

The debate on the *Epistolae duorum amantium*.
Current status quaestionis and further research

Réka Forrai, Sylvain Piron

9. III. 07

The *Epistolae duorum amantium* are the object of one of the most intense and interesting current debates in medieval studies. Could it be the case that this set of 116 anonymous sophisticated letters and poems exchanged by a couple of learned medieval lovers represents the actual correspondence of Heloise and Abaelard at the time of their love affair, as Constant Mews has claimed in a book published in 1999 ? This ascription has been accepted by some scholars (B. Newman, M. Clanchy, D. Boquet, etc.) ; some supporters have even produced more arguments and evidence in favour of such a result (S. Jaeger, J. Ward, S. Piron). On the other hand, a number of medievalists have expressed their scepticism on various grounds, arguing that is impossible to decide (G. Lobrichon), that the outcome doesn't matter much (J. Verger, M.T. Fumagalli), or just stating their disbelief (J. Marenbon, G. Orlandi). The number of actual argued critics against Mews' view is so far rather limited (G. Constable, P. Dronke, P. von Moos, J. Ziolkowski). Most of them originated among Latin philologists, but it would be misleading to reduce the debate to an opposition between disciplines (idest, the cautious philologists against the temerary historians) or, as J. Ziolkowski puts it, between continents (the European sceptics vs. the enthusiastic Australians and Americans), or to perceive it, as Ziolkowski also strongly suggests, as expressing an ideological divide on the issue of gender studies (the defender of the ascription being blinded by a feminist agenda).

The methodological questions at stake are much more important and interesting. To quote the initial words of P. von Moos' monumental article, these documents represent a real challenge for medievalism. They are almost totally deprived of internal or external criteria that could allow to relate them unquestionably to any social or cultural context. Any attempt at a comparison with other medieval texts is hampered from the start, due to the unique nature of these letters. There is just no other case of such a long series of private, intimate set of letters to which they could be confronted.

Many detailed studies of different types are required in order to reduce, step by step, the uncertainties surrounding these letters. Some have already been carried out, much more are

needed before an undebatable conclusion can be reached and shared by the whole scientific community of historians and philologists. Reaching such an agreement will require a major epistemological step : namely, that the results obtained by each specialised approach be accepted (and discussed when needed) by all researchers dealing with the topic. The difficulty of the case is such that any serious hint, be it of a stylistic, semantic, historical or philosophical nature, has to be taken seriously. The final word will not be delivered from one single view point that could pretend to possess a priority over the other ones. What is needed instead is that all possible angles of investigation be taken into account, and their results duly weighed one by one, in order to reach a global assessment of the question.

As always with textual studies, the preliminary steps pertain to the codicological enquiry. The letters are only known through lengthy excerpts contained in a fifteenth century manuscript. They appear in a volume in which the young librarian of Clairvaux, Jean de Woëvre, preparing in 1471 the new catalogue of the abbey's rich library, took some notes for his personal interest, mostly out of various epistolary collections. It can be very reasonably argued for that he found the manuscript containing the letters within the library, as was the case for the other sets of letters he excerpted in the same personal codex. Since the apograph volume does not appear in the inventory he was then compiling, a reasonable inference is that the librarian kept it for himself. The shift of the volume out of the library into private hands would then explain its disappearance (which also means that the chances to find again this very codex are close to nil).

Although many hypotheses can be imagined to account for the arrival of such a manuscript in a Cistercian library, one simple line of transmission could be identified in case the codex was produced by Heloise, kept as one of the most personal belonging during all her life and preserved after her death at the Paraclete. As a matter of fact, the task of confessing the nuns was entrusted to Clairvaux monks, one of them presumably being a permanent resident in the monastery since the distance (ca. 200 km) would be too long to allow for frequent travels back and forth. At some point in later centuries, one such friar could have discovered the volume in the library¹, and brought it back to his monastery, in order to enlarge what was one of the most important collection of manuscript in the medieval West. Such an

¹ On the the library and its dilapidation, cf. C. J. Mews, « La bibliothèque du Paraclet du XIIIe siècle à la Révolution », *Studia Monastica*, 27 (1985), p. 31-67, repr. in Id., *Reason and Belief in the Age of Roscelin and Abelard*, Ashgate, Variorum, 2002

hypothesis is grounded on the fact that one Jacques de Bar, “religieux de Clairvaux et confesseur du Paraclit”, actually left two volumes to the Clairvaux library².

Out of the excerpts, some solid inferences can be made in order to reconstruct partially the design of the lost manuscript. It was apparently lacking all signs of authorship, and had no editorial apparatus such as rubrics. Jean de Woèvre has entitled his notes as taken *ex epistolis duorum amantium*, out of the actual contents of what he copied. In the same fashion, he inserted himself editorial signs, ascribing in turn the letters to the woman or the man. The modern editor, E. Könsgen, supplied some more. We can also clearly assess the nature of the excerpts : the cistercian librarian was mostly interested in *formulae*, he gradually took more note of the love letters, but consistently left out all the particulars and concrete details that were most probably present in many cases. A good number of letters are indeed truncated at places where one would expect to find the expression of such details. To give just one example, an omission is preceding the formula ‘*certe fecisse iuvat*’ in V 12, the scribe omitting a passage in which the man was presumably telling a specific action he accomplished.

Another solid result is the fact that the scribe didn’t omit full letters, except in one case where such an indication is provided by a marginal note (M 112a). Therefore, however partial this copy of the letter is, we can nevertheless be reassured that we know what it looked like as a whole.

a. Authenticity of the letters

The first issue to be discussed is whether the librarian was or wasn’t misled by ascribing the epistolary to a pair of correspondents. E. Könsgen has provided a definitive answer to that question, noting the very distinct vocabulary used by both partners, and the different cultural references they are handling. G. Orlandi’s analysis of the *cursus* used in the letters reaches the same conclusion of a distinct authorship for the woman’s and the man’s letters. On a different level, C. Mews has also shown some remarkable differences in the philosophical discussion on love by the two. The statistical approach used by F. Stella reaches a similar conclusion. The authenticity criticism of the letters should therefore be considered as a settled issue.

The only argued objection against it, proposed by P. von Moos, is insufficiently substantiated to be able to reverse this result. The hypothesis of a fake correspondence, be it

² *La bibliothèque de l’abbaye de Clairvaux du XIIe au XVIIIe siècle. I Catalogues et répertoires, publiés par André Vernet, avec la collaboration de Jean-François Genest, Editions du CNRS, 1979, p. 317.*

written by one or more plagiarists, is faced with a number of internal difficulties. The alternative hypothesis offered to the case of the recording of a continued exchange of letters has flagrant weaknesses. In order to assess that the EDA represent some sort of « encyclopedia of love » written in the form of fake letters, one would need to present the overall structure and meaning of such an encyclopedia. The few indications provided in that direction are not conclusive at all. To the contrary, S. Jaeger has firmly shown the reasons why we should accept that these letters are recording a story, unfolding over a period of more than one year. The letters contain many obscure references to events going on in the life of the lovers that are not explained, and could only be understood by the authors themselves. Such details have often been left aside by the excerptor. It is all the more significant that so many remain. Along the same line, it can be shown that the attitudes and interests of both partners are evolving as time goes by.

The impression that this exchange is nothing more than a rhetorical exercise, expressed by various scholars, doesn't contradict the reality of a passionate correspondence between lovers. Within the framework of an exchange between a student and her master, these two types of letter writing could easily shift and transform into each other in a playful way.

The authenticity of the letters can thus be considered as a settled issue. The main elements of self-description that they contain should then be accepted at face value : we are indeed confronted with a famous master of philosophy and his brilliant pupil, active in « France » ; both are living outside the cloister and are « famous in their town » and aware of what this fame entails. The age of the woman is the subject of a minor discussion that depends on the way one understands the expression : '*Non michi vetus es; quotidie cordi meo innovaris*', giving the adjective 'vetus' a relative meaning ('you are not growing old within me, everyday you are renewed in my heart') or an absolute one ('you are not that old for me... '), the latter implying that the lady was in fact not so young.

Another certainty is that they are writing to each other on wax tablets. The woman appears to be sending her tablets via a messenger who is bringing them back once the man has added his answer. It is apparently her who is copying on parchment the letters she sends and the ones she receives. Such a procedure would perfectly fit in with the relations of a master and his female pupil, the sealed tablets allowing for an exchange of love letters under the guise of scholarly exercises (Lalou).

This result has also some important consequences for any internal analysis of the documents. We are here confronted with letters exchanged by two persons who were meeting often, apparently on a daily basis at some points, talking and listening to each other in various

circumstances. In other terms, the written documents preserved represent just one side of their linguistic exchanges. It is easily observable in daily life that people talking to each other tend to use a common lexicon, and imitate each other's habits. This renders all the more striking the peculiarities found in each of the partners' semantic and stylistic uses. But this situation implies that the interaction between them has to be taken into account. For instance, written words found in one person's letters may well in fact be an echo of spoken words used by the other one.

b. Dating

A second discussion is not settled yet. It regards the dating of the letters. Könsgen's proposal of an early XIIth cent datation has been regarded by some reviewers of his edition as insufficiently grounded, and the same impression remains among some researchers. The lack of knowledge of Aelred's treatise, invoked by Könsgen, cannot be taken as a strong argument, since this text only gained fame in the XXth cent. and had a rather limited impact at his time (Boquet). P. von Moos' attempt at postponing the composition of the epistolary to the late XIIIth or early XIVth cent. can be easily discarded. The ignorance of Aristotle's discussion of friendship in books 8 and 9 of the *Ethics*, from the part of people who claim to be the 'best philosophers of their age' suffices to render a date later than 1250 impossible. The poetic style used by both partners also argues strongly in favour of a XIIth Cent. date. In a recent paper, von Moos has mitigated his ideas. For him, the datation could now range from 1180 to 1470. Such a meaningless broadening is a clear admission that the dating he first proposed is by no means acceptable. The only question that remains, therefore, is whether the epistolary has been produced in the late or the early XIIth cent.

One test that had to be performed was to check the date of apparition of all the rare words used in the letters. These words are mostly found with the woman, who apparently delights in such rarities, even to the point of coining unused words. On the whole, only four neologisms can be found : *dehortamen* (constructed in opposition to *hortamen*), *inepotabilis*, *innexibilis*, *vinculamen*. These words do not provide any clear indication of date, since the creation of adjective in *-bilis* or substantive in *-amen* are too frequent and easily created. It should be reminded that *innexibilis* also appears in a later correspondence from Tegernsee (Dronke), but this one coincidence may not suffice to argue for a Bavarian origin. Apart from these cases, all the rare words are used by late XIth or early XIIth Cent. writers, such as Baudri de Bourgueil, Bernard de Clairvaux, Guibert de Nogent, Hildegard von Bingen, Robert de Liège

(Rupert von Deutz). What is significant here is that no word used in the EDA makes its appearance in medieval Latin at a later date. This test offers a negative evidence that the vocabulary used by the two lovers is consistent with the lexicon available in the first half to the twelfth century.

Francesco Stella has recently performed an exhaustive confrontation of the verses found in the EDA with other medieval poetry, using the database *Poetria Nova*. Searching for two or more common words within a single verse, 39 parallel *loci* have been found. These indications should not be taken as pointing to direct sources, in one way or another, but rather as revealing shared stock of poetical phrases. Apart from a pervasive Ovidian influence, and some reminiscences of a few other Latin classics, or a rare case of Carolingian poetry (Alcuin) the authors who emerge most frequently are late XIth Century poets, mostly from the Loire Valley: Marbod de Rennes (8 cases), Baudri de Bourgueil (6), Fulcoie de Beauvais and Hildebert de Lavardin (5) – other authors of the period such as Serlo de Bayeux or Alfano da Salerno also appearing with less occurrences. This very clear predominance indicates, in our eyes, that the authors of the EDA were sharing the same literary culture as these writers. That would be a strong element in favour of Constant Mews' views, who is reminding that Abelard was himself educated in the Loire valley at the time when these poets were active. More recently, Mews has been claiming that Heloise herself was connected to this area. It is a known fact that her uncle Fulbert was associated with Baudri de Bourgueil (in an attempt to win the bishopric of Orleans). The ties would be even closer with Heloise's mother, Hersende, who gave the land where the abbey of Fontevraud was created – a few miles away from Bourgueil –, where she became the first abbess, next to Robert d'Arbrissel, whose *vita* was written by Baudri himself³.

However, the same search provides some apparently disturbing results. Some parallels can also be found in later poets, active in the last decades of the twelfth century – mostly Robert Partes (4), Alexander Neckham and Nigellus de Longchamp (3), Jean de Hauville and Matthieu de Vendôme (2), Alain de Lille and John of Salisbury (1). Discarding the cases in which the same parallels are also found in earlier authors, these figures are notably reduced – Partes, Hauville (2), Lille, Neckham, Nigellus, Salisbury, Vendôme (1). Since we are dealing here with parallels of two or three words, one should be cautious before deciding how significant such findings are. For instance, it may sound peculiar that the little known English poet Robert Partes, monk at Reading and active ca. 1160-1170, shares two groups of

³ C. J. Mews, "Negotiating the Boundaries of Gender in Religious Life: Robert of Arbrissel and Hersende, Abelard and Heloise", *Viator* 37 (2006): 113-148.

three words with the woman. This is certainly not sufficient to posit any direct influence, since these expressions are not uncommon at all – e.g. ‘mens mea sentit’. It can only be said that both poets loosely shared the same cultural background, and had in mind the same type of poetical repertory.

The most significative cases are those that can be described as actual borrowings from one writer by another. At least four such instances are to be found : the woman appears to take her inspirations in verses from Marbode (‘Quam michimet vellem mitti tibi mitto salutem’, with a model in Ovid) or Baudri (‘te natura beavit’, a phrase also used by Partes). The final poem by the man has some clear counterparts in Fulcoie de Beauvais (‘Non homo sed lapis est’, a phrase also used by Nigellus) or John of Salisbury (‘Quicquid mundus habere potest’). This last case seems to offer the strongest argument against an early XIIth cent. dating. But some arguments can be opposed to this conclusion. This final poem occupies a peculiar situation in the epistolary. Under all appearances, it has not been copied like other letters and poems, in the chronological succession of the correspondence, but was rather added afterwards, once the exchange of letters had ceased to be copied in the manuscript. This would mean that such a poem differs from the rest of the EDA ; it was not conceived as a private composition directed solely to the woman (like V87 or V108), but as a more public poem, that the woman inserted afterwards at the end of the letters she collected, once the exchange conducted on wax tablets had ceased. Contrary to the rest of the documents that have a distinct private and secret flavour, this poem could have had some circulation, and John of Salisbury – sometime student of Abaelard in Paris and active for a long time in France – could have had access to it.

On a global level, the main conclusion that can be obtained by this inquiry is a confirmation of the close ties linking the EDA’s writers with the Loire valley poets. The final word on the datation has not been told yet, but – in our view – the available data rather tend towards the beginning than the end of the XIIth cent.

c. Ascription

The core of Mews’ argument for ascribing the EDA to Abaelard and Heloise does not rest on a lexicographic analysis but on philosophical terminology. The few indications he brought forward, showing that both partners were conversant with some technical concepts of Abaelard philosophy – such as *indifferenter*, *scibilitas* or the distinct use of *specialis* against *singularis* – may sound very limited findings. That would indeed be the case if this was the result of a lexicographical enquiry. But the matter is quite different : Mews is talking here

about peculiar philosophical concepts, that denote a close proximity to Abelard early dialectics. In the whole epistolary, the man is only writing one paragraph using technical philosophical notions (V24), and this is precisely where he sounds the most Abelardian. Furthermore, Mews has found in his more recent contribution that the same passage is using a line of Cicero's *De amicitia*, rarely put to use, but which also appears in Abelard's *Sic et non*. So far, these key arguments have not been challenged or answered by his opponents on the grounds to which they belong.

The most obvious way to confirm or disprove the ascription seems to lie in a textual confrontation between the EDA and the later, 'monastic' letters exchanged by the couple fifteen years after the events. Such a confrontation requires great caution. The difference in literary genre, time and frame of mind of both epistolaries are far too great to allow any decisive conclusion based on stylistic analysis alone. J. Ziolkowski brought forward a few elements. His remarks on the contrast between the rhymes used by the man's poems and the *Carmen ad Astralabium* are undeniably true. But such a difference could perfectly be explained away only by the difference in literary genre, opposing some ovidian love poetry, improvised and written ad hoc, with a didactical moral treatise composed in verse.

The same goes with a lexicographical approach. Ziolkowski remarks strong differences in the use of some logical particles by the man in the EDA and Abelard in the *Historia calamitatum*. This, according to him, would be highly significant. Many objections can be raised, in the first place, concerning the choice of such a limited sample (only 6 conjunctives are taken into account). A wider enquiry, considering as well the woman's letter and Heloise's, on the basis of the larger sample, shows a fairly different result. There are indeed sharp divergences between the two sets of letters, but there are also many cases where the use of these words is almost identical (some words that show a great divergence in the man's side are stable in the woman's or vice versa). This suffices to show that no serious conclusion can be drawn out of a very limited sample, as Ziolkowski did. On a statistical basis (Chi² test), the only notable correlation that appears is between the *Historia calamitatum* and Heloise's letters. Remarkably, such a method offers a confirmation to J. Benton's observation of how exceptionally close are the frequencies of some common words in both texts. As we know now, it would simply be wrong to take this similarity as a sign of identical authorship. Out of such calculation, it can only safely be said that two people writing to each other tend to develop similar patterns of writings, and the same can be said while considering the mulier and vir of the EDA. This approach therefore could hardly be conclusive on its own.

A more global confrontation of the overall vocabulary put to use by the woman as compared to Heloise's writings doesn't bring decisive elements in one sense or the other. The fact that exactly half of the words (particles excepted) used by the woman, who has a very rich and often unusual vocabulary, are to be found in Heloise is not enough to conclude in favour of an identical author on this sole basis. On the other hand, the result is sufficiently high not to exclude it neither, taking into account all the differences in genre. A more qualitative result of such a confrontation shows the very distinct nature of the words used by Heloise that the woman of the EDA ignores : the vast majority pertains to the field of the ecclesiastical and theological discourses. This divergence has a major significance. It confirms a fact that could be felt intuitively, namely, that the woman was not living within a monastic precinct. Being educated outside of the cloister for a woman in that period is such a rare case that it deserves to be strongly emphasised. If the woman is not Heloise, she was exactly sharing her exceptional condition.

These remarks brings us finally to the last level on which the letters should be analysed, that is, as historical documents. Since too little allows to relate them to exterior events, this historical approach has to be compared to the famous type of 'micro-storia' developed by early modern Italian historians. Such a perspective can be argued for in a strong manner. Love is not a simple emotion. It is rather a complex, enduring feeling, that defines a story between two individuals, which undergoes various phases and changes. The exceptional quality of the EDA as a historical documents is that they allow, for once, to follow, from the inside, the development of a relation between a medieval couple. To summarise it roughly, what appears to have started as a literate game between a master and his pupil became more and more serious.

A close reading of the letters in such a perspective can bring important information for the history of emotions, of relations between genders, etc. This is also the field in which a decisive aspect of the ascription debate has to be discussed. How does the micro-history developing between the couple of the EDA relate to what we know of the early phase of Heloise and Abelard's love affair ? It is not surprising that the events are not strictly conform to what Abelard tells later in his apologetic autobiography. The HC is not meant to be the faithful retelling of his past life. It is well known that the author is darkening on purpose his relationship with the young Heloise, reducing it to a sinful case of vile seduction. The divergent memories that the couple have of their past should prepare us to the fact that the story probably didn't exactly happened as Abelard wrote afterwards. With this precaution in mind, the reconstitution of the events, out what the letters allows to perceive about it, contains

no obvious contradiction with the little we know of this early phase. It supplements one episode, not mentioned in the HC, but that is quite understandable: after the discovery of the affair by Fulbert, Heloise was sent away for some period, in which Abelard did not try to see her (between V106 and V108 ; M107 is too much abbreviated to let us figure out its precise contents, but it sounds very much like a letter of reflection written by the woman in that period of distance). Other letters show that the man was sometimes going away from the home town of the woman for some periods of time. It would be difficult to relate these travels with any precise event in the life of Abelard. The only thing that can be said for sure is that the philosopher led so far, and kept on leading afterwards, even once he was a monk, a rather nomadic life.

Conclusion : towards a decisive historical argument

So far, the ascription has rested on a few, but highly significant, semantic facts, and on a general resemblance between the anonymous couple and the famous one. A probabilistic reasoning would strongly suggest that such a resemblance is enough to jump to the ascription : how many chances are there that another twelfth Century philosophy master, famous in his time, had a love affair with a female pupil who was not a nun, and that such a story left no trace at all, except for these letters ? It should be reminded that the historical reasoning, especially in medieval studies, is often functioning on the basis of “high probabilities”, when the lack of documentation doesn’t allow any possibility of reaching a totally certain conclusion. Here, the case is apparently so important, and so hot, that this resemblance is not enough. A statistical approach to the text can bring forward important elements and help to better locate the letters in the territories of medieval Latin literature, but it probably can’t go much beyond that. Therefore, what is needed to transform a “high probability” is an undebatable common feature that would tie together the relationship between Heloise and Abelard as we know it, and what can be reconstructed out of the *Epistolae duorum amantium*.

We claim that there could be a strong way to relate both stories. The most peculiar element in the story is Heloise’s attitude towards marriage, refusing it on a series of elaborated reasons. The chapter of the HC dealing with this episode is problematic. A detailed discussion could show that, even if Abelard has probably rewritten it (to some extent) in his own words, he was basing himself on an actual letter written by Heloise from Brittany to express her reasons, mixing these arguments with the contents of the actual discussion that the lovers finally had when Abelard came to meet her and take her back to Paris. There can be no

doubt that Heloise didn't want to marry, since she mentions this very unusual fact in her later letters. There, as in the "lost letter" quoted within the HC, she is combining three different arguments: in her eyes, it was not proper for a philosopher to marry; she wanted her love to be totally disinterested, and not to appear to be searching for earthly reward ; but most of all, she knew that Fulbert would not be content with the bad compromise of a secret marriage.

The reconstruction of the story happening between the EDA's lovers shows that a major crisis occurs, once the relationship has already been growing for a long period. The reason for this crisis appears to have been a forced sexual relation. What matters here is the way in which the woman is responding to it : after an initial willingness to stop all relations, she accepts to stay silent about the event 'in order to avoid scandal for me, danger for you'. The sequence of events is complicated by a second crisis, which has a different specific reason (she is angry because of a poem the man wrote while she wanted to stop the correspondence). The new attitude of the woman, once she has decided to resume the relationship, can be synthesised in the following way. First, we hear say the praises of her lover as the greatest master of philosophy, in verse more often than in prose – and this aspect is certainly crucial to her. Then, she redefines the bond by which they are attached to one another. Some of the most poignant letters of the series are dramatically stating that he is now "everything for her". In these letters, she is often insisting on her readiness to die for her lover – to which he once replies by calling her, jokingly, 'my martyr'. Bringing all these elements together, what we see emerging is a young woman making decidedly a very strong choice, accepting to go on as the lover of the greatest philosopher, in a tragic mood, that involves accepting many risks. We suggest that this choice, inspired by a variety of literary models, many of which are to be found in Ovid's *Heroides*, coincides with a refusal to marry. In other words, these letters of the woman would reveal Heloïse making her famous choice, shaping herself, with the help of her literary memory, and inventing a destiny that was incompatible with all social realities of early twelfth century France.

Bibliography

Ewald Könsgen, *Epistolae duorum amantium : Briefe Abaelards und Heloises ?*, Leyde, Brill, 1974.

Pro

Constant J. Mews, *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard. Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France*, New York, 1999, with a translation by C. J. Mews by N. Chiavaroli, New York, St. Martin Press, 199 ; trad. française, *La voix d'Héloïse. Un dialogue de deux amants*, Fribourg-Paris, Academic Press Fribourg-Cerf, 2005 (Vestigia 31).

Id « Thèmes philosophiques dans les *Epistolae duorum amantium*: les premiers lettres d'Héloïse et Abélard? », in Joel Biard éd., *Langage, sciences, philosophies au XIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1999, p. 23-38 ; Id., « Les lettres d'amour perdues d'Héloïse et la théologie d'Abélard », in Jean Jolivet et Henri Habrias ed., *Pierre Abélard. Colloque international de Nantes*, Rennes, PUR, 2003, p. 137-159 et en dernier lieu, Id., *Abelard and Heloise*, New York, CUP, 2005, p. 62-79.

C. Stephen Jaeger, *Ennobling Love. In Search of a Lost Sensibility*, Philadelphie, UPP, 1999 ; Id., « The *Epistolae duorum amantium* and the Ascription to Heloise and Abelard » et « A Reply to Giles Constable », in L. Olson, K. Kerby-Fulton ed *Voices in Dialogue: New Problems in Reading Women's Cultural History*, Notre Dame (IN), 2005.

John O. Ward, Neville Chiavaroli, « The Young Heloise and Latin Rhetoric: Some Preliminary Comments on the "Lost" Love-Letters and Their Significance », in Bonnie Wheeler ed., *Listening to Heloise: The Voice of a Twelfth-Century Woman*, New York, CUP, 2000, p. 53–119.

Lettres des deux amants, attribuées à Héloïse et Abélard, traduites et présentées par Sylvain Piron, Paris, Gallimard, 2005.

Barbara Newman, compte-rendu de C. Mews, *The Lost Love Letters The Medieval Review*, 2000. <http://www.hti.umich.edu/t/tmr/> ; compte-rendu de C. Mews, *Abelard and Heloise*, H-France <http://www.h-france.net/vol5reviews/newman2.html>

Michael T. Clanchy, « The Letters of Abelard and Heloise in Today's Scholarship », in Betty Radice, trans., *The Letters of Abelard and Heloise*, rev. ed., London- New York, Penguin, 2003, p. lviii-lxxxiv, p. 237-244.

Damien Boquet, compte-rendu de *La voix d'Héloïse* in *Médiévales*, 50 (2006).

Elisabeth Lalou, « Quid sit amor ? », *Critique*, janvier 2007 (à propos de *La voix d'Héloïse*).

Contra sive neuter

Giles Constable, « Sur l'attribution des *Epistolae duorum amantium* », *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, décembre 2001, p. 1679-1693 (version anglaise in *Voices in Dialogue*, avec la réponse de S. Jaeger).

Peter Dronke, compte rendu de B. Wheeler ed., *Listening to Heloise*, in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 8 (2002), p. 134-139.

Peter von Moos, « Abaelard, Heloise und ihr Paraklet: Ein Kloster nach Mass, zugleich eine Streitschrift gegen die ewige Wiederkehr hermeneutischer Naivität », in Gert Melville et Markus Schürer ed., *Das Eigene und das Ganze: Zum Individuellen im mittelalterlichen Religiösentum*, Münster, Lit, 2002, p. 563-619.

Id., « Die *Epistolae duorum amantium* und die säkulare Religion der Liebe. Methodenkritische Vorüberlegungen zu einem einmaligen Werk mittellateinischer Briefliteratur », *Studi Medievali* 44 (2003), p. 1-115.

Id. « Vom Nutzen der Philologie für den Umgang mit anonymen Liebesbriefen. Ein Nachwort zu den *Epistolae duorum amantium* », in *Schrift und Liebe*, M. Schnyder ed., Berlin De Gruyter (à paraître, disponible sur : <http://centri.univr.it/RM/biblioteca/scaffale>)

Jan Ziolkowski, « Lost and Not Yet Found : Heloise, Abelard, and the *Epistolae duorum amantium* », *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 14 (2004), p. 171-202.

Guy Lobrichon, *Héloïse, l'amour et le savoir*, Paris, Gallimard, 2005.

Peter Dronke, Giovanni Orlandi, « New Works by Abelard and Heloise », *Filologia mediolatina* 12 (2005), p. 123–177.

John Marenbon, « The Rediscovery of Peter Abelard's Philosophy », *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 44- 3, July 2006, p. 331-351.