the well-composed letter could also play a reconciliatory role.

The strategy of using the conventions and implications of the salutation to go succinctly and subtly beyond its conventional formality finds a striking parallel in the canonical letters of Heloise to Abelard. In her famous first letter to him after reading the *Historia calamitatum,* Heloise reestablished their correspondence with the following salutation: "To her master, or rather her father, husband, or rather brother; (from) his handmaid, or rather his daughter, wife, or rather sister; to Abelard, Heloise."[227] With these words she evocatively and succinctly captured the memories evoked by renewed contact with her former lover. Abelard's salutation in reply—"To Heloise, his dearly beloved sister in Christ, (from) Abelard her brother in Christ"—makes it clear that he prefers to avoid the issue of their past and to focus on their current relationship. His letter provokes what initially appears to be a rather pedantic response from Heloise: "I am surprised, my only love, that contrary to custom in letter-writing and, indeed, to the natural order, you have thought fit to put my name before yours in the greeting which heads your letter, so that we have woman before man, wife before husband, handmaid before master, nun before monk, deaconess before priest and abbess before abbot."[228] But is Heloise here really indulging in point-scoring over epistolary correctness? The picture we have of her from the rest of her correspondence with Abelard suggests otherwise, as do the forgoing observations on the epistolary skill and sensitivity of the de Vepria correspondents. Is it not more likely that Heloise, inevitably recalling their earlier love letters where each writer would have routinely placed the other's name first, was stung by the inappropriateness of Abelard's readoption of that practice? The more sympathetic interpretation would be to see Heloise's objection as a cry of the heart evoked by the bittersweet reminder of their former relationship, perhaps too as a cutting remark that sprang from anger, and certainly a provocative challenge to Abelard to confront their past openly.[229]

A final topic in the area of dictaminal/*trivium* studies is the use of *cursus* patterns. Peter Dronke has argued that Heloise's known letters make use of a peculiar *cursus* pattern linked with that of the contemporary Italian dictaminal expert Albertus Samaritanus[230]: "a preponderance of [*cursus*] 'tardus' over 'velox' [which] is extremely unusual in medieval Latin rhythmic prose."[231] This view has not gained much acceptance from

those skilled in the area.[232] Nevertheless, in view of the fact that "the *cursus* was not invented by the *dictatores* but was widely practiced in Europe for several centuries before formal descriptions of its rules began to appear in the French *artes dictandi* of the late twelfth century,"[233] it is worth asking what *cursus* patterns are evident in the de Vepria collection. The following is a brief sampling.

We start with the contention of Tore Janson "that in the period we are studying, when Latin was no one's mother tongue, and its users had several languages and prosodies, it was hardly possible for anyone to grasp the principles of [accentual] *cursus* only by reading or listening to Latin texts. One had to be taught before one could produce *cursus,* or even recognise it in the Latin of others."[234] With this in mind we have analyzed the sentence-end *cursus* patterns[235] of letters 22 (V), 23 (M), 24 (V), 25 (M), 49 (M), and 50 (V) in the de Vepria collection. Every sentence-end has been coded thus:

1 = monosyllable
2 = bisyllable, always paroxytone ('p')
pp = (trisyllabic) proparoxytone

All other words in the selected sentence endings have been codified as 'p' or 'pp' followed by the number of syllables in the word. This is a variant of Janson's own method. We have accepted as formally 'velox' the following terminations:

pp p4
pp p5
pp pp5

We have accepted as 'tardus' *clausulae* the following combinations:

p4 pp4
2 pp4
2 pp5
pp pp
pp 4pp
pp 4pp
pp pp4

We have accepted as 'planus' *clausulae* the following combinations:

2 p3
2 p4
p5
pp 2
p3 p3

If these words are found in the selected sentence endings, they are described as "actual" *cursus* endings. If, on the other hand, we pay regard only to terminal rhythm and not to the syllabic content of the final words of the selected sentence endings, then we accept as "virtual" *cursus* endings the following rhythms[236]:

'velox':–""–' or–"""–' or–""–" (where–is a stressed syllable and ' an unstressed one)
'tardus':–"–" or–"'–"
'planus':–"–' or–"'–'

The sample covers a total of thirty-eight sentence endings for "vir" and seventy-three for "mulier." Sixty-eight percent of sentence endings for *both* "vir" *and* "mulier" do *not* conform to "actual" *cursus* patterns as defined above. Of those that do conform, we find 21 percent of the total of sentence endings for the man are 'planus', 2.6 percent 'velox', and 7.9 percent 'tardus'. For the woman 15 percent are 'planus', 4.1 percent 'velox', and 12.3 percent 'tardus'. If we take into account only the basic rhythmic patterns, then 34.2 percent of the sentence endings for the man do not conform to *cursus* rhythms, but only 23.3 percent of the woman's sentence endings do not conform. Of those that do conform, 42.1 percent of the total sentence endings for V are 'planus', 5.3 percent 'velox', and 18.5 percent 'tardus', contrasting with 39.8 percent of sentence endings for M as 'planus', 12.13 percent 'velox', and 24.7 percent 'tardus'.[237]

Thus, 68 percent of sentence endings for both writers do not conform to the actual *cursus* patterns taught in twelfth-century and later textbooks, with Abelard showing a preference for 'planus', then 'tardus', then 'velox' patterns, and Heloise showing a reduced preference for 'planus' and a greater interest in 'velox' and 'tardus' endings. If we consider basic sentence-ending rhythms, without regard to word-syllable length, Heloise's nonconforming sentence endings drop to an interesting low of 23.3 percent as against 34.2 percent for Abelard, with both writers displaying again a preference for 'planus' endings, then 'tardus', then 'velox', but with Heloise again showing much greater interest than Abelard in 'velox' and 'tardus' with less interest (by a small percentage) in 'planus' endings.

Our initial conclusion, then, is that neither party in the de Vepria letters has consciously learned or sought to imitate the formulaic *cursus* pattern endings of twelfth- and thirteenth-century dictaminal manuals—a circumstance that may be seen as an argument for the spontaneity and authenticity of the letters in question—but that the woman displays a greater "unconscious" absorption of and sensitivity to the approved patterns than the man, and was more receptive to all types of endings than he was. This conclusion confirms an impression we have that Heloise expresses herself naturally and fully in prose and is less adept at "distinguishing" genres and generating compositions that illustrate the different requirements of nonrhythmic prose, rhythmic prose, verse using classical meters, and accentual verse, whereas Abelard is prosaic in prose, less interested in rhythmic prose, good at verse using classical meters, and a positive genius at accentual verse. Again, Abelard is the "compartmentalized" mind, Heloise the integrated person. Such comparisons do not take into account a careful study of all the verse Heloise might be said to have written, but sum up our current impressions.

Further, the de Vepria collection reveals how the nature and conventions of the letter were an ever-present and conscious backdrop to the amatory relationship. These conventions constituted not only a stylistic goal to be aspired toward for its own sake but a framework against which variations inevitably carried meaning. The salutation was especially suited to this role, for its formulaic nature allowed it to convey its meaning structurally as well as linguistically. Through variation, imitation, and innovation of their salutations, the lovers could implicitly acknowledge and celebrate their shared lit-

erary culture, confirm their mutual understanding, and engage in amorous play. Far from being solely a formulaic, ornamental part of the letter, then, the medieval salutation in many ways constituted a barometer of the amorous epistolary relationship.

This of course presumes a heightened awareness of the form and symbolism of the letter, one conceivably produced in a pedagogical context and/or scholastic environment. Heloise's correspondence clearly displays such awareness. The woman of the de Vepria collection shows a similar sensitivity, along with a dictaminal creativity and prodigiousness not incompatible with Heloise's. In many ways, her male correspondent shows similar affinities with the picture of Abelard that emerges from his letters to Heloise, although these could conceivably stem from the pedagogical role they share. Nevertheless, the common preoccupation with and sensitivity toward epistolary form displayed by both couples constitutes further evidence that the de Vepria correspondence may represent the early letters of Abelard and Heloise.

The major emphasis of Heloise's prose style and literary leanings, in fact, have been well emphasized by Dronke himself in several publications[238] and conform to what we know of Latin stylistic developments in the later part of the eleventh century and the early twelfth.[239] The de Vepria collection strengthens and reinforces this knowledge and, if Mews's view of authorship is accepted, provides new raw materials for a more precise estimation of the state of Heloise's literary expertise at the time of her meeting with Abelard. If, as letter 87 indicates, most of the de Vepria collection was written during a single year, it is clear that Heloise must have brought most of her skills to the relationship rather than learned them during it. We have to imagine, therefore, a much more mature and equally balanced relationship, with Heloise demonstrating, perhaps, fuller acquaintance with and interest in prose style and the grammatical *auctores* and Abelard a more professional knowledge of the arts of the *trivium* as taught in the cathedral schools of his day, and with a greater degree of sophistication and expertise in the writing of poetry. While such conclusions are no more than many have long suspected or asserted, it is fascinating to see the pattern of linguistic skills displayed by teacher and pupil in action some fifteen or more years before writing the materials on which estimates of Heloise's literary and intellectual attainments have hitherto been based.

Conclusion: Heloise the Arts Student, or Heloise the Anomaly?

We are compelled, we believe, to see Heloise not as the surviving member of a larger class of females attending the proto-university cathedral schools of Paris more or less on the same terms as males but as a *rara avis,* a young woman attracted to the environment of the city's schools by exceptional circumstances, circumstances not unrelated to her obvious literary talents but not a direct consequence of them. Once there she seems to have become renowned for her literary talents, but without formally enrolling as a student in any one of the masters' schools that were available at the time. She must have been, as it were, "partially" in circulation, but not so fully as to make opportunities for acquaintance easy for Abelard. Nevertheless, some chance opportunities to see her would not have been unexpected, and, as he tells us, "hanc igitur, omnibus circunspectis que amantes allicere solent, commodiorem censui in amorem mihi copulare."[240] He goes on, in famous lines, to say he felt her love for and knowledge of letters [*litterarum scientiam*] would facilitate his conquest. Once in communication with

Heloise, however, Abelard found that sex and genuine intellectual exchange and partnership were hard to keep apart, and the result seems to have been not unlike that envisaged in a recent film for the early seventeenth-century female painter Artemisia, and her older, skilled artist-lover, Agostino Tasso, whom Artemisia's father had engaged to "teach her."[241] Heloise's attempt to sort out her own emotions, the relationship between letters and love, between Abelard and the rest of her life, are vividly recalled in the de Vepria collection, but we are forced to conclude that what Abelard and Heloise taught each other or learned from each other belonged in the main to a world that was passing, the world of the Loire monastic verse friendship ambience. Transferred though this clearly was to the much more dynamic environment of the early twelfth-century Paris schools, fused with a genuine and relatively unrestricted physical relationship, and translated (for the most part) into prose of a unique and varying pattern, it is nevertheless observable that Heloise does not seem to have shared in the intellectual activities of the schools in her district. While not excluded from discussions with Abelard on various terms and positions that must have fallen within the fields of rational and moral philosophy, their mutual reading and "exercises" clearly fell more within the field of "grammar," sensitive reading and imitation of the prescribed *auctores,* exploration of the literary dimensions of *amicitia* as an alternative to *nuptiae* as a foundation for a sexual relationship, of *amor* as "a creative and complex natural force expressed in the sweetness of lovers' intimacy."[242] In all these respects the de Vepria collection does not so much change our picture of Heloise and Abelard in the second decade of the twelfth century, as sharpen it immensely and reveal its tragic poignancies, the shortcomings of the male and the infinite flexibility and optimism of the female, laying all the while a much firmer basis of understanding of the later, more celebrated letter collection and its vain but moving demand for a resumption of the dialogue that has been preserved for us in the "lost" letter collection.

APPENDIX A

A DETAILED READING OF THE "LOST" LOVE LETTERS AND THE *HISTORIA CALAMITATUM*

The following analysis of the way that the "lost" love letters (letters 1 to 83) might fit into the known biographical details of Heloise and Abelard will seem an odd appendix to a chapter devoted to the young Heloise's Latin rhetoric. Yet much of the sense of Heloise's Latin studies at this point in her life can be gained only from a close study of these "lost" letters. Since their authenticity can become clear only after readers have pondered Mews's book on the subject, it seems preferable to take any reader through the letters, avoiding the translations and commentary Mews provides. In this way we allow the place of letters to emerge from the involvements of life rather than break the letters down into systematized categories, as E. Le Roy Ladurie has done for his source in *Montaillou: Cathars and Catholics in a French Village 1294–1324,* trans. B. Bray (New York: Penguin Books, 1980), a method that has destroyed in large part the individuality of the characters with which he deals. Such a procedure should only be attempted when all of Heloise's prose and poetry is available for consideration and close study. For the moment then, the place of the *trivium* in life and letters for men and women at Paris in the second decade of the twelfth century AD, must be left to filter through to the reader's mind, as the human relationship between Abelard and Heloise unfolds *in litteris.*

It is clear that the de Vepria collection contains only some of the letters exchanged by Abelard and Heloise at different times, and most have been expurgated and deprived of unequivocal references to events of their lives. Thus it is difficult to make comparisons with the extant letter collection of Heloise and Abelard: these latter are longer, complete, and specific in their reference to detail, and both writers were clearly more skilled at the longer epistolary form in the 1130s than they were twenty years earlier.[243]

The de Vepria correspondence[244] opens—if the order of extracts has anything to do with the chronological order of composition[245]—with the *mulier* emphasizing a kind of profound religious friendship within the orbit of devotion to Christ (#3 [M])[246] of the sort that must have been devised to link Baudri with his female correspondents,[247] and with the *vir* presenting a kind of lassitude (#2 [V])[248] that sits well with the statement in the *Historia calamitatum* that just prior to his affair with Heloise, Abelard was gripped with a "mundana tranquillitas" that "vigorem enervat animi."[249] Heloise (accepting her identification with the *mulier*) alludes to the invigorating effect of her friendship when she offers her addressee, whose youth is fading,[250] the bloom of eternal happiness (#1 [M]) and seeks, for her own part, *tota ars, ingenium,* and *peritia philosophie,* in the belief that this will enable her to greet Abelard (accepting his identification with *vir*) in writing ["scriptis"] "ad consensum mee voluntatis" (the latter phrase tallying with the "ad consensum traherem" of *HC* M 303). Curiously, however, if we see these exchanges as opening the correspondence indicated in *HC* M 298—and letter 9 with its "litteris iuxta preceptum tuum intercurrentibus precordialis inter nos firmetur amicicia" confirms the impression—Heloise sees "peritia philosophie" to be a prerequisite and not a consequence of the new acquaintance, and looks to heaven for it, not to Abelard himself. Indeed, she is often otherwise preoccupied (#11: "quia ocium in scribendo non habeo"; #17: "quod tu tarda distulisti"; and #22: "et tu tamen ita differs") and has acquired without Abelard a good knowledge of Latin

Reimprosa,[251] mastery of a number of classical, scriptural, and patristic texts, elementary knowledge of the liberal arts[252] and a penchant for novel or unusual expressions or strings of words (#18: "sub immarcido liliorum candore"; #21: "inextinguibilis . . . superabilis . . . insanabilis . . . medicabilis"; #25: "assiduitas familiaritatem, familiaritas fiduciam, fiducia negligenciam, negligencia fastidium peperit"; #49: "rose immarcessibili"; #53: "guttula scibilitatis"; #62: "presentialiter"; #86: "inepotabili"; #94: "innexibilis"; etc.). Despite professions of disciplinary subordination (#5, 23, 25, 49, 53, 62, 76, etc.),[253] Heloise often hints at the equality of her intellectual position and the value of what she writes[254]; Abelard accepts this estimation of herself (#18–19, 24, 50, etc.). In letter 98 Heloise actually refers to Abelard as "the novice" [Tyroni et amantium dulcissimo] and herself as "fundamentum stabilis amicicie"![255]

In letter 3 [M] Heloise provides a *salutatio* mentioning her most pure love for Abelard, who is worthy of the most intimate loyalty, because of the state of true affection [*dilectionis*] between them and the secret of dear trust. The mention of secret is appropriate at this stage of their relationship.[256] Heloise places much emphasis upon God as the mediator between them, on Christ who as king of kings will save Abelard for the sweetest of eternities, on Him who rules everything on earth. These hints at Heloise's already existing religious feelings perhaps help supply a want in the picture of her provided by D. M. Stone in 1989.[257]

Letter 4 (V) asserts that Heloise is daily sweeter to Abelard and is now particularly cherished and is in all things to be cherished; Abelard offers Heloise the same unchangeable constancy of sincere trust that she offered in letter 3. Abelard calls Heloise a most brilliant star, his most noble sweetness and his only consolation, his health/welfare. The "nunc quam maxime" may refer to some new (sexual?) stage in their relationship.

In letter 5 (M) Heloise calls Abelard her joyous hope and offers her trust, herself with all devotion as long as she is living. She asks that the dispenser of all art and human talent fill the interior of her breast with the skilled knowledge of philosophy necessary for her to greet Abelard, her most cherished, in writings as much as she wants. This seems to fit the relationship at this stage, based on mutual learning and mutual writing, with Heloise aspiring to an appropriate amount of learning for the purposes of writing appropriately to the teacher.[258] This letter has been copied completely by Johannes de Vepria, despite its apparent lack of literary flourish.

Abelard replies with letter 6 (V), continuing the star image of letter 4, saying that he has recently delighted in Heloise's rays (a sexual reference?) and hoping she will remain in cloudless splendor. He calls her his sweetest mistress [*domina*], who instructs [*precepisti*], presumably in love, or the art of love-letter writing, or perhaps even in the idea of commencing such a correspondence, because the next phrase says "or, to speak more truly, since the most ardent flame of love compels [him]," her beloved cannot contain himself but must in place of his presence, greet her by means of a letter [*litterarum officio*]. He says he cannot refrain from writing to her in place of his presence because she instructs him, or, better, the ardent flame of love commands him. His *valedictio* is rhythmic but not rhyming, though we have the repetition of *mea/mea*. The *valedictio* also contains a neat idea: I am never awake without finding you located in my mind. The letter has a certain prosiness (the two *quin*s, the "ut verius dicam" [cf. also #16 (V) for this phrase]). It has been copied by de Vepria completely. It falls presumably within the period during which Abelard and Heloise lived in Fulbert's house following the "oscula quam sententie" of *HC* M 337, either as a quasi-literary exchange or something thrust into the hands of the go-between to explain a day away at the schools during which Abelard is unable to provide a "lesson" for Heloise.

Letter 7 (M) introduces an odd note of caution [*hucusque dilecto*], despite which Abelard is "semper diligendo." Heloise offers rather prosy greetings (but with her whole "re et affectu"), joy [*gaudia* has a sexual overtone in Ovid, *Her.* XVI.319],[259] and the progress/profit/convalescence [*profectum*] of all usefulness and uprightness. The *valedictio* is emotional in that "vale" is repeated; there is more stress on God [*regnum dei*]. The *salutatio* of letter 9 (M) is full of set biblical phrases, implying that Abelard has a sort of biblical importance for Heloise. She goes on to say that she greatly desires that a very deep friendship should develop between them nourished by

letters as their go-betweens. This is in accordance with his "preceptum" (whereas in letter 6 he says it is her "preceptum"). All this is accompanied by a longed-for anticipation of the actual sight of Abelard. This suggests that the two are some way apart or not actually able to meet as often as Heloise would like, a situation difficult to square with Abelard's residence in Fulbert's house. (Is the letter out of place, or did Abelard from time to time leave Paris or stay elsewhere for periods of days?) Heloise's *salutatio* in letter 11 (M) is nicely expanded and conveys the notion of herself as the most trusted of all. The only sentence de Vepria has copied from the body of the letter expresses in rhythmic and rhymed prose her complete love, beyond any contrived concealment [*ulla secreti machinacio*].[260] *HC* M 363 "paucos . . . decipere" may also refer to their need to "keep up pretences." Again Heloise calls upon God to be her witness. This is an element absent from Abelard's letters. If genuine, it would suggest that Heloise began as the more religiously committed of the two, a circumstance appropriate for someone who grew up in a convent and was the niece of a canon, living with him. To some extent their later career reverses these positions.

In letter 13 (M; de Vepria omits the *salutatio*), Heloise uses the technical terms *benivolencia* and *officio* to say that Abelard has won her goodwill, and her *officium* is to be submissive/beholden to him.[261] She cannot give as many *salutes* as she would like but does not want to specify those she does not send because to do so might somehow prejudice those she does send. This is a difficult sentiment to make out and recalls (although not in language) Catullus' playing with the number of *basia* that must be exchanged by himself and his lover (e.g., Catullus, poems 5 and 7). Heloise then implies that she does write, again and again, repetitively because he and she are, as it were, the same person.[262] So it is like talking to oneself. In him she lives, yet in that she lives in him she dies in herself (says her *valedictio*). These complicated ideas seem worthy for their message rather than their elegant style—de Vepria could hardly be copying them for the latter aspect.

De Vepria copies the whole of letter 14 (V), a little letter that sets out the epistolary situation, perhaps as it existed during Abelard's and Heloise's joint residence in Fulbert's house[263]: they are exchanging wax tablets. As each one arrives the interlocutor is expected to read it and add a reply; but it seems that it must be done while the courier waits, for he says that he would write more if only he could hang on to the tablets a little longer; he then reveals this to be only a conceit by saying that even if he had all the time in the world for writing and did nothing else, he would never run out of material owing to her great honesty and merit as he sees them. Again it seems unlikely that de Vepria copied this letter out for its style. Equally unlikely is it that we have here but an imitation of the classical love and wax tablets theme (as, e.g., in Ovid, *Amores* 1.11 and 12). The usages in the de Vepria excerpt collection seem so individual as to suggest the actual use of wax tablets, not a reading of their use in past times. This is, indeed, the conclusion of all modern students of the wax tablet in the Middle Ages,[264] and the conclusion suggested by such passages as that in which Guibert of Nogent states that when forced to prepare his *Hexameron* commentary "in secret" [*clam*], he did not entrust the composition and writing to wax tablets (as would presumably have been the case had he been composing in the normal manner) but rather put what he had to write by way of commentary without alteration straight on to the parchment.[265]

Letter 15 (V) is another wax tablet two-liner. The allusion seems indeed to be to Ovid, *Her.* XXVI.320, where Paris speaks of Helen sleeping alone without him, and opines that if they were to share *communia gaudia,* then it would truly be as bright as day in the middle of the night for him. *Candidus* thus stands for a brilliant sexual night.[266] So Abelard wishes Heloise such a night and with him. It is a wish that would certainly be appropriate in a house where their relationship is expected to be strictly intellectual.

The *salutatio* of letter 16 (V) contains a technical term familiar to Abelard.[267] Here he seems to be adopting realist terminology; he asserts that he and Heloise share a commonality (the seal[268] and its imprint) because although they are distinct, they are similar in their lack of difference. (The realist would say the lack of difference concerns their humanity, whereas for lovers

it is their common troth—and here Abelard emphasizes the notion of being "totus in te" as is often found in their exchanges [cf. #6, 7, etc.].) As if taking up the cue from letter 8, he now accuses her of forgetting the man who is her very soul (i.e., himself), using the language of the Roman love poets (*immemor,*[269] *oblita,*[270] *dura*[271]), although he still claims, with his prosy "ut verius dicam" (cf. also letter 6) to be one with her ("totus in te," etc.). We have here either the required lover's tiff or some genuine slight, loss of contact or diversion, put interestingly but not very elegantly.

In letter 12 (V) Abelard offers a kind of courtly love service (according to the *amoris regula*) and feels that this is rewarded by Heloise's deeds as well as by her words. This emphasis is picked up again strongly in letter 22 (V), where Abelard writes that a divorce has developed between the words he addresses to others and the meaning [*intentio*] that is always reserved for Heloise. He alludes to the same circumstance in *Historia calamitatum* (M 348ff.). What is it that Heloise "does" to earn Abelard's gratitude here? Despite Dronke's opinion,[272] it seems possible to equate letter 22, with its hint at the poem often ascribed to Abelard, *Hebet sydus*[273] (#22: "sine te [h]ebes"), and *HC* M 347ff. "nocturnas amori vigilias et diurnas studio . . . carmina . . . amatoria, non philosophie secreta," to suggest that under cover of some "secreti machinacio" (#11), many a white night (#15) is being passed. Heloise herself later referred to frequent letters and frequent *carmina* accompanying "turpes voluptates" at this time.[274]

It is clear from a letter such as 23 (M) and Heloise's own remarks that Heloise is either attending the schools as freely as Abelard or has acquired very considerable literacy from them prior to Abelard's onslaught.[275] "Me platee omnes, me domus singule resonabant": would not Heloise also have trod those streets and passed those houses in the course of her studies? "Cum me ad turpes olim voluptates expeteres": Abelard and Heloise go about their studies and business with Heloise under Abelard's *magisterium,* except for those moments when Abelard might be free and was "teaching" Heloise, and any other moments when he "sought her out" [expeteres] for sex.[276]

Letter 23 (M) is a set-piece demonstration of dictaminal competence: it is a combination of rhymed *isocola,*[277] apostrophe,[278] *amplificatio/chiasmus*[279] ["liberalis benignitas et benigna liberalitas"], and *exercitatio* in the demonstrative or epideictic oratorical *genus:* the exercise is to praise Abelard by way of a *controversia* or *altercatio,* or presentation of competing *persuasiones* [*hortamen/dehortamen*],[280] and Heloise reveals an acquaintance with the technographic rhetorical literature.[281] The didactic fiction here blends life and learning: assume the task is to praise Abelard in a letter, assume a contrast between *copia dicendi* and *sublimia* on one hand and *defectus ingenii* on the other; assume that the student comes to the master for the nectar of his eloquent tongue (#23: "suavi oris . . . nectare") and assume that beyond the words of the exercise (#23: "Quid pluribus opus est verbis?") lies the urgency behind the instruction, the "dilectio/amor" before the eyes of God (#23: "Deo teste") that binds the couple in their novel and presumably still officially secret relationship. This letter and its response (#24 [V]) reveal both the scope and seriousness of the exercises and instruction that surrounded the core of their relationship and the amount of current scholastic learning that marked Heloise's approach to life.

Abelard's response (#24 [V]) compliments Heloise ("litterarum tuarum copiosa . . . ubertas") and reveals that much of their scholarly dialogue must have been on the very subject of their relationship and the relationship between themselves and the *amicitia* of which Cicero spoke and which was so much in the air among monks and clerics of the day. In their relationship they are equals, all trace of master/student disappears: "eque annuimus, eque negamus, idem per omnia sapimus." When one writes, the other thinks the same things. There is a similitude between their *mores* and their *studia* (#25).

In this latter *littera* (#25 [M]), written it seems away from Paris ("ast nunc, tui presencia dum careo, cantibus volucrum, viriditate nemorum permota amore tuo langueo")[282] Heloise presents a considered reflection on "verus amor" as perceived "naturali intuitu" (although the reading of Cicero's *De amicitia* lies behind the reflections).[283] Their relationship must now take on new intensity: hitherto it has been but a simulation of love, a matter of "soothing and simple words"

[verba mollia et plana]: the "veri amoris officia" require an eternity that even life cannot fulfill. There must always be a shortfall in what a friend can do and does for a friend, just as "in te salutandi officio" there is a shortfall between "velle"[284] and "sufficientia." In language that seems an unlikely candidate for scholastic dictaminal imitation, and which while lamenting the physical separation of the lovers expresses an appropriateness about the preservation of desire and longing that absence promotes (and presence kills), Heloise refers to Abelard's initiation of their relationship: "indeed, it was with great enthusiasm that you began to want me ["me appetere"—"to try to get access to me"] when the friendship between us was born, and it was with an increased enthusiasm that you strove to increase and to make permanent our affection," but things did not go smoothly and you made your happiness and your bitterness mine. But you (Heloise addresses Abelard) should not have tried to complete what was perfect: it is one thing to complete what we have begun, quite another to try to increase what is complete.[285] You see, we display complete charity [*integra caritas*] toward all, but that does not mean we love [*diligimus*] everyone in the same way: that which is general to all becomes special when directed toward certain people in particular: it is one thing to be invited to court to advise a ruler [*princeps*], quite another to be drawn to love someone. (Heloise uses the words "ad amorem trahi," as Abelard had said "ad consensum traherem" [*HC* M 304].)

Where is this thought train going? Why did de Vepria choose to copy it out? Although nicely patterned, the drift is obscure and hardly useful for *imitatio.* The climax of obscurity is reached with the sentence "and so I do not owe you so much thanks because you didn't turn me away, but because you took me up with open hand": there is a difference between being actually welcomed ("drawn to love") and merely received ("to give advice," Abelard in the analogy being the prince). Heloise is thanking Abelard for treating her as special rather than general. So there is a difference between genuine and continuous love, and mere "verba mollia et plana": to love Abelard is general, to forget him is special. That is to say, to require words all the time is to distrust: their relationship has gone beyond this and if Abelard cannot trust Heloise without continual reinforcement, his love is not "verus."

The point of the letter steals in with suddenness: "tam fideli amice rarus[286] esse noli": Abelard has been "distant" on some pretext or other and has not provided "colloquium et presencia secundum velle meum," that is, has not sought her out in person.[287] In his response—if letter 26 (V) is a response—Abelard admits that he does not yet "know" Heloise "interius" and calls upon her sweet breast [*pectus*], her complete charm [*integra venustate*], and her juice-filled body [*corpus succi plenissimum*] to reveal its secrets.

The *litterae* that follow suggest a gamut of situations[288]: the jealousy and tittle-tattle of the envious (#28 [V])[289]; apparently bleak moments when Heloise seeing all her ambitions, hopes, relationships going astray, is reliant on Abelard alone but hints that this is even more hopeless a plight than that of Ovid's wife as her husband went into exile: Heloise cannot even utter the sad words that marked the ancient occasion[290]; illness and light snowfalls (#32 [M]); renewed zeal for composition (#33 [V]: "novus dictandi fervor") and meetings—*colloquia*—that suggest a still covert relationship and some measure of living at different addresses or in distinctly different parts of a largish establishment (#34 [M]); minor differences (#35 [V] in which the classical opposition between the *vir/homo durus* and the *sermo mollis . . . suavis* of the woman is mentioned[291]; and letter 36 [V] in which a degree of estrangement is associated with the use of the term *domina* and the replacement of the "tu" by the "vos"; hints of sexual frustration (#37 [V] "Interroga nuncium quid egi, postquam litteras perscripsi . . ." and letter 38a [V] "tangere sic pectus iam gestio temet anhelus"). Exchanges of verse (one with a Catullan hint) suggest the practical dictaminal range of the *exercitia* set up between the two, and one short letter seems to say that the teacher has on the occasion in question no particular "praeceptum" for composition: the student should just write something, a couple of words at least (#41 [V]).[292]

This last four-line *littera* (copied intact by de Vepria [why?]), so simple and didactic as it may seem, is followed by three more from Abelard (#42–44 [V]) that suggest an interruption to the

literary exchange and a distancing on the part of Heloise. The way flashes of classical texts glitter behind the prose of these *litterae*[293] suggests not that they are composed as dictaminal models but that the vicissitudes of life are fusing with the processes of learning, a unique feature of the humanism of this transitional moment in Western history.[294]

Letter 45 (M) and 49 (M)–50 (V) demonstrate this. Letter 45 seems to refer to a departure of Abelard from "France" (not recorded here in the *Historia calamitatum* but compare "nec aliud relictum fuit patrie" with the word "repatriare" at *HC* M 156) and laments the relationship thus ruptured both lyrically (in the *salutatio*) and learnedly (in the allusions found in the remaining body of the letter). By this time their physical relationship has reduced the role of letters (cf. also # 46 [V]–48 [M]), but, as the *Historia calamitatum* indicates, even the news of Heloise's pregnancy was conveyed to Abelard in writing (M 393).

Letter 49 is another great excursus on the nature of the friendship/love that unites the pair.[295] Its significance is perhaps indicated by the fact that although three pages in length, it is copied by de Vepria without apparent deletions. This essay on the nature of friendship begins conventionally by pointing out the distinction between friendship based on probity, virtue, and deep love and that based on expectation of riches or pleasures. After an arresting *salutatio* in which "she" [*illa*], describing Abelard, in ecclesiastical Latin, as "an unwithering rose" and "the blooming flower of blessedness," [offers him] a *chiasmus* "florendo crescere et crescendo florere," Heloise points out that her love for Abelard is based on a "quite different agreement" [pacto longe tibi alio]: "sola excellentissima virtus," not a "sitis habendi" compelled her to love Abelard. Much of the argument here is faithfully echoed later by Heloise in her response to the *Historia calamitatum*.[296] The theme is suddenly interrupted by a dense ten-line sentence that invokes in spell-binding detail the deeply tangled nature of their extraordinary relationship: a young woman known throughout "France" for her learning (*HC* M 288), locked into an emotional and physical relationship with the same kingdom's greatest master ["cui jure cedit francigena cervicositas"], confesses that the relationship has no future other than in an uneven correspondence and that, even thus, she cannot attain the heights of her partner/teacher's fame and eloquence. The letter contains mixed themes and emotions. Protestation of an urge to pursue learning with Abelard without regard to career or fortune mix with a profound understanding of the new processes surrounding the acquisition of "florid eloquence" (the ingestion to the point of habit of devoted attentions to every detail and every setting forth [*dispositio*] of the arts),[297] with the realization that she herself lacks that capacity for comprehensive detail and that even if she were perfected to her fingernails in such matters, such crafted skill in the arts would be no match for the virtues, the moral charisma of her partner in life. The contrast between oral, ethical charisma and the new craft of the *artes* suggests again that confrontation between eleventh-century and twelfth-century humanism hinted at by Jaeger.

Thus Heloise confesses—in language that recalls a rather more routine letter that Stephen of Blois sent his wife, Adela—that it is great temerity for her "to send words to you in the manner of a letter,"[298] for it is not good enough to "floridum eloquencie vultum depingere" as if it were worthy of the sight of so great a master, for someone whose talents *were* "honed to a pitch"[299] and whose ingestion of the system of the *artes* has been perfected by long habit and close attention. At this point Heloise shifts key enigmatically—"much less to me (she goes on, the dative matching *conspectui* immediately preceding and *cuique* four lines previously) who seems scarcely ready for such insubstantial/fickle/unreliable/inconstant things, things which certainly do not savour of gnawed fingernails, or thumped desks." We are abruptly informed that it is not so much Abelard's greatness that shames such eloquence (of which Heloise is incapable) but the shameful nature of the composition. To explicate this Heloise has given us the clue: Persius, *Sat.* 1.106, where the poet is deploring the verse of the day and, by implication, the corrupt, hedonistic morals that produce it.[300] The inference we derive from line 106 is that real "quality" verse should derive from gnawing of the fingernails and thumping of the desk: the poets of Persius' day engage in no such hard work. Heloise, however, is telling Abelard, and us, that even if someone were to produce their best composition [*floridum eloquencie vultum*], she

herself would consider it trite and deceptive. Eloquence is a false indicator of truth, and it is rash to write letters to Abelard because the better they were, the less truthful they would be, the less they would involve genuine fingernail-gnawing and desk-thumping. There is even a sort of irony. The "honed-to-a-pitch" writer has "omnis dispositio artium" transformed into habit by diligent and long-standing attention, but Heloise is not so "arranged" [*vix videor disposita*]: for her, fingernail-gnawing and desk-thumping betoken a real person facing real moral dilemmas, not a consummate poet of the day producing "spumosum et cortice pingui,/ut ramale vetus vegrandi subere coctum."[301]

Part of the ambiguity of Heloise's prose at this point is created by the word *michi* ["nedum michi"], which seems to be a dative of indirect object but may well be a dative of agent, implying not a parallelism with "tanti magistri . . . conspectui" but with "cuique litteratissimo" read in another way: "it is not good enough even for a most polished person to produce eloquence, let alone for me to do so. . . ." The latter rendition fits in with the theme that Heloise is incapable of the literary capacities she aspires to, whereas the former opens up a much darker theme, that eloquence is a (male) fraud. She immediately goes on to stress Abelard as a man of virtue and moral integrity to whom proud France and the arrogant world would yield;[302] she then switches to the literary theme: whoever might have prepared himself [or whatever speech/document might have been composed], whoever might have thought himself to be a by-word for learning, at once he would judge himself to be tongueless and mute [when confronted by so morally charismatic a figure as Abelard]. There is even a usage from Jerome's letters[303] to hint at Abelard's literary *persona*.[304]

The letter continues with an odd usage of 'credula' used of a thing rather than a person. We are brought to mind of Ovid's "credula res amor est" from *Heroides* 6.21. The context is suggestive. Jason, having made Hypsipyle pregnant, has been slow to correspond with her once he departed in search of the Golden Fleece, and rumors of his infidelity have reached the Lemnian maiden. Yet, she says, if one is in love, one will always believe in the best outcome and discredit the rumors. So she continues to hope that Jason will be faithful to the marriage vows he made her. A comparable context of a possibly unfaithful lover in Ovid sees the same phrase used in the opposite sense: that love makes us disbelieve the truth.[305] Heloise, perhaps with these competing, self-undermining contexts in mind says that Abelard's kindness ["benignitas"] will always seem credible to her (or will seem misplaced), because she believes that underlying it, sewn into it as it were, is (or should be) the undying friendship of love ["dilectionis indefectam amiciciam"]. That is why she can send him unpolished letters, rude in style, because they say the moral truth to someone of great virtue, better than polished eloquence from someone whose eloquence may exceed their morals (or because *litterae* and truth are in any case incompatible).

In dark and opaque phrases the letter goes on to hint that this "indefective caritatis dulcedinis . . . stimulus" which drives Heloise to love Abelard may well be lacking in his case, and, if she had her way, there would be much cause for her to write her (unpolished) letters (because she would believe Abelard's *benignitas*): she would write only to him, if her estimation of his "dilectionis indefecta amicicia" (= *mea res?*) truly warranted it, and then, it would be her delight never to have a holiday from writing—though he might not reply because (a) his "dilectionis indefecta amicicia" may be wanting, (b) her letters might strike him as unworthy from a literary point of view because he was a great scholar, or (c) her letters might strike him as unworthy from a literary point of view because they were actually too "florid" (and a man such as Abelard is too lofty even for the most florid eloquence). Whatever we make of these criss-crossing threads and the (intentionally?) inadequate language in which they are expressed (she herself calls it "sermone impexo,"[306] and we are indeed led to wonder how such enigmatic language could be of any use in the dictaminal schoolroom), the resolution is clearer: "when I am in my most withdrawn mode," she seems to say, in her singsong Latin, "and grow weak with a longing for my friends, you [Abelard] would assuage my grief a great deal if you were to use a fuller style [of writing]."

From what follows, it seems Heloise has received only a "salutationis compendium" [summary greeting], which she will read and reread as if it were his angel, and she will kiss it in place of him, for, she says, nothing gives her greater delight than to speak to him, or to hear him speaking, or to write to him. A bundle of possibilities float before us: having yielded her body to him, and still being constrained to secrecy, she is dependent on his initiative to continue the relationship that she obviously found thrilling; yet he, sidetracked by any male shortcoming (solidarity with his studies and male contacts, postcoital nonchalance, etc.) is less than forthcoming. Yet, she finishes, he must have some inkling of how she feels and will one day see it all in its full truth, as the primacy of moral values: genuine emotion, love and friendship rather than books and pretty phrases (the desire to master which may have led her, or her uncle, to engage Abelard as tutor in the first place).

It is a complicated letter, too complicated in our view to be the product of some forger of dictaminal materials. She terms it an *exclamacio,* a technical term of classical rhetoric used to indicate an exceptional full-voice outburst (*Ad Her.* 3.12.22), or a mode of speaking suitable to *distributio,* which Caplan translates as "The Broken Tone of Debate": "oratio frequens cum raris et brevibus intervallis, acri vociferatione" (*Ad Her.* 3.13.24): "The Broken Tone of Debate is punctuated repeatedly with short, intermittent pauses, and is vociferated sharply."[307] Quintilian advises that only exclamations "simulata et arte composita" are properly called figures of speech ["*schemata,*" Quintilian, *De institutione oratoria* 9.2.27]. To one familiar with these citations, Heloise would be drawing attention not only to the exceptional nature of her outburst but to its artistry: a perplexing combination. She might even have followed up Quintilian's reference at the same place to "licentia" in "Cornificius," and if she took that to indicate (as modern editors do) the *Ad Her.* 4.36.48, she would have found there *licentia* described as a figure of speech ["frankness"]: "when, talking before those to whom we owe reverence or fear, we yet exercise our right to speak out, because we seem justified in reprehending them or persons dear to them, for some fault."[308] However justified all this may seem by the context, philology forbids us to imagine that Heloise was an early believer in the "Cornifician" authorship of the *Ad Herennium!*[309]

Nevertheless, the line in which the word *exclamacio* appears is an odd one. The word is contrasted with *racio,* which is used in the *Ad Herennium* (and in other rhetorical treatises) to express the second part of "absolutissima et perfectissima . . . argumentatio," "the proof of the reason of the most complete and perfect argument" (*Ad Her.* 2.18.28; Caplan, p. 107). In Heloise's sentence, the *racio* is elaborated as the "method by which our [an odd objective genitive] love can be held fast," and it is "paid as a due," "restored," "recited, represented or reproduced by imitation," "given in return," "interpreted/translated," or "administered" [as in the administration of justice], or whatever meaning we are meant to attach to the Latin word *reddo, reddere.* Perhaps the meaning of "restored" or "given in return" is intended, for what follows is a neat three-line piece of hexametric verse composition in praise of Abelard, no doubt intended by Heloise to "repay" him for what he had taught her. The *racio* would then be: letters [*litterae, litterae humaniores*] drew us together, letters must maintain our friendship, but only such letters as are accompanied by "dilectionis indefecta amicicia."

One cannot insist on all or indeed on any of these complex of interpretations. Who knows what Heloise meant by letter 49? Who knows whether letter 49 had anything to do with her? Nevertheless, we would argue that all the overtones and twists of thought to which we have drawn attention are possible, that the letter is too complicated and ill-expressed to serve as a dictaminal model (especially for the tastes of the twelfth century), and that the *in tempore* situation that a little imagination may construct for us is both poignant in itself and appealing to our late twentieth-century sense of "reality."

The *salutatio* of Abelard's "reply" (#50 [V]) stuns us with its appropriateness: "To the only [female] disciple of philosophy among all the girls [*puellas*] of our age, to the only one, upon whom Fortune has fastened completely all the endowments of the numerous virtues, to the only pretty ('speciose' cf. letter 960 [disciple of philosophy], to the only charming/obliging ('graciose') [disciple of philosophy] . . ." recalls *HC* M ll. 284–95 closely enough to encourage

us to believe that it is Abelard writing to Heloise, but not closely enough to suggest a "forger" wishing to make capital out of the resemblance. De Vepria has displayed less patience with Abelard's reply than he had displayed toward Heloise's letter, for he cuts passages out of it. Enough remains, however, to convince us that Heloise's letter succeeded in shaking Abelard out of whatever complacency had produced letter 49. Not only does he echo her account of friendship, appropriately larded with reference to Cicero's *De amicitia*—in the reading of which Abelard admits Heloise holds first place—but he also matches her phraseology (#49: "pacto . . . alio"; #50: "alio pacto") and tells us that he "chose her among thousands" for her "many virtues"! This arrogant anticipation of *HC* M 289 differs only in that whereas now he claims to have "chosen" Heloise for her virtues, later (in the *Historia calamitatum*) he claims he "chose" her for her "not unattractive looks and knowledge of letters": no wonder Heloise was annoyed with the *Historia calamitatum!*

Heloise's sentiments in letter 49 inspire Abelard to a lyrical assertion of his dependence upon the *puella* as "omnium miserarum . . . lenimen": his decision to seek the company of girls (*HC* M 252ff.) came at a favorable moment in his life (*HC* M 241ff.), but the general narrative of the *Historia calamitatum* provides enough to justify his use of "omnium miserarum" in letter 50. What follows throws fascinating light on the initiation of their relationship. Whereas the *Historia calamitatum* ascribes the relationship to Abelard's lust and initiative, or to Fulbert's ambitions, letter 50 admits that it was some "good opinion of me," perhaps, "that made you deign to call me to your notice." In a rare moment of humility, Abelard now admits that Heloise is actually his superior: "ingenium tuum, facundia tua ultra etatem et sexum tuum iam virile in robur se incipit extendere": "your talent, your eloquence goes beyond your years and your sex: it now begins to endow you with manly strength; (even where I seem to have the edge, [he goes on] it is you who really outstrip me)." The final paragraph of the letter seems a heartfelt response to the main allegation leveled in letter 49, that Abelard has failed to appreciate the nature of Heloise's affection for him. In an impassioned outbreak he claims he is not a blockhead at all and knows "ubi verus amor sit et quis me ex corde diligat." He may even make an allusion to the same Persian satire that Heloise used.[310] In a later letter he is prepared to admit a religious basis for their affection (#52 [V]). This is the first letter in which Abelard has used the word *dilectio* (common hitherto in Heloise's letters). One suspects that Abelard learned as much about life from Heloise as she claims she learned of bookish wisdom from him.

It is clear from letter 53 (M) that the two are still kept apart, by distance, preoccupation, or the need for secrecy. Its *salutatio* suggests a consciousness of Abelard's physical (sexual?) form and Heloise's statement that she lacks "peritia," while it may refer to her usual posture of literary inadequacy, seems from the context to refer to his greater physical (sexual?) abilities. Certainly this letter seems to indicate that their physical and emotional relationship has far exceeded her ability—even if some small drop of knowledge had derived from his teaching—to "paint in *sermo,* with the marks of letters," her love. The use of *depingere* recalls letter 49.

Letter 54 (V) refers to the literary exercise of *ecphrasis* or the literary commendation of set topics, and to the use of arguments in (legal) advocacy.[311] Both, Abelard claims, are no longer necessary in praise of love since now Heloise has learned/been taught (? "quia in rebus abundantes sumus") how to see it in its nonverbal nakedness. But still, the writer claims, the "edax malorum hominum invidia" requires continued use of the *littera* as a means of communication. It is difficult but not impossible to square this with Abelard's presence in Fulbert's house and the loveplay that he claims they indulged in there: the phrase in letter 54: "nos pro libito nostro iungi non patitur" seems to imply a date before the "[p]rimum domo una conjungimur, postmodum animo" of *HC* M 332–33, which in turn suggests that in the *Historia calamitatum* Abelard has telescoped the stages in their relationship indicated by *HC* M 296–303.[312] Nevertheless, as indicated above, the supposition of consummated sexual relations *before* Abelard's move into Fulbert's house is possibly unwarranted by the language of the *Historia calamitatum.*

The ensuing letters indicate a maintenance of this agitated but satisfying state of mutual affection (#55 [M] and 56 [V]) but #57 (M) indicates a breach in their "familiaris confabulacio":[313]

Abelard is no longer able to supply his "presencia ad libitum meum" and letter 58 (M) actually refers to Abelard's withdrawal of the "privilege of love" from Heloise. Letter 59 (V) supplies a telling comment from Abelard: "causa necessaria" keeps him away from Heloise, and it was wrong of him to force her into sin. Letter 60 (M) is movingly appropriate: the "pact" of letters 49 and 50 is broken, Heloise does not hear Abelard's words (because they do not speak truthfully of "dilectionis indefecta amicicia"); his "sapiencia et scientia" deceived her (Abelard himself says why—*HC* M 294–96), so "pereat scriptura."

There seems in this letter such little art and such desperate recourse to Latin (rhymed) prose as the only medium of intelligent epistolary communication that the reader is challenged to place it within the known framework of the Abelard-Heloise affair, that is, in the narrative presented in the *Historia calamitatum*. This is difficult to do and letter 61 (V) (which may, in fact, be two letters conflated, the "mulier" portion beginning at "Non sunt hec dicta amici . . .")[314] does not help for Abelard claims he does not know what "peccatum" on his part has alienated Heloise (although in #59 he seems to know well enough).[315] He refers again to Heloise's role in solacing his trials and tribulations (cf. #50). Clearly a severe rupture has occurred in their relationship, which does not match anything in the *Historia calamitatum* before events such as Heloise's pregnancy (which might, one would have thought, figure in the Könsgen correspondence, unless de Vepria or an earlier editor has excised all matters that might easily have led to the identification of the correspondents).

In letter 62 (M) Heloise, with a perfunctory *salutatio,* assumes again the *persona* of an only roughly literate person ["sermonum facecia . . . modulo scienciole"] and cautions her lover to avoid danger (to himself) and scandal (to her). Despite the breach of *fedus*[316] in letter 60 she can refer again to some "arrangement" [quoque pacto—cf. #49 and 50] by which he can discuss with her "presentialiter" the things which he had entrusted to letters. Their letters must have contained "amaras atque flebiles descriptiones"[317] and matters that, she, Heloise, thinks run the risk of driving Abelard to tears. It is difficult to believe that Heloise can be referring to her pregnancy—concerning which she wrote to Abelard, according to the *HC* M 392–93, "cum summa exultatione"—and we are left only with the possibility that the tribulations associated with *HC* M 379ff. are being referred to. It is possible that Abelard "took fright" when their affair became known, causing Heloise to write letter 60. At any rate, the matter is not sufficiently serious to prevent her from exhorting him to press the wax on more auspicious topics.

The letters that follow seem to preserve aspects of the above relationships, but not necessarily in the chronological order that we seem to have detected in the previous letters,[318] and ensuing letters continue the fragments of the story.[319] In some senses letter 75 is a set piece, using an inverted version of the 'inexpressibility' or 'outdoing' topos discussed by Ernst Curtius.[320] The context could easily be a demonstration by Abelard of "how to do it," using an alleged improvident *promissio* or *vox nimium preceps et temeraria* in their real or fictive love relationship. At any rate it seems a "curriculum" effort, mentioning Ovid for his "metrum" and Tullius for his "facundia," alluding to Vergil, *Aeneid* VI.129 along with other passages from Vergil, Ovid, and Horace (*Ars poetica*).[321] The context is a stock one: the lover "dictates," causes to be written, "in ipso doloris cursu," something he wishes he had not so set to writing ("et utinam non dictassem"), something that seems to have to do with the growing old of their relationship (? "non michi vetus res"). Yet there are hints that this is discourse adapted to the anguish of reality: he describes himself as "tanta sciencia plenus," "labiis circumcisus." The latter phrase seems to contrast with the phrase "incircumcisis . . . labiis" used in letter 23 and biblical in inspiration (Exodus 6.12, 30) to express verbal artlessness.

Yet here the implication seems to be that the speaker/writer is too skilled in words,[322] and too unskilled in their effect ["noli verba, sed facta consulere"], one who needs advice on how to "sapienter amare" (note the contrast between "tanta sciencia plenus" and "sapienter amare.") The allusion to public opinion ["et fame nostre sollerter consulemus"] suggests an ill-considered remark about their relationship to a third party, some word of which has gotten back to Heloise. In her "reply" Heloise makes a complicated transition from their didactic or "school"

relationship to a genuine or "adult" relationship: she confesses that without his "magisterialis institucionis . . . sollercia" she would have been like (to adopt a phrase of Vergil's) "a lazy herd."[323] But now the literary rivalry between them should cease and they should become *sodales.* There are two enriching literary allusions here. The first is to the last line of Vergil's *Eclogue* III, which alerts us to the nature of the "contest" Heloise thinks should cease. *Eclogue* III records a poetic context between two unfriendly shepherds, Menalcas and Damoetas [Damon], and the last line, cited by Heloise, is an agricultural metaphor to the effect that the streams of poetry should now cease. What follows in letter 76 deepens the sentiment: the heavy and legalistic "decrevit hoc mea intencio" is advanced to end an "alterna contencio," that is, litigation rather than poetic rivalry. The reference to Statius *Thebaid* 1.411–12 "mox ut iactis sermonibus irae intumuere satis" [when flung taunts had swelled their anger to the pitch],[324] with the addition of the word *dire* to intensify *ire,* completes a sudden transition from the didactic and the bucolic, to the blood-torn and the real. Letter 77 (V) seems to accept the new challenge, admittedly (and this seems to contradict the spirit of letter 76) in language borrowed from the Roman comedians ["ut ergo operas demus, tu es ego et ego sum tu"].[325] Letter 77 (V) could, of course, come from any stage in the couple's relationship, as could letters 80 (V) and 83 (M). Letter 81 (M), however, with its reference to the malevolence, perhaps, of those who had enforced the "separatio" referred to at *HC* M 380,[326] and its elaborate *salutatio* referring to Abelard's skill as a lover, to (again) Heloise's incapacity to thank him adequately, and assigning praises to all who serve him [because he should be served by all?] and all beauty [because it excites him?], seems to suggest an earlier period in the relationship. Letter 78 (V), from a slightly later period, seems to suggest that when one has reached the stage of *sodalitas,* writing is unnecessary.

Letter 79 (M), a difficult, contemplative, and biblically influenced letter, seems redolent of the dangers that prompted Abelard to send Heloise back to Argenteuil[327]: "unde vehementer ille commotus crebris eam contumeliis afficiebat."[328] The meaning of the two dense paragraphs "si grande . . ." and "ego tamdiu . . ." is hard to make out. Heloise draws a parallel between the application of *labor* and *studium* to achieve an external manifestation of some internal intention [*intencio* picks up the same word in letter 76][329] and notes a tendency "deficere, cum ad votum, quod cupit, non potest pervenire." The second paragraph applies this sentiment to a task being faced by Heloise herself, a task in which the expectation of *defectus* weakens the "intencionem mei affectus." The task so confronting Heloise is the task of addressing/appealing to/seeking help from Abelard, conscious as she is of the *beneficia* he has bestowed upon her and the *grates* she owes him for these. What is her rather formally expressed purpose here? Perhaps the key lies in some words from the *Historia calamitatum:* "moxque occulte divisim abscessimus, nec nos ulterius nisi raro latenterque vidimus, dissimulantes plurimum quod egeramus . . . quod cum ego cognovissem" of *HC* M 564–66 and 573: at this point in their relationship Heloise may certainly have felt that there were dangers, that calling upon Abelard for further intervention was difficult, that she had no wish to offend him further,[330] and that *dolor,* now that she was separated both from Abelard and Astrolabe, was to succeed *amor* (*HC* M 555–57).

Letter 82 (M) seems written in that grief of resignation to which Abelard refers in the *Historia calamitatum.*[331] Somehow—this is more a matter of what is in the reader's mind than of anything Heloise or the writer of letter 82 may have intended—*pyra* (#82.12) and *late* (#82.13) call to mind two of the most poignant moments in Vergilian verse, the one Dido's abandonment by Aeneas, the other Orpheus' grief at the loss of Eurydice[332]: Heloise imagines first the stones that Deucalion placed on the earth to repopulate the world after the flood: once thrown down they liquefied into life, those thrown by Deucalion becoming men, those thrown by Pyrrha becoming women. When the (funeral) pyre (of Abelard and Heloise's life and loves) is likewise liquefied having been placed on the stones (this time paving stones), love vanishes with the burned bodies. The *longa tempora* of the Sibyl is an ironical wish, for the Sibyl refused to grant her lover (Apollo) requitement and grew old and haggard because she forgot to ask for health and beauty when she asked of him that she live for as many years as there were grains of sand in her hand. So, too, the wish that Abelard live the long life of Nestor is ironical, for

Nestor's long life was spent in the contentment of his family.[333] It is not difficult to imagine Heloise penning such verses as letter 82 in the discontent and resignation that followed her failure to convince Abelard that they should live together openly as *sodales* rather than secretly as *conubiales*. Whatever their lack of poetic merit may be, these lines reveal a well-stocked literary mind and a sharp sense of occasion: the single line of prose at the end relies on a neat inversion: instead of love binding, in this case it constricts, as it prevents Heloise from agreeing with Abelard's view of their relationship.

APPENDIX B

A DETAILED READING OF THE "LOST" LOVE LETTERS 88 TO 111 AND THE *HISTORIA CALAMITATUM*

The remainder of the Könsgen collection (#88–113) is a mixture of the generalized, the exemplary poetic (#113 [V] for example, an appropriate end piece, with its memorable, if Ovidian, "facundum me sola facis" and the line "urbi te nostre conspicuam faciunt," to which Heloise seems later to refer),[334] and those that bear a tinge of nostalgia and regret that may date them to the years following Heloise's removal to Argenteuil, and possibly even after she took the veil there, that is, between about 1118–1120 and 1129.

Letters 88 (M) to 93 (V) seem, however, to suggest the moments of separation and difficulty occasioned by the couple's decision to conceal their marriage and live apart (*HC* M 563–71). Letter 88 (M) begins with a curiously heavy biblically influenced *salutatio* in which Heloise likens herself to a "very well built and consummately finished house" [domus superedificata atque optime consummata][335]—based on the foundation that is Abelard's love for her—providing (for her builder)[336] a neighborly congeniality and stability for their *fedus.*[337] The Pauline analogy here—if Heloise intended it—is complicated, in that for St. Paul he himself, the wise builder, with the grace of God, laid the foundation, while another built upon it, using gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw: "unusquisque autem videat quomodo superaedificet . . . Dei aedificatio estis . . . templum Dei estis"[338]: both the foundation and the subsequent building are the work of Heloise, and Abelard, like God, is the helper, and Heloise is Abelard's helper: "Dei enim sumus adiutores."[339] It is hard to escape the inference that Heloise is her own finished product, and a *domus* rather than an *aedes* or *templum,* the first term implying a measure of homely human comfort perhaps lacking in the two last terms, which seem required by the Pauline context. In a conscious allusion not only to Vergil but also to her own previous statement (#84 [M]) that Abelard is her own natural habitat, Heloise alludes to the difficulties and labor involved in writing back to him, but claims her ready will enables her to triumph over the obstacles. Hovering in the background and summoned by the learned allusions is the male's lament to the woods and groves for his lost mistress.[340] With a rather purposeful and complicated reference (by implication) to Abelard's physical excellence ["corpus . . . bene politum"], Heloise seems to allude to being apart from him, having him present to her mind waking and sleeping, wanting to be "fida, stabilis, immutabilis et non flexibilis," despite the *fallacia* that seems now to govern their relationship (cf. later in letter 88: "plus absconditur," "oculis corporeis a me non videaris, tamen ab intentione mentis non labescis,"[341] "si caute cineribus sepelitur" and *HC* M 564–66: "occulte divisim . . . raro [cf. letter 88: "raro quendam"] latenterque . . . dissimulantes"), despite the "iniuria" done her by Abelard (cf. #87.42: "nec culpe sis memor ulterius"; *HC* M 552–53, perhaps too 559: "parvulo nostro sorori mee commendato"; or even 573: "transmisi eam ad abbatiam"?). In an odd phrase, Heloise states her adherence to their new, hidden, postmarital relationship: "even if all men were made into "unique ones," nothing would force or drive me from you." Use of the term "unicos" represents Heloise's deliberate allusion to Abelard's favored way of addressing her. Only once has she used the term in these letters, and then not with reference directly to Abelard, but to the "unica salus mea" that he represents for her.[342] Here she seems to be iron-

ically turning the term ["even if you were to me, in spades, what you say I am to you . . ."], just as in her *salutatio* to one of the later, well-known letters, she also plays ironically with the term in an ostentatious way.[343]

In his reply (#89 [V]) Abelard picks up (in his *salutatio*) Heloise's use of 'unicus' and (in the four lines of letter proper) the contrast between will or intent and action ["verba" and "mittentis voluntatem"] referred to in her letter, matching it with other contrasts—*inopia/copia* (from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*), *dubitando/faciendo, erumpere/se invicem officiunt.* His *valedictio* "gemma tocius Gallie" recalls (for us) the "in toto regno" of *HC* M 288 and (for her) the "gemme sue" of letter 22 (V).

Heloise's response (#90 [M]) adopts an evocative floral metaphor that picks up again letter 84 [(M): "nemorum umbrosa diligunt volucres"] and ends with the *color adnominatio* ["augmentum . . . incrementum"].[344] Her letter is notable in its explicit reference to the painful conditions that prevent adequate contact and even correspondence, and her phrases "me impediunt cure"[345] and "pre nimio dolore" seem to refer to the "crebris eam contumeliis afficiebat" of *HC* M 571–72.

The group of letters that follow (#91 [V], 92 [M], and 93 [V]) continue an elaborate play that seems to have begun with letter 22 (V). There Abelard was the moon and Heloise the sun, with this difference, that as the moon approaches the sun, it becomes obscured, while as Abelard approaches Heloise, he glows. Away from Heloise, Abelard becomes "fuscum et pallidum": the moon is obscured upon approaching the sun, Abelard is obscured when away from his Heloise. All this renders the *salutatio* of letter 91 (V) a little startling, for there Heloise is herself addressed as a "most splendid moon" which drives away all the shadows, a moon whose "splendor" should always "fulgere" ["shine, gleam, glitter," etc.]. This letter refers again to the *cure* that give Heloise anguish and represent all the more powerful an argument of her *fides,* and the conclusion couples in an interesting way "pectus" and "ambirem," rather as do Lucan[346] and Ovid,[347] and puts forward the proposition that were Abelard present with Heloise, he would "give shape again to [her] happiness" [leticiam tibi integre reformarem].

In her own response (#92 [M]) Heloise furthers the play on light, the moon, and the sun. Picking up Abelard's statement (#22) that without her, he has no *lumen,* Heloise addresses him as "lumini clarissimo," immediately complicating the epithet by reference to the solstice, when the sun is at its brightest: Abelard is now the sun (as Heloise in letter 91 is the moon), but the allusion to letter 22 is maintained by her choice of the words "fuscis tenebrarum," a direct reference, perhaps to the "tenebris" and "fuscum" of letter 22, where Heloise is *sol* (as she is again in letter 108 [V])[348] and Abelard *luna*. The *salutatio* of letter 92 then places Heloise as the recipient of the rays of both sun *and* moon, in the course of which we have an allusion—for those who know the poem and there is no evidence that Heloise or Abelard did—to Catullus' poem 8: the line (3, 8) "fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles" is echoed in the words selected for letters 91 and 92—"semper fulgere . . . solsticio . . . semper candoris . . . tu sol . . . candescere . . . fulgere"—though Abelard is not yet farewelling his mistress, as Catullus is in poem 8. Pain, yet, is on his mind, as letter 93 (V) refers again to the shadows ["tenebris"] penetrated by Heloise's "splendid light" and laments in language that recalls the later *Historia calamitatum* to us his own[349] luckless plight, being drawn in different directions by both *amor*[350] and *pudor.*[351]

In a sudden, virtuoso display of isolated language and language seemingly redolent of Prudentius and the Song of Songs, Heloise (in #94 [M]), as the *luna plena,*[352] offers the "innexibilis[353] amoris delicia" to [her?] first quality "spice, multiplied one-hundred-fold in the desert air, with the seed of sweetness."[354] The body of the letter, however, forms a sharp contrast: with an Ovidian flourish, Heloise dismisses Abelard as a fair-weather friend, following her contempt up with an even more pointed letter (#95 [M]), prosy and colloquial in tone, in which, using a nautical metaphor, she contrasts herself, unmoved by the winds, with Abelard as a ship in danger of sinking and without "the anchor of true fidelity." She offers this Abelard whatever is appropriate to his infidelity, stressing again that *she* chose to "affix *him* firmly to her heart, before all" yet found him in the end unresponsive. To those familiar with Penelope's lament to Ulysses

(Ovid, *Her.* 1.10) there is an evocative bonus here: as is clear from the *Historia calamitatum* narrative at this point, Heloise is living apart from Abelard.[355] So Penelope has been abandoned by Ulysses, who is "slow of return"[356]; Penelope is "deserto . . . lecto . . . frigida," and the "pendula tela" hangs lifelessly in her "viduas manus." It is a powerful reinforcement of her mood and recalls no doubt their reading together of the classical *auctores,* just as it reinforces the fusion between life and art that is so characteristic an aspect of what Bond has called "the revolution in twelfth-century secular lyric."[357] As its master architect Marbod of Rennes puts it, "ars simulat verum mutatque vocabula rerum": the recipient is urged: "me non ex libris, sed totis dilige fibris."[358] In his "reply" (#96 [V]) Abelard, using the "estuans" of the famous *cri-de-cœur* of the "archpoet," wishes his "speciosa"[359] all that his physical passion for her might yield "iugiter." Again, the *suavissima dulcedo* of Heloise is likened to the "sol quotidie novus."[360] The reference to Heloise as a "martyr" must refer either to her confinement at Argenteuil or to the suffering she was at the putative time of the previous letters enduring for Abelard and his version of their relationship.[361]

Letter 98 (M) has an elaborate *salutatio,* which proved of some interest to Johannes de Vepria, but the rest of the letter has been crucially pruned. The letter opens with the arresting word "Tyroni." The associations deriving from a momentary equation between Heloise herself and Tyro "a beautiful nymph . . . [who], removed from her father's house by her uncle . . . exposed [her two sons] to conceal her incontinence from the world [and who, sometime after her love affair with Neptune/the river Enipeus] married her uncle . . ."[362] are, of course, quickly banished when we realize that Heloise is addressing Abelard as a "tiro" in love, a novice, a beginner, a young soldier. She offers herself as the "fundamentum stabilis amicicie" and, referring to his expressions in letters 22 [*fusca nescire*] and 96 [*ardentius estuare*], exhorts him to remain passionate about her. The excised portion must have contained something very specific, because the only remaining line of the letter breathes a quite contrary spirit of broken dejection, in which the writer says that her *vota* ["marriage vows," "wishes" in the matter now lost?] have profited her nothing; both she and "hers" (the "vota," her "proles"?) are now cheap to him, and he puts up with the *delectacio* (her "proles"?) of the joy they had together, but *iratus.* The apparent response, referring as it does to the "amoris leges" and to Heloise as one who has *scientia* of them, seems hardly adequate and may be a generalized note from any period of the relationship (#99 [V]), as indeed may be the case with letter 100 (M), with its interesting periphrasis ("nodum, qui nunquam denodatur" for letter 94 *innexibilis*). An appropriate response from the man comes only with letter 101 (V): picking up the "mando, quod sum: tibi sum, dum vivo" of 97 and the "idem, qui fuerat" of 99, Abelard asserts: "ego sum, qui fui," but this time he elaborates in language that strongly suggests the period after their clandestine marriage when they are living apart (*HC* M 496–502). He speaks to Heloise "cautius," he approaches her "cautius"; *pudor/verecundia* constrains *amor,*[363] lest *amor in immensum proruat.* Such restraint, he argues, will permit both fluency/abundance [*copia*][364] as far as their *vota* are concerned, and some attenuation of the *fama* that is developing around them and that will eventually undo them, Abelard physically, Heloise emotionally. Abelard is arguing that only by continued discretion and secrecy can they enjoy their relationship, in word and in deed. One is reminded forcefully of *HC* M 566–69: "avunculus autem ipsius atque domestici ejus, ignominie sue solatium querentes, initum matrimonium divulgare et fidem mihi super hoc datam vilare ceperunt."

Heloise's "reply" (#102 [M]) picks up notes from earlier letters (the unchanging stability of her love from letter 98, the notion of "intention" from letter 88 [but this time "cordis" rather than "mentis"]) and offers a simple (in concept) but rich and rhythmic (in expression) assertion of commitment ["quod preciossimum habeo, tibi do, scilicet meipsam"], but the slightly cautious *valedictio* ["nec me per te ledat"] hints at Abelard's continued capacity to fall short of the image of devotion roundly proffered in letter 102. Abelard's "rejoinder," a prosy statement of facts (livened only by the "repetition" of "semper . . . nunquam . . . nunquam" and the ornate *salutatio,* with its picturesque notion of Heloise exceeding all the pigments/colors in aroma and savor, and the perplexing "blanda novitate"),[365] promises a visit ["tibi familiariter

intimabo"]—perhaps the sort of visit referred to in the later correspondence, after Heloise's removal to Argenteuil.[366]

Letter 104 (M) seems to hope for Abelard some greatness from his "regimen scholarum/magisterium"[367] ["ut dignitas tua ineffabili gloria renovetur," "et adipiscaris quandoque coronam immortalitatis eterne"]. Heloise's emotional attachment to Abelard grows within her and forces her to maintain contact by writing. Echoing his phraseology ["superanti" and "nunquam . . . labascit" from letter 103] she states movingly that she can only grieve for someone loved "tenere . . . interne" but whom she cannot see: recalling, perhaps, the coupling of "turtur amice" and "dole" in *Amores* 2.6.12 (#104: "doleo . . . doloris . . . in modo turturis"), Heloise rams together images from previous letters: for one who will never slip "ab intencione mentis" (cf. #88) and who cannot be physically experienced, only an eternal "pignus amoris"[368] will serve (#60, 69.12, and 84).

Letter 105 (V) responds prosily, but 106 (V) seems to reflect some kind of a growing apart (perhaps produced by their different situations "te quidem Parisius scolis presidente et me ad imperium tuum Argenteoli cum sanctimonialibus conversante"), a growing apart that stimulates Abelard to intense regret and a sense of finality about their relationship, a finality matched by the fragments of a Boethian visitation (#107 [M]) in which Heloise seems to liken herself to the late Roman philosopher in prison, as she focuses her *animus* from "multa" to "singula," and attempts to harness "spiritus sancti gratia" against "saecularibus calliditatibus."[369]

Notes

1. Neville Chiavaroli has been responsible primarily for the comments on dictaminal practice at notes 181–229, John O. Ward for the rest. However each has reviewed the work of the other. The present text is a slightly abridged version of the original, without the epigraphs, and with much material relegated to appendices. It also lacks an 'Appendix C' that presented a detailed chronology of the lives of Heloise and Abelard from the *Historia calamitatum* and other sources, with indications of the possible places occupied by the de Vepria letters. J. O. Ward wishes to express his thanks to the members of the Sydney University Medieval Latin Reading Group: John Scott, Deirdre Stone, Alison Waters, and Sharon Davidson with whom he had the valued opportunity of reading through the letters during 1998. On one occasion the group had the pleasure of Constant Mews's company, and Ward would like to express his profound thanks to Mews, whose generous invitation to read his *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France,* with Neville Chiavaroli, in first draft was responsible for arousing his interest in the present subject. J. O. Ward would also like to acknowledge the help and stimulation that he has received, in all phases of the present topic, from Juanita Ruys.
2. Könsgen. We generally cite this collection in what follows as the de Vepria collection.
3. *HC,* ed. Monfrin 71: ll. 296–99; ca. AD 1116–17: "nosque etiam absentes scriptis internuntiis invicem liceret presentare et pleraque audacius scribere quam colloqui, et sic semper jocundis interesse colloquiis"; ed. Hicks xii and 10 (ll. 265–67); "crebris me epistolis vistabas": Heloise, "Appendice: I. Heloyse sue ad ipsum deprecatoria," in *HC* ed. Monfrin, 117 l. 270.
4. It is difficult to credit Neil Cartlidge's remark that the de Vepria collection "is a purely literary collection, its impression of temporal development being simply the impression given by patterns in the sequence—just as in Elizabethan sonnet-sequences" as anything more than a hasty and ill-formed judgement (*Medieval Marriage: Literary Approaches, 1100–1300,* p. 60, n. 142). According to Graziella Ballanti, ed. *Anonimo: un epistolario d'amore del XII secolo (Abelardo e Eloisa?),* p. 23: "la maggior parte dei critici sono con-

vinto . . . che quelle di Troyes sono vere lettere, e non letterarie finzioni." Könsgen, pp. 80 and 83 for the same view.

5. The manuscript is an advanced resource book for dictaminal and epistolary purposes: Könsgen, pp. ix-xiv.
6. These matters are all examined with great skill and sympathy in Mews, *The Lost Love Letters.*
7. Peter Dronke, ed. and trans., *Medieval Latin and the Rise of the European Love-Lyric,* 2nd ed., 2 vols.: 1, *Problems and Interpretations* and 2, *Medieval Latin Love-Poetry,* vol. 2: pp. 422–47 and commented on in vol. 1: pp. 221–29 and in *Women Writers,* pp. 91–92.
8. Gerald A. Bond, *The Loving Subject: Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France; Women Writers,* chapter 4; Mews, *The Lost Love Letters.* The collection edited and discussed by Therese Latzke, "Die Carmina erotica der Ripollsammlung," pp. 138–201, also requires close attention in this context. Cf. also Latzke's "Zum 'Iudicium de calumnia molendini Brisesarte' und zu den vier Nonnenepisteln des Hilarius," pp. 73–96.
9. The verses envisage love between (male) master and (female) pupil. (Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* p. 424)
10. Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* pp. 422–23: "iam pergito lusum" [let love's play go on]; "ludos ymenei" [the sports of wedded love]; "nimium deludis amores" [you make sport of constant love]. In the Regensburg collection the context seems monastic—'frater/sorores' and from the Liège region ["nec habet te Legia natum"]. Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* pp. 430, 433.
11. The Regensburg verses no doubt have a didactic origin: "corrige versiculos tibi quos presento, magister" [correct the brief verses I am sending you, master]. Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* p. 424. Cf. also pp. 430–34.
12. Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* pp. 425–27, 429, 435–42.
13. Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* pp. 426, 441–42.
14. For Mercury: Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* p. 443.
15. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.2.3, Marx *ed. min.* p. 3.
16. "Quod celat pectus modo, tunc retegit tibi lectus," Dronke, *Medieval Latin,* vol. 2: p. 426.
17. Frank McCourt, *Angela's Ashes: A Memoir,* p. 324.
18. Cf. I. S. Robinson, "The *colores rhetorici* in the Investiture Contest," *Traditio* 32 (1976): 210–38, on the investiture controversy *epistolae* and the *colores.*
19. As Ballanti maintains, all love letters of the time involved art; those who wrote them were "sempre persone 'di scuola,' non puramente di cultura." *Anonimo,* p. 13.
20. "Sono in massima parte, veri *billets doux,* come potrebbero scambiarsi due amanti che pur essendo vicini non fossero liberi di comunicare apertamente; non sono elaborati, ma immediati, con tuttto la forza e i limiti del primo impulso." Ballanti, *Anonimo,* p. 29.
21. John Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard,* especially pp. 82ff. and 298ff.; M. T. Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life;* and, of course, Mews, *The Lost Letters.* See Ballanti: "Bisogna dunque estendere alle *Lettere di Troyes* la stessa considerazione che vale per l'*Epistolario:* che siamo in presenza di un documento prezioso, interessante e rivelatore di un'epoca, di un tipo di cultura e costume, a di una speciale situazione scolastica, che sono quelli del tempo di vita di Eloisa e Abelardo; e che non è un grave errore leggere quelle lettere 'come se' fossero loro, pur dubitando che lo siano." *Anonimo,* pp. 18–19.
22. The topicality of the *salutationes,* nevertheless, is indicated by, among other things, the place they occupy in the nearly contemporary *Codex Udalrici:* see Robinson, "The *colores rhetorici,*" p. 210.
23. Kenneth Quinn, *The Catullan Revolution,* p. 24.
24. John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 1.24, most recently in *Ioannis Saresberiensis Metalogicon,* ed. J. B. Hall.
25. For an initial indication see Könsgen's source citations, and below.

26. For philosophical terminology, see Könsgen, p. 9 litt. 21: "et ex ipsius experimento rei esse, quod est . . . equipolenter": see R. W. Southern, "Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours," pp. 42–43; Anselm, *De veritate,* "magister 'ad quid facta est affirmatio?' Discipulus 'ad significandum esse quod est,'" and the recurring uses of the phrase *esse quod est* in what follows. On *equipollenter* see *De veritate,* pp. 41–43 "aequipollentia" and "per aequipollentias propositionum."
27. "Et quia in toto preexercitamine erudiendorum nichil utilius est . . . humilitas," PL 199.856A; Clement Charles Julian Webb, *Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis, Metalogicon Libri IIII,* p. 57; D. D. McGarry, trans., *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A Twelfth-Century Defence of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium,* p. 70: "A further feature of Bernard's method . . ."
28. C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe 950–1200.*
29. Mews, "Orality, Literacy, and Authority in the Twelfth-Century Schools," p. 480.
30. J. O. Ward, "Rhetoric in the Faculty of Arts at the Universities of Paris and Oxford in the Middle Ages: A Summary of the Evidence," especially pp. 229–31; Winthrop Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century,* chapters 6 and 7.
31. Brian Stock, "Literacy and Society in the Twelfth Century" in *The Spirit of the Court,* p. 1; a fuller text is to be found in his "Medieval Literacy, Linguistic Theory, and Social Organization."
32. Halm #16; Howell (J. O. Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion and Commentary Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental* 58, p. 34). All relevant references are in Ward at this page.
33. Cf. picture of Fulbert teaching in MS Chartres Bibl. Mun. nouv. acq. 4, edited and discussed by René Merlet and l'Abbé Clerval in their: *Un Manuscrit Chartrain du XIe Siècle: Fulbert, Évêque de Chartres, Martyrologie à l'usage de l'église de Chartres; Fulbert et sa Cathédrale; Nécrologie du Chapitre Nôtre-Dame de Chartres; chartes et pièces liturgiques,* Société Archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir (Chartres, 1893), color plate opposite p. 227. No longer extant in the manuscript when Merlet and Clerval studied it were illustrations of Fulbert visiting the poor and succoring the sick.
34. See Cicero, *De inventione* 1.1 *et seqq.;* J. O. Ward, "*Artificiosa Eloquentia*" J. O. Ward, ed., *Ciceronian Rhetoric,* I, pp. 44ff., 48; C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939–1210,* especially chap. 6.
35. References to Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels,* throughout the preceding paragraphs are: pp. 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 48, 62, 66, 79, 106, 110, 131, 137, 141, 147, and 218. On the general significance of the modern literacy/orality debate in the period, see: Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, eds., *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530;* Guy Lobrichon, "The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre," pp. 80–103; R. I. Moore, trans., "Literacy and the Making of Heresy ca. 1000-ca. 1150" in *Heresy and Literacy,* pp. 19–37, also available in *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings,* pp. 363–75; Edward Peters, *The Magician, the Witch and the Law,* especially chap. 2; Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,* chap. 5 and pp. 104–106 and 115–17; Stock, "Literacy and Society in the Twelfth Century"; J. O. Ward, "The First Crusade as Disaster: Apocalypticism and the Genesis of the Crusading Movement," pp. 253–92.
36. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 4–5. Whether the wax tablet, carried between correspondents by trusted servants (of the sort whose disloyalty resulted in Abelard's castration: "quodam mihi serviente per pecuniam corrupto" *HC* Monfrin ll. 83–84), was less "public" (in the sense discussed by Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 47–48) than the letter on parchment is an interesting point for the subject of this chapter. For the carriage and delivery of letters in Abelard's day, see Constable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable,* vol. 2: pp. 23ff.

37. For motives, see Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 37–38, and cf. the somewhat later example of Stephen of Rouen: J. O. Ward, "Quintilian and the Rhetorical Revolution of the Middle Ages," p. 253ff.
38. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 7–8.
39. On *amor/amicitia,* see R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe,* vol. 1, pp. 28ff. and, especially, Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience 350–1250,* chap. 5.
40. For the *fedus amicitiae,* see Catullus, poem 109: "aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae" in *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina,* ed. R. A. B. Mynors, p. 102. On *foedus/amor* in Baudri of Bourgeuil's poetry, see Gerald A. Bond, "'Iocus Amoris': The Poetry of Baudri of Bourgeuil and the Formation of the Ovidian Subculture," pp. 172–74. For "matrimonii foedera" see *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 71, and for "sordida foedera carnis" see Aurelius Clemens Prudentius, *Apotheosis* [*On the divinity of Christ*], 2 vols., vol. 1: p. 186, l. 910.
41. For the centrality of the epistolary genre, see in addition to Bond's remarks and those of I. S. Robinson, "The *colores rhetorici,*" pp. 210ff., L. Merlet, "Lettres d'Ives de Chartres et d'autres personnages de son temps," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* and note the remark of Southern, *Scholastic Humanism,* p. 164 n. 2.
42. On the early monastic phase of the developments under consideration, see Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 45–49. It interesting to note that the concept of monastic "otium" discussed by Bond, "'Iocus Amoris,'" pp. 156–58, approaches the notion of Ciceronian and humanist *otium* so crucial for the cultural productivity of both the Roman Republican and the Italian Renaissance periods: see John F. Tinkler, "Renaissance Humanism and the *genera eloquentiae,*" pp. 286ff., and Brian Vickers, "Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: The Ambivalence of *otium.*"
43. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 20.
44. Thoughts on these developments and some references will be found in J. O. Ward, "Magic and Rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Some Ruminations"; Ward, "Rhetoric, Truth, and Literacy in the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century," pp. 126–57; Ward, "The First Crusade as Disaster"; as well as his "From Marginal Gloss to *catena* Commentary: The Eleventh-Century Origins of a Rhetorical Teaching Tradition in the Medieval West."
45. Dronke, *Women Writers,* chap. 3; E. Bos, "Patterns of Male-Female Religious Friendships and Their Influence on the Construction of the Literary Identities of Medieval Women," pp. 326–36; J. O. Ward, "After Rome: Medieval Epic," pp. 285ff.
46. R. Howard Bloch, *Medieval Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love,* pp. 178–84; Bruce L. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism and Medieval Society: Nunneries in France and England, 890–1215,* index *sv.* "Robert of Arbrissel;" J. M. B. Porter, "Preaching of the First Crusade? Robert of Arbrissel after the Council of Clermont."
47. R. I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent,* 2nd ed., pp. 63–105; R. I. Moore, ed., *The Birth of Popular Heresy,* pp. 27–38; Brenda Bolton, *The Medieval Reformation,* chap. 5; Jacqueline Smith, "Robert of Arbrissel: *Procurator mulierum,*" pp. 175–84; J. Dalarun, "Robert D'Arbrissel et les femmes," and the same author's *L'impossible sainteté: la vie retrouvée de Robert d'Arbrissel (1045–1116) fondateur de Fontevraud.*
48. "His temporibus florere coepit in Theutonica terra Manegaldus philosophus divinis et saecularibus litteris ultra coetaneos suos eruditus. Uxor quoque eius et filiae religione florentes multam in scripturis habuere notitiam, et discipulos proprios filiae eius praedictae docebant." Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalter,* vol. 3, p. 178. The (slightly fuller) original text may be consulted in E. Martène and U. Durand, eds., *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicorum, Dogmaticorum, Moralium amplissima Collectio,* vol. 5, col. 1169. For *scriptura* see Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels,* p. 68; and for *notitia* see Stock, *The Implications of Literacy,* p. 245; also PL 148.1417, 152.1316B, 156.525C, and 669D, confirming that the phrase "in scripturis habere notitiam" means

to have a knowledge of the scriptures. From the other personages mentioned in the immediate context, it is apparent that the original entry in the chronicle (cols. 1160–1174 "Chronicon Richardi Pictavensis monachi Cluniacensis" covering the years 754 to 1153) concentrates on the dates 1060 (death of Henry I of France), 1024 (death of Henry II of Germany), 1049 (death of Odilo, Abbot of Cluny), 995/96–1030 or 1058–1086 or 1086–1126 (rule of "William, duke of Aquitaine," either William V, VIII or, less likely, IX), 1054 (death of Leo IX), and 1073 (death of Alexander II). Col. 1171 mentions the floruit of "Anselmus philosophus." J. O. Ward would like to thank Constant Mews here for profitable discussions on the likely implications of the passage. Manegold's teaching is mentioned in a letter of the early twelfth century. (Southern, *Scholastic Humanism,* p. 202). Richard, a monk who may have spent time at Cluny, was probably an approximate contemporary of Heloise and Peter the Venerable. For his chronicle see Elie Berger, "Notice sur divers manuscrits de la bibliothèque Vaticane: Richard le Poitevin, moine de Cluny, historien et poëte," pp. 43–138. Berger has for *uxor quoque et filiae* "filii (*lege:* 'filiae') . . ." (p. 99) and thinks that Richard, who dedicated his chronicle to Peter the Venerable and seems to have put together the earliest versions in the 1140s and 1150s, got his "sèches indications" on Berengar of Tours from "des annales monastiques": "pour les faits antérieurs [to his own day] il parait avoir eu sous les yeux quelque chronique monastique, rédigée en Poitou, et sans doute dans l'une des maisons qui appartenaient à l'ordre de Cluny" (p. 97). It seems that the manuscript used by Martène and Durand for their excerpts goes back ultimately to the first redaction of Richard's chronicle (pp. 56–57). On the dedication to Peter the Venerable: see Constable, vol. 2: pp. 38–39. Richard seems to have felt that the reference to Manegold's wives and daughters was not odd enough to require any special explanatory comment from him. Nevertheless, all trace of their activity has dropped from the record. Richard's list of great teachers includes Hildebert of Tours (Lavardin), Gilbert the Universal, Alberic of Rheims, Pierre de Saintes, Hugh of St. Victor and Abelard.

49. For Tengswich, see J. L. Baird and Radd K. Ehrman, trans., *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* vol. 1: pp. 127–30. See also J. O. Ward, "Women and Latin Rhetoric from Hrotsvit to Hildegard."
50. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 1. See also Dronke, *Women Writers,* chapters 4–5, and D. M. Stone, "Heloise: *la très sage abbesse* of the Paraclete," p. 26.
51. Enid McLeod, *Héloïse: A Biography,* 1938 edn., book 1.
52. See Stone, "Heloise: *la très sage abbesse,*" pp. 26–28, for a sensitive discussion.
53. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* map 2 on p. xvi.
54. Régine Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* 1973 edn., pp. 47–48, gives a vivid picture of the "academic" quarter of Paris in Heloise's youth: The Paris "cathedral close, like those of Wells and Salisbury, with a cluster of small houses, provid[ed] accommodation for the members of the chapter. About forty of these houses stood at the eastern extremity of the Île-de-la-Cité. They may have been walled off from the rest of the town, for the area had always enjoyed a considerable measure of autonomy: officers of the crown were not allowed to set foot in it. . . . Thus, the tip of the Île-de-la-Cité was the home of a small, self-sufficient ecclesiastical colony, containing churches and chapels, cloisters and schoolhouses, gardens and private residences—including the house of Canon Fulbert. According to legend, it stood close to the corner of the Rue des Chantres and of the present Quai aux Fleurs." Abelard's "school" at the time of his first affair with Heloise was very close to Fulbert's house. Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 52.
55. See Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* pp. 47 and 53.
56. "The erotic will always dance between people who teach and learn, and our attempts to manage its shocking charge are often flat-footed, literal, destructive, rigid with fear and the need to control. For good or ill, Eros is always two steps ahead of us, exploding the constraints of dogma, turning back on us our carefully worked out *positions* and

lines, showing us that the world is richer and scarier and more fluid and many-fold than we dare to think." Helen Garner, *The First Stone: Some Questions About Sex and Power,* p. 161. It is tempting to imagine that Heloise would have realized this "truth," even if Abelard did not.

57. Monfrin pp. 71–72. Hereafter for citations from the letters of Abelard and Heloise, cite "M" for Monfrin's edition of the *Historia calamitatum.*
58. Cf. Brooke cited in Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 155.
59. *HC* Monfrin ll. 296–99; for the implications of the term *colloquium,* see Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 53. Abelard's approach to the subject of initiating a relationship with Heloise suggests a mature woman rather than the teenager of tradition.
60. 'ipsius' *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 304.
61. *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 272–75. Some contemporaries, of course, had other ideas about Abelard's relations with prostitutes and loose women. For Fulk of Deuil's allegations, see Mews, *Peter Abelard,* p. 45 [37], and Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* index *sv.* "Fulk of Deuil."
62. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 288: "puellam . . . in toto regno nominatissimam." "Audiebam tunc temporis, mulierem licet necdum saeculi nexibus expeditam, litteratoriae scientiae quod perrarum est, et studio licet saecularis sapientiae, summam operam dare, nec mundi voluptatibus, nugis, vel deliciis, ab hoc utili discendarum artium proposito retrahi posse" (Constable, vol. 1: pp. 115 and 303). According to Constable, "[t]his, one of the most famous of all Peter the Venerable's letters . . . may not have been written before 1144" (vol. 2: p. 177). Mews posits (*Abelard,* p. 12[4] n. 14; Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* pp. 173–74, 369, n. 4, and elaborated in Mews, *The Lost Letters*) that Heloise was about the age of Peter the Venerable (i.e., in his/her early twenties at the time of the exchange of the letters excerpted by Johannes de Vepria). This view requires a different understanding of the relationship between Heloise and Abelard, which must have been much more mature than is commonly believed, even if it does raise new questions about the pattern of Heloise's life between her return from Argenteuil and her meeting with Abelard. Peter the Venerable grew up and was educated in Burgundy. See Constable, vol. 2: pp. 257ff.
63. Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 53: "She [Heloise] herself was committed to a life of scholarship." See Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 110, on Guibert of Nogent's devotion to letters in youth ("solis litteris intentus") for the attainment of high status and wealth ("culminum opumque assecutiones").
64. Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 48.
65. E. McLeod, *Héloïse,* p. 12.
66. Cf. #113: l. 29 'genus,' Könsgen, p. 63.
67. Penelope D. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France.*
68. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism.*
69. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* p. 8.
70. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* p. 10.
71. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* p. 9.
72. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* p. 14.
73. Examined in Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* chapters 3 and 4.
74. Cf., for example, the patronage of Robert of Arbrissel. Ibid., pp. 57ff.
75. Ibid., p. 55; "was" seems to be required by the syntax of the sentence rather than 'were'.
76. Venarde, *Women's Monasticism,* pp. 43–44.
77. Guibert of Nogent, *Self and Society in Medieval France: The 'Memoirs' of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064?–c. 1125),* ed. John F. Benton, trans. C. C. Swinton Bland, p. 16. Heloise's mother, Hersindis, Hersende (E. McLeod, *Héloïse,* pp. 9, 12), has the same name as that of "a forceful noblewoman [who] made a major donation to [a priory] . . . in Périgord in 1010": Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* p. 21.
78. According to Pernoud, illegitimate children were brought up in the father's family *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 63.

79. Abelard's own mother retired to a monastery. "Thirty-five per cent of the nuns entering Ronceray before 1100 were widows or married women." Mary Skinner, "Benedictine Life for Women in Central France, 850–1100: A Feminist Revival," pp. 87–113, p. 98. Pernoud assumes that Heloise's parents directed her education at Argenteuil and her remove to Paris to live with Fulbert, not Fulbert himself. See Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* pp. 32, 47, 53.
80. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* pp. 15–16, 18–27.
81. Cf. the case of Ermengaud of Anjou, the recipient of a 'sermo' from Robert of Arbrissel (Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 138–39).
82. Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages,* p. 8, cited in Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* p. 33. Cf. Shahar, *The Fourth Estate,* chap. 3 in general. On nunneries as places of expectation for a schooling and literacy for daughters, see Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* pp. 144–47 (including consideration of a poem allegedly written by Heloise—see Mews, *The Lost Letters*). Constant Mews, in *The Lost Love Letters,* refers to the case of Vital of Mortain, who, according to Marbod of Rennes, enabled a girl to obtain an education that otherwise would have been unavailable because of the expense involved (Marbod, *Ep.* 4, PL 171.1474AB). See also Skinner, "Benedictine Life for Women," p. 98.
83. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* p. 28.
84. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* p. 29.
85. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* pp. 31–32.
86. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* pp. 150–163; cf. also Michel Parisse, *Les Nonnes au Moyen Âge,* pp. 182ff.
87. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession,* pp. 112–130; Parisse, *Les Nonnes au Moyen Âge,* pp. 240ff.
88. The "worldliness" of Argenteuil during Heloise's time there is stressed by Thomas Waldman, "Abbot Suger and the nuns of Argenteuil," citing Matthew of Albano and by Lindy Grant ("Abelard and Heloise used the nunnery like a hotel"): references at Lindy Grant, *Abbot Suger of St. Denis: Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France,* pp. 190–93.
89. Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* pp. 47 and 53.
90. On this subject, see also: Eileen Edna Power, *Medieval Women,* chap. 5, for an older view, emphasizing the limited number and aristocratic nature of nunneries (in England) but mentioning education as a motive for entering the female foundations (p. 91); Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England 450–1500,* pt. 4: pp. 189ff., again restricted to England, but revising Power, especially on the number of nunneries (pp. 190ff.); patterns of growth and patronage of women's monastic foundations in England are also investigated by Sally Thompson in her *Women Religious: The Founding of English Nunneries After the Norman Conquest;* some remarks on the continental scene will be found in Edith Ennen, *The Medieval Woman,* pp. 122–37, and in Herbert Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Age.* See also Ernest William McDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture, with Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene,* and Ward and Bussey, eds., *Worshipping Women.* Parisse surveys the topic "par le biais de la noblesse et de l'histoire germanique, parce que je voulais comprendre l'originalité que représentent les chapitres de dames nobles, et les raisons de leur opposition aux abbayes bénédictines traditionelles." *Les Nonnes au Moyen Âge,* p. 9. For our period, Parisse writes (p. 63): "Le plus souvent, le monastère féminin est conçu comme une maison d'accueil pour les jeunes filles non mariées et les veuves qui renoncent à d'autres noces. C'est une affaire de famille, de société, moins souvent de religion." He stresses "un élitisme [social] certain dans la vie monastique féminine," pp. 131–34 and cf. pp. 208ff. On the female monastics of our period, see Michelle Pontenay de Fontette, *Les religieuses à l'âge classique du droit canon: recherches sur les structures juridiques des branches*

féminines des Ordres. Ward would like to acknowledge the generous assistance of Deirdre Stone on this topic.

91. According to Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 49, Heloise was "beautiful."
92. All references found in Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric.* Here, *Ciceronian Rhetoric* p. 30, Dickey 1968, p. 15: "noli iacere cum monialibus quia ex huiusmodi negotio evenit hoc nuper quod quidam testes amisit." Castration was the punishment meted out to the Count of Nantes (Dronke, *Abelard and Heloise in Medieval Testimonies,* pp. 19 and 45–46 and reprinted in *Intellectuals and Poets in Medieval Europe,* pp. 247–94); Fredborg 1976b (Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* p. 30) and Ward 1978 (Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* p. 38) p. 47 n. 60.
93. *HC,* ed. Monfrin 573ff.
94. For the letters down to #84 see Appendix A below. Citations in the following notes assume a reading of the notes to Appendix A.
95. As Könsgen notes (47 n. 6) the phrase is taken from the Song of Songs; the *sponsa* speaking.
96. Cf. the comments at n. 345 below.
97. P. G. W. Glare, ed., *Oxford Latin Dictionary,* p. 1379; Propertius 4.11.12: "famae pignora tanta meae," 73: "communia pignora"; *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* ed. and trans. Frederick W. Shipley, p. 396. In Baudri of Bourgeuil the "security or pledge [*pignus*] for this contract [between the poet and Galo] is the letter-poem itself": Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 65.
98. Cartlidge, *Medieval Marriage,* p. 65 (citing Luscombe).
99. Cartlidge, *Medieval Marriage,* p. 66.
100. See Skinner, "Benedictine Life for Women," p. 102.
101. Dronke, *Women Writers,* p. 95. For Dronke's general (negative) discussion of the authenticity of these letters, see his *Medieval Testimonies,* pp. 24–26.
102. "certatim pro bravio curramus in amore." "Veris leta facies," [Anonymous], *Carmina Burana* 1.2 *Text: Die Liebeslieder,* p. 138, where the word 'bravium' seems to imply "a state of true love," that is, mutual acceptance and loving devotion expressed equally by both parties in the couple: love, in this sense, crowns/rewards those who seek it.
103. For example, in *Menander Rhetor* (*Menander Rhetor,* p. 149), advice for the "bedroom speech"—*kateunastikos.*
104. Könsgen, p. 47, nn. 8–9.
105. C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary,* p. 248.
106. Cf. his #61 and her #53 for the interchangeability of this idea.
107. Cf. Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.41 'segnis,' where the word seems to imply neglect of 'amor.'
108. The failure to mention Rachel and our recall of the identification of "Mary" with Mary Magdalene that is found in many sources adds a twist to a commonplace in patristic, medieval and especially monastic literature: Giles Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought: The Interpretation of Mary and Martha, the Ideal of the Imitation of Christ, and the Orders of Society,* pp. 16, 27, 51, 73–74, and 87. A characteristic monastic reference to the two pairs of biblical figures will be found in R. E. Pepin, ed., *Scorn for the World: Bernard of Cluny's "De contemptu mundi": The Latin Text with English Translation and an Introduction,* pp. 22–23. See Ballanti, *Anonimo,* p. 33 of #86: "Forse, è l'eco della maternità di Eloisa. . . ."
109. See Könsgen, p. 113, providing nine references, all the woman's. In *Ep.* 2, ed. Monfrin 116: l. 212, Muckle 72 (Radice 115) Heloise sets up a contrast between the outcome of some alleged wrong act and the intention behind it in the mind of the doer, using for the latter "efficientis affectus." Perhaps the contrast between *affectus* and *amor* is intended to be the particular intention that inspires a particular act (*affectus,* in this context to make love?) as contrasted with a general disposition to love someone (*amor*)? Certainly #23 seems to use the word *affectus* in this localized sense. In #76 the word seems to mean "my great desire for you at this particular moment," and in #79 we find

the actual phrase "intencionem mei affectus"—the "intention that my desire for you promotes at this particular moment." This is the sense in which Heloise uses the word in *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 72 (Radice 115): "non enim rei effectus sed efficientis affectus in crimine est." Abelard uses the word in the sense of conscious choice or favor (versus "animal coercion") in his *Carmen ad Astralabium:* Josepha Marie Annaïs Rubingh-Bosscher, *Peter Abelard, Carmen ad Astralabium, A Critical Edition,* p. 113: l. 124. Juanita Ruys and J. O. Ward are currently engaged in a complete annotated translation of this *Carmen* and the *planctus Abelardi.*

110. J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary,* p. 190.
111. This is a paraphrase of the lines in question.
112. Abelard knew of Ovid's songs—*HC* Monfrin l. 390 = Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.39–40.
113. See for the letters that follow Appendix B below. Citations in the footnotes below assume a reading of the footnotes to Appendix B.
114. There is a sad irony in the use of these words "summa . . . exultacione": *HC* Monfrin ll. 392–93.
115. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 170–193.
116. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 188: l. 103.
117. Cf. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 184: l. 62 with #87.
118. Cf. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 182: l. 29 with #50.
119. Cf. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 182: l. 6 with p. 172: l. 51.
120. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 172.
121. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 170–172.
122. Mews observes that de Vepria has "effectively silenced the woman's voice" by cutting out all that preceded the fragment preserved. *The Lost Love Letters.*
123. Does this settle the question of Heloise's social class?
124. *HC* ed. Monfrin 117 ll. 271–72.
125. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 239.
126. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 125.
127. *Ep.* 2–5, ed. Monfrin 111–125, Muckle 47–94 (Radice), in particular.
128. Radice 110–111 and 116; it is not hard to jump from such lines as "solus quippe es qui me contristare, qui me letificare seu consolari valeas" (*Ep.* 2, ed. Monfrin 114: ll. 133–35, Muckle 70 [Radice 113]) to the de Vepria collection.
129. Rather as Abelard himself claims to have done, #110 [V] "quotiens tuas litteras incipio, tanta interius suavitate perfundor, ut litteram, quam legi, sepe cogar repetere, quia attencionem michi magnitudo aufert leticie."
130. *Ep.* 5, ed. Muckle 88 (Radice 146).
131. Fully and interestingly surveyed in Mews, *The Lost Love Letters.*
132. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 14.
133. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 16.
134. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 16.
135. 'Ars dictaminis' does not mean 'art of dictation,' nor—in its sense as the art of epistolography—can it be shown to have been taught "along with Latin in the classroom" of Abelard's day.
136. See Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* pp. 50ff. and 58ff.
137. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 85: "If I consider this booklet a crafted text of its own age rather than a degenerate rhetoric from Antiquity, its significance becomes clearer. It is the first high medieval rhetoric for poets, and displays a strong interest in 'translating' the study into the terms of its own age. . . ." Such a view, satisfying as it is to medievalists, works against the implications of Brian Vickers's *In Defence of Rhetoric,* chap. 4.
138. For example, in the *Ad Herennium* commentary beginning "Etsi Cum Tullius" attached in many manuscripts to the more authoritative and exhaustive *De inventione* commentary known as "In primis": Fredborg (1976b) as cited in Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric,* p. 32.

139. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 52.
140. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 53.
141. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 86.
142. Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* p. 56.
143. *Ad Her.* 1.2.3.
144. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 86–87.
145. See Ward 1972a in Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric,* p. 48.
146. MS London, BL Harley 6324. See Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* pp. 29 [Caplan 1970] and 369 [index *sv.* 'London B. L. MS Harley 6324']).
147. ed. C. Halm (as cited in Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* p. 34).
148. Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* index *sv.* '*Heptateuchon*'.
149. Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* index *sv.* 'Peter Abelard'.
150. Outlined in Constant Mews, *Abelard;* Clanchy, *A Medieval Life,* pp. 24, 120, and 204; and Hicks xi-xv.
151. Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* pp. 108–109.
152. John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 2.9, trans. McGarry, pp. 93–95 and 3.10, pp. 190–201, etc.
153. Cf. Pernoud's description of the later correspondence: "the white-hot correspondence which has survived the passage of the centuries" (*Heloise and Abelard,* p. 55).
154. There is much that is suggestive here in Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 64–69. Not only are Abelard and Heloise exactly the social types identified by Bond as participants in the new Ovidian humanism—people with less established social networks of power—but they represent and perhaps aim at exactly the audience Bond envisages for the writings of such as Baudri of Bourgeuil—"the teachers and especially the students and pupils of the cathedral and monastic schools." Further, their correspondence illustrates well "the collapse of character and author associated with the emergence of the complete literary persona."
155. Pernoud, *Heloise and Abelard,* p. 11; cf. *HC* Monfrin ll. 25, 28–30, 59, 65, 69, 81, 84, 92, etc.: despite reference to "litteratoria disciplina," "studium litterarum/philosophie," 'rethorica' and similar phrases in the early lines of the *HC,* the universal (no pun intended) preoccupation seems to have been what passed for 'dialectical' disputation.
156. Despite Abelard's interest in that text, and despite the role alleged for the text by some in the later letter collection—see chapter 5 by Wilson and MacLeod in this volume.
157. See: Margaret H. King and Albert Rabil Jr., *Her Immaculate Hand: Selected Works By and About the Women Humanists of Quattrocento Italy;* Albert Rabil Jr., *Laura Cereta: Quattrocento Humanist;* Diana Robin, trans., *Laura Cereta: Collected Letters of a Renaissance Feminist.*
158. Könsgen, pp. 3ff. (foot of page).
159. 'Anhang 6,' pp. 67–68. See also Ian Thomson and Louis Perraud, eds. and trans., *Ten Latin Schooltexts of the Later Middle Ages: Translated Selections.*
160. Elsewhere in this chapter we suggest a few possible additions to Könsgen's annotations.
161. See Könsgen's annotations p. 23.
162. *Ep.* 5, ed. Muckle 88 (Radice 146–48).
163. Dares Phrygius as reported in J. Lemprière, *Classical Dictionary,* p. 121.
164. Cf. Heloise in #60 "nosti quoque, si tantum dignaris, quod nunquam fuit erga te duplici animo nec esse volo."
165. It is sometimes insisted that Abelard's decision to place Heloise back at Argenteuil after their marriage was in part motivated by an unwillingness to leave her in society where she could have the sexual relations that he himself could not. Juanita Ruys supplies the following references: Marjorie Muir Worthington, *The Immortal Lovers: Héloise and Abélard,* p. 57; Elizabeth Hamilton, *Héloïse,* pp. 49–50; D. W. Robertson, Jr., *Abelard and Heloise,* p. 58; Radice 22–23 and her "The French Scholar-Lover: Heloise," p. 94; Glenda McLeod, "'Wholly Guilty, Wholly Innocent': Self-Definition

in Héloise's Letters to Abélard," pp. 68, 84 n. 17; Linda S. Kauffman, *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre and Epistolary Fictions.*

166. Terence, *Hauton Timorumenos,* ed. Alfred Fleckeisen, pp. 51ff.
167. Terence, *Terence, The Comedies,* trans. Betty Radice, pp. 93ff.
168. Terence, *Hauton Timorumenos,* ed. Fleckenstein, p. 56: *ll.* 97–98.
169. Terence, *Hauton Timorumenos,* ed. Fleckenstein, p. 65: *ll.* 286–91.
170. Terence, *Hauton Timorumenos,* ed. Fleckenstein, p. 69: *ll.* 382–95 (Terence, *Terence, The Comedies,* trans. Radice, p. 118).
171. See Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* pp. 134ff.; Ward, "From Marginal Gloss"; Ward, "Women and Latin Rhetoric from Hrotsvit to Hildegard" in *Women and the Rhetorical Tradition,* eds. Christine Sutherland and Rebecca Sutcliffe; Ward, "The *Catena* Commentaries on the Rhetoric of Cicero."
172. Ward *Ciceronian Rhetoric* pp. 108ff.
173. *Ep.* 2, ed. Monfrin 115: *ll.* 169ff., Muckle 71 (Radice 114).
174. Giles Constable, "Letters and Letter-Collections," p. 31.
175. Constable, "Letters and Letter-Collections," pp. 32–33.
176. Robinson, "The *colores rhetorici,*" p. 215.
177. Constable, vol. 2: p. 31; Constable, "Letters and Letter-Collections," p. 35.
178. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 45.
179. See Könsgen, pp. ix-xiv.
180. According to the *Repertorium der Artes dictandi des Mittelalters (Von den Anfängen bis um 1200)* of Franz Josef Worstbrock, Monika Klaes, and Jutta Lütten (vol. 1, Münsteresche Mittelalter-Schriften 66; Munich, 1992, p. 183), only a handful of such *artes dictandi* had been produced by that stage: Alberic of Montecassino's works, Adalbert of Samaria's *Praecepta dictaminum,* Hugh of Bologna's *Rationes dictandi prosaice* and Henry Francigena's *Aurea gemma.* These were all products of the Italian schools; the first surviving dictaminal text produced in France is the anonymous *Aurea gemma Gallica,* which Worstbrock et al. assign most likely to Tours around 1154.
181. The term is used by Heloise in a later letter, *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 73 (Radice 115): "you left many love-songs and verses which won wide popularity for the charm of their words and tunes [*prae nimia suavitate tam dictaminis quam cantus*] and kept your name continually on everyone's lips," a suggestive echo of the woman's words to her lover in #69.
182. The term, though current in late Latin, seems to have gained particular currency from the eleventh century on, to judge from its occurrences in the *Patrologia latina.*
183. Their occurrences are conveniently identified and listed by Könsgen, pp. 67–68.
184. Gian Carlo Alessio, ed., *Bene Florentini Candelabrum,* pp. 274–86.
185. Since here we are stressing the "formal," dictaminal elements of the de Vepria correspondence, we will revert to a more neutral position with respect to the correspondents' identities.
186. According to the *Oxford Classical Dictionary,* 'declamation,' the main pedagogical technique for rhetorical training, consisted of two main forms: the *controversia* ("a speech in character on one side of a fictional law case") and the *suasoria* ("a deliberative speech advising a course of action") Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., 3rd edn., p. 436. See also Carol Dana Lanham's article "Freshman Composition in the Early Middle Ages: Epistolography and Rhetoric Before the *Ars Dictaminis,*" where she explores the link between such schoolroom rhetorical exercises (*progymnasmata*) and the development of the *ars dictaminis.*
187. "Quippe qui rem quamlibet assumit laudare, debet tandem in partes distribuere singularumque partium qualitates summa cautione pensare et quamque secundum dignitatem congrue laudis celebritate conorare. Alioquin rei laudande iniuriam facit, qui [. . .] eleganciam enormi narracione deterit." All translations from Latin in this section

of the paper are by N. Chiavaroli unless otherwise indicated. Translations of the de Vepria letters are essentially those of *The Lost Love Letters* by Mews and Chiavaroli. Chiavaroli would also like to register his thanks to Mews, with whom many of the ideas in this section were discussed during the collaborative translation of the text.

188. Boncompagno da Signa, *Boncompagnus* 6.2.7: "Suasio de commendatione morum et pulchritudine corporea et nobilitate"; 6.2.8: Dissuasio propter morum ineptitudinem, deformitatem persone atque ignobilitatem."The text of the *Boncompagnus* has been extracted and partially edited by many scholars in succession but is only now being edited as a whole, by Steven M. Wight. His edition-in-progress may be found on the Internet at www.loop.com/~swight, from which the above letter rubrics are taken.
189. Ballanti (*Anonimo,* p. 9) thinks de Vepria himself rendered the letters anonymous, but Könsgen (p. 76) feels that even for him they were anonymous.
190. "Hos, rogo, ne versus oculus legat invidiosus / Hosque sciant nolo pectora plena dolo."
191. "Cautius modo te alloquor, si notare vis, cautius aggredior, pudor se amori contemperat, amorem verecundia cohibet, ne in immensum proruat, ut et nostris dulcibus votis copiam demus et famam, que de nobis orta est, paulatim attenuemus."
192. "Et est notandum, quod tam mulieres quam viri, cuiuscumque sint ordinis vel conditionis, debent epistole titulum in huiusmodi lasciviis taliter occultare, quod si littere ad aliquorum manus pervenerint, nequeant de facili cognosci": *Rota Veneris,* ed. Paolo Garbini (Rome: Salerno Editrice, 1996), p. 36—[this edition is based on that of Friedrich Baethgen].
193. The *Corona,* identified by Emil J. Polak in his *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters. A Census of Manuscripts Found in Part of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States of America,* Davis Medieval Texts and Studies 9, and edited by Franco-Lucio Schiavetto, "Un'opera sconosciuta di Boncompagno."
194. In Carol Dana Lanham's study *'Salutatio' Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style and Theory,* especially pp. 7–8.
195. These are the usual cases, although as Lanham discusses (*'Salutatio' Formulas,* pp. 106ff.), they were occasionally challenged by some *dictatores.* Throughout this chapter, the term 'salutation' (or *salutatio*) will refer to the entire three-part structure, while the English term 'greeting' will be used specifically for the third part only.
196. "Si minor scripserit maiori, maior persona preponitur, minor subsequitur. Si maior minori, eadem semper precedit. Si par pari utralibet potest preponi et subponi iuxta placitum scriptoris. Salutatio vero diversa qualitate personam et ordinem designet, aliter enim superiorem, aliter inferiorem, aliter salutamus equalem" (Adalabertus Samaritanus, *Praecepta Dictaminum* 1.8–13). I have adopted the attested variant *designet* for Schmale's *designat.*
197. See Lanham, *'Salutatio' Formulas,* pp. 114–16.
198. "Tocius artis largitor et humani ingenii largissimus dator mei pectoris interna philosophie artis impleat pericia, quo te possim, dilectissime, ita salutare scriptis ad consensum mee voluntatis."
199. "Ego tamdiu tractavi cordis et corporis flagranti nisu, qualiter te, o gemma decora, apellarem, sed intencionem mei affectus hucusque distulit difficultas suspecti defectus" (#79). Cf. also #90 by the woman: " . . . pre nimio dolore cordis vix proferam aliqua verba salutacionis" [I can barely find any words of greeting because of the great grief in my heart].
200. "Merito specialis dilectionis amplectendo amore incendium tui amoris, quot ameno tempore redolent flores, tot percipere salutes." For the rhetorical 'quot-tot' topos, see Könsgen, p. 79.
201. "Quam michimet vellem mitti, tibi mitto salutem. / Nescio, quod magis hac esse salubre queat" (#82). I take the *salubre* of the second line to be a deliberate echo of *salutem,* playing on its two meanings of 'salutation' and 'well-being,' and possibly also its third as

'divine salvation'. Obviously, no English translation can hope to do justice to such density of meaning.

202. "Cedrine domui sue eburnea statua, supra quam domus innititur tota, nivis albedinem, lune fulgorem, solis candorem, stellarum splendorem, rosarum odorem, lilii pulchritudinem balsamique suavitatem, terre fertilitatem, celi serenitatem et quicquid in eorum dulcedinis comprehenditur ambitu." The translation is Dronke's, although I have removed the word 'from' at the beginning of the greeting, presumably a typographical error (*Women Writers,* p. 95).
203. For example, Guido Fava, in his *Summa dictaminis:* 62—Que persone non debent salutari and 63—Quando salutatio in epistola non ponatur . . . , ed. Augusto Gaudenzi in *Il Propugnatore* 23 ns. 3 (1890): 1.287–338. In his early treatise, the *Palma,* Boncompagno was evidently more interested in typology than protocol: "For I myself once obtained from the lord pope Celestine a letter, stamped with the apostolic bull, in which the same Pope completely denied a greeting to the Florentine consuls and the entire populace. Yet it was a letter and a complete one too, since it had a heading; that is, the name of the sender and recipient were placed at the beginning." [Nam ego ipse a domino papa Celestino unam epistolam impetravi apostolica bulla impressam, in qua idem papa consulibus Florentinis et toti populo salutationem penitus denegavit. Verumtamen epistola fuit et perfecta, quia titulum habebat id est nomen mittentis et recipientis erat in principio positum], Carl Sutter, *Aus Leben und Schriften des Magisters Boncompagno: ein Beitrag zur Italienischen Kulturgeschicte im Dreizehnten Jahrhundert,* pp. 105–27 [109].
204. "Cordi dimidio, parti anime mando, quod sum: tibi sum, dum vivo. Vale, quamvis nullum miseris michi salve." This occurs in letter 97 and may imply an error in sequencing.
205. "Quia uterque nostrum alter alterius conspectui modo in momento presentari valet, littere nostre salutacione non indigent. Cupio te tamen esse salvum, virtutum decore indutum, sophie gemmis circumtectum, morum honestate preditum, omnisque composicionis ornatu decoratum."
206. "Vale et, ut neminem mortalium michi compares, diligenter observa, quia ego in eadem circa te intencione tenaciter perseverabo. Salve, dilectissima, et me semper tuum in memoria habe!" (#72).
207. "Salve et tu, dilectissime, omni dulcedine digne!" (#73).
208. Lanham, *'Salutatio' Formulas,* pp. 9–12.
209. Accusative phrases: #1–16, 42–61, and 76–90; 'Whatever' phrases: #18–28, 55–56, 62–63, and 68–75; and Infinitive phrases: #6–10, 31–37, 44–54, 91–93, and 98–104.
210. As in the sequence of letters from #91 to #94, where the writers play with the imagery and symbolism of the sun and moon, light and darkness.
211. "Sol meus atque serena dies mea, lux mea, salve. / Tu mea dulcedo, te sine dulce nichil. / Si queris, quis verba tibi tam dulcia mittat: / Vita manes cuius, hoc facit ille tuus, / Cui potus lacrime te discedente fuere, / Cui dolor et gemitus mixta fuere cibus" (#108).
212. Assuming, of course, that they have not been omitted by the copyist without signaling. But given his particular focus on them, this would appear unlikely, and as Könsgen shows (pp. xxviii-xxx), de Vepria was careful to indicate where he elided text.
213. "Grata mentis mee benivolencia, pro se et officio suo tibi semper obnoxia, cum omnes quas vellet salutes expedire non potuit, permultas et iam siluit, ne plures enumerando offendere sibi videretur universas."
214. "Pauca quidem verba tua sunt, sed ea plura feci sepe relegendo, nec ego penso, quantum dicas, sed de quam fecundo corde procedat, quod dicis. Vale, dulcissima" (#19, in its entirety). The *dictatores* were often concerned with such questions as whether letters of this kind could be considered legitimate. Boncompagno, for example, thought they should, claiming in the *Palma* that while such letters might be termed 'incomplete,' they still constituted letters, in support of which he adduces a letter of Yvo of Chartres, com-

plete with episcopal seal (Carl Sutter, *Aus Leben und Schriften des Magisters Boncompagno,* p. 109).

215. "Reverende domine sue humilis servus eius devotum servitium" (#36).
216. "Sic enim vos appellare iam michi opus est, ut non dicam tu, sed vos, non dulcis, non cara, sed domina, quia non sum familiaris ut antea et vos michi nimis estis extranea."
217. A later use of the formal plural by the woman, on the other hand, appears more significant (#58). It is followed by several letters that suggest that a genuine rift had occurred. See also Appendix A below.
218. See the quotation from Adalbertus Samaritanus above.
219. Whenever Boncompagno furnished sample salutations in his *Rota Veneris,* he regularly had his correspondents place the other first (Boncompagno, *Rota Veneris,* ed. Garbini, pp. 30–35).
220. "Magne temeritatis est litteratorie tibi verba dirigere . . . ; nisi scirem vere dilectionis indefectam amiciciam tibi insitam esse, impolitas tam rudis stili litteras non tibi mittere presumerem."
221. "De favo sapiencie si michi stillaret guttula scibilitatis, aliqua olenti nectare cum omni mentis conamine alme dilectioni tue litterarum notulis conarer depingere" (#53).
222. "Quis ergo sum ego aut que in me facultas, ut tales litteras dictare queam, que me aureo sinu tuo, eburneis brachiis tuis, lactea cervice tua dignum exhibeant?"
223. This sense of the ineffability of love and the inadequacy of the letter to convey it has been identified as a major theme in love letters, especially as part of the discourse of the female correspondents. See Kauffman, *Discourses of Desire,* p. 254, who claims that "amorous discourses are always critiques of language, for the alphabet of the body has to be replaced with what is considered an inadequate system of signs: words."
224. "Clamor tuus recedat a me, verba tua ultra non audiam. Nam unde michi profutura multa speravi bona, inde lacrimabilia cordis creverunt suspiria" (#60). "Certe, quisquis verba tua diligencius consulit, reperiet ea non esse amantis, sed discidium querentis; nusquam in eis cor molle respicio, sed pectus durum et amori inexpugnabile adverto" (#61).
225. "Si inesset michi tanta sermonum facecia, ut verbis tuis prudenter respondere valerem, quantocunque decentius possem, libenti animo tibi responderem. At tamen, licet satisfacere non valeam, pro posse et modulo scienciole mee respondeo" (#62).
226. "In litteris, quas misisti, mature fuerunt sentencie, racionalis et ordinata composicio; nunquam certe aptius vidi dispositas. Ego, dulcissima, multas horas deo volente tibi prestabo dulcissimas et letissimas" (#63).
227. *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 68 (Radice 109).
228. *Ep.* 4, ed. Muckle 77 (Radice 127).
229. Yet Abelard will again avoid the subtext and respond to Heloise's complaint on a superficial level only: the pre-placing of her name was appropriate, he retorts, for once she became a nun, she also became the bride of Christ, and thus, ipso facto, his superior. It is not dissimilar to the man's adoption of a pedagogical tone seen earlier; in both cases, the male correspondents seem to have missed the point. See Juanita Ruys, "Role-Playing in the *Letters* of Heloise and Abelard: Readings of the Correspondence Between Heloise and Abelard," p. 53ff.
230. Dronke, "Heloise's *Problemata* and *Letters:* Some Questions of Form and Content" in Trier pp. 53–73, [p. 56]; Stone, "Heloise: *la très sage abbesse,*" p. 26. According to Constable "the *ars dictaminis* and formulary of Albert of Samaria, the earliest of the known Bolognese *dictatores* [to be used in France], appear in conjunction with a group of French letters of about 1130/50 and with the letter collection of Prior Peter of St. John at Sens, who died about 1146" (Constable, vol. 2: p. 32). It is highly unlikely, therefore, that such materials were being taught or were available for imitation in the Paris of the years A.D. 1116 to 1118.
231. Dronke, "Heloise's *Problemata,*" p. 55.

232. Neither Martin Camargo nor Constant Mews, who have been kind enough to communicate their views orally to us, are prepared to support Dronke's arguments in regard to the relationship between Heloise's *cursus* patterns, as evident in the known letters, and Adalbert of Samaria's *Precepta dictaminum*.
233. Martin Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis, Ars Dictandi,* p. 26.
234. Tore Janson, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century,* p. 35.
235. Excluding 'Vale'.
236. The selection of *cursus* patterns has been taken, by no exhaustive search, from Janson, *Prose Rhythm;* Giovanni Cremaschi, *Guida allo studio del latino medievale,* pp. 110–111; N. Denholm-Young, "The *cursus* in England," in his *Collected Papers,* pp. 42ff.; Terence Tunberg, "Prose Styles and *cursus,*" pp. 111ff.; and Paget Toynbee, *Dantis Alagherii Epistolae: The Letters of Dante, Emended Text with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Indices, and Appendix on the Cursus,* 2nd edn., pp. 224–47, and other basic textbooks. The provisional nature of the method adopted will, we think, be justified by the conclusions reached. We have ignored, for this exercise, the *cursus medius,* the *cursus trispondaicus,* apparently a French specialty (Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis,* p. 26), and some other less common cadences dealt with from time to time in the manuals.
237. This latter exercise requires for 'V' in two instances a monosyllable to be taken unstressed with the previous word to make '2 + pp,' and, for 'M,' on one occasion, a monosyllable needs to be assmilated to a previous 'p3' making a 'pp4'.
238. *Women Writers* and "Heloise's *Problemata.*" In *Women Writers,* pp. 110–136, Dronke stresses Heloise's verbal artistry; preference for *cursus tardus* and *velox;* careful letter-structure; balanced sentence structure ("tanto . . . quanto"); rhyming antitheses; word play; symmetrical questions and parellelisms; "rhetorical and poetic shaping" (p. 126); "rhymes, rhythmic symmetries and cadences" (p. 127); and "parallelistic rhymed prose, heightened prose, laden with rhymes" (p. 135).
239. See the remarks of Terence Tunberg in *Medieval Latin,* pp. 112–13: the leading authors of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, many of them monks, "emphasized symmetry and parallelism in the structure of their ample sentences through the use of such devices as *isocolon . . . , anaphora . . . ,* and end rhyme. In many cases, especially by the mid-twelfth century, the harmony of formal prose is enhanced by the practice of ending sentences and clauses with accentual rhythms, or *cursus. . . .*" Classicism (involving, among other things, avoidance of [monastic] parallelism of sound and structure, and cultivation of a more periodic style), and, in the more dictaminal texts, what might be called 'manneristic' writing is progressively evident. See, further, J. O. Ward, in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography,* pp. 133–35.
240. *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 288–90.
241. *Artemisia* (1997), directed by Agnes Merlet and starring Michel Serrault and Valentina Cervi, et al. For the "facts" of the matter, as far as they can be obtained, see Germaine Greer, *The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Painters and Their Work,* ch. 10. It is worth noting that Artemisia in the filmed reconstruction is about the age that used to be assumed for Heloise (mid-teens). In the film Camille Claudel, the "heroine" (noted perfunctorily in Ionel Jianu, *Rodin,* pp. 65, 123–24) also shares a sense of disillusion, blunting of artistic talent by another (male), a sense of imprisonment/confinement by and for the convenience of males, with Heloise.
242. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 62.
243. It might not be impossible to render the longer letters more similar to the de Vepria collection by the deletion of certain paragraphs. For example, if we were to delete from *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 68–73 the following material: p. 68 between "Erant memini . . ." and " . . . consummasti" and "Per ipsum . . . participes habeas"; p. 69 "Deo autem . . . complexa sum," "non matrimonii foedera . . . imperatrix," "Duo autem fateor . . . accendit

invidiam,""Dic unum si vales . . . Deo mancipasti,""Memento, obsecro . . . inchoaverim principio," and "Cum me ad turpes . . . excitares?"

244. The following review is designed simply to develop at close range the idea that 'V' = Abelard and 'M' = Heloise. Since Constant Mews's book on the de Vepria collection is accompanied by a translation no systematic attempt has been made here to convey any exact idea of the contents of each letter.
245. See Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 61 in regard to the manuscript and chronological order of Baudri of Bourgeuil's letter-poems.
246. We cite the de Vepria correspondence by the number of each letter assigned in Könsgen's text, followed by 'V' to indicate that the man, here considered to be Abelard, is speaking, 'M' to indicate that the woman, here considered to be Heloise, is speaking.
247. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* and Dronke, *Women Writers.*
248. Abelard claims to have a tired mind of which Heloise is the sole solace; there is no reference to Abelard's "youth" (which one might expect in a 'set-piece' letter).
249. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 252.
250. The curious tartness of this reference (which contradicts *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 292) may be expunged by inferring that the "viriditatem" is to last as long as life, but the positioning of the elements in the *salutatio* does not seem to support this interpretation: "to her heartfelt love, to the one sweetly redolent of every aroma, [she] with her heart and body, with the flowers of your youth becoming exhausted/fading/pining away [Lucan/Vulgate], [offers] the bloom of eternal happiness."
251. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI J/h v.Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance,* vol. 2: pp. 760–63.
252. Könsgen, p. 9: #21 ("et ex ipsius experimento rei esse, quod est . . . equipolenter") and #13 ('benivolencia' and 'officio' represent concepts that would have been met with early in an acquaintance with the *auctores* in rhetoric: *Ad Her.* 1.2.2, 1.4.6, etc.).
253. See Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 88 for such pretensions (in a male) as an artistic pretence.
254. On the notion of men and women living equally and freed of sexual passion at the time see Mary Skinner, "Benedictine Life for Women," p. 102.
255. The context is doubtless amatory: cf. Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.566.
256. Perhaps when Abelard was living in Fulbert's house, since his presence there did not in itself abrogate the need for wax tablets: exercises set would still have to be completed and the fiction of their apparent relationship could always be used as a code for their real relationship: the wax tablet exchanges could easily therefore function as both *exercitia* and as communication. It seems unlikely that the intimate relationship already reflected in these letters could be earlier.
257. D. M. Stone, "Heloise: *la très sage abbesse,*" p. 21: "the present paper [. . .] has a [. . .] modest aim—to view the monastic experience of Heloise in terms of some virtues dear to the heart of monasticism [. . .] chastity, poverty, obedience and silence." Stone claims that "we have no evidence that the source of her [Heloise's monastic] practice [of these virtues] lay in Christian spirituality" (p. 24) and feels that Heloise's exceptional learning (Latin, Greek, and Hebrew) derived from her time at Argenteuil (p. 26). Rejecting the argument that the nuns at Argenteuil before their expulsion at the hands of Abbot Suger behaved in an 'immoral' manner (pp. 23–24), she asks: "might it have been a rather too close acquaintance with worldly literature that gave Suger the opportunity for criticism of the nuns?" (p. 26). After a look at Abelard's *Ep.* 9 and the *Problemata Heloissae,* she concludes that "we see a monastic influence on Heloise's love of learning [. . .] more clearly than we can see a monastic influence on her practice of the virtues."
258. When Abelard is resident inside Fulbert's house.

259. As commonly in classical love poetry (J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary,* pp. 197–98).
260. Cf. *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 68: "falsorum machinationem accessisti."
261. *Ad Her.* 1.2.2, 1.4.6, etc.
262. An idea much circulated in what Bond calls "Romanesque France," *The Loving Subject,* p. 49.
263. How many rooms did Fulbert's house boast? Did it have a kind of separate area or "apartment" that a teacher of the rank of Abelard might have used as his quarters? And would this have been some noticeable distance from where Fulbert's niece slept? Régine Pernoud has Abelard longing "for the curfew, for the dying away of noise within the unlit house, for the moment when he could safely steal along the corridor and up the stairs to the door which led to paradise" (*Heloise and Abelard,* p. 58)!
264. See Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 54 (or his "'Iocus amoris,'" pp. 175–76) for a recent statement of the position here.
265. "opuscula enim mea haec et alia nullis impressa tabulis dictando et scribendo, scribenda etiam pariter commentando immutabiliter paginis inferebam" (Guibert of Nogent to be found in: Guibert de Nogent, *Guibert de Nogent, Autobiographie,* p. 144; Guibert, *A Monk's Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent,* trans. P. J. Archambault, p. 63; and *Self and Society in Medieval France,* p. 91.
266. The use of 'candidus' or a variant is nevertheless a commonplace of 'erotic' poetry; cf. "candore gulae," "candentes dentes," "crura candidiora nive," "papilla nive," "candore Dianam," "candor inest Veneri," etc., in Therese Latzke, "Die Carmina erotica der Ripollsammlung," pp. 183–84.
267. *HC,* ed. Muckle 16; *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 91.
268. Abelard had, I am informed by Juanita Ruys, a double-sided seal, which is referred to at the end of Roscellin's letter to Abelard.
269. Catullus, poems 30.1; 64.58, 123, 249; etc.
270. Catullus, poem 83.3, etc.
271. Catullus, poem 8.11; Tibullus 2.6.28, K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature* (London: Routledge, 1963), p. 133, etc.
272. *Women Writers,* pp. 94–95.
273. [Anonymous], *Carmina Burana* 1:2 *Text: Die Liebeslieder,* #169: p. 285. Cf. also the "sed michi sydus hebet" of #20.2 (Könsgen, p. 9).
274. M 117: ll. 269ff., *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 73; for *voluptas* as sexual pleasure see Adams, *Sexual Vocabulary,* pp. 197–98.
275. M 117: ll. 269ff.
276. M 318; all students were normally required to register with a master, the only real guarantee of existence and progress through a very informal arrangement of study possibilities. For this practice in later times, see Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, ed., *Universities in the Middle Ages,* vol. 1 of *A History of the University in Europe,* p. 157. Robert de Sorbonne put the matter this way in 1215: "nullus sit scolaris Parisius, qui certum magistrum non habeat" (*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* eds. H. Denifle and E. Châtelain vol. 1: p. 79). While it cannot be argued that thirteenth-century practices date back to Abelard's day, it is reasonable to assume that some informal equivalent of the practice later known as "registration" existed and that what Fulbert is doing is ensuring that Abelard would be Heloise's *magister.* Abelard himself, in the *HC,* refers to his *magisterium* (Monfrin 33), his aspiration "ad scolarum regimen" (Monfrin 46), his "scolarum nostrarum tirocinio" ([Monfrin 58] and cf. Könsgen, #98, "Tyroni"), to William of Champeaux as his *preceptor* (Monfrin 71); he uses the phrase "publicas scolas exercere" (Monfrin 80), describes the position of leading teacher in an art as "me dialectice studium regente" ([Monfrin 108–109] and see "in scolis . . . preminere" [Monfrin

226–27]), speaks of "succeeding to the schools" (Monfrin 105), "adhering to our master" (Monfrin 103), "hastening to our teaching [*doctrinam*]" (Monfrin 104), and "retiring from teaching" [*a regimine scolarum cessare* (Monfrin 141)]. To 'give a lecture' is to assume the role of *expositor* and to proceed *ad lectionem* (Monfrin 203–204), with a second and third lecture being described as "ad secundum et terciam lectionem concurrere," the *auditores* then busily occupying themselves with making copies of the previously heard lecture(s) ("de transcribendis glosis" [Monfrin 218–20]). Apparently a successful lecturer would be asked to formally gloss a text in accordance with the tenor of his lectures ("me secundum hunc nostre lectionis tenorem ad glosandum compellerent [auditores]" [Monfrin 216]). Quite how this latter was achieved is not made clear, whether through further lectures, or some form of formal 'publication' alongside or beyond lectures. When Anselm of Laon "forbade me to exercise further in the place where he held the *magisterium* the work of glossing that I had begun" [mihi interdixit inceptum glosandi opus in loco magisterii sui amplius exercere (Monfrin 232–33)]—work, we remember that had been undertaken because Abelard felt he needed no further *magisterium* "ad expositiones sanctorum intelligendas" (Monfrin 195)—it seems, from the excuses Anselm alleged, and the reaction of the *scolares* when they heard about the ban, that a fairly informal practice prevailed. Abelard must have provided his "opus glosandi" in the form of aural lecturing, more or less supplementary or alternative to the lectures of the teacher who "held the *magisterium*".

277. *Ad Her.* 4.20.28.
278. *Ad Her.* 4.15.22.
279. Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms,* 2nd edn., p. 33.
280. Cf. Isidore of Seville, "De rhetorica," ed. Halm 520.3–4: "aliae exhortativae, cum ad sententiam provocamus . . . aliae dehortativae, cum a contrario vitio peccatoque reducimus."
281. *De inv.* 2.59.177, 2.53.159, etc.
282. Did Heloise ever 'visit' the coutryside around Paris? Or return to Argenteuil? Or visit her mother (McLeod pp. 9, 12), if she was still alive, or some other relative?
283. Cf. Könsgen n. to #25.
284. John Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard,* pp. 258ff. on "*voluntas* and its cognate verb *velle.*"
285. Cf. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 1290; *Luke* 14.30.
286. See meaning no. 4 in the OLD, p. 1575: col. a.
287. Könsgen, p. 16: "colloquio et presencia." See *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 299: "jocundis . . . colloquiis."
288. Many of these letters are little more than a line or two, copied without deletions by Johannes de Vepria. They are thus indeed suggestive of a series of actual wax tablet exchanges.
289. See *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 363.
290. #29 (M): Ovid, *Tristia* 1.3.80 reading *verba* not *dicta.*
291. Cf. also Jakob Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* 2nd edn., #116: pp. 45–46 (reference courtesy of Mews, *The Lost Love Letters*).
292. #38b: l. 6 = the opening of Catullus, poem 76.
293. E.g., #29: Terence, *Andria* 1.1.134 and Ovid, *Tristia* 1.3.80 or the "si fas est" of #43 (see Catullus, poem 51); #42: "amiciam ad calculum" and the same phrase in #50.
294. This was the moment when "writing, desire and self begin to merge" (Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 62).
295. For background see Marenbon, *Philosophy,* chap. 13 "Virtue, love and merit" and *Excursus* II pp. 298ff. "Love, selflessness and Heloise."
296. *Ep.* 2, ed. Monfrin 114–15, Muckle 71 (Radice 114).
297. *Ad Her.* 1.2.3: 'dispositio est ordo et distributio rerum, quae demonstrat quid quibus locis sit conlocandum.'

298. "litteratorie tibi verba dirigere"; compare Stephen of Blois's "litteratorie tibi mandare," (epistle 1). The two letters from Stephen to Adela are in *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes,* ed. H. Hagenmeyer, letters IV (pp. 138–40) and X (pp. 149–52). I thank my colleague John Pryor for bringing these letters to my attention in the present context. See now his Stephen of Blois: Sensitive New-Age Crusader, or Victim of History" *Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association* 20 (1998): 267–74. The *salutationes* of the letters should also be compared with those found in the de Vepria collection. See Bond, *The Loving Subject,* chap. 5 for Adela.
299. "ad unguem": Horace, *Sat.* 1.5.32, used of Fonteius Capito, "a man of great abilities and elegant manners sent by Anthony to settle his political disputes with Augustus" (John Lemprière, *Classical Dictionary,* p. 138).
300. Persius helps Thierry of Chartres make a personal point at the outset of his lectures on the *De inventione* (*The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres,* ed. K. M. Fredborg, p. 49).
301. Persius, *Sat.* 1.96–97.
302. Using *conduplicatio* (*Ad Her.* 4.28.38, Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 74) and a variety of other *colores.*
303. *sciolus:* Jerome, *Letters* 48.18, 58.5, and 125.16 (Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary,* 1933, p. 1644, col. b; Könsgen, p. 26, n. 7).
304. See Mews as on p. 75 [67] of his *Peter Abelard.*
305. Ovid, *Met.* 7.826.
306. Könsgen, p. 28; Lewis and Short, but not the OLD, give Tacitus, *Or.* 20, as the only comparable classical usage of this word.
307. H. [Cicero], *Ad Herennium De ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium),* p. 197.
308. Caplan, p. 349.
309. John O. Ward, "Quintilian and the Rhetorical Revolution of the Middle Ages."
310. Könsgen, p. 29 n. 9: Abelard seems to express the sentiment of Persius, *Sat.* 1.47, but with the phraseology of Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 11.159 or Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 1.101.
311. C. S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400) Interpreted from Representative Works,* p. 17ff.
312. "nosque etiam absentes scriptis internuntiis invicem liceret presentare et pleraque audacius scribere quam colloqui, et sic semper jocundis interesse colloquiis . . . In huius itaque adolescentule amorem totus inflamatus occasionem quesivi qua eam mihi domestica et cotidiana conversatione familiarem efficerem et facilius ad consensum traherem."
313. Cf. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 302: "familiarem."
314. The gender of "benivolus . . . qui . . . querit . . . qui . . . expectaverit . . . locuta . . . anima mea" is difficult for either hypothesis.
315. Some members of Sydney University Medieval Latin Reading Group were not unduly worried by any implied contradiction here between #61 and #59: the latter might refer to sexual transgression, the former to some larger neglect in a relationship.
316. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* pp. 45 and 65. According to Bond "the word was also used from Ovid on to imply sexual union."
317. Letter 62, Könsgen, p. 62.
318. Letter 63 (V) seems to be the teacher's compliments for exercises well completed, with the promise of long lessons appropriate to the spirit of *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 319: "ut quotiens mihi a scolis reverso vaccaret"; #66 (M) is a tyro verse composition of the sort Heloise might have written early in their relationship, to demonstrate competence in work assigned; and #69 (M) looks like a poetic form of #60: some phrases pick up earlier expressions (#69: "eius sermonis credula" and #49: "sit michi credula benignitas"; #69: "pignus fidei" = #60: "rumpi fedus"; #69: "cur tam raro venit" = #62: "si vincula . . . ," #49, 54, etc); others touch upon ideas common to the Roman love poets

(e.g., #69: *ll.* 15–16 = Catullus, poems 5.2–3, 11; 7.11–12) and the whole is in the form of what the author of the *Ad Herennium* calls "conformatio" (4.53.66)—used elsewhere by Heloise (#23). Just when we have convinced ourselves that #69 is a set piece we read on and the twist of pace perplexes us: Heloise is experimenting with different sweetnesses of composition [*dictamen*] in an attempt to communicate with Abelard. Her mind wanders off into obscure analogies: Abelard is at the centre of every kind of love for her, as the heart itself is seated in the midst of the [body's] blood; just so Abelard is at the center of all kinds of *dictamen,* but it is beyond the 'valency' of her mind to find the key; words become darts piercing the heart, Abelard himself becomes part of the heart: she addresses that part of her heart and wonders why it can have broken loose from the seal, the tenacious anchor of love. There is a sudden shift to the garb of mourning ("Idcirco cultrix cineris . . .") and the letter ends with Heloise confronting Abelard and his miseries (#50 and 61) with her miseries.

319. Letter 73 (M) seems unrelated to the ebb and flow of personal problems, a piece of school poetic *ecphrasis,* perhaps as "set" by Abelard, or as thought appropriate by Heloise in view of her reading in the classical poetic *auctores* (cf. the use of the word *undisonus,* l. 12). Letter 71 (M) seems to express a disturbed resignation, an acceptance of Abelard's instructions (in handling the looming crisis of *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 379ff.?), another reference to her "inornatas litteras," an inability to concentrate on her studies and a wish to be with, speak with him, despite the bitterness that poisons her mind. Her *valedictio* puns bitterly on the *salutatio* of his #67. The *salutatio* of #72 (V) picks up the discontents of #59 and 61 and the prose portion of #69 (M); it seems to be adjusting *amicitia/amor* theory (Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 50, etc.) to practice: Abelard has recovered some intimacy ("receptus in graciam") lost by earlier "peccata" (#61). Letter 74 (V) is in a similar vein, without a *salutatio,* and apparently overwhelmed by consciousness of an *iniuria* done Heloise by her partner's "stupid and thoughtless hastiness." While he elsewhere thanks Heloise for her deeds (as distinct from words, cf. #22), Abelard now applies the same distinction to reverse effect: "what I said was only words, *nichil significans.*" Abelard apparently uttered a *vox cassa* against Heloise and he refers to it again in #75, which decries again the emptiness of words and the vainness of a certain "promise" in writing made by Abelard, a promise that has not come down to us in the extant correspondence.
320. Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages,* pp. 159–65, and cf. #50: "ut non Tullium legisse, sed ipsi Tullio precepta dedisse videaris."
321. Parodied in Ovid's *Ars amatoria* 1.453, p. 112: "this is the kind of parody which involves mocking one's own pretensions."
322. The balance of citation in Lewis and Short and OLD for *circumcisus* (and the word is often found in a rhetorical context) suggests that it means 'trimmed and polished'.
323. Vergil, *Georgics* IV.168.
324. *Statius with an English translation* vol. 1: p. 371.
325. To Könsgen's annotation (p. 44 n. 7) add Terence, *Phormio* 267.
326. Not the malevolence of those ("avunculus autem ipsius atque domestici ejus" [*HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 566–67]) who wished to bring them together!
327. *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 562–66: the period after the clandestine wedding ceremony during which the couple were living apart. Heloise living—and arguing—with Fulbert.
328. *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 570–572: the letter refers retrospectively to the redoubling of Abelard's *honor,* had the two of them been permitted to live together to the end (presumably adding her literary fame to his scholastic fame); "now" she goes on, "I choose rather to be cut off by the peril of death, than by sweet life to be deprived of the joy [*gaudium,* used in #2, 7, etc. and in the classical love poets, with sexual undertones] that comes from the sight of you." The reference to *amica* in the *salutatio* of #76 and in *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 547–48, to "quantum leticie et exultacionis" in #78 and to "cum summa exultatione" in *HC,* ed.

Monfrin ll. 392–93, to "honor . . . geminasse" in #78 and "honestius" in *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 547 (etc.) suggests this moment in their lives.

329. On "Act, intention and consent" in Abelard see Marenbon, *Philosophy,* chap. 11.
330. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 553: "nec me sustineret offendere" and cf. the implications of M 637–38.
331. *HC,* ed. Monfrin ll. 545–578: "si quicquid Caesar . . ." is picked by M 548 and M p. 114.160 (*Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 71), M 541 matches M p. 115.170 (*Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle p. 71), *gaudia* (#82.6) is picked by *gaudia* (*HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 551), *dolor et luctus* (#82.7) is picked by *dolor* in *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 556, Abelard's rueful ascription of prophetic powers to Heloise in *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 558 is ironically preceded by Heloise's ascription of prophetic powers to Abelard in #82.14 (although he is enjoined in a further irony, to live prophetically as a woman, a Sybil).
332. Vergil, *Aeneid* IV.494 and *Georgic* IV.515.
333. "After the Trojan War, Nestor retired to Greece, where he enjoyed, in the bosom of his family, the peace and tranquillity which were due to his wisdom, his services, and his old age. . . . From that circumstance, therefore, it was usual among the Greeks and the Latins, when they wished a long and happy life to their friends, to wish them to see the years of Nestor" (Lemprière, *Classical Dictionary,* p. 439).
334. *Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 71–72 (Radice 115).
335. For the biblical foundations of the language here see Könsgen's annotation *ad loc.* Cf. also " . . . tu post Deum solus es fundator, solus hujus oratorii constructor, solus hujus congregationis edifficator. Nichil hic super alienum edificasti fundamentum" M p. 113: *ll.* 77–79 (*Ep.* 2, ed. Muckle 69).
336. Abelard, the "sapiens architectus" of 1 Cor. 3.10.
337. See poem #60 above.
338. 1 Cor. 3.10, 9, 16.
339. 1 Cor. 3.9.
340. Vergil, *Eclogue* X.8–11, and cf. the way in which, elsewhere in Vergil, a forest echoes the laments of a singing, poetic lover who has lost his wife (*Georgic* IV.510).
341. The references in #88 to will and intention ("voluntarius. . . . intencione mentis") recall passages from *Peter Abelard's* [later] *Ethics,* ed. and trans. D. E. Luscombe, p. 32 and p. 140 *sv.* "intention." Cf. also "verba" and "mittentis voluntatem" in #89.
342. #48 and see Könsgen, p. 136 *sv.* "*unicus.*"
343. M p. 117: "Unico suo post Christum unica sua in Christo." See Juanita Feros Ruys, "Role-Playing in the *Letters* of Abelard and Heloise," p. 53ff.
344. *paronomasia, Ad Her.* 4.21.29, eight types.
345. See #87.6 for a nuance in this word that Abelard would have been expected to grasp, and the use of the word in Vergil, *Aeneid* IV.1 and 5 (on which R. G. Austin comments: "possibly *cura* here has a wider sense than in line 1, implying her [Dido's] general 'worry' at her situation" [*P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus,* pp. 26–27); cf. also Vergil, *Aenied* X.217 and Abelard, *Carmen ad Astrolabium,* l. 201.
346. Lucan, *Phars.* 8.67.
347. Ovid, *Met.* 2.355.
348. This poem, placed late in the collection, is a generalized statement about parting and return (compare "te discedente" in line 5 with the same phrase in #45), though the reference to "pudor et metus" suggests the period of the relationship after the clandestine marriage.
349. Taking "nobis . . . rapiunt" as the 'royal plural' rather than as referring to both Abelard *and* Heloise, which, of course, it might.
350. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 333: "amori penitus vaccabamus."
351. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 402: (Fulbert's *pudor*) and 624: (Abelard's *pudor*). Cf. *Carmina Burana,* "in trutina mentis dubia fluctuant contraria lascivus amor et pudicitia" cited in Köns-

gen, p. 54 n. 1. Cf. also Therese Latzke, "Die Carmina erotica der Ripollsammlung," p. 164.

352. Juanita Ruys informs me that this expression often implies pregnancy in such texts as the *Gesta Romanorum*.
353. Not in R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist from British and Irish Sources;* Alexander Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.;* Leo F. Stelten, *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin;* Lewis and Short; or OLD.
354. Song of Songs 3.6: "per desertum . . . ex aromatibus," etc. Also: Prudentius, *Liber Cathemerinon* 5.89 in *Prudentius,* ed. and trans. Thomson, vol. 1: p. 42: l. 89: "cui ieuna eremi saxa loquacibus" "at thy command the barren rocks of the desert gush with babbling springs"; also: *The Last Poets of Imperial Rome,* trans. Harold Isbell, pp. 139 and 175.
355. Period after the clandestine wedding ceremony, living apart, Heloise living with Fulbert and arguing with him.
356. Ovid, *Heroides and Amores,* in *Ovid in Six Volumes,* 1986 p. 11.
357. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 98.
358. Bond, *The Loving Subject,* p. 240, n. 64.
359. Again the image is taken from the Song of Songs.
360. Compare the phrase *novus est* with the *Carmina Burana,* lines: "Oh, Oh, Oh! / totus floreo, / iam amore virginali, / totus ardeo, / novus, novus amor / est, quo pereo" (W. Meyers, A. Hilka, O. Schumann, *Carmina Burana* I, Text, 2 'Die Liebeslieder', Heidelberg: Winter 1971 (2nd edn.), p. 298 (poem #179).
361. Period after the clandestine wedding ceremony, living apart, Heloise living with Fulbert and arguing with him.
362. John Lemprière, *Classical Dictionary,* p. 701.
363. See again the extract "in trutina" from the *Carmina Burana* cited in Könsgen, p. 54, n. 1.
364. *Ad Her.* 1.1.1: *copia dicendi,* a standard phrase for 'eloquence'.
365. 'agreeable' / 'ingratiating' / 'fawning' / 'deceptive' / 'being different' / 'newness' / 'unexpectedness' (?)
366. *Ep.* 5, ed. Muckle 88 (Radice 146); and for Heloise's reference, *Ep.* 4, ed. Monfrin 120, Muckle 79 (Radice 130). See also #109–111, which seem to imply such visits or their prospect.
367. *HC,* ed. Monfrin l. 114, 141 for these terms, and Radice 130/M p. 120: ll. 111–13, for Abelard "presiding over the schools" while Heloise was at Argenteuil.
368. Astrolabe?
369. M p. 120: ll. 111–13.