Bibliographia. Annotated Bibliographies (www.bibliographia.co)

by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

Peter Abelard. Bibliography on His theology and the doctrine of the Trinity (A - L)

Contents of this Section

The Philosophy of Peter Abelard

Editions and Translations of the Logical Works

Studies in English:

Abelard and Heloise. Bibliography of the English Studies (A - J)

Abelard and Heloise. Bibliography of the English Studies (K - Z)

Bibliography of Studies in English on the Philosophy of Peter Abelard (A - L)

Bibliography of Studies in English on the Philosophy of Peter Abelard (M - Z)

Bibliography on His theology and the doctrine of the Trinity (A - L) (Current page)

Bibliography on His theology and the doctrine of the Trinity (M - Z)

Bibliography on His Ethics and Moral Philosophy

Bibliographies on Abelard in languages other than English:

Bibliographie des études en Français

Bibliografia degli studi in Italiano

Bibliographie der Studien auf Deutsch

Bibliografía de estudios en Español

Bibliografía de estudos em Português

On the website History of Logic"

I. Logic, Semantics and Ontology in the Work of Abelard

II. Theories of the Copula in the Logical Works of Abelard

Selected Bibliography on His Logic and Metaphysics

Abelard: A - L

Abelard: M - Z

Bibliography

1. Bell, Thomas J. 2007. *Peter Abelard after Marriage: The Spiritual Direction of Heloise and Her Nuns Through Liturgical Song*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.
"The combined power of language and music forms the subject of this book, especially when the two wielded by a master of rhetoric, poetry, and melody the famous twelfth-century philosopher Peter Abelard (1079-1142). Scholars have long known of the liturgical sequences *Virgines castae* and *Epithalamica*, but only recently has it been argued by Chrysogonus Waddell that they are the work of Abelard.
Richly layered and polysemous, like much of medieval art, these two sequences harmonize remarkably well in style and content with the large body of extant compositions that Abelard composed for his beloved Heloise (c. 1090-1164).
The two sequences, restored to their composer, offer us new opportunity to explore the mature Abelard's exegetical skills, to witness his gifts as a liturgist, and to examine his role spiritual adviser to Abbess Heloise. My work takes advantage this opportunity by examining in detail the internal rhetoric *Virgines castae* and *Epithalamica*. Abelard had a specific vision for how Heloise should understand her role as abbess of Paraclete community, her relationship to Christ, and her feelings for Abelard himself. He displayed that vision to Heloise and nuns through the rich tapestry of words and music that form sequences. *Virgines castae* and *Epithalamica* speak directly to life situation of the Paraclete abbess; their significance reaches the way back to Abelard's earliest relations with Heloise." (*Prologue,* p. VII)

2. Bloch, R. Howard. 2022. "Syllogisms in Stone: Theophilus, Stephen, Abelard on the Walls of Notre-Dame de Paris." In *Revealing New Perspectives: Studies in Honor of Stephen G. Nichols*, edited by Brownlee, Kevin and Brownlee, Marina S., 75–103. New York: Peter Lang.
"The prime example of Abelard's confrontation of an ancient theological problem head on, without authority, is his treatment in logical terms of the core theological issue of the relationship of the Three to the One of the Trinity: "Now it happened that I first applied myself to lecturing on the basis of our faith by analogy with human reason, and composed a theological treatise On the Unity and Trinity of God for the use of my students who were asking for human and logical reasons on this subject, and demanded something more intelligible rather than mere words. In fact they said that words were useless if the intelligence could not follow them, that nothing could be believed unless it was first understood, and that it was absurd for anyone to preach to others what neither he nor those he taught could grasp with the understanding …"(24) Abelard, who mentions in the *Dialectics* Aristotle, Porphyry,

and Boethius, seeks to introduce reason into faith; and he ends up, finally, by inserting the question of the Trinity into the ancient debate, revived in the late 11th century by his teacher Rocelin, concerning the ontological status of universal terms. Abelard maintains that the difference between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is either substantial or accidental.
If substantial, that is, real, then they cannot be three; if accidental, then they are not one. His solution to this seemingly intractable contradiction involves a third term between the two, that they inhere as an idea of the mind, an *intellectio*, on the model of the way that abstract nouns signify both the existence of an ideal substance and its difference in material reality.
This outraged the ecclesiastical authorities. Bernard denounced Abelard in 1141 to Pope Innocent II, whom he had helped install against Anacletus II, which led to the Council of Sens. Abelard recounts in the *Historia calamitatum* the story of the Council of Soissons at which “they compelled me to throw my book into the fire with my own hands.”(25)" (pp. 98-99)
(24) Abelard, *Letters*, 78.
(25) Abelard, *Letters*, 83.
References
The Letters of Abelard and Heloise, trans. Betty Radice (London: Penguin Books, 1974).

3. Bond, H. Lawrence. 2007. "Another Look at Abelard's Commentary on Romans 3:26." In *Medieval Readings of Romans*, edited by Campbell, William S., Hawkins, Peter S. and Schildgen, Brenda Deen, 11–32. New York: T&T Clark International.
"A new generation of theologians has raised serious misgivings about the classic and objective atonement theories that were adopted by the Church, or perhaps one should say churches, during the early, medieval, and Reformation eras. At the same time, thoroughgoing reexaminations of the Pauline texts by New Testament scholars have produced invigorating fresh perspectives on Pauline theology. Abelard's commentary on Paul's *Letter to the Romans* deserves the same question that others have been asking of Paul's Letters: What did Abelard really say? As with Pauline studies, the temptation is instead to answer what one wants Abelard to have said. Peter Abelard's *Commentaria in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* should lend itself to a variety of treatments if for no other reason than the diverse ways Abelard addresses and explicates the Pauline text. This has not always been the case. At times it has become commonplace to consider Abelard's commentary on Romans 3:26 as if Abelard were saying one thing and one thing only. This is one reason why some have often dismissed his soteriological theologizing as merely exemplarist and crypto-Pelagian. That sort of analysis of Abelard's atonement theory almost always occurs outside the immediate textual setting and with little or no reference to the exegetical style Abelard employs or to the hermeneutical principles impelling it." (p. 11)
(...)
"Abelard's comments here do not amount to a complete theory, nor do the remarks in this essay tell the whole story of his efforts to grasp the atonement. He addresses the question of redemption in various other important places in his theological writings that bear comparison and contrast with what he has set forth in his exegesis of *Rom*. 3:26.
However, that would require not only several papers but also a monograph or two. This attempt to reopen the question of what Abelard really says about the atonement focuses on only one very specific context. It is much indebted to the superior efforts of other scholars, especially Weingart, Quinn, Williams, Peppermiiller, and Buytaert. It tries, however, to supplement them with additional commentary and textual analysis, albeit limited to a small compass." (p. 31)

4. Briola, Lucas. 2016. "A Case Study of Scholasticism: Peter Abelard and Peter Lombard on Penance." *Journal of Moral Theology* no. 5:65–85.
"Because an adequate theology of the sacrament was only beginning to be formulated during this time, a study of this time period elucidates some interesting

and important points for an adequate notion of penance.
Additionally, medieval scholastic theology cannot be understood apart from its context, inarguably affected and conditioned by other historical and cultural currents. Taking this broader theo-cultural milieu into account, this essay deals with two key scholastic debates over penance. First, I will locate Abelard and Lombard as contritionalists—those who assert that God's forgiveness occurs at contrition rather than confession—and consequently consider their respective views on the necessity of confession. Second, since both acknowledge that God's forgiveness comes at contrition rather than confession, I will examine how this position changes the role of priests for the two thinkers, as priests are now considered judges or doctors who need to develop suitable tools for these roles. The guiding idea of both sections is simple—Abelard and Lombard put forth theologies that overcome any overly routinized understandings of penance, placing personal responsibility on both penitent and confessor." (pp. 65-66)

5. Brower, Jeffrey E. 2004. "Trinity." In *The Cambridge Companion to Abelard*, edited by Brower, Jeffrey E. and Guilfoy, Kevin, 223–257. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"In this chapter, I show how Abelard's treatment of a deep, logical problem associated with the Christian doctrine of the Trinity gives rise to important developments in his philosophy. As will emerge, in addressing this problem he not only presents a philosophically interesting account of the Trinity, but also develops a highly sophisticated theory of identity or numerical sameness, as well as a distinctive approach to issues now generally recognized under the rubric "the problem of material constitution"." (p. 223)

6. Brown, Stephen F. 1992. "Abelard and the Medieval Origins of the Distinction between God's Absolute and Ordained Power." In *Ad litteram. Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, edited by Jordan, Mark D. and Emery, Jr. Kent, 199–215. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
"In the *Theologia Christiana*, the *Theologia 'Scholarium'* and in the *Expositio in Hexaemeron* Abelard argues from this same Timaeus text [29D-30A)] that God could only create what in fact he did create and could not produce a better universe than he has produced.(7) For Abelard, God had to work in accord with the full nature of his goodness. Goodness is for God not an accidental quality. He is substantial goodness. So, when God creates, he cannot be stingy or miserly. Just as the Father could not spare himself in producing the Son and make the Son less than the Son could be — otherwise he would be miserly (and therefore not substantially good)—so the Creator could not hold back something and not make the world the best that he could make it be. For, in such a case, the Creator would be miserly. Abelard further argued that whatever God does, he does for the best and wisest reason—even if it be hidden from us. God's nature is such that he has thus to create what is wisest and best. The world he actually created must be the best that the most wise God could create. Otherwise, he could have planned in a more wise manner, which is impossible because of his being most wise. If one rejects this option, one falls back to the previous dilemma-— that God planned most wisely, but he held back on the side of his goodness - that is, he was selfish.
Or one might say that God is most wise, and most good, but not most powerful—that he planned most wisely, and was generous in his desire to share his goodness, but could not accomplish his will." (pp. 200-201)
(7) *Theologia Christiana* 5.29-58 (Buytaert, 358-372; PL 178:1324-1330).

7. Burnett, Charles. 1986. "Peter Abelard, Confessio fidei 'Universis': A Critical Edition of Abelard's Reply to Accusations of Heresy." *Mediaeval Studies* no. 48:111–138.
"In the *Confessio fidei 'Universis* Abelard replies to each of seventeen of the capitula under which his heresies had been listed in the *Capitula haeresum xix* attached to St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola 190 ad Innocentium papam*, with a brief statement of the orthodoxy of his belief. A much more detailed and scholarly

reply to the same *capitula* (in addition to the two which have been omitted in the *Confessio fidei 'Universis* ') appears to have been the subject of Abelard's *Apologia*, of which we have only the opening section and fragments preserved in Thomas of Morigny's answer to that work. The verbal similarities between the two works suggest that they were composed in the same circumstances. In both works Abelard refutes the allegation in the *Capitula haeresum xix* that the propositions listed are to be found in his *Theologia*, his *Scito te ipsum* (*Ethica*) and his *Sententiae* (a work whose composition he denies). In both works also he brings together the same authorities to show that he has a right and a duty to defend himself. However, there are important differences.
In the first place the Apologia is addressed directly to St. Bernard."
(...)
"*The Confessio fidei 'Universis* ', on the other hand, while referring obliquely to Bernard in perhaps an ironic tone as *amicus noster,*1 is addressed to the church at large, against which Abelard has no particular grudge." (pp. 111-112, notes omitted)

8. Burnett, Charles S. F. 1985. "The 'Expositio Orationis Dominicae' Multorum legimus orationes', Abelard's Exposition of the Lord's Prayer?" *Revue Bénédictine* no. 95:60–72.

9. Buytaert, Eligius M. 1963. "Critical Observations on the "Theologia Christiana" of Abelard." *Antonianum* no. 38:384–433.

10. ———. 1963. "An Earlier Redaction of the "Theologia Christiana" of Abelard." *Antonianum* no. 37:481–495.

11. ———. 1964. "The Greek Fathers in Abelards "Theologies" and Commentary on Saint Paul." *Antonianum* no. 39:408–436.

12. ———. 1966. "The Greek Fathers in Abelard's "Sic et Non"." *Antonianum* no. 41:413–453.

13. ———. 1968. "The Anonymous Capitula Haeresum Petri Abelardi and the Synod of Sens, 1140." *Antonianum* no. 43:419–460.

14. ———. 1968. "Abelard's Expositio in Hexaemeron." *Antonianum* no. 43:163–194.

15. ———. 1969. "Abelard's Collationes." *Antonianum* no. 44:18–39.

16. ———. 1974. "Abelard's Trinitarian Doctrine." In *Peter Abelard: Proceedings of the International Conference*, edited by Buytaert, Éloi Marie, 127–152. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
"An attempt will be made to show the evolution of Abelard's doctrine, and, therefore, it is good to keep in mind the chronological succession of our author's pertinent writings: the *Theologia 'Summi boni*', two redactions, composed in 1118-1120; the *Theologia Christiana,* first and second redactions, written respectively in 1123- 1125 and 1134-1135; the first three redactions of the *Theeologia 'Scholarium*'. 1134-1138. all after the second redaction of the *Theoologia Christiana*; the third redaction of the same *Theologia Christiana*, the fourth redaction of the *Theologia 'Scholarium',* and the '*Apofogia contra Bernardum*,' all dating from the years 1139-1140. Both the *Theologia Christiana* and the *Theofogia 'Schofarium'*. even in their last redaction, remained unfinished, and of the *Apologia* we have only (substantial) fragments. Yet. in these sources enough elements are found to give us a fair idea of Abelard's thinking on Blessed Trinity." (p. 127)

17. Cartwright, Steven Richard. 2001. *The Romans Commentaries of William of St. Thierry and Peter Abelard: A Theological and Methodological Comparison*, Western Michigan University.
"Having made these points in each of the major areas of analysis, we can make comparisons and conclusions about the commentaries as a whole and about w hat they contribute to our understanding of the conflict between William and Peter. Within the corpus of each writer’s works the commentaries stand out as expositions of Scripture, different from yet foundational to all their other theological works.

They also stand out among contemporary commentaries on Romans, and among medieval Romans commentaries considered as a whole. I would go so as far to call them the finest commentaries on Romans written between the time of A ugustine and the Reformation: William's because of his excellent rhetoric and spiritual program, and Peter's because of his use of dialectic and his bold, ground-breaking positions on various doctrines. While grounded in the ancient tradition of Romans interpretation begun with Origen, the two commentaries reflect the modes of thought that make their authors stand out among other twelfth-century theologians and commentators on this epistle." (p. 286)

18. ———. 2013. "Twelfth-Century Pauline Exegesis: William of St. Thierry's Monastic Rhetoric and Peter Abelard's Scholastic Logic." In *A Companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*, edited by Cartwright, Steven R, 205–234. Leiden: Brill.
"The Romans commentaries of William of St. Thierry and Peter Abelard provide excellent examples of mature monastic and early scholastic exegesis of St. Paul. Written probably simultaneously in the mid-1130s, they reflect the culmination of one tradition of exegesis and the development of another." (p. 205)
(...)
"The most famous question, and certainly the most frequently and thoroughly analyzed,(71) is the question on redemption found in Abelard's comments on 3:26. The major question subsequent generations have asked about this question is whether Abelard taught a subjective, "exemplarist" theology of atonement, emphasizing the devotion felt by the believer on considering Christ's demonstration of love, in distinction to the traditional objective theologies that emphasized the work of Christ on the cross. Space does not allow a complete analysis of this matter; rather, we can only look briefly at what his intention was in posing and resolving his own question: "What is that redemption of ours through the death of Christ? or, how does the Apostle say that we are justified in his blood, we who seem worthy of a greater punishment, because we, unjust servants, committed that deed on account of which the innocent Lord was murdered?" (p. 226, a note omiited)
(71) See Cartwright, "Romans Commentaries," 194–96, for a summary of the earlier scholarly analyses; there are also two more recent excellent discussions: H. Lawrence Bond, "Another Look at Abelard's Commentary on Romans 3:26," in *Medieval Readings*, 11–32, and Mark Reasoner, *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation* (Louisville, 2005), 27–29.

19. Colish, Marcia L. 1992. "Peter Lombard and Peter Abelard: The *Opinio Nominalium* and Divine." *Vivarium* no. 30:139–156.
Reprinted as Essay VI in: M. L. Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism,* Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006.
"This paper supports the claim that what "nominalism" meant to twelfth-century thinkers was the doctrine of the univocal signification of nouns and verbs, with their oblique or tensed forms conveying consignification of the things or actions they signify in the nominative case or present tense, respectively. The paper shows that both Peter Abelard and Peter Lombard called upon this doctrine in their argument over whether God can do better that He does, indicating that nominalism so defined has a perceived utility for exponents of differing logical and theological persuasions at the time."
"With respect to the Lombard's contribution to the history of nominalism in the twelfth century, then, we may offer three conclusions. First, from our consideration of Abelard's case, it is clear that the *opinio Nominalium* could be, and was, yoked to a post-Aristotelian kind of logic. From our consideration of the Lombard's case, it is equally clear that the *opinio Nominalium* could just as easily be yoked to a mode of reasoning deemed capable of yielding cogent ontological conclusions. In this respect, the fact that a twelfth-century thinker espouses the *opinio Nominalium* does not mean that he is automatically or necessarily required to embrace one rather than the other of these different conceptions of logic. Second, it was not just the fact that the Lombard was a theologian but his particular agenda as a theologian who sought to affirm God's omnipotence and God's essence as the transcendent metaphysical

reality that accounts for both his borrowings from Abelard and his more fundamental hostility to Abelard in this area. And, finally, thanks to the rapid and enduring success of the Lombard's *Sentences'* as a textbook, he was able to place both his position on divine transcendence, the distinction between God's absolute and ordained power, and the *opinio Nominalium* with which he bolstered these teachings squarely before the eyes of his scholastic contemporaries and successors." (pp. 155-156)

20. ———. 2005. "Abelard and Theology." In *Medieval Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Jeremy DuQuesnay Adams. Vol. I*, edited by Hayes-Healy, Stephanie, 3–12. Dordrecht: Springer.
Reprinted as Essay VII in: M. L. Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism,* Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006.
Abstract: "As a theologian no less than as a logician, Peter Abelard has been hailed as the father of scholasticism. Both in the rules for critiquing authorities laid out at the beginning of his Sic et non and in his challenge in the Dialogus, that believers need to bolster their creeds with rational arguments, he takes to the field as the emblematic opponent of Bernard of Clairvaux, their standoff representing the last ditch effort of monastic obscurantism to halt the advance of scholastic enlightenment. In this essay, I wish to question this standard picture of Abelard the theologian. Despite his insistence on the need to apply reason and critical analysis to the Christian tradition, his project turns out to be better stated in theory than it was worked out in actual practice. And, in some of the substantive areas where he is deemed the most radical, he emerges as closer to the theological mainstream than is often appreciated."

21. Cosgrove, Charles H. 2007. "Abelard's Interpretation of Romans: Response to Jean Doutre." In *Medieval Readings of Romans*, edited by Campbell, William S., Hawkins, Peter S. and Schildgen, Brenda Deen, 135–141. New York: T&T Clark International.
Reply to J. Doutre, *Romans as Read in School and Cloister in the Twelfth Century: The Commentaries of Peter Abelard and William of St. Thierry*, same volume.
"Even Peter Abelard, the most independent of the medieval interpreters before us, takes pains to show agreement among authorities. Doutre points out that he does so by using dialectics, applying an Aristotelian logic to make fine distinctions and thus allow apparently contradictory authorities to agree." (p. 135)
(...)
"2. The Atonement
One way in which Abelard stands out from his contemporaries is in his distinctive interpretation of the atonement. In his comments on *Rom*. 3:25-26 Abelard rejects the notion that the death of Jesus satisfies a debt to the Devil. Perhaps echoing but not acknowledging Anselm, he argues that the Devil has no rights before God and is owed nothing by God. Abelard goes on to reject the idea that Christ's death satisfies God's wrath, as if God could not be gracious without first being appeased. In an oft-quoted rhetorical question, Abelard asks, "Did the death of the innocent Son please the Father so very much that he was reconciled to us through it . . . ? " (Abelard, 286-287).(8) Abelard sees this whole idea as "cruel and unjust," an affront to God's goodness (288-289). Abelard's own solution is that God's exemplary love brings about our salvation. By assuming our nature and proving his love through both word and example even to the point of death, Christ saves us by awakening in us a responding love toward God (288-291)." (p. 137)
(8) Here and in what follows I cite to the page numbers of Peppermüller's edition. The English rendering is mine.

22. Cross, Richard. 2012. "Philosophy and the Trinity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Philosophy*, edited by Marenbon, John, 705–729. New York Oxford University Press.
"The notion of sameness-without-identity was systematically applied in a Trinitarian context first of all by Abelard some 150 years before Henry [of Ghent], using the

notion of material constitution as an illustration of the kind of relation he has in mind.
(Clearly the two relations are different: sameness-without-identity is symmetrical; constitution is not.) Abelard argues that there are cases in which two things can be numerically the same—say, a lump of wax and a waxen image—but nevertheless differ 'in property':
[The wax: viz. the] matter of the waxen image and what is made from it do not share all their properties in common, since the matter of the waxen image is not made from matter (that is, the wax itself is not made from wax), just as what is made from the matter in this case is not the matter (that is, the waxen image is not the matter of the waxen image). (Abelard 1969, 248; *Theologia Christiana*, l.3, c.140; translation from Brower 2004, 227)." (pp. 709-710)
References
Brower, Jeffey E. 2004. 'Trinity'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Abelard*, ed. Jeffrey E. Brower and Kevin Guilfoy, 223–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Peter Abelard. 1969. *Opera theologica*, II, ed. E. M. Buytaert. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols (Corpus christianorum continuatio mediaevalis, 12).

23. Cvetković, Carmen Angela. 2021. "Conflict and Authority: William of Saint-Thierry and Peter Abelard as Readers of Origen." *Open Theology* no. 7:531–554.
Abstract: "This study compares how two prominent twelfth-century Latin authors and theological opponents, namely the monastic author William of Saint-Thierry (c. 1080–1148) and the school master Peter Abelard (1079–1142), variously understood the authority of the controversial yet influential Greek author Origen (c. 184–253) in their works. Modern scholars who study the reception of Origen in the twelfth-century Latin West have, to this point, spoken of an Origenian revival in this period, concluding that Origen was especially popular in the cloister, among Cistercian monks, such as Bernard of Clairvaux and his followers, like William of Saint-Thierry, based on the assumption that as monks they found his writings more relevant. This study seeks to challenge this scholarly narrative by focusing on two authors who are perceived as typifying two different strands of theology, one of a contemplative character developed in the cloister (William) and one making use of dialectics and developed in the emerging schools (Abelard). By demonstrating that the schoolmaster Abelard drew on Origen to a greater degree and in a more transparent manner than his monastic opponent, this study will show that Origen's popularity in the cloisters was not, as such, a clear point of distinction between them and schools in the way that has usually been claimed by modern scholarship."

24. Doutre, Jean. 2007. "Romans as Read in School and Cloister in the Twelfth Century: The Commentaries of Peter Abelard and William of St. Thierry." In *Medieval Readings of Romans*, edited by Campbell, William S., Hawkins, Peter S. and Schildgen, Brenda Deen, 33–57. New York: T&T Clark International.
"I. Introduction
The context of the two commentaries
The commentaries on the *Letter to the Romans* by Peter Abelard (1079-1142) and William of St. Thierry (1070/75-1147/48) were written between 1133 and 1139 in the region of Rheims, in France, before the letter and treatise against Peter Abelard that led to the latter's condemnation at the Council of Sens in 1140. Writing his *Expositio in epistolam ad Romanos* in the monastery of Signy, which he entered after retiring as Abbot of St. Thierry, William is one of the most important twelfth-century figures rediscovered during the last sixty years.(...)
The perspective of the author In this essay, we will not discuss the different transformations that *Romans* undergoes when interpreted in each commentary. Instead of making a presentation of the different methodologies used by Abelard and William, we will only focus on one important difference: the way each commentator uses the Fathers. Then we will deal with the different understandings of the figure of Paul which is the first word of *Romans*.

We will also focus on the commentaries on *Rom*. 8:1-30 because the medieval commentators used this chapter to present, expand, and develop many important and characteristic aspects of their theology. Finally we will engage the commentators on their own frame of interpretation.
Like other medieval commentators, both Abelard and William rely on *auctoritates*. Abelard quotes the Fathers: Bede, Florus of Lyons, Rhaban Maur and the commentaries of Pelagius (under the name of Jerome), the Ambrosiaster, and Aymon of Auxerre (Peppermüller 2000, 21). To these he adds philosophers such as the pseudo-Seneca (*Comm Rom* I, i, 109-128). Abelard freely presents his own opinions along with those of the Fathers (*Comm Rom* III, viii, verses 3-4). Moreover, he can be critical of his sources." (p. 33, a note omitted)

25. Dunn, James D. G. 2007. "Romans in the Middle Ages: Some Responses to the Essays of H. Lawrence Bond, Ian Christopher Levy, and Thomas R. Ryan." In *Medieval Readings of Romans*, edited by Campbell, William S., Hawkins, Peter S. and Schildgen, Brenda Deen, 153–157. New York: T&T Clark International.
"The question I ask, therefore, is whether Abelard intended that allusion to Romans 8 or did he simply slip into biblical language. For if he did indeed intend it, then the point is that he thereby evoked one of the most important passages in Paul, which speaks of the transformation process of "sanctification," if you will. The Spirit of adoption (not the spirit of slavery) points us forward to the adoption still awaited — that is, "the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8:23). The process between these two "moments" of adoption is the process in which creation shares — the groaning of childbirth. We are heirs together with the Son, provided that we suffer with the Son, share in his Passion.
The process, in other words, is the working out of Christ's death in the believer; sanctification is a process of being conformed to Christ's death (*Phil.* 3:10). This is miles away from a merely exemplarist nderstanding of Christ's death.
In which case, such a deliberate allusion to Romans 8 certainly seems to support Bond's exegesis." (p. 154)

26. Dyer, Lesley-Anne. 2014. "Veiled Platonic Triads in Abelard's *Theologia 'Summi Boni'*." In *Rethinking Abelard: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Hellemans, Babette, 119–151. Leiden: Brill.
"Here I will argue that Abelard's theological appropriation of the World Soul should be seen within the larger context of not one, but two Platonic triads that were widely available and used in the medieval tradition—the God-Mind-Soul triad and the God-Archetype-Matter triad. These triads represent 'textbook' Platonism and as such became key centers for discussion. The main text considered will be the earliest extant text of Abelard's theological works, the *Theologia 'Summi Boni'*. Later revisions will be referred to only when necessary because it has been widely acknowledged that Augustine is one of the key sources for this first edition and my argument addresses the nature of Abelard's use of Augustine when it comes to these triads.(5) In addition, the kernel of most of Abelard's theology can be found in this first text.(6)" (p. 120)
(5) The introduction to the *TSch* [*Theologia 'Scholarium']*, ed. Buytaert and Mews (1987), 203–308 gives an extensive account of the differences between recensions, including a chart that shows where overlapping sections can be located in the different versions. For the full citation, see *infra*. The discussion of the *TSB*'s [*Theologia 'Summi Boni'*] Augustinianism can be found on page 204.
(6) Willemien Otten has observed this point and writes that the core of Abelard's theological doctrines can be found in this first theology in Willemien Otten, *From Paradise to Paradigm: A Study of Twelfth-Century Humanism*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 149.

27. Elliott, Mark W. 2016. "Tracing the Romans commentary of Origen in Abelard's. Appearance and Reality." In *Origeniana Undecima: Origen and Origenism in the History of Western Thought. Papers of the 11th International Origen Congress,*

Aarhus University, 26-31 August 2013, edited by Jacobsen, Anders Christian, 415–420. Leuven: Peeters.
"Haimo of Auxerre might well have played an important role in linking Origen to Abelard((8). In his study of Abelard's commentary(9) Rolf Peppermüller seems quite aware of this occurring at a number of points: on the setting and context of the epistle (at p. 21, n. 127); on the question of Paul's two names (at p. 35, n. 212); on *Rom* 4,9-11 on the difference between the visible *signum* and the invisible *signaculum* (at p. 109, n. 598); on *Rom* 8,2-4 where the idea is of a sacrifice for sin allowing justifying love to spring up in people's hearts (at p. 102, n. 273); Scriptural law (Torah) was for Israel only (p. 149); true Jews follow the believing fathers such as Abraham (at p. 155 – Haimo has this too.)"(p. 417)
(...)
"However the aim of research in this paper is to examine the debt of Abelard, not Haimo, to Origen. If we can focus more closely on their respective Romans Commentaries, Scheck is bold to claim: "On the other hand [in contrast to Aquinas], Origen's CRm is woven into the fabric of Peter Abelard's commentary on Romans". However Scheck's reference here, which we might expect to substantiate this claim merely refers the reader to Peppermüller's edition of Abelard(11). No more is done to make the case. Yet, perhaps surprisingly, and perhaps tellingly, in his earlier work, *Origen and the History of Justification,* Scheck took the road marked "William of St Thierry" at this point and more or less avoided Abelard. Of course the road from Origen passes through William too, but it is arguably a less interesting one." (p. 418)
(11) T. Scheck, *Origen's Interpretation of Romans*, in S.A. Cartwright (ed.), *A Companion to Paul in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2013, 15-49, p. 22, n. 42: "Cf. Peter Abelard, *Expositio in Epistolam ad Romanos* / *Römerbriefkommentar*, 3 vols., Freiburg, Herder, 2000". Also, T. Scheck, *William of St Thierry's Reception of Origen's Exegesis of Romans*, in *Adamantius* 10 (2004) 236-256, p. 237: "This irenic usage of Origen's Pauline exegesis during the Middle Ages suggests that the clouds of suspicion that hungelsewhere over Origen's orthodoxy did not render suspect his *CRm*. As an exegete of Paul, he was normally cited as a Catholic authority of good faith".

28. Ferrante, Mauro. 2017. "The word "Theology" from the Presocratics to Peter Abelard: Philosophy and Science. Some Remarks." *Philosophy and Cosmology* no. 18:219–228.
Abstract: "The purpose of this paper is to reconstruct, through the analysis of some key moments, the evolution of the term "theology" within the Western philosophical thought. Starting with the first formulation by the Presocratics, the study takes into consideration both the first attestation of the term by Plato (in the second book of the *Republic*) and the role it plays in Aristotle's works (*Metaphysics*). In its second part,
the paper considers the importance of the term "theology" in the Latin world, through the study of the Augustine's critic against the greek thinkers, which will lead to a further development in the Middle Ages. The point of arrival is Peter Abelard, who formulated a concept of "theology" conceived as a science. At first, the term was tied to a pagan conception of society and was devoid of any scientiic connotation. With the advent of Christianity, it begins to take on an universalistic character connected with the concept of an absolute truth. It is here pointed out, through all of these antecedents, how, in the Middle Ages, when the "theology" became an autonomous science and responds to its own laws, how it is assumed and used as an instrument to manage both science and truth.
Thanks to the contributions of the ancient philosophers, developed by medieval thinkers, it was possible to subsequently use the term "theology" also in a political sense. It also allows us to extend it to other fields than its original one. Finally, this paper wants to stress that it is necessary to first study the evolution of the concepts of terminology, because it allows us to better understand the concepts that are used in science."

29. Georges, Tobias. 2016. ""Summus christianorum philosophorum": Origen as christian philosopher in Peter Abelard." In *Origeniana undecima: Origen and Origenism in the History of Western Thought, Papers of the 11th International Origen Congress, Aarhus University, 26-31 August 2013* edited by Jacobsen, Anders-Christian 431–440. Leuven: Peeters.
Abstract: "While Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, is famous for using Origen in his sermons on the *Song of Songs,* Peter Abelard is often quoted as a scholastic criticising Origen – in the line of thought: During the 12th century, Origen was appreciated by monastic exegesis, but not by scholastic reflection. Indeed, in his "Theologia", Abelard criticises Origen, like many other authorities. But Abaelard can also call Origen "a great" or even "the greatest Christian philosopher", as he does in his "Historia Calamitatum" and in his letter 8. This seems to be meaningful, as Abelard understood himself as a Christian philosopher. In letter 8, Abelard also quotes long passages from Origen's homilies 12 and 13 *on Genesis* (in Rufinus' translation). Hence the question: Is there an overall attitude towards Origen to be found in Abelard, and how is Abelard's attitude situated in the context of his time? Based on Abelard's references to Origen, my paper shall scrutinize this question."

30. ———. 2023. "From reading to understanding: *Profectus* in Abelard and Origen." In *Progress in Origen and the Origenian Tradition*, edited by Lettieri, Gaetano, Fallica, Maria and Jacobsen, Anders-Christian, 127–140. Berlin: Peter Lang.
Abstract: "In the final passage of his letter 8 ("The rule"), Abelard talks of "advancing by understanding" (*intelligendo proficiens*) – meaning understanding the Scriptures.
It is argued that this formulation is strongly influenced by Origen, namely his homily on *Genesis* 13. Abelard actually seems to have had great sympathy for Origen's focus on understanding (*intellectus*) and rational perception (*rationabilis sensus*).
However, the term *profectus* is not a key one for Abelard; and when he refers to Origen as a role model for his theological method of moving from reading to understanding the Scriptures in letter 1 (*Historia Calamitatum*), it becomes difficult to say where he is really influenced by Origen and where he imagines it. Following Jerome, Abelard praises Origen in the exegetical context, but in his "theological" treatises, most of his – rare – references to him are polemic."

31. Georgianna, Linda. 1987. "Any Corner of Heaven. Heloise's Critique of Monasticism." *Mediaeval Studies* no. 49:221–253.
"This article will explore the significance of Heloise's third and most neglected letter, especially when viewed in the context of contemporary controversies concerning the monastic life as well as other forms of spirituality. This discussion should help us to see that, in fact, Heloise's concerns in this letter rather closely resemble ideas expressed in other letters. Although primarily concerned with Heloise's third letter, the aim of this essay throughout is to suggest that we can understand better both Heloise and those aspects of twelfth-century spirituality which she epitomizes if we treat her works as a coherent and imaginative whole, rather than as a disjointed series of documents, explicable only in terms of forgery, interpolation, or repression." (pp. 224-225)

32. Häring, Nikolaus M. 1956. "A Third Manuscript of Peter Abelard's Theologia 'Summi Boni' (Ms Oxford, Bodl. Lyell 49, Ms. 101-128v)." *Mediaeval Studies* no. 18:215–224.
"In 1950, R. W. Hunt published a description of the mediaeval manuscripts bequeathed to the Bodleian Library by James P. R. Lyell.(2) The entry listed under no. 4n reads as follows:
Boethius, De Trinitate, with the commentaries of Remigius of Auxerre (59) and Thierry of Chartres (81); P. Abailardus, Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina (101). Admont, no. 382. Sheepskin binding, 15th cent. 12th cent. i+129 leaves: 235Xl50 mm.

The manuscript contains three distinct commentaries. on the opuscula sacra of Boethius." (p. 215)
(...)
"On fols. 99v_100v of the Oxford manuscript we find the fragment of a commentary on Boethius *De Hebdomadibus*, written by the author of *Librum hunc*. For some unknown reason it breaks off on fol. 100 after the first word in the fifteenth line. The rest (seventeen lines) of the folio is blank.
The same scribe wrote the *Theologia 'Summi Boni'*, beginning on fol. 101 without indication of its author. At a recent date a librarian wrote the name Abälard on the margin. In point of length, the Oxford copy agrees exactly with the Erlangen copy of this work. We shall now use L (Lyell) to designate the former, and shall follow both Stolzle and Ostlender in designating the latter by E. B designates the Berlin manuscript mentioned above. (pp.. 215-216)
(...)
"In view of such lively debates and rigorous demands, Ostlender was well advised to pay more than usual attention even to the position of words, but above all because of the close textual relationship between the *Theologia 'Summi Boni'* and the later *Theologia christiana*. Our list of variants sometimes confirms and sometimes weakens Abelard's text as it is published. It shows that in numerous instances EL are closer to T than B which is Ostlender's basic manuscript. Hence there is new evidence that the text as published is not final.
Of course, under the circumstances it was not meant to be final. The day, we hope, will come when the discovery of yet another manuscript will bring us another step closer to the original Abelard." (p. 218)
(2) R. W. Hunt. "The Lyell Bequest", *Bodl. Libr. Record*, III (1950), 68-100.

33. Hause, Jeffrey. 2007. "Abelard on Degrees of Sinfulness." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 81:251–270.
Abstract: "Like many of his medieval successors, Peter Abelard offers principles for ranking sins. Moral self-knowledge, after all, requires that we recognize not just our sinfulness, but also the extent of our offense. The most important distinction among sins is that between venial and mortal sins: venial sinners show less contempt and may also be victims of bad moral luck, and so they are far less blameworthy. However, the subjective principle which Abelard uses to protect the venial sinner from blame appears to have absurd consequences: some agents whom we intuitively find saintly turn out to be mortal sinners, while other agents whom we intuitively judge wicked turn out to be mere venial sinners. I argue that Abelard suggests promising replies to these objections, but these replies themselves depend on controversial views about moral psychology."

34. Jaeger, C. Stephen. 1980. "Peter Abelard's Silence at the Council of Sens." *Res publica litterarum* no. 3:31–54.

35. Johnson, Junius. 2016. *Patristic and Medieval Atonement Theory: A Guide to Research*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
Chapter 9: *Peter Abelard (1079–1142): Moral Influence,* pp. 119-124.
"Peter Abelard approaches theological topics with a more stringently philosophical mind than any of the other authors we are considering. He is concerned about justice and love and feels that these two points often get obscured in traditional discussions. Particularly, he feels that we often don't make subtle enough distinctions in our moral judgments and that we don't understand how deep divine love goes. His thoughts on morality will be discussed on the basis of his book *Ethics* (also titled *Know Thyself*), and his thoughts on divine love will be illustrated from a section of his . The theory he develops is often called either a moral influence theory or exemplarism: in both instances, what is meant is that we are moved (influenced) by Christ's great action to a different manner of life." (p. 119)
(...)
"If we recall the distinction between actions and intentions in the discussion of sin in Ethics and that it is intentions rather than actions that are sin, then what Abelard

is arguing here is that it is intentions rather than works that save us. Works would be outward actions: but a saving intention is a directing of the heart to God, the opposite of the scorn that is the content of sin. Abelard clearly is not impressed by Anselm's arguments about guilt, insult, or dishonor: whatever damage is done to things by human guilt in sinning can be undone by God's will and so requires no special work. What humanity needs is not a redeemer but a reminder of God's great love." (p. 124)

36. Kaiser, Denis. 2009. *The Doctrine of Atonement According to Peter Abelard: A Literary and Historical Analysis*. Aschen: Grin.
"This study analyzes the writings of Peter Abelard with a special focus on the *Commentaria in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* in order to give a comprehensive view of his atonement theology and the factors that may have influenced it.
First, I want to give a sketch of Abelard's life and a list of his works in a probable chronological order. Both the biography and bibliography, in drawing a picture of his personality, behavior, actions, writings, and teachings, will help to provide insight into Abelard's character, and eventually give reasons for the inevitability of misunderstandings. Second, a survey through the theology of atonement of the preceding centuries, beginning with the Bible and the church fathers, and concluding with Abelard's contemporary theologians will show similarities and differences between Abelard's view and the teachings of his predecessors and contemporaries.
Third, Abelard's writings on atonement are examined with a special attention to his commentary on Romans. Further, I will observe connections to other theological topics, and how they possibly influenced his atonement theology." (pp. 2-3, a note omitted)

37. ———. 2015. "Peter Abelard's Theology of Atonement: A Multifaceted Approach and Reevaluation." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* no. 26:3–28.
"*Cur Deus homo*—Why God became man: The title of Anselm of Canterbury's famous book touches at the core of Christianity's foundational issues—the significance and purpose of Christ's incarnation, life on earth, and death on the cross. The French philosopher, theologian, and logician Peter Abelard (1079–1142), a contemporary of Anselm, resolved this question in a manner that gave rise to theological discussions and controversies among his contemporaries and numerous generations of scholars. There are three main interpretations of Abelard's work. The first group of scholars concluded that this medieval theologian-philosopher overemphasized the moralistic or subjective aspect of Christ's death, at the expense of its substitutionary nature, and they concluded that Abelard's atonement theology was heresy. The second group of writers agreed that Abelard overemphasized the subjective aspect of the atonement, yet considered Abelard a genius and orthodox theologian. The third group of theologians rejected both assessments, suggesting that Abelard did not deny the substitutionary aspect of Christ's death at all. In other words, various scholars have come to entirely opposite conclusions about the central question of whether Abelard did or did not reject the substitutionary aspect of Christ's death. It is no wonder that the French abbot Thomas of Morigny, one of Abelard's contemporary opponents, compared him with the Homeric sea-god Proteus "who slips through our hands and takes another shape before our description of him is complete," implying that Abelard is one of the most difficult persons to assess.
The writer of this article sides with the third group. Yet one may legitimately ask what statements from the writings of Abelard gave rise to the conclusion that he denied the objective, substitutionary aspect of the atonement. Thus this article looks at the issue from various angles (historical, literary, and theological) in order to clarify what Abelard's view of atonement was, why he presented it in such a way as he did, and why it is so easy to misunderstand him." (pp. 3-5, notes omitted)

38. Kearney, Eileen F. 1980. "Peter Abelard as Biblical Commentator: A Study of the *Expositio in Hexaemeron*." In *Petrus Abaelardus (1079-1142). Person, Werk und*

Wirkung, edited by Thomas, Rudolf, 199–210. Trier: Paulinus-Verlag.
"Until the past decade with the publication of R. Peppermüller's monograph Abaelards *Auslegung des Römerbriefes,* scholars have focused on the philosophical and theological treatises of Peter Abelard rather than on his scriptural commentaries(1). Yet, our awareness of the role of Peter Abelard as theologian depends upon our understanding of Abelard's exegetical stance. This is true not only because Abelard himself indicated the correlation(2) but also because continuing research on the development of theology as a science in the twelfth century exposes a textual continuum between the divine science and Scripture(3).
For this investigation of Abelard as biblical commentator, I propose to examine Abelard's interpretation of the creation account from the opening chapters of *Genesis,* his E*xpositio in Hexaemeron(*4). With the exception of Buytaert's essay which deals with the manuscript tradition of the *Expositio*, there is no comprehensive study of Abelard's only extant Old Testament commentary(5). More recently, reflections on the *Expositio* have appeared within the context of research related to the Masters of Chartres and to a consideration of nature and the natural sciences that such investigation has engendered.(6)" (p. 199)
(1) R. Peppermüller, *Abaelards Auslegung des Römerbriefes,* Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 10, (Münster 1972).
(2) *Theologia 'scholarium*' edited by E.M. Buytaert in *Petri Abaelardi opera theologica* Il, *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis*, XI. (Turnhout 1969), 'Prologus,' 1, p. 401. Cf. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia latina* 178, 979A, (Paris 1844-64).
(3) For example, M.-D. Chenu, 'De la dialectique à la science,' in La théologie comme science au XIII^{e} siecle, *Bibliotheque Thomiste* 33 (Paris 1957), pp. 15-32.
(4) *Expositio in Hexaemeron* edited by J. P. Migne, *PL* 178, 731-784. Unless otherwise indicated, citations from the *Hexaemeron* are from this source and will be indicated within the essay itself by reference to the appropriate column number. In addition to the *Hexaemeron*, there are three other extant biblical commentaries by Abelard: the *Expositio orationis Dominicae*, the *Problemata Heloissae*, and the *Commentaria in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*. Abelard's Commentary on Ezechiel has been lost. Cf. D. Van den Eynde, 'Les écrits perdus d'Abelard,' *Antonianum* 37 (1962), 467-80.
(5) E.M. Buytaert, 'Abelard's Expositio in Hexaemeron,' *Antonianum* 43 (1968), 163-194.
Four manuscripts are extant although none are complete. The Migne edition follows the text of Martene-Durand (Paris 1717) which relied on a single manuscript and ends in the midst of Abelard's exposition of *Genesis* 2:17. The remaining manuscripts extend the commentary to Genesis 2:25. This portion is edited by Buytaert in his essay.
(6) For example, J. M. Parent's study *La doctrine de la création dans l'école des Chartres* (Ottawa 1938), especially pp. 69-76. The following essays from *La filosofia della natura nel medioevo* (Milan 1966) are also pertinent: J. Jolivet, 'Elements du concept de nature chez Abélard', pp. 297-304, and D. E. Luscombe, 'Nature in the Thought of Peter Abelard,' pp. 314-319.

39. Knuutila, Simo. 1999. "Philosophy and Theology in Twelfth-Century Trinitarian Discussions." *Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser* no. 77:237–249.
Summary: "Peter Abelard's theory of the identities and differences applied to beings and non-beings and Gilbert of Poitier's conception of an individual person were new philosophical ideas developed in theological contexts. How much should those interested in medieval philosophy learn about medieval theology? It is argued that paying attention to the non-philosophical cognitive determinants of philosophical arguments is philosophically motivated. According to the suggested approach, philosophical studies of medieval philosophy should include systematic and evaluative discussions while the possibly relevant theological context may be treated as a merely historical factor."

40. Kotsko, Adam. 2010. *The Politics of Redemption: The Social Logic of Salvation*. New York: Bloomsbury.
Chapter 7: *Abelard*, pp. 150-170.
"The goal of this book is to bring to the surface the ontology implicit within the tradition of theological reflection on the question of why God became human, a tradition normally called “atonement theory.” By ontology, I simply mean the logic by which this tradition guides our thinking about the world and our place in it. My contention is that all the major thinkers in this tradition have been drawn, even if despite themselves, to speak according to a certain social or relational logic in their attempt to make sense of God’s saving work in Christ—and that their departures from this logic represent steps along a path that would ultimately render the Christian concept of salvation incomprehensible and irrelevant." (p. 1)
(...)
"There has been a tendency to treat the short discussion in the Romans commentary as a full-blown theory of the atonement parallel to Anselm’s *Why God Became Human*, but Abelard himself considered it only an initial indication of a position that would be worked out in more detail in his *Tropologia* (*ER* 118)—a work that has not come down to us and may never have been completed. As his three theologies were all taken up with the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of God more generally and do not address the question of Incarnation directly, his commentary on Romans is thus, despite the avowedly provisional nature of his remarks there, essentially the only witness to Abelard’s thinking on atonement.
It also provides the only extended discussion of the first Adam/second Adam schema, which I have argued is the basic structure underlying all atonement theories and which in Abelard’s medieval context immediately brought to mind the doctrine of original sin.(2) The editor of the standard anthology in which the discussion of the atonement is translated also includes some supplementary passages from the *Ethics*, presumably because of Abelard’s reputation as a theorist of “moral influence,” but ironically the extant text of the *Ethics* is almost entirely about sin, with only a few brief paragraphs of the second book on virtues surviving.
The Romans commentary therefore remains basically the sole source for the questions animating the present study—namely, what it is about the structure of creation and particularly of humanity that gives the Incarnation its sense and efficacy." (p. 151)
References
A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham, ed. and trans. Eugene R. Fairweather (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966).
ER = *Petri Abaelardi Opera Theologica*, vol. 1, ed. E. M. Buytaert, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis series*, vol. 11 (Turnholt: Brepos, 1969).

41. Kramer, Susan R. 2000. ""We Speak to God with our Thoughts'": Abelard and the Implications of Private Communication with God." *Church History* no. 69:18–40.
"This essay will examine some writings by Abelard that seem to extol a very personal spirituality through their descriptions of unspoken, even nonverbal communication with God. Such direct communication with God was at the heart of Abelard's description of prayer as well as his theories on sin and its remission. I will also explore some of the implications of Abelard's outlining such a private relationship by looking at monastic and scholastic reactions to Abelard's theories on penance and absolution—theories that were consonant with Abelard's position that we communicate with God through our thoughts. For if Abelard was an innovator in describing an inner, hidden self known only to God, he also led the way to exposing these secret things of the heart to others through his theory of penance and the role of confession therein." (p. 23)

42. Krey, Philip D. W. 2007. "Response to H. Lawrence Bond, Ian Christopher Levy, and Thomas F. Ryan." In *Medieval Readings of Romans*, edited by Campbell, William S., Hawkins, Peter S. and Schildgen, Brenda Deen, 158–163. New York: T&T Clark International.
"Peter Abelard on Romans 3:26

Abelard described his own "reading" of Scripture as "glossing," and the chief point of glossing was to explain a text word by word (Van Engen, 23). Bond's paper on Abelard's gloss on Romans 3:26 follows this medieval gloss tradition and explains Abelard's text word by word. His essay demonstrates how a close and careful reading of Abelard, who was himself a close reader of Paul, can yield new insights. Bond parses Abelard's sentences as a careful Latinist and grammarian. Paul writes in Romans 3:26, "It was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus." Bond notes, "At times it has become commonplace to consider Abelard's commentary on Romans 3:26 as if Abelard were saying one thing and one thing only. This is one reason why some have often dismissed his soteriological theologizing as merely exemplarist and crypto-Pelagian." None of these commentators wanted to be Pelagian. Abelard was fundamentally a teacher, and Bond points out that in his text Abelard seems most interested in the question, "Why would the Apostle Paul say that we are justified by Christ's death when a command would do?" Bond notes that there are 117 lines attributed to the question and only 28 to the solution. He carefully investigatesparticular exegetical processes and concludes that what is central to Abelard's interpretation is God's own Son having taken on our nature. The place of the words "by example" in Abelard's famous sentence in question do not bear the emphasis they have been given by their readers. Bond writes, "The loving death even of the best of us renders only so much love and gratitude but neither justification nor reconciliation. For death to effect the soul's atonement it has to be the death of God in flesh, and not the death of a human being, offered as propitiation to God. Christ's passion works because it is not our passion but God's."
According to Bond, it is clear to Abelard how atonement does not occur: neither because or when God has paid ransom to the Devil nor because or when God finds divine justice to be satisfied through the death of the innocent. For Abelard, God's joining us with God, not Christ's example, is the atoning work. Thus Bond argues with interpreters of Abelard who overemphasize the exemplarism of Abelard's understanding of the atonement." (pp. 159-160)
References
Van Engen, John. 1996. "Studying Scripture in the Early University." Pp. 17-38 in Lerner, Robert, (ed.) 1996. *Neue Richtungen in der hoch-und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese*. Schriften des Historischen Kolleges Kolloquien 32. Munich: Oldenbourg.

43. Love, Gregory Anderson. 2009. "In Search of a Non-Violent Atonement Theory: Are Abelard and Girard a Help, or a Problem?" In *Theology as Conversation: The Significance of Dialogue in Historical and Contemporary Theology. A Festschrift for Daniel L. Migliore*, edited by McCormack, Bruce and Bender, Kimlyn, 194–214. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
"Peter Abelard rejected crusading and Anselm’s atonement theology as unethical and unreasonable. Abelard had different understandings of God’s character and of the source of divine-human estrangement. Abelard perceived the divine as a God of love and clemency, a merciful father rather than a stern lord of judgment and punishment. Further, God’s love is eternally boundless, even for sinful humanity. Such perfect love is not diminished by sinful acts, nor in need of payment to restore its honor; it is everlastingly complete and generous. The problem is not sin’s accumulated debt, but its hardening effect upon the human heart.
God saves by moving the human heart from fear to love, and the death of Jesus makes this change of heart possible. While God displays God’s compassion for humanity through Jesus’ words and actions, the death of Jesus creates a deeper love for God than would have been possible without it. Jesus proves the extent of his, and of God’s, love for humanity by his willingness to endure anything on humanity’s behalf, including his suffering and death.
Seeing Jesus as a victim undergoing unjust suffering, sinful witnesses may feel compassionate pity for Jesus as tortured victim, mixed with a sense of guilt for their role in his death, plus a desire to seek forgiveness, and make amends and act

differently. Salvation thus occurs when compassion and contrition before the flogged Christ move the sinner from self-love to a pure, selfless love. Love is therefore defined as a willingness to suffer unto death for the sake of the "other," as Christ did. God illumines the true nature of this love and enkindles hearts for love by sending the Son not only to live compassionately, but above all to die holding such a virtuous, selfless love." (pp. 196-197, a note omitted)

44. Luscombe, David E. 1983. "St. Anselm and Abelard." *Anselm Studies.An Occasional Journal* no. 1:207–229.
"In what ways and how extensively did Anselm of Canterbury shape the thought and influence the writings of Abelard? No adequate answer could be given to such a question, but useful comparisons between the two men may be drawn and differences may be noted. R. Thomas has skilfully and profitably juxtaposed Abelard's views on logic and faith, as they are found in his *Dialogue*, and Anselm's views on argumentum and on faith as contained in the *Proslogion*.(1) Thomas rightly emphasizes that Abelard was a younger contemporary of Anselm: Abelard was born in 1079 when Anselm was Abbot of Bec, and he was thirty years old when Anselm died.(2) One could, in a similar way, study the affinities between statements regarding the understanding of faith that Abelard made in his *Theologia* and Anselm's own remarks in the *Epistola de incarnatione verbi* and elsewhere." (p. 207)
(...)
"Before continuing we must look further at R.E. Weingart's excellent study of Abelard's soteriology. Weingart's tragic death removed all possibility that he might develop the views he advanced so eruditely in his book, and in offering a disagreement with one small part of his study I wish in no way to subtract from my admiration for the rest. Weingart presents Abelard's discussion of the necessity of the incarnation as a critical reaction against Anselm's search for necessary reasons why God became incarnate.(67) He reads Abelard's questions not only as indications that Abelard is sceptical of talk about necessity but also as direct attacks upon Anselm. Weingart finds support for his interpretation of the direction of Abelard's argument in the *Theologia,*(68) where he believes that Abelard shows his objection to necessary reasons and indicates his preferences for discovering 'worthy' reasons.(69) Therefore, Abelard can be presumed to have regarded Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* unfavourably in so far as Anselm had set out to prove the necessity of Christ's death, whereas Abelard distrusted talk of necessary reasons. Weingart further quotes a remark in Abelard's *Theologia Christiana:* 'it is written that God could have redeemed the human race in a way other than he did'.(70) Abelard here produced quotations from Scripture which seem to confirm this view.
Now, Weingart's interpretation of Abelard's anti-Anselmianism appears to be wrong for two reasons. The first is that Abelard and Anselm speak with a similar voice about divine necessity. In the *Cur Deus homo*, Anseim himself defined necessity in the sense of God's unalterable *honestas* rather than in terms of any extrinsic constraint upon divine omnipotence or freedom.(71) He admits that the word 'necessity' is only used' of God *improprie*, in an ill-fitting way. He assesses the type of necessity by which God acts; necessity in God means the immutability of divine *honestas*. Anselm, therefore, is close to agreement with Abelard in his application of a notion of necessity to the Godhead.(72) Secondly, Abelard, far from concluding that God might have redeemed man in a way other than the way he chose, in fact argues the opposite. One of the most salient features of Abelard's *Theologia* is the thesis that God does not and cannot act in any other, way or in any better way than the one in which he does act. The reason Abelard gives for his view is that God, being supremely reasonable and wise, chooses the most fitting way in which to act." (p. 216)
(1) R. Thomas, 'Anselms Fides Quaerens Intellectum im Proslogion und Abaelards Rationibus Fides Astruenda Et Defendenda im Dialogus Inter Philosophum, ludaeum et Christianum. Eine Vergleichserörterung', *Analecta Anselmiana*, 5 (1976), 297-310. This study also appeared under the same title in the *Bulletin de la*

Société academique, religieuse et scientifique de l'ancien duché d'Aoste, 47 (1974/5), 297-310. On the links between Anselm's and Abelard's discussions of logic, see D.P. Henry, *The Logic of St Anselm* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 65-6, 89-90, 141-2.
(2) Ibid., pp. 297, 307.
(67) Weingart, [*The Logic of Divine Love: A Critical Analysis of Soteriology of Peter Abailard*], pp. 91-93.
(68) Ibid., pp. 51-52.
(69) 'Magis autem honestis quam necessariis rationibus nitimur . . Abelard, *Theologia Christiana*, 5.15, p. 353; Abelard, *Theologia 'Scholarium*', 3.2, PL 178.1090C.
(70) Abelard, *Theologia Christiana*, 5.38, p. 364.
(71) *Cur Deus homo*, 2, 5, *Ans. Op. Om*., II, 100:20-8.
(72) cf. Peppermüller, *Abaelards Auslegung des Römerbriefes*, p. 90, note 496, where he notes that Abelard means by 'necessity' either *convenientia* in God, i.e. what is fitting for God, or our necessity, i.e. what is inescapable for man.