RHETORIC IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS
AT THE UNIVERSITIES OF PARIS AND OXFORD
IN THE MIDDLE AGES:
A SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Introduction

The subject of the present paper — the ‘decline’ of rhetoric at the Universities of Paris and Oxford (taken as the premier, benchmark institutions of their type for the period) during the last three

1. The present investigation represents a preliminary survey of the possibility that rhetoric was taught in the medieval western universities of Paris and Oxford more substantially than has hitherto been thought. The investigation arose out of two circumstances. The first was to find a home for the manuscripts of rhetorical commentaries written, apparently, during the second half of the twelfth century and the first quarter of the thirteenth, that have come to light since I began working on articles concerning the fortleben of Cicero’s De inventione and the pseudo-Ciceronian Ad Herennium for the international series Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum Medii Aevi, ed. V. Brown, F. E. Craz and P. O. Kristeller. The second circumstance was an invitation to talk on the subject at a special Colloque organised by Olga Weijers (Constantijn Instituut, The Hague) and Louis Holtz (Institut de Recherche et d’histoire des Textes, Paris) at the Institut de France, Paris, 18-20 May 1995 and entitled ‘L’Enseignement des disciplines à la Faculté des Arts (Paris et Oxford, XIIIe-XVe siècles)’. The Proceedings of this Colloque are currently in press, under the just-mentioned title. They contain a short summary of some aspects of the paper here printed. I am grateful to Dr Weijers for the invitation to speak at the Colloque and for her generous interest in my work since. I am also grateful for an opportunity to discuss aspects of the topic at the Tenth Biennial Conference of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric, Edinburgh, 1995, and for subsequent invitations to lecture on the subject at Johns Hopkins University Baltimore (Nancy Stuever) and Jean Dietz Moss (Catholic University of America, Washington D.C.).

2. J. A. Weisheipl, The Parisian Faculty of Arts in mid-thirteenth century : 1240-1270 in American Benedictine Review 25 (1974) [pp. 200-217] p.202 asserts that ‘by 1270 the ... arts faculty at Paris was ... basically identical with the Oxford arts faculty in the early fourteenth century’. What is said of the former, therefore, in some senses will also do for the latter.
centuries of the middle ages — is no small topic. On the face of it, we have to tell of the simple outmoding of an art with the passage of time and the changing of socio-institutional circumstance. Upon closer examination, however, the subject is more complex. In the first place it is a matter not of ‘decline’ or ‘disappearance’ but of transformation, transformation of the art of rhetoric from a comprehensive and, as it were, magical art of words, practised in the language for which the ancient and canonical Roman art was designed — Latin, into, on the one hand, a narrow, theoretical Latin technē, together with a series of pragmatic Latin language practices (dictamen, the ars poetria, the ars predicandi), and, on the other hand, a burgeoning eloquence of the French, German and Italian vernaculars that embodied what they could of the old Roman art of eloquence. This is a transformation of extraordinary interest today, for it parallels what we are experiencing in our own world. The twelfth century A.D. marks, indeed, the cultural terminus of an efflorescence of Latin discourse that, with ups and downs, had begun thirteen or fourteen centuries previously, in the extraordinary oeuvre of Quintus Ennius (b.239 B.C.). It is true that Latin as a language of academic and specialist communication survived on beyond the year 1200 A.D., indeed increased its utility and sophistication after that date, but how may one compare the dry, technical prose of the scholastics and lawyers with the prose and poetry of a string of twelfth-century writers, amply documented in the volumes of F. J. E. Raby and J. de Ghellinck? Should we not view the Benediktbeuern manuscript of the Carmina Burana, in fact, as a vast exercise in linguistic nostalgia? R. W. Southern, among others, has blinded us to the divide that marks the twelfth century off from its successors in this regard. An

4. Gk: a system of rules for obtaining / making something (involving, perhaps, less demonstrable ability at the skill than might be the case for the Latin ars).
adventure begun in the later years of the eleventh century and reaching a point of pioneering sophistication in the early years of the twelfth, established a form of philosophical nominalism as an intellectual discourse for freeing language and thought from the tyranny of specific, indeed objectively valid, reference to things, whilst, at the same time, rhetoric, as both technē and scintillating verbal practice, gave elegant expression to this new freedom, culminating with the notion that language was the only reality, that the integumentum of words obscured for ever the 'reality' of things. C. S. Jaeger in his two books has established some of the ramifications of these developments, and W. Wetherbee others, but the salient aspect of them is a sense of a cultural terminus as the year 1200 neared. It is a sense elaborated everywhere, in the goliardic poetry of the day, in the writings of Walter of Châtillon, John of Salisbury, Gerald of Wales, Peter of Blois, Walter Map, Hugh Primas and so many of those liberal humanists of the time. All of them lament the passing of a universal

---

8. I owe these ideas to discussion with Walter Kudrycz, to whom I record here much appreciation. Kudrycz writes (in an unpublished paper, Anselm and a New Generation: an examination of some recent theories of conceptual reorientation in eleventh- and twelfth-century western Europe): 'This extreme nominalism [of Roscelin] would mean that objective or true knowledge could not be perceived or communicated and that no ultimately valid relationship exists between the mind and the world'. On the nominalism of Roscelin see Constant J. Mews Nominalism and Theology before Abelard: new light on Roscelin of Compiègne in Vivarium 30:1 (1992) 4-33. The reader may like to compare my remark with Brian Stock's conclusion p.849 of his The self and literary experience in late antiquity and the Middle Ages in New Literary History 25:4 (1994).


language of humanism, one which valued the cultural traditions of the past and privileged a small, highly educated elite, who, in a spirit of what Becker would call 'gentle paideia' 13, saw themselves as filtering liberal humanist values through to the rest of the world, from the paideia of a classical and Christian past. This is the world of Foucault's 'universal' (versus 'specific') intellectual 14, and the language of this class was the euphuistic eloquence of the twelfth century.

R. W. Southern's notion of an intellectual adventure stretching from the lifetime of Gerbert of Rheims through to the work of Thomas Aquinas, obscures the extent and nature of the change that overtook the Latin world in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D. 15 The optimism, faith and sense of freedom of the intellect that had funded the nominalism and the euphuistic rhetoric of the twelfth century did not reach its natural and glorious climax with the work of Thomas Aquinas. Rather, it died in the institutionalising process known as the 'rise of the universities'. The foundations of this latter, emerging, world were relatively narrow, specialist and bureaucratic; the patronage system that seems to have supported forests of intellectuals with no further demand than that they think, communicate and write 16 seems to have dried up, in favour of a few privileged environments, not unlike the modern universities, and, indeed, of

which these early environments were the founding institutions. Learning became a cluster of specialisms, which, while evincing a formulaic unity in terms of accessus, schemes of knowledge and methodological terminology, marginalised Latin literary endeavour, professionalised the subject of morals, pluralised the market for higher education and catered more specifically to a geographically, sociologically and institutionally more widespread, demand for functional learning on the part of a much more numerous clientele than had existed in the previous century. If we are to believe the scholars whose work will be noticed below, higher learning had become, by the early twelfth century, not only ‘bigger business’ than it had been previously, but business tied more tightly to social consumer patterns. The role of humanist and social critic passed to the vernacular writer (Jean de Meun 17, Rutebeuf, Dante, to name but a few) and the institutions of higher learning became support faculties for the establishment of the universal Church and the monarchical State, in a manner that has become canonical ever since.

In all this, we must not mistake the universalism of a Thomas Aquinas for the humanism of the twelfth century. It is true that thirteenth-century academics had a grasp of the entire system of knowledge that had escaped their predecessors (and was to be spurned by the vernacular social critics of their own day), but what was the cost of such sinewy, didactic specialism? The price paid was an unsystematic adherence to the canons of Latin eloquence and the major achievements of its practitioners across thirteen or fourteen hundred years. The world had changed by the early thirteenth century, and a horde of individuals, motivated by competitive social pressures and straightened finances, descended upon the carrion legacy of those fourteen hundred years, dismembered it and carried off what they would for their new range of more specialised, professionalised, pragmatic pursuits. Within a half century of Thomas Aquinas’s day, the University of Paris was to lose its primacy among the universities of Europe, and, if we are to believe Pope Clement VI and the modern scholars who have taken up his theme, the pioneer tertiary institutions of the medieval world were in steep decline: ‘the masters were spending their time in endless meetings of the entire

17. G. Duby, Le Roman de la Rose in Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages, pp. 64ff. In some senses, too, the dictatores were the heirs of the twelfth-century humanists.
university staff, or of faculties and nations; in those meetings they were not consulting each other on what was most needed, but, disregarding all statutes, stubbornly bickering over titles and ranks.'

18. Bishop William of Angers complained vehemently at the Synod of Vienne in 1311 about the 'slackness and slow destruction of the universities' [because] scholars were not being sufficiently supported by the benefice-holding prelates of their home cities.' Such insecure conditions were not conducive to the encouragement of intellectual exertion.' The new universities, founded in the twilight of incomplete ideas, developed amid the confusion of chance and neglect and escaped neither the rut of tradition nor the chaos of reform.' I am sure the resemblances to the situation faced by the humanities in tertiary institutions throughout the western world today needs no underlining.

What does the history of rhetoric in the early universities tell of all this? That is our subject in the present paper.

---

In its classical formation, rhetoric was originally 'market' or 'probability' oriented rather than 'academy' / 'institution' or 'truth' oriented. It is thus, initially, no surprise to find that conventional wisdom assigns the subject but a reduced place in the curriculum of the two major medieval tertiary institutions, the Universities of Paris and

19. BORST, p. 177.
20. BORST, p. 179.
21. BORST, p. 181. Cf. also the comment of Jacques Verger on the University of Paris in the fifteenth century: 'the university as a whole was incapable of adapting itself. It failed to elaborate a new ideology — new social and political concepts — that would have enabled it to grasp the meaning of events and to intervene effectively. Instead, trying to conceal its impotence and to gratify, at least verbally, its pride of caste, it sought shelter in great traditional themes and in a phraseology whose inanity became ever more evident. This collapse of energy, this verbalism, were also the features of the university's inner life and of its teaching at the close of the Middle Ages' (J. VERGER, The University of Paris at the end of the Hundred Years' War, in JOHN W. BALDWIN and R. A. GOLDTHWAITE, Universities in Politics: case studies from the late middle ages and early modern period, Baltimore and London, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1972, p. 78).
Oxford. A short search through readily available texts, for example, confirms an impression that rhetoric, at least in its Ciceronian form, was little studied at the two universities in question during the last three centuries of the Middle Ages. Osmund Lewry canvassed the teaching of rhetoric at both Paris and Oxford in the mid-thirteenth century, and found little. Margareta Fredborg considers a later period.

22. As far as Paris is concerned, the letters 'A' and 'B' of Olga Weijers, 'recent Le travail intellectuel à la Faculté des arts de Paris : textes et maîtres (ca.1200-1500), Brepols, 1994, yield no rhetoric, though alchemy, Aristotle's Poetics, and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Poetria appear, and the Divisio scientiarum of Arnoul de Provence (around 1250 A.D.), a work which at least encompasses rhetoric and mentions Cicero as the only appropriate authority for it (J. O. Ward, 'Artificiosa Eloquentia' in the Middle Ages: a study of Cicero's De inventione, the 'Ad Herennium' and Quintilian's De institutione oratoria from the early middle ages to the thirteenth century, with special reference to the schools of Northern France Diss., Toronto University, I, p. 517), is found. See P. Osmund Lewry, Rhetoric at Paris and Oxford in the Mid-Thirteenth Century, in Rhetorica 1 : 1 (1983) p. 49 n. 15. H. Rashdall's, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (1895; new edition, ed. F. M. Powicke, and A. B. Emden. Oxford University Press, 1936) vol. I 'Salerno, Bologna, Paris', has little to say, but reinforces the stereotype: 'Rhetoric and grammar always remained important subjects of instruction in Italy; throughout the Middle Ages they were far better and more thoroughly taught than in northern Europe, where the new Aristotle and its attendant scholasticism threw all literary studies into the shade' (I, p. 234). I, pp. 439ff discusses the Paris 1215 statutes, in conventional terms. I, p. 447 mentions the study of Aristotle's Rhetoric, despite the absence of reference to it in the statutes. Arguing from mentions in connection with other universities, Rashdall feels that the Grecismus of Eberhard and the Labyrinthus were probably studied at Paris (I, 448-49). On the latter text see W. M. Purcell, Eberhard the German and the Labyrinth of Learning: Grammar, Poesy, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy in 'Laborintus' in Rhetorica 11:2 (1993) 95ff. M. Donald, Origins of the Modern Mind: three stages in the evolution of culture and cognition, Cambridge, Mass., 1991, citing Roland Barthes (trans.) The Semiotic Challenge, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988, L'Aventure Sémiologique, Éditions du Seuil, 1985), considers that rhetoric had ceded the palm of supremacy in the trivium from as early as the eighth century A.D. (p. 348). 'The trend toward the preeminence of logic and away from the imaginative and purely persuasive uses of rhetorical skill, continued... In much the same way that the second half of the twentieth century has been obsessed with the properties of computational devices, medieval scholars were entranced with their logic-machine; it promised to reveal the secrets of the universe' (p. 352). Margareta Fredborg, Ciceronian Rhetoric and Scholasticism, unpublished paper, Notre Dame, 1992 writes: 'Hard pressed by dialectic, medieval rhetoric in the thirteenth century changed focus from rhetorical argumentation to matters more closely allied to the concerns of narrative topics and poetical description, and became important background material for poetics and the art dictaminis'.

as a dividing line, between the unstructured humanist commentary on the *auctores*, with considerable attention to rhetoric and some concern for the unity of the trivium, and the scholastic commentary which displaced a genuine interest in rhetoric and honoured the concept of the unity of the trivium in the breach: ‘in my opinion’, she writes, with regard to the displacement of rhetoric, ‘the thirteenth-century Parisian University statutes legalised a state of affairs which had existed already from the middle of the twelfth century’ 24. Indeed, her designation of the twelfth century as the age of Cicero, the thirteenth century as the age of Boethius and the fourteenth the age of Aristotle, in rhetorical terms, has more than a little truth in it. 25.

Rhetoric, it seems clear, implied the negotiability of all certainty, whilst university scholasticism assumed the certainty of all truth and eschewed an art that taught the fabrication of plausibility outside the schools, in the market-place, the forum, the lawcourt, the retinue of duke, king, pope. Indeed, R. W. Southern, in his influential survey *The Making of the Middle Ages* 26, asserts that, from the twelfth century on, ‘logic was an instrument of order in a chaotic world’ 27, whereas ‘the art of rhetoric’, though it ‘could perhaps claim to be as highly developed and systematised as the sister art of dialectic’, and despite its eager advocacy by Gerbert of Rheims 28, fell into desuetude, because, ‘in the conditions of the tenth and eleventh centuries there was something unreal and futile about the exercise of an essentially practical art which had no roots in the practical life of the time’ 29. The work of L. J. Paetow strengthened the notion that

---


26. 1953.


rhetoric, which, during the Middle Ages, ‘never flourished... in the old Roman sense such as Quintilian described it’ 30, was an alien study at the University of Paris. For Henri D’Andeli, whose poem on ‘The Battle of the Seven Arts’ Paetow edited, ‘Rectorique’ took the shape of a contingent of knights from Lombardy 31, which ‘rode hard after dialectic’ ‘although they did not love her, for they were but little acquainted with her’ 32. Rhetoric is particularly associated by Henri with pleading and legal suits 33, but, at the end of the ‘battle’, Grammar withdraws to Egypt, Logic holds the field at Paris and rhetoric has become ‘the courtly Sir Versifier’ 34, who has ‘fled away between Orleans and Blois’ and ‘does not dare to go abroad in

30. L. J. PAETOW, Two Medieval Satires on the University of Paris: La Bataille des VII Ars of Henri D’Andeli and the Morale Scolarium of John of Garland, edited with renderings into English, Berkeley, University of California Press (Memoirs of the University of California 4 : 1-2), 1927 p. 24. L. J. PAETOW, The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with special reference to Grammar and Rhetoric (University of Illinois, The University Studies vol. III no.7, January 1910, University Press, Urbana-Champaign), p. 16ff, esp. p. 93: ‘The study of rhetoric as outlined by Cicero and Quintilian never flourished during the Middle Ages’. For Paetow’s works see C. H. HASKINS, Studies in Medieval Science (1924/1927 [Harvard University Press], 1960 [Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, Constable and Co. Ltd, London]), p. 370 n. 70. It was Paetow who gave utterance to the view that dictamen ‘killed’ classical and humanistic studies (PAETOW, The Arts Course pp. 28-29). Chapter III of his The Arts Course (‘Rhetoric. The “Business Course” at Medieval Universities’, pp. 67ff) argued that ‘Deprived almost absolutely of its most important function, that of training for eloquence, rhetoric lost much of its individuality. Its doctrines were often merged with those of grammar...It is not surprising therefore to find that very little of the old formal medieval rhetoric was taught at the universities’. Like law, dictamen broke away from rhetoric and ‘so important did it become’ as a separate discipline, ‘that in some places it usurped the whole field of rhetoric and was often simply called by that name’ (p. 70). Though ‘The statutes of the University of Paris give absolutely no indication that the new art was ever taught there’ (p. 85), various indications, not least the witness of John of Garland and Henri D’Andeli, suggest that it was (pp. 85-87).

32. ‘Poinstrent après Dialetique,
Ja soit ce que pas ne l’amoient,
Quar de petit la connoissoient’. PAETOW, Two Medieval Satires p. 51. Cf. also pp. 54, 57 for the ‘alliance’ between rhetoric and dialectic.
33. PAETOW, Two Medieval Satires, p. 57.
34. PAETOW, Two Medieval Satires, p. 59, line 440 ‘Versefieres li cortois’.
France since he has no acquaintance there’: the Bretons and the Germans pay some respect, but the Lombards (dictamen ?) ‘would strangle him’. Neither is rhetoric studied at Paris, nor is it any longer ‘the Ciceronian’ (or for that matter the ‘Aristotelian’) art. This impression that logic drove out rhetoric and the Latin literary classics at the University of Paris during the thirteenth century has become canonical.

The flourishing of rhetoric in the twelfth century, and its ‘decline’ in the thirteenth, is perhaps no surprise. Rhetoric is indeed likely to come to the fore when certainties begin to crash, when truth becomes negotiable, when institutions lose their monopolistic control of knowledge. Such a period was the century and a half that divides the lead-up to the Investiture Contest from the Fourth Lateran Council (c.1070-1215). These years, in fact, represent the classic period for the role of Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory in medieval tertiary education and thinking; from this period come twenty-two catena or ‘link’ commentaries on the Ad Herennium and De inventione, mostly from northern Europe. Of these we have reasonably

35. PAETOW, Two Medieval Satires p. 60.
36. HASKINS, Medieval Science, p. 370 ‘the thirteenth [century] when dialectic had driven the poets, historians, and moralists of ancient Rome from the curriculum in arts’. I canvassed the matter in my 1972 doctoral dissertation (‘Artificiosa Eloquentia’ [above n. 22]) I pp. 482ff. See also WETHERBEE, Platonism and Poetry pp. 255-56, and R. H. ROUSE, Florilegia and Latin classical authors in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Orléans in Viator 10 (1979) pp. 131 and 155ff. G. LEFF in H. de RIDDER-SYMOENS (ed.), Universities in the Middle Ages (A History of the University in Europe, vol. 1), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992, p. 315 sums the matter up well, arguing that rhetoric was not so much ‘unstudied’ as being studied without undergoing the kind of ‘internal development’ characteristic of speculative grammar or logic (apart from its application to the practical activities of letter-writing, in the ars dictaminis and ars notaria, and, in the thirteenth century, preaching, the ars predicandi). The De inventione and Ad Herennium, he says, remained basic. A. B. COBBAN, The Medieval Universities: their development and organization London: Methuen and Co. Ltd, 1975, p. 19 mentions and explains ‘the ousting of classical studies from the curricula of the new universities’ by the dominance of logic in the arts course.
37. One may compare the triumph of marketing rhetoric and ‘Business Studies’ in our own day.
38. The ‘links’ are the ‘lemmata’ or extracts from the original (classical) text, used as a key to the location of the glosses, which are consequently written out continuously — as distinct from the true ‘gloss’ format, in which the glosses become marginal or interlinear additions to the full classical original text.
full manuscripts of but twelve, and even these are seriously lacunose in minor ways and seldom agree with each other in details. Presumably, even then, rhetoric, was a relatively low-status art and did not enjoy the institutional investment that would have been necessary to produce the scale and standard of scriptorial activity evident in the study of the other arts.

The fate of the art of rhetoric in the later medieval, scholastic, period, when the 'liminal' conditions of the twelfth century had passed away and learning had become entrenched in the pragmatic and — to an outsider — rigid procedures and methods of the university/studium, the great 'engine of truth' in the late medieval intellectual and educational ferment, is the subject of the present paper. The conventional view, indicated at the beginning of my discussion above, ignores new evidence and does not take adequately into account the new sensitivity towards the place of rhetoric that characterises our postmodern era; the negative conclusions of generations of scholars may, accordingly, need to be modified.

A starting point is provided by the recently expressed views of Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton:

'The older (medieval, scholastic) system had fitted perfectly the needs of the Europe of the High Middle Ages, with its communes, its church offices open to the low-born of high talents and its vigorous debates on power and authority in church and state. The new (humanist) system, we would argue, fitted the needs of the new Europe that was taking shape, with its closed élites, hereditary offices and strenuous efforts to close off debate on vital political and social questions. It stamped the more prominent members of the new élite with an indelible cultural seal of superiority, it equipped lesser members with fluency and the learned habit of attention to textual detail and it offered everyone a model of true culture as something given, absolute, to be mastered, not questioned — and thus fostered in all its initiates a properly docile attitude towards authority. The education of the humanists was made to order for the Europe of the Counter-Reformation and of late

39. See WARD, Rhetoric, Truth and Literacy.
Protestant Orthodoxy. And this consonance between the practical activities of the humanists and the practical needs of their patrons, we argue, was the decisive reason for the victory of humanism. Scholasticism bred too independent an attitude to survive’ (pp. xii-xiv).

This is an attractive statement and it implies that some considerable attention to rhetoric must have been the order of the day at the medieval universities, for the rugged work of persuasion in the market-places of power surely required this. It is, of course, true, that rhetoric has two aspects, an ‘agonistic’, ‘combative’, ‘argumentative’, ‘judicial / deliberative’ aspect, and a ‘smoothing’, ‘resolving’ ‘epideictic / demonstrative aspect’. The inference that the Jardine / Grafton statement above would imply some vigor for rhetorical studies is probably only valid if we take rhetoric in its first aspect. This is not, however, the aspect of rhetoric that was uppermost at the time. Indeed, the dialectical / combative / disputative aspect of later medieval university scholastic studies was adequately catered to under the heading of logic / dialectic. Nevertheless, rhetoric was the classic discipline for argument in the ‘open’ society of Graeco-Roman antiquity, and it seems worthwhile in the light of the Jardine-Grafton statement to re-examine the place of rhetoric in the university curriculum.

Before doing so, however, it is necessary to state clearly what it is that scholars are looking for when they inquire into the place of rhetoric in the later medieval universities in question. In the first place they are searching for evidence of a full curriculum of teaching classical rhetorical (primarily judicial) theory, with appropriate manuscript indication of methods and exercises (commentaries on the relevant major classical treatises — usually the rhetorical works of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian and the rhetores latini minores —


glossed texts, *quaestiones*, model speeches or speech openings (*exordia* 44), *summae*, *distinctiones* and any other of the standard forms of scholastic instruction). It is important to stress that rhetoric is here encountered not as a *practice*, but as a theoretical art, a *techne*, a ‘mode of thinking concerned with production rather than action’ 45. In the second place, modern scholars are seeking evidence of University instruction in *parts* of the classical art of rhetoric, for example, the art of memory 46 or the figures of speech and other aspects of the fifth and final part of rhetorical theory, *elocutio*. Thirdly, they are looking for evidence of the teaching of practices that drew heavily upon classical rhetorical theory, but in an ‘applied’ context, for example, preaching (the *ars predicandi*), praying (the *ars precandi*), letter and document composition (*dictamen*), poetry composition (*artes poetriae*) 47.

Having specified the goals of the modern search for rhetoric in the later medieval universities of Oxford and Paris, it is now necessary to specify the classes of source in which the search is to be undertaken. Here it will be convenient to mention (a) the surviving university statutes and official promulgations; (b) related ‘semi-official’ texts, such as examination manuals; (c) incidental remarks in miscellaneous writers and evidence to be derived from the writings of authors with an obvious university background or context; (d) texts probably used in universities as instructional manuals within the *ars rhetorica*.

---

44. For example, *Ward, Ciceronian Rhetoric*, p. 249.
(a) The surviving university statutes and official promulgations from papal intervention at Paris in 1215 to Oxford in 1431 and beyond

The statutes of both universities make little, if any, mention of rhetorical studies and such mention of rhetoric as is evident (more explicit at Oxford than Paris, though late in the period), suggests that the primary texts studied were Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and Boethius *De differentiis topicis*, — not the *Ad Herennium*, the *De inventione*, Quintilian’s *Institutes*, or any of the rhetorical works by *moderni* — and that the points of reference were (a) dialectic / logic, (b) ethics and politics, (c) the theory and internal structure of the art of rhetoric, rather than practice of its precepts. Lecturing seems to have stressed understanding the littera, resolving apparent contradictions and non sequiturs, and training students to address certain *quaestiones* concerning the internal structure of the art and consistency among its parts. This is a far cry from the market-place rhetoric of the non-university rhetorical texts that seem to have survived from the university era, as for example, that group of quasi dictaminal, grammatical and rhetorical MSS that Martin Camargo has studied and which, even when they appear to derive from an Oxford context, seem to come from schoolmasters outside the University, or from busy practitioners in the market place. Nevertheless, the more theoretical of the *dictamen* treatises studied by Camargo may, in fact, derive from masters who ‘taught *dictamen* in association with the arts course at the university’ (of Oxford in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries). These treatises privilege ‘stylistic ornament’ (*elocutio*), whilst the business-oriented treatises, used ‘on the fringes of the university’ dealt shortly with theory ‘and clearly based their instruction primarily on abundant models for imitation’, with a curriculum that was, in some ways, ‘broader than that of the grammar masters’, (including for example) ‘collections of model wills, privileges, charters, and other documents, as well as letters’.

49. MARTIN CAMARGO himself in his *Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition: five English *artes dictandi* and their tradition* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, Binghamton, New York, 1995) pp. 18 (n. 61 : T.F. Tout believed [in 1929] ‘that public officials learned the skills necessary for their job through apprenticeship rather than from a university education’), 20 (n. 70 : ‘Whether the *ars dictaminis*
The foundation text at Paris — ‘the legatine decree of 1215’ — remarks only that the ‘ordinary’ Paris arts curriculum at this stage (based on lecturing ordinarie, that is, not ad cursum), consisted (at least) of rhetoric, style, versification, poetry and similar topics, but whether in the arts course attached to cathedral school / studium / university or in a ‘grammar school’, distinct from, though in many cases regulated by, the University regent masters and chancellors, is hard to determine. N. Orme, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* London, Methuen, 1973 divides the schools of medieval England into four grades, without the word ‘university, -ies’ ever appearing in his index. ‘The fourth and highest grade of medieval schools’ dealt with the seven liberal arts, canon and civil law and theology (p. 79). These schools were grouped around the major cathedrals, or located in major towns in England, and two at least of such centres became universities (Oxford and Cambridge). The third grade of school were the business schools to which Camargo has referred (Orme, p. 71), and the second were the grammar schools (Orme, 68), with dictamen floating between the second and third grades. The magi-stri in these schools were ‘secular priests or clerks and later on laymen too’ (p. 60) with no necessary or organic link to the universities, except at Oxford, where, as already noted, there was some overlap in the areas of grammar and ‘business studies’ / dictamen. Alan B. Cobb has usefully applied to this area of overlap the notion of ‘university extension courses’ (*The Medieval English Universities : Oxford and Cambridge to c.1500* Aldershot, Scolar Press, 1988 p. 348, and see his whole discussion pp. 344-48). Cf. also below at nn. 94-97.


51. L. Thorndike (ed.) *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages* p. 28 n.1. On this distinction, perhaps the best guide is now O. Weiders, *La 'disputatio' à la Faculté des arts de Paris (1200-1350 environ) : esquisse d’une typologie*, (Studia Artistarum ; Études sur la Faculté des arts dans les Universités médiévales 2), Brepols, 1995 pp. 11f, but see also Alfonso Maierù, *Le Scuole degli ordini mendicanti sec. XIII-XIV* Todi 1978 pp. 327-29. I give the relevant extracts together with the whole matter of the University and mendicant teaching of rhetoric in the later middle ages on pp. 259ff of my *Ciceronian Rhetoric*. Cursory, or ‘extraordinary’ lecturing (Weiders, *La 'disputatio' * p. 21) paid attention to the literal sense and was less thorough-going than the ordinary lectures, which occupied the first hours of the morning and were required for most graduation purposes. The cursory lectures tended to be given by bachelors, following the master’s ordinary lectures, and even on
least) of ‘the books of Aristotle on dialectic old and new’ and ‘both Priscians’; masters were not to lecture on feast days, except on ‘philosophic [books ?], rhetorical [matters ?]’, topics to do with the quadrivium 53, the third book of the Ars maior of Donatus, [Aristotle’s] Ethics, if the lecturers so desire 54, and the fourth book of the Topics’ [that is, the De differentiis topicis of Boethius, itself a commonly used textbook in university rhetorical studies]. The usual conclusion — that rhetoric mattered little at Paris at the time — is hard to support, on a number of grounds, not least the fact that the ‘ordinary’ arts curriculum can hardly have consisted only of the texts nominated; if this is so, then there must have been a much more extensive ‘ordinary’ curriculum, which the statutes, for some reason, chose not to mention. The witness of the statutes, however, is not so easily deduced, and can only be interpreted in their context. A number of points must be made.

In the first place, it can be urged against the case that the 1215 statutes suggest minimal attention to rhetoric, that many subjects

holidays, or as ‘repetitiones’ by the degree candidate for the benefit of private students, in his own rooms, of the master’s morning lectures. See further RIDDER-SYMOENS (ed.) Universities in the Middle Ages, pp. 148, 154-55, 232, 234 (half the material for the four to five years arts cursus or study derived from the baccalaureate and half from the master’s course), 326. See also J. A. WEISHEIPL, Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the early fourteenth century in Mediaeval Studies 26 (1964) pp. 150-52 and The Johannine Commentary of Friar Thomas in Church History 45 (1976) [185-95] 188 (on the terms reportatio, ordinatio, lectura). WEISHEIPL, in Mediaeval Studies, 26 (1964) p. 149 observes that ‘before 1431, Oxford masters were apparently free to choose their own subjects upon which to lecture, although those lectures required pro forma [that is, ‘the norm according to which one proceeded ad gradum magistri’] would naturally be the more popular. The books required pro forma should not be identified with the full teaching of the arts faculty; they were merely set books required for the degree. If the number of regent masters allowed and their personal inclination so determined, lectures would be given on all the approved books of the trivium, the quadrivium and the three philosophies’. Presumably the same could be said of Paris. See also COBBAN, The Medieval English Universities pp. 162ff.

52. rhetoricas, to be distinguished from philosophos. The feminine plural of the former term no doubt refers to the De inventione and Ad Herennium, known collectively as ‘the rhetorics’ of Cicero. According to later authority, even the Ad Herennium was correctly referred to as ‘rhetorics’ rather than ‘rhetoric’. The feminine, of course, derives from the gender of the substantive rhetorica. See J. O. WARD, Quintilian and the Rhetorical Revolution of the Middle Ages in Rhetorica 13 : 3 (1995) p. 239.

53. quadrivalia.

54. si placet.
were pursued at the Universities in question, for practical or market purposes and without the 'taking out of the degree' 55. The procedures for taking out a degree affected a minority of students, primarily those aiming to pursue their studies in the higher faculties of law, medicine and theology. The 1215 statutes are primarily concerned with degree-taking, and therefore would have had no cause to legis­late for those not taking out their degrees. Hence, rhetorical studies, if they were not pursued for degree purposes, would not have been included in any of the statutes. Thus, we cannot argue ex silentio as far as the statutes are concerned. Instead, we should inquire into what the 'option pool' of non-core subjects at universities was and how it was organised. How such an 'option pool' of non-core subjects related to the subjects pursued in licensed and non-licensed private schools beyond the curriculum of the universities, is also relevant: did would-be 'grammar' masters take a few courses in arts at the universities and then set up their own schools, without further qualification or graduation? If so, then there may well have been an extensive array of rhetorical options available within the Arts courses at universities, perhaps under the aegis of grammar, which were sus­tained by these non-graduating students, rather than by students whose concerns would have been the subject-matter of university statutes.

55. W. J. COURTENAY, Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England (Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1987) pp. 21, 60, 64: 'most stu­dents sent to the university were not expected to take degrees but only to study for a year or two before returning to teach in one of the provincial schools of natural phi­losophy or theology'; 'It would be wrong to consider the attainment of an advanced degree to be the goal of most medieval students. A few years of study was sufficient purpose and reward. The degree was a goal only for those few whose career plans were advanced by membership in the corporation of masters, and who met the requirements and probably quota limitations of the corporation'; The 'begging' letters from students to their parents, discussed by C. H. HASKINS, in his Studies in Medieval Culture, (1929) N.Y.; Frederick Ungar n.d. ch 1, do not always allege graduation / inception as a reason for continuing (or fearing the arbitrary shortening of) their stud­ies. COBAN, The Medieval English Universities p. 344 mentions 'that area of uni­versity studies which catered for students who attended the university not in order to follow an official degree course, but in order to undertake a practical training in preparation for a particular line of employment'. COLEMAN, The science of politics (p. 186 and see too p. 192) says most medieval arts faculty students 'would never pro­ceed to a higher faculty (or even obtain their BA)'. 
In the second place, it is quite clear, from the tone of Robert’s decree, that he is correcting certain abuses rather than providing comprehensive rules for all aspects of the operations of the arts faculty. The context suggests, in fact, that Robert is resolving by papal intervention, a series of disputes that had manifested themselves some years before 56. As early as 1208-09, for example, recently appointed masters at Paris (‘moderni doctores’) had initiated practice in three areas which aroused resentment on the part of older scholars: (a) wearing of garb that was ‘embarrassing’ (habitu inhonesto); (b) varying the traditional order of lectures and disputations; (c) discontinuation of the pious custom of honouring deceased clerics with due exequies 57. These three items are certainly curious and we have no real idea of the extent and nature of the practices condemned. The first (to judge from the specific reference in the 1215 statutes 58), referred to a tendency to wear ‘secular’, or decorative garb, particularly in contexts that had a social flavour, whilst the third seems to have been a matter of declining collegiality, due to the growing size of the student and magisterial body: masters and students were no longer so close-knit a community, and individuals were therefore less known to each other and less inclined as a matter of automatic assumption, to attend each other’s funerals, or even to mount funerals at all. The central item is obscure, but seems to have concerned such matters as: lecturing below a certain age; lecturing without the guarantee of a specified master who will have had jurisdiction (forum) over the scholar; failing to lecture for the prescribed minimum time before proceeding to a higher degree; lecturing without proper examination; varying and/or abbreviating the lecturing curriculum and the requisite texts (and ‘bribing’ the chancellor to grant the status of ‘licentiatus’); altering the customary practices in regard to cursory and ordinary texts; lecturing on a broader spread of texts during feast-days than was thought by the older brigade to be


58. THORNDIKE p. 29; DENIFLE-CHATELAIN, *Chart.*, I, 79.
conducive to proper non-feast-day decorum; lecturing on prohibited
texts (Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* and natural philosophy and on the
doctrines of ‘David of Dinant and Amaury or Mauritius of Spain’). There
were other small points of dispute (as the 1215 statutes reveal), but the
method chosen to regularise all of these practices, was to capitalise on
the desire of the larger, older and wiser group of masters to convert cus-
toms into written prescriptions, and to sanction their enforcement by
majority vote of masters and the appointment of proctors or representa-
tives (juratos), upon pain of excommunication. Short of dissolving
the *studium*, the masters in majority, could decide matters. The 1208-09
papal letter records, apparently, the earliest steps in these arrangements:
the masters in favour of tradition had, following their initiative just
mentioned, warned any deviant masters that obdurate resistance to the
new statutes would result in exclusion from the benefits of the society
of masters. Only Master ‘G’ — it seems — had refused to swear alle-
liance to the new statutes, contenting himself with a ‘fidejussoriam... cau-
stonem’ (a cautioning, a statement as to the consequence of refusal).
The interest of the document is that, apparently, the masters
felt they could not undo their own sworn agreements without papal
intervention. Thus, when Master ‘G’ appears to have changed his mind,
readmission was thought possible only by way of appeal to the Pope.
The 1215 decree should presumably be taken in this context: it restates
the jurisdiction of the masters over themselves, and attends by legatine
(i.e. papal) authority to a variety of matters in dispute.

59. LEFF, *Paris and Oxford Universities*, pp. 191ff: Robert de Courçon was him-
self a conservative theological professor at Paris during the relevant years.
60. ‘si quisquam magistrorum...universitati parere contemperet magistrorum’,
DENIFLE-CHATELAIN, I, p. 67.
61. ‘beneficio societatis eorum in magistralibus privaretur’.
62. That is, presumably, having read to him the statement that if anyone refused
obedience to the university of masters beyond three warnings spread over three days,
he would be deprived of the benefits of belonging to the society of masters. See
63. ‘ut autem ista inviolabillitatem observentur, omnes qui contumaciter contra hec
statuta nostra venire presumpserint, nisi infra quindecim dies a die transgressionis
coram universitate magistrorum et scolarium, vel coram aliquibus ab universitate con-
stitutis presumptionem suam curaverint emendare, legationis qua fungimur auctoritate
vinculo excommunicationis introdavimus’, DENIFLE-CHATELAIN, I, p. 79 (my italics).
For the view that Paris masters in the thirteenth century operated in a much more fight-
ly controlled environment than has hitherto been thought, see L. BIANCHI, *Censure, li-
berté et progrès intellectuel à l’Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle* in *Archives d’histoire
doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 63 (1996) 45-93.
The statutes, thus, must be seen as in general lagging behind practice, and addressed only to specific problems; their coverage will thus seldom be comprehensive or systematic.\(^{64}\) We may, therefore, reverse the prohibitions of the 1215 Paris statutes and argue that schoolmen, at some time prior to 1215, often lectured cursorily on 'the books of Aristotle on dialectic old and new (and) on both Priscians' and that they did lecture on these books on feast days. This suggests that they did lecture ordinarily on other books (including, probably, \textit{rhetoricas et quadrivalia}) on non-feast days. If Ferruolo’s figures of some 4,000 students at Paris c.1207 and around 100 \textit{magistri in artibus} are at all accurate, the situation must have been one in which masters competed for students in a kind of institutional/regulatory vacuum. Ferruolo, in fact, suggests that the subjects selected in the 1215 statutes for feast days were selected because of their greater appeal to students (given the competing attractions on those days). The lesson here is that one must read between the lines of the statutes and scholars working recently on both the Paris and Oxford statutes have done so and concluded that far more rhetoric was taught than appears to have been.

In the third place, it must be pointed out that there were, in the liturgical calendar at the time of Robert’s statutes, almost as many feast-days as non-feast-days. In addition, there were various types of feast-days, i.e. feast-days on which no activity at all was permitted and feast-days on which only certain subjects were permitted to be lectured on. It is therefore quite possible that the distinction between ‘feast’ and ‘non-feast’ days was simply one of convenience: instead of saying (for example) that this or that subject will be lectured upon on Mondays to Wednesdays, and other subjects on Thursdays and Fridays, it struck the masters as simpler to apply a ‘feast’ and ‘non-feast’ day distinction, because our kind of distinction, i.e. Monday-

\(^{64}\) Cf. S. FERRUOLO, \textit{The Paris statutes of 1215 reconsidered} in \textit{History of Universities} 5 (1985) [1-14], p. 7: Courçon ‘seems to have wisely decided to limit his efforts to those matters about which there was already substantial consensus about what ought to be done or where established practices and customs consistent with the objectives of reforming and tranquillising the schools, needed to be formally confirmed. Despite their disorder and lack of any apparent unifying principle, the statutes of 1215 succeeded in addressing many of the principal criticisms which had been made of the schools during their previous decades of rapid growth and expansion’. See also FERRUOLO, \textit{The Origins of the University}, p. 279ff, esp. p. 288ff.
Wednesday, versus Thursday — Friday (e.g.), would be so broken up by feast days as to be meaningless.

Subsequent mentions of the trivium in the Paris statutes need to be interpreted with the above cautions in mind. The regulations for the bachelor’s decree in arts for the English nation at Paris in 1252, for example, contain no reference to rhetorical texts or matters. In this regard, rhetoric is not the subject of any special exclusion; with the exception of the ‘De anima’, the regulations specify only grammatical and logical texts for the degree. The nearest approach we have to comprehensive rules for the thirteenth century at Paris are those contained in the 1255 regulations, which seem to have been promulgated in order to remedy pressures aiming at a general abbreviation of teaching terms and contents. The texts mentioned, that is those that have been subjected to attempts at abbreviation by the lecturers, do not include rhetorical texts. Indeed, the only rhetorical text mentioned, the fourth book of Boethius De differentiis topicis, presenting a very ‘dialectical’ view of rhetoric, is specifically excluded from regulation, meaning either that it was not the subject of lecturing, or that it was not subject to abbreviation, or that the authors of the regulation did not mind how long lecturers lingered over it. If we are to argue from the texts that lecturers tried to abbreviate, we would have to conclude that the 1255 curriculum is generally wider than it had been earlier, with many Aristotelian books on ‘science’ included. Such an inference, however, is hardly warranted, as, again, the emphasis of the 1255 regulation is selective: it concerns only those aspects which the authors thought needed reform. The required curriculum might by now have been broader, but the actual teaching

65. I owe this suggestion to the intervention at the Paris Colloque (mentioned in n.1 above) of Patricia Stirnemann of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (Paris). Dr Stirnemann calculates that there would have been, over the average academic year, and without counting Sundays, Easter, Pentecost, Ascension or the Feasts of the Apostles and Evangelists, some 84 festivi (as opposed to 120 feriales). On the precise regimentation of the calendar year at the medieval university see WEJERS, La ‘disputatio’, p. 18.


68. For Boethius’ De differentiis topicis in the thirteenth century, see FREDBORG, The Scholastic Teaching of Rhetoric pp. 96-7.
curriculum is hard to estimate from the regulations. In this respect, even Lewry’s conclusions go beyond the evidence.

The habit of ‘abbreviating’ the arts course is worth a short digression. It is specifically the subject of some remarks by Giraldus Cambrensis, writing, apparently, after the 1215 Paris statutes, but referring to the scene in Paris in his youth. There are, in fact, he says, quoting an older distinction of Master Ralph of Beauvais, three classes of student, only the first of which may be described as ‘abbreviators’ (superseminati). The middle group, the inevitable mediocre students who make only a ‘patchy’ attempt upon their subject (and hence are called pannosi), should occasion no surprise, and the third group (the massati) are those who do choose to acquire a firm grounding in the arts. These are those who, presumably, do not omit the first two steps of the trivium in their haste to attain the third: they are unlike those who skip grammar and rhetoric (which ‘lepide loqui docet et ornate’) and hurry ‘ad studium logices, et garrule loquacitatis apparentiam’. It seems reasonable to argue that if the thirteenth-century Paris statutes were designed to catch the parinosi and the superseminati, they cannot be expected to have made any reference to the ongoing curriculum studied by the massati. To argue from these statutes, therefore, that there was no such curriculum as the latter, would seem rash.

Research has shown too, that in the case of quadruvial studies the Paris regulations do not imply a dearth of attention to the subject. Equally, despite the ban placed upon them, Aristotle’s works on natural philosophy remained studied. Whether the same may be said for rhetoric and whether rhetoric could be lectured on ordinarie or

69. Op. cit. pp. 45-46. RASHDALL (I, 442) asserts that the 1255 decree ‘gives us the list of textbooks, in order, upon which a master was required to lecture at that date’, and provided that we emphasise the word ‘required’ and add ‘for inception / graduation / determination’, we can accept the statement.


71. HUNT, p. 194.

72. HUNT, p. 206.

73. See RIDDER-SYMOENS (ed.) Universities in the Middle Ages, pp. 113 and 324: the existing statutes deal only with ‘certain matters of dispute’, most regulations were a matter of unwritten custom.

74. Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Âge, pp. 175ff.

75. RIDDER-SYMOENS (ed.) Universities in the Middle Ages, pp. 320-21.
cursorie remain the subject of conjecture. MS London B. L. Harley 3593 is a *summa dictaminis composita Parisius per magistrum Laurentium de Aquilegia iuxta doctrinam Tullii* and dedicated to Philip IV. This narrow, dictaminal, rhetorical study does not appear to have been implied by the 1215 Paris statutes. If Lawrence, an apparently successful international teacher of *dictamen*, wrote his *Summa* at Paris, was he not teaching there, and if he was, at what institution? Weisheipl, too, while noting that the 1366 Paris statutes make no mention of rhetoric, music or astronomy, writes: ‘these were taught, as we know, in the faculty of arts at Paris and elsewhere’. The same impression is gained from a casual remark made a little later by Nicholas of Clemanges, rector of the University of Paris. The common impression (continues Weisheipl) is that the

76. P. Delhaye, in *Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Âge*, p. 168 n. 18; J. J. Murphy in the same volume p. 833 is unnecessarily pessimistic. Note the remark of Weisheipl, *American Benedictine Review*, p. 207: ‘In other words, Pope Gregory IX [in *Parens Scientiarum*, 13/4/1231, Denifle/Chatelain, I, pp. 136ff, Thorndike, pp. 35-39] introduced no new regulation regarding the teaching of arts. He merely says that Priscian’s grammar is to be read with the other books of Aristotle’s logic, Cicero’s rhetoric, and the books of the quadrivium *ordinarie*, i.e. magisterially and not *ad cursum*. *Parens Scientiarum* does not itself say all this.


79. P. Kibre, *Studies in Medieval Science: alchemy, astrology, mathematics and medicine*, London: Hambledon Press, 1984, item XII ‘Arts and Medicine in the Universities’ pp. 219-21 writes that ‘Nicholas of Clemanges, rector of the University of Paris in 1393 replied [to Petrarch’s denunciation regarding the teaching of rhetoric and the poets north of the Alps] that he had seen and heard lectures being given in the Paris *studium* on the rhetoric of both Aristotle and Cicero, and that the best of the [classical Latin] poets...were indeed being taught and read. And Pierre d’Ailly, chancellor in 1389, and later Cardinal in 1411 ... described the program encompassing those authors who were being lectured on in the last decade of the fourteenth century at Paris’. These included the ‘rhetorical blandishments of Tullius Cicero’ and a great range of classical Latin belles-lettres (under ‘rational philosophy’ in the arts faculty). ‘Moreover the humanist tastes of Jean Gerson, chancellor in 1395, as revealed in his sermons and the manifest interest in rhetoric of Guillaume Fichet at Paris in 1449, and rector of the university in the year 1467... were, in all likelihood, reflected in the teaching in the Faculty of Arts’.
fifteenth century (at Paris) excelled in the rhetoric of the new *ars dictaminis* as well as astronomy and mathematics generally*80.

The Paris (and Oxford) university statutes have long been taken to imply that rhetoric was progressively little studied in the environment of the later medieval university. I would like to suggest, however, that in view of the remarks above, the only inference we are entitled to make from the thirteenth-century Paris statutes is that rhetoric was not a 'sensitive' lecturing subject: it was neither banned, nor 'required', nor subject to graduation-oriented pressure*81 and abbreviation.

If we turn to Oxford, we find Courtenay's hopeful assertion that (in the fourteenth century) the university curriculum included 'Cicero, Ovid, Boethius and Virgil on rhetoric'*82. If this were, in fact, the case, we could conclude that at least at Oxford, students in the arts secured a broad and humanistic training along classical lines*83. Lewry argues that Kilwardby in the middle of the thirteenth century

---

80. *Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Âge*, p. 212.

81. According to P. Moraw (Riddel-Symeons (ed.) *Universities in the Middle Ages*, p. 255) 'the Italian university ... lived off the city in the cultural area of rhetoric': clearly the careers available to university graduates afforded the studies they chose, but it is not impossible (see n. 55 above) that some graduates acquired certain skills at the University in Paris which they took into market situations without proceeding to formal graduation; this would have been most likely in the areas of rhetoric and (literary) grammar. In this situation it is understandable that the statutes might stress rhetoric and grammar far less than they would the formal requirements for graduation, inception and the licence. See also the remark of Cobban, *The Medieval Universities*, p. 220 on rhetoric and the job market. On careers for graduates see Riddel-Symeons (ed.) *Universities in the Middle Ages* p. 249.

82. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England*, p. 32, and cf.p.23 for the statement that most of the evidence for 'university' studies in fourteenth-century England comes from Oxford. Murphy's reference to 'an unspecified book of Cicero... in the account of a meeting held in Oxford about 1200' (*Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, p. 110), fuses, apparently, two footnotes in Rashdall (III, p. 32, nn. 2-3): it is a matter of an abbot of Evesham c. 1200 bringing with him to his management of the schools 'apud Oxoniam et Exoniam' books of civil and canon law, together with Cicero, Isidore, Lucan and Juvenal.

83. Contrast J. A. Weisheipl, *Developments in the Arts Curriculum at Oxford in the early fourteenth century in Mediaeval Studies* 28 (1966) pp. 151-52: 'The two main pillars of Oxford education in the early fourteenth century were logic and natural philosophy. ... Nevertheless it can be said that by the middle of the fourteenth century, 'scientiae sermocinales' at Oxford were basically represented by the *libri logicales*...'. On rhetoric at Oxford in c. 1193 see Cobban, *The Medieval English Universities*, p. 43.
carried from Paris to Oxford his interest in the status of the rules of rhetoric (vis-à-vis dialectic), for which his major authorities were besides Gundissalinus and Boethius [De diff. top. IV] ...the Ad Herennium with its familiar stock of definitions', even though, as is well known, the visibility of Aristotelian and 'Ciceronian' rhetoric in the Oxford statutes has to wait until 1431 A.D. 85.

Aristotle's Rhetoric makes its well-known appearance in the 1431 Oxford statutes for the license and inception in the School of Liberal Arts and the Three Philosophies, along with the fourth book of Boethius’ De differentiis topicis, the Rhetorica Nova (Ad Herennium), Ovid's Metamorphoses and Vergil's Poetria 86. Murphy considered that this statute represented a new development in Oxford studies: rhetoric, not taught previously at Oxford, is here presented as an alternative to the study of literature 87. Schoeck 88, however,


86. RASHDALL, III, pp. 153ff gives full details, with the rhetorical material on p. 155. There, three terms of reading in rhetorical texts (the same as for logic, contrasting with one term for grammar) are required for licence and inception, in addition to the books already read for the B.A. determination (‘Admissio ad lecturam alicuius libri Facultatis Artium’, four years study). Rashdall also speaks of degrees in rhetoric at Oxford, towards the end of the fifteenth century (III p. 161). Cf. WEISHEIPL in Mediaeval Studies, 26 (1964) p. 169. The text of the statute is provided in Strickland GIBSON (ed.) Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1931, p. 234.


stressing, like Weisheipl 89, the importance of the dictaminal curriculum at Oxford 1220-1430, observes that the thirteenth-century statutes mention Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis* IV. These circumstances, in addition to the emphasis placed upon preaching at Oxford by the religious orders, led Schoeck to the conclusion that rhetoric was studied at Oxford in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and that the 1431 statutes must be read in this light 90. So too Lewry writes that his study of Oxford epideictic oratory (‘more influenced by the *Ad Herennium* than by Aristotle’s *Rhetoric’ 91) c.1270-1310 ‘encourages me to think that there was teaching of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* at Oxford before 1300, and it is safe to assume that more was always studied than was taught, and more taught than was prescribed by statute or made the subject of examinations’ 92. Such an assumption is supported by ‘the Peterhouse anonymous teaching perhaps around 1250’ 93, who ‘freely draws on Cicero’s *De inventione* and its exposition by Victorinus to extend his students knowledge of the resources of rhetoric’, much in the manner of the rhetorical teaching found in the *Ad Herennium* gloss of MS Oxford CCC 250, to be noticed again below. Lewry concludes that the Oxford masters in all probability borrowed from their Parisian colleagues the prevailing emphasis upon rhetoric as a theoretical system of interest for its bearing upon dialectic and moral philosophy, from the thirteenth century onwards. In this reading, the 1431 statute becomes a not uncommon case of institutional lag, and we may, with Courtenay, backdate the humanist emphasis it indicates, to the fourteenth century.

A further point that needs stressing in the present context, and which has been raised already above, is the progressive absorption into the Oxford University arts faculty curriculum of grammatical and dictaminal teaching which had hitherto taken place on the

90. ‘rhetoric in fact was taught ... in fourteenth-century Oxford’ : SCHOECK, *On Rhetoric in Fourteenth-century Oxford* p. 225.
92. LEWRY, *Rhetorica* p. 61. Cf. also his remark p. 433 of CATTO (ed.) *The Early Oxford Schools* : ‘if little has survived to represent thirteenth-century rhetorical studies [at Oxford], these none the less cannot be discounted’.
93. LEWRY, *Rhetorica* p. 61 ; p. 59 : ‘Peterhouse 205 is mainly English teaching from Paris’.
margins of the university. Camargo, in a recent unpublished study, speaks of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century efforts in the Oxford University environment

‘to formulate a comprehensive art of composition, whether through a single, relatively lengthy treatise, such as the long version of the Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi (incorrectly attributed to Geoffrey of Vinsauf), or through several, shorter treatises intended for use in combination with each other’.

Camargo continues, asserting that

‘the more homogeneous collections in which the Forma dictandi is found testify to late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century efforts to subordinate the ars dictaminis to an expanded grammar curriculum taught under the supervision of the Oxford [University] arts faculty. This curricular reform was carried out partly through new combinations of existing texts; but at the same time, new textbooks, most of them syntheses of earlier works, were created and disseminated by the Oxford masters. The Forma dictandi was created for the same purpose that the long Documentum and perhaps a dozen similar textbooks were: to provide textbooks of general composition that integrated the ars dictaminis into their teaching’.

In support of these remarks, Camargo cites three Oxford University Arts Faculty Statutes for the years (prior to) 1350 (and probably prior to 1313), (prior to) 1380, and 1432. The earlier

94. M. CAMARGO, An Oxford ‘Forma Dictandi’ of the late Fourteenth Century, unpublished. I would like to thank Professor Camargo for sending me a typescript of this presentation.

95. One of the fuller of the eleven MSS cited by Camargo for the Forma dictandi, is London BL Harley 3224 fols 54r-66v, s. XIV-XV.

96. CAMARGO, Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition pp. 27-28, citing GIBSON, pp. 20-23, 169-74, 240-41. I have consulted these. The late medieval and early modern material contained in C. W. BOASE (ed.) Register of the University of Oxford, 1 (1449-63, 1505-71), Oxford, 1885, represents, presumably, a culmination of the development Camargo is referring to, as also the greater prevalence of humanist modes of teaching and study. For example, from the year 1512 (p. 299) ‘Smyth (Richard) capellanus secularis supplicat quatenus studium sexdecim annorum in arte rethorica cum informatione puerorum in eadem arte per spaciun decem annorum sibi sufficiat ut admittatur ad informandum in eadem arte’ (permission is granted provided that Smyth lecture on Sallust and write one hundred poems in praise of the university, and one comedy to that effect!). See also GIBSON, pp. Ixxxviii, xliii, xcv etc. On the practice of issuing ‘graces’ or dispensations see COBBAN, The Medieval English Universities, pp. 85, 355-56, 391.
statutes are evidence that regent masters in grammar were required to teach the elements of versification and dictamen 'on which we know that considerable emphasis was laid' 97, while the last statute actually sought to discipline students who were following the non-University 'business course' (including the arts of writing / composing [in Latin], of speaking French, of drawing up charters and similar documents, of holding the cure of souls or of pleading in English 98), for which the university provided no 'ordinary lectures', by requiring them to attend the ordinary lectures 'arcistarum gramaticam vel rethoricam legencium' on the grounds that the subjects of the business course were more similar to grammar and rhetoric than to the other sciences or faculties, 'tamquam eis sub-alternate'. All these texts should be borne in mind when contemplating the involvement of the Oxford Arts Faculty in the teaching of rhetoric.

(b) related 'semi-official' texts, such as examination manuals and study guides

The impression that rhetoric was indeed studied at Paris and Oxford universities in the last three centuries of the middle ages is confirmed by the 'introductions to philosophy' and examination

---

97. R. W. HUNT, Oxford Grammar Masters in the Middle Ages in Oxford in Oxford Historical Society (Studies Presented to Daniel Callus) n.s. 14 (1964) p. 187. Hunt observes no clear distinction between University grammar schools and those beyond the confines of the University. He adverts (pp.185-86) to two of the three statutes discussed by Camargo. In the earlier statutes, he says, it was assumed that grammar masters would hold the degree of Master in Arts (on which see BERNSTEIN, Magisterium and License, p. 296), non masters being permitted to keep schools in the suburbs, but later statutes, owing to declining educational standards, do not assume that teachers will normally be masters. In general on the English University and non-University schools see LEACH, The Schools of Medieval England, ch. 8 ; John N. MINER, The Grammar Schools of Medieval England : A.F. Leach in Historiographical Perspective, Montreal and Kingston, London, Buffalo : McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990 ; and the work of Nicholas Orme (MINER, pp. 256ff). All these studies regard the actual contents of the school curricula as a frontier for exploration. Note also on the ars dictaminis in fourteenth-century England, SCHOECK, On Rhetoric in Fourteenth-century Oxford pp. 217ff, and p. 219 : 'of the English dictaminal treatises composed between 1220 and 1450 which we possess, all are connected with the University of Oxford'.

98. CAMARGO, Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition, p. 28, GIBSON, p. 240.
manuals of thirteenth century Paris, which have lately come to enjoy considerable attention\(^9\).

These introductions to philosophy, which are over twenty in number and date from the first three-quarters of the thirteenth century in Paris ‘the most important centre of higher education in the Christian West at that time’\(^10\), were designed, stresses Lafleur, to fulfill three functions: (1) to furnish for candidates attempting the licence (i.e. graduating) some idea of what they might be questioned on; (2) to clarify the architectonic structure of the new knowledge recently gained from Graeco-Arab sources; (3) to stress reason and the ancillary role of philosophy to other disciplines. It is noteworthy that all the introductions mention rhetoric\(^101\), in terms of its parts, its principle text-books (the *Ad Herennium* and the *De inventione*) and some questions regarding its place and use, such as, for example, why does it use enthymeme and example rather than syllogism and induction, how does the Ciceronian treatment of the subject differ from that to be found in Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis*, why does the rhetor deal with the virtues, whether *ornatio sermonis* is a science in itself, why the rhetor does not deal with the parts of speech the way the logician and grammarian does. There is a legal flavour about some of the descriptions in these introductions, and all derive clearly from the kind of classroom that produced the *Ad Herennium* commentaries of the previous century. The obvious textbook for them all is

---

99. For example, from Claude Lafleur (Faculté de Philosophie, Université Laval, Québec), who was kind enough to send me details of his work, and to discuss its implications at the 1995 Paris Colloque (mentioned in n.1 above), where he delivered an informative paper (see below). See C. LAFLEUR, *Quatre Introductions à la Philosophie au XIIIe Siècle, textes critiques et étude historique*, Montréal Institut d’Études Médiévales, Université de Montréal, Paris, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1988; C. LAFLEUR, Les ‘Guides de l’étudiant’ de la Faculté des Arts de L’Université de Paris au XIIIe Siècle, in M. J. F. M. HOENEN, J. H. JOSEF SCHNEIDER, G. WIELAND (eds) *Philosophy and Learning : Universités in the Middle Ages*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995 pp. 137-199; C. LAFLEUR avec la collaboration de Joanne CARRIER (eds), *Le ‘Guide de l’étudiant’ d’un maître anonyme de la Faculté des Arts de Paris au XIIIe Siècle, édition critique provisoire du MS Barcelona, Arxiu de la Corona d’Aragó, Ripoll 109, ff. 134va-158va*, Faculté de Philosophie, Université Laval, Québec, 1992; C. LAFLEUR, Les textes ‘didascaliques’ (‘introductions à la philosophie’ et ‘guides de l’étudiant’) de la Faculté des Arts de Paris au XIIIe siècle : Plan, as distributed at the Paris Colloque.

100. LAFLEUR, Les ‘Guides de l’étudiant’, p. 137.

101. See LAFLEUR, *Quatre Introductions*, index, p. 419 s.v. ‘rethorica’.
the *Ad Herennium*, but some discuss the differences between this text and the *De inventione*, and one has the following helpful statement:

‘rhetoric is defined in many ways, as is clear from Quintilian’s *Institutes of Orator*. But, since all these definitions add up to the same thing, we will take one for them all. Rhetoric, therefore, is, according to Quintilian, the art of discourse appropriate to persuading, that is, it is the art of discoursing upon such things as are convenient and suffice for persuading’.

The space allocated to rhetoric is sometimes not large: in the celebrated Barcelona compend, ‘discovered’ by M. Grabmann in 1927 and composed at Paris c.1230-40 by a conscientious master in the arts faculty, to assist students in their examinations, 103 60 of the 99 columns of the surviving MS are dedicated to logic, 24 to grammar and only two to rhetoric. Another text, however, the so-called ‘Accessus to Philosophy and the Seven Liberal Arts’ 104 has the following, more generous (to rhetoric) lay-out: introduction (16 lines), definition of philosophy (40 lines), divisions of philosophy (16 lines), on the quadrivium (110 lines), arithmetic (240 lines), music (85 lines), geometry (133 lines), astrology (145 lines), Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophorum* (54 lines), Plato’s *Timaeus* (75 lines), rhetoric (126 lines). This is an interesting allocation, in that it seems in part directed towards lecturing on feast-days (in accordance with the prescriptions of Robert of Courçon in 1215). Only arithmetic, astrology and geometry exceed the allocation for rhetoric, which occupies about 12% of the entire text 105. There is, of

102. LAFLAUR, *Quatre Introductions*, p. 279. Quintilian’s discussion of the various definitions of rhetoric that were current in his day and in the textbooks accessible to him is to be found in 2.15 of the *Institutes of Oratory*, and following; these passages were known to twelfth-century glossators, especially the author of the gloss in MS CCC 250 (on which see below).


104. LAFLAUR, *Quatre Introductions*, pp. 179ff.

105. LEWRY, *Rhetoric at Paris and Oxford*, p. 54 n. 34 observes that the allocation of space to rhetoric in this text ‘represents the most complete summary of material from the *Ad Herennium* which I have seen from mid-thirteenth century Paris’. The rhetorical material will be found in LAFLAUR, *Quatre Introductions* pp. 237-244, lines 911-1036.
course, no mention at all of grammar and logic. It is noteworthy that the explanation of rhetoric succinctly abridges material commonly found in the catena commentaries on the De inventione and Ad Herennium, whether twelfth-century in date or Italian in origin, but in a manner that is more technical and systematic. There is a characteristic emphasis upon theory: whether, for example, the rhetor and the orator have different subject-matters (‘quaestio implicita circumstanciis’ or ‘ypothesis’ for the rhetor and ‘rethorica’ or ‘copiosa et artificiosa eloquentia’ for the orator); the species, partes, instrumentum of the art of rhetoric and the species constitutionis are all summarised, using words from the Ad Herennium (without actual reference to the Ad Herennium), in a manner that will recall Boethius’ De differentiis topicis IV and the introductions or accessus to the twelfth-century catena commentaries on the Ciceronian and pseudo-Ciceronian texts. The prevailing terminology is scholastic: ‘the formal cause (causa formalis) is the way the art works (modus agendi) or the characteristics of the textbook in question (qualitas operis); the latter is located in the goals (intentiones) of each book. There are in Rhetoric four constituent books (libri partiales); the latter are distinct and different (quorum distinctio et diversitas habetur) in that they cover in toto three kinds of case, five parts of the art of rhetoric and six parts of the inventional system that is used in a rhetorical oration. This makes a total of fourteen items which constitute the whole matter of rhetoric, and they are distributed among the four constituent books thus:’ (the contents of the four books of the Ad Herennium are then summarised). The relationship between the De inventione and Ad Herennium is then indicated, as is common in the twelfth-century commentaries. The whole approaches in content the ‘accessus artis rhetoricae’ developed in the twelfth century, but the content and lay-out is unlike that to be found in the surviving catena commentaries, indicating, perhaps, that this kind of summary progressively did duty for the more detailed line-by-line textual commentary.

107. It is clearly, however, the Ad Herennium that the author has in mind because, at a slightly earlier point, on the causa materialis and the causa efficiens (Lafleur, pp. 239-40), the text in question is openly named.
The Ripoll ‘Guide de l’étudiant’, to which reference has already been made, provides further insight into mid-thirteenth-century Paris arts faculty ideas about rhetoric. The material is arranged basically in accordance with the ‘Platonic’ classification of knowledge: *philosophia naturalis, practica sive moralis and rationalis*. The first division contains metaphysics, mathematics and physics (*sive scientia inferior naturalis*), the second theology, domestic organisation and community politics (*politica, leges et decreta*), and private life (using Aristotle’s *Ethics*, Plato’s *Timaeus* and Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophiae*). The third division contains rhetoric, grammar and logic. The manual asserts that it will deal first with rhetoric as it happens to require fewer words than the others. It is customary to describe rhetoric as the ornate, or inornate, speech the rhetor uses to better move the judge. As far as the particular hue (*color*) of the speech, laws and decretals can be made use of by rhetoric. It should also be noted, the writer continues, that in the *Rhetorics* [i.e. the *Ad Herennium*], there is a double quality (*color*), the quality of the word and that of the opinion. The former derives its force from some similarity between the form of the words themselves, whilst the latter takes its effect from some similarity in the meaning (what is signified, *significatorum*). The manual continues by applying the notion of *libri partiales* to the *De inventione* and the *Ad Herennium*, each being one of two *libri partiales*, the latter being divided into four ‘partes’ (which are then described, much more summarily than is the case with the *Accessus Philosophorum*).

---

110. ‘de ipsa pauciora nobis competit dicere’ (C. Lafleur et J. Carrier [eds], *Le ‘Guide de l’étudiant’*, p. 77), presumably because rhetoric was not the major lecturing topic that, for example, dialectic was. The text I am using will also be found on p. 52 of Lewry’s article. M. Grabmann, who brought the document to the attention of scholars, wrote (*Mitt. Geistesle.*, II, p. 198): ‘when we compare the beginning of the section on *philosophia rationalis*, especially the part dealing with logic (fols 137r-158v) with the beginning of the explanations dealing with *philosophia naturalis* and ethics (fols 134v-137r), we see clearly that the main part of philosophy lectures in the arts faculty in mid-century Paris dealt with logic, especially sprachlogik’.
111. ‘unde quantum ad colorem sermonis possunt leges et decreta subalternari rhetorice’.
112. *Ad Herennium* 4.13.18 ‘haec in verborum et in sententiarum exornationes dividitur’.
113. *Lafleur, Quatre Introductions*, pp. 242-44.
The treatment of the Ripoll Guide is different from that of the *Accessus Philosophorum* in that it places its summary of the 'libri partiales' first and adds its 'quaestiones' last. Both Guides make clear that the *De inventione* is no longer studied. The Ripoll Ms explicitly states so: 'et ideo non legitur nisi secundus liber [i.e. the *Ad Herennium*] tantum'. The author asserts that the *De inventione* deals 'in general with the finding of those arguments which are to be put before the judge, and with the means of putting them forward, whereas the *Ad Herennium* deals with the same things *in speciali*, adding in addition things which are useful to the art'. This hint that the *De inventione* was seen as the 'speculative treatment of the principles of rhetoric, while the *Ad Herennium* is the applied art, variously divided by the commentators and including moral knowledge in a broad sense' is certainly picked up around the same time by 'Peter of Ireland, Aquinas' teacher at Naples in the 1240's, in the division of the sciences which introduces his *Isagoge* commentary'. Roger Bacon, too, around 1268, argued that rhetoric is a double art: the theory of rhetorical argument (*pars logicae*) and the applied art of using this kind of argument ('pars moralis philosophiae, cujus socia est poetica, quae consistit in dictis, sicut reliqua pars moralis philosophiae consistit in factis'). Bacon used this approach to reject the traditional three-fold division of the trivium. The line-up, therefore, between the 'extrinsic' *De inventione* (and, for that matter, the *De differentiis topicis*), and the 'intrinsic' *Ad

---

114. C. Lafleur et J. Carrier (eds), *Le 'Guide de l'étudiant'* , pp. 78-79 : why the rhetor uses enthymeme and example rather than syllogism and induction ; how the Guide's own treatment differs from that found in Boethius' *De differentiis topicis* (an interesting distinction, between 'dispositiones generales que pertinent proponenti et etiam modo proponendi' and Boethius' treatment 'de habitudinibus localibus secundum quas contingit argumentari in rethoricis, et de confirmationibus eorumdem. Unde etiam iste liber continuatur locis dialecticis, quia procedit per proprias habitudines locales, sicut dyaletics') ; why the rhetor deals with the virtues (because he deals with issues in ethics, the common good and the private good) ; whether *ornatio sermonis* is 'sciencia per se' ; the essence of the *tria genera dicendi* ; why the rhetor does not deal with the parts of speech the way the logician and the grammarian do.


116. Lewry, p. 54.

Herennium is evident. The Ripoll Guide, indeed, in its discussion of the *genera dicendi* hints at the world of legal reality outside the rhetorical schools.

It is, of course, by no means assured that such a full programme as is laid out in the Ripoll ‘aide-mémoire’ and the 1252 examination manual (or indeed in any of the other manuals surveyed by Claude Lafluer) was ever carried out in the regular course and examination work of the university at Paris. The manuscript survival pattern of Lafluer’s manuals is, perhaps, an argument against their being in very widespread use. Nevertheless, in the anonymous (pseudo-Boethian) — and very popular — *De disciplina scholarium*, composed perhaps at Paris between 1230 and 1240, and motivated by serious didactic intent, we find some familiarity at least with such elementary rhetorical doctrines as the importance of *attentio*, *benivolentia* and *docilitas*. (The art of) memory and the ‘eloquencie…partes’ are mentioned, the ‘Tullii facunditas’ is recommended under grammar, and it is advised that the pursuit of dialectic should not crowd out the study of grammar, the quadrivium and the *rhetoricae lepor* (= *elocutio, Ad Herennium IV*?), the latter two being recommended to students only in the measure of their capacity (‘rethoriceque lepor quadrivialiumque honos studii comparacione adquisita pro posse non habent omitti’) — and they find no place in the Ripoll ‘aide-mémoire’. One is entitled to assume that literary rhetoric (the *colores, ars poetria*) was ‘an endangered species’ in thirteenth-century Paris, but not an unfamiliar or

---


119. ‘sunt et alie partes superaddite, scilicet prohemium per quod debet advocatus primo notificare iudici quasi in summa que intendit’ : C. Lafluer et J. Carrier (eds), Le ‘Guide de l’étudiant’, p. 78, § 147.

120. See Ward, ‘Artificiosa eloquentia’ I, p. 516 and the edition of the *De disc. schol.* by OLGA WEIJERS (Pseudo-Boëce, *De disciplina scolarium*, proefschrift Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1976), who reaffirms the connection between the treatise and the
unknown study. Its appearance in the *De disciplina scolarium*, before dialectic, and under the general rubric of ‘rudimentary elements’ is significant. The context for Ciceronian rhetoric is literary and grammatical, rather than properly rhetorical, in the sense, for example, elaborated in Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis*. The *De disciplina scolarium* mentions ‘Senece tradicio, Lucani inexplecio, Virgilii prolixitas, Stacii urbanitas, dura Flacci translacio, durior Persii edicio, Marcialis indigna lesio, Nasonis discrecio’ all as worthy of memorisation. The ‘philosophorum capacitas’ should be attended to according to ability, and ‘moralitas, ut sic dictaminis sentenciosa vigeat serenitas et metrorum floreat iocunditas’. It is at this point that the author exclaims ‘O how we must match Tully’s eloquence [*facunditas*] to the deepest longings [of the student]’. This is an ambitious programme, and if it reflects anything of the grammatical curriculum at the university of Paris in the thirteenth century, we must learn to balance the apparent lack of emphasis upon rhetoric as a trivial art in its own right, against a considerable emphasis upon it under the head of grammar 121. This situation is, after all, no more than we would expect from any study of the career and writing of John of Garland and his predecessors in the *ars poetria*, which does seem to have been taught extensively in the Paris arts faculty and which included much material that would normally have fallen within the province of rhetoric (or at least within the ambit of *rethorice lepor*) 122.

University of Paris during the same years as those in which the ‘aide-mémoire’ was composed. See also HASKINS, *Studies in Medieval Culture*, ch. 3. For ‘rhetorical elements’ in the treatise see WEIJERS, pp. 93-96, 99. Also RIDDER-SYMOENS, *Universities in the Middle Ages* p. 161. WEIJERS, mentioning 136 manuscripts of the pseudo-Boethian treatise and 32 commentaries on it, speaks of the ‘grande popularité’ of the treatise (p. 30). By contrast, LAFLEUR can mention but thirteen manuscripts for his *Quatre Introductions à la Philosophie au XIIIe siècle* (ch. 1), and some of these contain only fragments of the work in question.

121. RIDDER-SYMOENS, *Universities in the Middle Ages* p. 308: ‘in the two leading northern universities of Paris and Oxford, within the *trivium* grammar and logic largely ousted rhetoric, which became an adjunct of grammar, while grammar itself largely came to be governed by logical considerations...at all three northern universities, above all Paris, the arts course had a strongly philosophical character, with logic as the dominant subject in the old *trivium*...’ (LEFF). Contrast, however, the same author’s assertion (p. 311) that at Paris, Oxford and Cambridge the arts, ‘far from being subservient to theology,...continued to follow their own autonomous development, as they had in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as well as being the dominant faculty’.

122. See MURPHY, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, pp. 175ff and ch. 4 generally; D. KELLEY, *The Arts of Poetry and Prose* (Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age
Much the same emphasis continued at Paris until at least the early fourteenth century, when Radulphus Brito drew, again, the distinction between ‘theoretical’ rhetoric (presumably the proper subject of attention in an arts faculty), and ‘rhetorica quae est usualis, ita bene utuntur laici sicut et clerici’, which, ‘has no claim to be a science’. The fact that Ralph uses Cicero, Victorinus, Boethius, and Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, indicates the silent assimilation of the latter text into the Paris schools, a circumstance which warrants further attention below\(^\text{123}\). It seems only fair to conclude that the thirteenth-century Paris curriculum offered many other lecturing options than those that happened to get a mention in the statutes\(^\text{124}\), and there is no reason to suppose that the situation changed markedly in the fourteenth and even the fifteenth centuries\(^\text{125}\).

(c) incidental remarks in miscellaneous writers and evidence derived from the writings of authors with an obvious university background or context, from medieval book catalogues and from other miscellaneous sources

I refer here to evidence that is to be derived from the grouping of texts in manuscripts\(^\text{126}\) or from medieval book catalogues, from

\(^{123}\) Lewry, p. 57.

\(^{124}\) This remark derives support from two comments of Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities*, pp. 137-38: ‘The regulations of the faculties alone cannot provide more than a superficial glimpse of the intellectual content of the courses...For the majority the arts were mainly a stepping stone either to a higher faculty or to a career in the world. Unlike the faculty of theology, the chairs were not limited; the danger was from demand for teaching in arts outrunning supply. The master in order to teach needed only to hire a room in a school in the Rue du Fosarre or elsewhere...The books to be lectured on, as we have just said, do not give any indication of the state of studies within the different arts subjects’.

\(^{125}\) There are, for example, fourteenth and fifteenth century MSS of the ‘Guides’ discussed by Lafleur in his *Quatre Introductions*.

\(^{126}\) An interesting example of this kind of procedure is provided by J. J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* p.100 (on the topic discussed see below, at nn. 209 et seqq.).
references to rhetoric in other didactic trivial works, from knowledge of and reference to rhetoric by leading university academics and persons closely connected with university studies, from the practice of rhetoric by such persons, especially in the areas of the artes poe­triae, dictaminis and predicandi, areas which, although strictly outside the purview of classical rhetorical doctrine, yet made much use of it and imply considerable study of and drill within it. Aspects of these sources have already been touched upon in the present paper, particularly in notes, and attention here is focussed upon rather arbitrarily assembled material; nevertheless, if we loosen up our curricular expectations, and cast our eye around a wider evidential net, we may form the impression that one way and another much that might today be called rhetoric was in fact studied at the universities in question.

There is, as has been already indicated above, much evidence that extensive portions of the rhetorical curriculum were handled in University teaching under other headings, for example, grammar and the study of the (ancient and medieval) literary auctores in prose and verse, dictamen, and theology (preaching). In some cases the impetus for the study of prose, poetry and letter composition was the demand pull of the market. Paetow, for example, cites a model letter, admittedly from the diocese of Orleans, advising students to give up poetry and take up the study of ars dictaminis as more likely to lead to worldly success. D’Avray cites Paris University as a major centre for the diffusion of (mendicant / University) sermons and sermon models / collections. Glorieux finds several works associated with Paris arts magistri that suggest active consumption of teaching in the areas of dictamen, and the artes predicandi / poetriae.


128. In his The Arts Course, p. 29 citing ‘Valois De arte scribendi epistolae, pp. 25-26’. HASKINS, Studies in Medieval Culture ch. 1 p. 25 n. 6 cites a letter from a ‘scolaris studens Parisitus’ to a student at Toulouse to the effect ‘quod dictator optimus venit Parisius, et ibi ad studendum venire non postponat’.

129. D. D’AVRAY, The Preaching of the Friars, sermons diffused from Paris before 1300, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985, pp. 7-8, 96. See also HASKINS, Studies in Medieval Culture ch. 2. SCHOECK On Rhetoric in Fourteenth-century Oxford in Mediaeval Studies 30 p. 221 : ‘it is highly likely that the religious orders in and around the university [of Oxford] would have established some instruction in rhetoric, formal or otherwise, as a part of the ars praedicandi’.

130. La Faculté des Arts et ses Maîtres.
Schoeck finds that in fourteenth-century Oxford 'a strong dictaminial tradition contributed significantly to the larger teaching and use of rhetoric'. A number of magistri who taught and composed texts for the ars poetriae worked at the University of Paris in the first half of the thirteenth century and their writings suggest an evident contemporary demand for verbal skills in useful contexts. The oft-mentioned John of Garland, for example, teaches both florid poetic composition and the art of preaching a crusade in a single example. Despite its gloomy assertion that the 'rhetoricus flos' is on the decline, Eberhard the German's Laborintus has much time for verbal rhetorical skills based on the Rhetorica ad Herennium and this situation is not untypical: university grammar studies at Paris and Oxford seem in general to have been fed by some study of certain key classical Latin literary texts and by study of at least the fourth book of the Ad Herennium.

If we look at the sources for the study of rhetoric in Paris around the turn of the twelfth century, and into the thirteenth, we find that though complaints regarding the 'decline' of 'rhetorical civility' are near universal, rhetoric in its classical guise is nevertheless studied in accordance with a broad interpretative paradigm. The works of Alan of Lille, of Gerald of Wales (who 'clearly underwent formal instruction during the third quarter of the twelfth century at Paris in the study of the auctores, rhetoric and perhaps even dictamen'), of the teachers of versification, of the practitioners of the ars predicandi \(\text{orandi}\) and the ars

---

132. LAWLER, Parisiana Poetria, p. 69.
133. PURCELL, Rhetorica, 11 : 2 pp. 95ff
134. The phrase is that of Alan of Lille; WARD 'Artificiosa eloquentia', I, pp. 497-98.
135. 'Alan of Lille's conception of and training in classical rhetorical theory clearly went beyond the artes poetriae and predicandi, although he does confess that by his time rhetoricae linguascat civilitas' (WARD, 'Artificiosa eloquentia', I, p. 497).
137. See KELLEY, The Arts of Poetry and Prose.
138. See D'AVRAY, The Preaching of the Friars ; M. G. BRISCOE, Artes Predicandi, B. H. JAYE, Artes Orandi (Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, Fasc. 61, Brepols, 1992) pp. 27-36, 90-107 ; R. H. and MARY ROUSE,
dictamen \(^{139}\), the already-mentioned preface to the *Speculum Ecclesie* of Giraldus Cambrensis \(^{140}\), the controversial commentary on the *Ad Herennium* which Caplan sought to ascribe to Alan of Lille or someone close to him in time and context \(^{141}\), and the 'list of textbooks' that Haskins ascribed to Alexander Nequam \(^{142}\), all indicate extensive tertiary study of classical rhetorical theory, and it is difficult to believe that this interest and attention had expired by 1215 A.D. or was excluded from the curriculum of higher arts studies in force at the incipient Paris *Studium* in the first half of the thirteenth century \(^{143}\).

Alexander Nequam's evidence is particularly puzzling. His acquaintance with the *Studium* of Paris apparently goes back to the years 1180-86 \(^{144}\) and he describes Paris as the preferred place for 'coelestis scriptura et liberales artes' \(^{145}\). According to O'Donnell, 'Alexander was better informed about rhetoric than metrics' \(^{146}\) and his praise of rhetoric in *De laudibus divinae sapientiae* is, indeed augst: it is the power Orpheus exercised over Dis, with which Cicero defended Deiotarus and mitigated Caesar's wrath \(^{147}\):

---


\(^{141}\) Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric* p. 29 (Caplan [1970]).


\(^{143}\) A cluster of MSS from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries point to considerable teaching of rhetoric at Paris (?) in exactly Alexander Nequam's active lifetime. These will be examined in another context, but one of them forms the subject of some remarks at the end of the present paper (MS Oxford CCC 250).

\(^{144}\) O'Donnell, p. 128, citing *De naturis rerum* ch. 173 (Rolls Series ed. Wright, pp. 283ff), and *De laudibus divinae sapientiae* dist. 10 (Rolls Series pp. 496ff). Thomson (R. M., ed., *Alexander Nequam: Speculum Speculationum* ['Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi' XI, British Academy, Oxford University Press, 1988]) p. ix gives the years c.1175-82 as those in which Alexander acquired his primary educational experience at Paris.

\(^{145}\) *De naturis rerum*. Rolls Series, p. 311.

\(^{146}\) O'Donnell, p. 133.

\(^{147}\) Not entirely original, as I remark in 'Artificiosa eloquentia', I, p. 498.
'I marvel at the soul of Aristotle, the tongue of Cicero,
And I praise, O Quintilian, your flowers;
Aristotle rejoices that he has distinguished the *colores* of
Rhetoric, in which he was the supreme *auctor*.
Consult the rhetoric of Theodectes 148, consult what has been taken over
from the master 149;
Empty glory wretchedly deceives man.
Now the orator attends to his conjectures 150; sometimes he enters
Potently upon a judicial 151 case.
Now he contends with demonstrative 152 reasoning;
In conjectural matters, O Quintilian, you are mighty 153.
Now refuting 154, now perorating 155 with proof 156,
He rejoices to have obtained his case'.

This somewhat enlarged portrayal of rhetoric betrays, as in the case of the rhetorical section of Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus*, an acquaintance with the technical rhetoric of the *studium* (usually by way of lecturing on the *De inventione*, with some reference to Quintilian and other supportive texts). It is essentially the picture of rhetorical studies suggested by the 'list of textbooks' which Haskins assigned to Alexander himself: 'in rethorica educandus legat

148. A Greek orator of Cilicia, a disciple of Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle; *Cicero, Orator* 51, 172; 57, 195; 64, 218; *Tusc.,* 1.24.59, *Quintilian*; *Inst.* 1.4.18, 2.15.10, 3.1.14, 4.2.63, 9.4.88, 11.2.51.
149. 'consule furtum'? To Theodectes, according to *Quintilian*, *Inst.*, 2.15.10, was ascribed a treatise on rhetoric which was actually thought to have been written by Aristotle himself. Theodectes must have struck Alexander as worth mentioning because *Cicero (Orator, 51.172)* describes him as 'ut Aristoteles saepe significat, politus scriptor atque artifex'.
150. *Cicero, De inventione*, II.14-51. The 'conjectural' issue or *constitutio*, was one of the four subdivisions of the 'judicial' case, which was, itself, one of three 'types'; of rhetorical / oratorical situation, the other two being epideictic or demonstrative and political or deliberative, according to Cicero's scheme in the *De inventione* (a not very dissimilar scheme being also present in the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium*). Cicero's scheme was derived in great part from his Greek predecessors.
151. *Cicero, De inventione*, 2.4.12.
153. *Quintilian, Inst.*, VII, §2, a long chapter.
155. *Cicero, De inventione*, 1.52.98.
primam Tullii rethoricam et librum ad Herennium et Tullium de oratore et causas Quintiliani et Quintilianum de oratoris institutione'. The addition of Quintilian's *Declamations* and Cicero's *De oratore* reveals this programme to have been a sophisticated one. Although figures such as Rupert of Deutz and Stephen of Rouen demonstrate that private monastic study could acquire a profound knowledge of rhetorical matters, the technical details of the *causa* in the passage cited above from Nequam's *De laudibus* do breathe the atmosphere of school lecturing and it is unlikely that Alexander would have been dragged through these dry matters in any other context (and certainly not private study in connection with his later teaching of grammar at Dunstable and St.Albans). Nequam's study at Paris certainly emphasised grammar and dialectic and a specific anecdote refers to a 'rhetorical persuasio' (sophistical quibble), on the part of a 'scholaris...quidam laborans Parisius in extremis', suggesting that the rhetoric he encountered at Paris was essentially dialectical, as it had been in Abelard's day. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that in the late twelfth century, the details of Ciceronian technical rhetoric were not being lectured on, and, this being so, it is possible that they remained an element in the arts curriculum there for some time. Certainly there is nothing in the *Chartularium* of Paris to specifically contradict this assumption. The surviving commentaries on the *Ad Herennium* and *De inventione* seem to require such a conclusion.

The same conclusion is forced upon us by a consideration of the phenomenon of Jean de Meun, universally recognised as the genius who fused Paris and Orléans, Ovid and Aristotle, Cicero and Boethius, rhetoric and dialectic, 'les idées et les lettres', poetry and

158. THOMSON, p. ix. Nequam's *Speculum Speculationum* seems to serve, as in the case of Alan of Lille's *Contra Haereticos*, as Parisian dialectical theology put to the service of orthodoxy (cf. GILLIAN EVANS' emphasis upon 'missionary theology' as a late twelfth-century Parisian preoccupation [*Old Arts and New Theology: the beginnings of theology as an academic discipline*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1980, ch. 4]).
160. WARD (F4) as in WARD, *Ciceronian Rhetoric*, p. 347; WARD, 'Antiquarian or pragmatic? The survival of an ancient rhetorical doctrine (the doctrine of insinuatio) in Medieval and Renaissance times', (unpublished paper, 200 pp., typed up from delivery at Chicago in 1979).
reason, Virgil and Christian learning. Though born within a stone’s throw of Orléans, where he might well have obtained his insight into poetry, language and the classical past, Jean is nevertheless seen as the quintessence of the University of Paris scholar, as a Parisian university magister who wrote his portion of the Romance of the Rose in the heart of the Paris university precinct, who absorbed and ‘processed’ the Paris University disputes of the years 1265-85. Yet, Jean is seen as one whose ‘oeuvre’ suggests the primacy of belles-lettres; the classical grammatical and rhetorical auctores; close familiarity with the late twelfth-century Latin poetic creations which were ‘increasingly used in place of classical examples of style in the artes poeticae’ and with the vernacular writers of the same period, whose authors ‘were in close contact with the classical studies of the schools’; and ‘rhetorical civility’. Was all this a memory from Orleans?

The subject of classical teaching at Orleans may, in fact, bring us back to Paris in the thirteenth century. The research of R. H. Rouse has pointed up the curious fact that all traces of the twelfth and
thirteenth century classical holdings of libraries at Orléans have disappeared. Whatever may have been in these libraries for the students of the day, no trace of it has survived. Careful detective work, however, based upon the surviving manuscripts of two florilegia (the Florilegium Angelicum, surviving in twenty manuscripts, and the Florilegium Gallicum, surviving in twelve manuscripts), together with Richard de Fournival’s Bibliomonia and the authors cited in the margins of a Bern manuscript (by, concludes Rouse, ‘a [mid-thirteenth grammatical] master in the arts faculty at Orléans’), allows Rouse to conclude that Orléans indeed contained valuable texts for the teaching of the arts and the auctores. For our present purposes, the Orléans libraries seem to have contained crucial texts for the teaching of many aspects of classical rhetorical theory and practice. The Florilegium Angelicum, for example, contains, for rhetoric, extracts from some Ciceronian speeches, and, indeed, all its extracts seem to have been ‘selected for their eloquence and tailored for use in public pronouncements and in letters’ 167. The Florilegium Gallicum contains, for rhetoric, similar extracts from some Ciceronian speeches and, more importantly, from Cicero’s De oratore, a text that we have found cited by Alexander Nequam in his ‘list of textbooks’ (if indeed it is his list). Careful scrutiny of Richard de Fournival’s Bibliomonia suggests that Orléans also taught Cicero’s letters (presumably as a dictaminial text, a practice very popular in the Italian Renaissance, when Cicero’s epistulæ exceeded in popularity even the Ad Herennium for the teaching of rhetoric). The other probable Orléans-derived Fournival MS of rhetorical interest is Cicero’s Philippics, portions of which were also contained in the florilegia just mentioned. It seems too, that a family of Quintilian Institutes MSS was disseminated in the Loire region 168, though there is no trace of Quintilian in the evidence Rouse surveys in the article to which my discussion here refers.

Rouse deduces from his evidence that the Paetow-Haskins stereotype of the ‘decline of the auctores’ at Paris and Orléans in the thirteenth century 169 needs to be modified. In fact, the Orléans material remained available and used, for various purposes, at Paris and

---

167. ROUSE, p. 135.
168. ROUSE, p. 151.
169. See the beginning of the present paper.
elsewhere; it was, for example 'appropriated ... and recast as preachers' tools', 'by the new community of preachers who combat heresy and sustain orthodoxy from the pulpit'; this interest emanates 'first from Cistercian houses and then from the universities in the thirteenth century' 170. Presumably, if the Orléans material remained available for these various applied uses in the thirteenth century, it must have been taught somewhere, whether at Orléans itself, or in nearby studia and scholarly centres.

A further deduction is permitted by Rouse's investigation. It is noteworthy that the Orléans rhetorical texts do not include any texts relating to the technical details of Ciceronian rhetoric: there are no copies of the Ad Herennium or the De inventione, for example. One can only conclude that the curriculum at Orléans was oriented towards belles-lettres and dictamen, if not also preaching. Where else, then, would contemporaries have acquired these technical details than the schools of Paris? Where else would lecturing on these texts have taken place by the end of the twelfth century?

Later in time, we may, under the present heading, consider the already mentioned and often-quoted remark of Nicolas de Clemanges (1360-1440 171): 'vidi ego in studio Parisiaco sepe Tullianum publice legi rhetoricam, sepe item privatim, nonnunquam etiam Aristotelicam, poeteque summi et optimi Virginii et atque Terentius illic etiam sepe leguntur'. There is nothing in the statutes that would illustrate the obvious deduction from this remark that lecturing in the Paris Arts Faculty during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries covered Ciceronian and Aristotelian rhetoric, presumably from the originalia.

During the thirteenth century, the mendicant studia, despite an initial opposition to secular studies, appear to have offered instruction

170. ROUSE, pp. 156.
171. Cf. PAETOW, Arts Course, p. 61 citing DENIFLE/CHATELAIN, Chart. III intr. xi. Paetow sees such a remark as evidence 'at Paris... of a sporadic revival of classical literature about the middle of the fourteenth century quite independent of that in Italy', which was apparently insufficient to prevent an allegation of barbarism among the French from Petrarch in 1367, against which Nicholas was later protesting in the words cited. See above n. 79.
in classical rhetorical theory. That this instruction, which should not be confused with instruction offered in the University arts faculty, but which nevertheless reflects the same intellectual ambience as that which nourished arts faculty studies, was justified by reference to the art of preaching (the special interest of the mendicants) is suggested by the function allotted to the arts in the Augustinian conception of the relationship between the arts and theology put forward in St. Bonaventure's *De reductione artium ad theologiam*. Rhetoric is taught, says St. Bonaventure (a [mendicant] theological professor at the Paris studium), *ad movendum*, and this is accomplished *per sermonem ornatum*. Nevertheless, it seems that the friars, at least in the early stages of their education, studied rhetoric in its traditional form. The adaption of rhetorical theory to the construction of 'ornate speech', or the sermon, does not appear to have obliterated the older *ars rhetorica*. Gilbert of Tournai, for instance, in his *De modo addisciendi*, draws upon Quintilian, Martianus Capella, the *Ad Herennium* and *De inventione*, even if rather superficially, in a manner suggesting some kind of formal training in rhetoric as it was taught in earlier centuries.

Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum doctrinale* is more widely known, being part of the *Speculum maius* 'a colossal work in eighty books and 9,885 chapters...the best encyclopedia to come out of the Middle Ages'. The rhetorical section of the *Speculum* uses the *De oratore*, Isidore, Boethius *De differentiis topicis*, Quintilian's *Institutes*, the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*, and covers, in spite of a rather narrow definition of rhetoric as *ars exornandi sententias seu dictiones*, the traditional subject-matter of classical rhetorical theory, though briefly. It seems reasonable to suppose that Vincent, whose basic educational experience was had at the University of Paris, is reflecting here the standard curriculum pattern of his day: 'Vincent did not shroud the intellectual background of his age behind a screen of original material and personal opinion'.


173. HINNEBUSCH, II, p. 421.

Even lesser Dominican encyclopedists had an energetic view of rhetoric. Gossuin of Metz, for example, in the first half of the thirteenth-century, could still define rhetoric as

droiture et raison et ordonance de parole...car li droit, par quoi li jugement sont fet, et qui par raison et par droit, sont esgardé en court de roi, et de baron, viennent de rectorique. De cest art furent decretales estraites, et lois et decrez qui ont restier en toutes causes et touz droiz.

Who would know rhetoric, he concludes, must know right and wrong; to do wrong, is to be lost and damned, to do right is to be saved and to have the love of God.\(^{175}\)

No less a Paris scholastic figure than Thomas Aquinas, though his arts studies seem to have been completed at Naples and he lectured in Theology at Paris, knew the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*, and viewed rhetoric not simply as the *ars predicandi*, but as one of the parts of logic concerned with probable argumentation in the manner of the eleventh and twelfth-century schools.\(^{176}\) His teacher Peter of Ireland apparently also associated grammar, rhetoric and dialectic as *sermocinales*,\(^{177}\) and this view of rhetoric is supported by the evidence of the one specific rhetorical text that, apart from the rather vague *rhetoricas* of the 1215 regulations, is mentioned in the thirteenth-century Paris records, the fourth book of Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis*, the ‘standard text’ for university rhetorical studies in thirteenth-century Paris.\(^ {178}\)

Some further evidence for the teaching of rhetoric at Paris may be derived from book catalogues. According to Murphy,\(^ {179}\) ‘in 1342 the library of the Sorbonne contained twenty-four of Cicero’s works,

---

175. Gossuin’s encyclopedic *L’image du monde*, written c. 1218-1250, has been edited by O. H. Prior (Paris, 1913).


177. *Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Age*, p. 623; Lewry, p. 54.


including rhetorical treatises". More, perhaps, can be gained from Richard de Fournival's books, which, though, apparently, acquired while Richard was at Amiens, were retained (and used ?) by Gerard d'Abbeville, canon and archdeacon at Amiens, but c.1257-72 a Parisian magister who bequeathed his books (and Richard's) to the Sorbonne library, where they appear in the 1338 catalogue. Richard's books contain some perplexing items, such as commentaries by Victorinus and Grillius on the Ad Herennium, and there is an odd relationship between these items and the volume of De inventione / Ad Herennium texts and commentaries Jean Poulain produced in the fifteenth century and which is now in Stockholm (Kgl. Bibl. Va 10). The solution to this puzzle may reveal a continuous tradition of commentary on the 'Ciceronian' rhetorical texts at Paris during the later middle ages.

Isolated manuscripts may reveal more of the 'hidden' curriculum in rhetoric at Paris. In the year 1467 one Hugh, of the Cistercian abbey of Cherlieu (de Caroloco, Besançon) and a student at the college of St. Bernard at Paris, compiled a manuscript (now Vat. Reg. lat. 1568) which indicates the extraordinary variety of rhetorical contexts current in the late middle ages. The MS contains works on grammar, rhetorical composition and dictamen (with letter models) including the colores (citing Geoffrey of Vinsauf), on poetic composition (with models, including classical examples), on theology and the Bible (including biblical prophecies of the death of Louis of Orleans at the hands of John the Fearless of Burgundy in 1407 A.D. !), on religious history, preaching and moral exegesis, papal documents and canon law. Accompanied by such a miscellany, we find an introduction to school rhetoric (De rhetorica beginning 'queritur primo quid sit rethorica...'), tables of rhetorical doctrine, with examples, and a glossed Ad Herennium. While difficult to tie


precisely into the University curricula of the day, the manuscript is suggestive of rhetorical studies there and may be worth further investigation.

(d) The evidence of texts used in the universities as instructional manuals within the *ars rhetorica*, or else surviving in manuscript as relics of such instruction

A major point made at the 1995 Paris Colloque against the argument that rhetoric was much taught at the universities in question, concerned the absence of a major core of manuscripts — especially commentaries on the *Ad Herennium*, or *De inventione* — that might testify unequivocally to such study. Such a core exists for grammar and logic, but not rhetoric. A very few commentaries do survive from Paris and Oxford universities on Boethius’ *De differentiis topicis* and Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, but I have so far identified none certainly from the period 1215-1500 A.D. on the *Ad Herennium* and *De inventione*. This is a puzzle, and a great contrast with the Italian situation. It may be that twelfth-century commentaries were re-used, or that, as rhetoric became reduced to a non-core ‘option’, lectures were only ‘cursory’, surviving in the form of annotated *originalia* rather than in the form of full *catena* commentaries along the ‘ordinary’ or twelfth-century pattern. Nevertheless, some points need to be made here.

First, the evidence of the manuscripts has not yet been specifically surveyed to find what light it might throw on the non-core studies at the universities. What contribution can closer study of the MSS themselves make? How can we relate specific MSS directly to this or that university environment or context? I have been studying perhaps 1,000 MSS of *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* texts and

---

182. Ward, Ciceronian Rhetoric, p. 241. Judson B. Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages*, Toronto, 1982, pp. 96-97 and 115 also mentions a fifteenth-century *Ad Herennium* commentary that I have begun to study and which may prove interesting in this respect (BN Lat.14,716). It seems to be directed at fairly practical aspects of Ciceronian rhetoric in the court life of the time and the assemblage of texts in the volume is suggestive of arts teaching / studies in the northern universities (Paris?) in the later middle ages.

183. See n. 1 above.

commentaries for some years, together with certain related texts (i.e. texts that are closely related in nature to the above texts). I have not yet discovered how to link them closely to specific generating contexts and environments. Even for a very critical MS, Oxford CCC 250, for example, I am reduced to hunches and guess work. The MSS appear to throw little direct light on the problem of the present paper — most of them are probably pre-1200 A.D., or Italian or late medieval, and few, if any, are peciae MSS — but with a more careful approach, perhaps they may be made more useful for our current purposes. In other words, I am suggesting that the jury is still out on the evidence of the MSS.

Secondly, it needs to be pointed out that rhetoric — if it was taught at the universities of Paris and Oxford — was presumably organised differently from the study of logic and grammar. These latter disciplines could be and were practised both practically and theoretically — ex arte and de arte, to use the language of the commentaries — inside the universities. Their procedures were essential
to the chosen methods of debate and analysis that applied to all theoretical disciplines within the university. Their theoretical operating rules therefore formed a relevant study, and practical exercises (for example, disputations) could be and were readily devised and practiced within the confines of the university curriculum. Additionally, they were specifically required for examination leading to graduation. Hence there survive numerous manuscripts relating to the theory and the practice of their study, and many commentaries on the leading texts.

Rhetoric, on the other hand, could only be studied theoretically at the university (and was). Practical rhetorical exercises, because they would take the student away from the chosen environment of the

function is to speak appropriately for persuasion'). It is clear from this passage that while university students in arts at Paris and Oxford in the later middle ages, handled the arts of grammar and logic theoretically and practically, for rhetoric, they could only, within the confines of the University, deal theoretically (whatever they may have done after they left the university). Kilwardby’s appeal to Boethius De topicis differentiis under the heading of ‘practical rhetoric’ is typical.

187. ‘L'une des méthodes de base de l’enseignement universitaire au moyen âge’, WEIJERS, La ‘disputatio’, p. 7. Weijers does not speak specifically of any disputatio in rhetoric, but claims that the disputation had its place in all the disciplines of the Arts Faculty (p. 92). COBBAN, The Medieval English Universities, p. 167ff. The ‘questions’ contained in the (late twelfth-century early thirteenth-century, Paris ?) commentary on the Ad Herennium in MS Oxford CCC 250 provide ample material that would have been suitable for disputation and lecturing at least ‘cursorie’. See MURPHY, Rhetoric in the Middle Ages, pp. 102ff.; WEISHEIPL, in Mediaeval Studies, 26 (1964), pp. 176ff.

188. The Paris Colloque (n.1 above) vigorously opposed this suggestion. Yet compare the remark of Margareta Fredborg, from the typescript of a paper given to the 1995 Biennial Conference of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric, at Edinburgh (‘A Fourteenth-Century Commentary on Aristotle’s Rhetoric’): ‘the medieval commentary on Aristotle’s Rhetoric aimed at understanding a major university text, not at producing oratory, or the humanist literary concern for “prudently evaluating and understanding the writings of others” (as Melanchthon put it). The commentators were certainly not unconcerned with the vita activa, but at the commentary level, such a concern for rhetorica docens, their primary preoccupation’. FREDBORG again: (at the medieval university) ‘Rhetorical ornament and playing upon the emotions made rhetoric inferior to logical acumen. John Buridan has put it better than most scholastic writers, when he commented on the first chapter of Aristotle’s Rhetoric, with its celebrated reference to the anti-rhetorical court of the old, conservative (Athenian) Areopagus council: “emotional speeches...are not permitted in some states that are well ruled by their laws. And the same ought to be the case in the king’s parliament or the papal court.”’ (FREDBORG, Ciceronian Rhetoric and Scholasticism). It is also worth recalling that Roman rhetoric, at its birth so to speak, was already a highly theoretical art:
university, could not be, and were not, devised. Such practical exercises, of course, would be continuous set speeches, in either a judicial, epideictic or deliberative situation. Universities did not normally deal with such situational contexts. Debates about political theory may have provided an environment for deliberative oratory (and there is evidence that rhetoric was linked with political theory at the university), but few real political situations were debated at the universities, other than — perhaps — the rather broad question of the relative claims of pope and emperor, or of rival popes. These claims were theoretical enough, and there is no proof that the principles of deliberative oratory were not employed in arranging and conducting any debates that may have taken place. Dictaminal, poetic and preaching exercises certainly would count as 'practical rhetorical exercises', but they are not closely related to the study of Ciceronian rhetorical theory; they are related to the rhetorical studies of the moderni, applied rhetorical studies. I am concerned here with the Ciceronian curriculum, as presenting the potential for a far broader training in rhetorical practice generally, than the applied arts, whether dictamen, predicandi or poertrie. Such practical poetic, preaching and dictaminal exercises, therefore, as may have flowed from university rhetorical studies, are less relevant to the whole canvas of the ancient rhetorical system and I do not therefore consider them now. For the same reason, the flurry of disputational rhetoric (whether academic or legal) that has been linked by some with a form of rhetoric, is excluded from the present consideration.


189. For some refinement of this statement see the articles in BALDWIN and GOLDSMITH (eds), Universities in Politics and Coleman, The science of politics, pp. 203-09. Coleman (pp. 187, 195 etc.) stresses that the universities provided 'methods' and 'techniques for accumulating, arranging, reorganizing, interpreting a vast body of written materials from the past and present so that answers could be given to those questions it was thought important to ask, with consequences outside the university as well as within it'. Some of the 'political' issues that interested thirteenth-century Dominicans in their studia are mentioned by Coleman pp. 202-03. See also Dunbabin as cited Coleman ibid.

point is that the practical side of Ciceronian rhetorical theory would have carried the student away from the university into the marketplace. Consequently the universities did not devise practical exercises, and students took their university rhetorical theory directly into the marketplace: they did not graduate for higher studies. In these circumstances, the only manuscripts to survive might be short discussions of the theoretical structure of the art of rhetoric and annotated copies of the main classical text-books. Such manuscripts I am sure do survive.

It may be asked at this point why the Italian universities display a different pattern. Why did Paris and Oxford universities confine their rhetorical teaching to such level as appears not to have generated the mass of catena commentaries that survive from Italian university and studium practice? Northern university rhetorical studies seem never to have developed the more utilitarian uses for advanced level classical training in pleading and legal oratory that appealed to substantial elements in Italy. I cannot, however, take up here the large question of why they did not; I can only stress, first, that there is much evidence that rhetoric was studied as a theoretical discipline at Paris and Oxford universities, despite the apparent 'silence' of the statutes and despite the apparent absence of a large mass of manuscript relicts, and secondly, that the universities of Paris and Oxford were driven by a variety of interesting circumstances into a highly theoretical pattern, designed to serve the higher faculties and to permit theoretical examination of Aristotelian texts in the so-called three philosophies. As such, practical rhetoric could not be a major concern.

The distinction I am trying to draw here is well put by Radulphus Brito in his 'quaestiones super libro Topicorum Boethii', from around the year 1300 A.D.:

---


Modo dialectica potest sumi dupliciter: uno modo pro habitu acquisito per syllogismum dialecticum de aliqua conclusione, et talis est utens, id est dialectica qua utimur applicando syllogismum dialecticum ad quamlibet materiam. Alia autem est dialectica docens, et est ista habitus aggeneratus in nobis de syllogismo dialectico per eius principia et causas; et talis habitus est scientia. Eodem modo poterimus distinguere de rhetorica, scilicet quod rhetorica potest accipi pro habitu aggenerato in nobis de oratione persuasiva per eius causas et propria principia. Modo rhetorica primo modo non est scientia, sed secundo modo est scientia. Primum declaratur, quia ille habitus qui non est firmus sed debilis non est scientia. Sed rhetorica primo modo dicta est huiusmodi

Brito is here drawing a distinction between *dialectica / rhetorica utens* and *docens*. But whereas *dialectica utens* and *docens* can be clearly accepted as a teachable science within the confines of the university, *rhetorica utens* is clearly excluded because the ‘habitus’ of it generated within us ‘is not firm, but weak’. *Rhetorica utens*, in other words, is excluded because rhetoric is a ‘quaedam credulitas generata per quasdam persuasiones’, and because ‘argumenta rhetorica solam generant suspicacionem’. Indeed, ‘omnia argumenta rhetorica sive sumantur ex circumstanciis facti vel personae sive ex gestione negotii solam probabilitatem inducunt et non scientiam’. By its very nature, *rhetorica utens*, practical rhetoric, cannot be the subject of scientific study within the university.

With these general obervations out of the way, we may ask what texts do survive that might tell of theoretical instruction in the classical art of rhetoric at the universities in question? Actual teaching content and method inside the universities may be illustrated from such Ad Herennium commentaries as will be found in MS Oxford CCC 250 (and possibly also in MS Paris BN lat. 14,716) and by the commentaries and *quaestiones* on such texts as Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and Boethius *De differentiis topicis*.

‘Quite unlike Roger Bacon, Radulphus Brito is interested in rhetoric as a theoretical study dealing with acts and people committing those acts, while practical oratory more narrowly deals with particular persons and acts, and cannot be accepted as a science. For rhetoric does have a theoretical bent, dealing with specific modes of persuasion that are independent of varying legal custom and regional laws. And such modes can be taught. For a textbook, Radulphus recommends Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* as being very useful to students of the law’ (‘Dialectica Moralis’, unpublished paper, citing GREEN-PEDERSEN, *Introduction to and edition ‘Radulphi Britonis Quaestiones super libro Topicorum Boethii’*, pp. 85-87).
There are, according to Margareta Fredborg \(^{193}\), six extant thirteenth-century commentaries on Boethius’ De differentiis topicis, only four of which go as far as bk. IV (where rhetoric appears, in a heavily dialectical guise) \(^{194}\). It is difficult to see how four commentaries can be used to sustain a meaningful comparison with the usage of the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium*. The ‘apparent paucity of thirteenth-century commentaries on’ the latter texts \(^{195}\) can only be a relative indication. An exhaustive search through the MSS of the two ‘Ciceronian’ texts is now in progress \(^{196}\) and although it is unlikely

---


\(^{194}\) See Fredborg, *Cahiers*. (Copenhagen), 55, pp. 95-96.

\(^{195}\) Fredborg in Pinborg (ed.), *The Logic of John Buridan*, p. 49.

\(^{196}\) I have secured special funding from the University of Sydney for the triennium 1994-96 to make an exhaustive ‘Census’ entitled Cicero Rhetor: A Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts containing texts of, and/or glosses, commentaries, notes etc. on, or accessus (introductions etc) to Cicero’s *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, together with certain related texts. The work is intended at this stage to contain the following sections: (A) Introduction and description of the project; procedures; abbreviations/terms/codes used; scope. (B) Manuscript Catalogue (i.e. basic shelf-mark-ordered file of relevant manuscripts), supported by a MAC FileMaker data-base organised in such way as to permit searching and grouping of manuscripts according to appropriate heads. (C) (a) Essay on quantitative aspects of MS survival in medieval and Renaissance times; (b) Comparative tables to illustrate the survival into modern times of a range of other classical and medieval texts. (D) Bibliography. (E) Index of incipits. (F) Index of explicits. (G) Index of authors. If time and resources permit, supplementary descriptive and bibliographic material will be added for each MS surveyed, (excluding continuous texts, paraphrases and summaries) together with comments [by my collaborator, Dr Ruth Taylor of the University of Birmingham] on stemmatalogical matters. The intention here would not be to duplicate existing printed descriptions of MSS, but to provide further detail regarding the manuscripts and texts surveyed as a supplement to the available existing printed material. The project is intended to provide novel raw data for a further work on the medieval and Renaissance history of classical communication theory, and to permit satisfactory completion of the ‘Fortuna’ section of the articles I am preparing on the *De inventione* and the *Ad Herennium* for the international project *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum Medii Aevi*. Project ‘Census’ will not attempt to discuss the cultural significance of the material it surveys: this will be the task of subsequent projects. The focus of both works will not be texts that deal with the *artes predicandi, dictaminis, poetiae, arengandi*, and similar, or substantially rewritten theoretical rhetorics, even if they are heavily dependent upon the doctrines of the *Ad Herennium*, unless they are entitled by their authors as abridgements, introductions to or presentations/versifications of the doctrines of the *Ad Herennium*, and they deal substantially with those doctrines. The texts are normally in Latin, but occasionally in French, and not uncommonly in Italian. Other European languages have not been included systematically. The work is meant to conclude a project that began...
that this material will yield any commentaries comparable with the four just mentioned, it may indicate glossed texts that reflect *studium* use in the period, appropriate to the somewhat more elementary level at which Ciceronian rhetoric may have been studied. It is probable, for instance, that students followed the *lectiones* of their *magistri* in their own texts, on which they made glosses, the masters periodically arranging for versions of their lectures/ commentaries to be circulated via the University stationers. One puzzle that may yield interesting conclusions is the apparent lack of evidence for extensive use of the group of *Ad Herennium* commentaries associated with the name of Alan of Lille (whose own *Anticlaudianus* seems reliant, instead, upon the *De inventione*) at Paris during the thirteenth century. The somewhat exiguous early evidence for the use of this gloss pales when compared with its vigorous survival in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italian schools, leading to the suggestion that lecturing on the full *Ad Herennium*, if it occurred regularly at Paris during the thirteenth century, seems curiously to have spawned no readily visible group of manuscript relics. The fact, however, that in the second half of the fifteenth century, Jean Poulain, Parisian *magister in artibus*, was able to produce at Laon and at the Parisian college of St. Martin a surviving extraordinary volume of texts of the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* with massive composite glosses on them, making use of most of the previous glossating traditions (Victorinus, Grillius, Thierry of Chartres, ‘Alanus’, Bartolinus and others), indicates that manuscripts did survive in his environs, and this survival suggests usage that may not be otherwise apparent to us today. The pattern of this ‘lost’ usage is best indicated by the contents of the *Ad Herennium* gloss in MS Oxford CCC 250, to which I shall return with volume two of my dissertation (WARD, ‘*Artificiosa eloquentia* in the Middle Ages’, II).


198. Cf. the commentaries in MS Venice Marciana XI, 23 (4686), on which I hope to comment in later articles.

199. WARD in MURPHY (ed.), *Renaissance Eloquence*, p. 139.

200. This MS may be the only significant item to place alongside Lewry’s remark that ‘the evidence has yet to be adduced that the *Ad Herennium* received the full
More importantly, perhaps, Lewry, in his brief survey of *De differentiis topicis* commentaries from the ambience of Paris and Oxford in the thirteenth century found considerable evidence of an acquaintance with the *De inventione* and the *Ad Herennium*. It is interesting to find the following sentence in Nicholas of Paris’ mid-century exposition of Boethius’ work: ‘hie deficiunt exempla sine quibus ista lec­cio non potest intelligi neque sequens, set illa exampla in *Rhetorica* in secundo libro expresse et plane inveniuntur’.

There is, in fact, a basic stock of Ciceronian material’ writes Lewry, which is used to fuel the discussions of the schools, covering, for example, such topics as the relationship between rhetoric and dialectic, or rhetoric and moral philosophy, the common and individual good, virtue, the controversial subdivisions of the *constitutiones* and similar matters.

Boethius, in fact, ‘is being read in the light of Cicero and his expositor’. It would seem, indeed, that rhetoric was of concern to thirteenth century Paris arts teachers in general terms, in terms of its relationship with other arts and subjects, in terms of, that is, ‘extrinsic’ considerations as distinct from ‘intrinsic’ ones. The exact relationship between the internal subdivisions of the art were also of some concern to lecturers, who thus displayed a theoretical rather than a strictly practical concern for their subject. The best model for the probable pattern of *Ad Herennium* lecturing, if such existed, is, in fact, the *Ad Herennium* commentary in Oxford CCC 250, with its judicious blending of Boethius, Quintilian and the ‘Ciceronian’ text, and to this I will return at the end of the present paper.

It is unlikely that even the above degree of acquaintance with the Ciceronian rhetorical texts could have existed, or been taken for granted, without some lecturing on them, even if cursory, or beyond

---

202. LEWRY, p. 50, n. 18.
203. LEWRY, p. 50.
204. LEWRY, p. 49.
205. LEWRY, p. 51.
207. See WARD in *Viator*, 3 (1972).
the sphere of sensitive concern to the University legislators. In fact, one thirteenth-century Boethius commentator, working perhaps in mid-thirteenth century Paris, is quite happy with the idea of the rhetor teaching in the schools: 'the word 'to teach' (he writes) can be taken to refer to the rhetor lecturing \textit{(legetem)} in the schools and handing down his own science'. This commentator is quite at home with the twelfth-century language of extrinsic introductions to the art of rhetoric\textsuperscript{208}.

From the 1270's on, as Lewry has noted\textsuperscript{209}, Aristotle's \textit{Rhetoric} (in the translation by William of Moerbeke) was among the books distributed by the University stationers at Paris, though there is no clear evidence that knowledge of it was required for graduation. Nevertheless, its importance can be gauged by the place it occupies in the work of Giles of Rome (Egidius Romanus, 1247-1316), 'a powerful figure in Parisian University life' and a student of Thomas Aquinas\textsuperscript{210}. In 1969 Murphy had argued, from the fact that in his commentary on Aristotle's \textit{Rhetoric}, Giles made no reference to Cicero's rhetoric, whereas, in his treatise 'De differentia rhetoricae, ethicae et politicae', he did, that Giles wrote the commentary first, then 'became acquainted with Cicero's view' and wrote the treatise\textsuperscript{211}. A short analysis of the two works leads Murphy to the odd conclusion 'that Aristotle's \textit{Rhetorica} became for the Middle Ages not a rhetorical or dialectical work, but rather a treatise useful in the study of moral philosophy'\textsuperscript{212}, 'a valuable adjunct to the studies of ethics and political science'\textsuperscript{213}. This conclusion is supported by an analysis of the contents of some 96 manuscripts containing

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{208} \textit{Lewry}, p. 48 n. 13, and for the extrinsic introductions see \textit{Ward} in \textit{Viator}, 3 (1972), \textit{Haring} in \textit{Mediaeval Studies}, 26 (1964) and \textit{Fredborg} in \textit{Cahiers} (Copenhagen), 7 (1971).
\item \textsuperscript{209} \textit{Lewry}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 46. See too \textit{Murphy}, \textit{Rhetoric in the Middle Ages} (1974) pp. 93f and \textit{Ward} in \textit{Murphy} (ed.), \textit{Medieval Eloquence}, pp. 54-56.
\item \textsuperscript{210} See \textit{Murphy} in \textit{Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Âge}, p. 834ff and \textit{Lewry}, pp. 55-56.
\item \textsuperscript{211} \textit{Murphy}, in \textit{Arts Libéraux}, p. 836.
\item \textsuperscript{212} \textit{Murphy} in \textit{Arts Libéraux}, p. 841.
\item \textsuperscript{213} 'Aristotle's, \textit{Rhetoric} in the Middle Ages' \textit{Quarterly Journal of Speech} 52 (1966) p. 13 and cf. his \textit{Rhetoric in the Middle Ages} p. 97 (and pp. 98-101). Murphy's remark on the same page that 'it is tempting to speculate that the subject of \textit{dialectica} in some way absorbed or took over the Aristotelian rhetoric' is perhaps nearer the mark, though at odds with his statement in regard to ethics and politics (cf. p. 111 'the exacting spirit which made Paris the center of scholasticism [and could make Aristotle's \textit{Rhetoric} into a book of ethics]...').
\end{itemize}
Aristotle’s *Rhetorica*. Only one binds the *Rhetorica* with other rhetorical works; the rest group it with other works of Aristotle.

Murphy’s conclusions argue the existence of clear boundaries within arts teaching at Paris towards the end of the thirteenth century. Such do not appear to have existed. Even the 1215 statutes, as we have seen, juxtapose ‘philosophos et rhetoricas’, the grammatical text ‘barbarismum’ with Aristotle’s *ethicam*, whilst in the Ripoll ‘aide-mémoire’ of c.1230-45 ‘questions on the *Timaeus* and *Consolation* follow those on the *quadrivium* and the first three books of the *Ethics*, and precede those on the *trivium*’. The 1255 statute runs its texts in the following order: texts in the Old Logic, Priscian *minor* and *major*, advanced portions of Aristotle’s *Organon*, his *Ethics*, further grammatical texts, a long string of Aristotle’s writings, beginning with the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. The important thing was that Aristotle had now effectively become the arts course; the arts course was now a training ground not only in Aristotle’s logic (together with the commentaries of Boethius, Porphyry, and Gilbert de la Porrée) but in pagan philosophy. In fact, there seems to have been no set of rigid compartments within the arts curriculum. The phrase ‘the seven liberal arts and three philosophies’ probably began life as a kind of unofficial shorthand to describe the contents of the arts curriculum. The elaborate process of ‘graduation’ (responsions, determination, the licence, inception) at both Paris and
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216. LEFF, p. 141 (the account seems somewhat confused), and cf. above at nn. 103, 109 etc.
217. LEWRY, pp. 51-52.
218. LEFF, *Paris and Oxford Universities*, p. 159 and RIDDER-SYMOENS (ed.), *Universities in the Middle Ages*, p. 308: the notion of the liberal arts by the middle of the thirteenth century ‘no longer corresponded to the content of the arts course and [was] supplemented or superseded by other classifications, notably the addition of the three philosophies, natural, moral and metaphysical, which were not covered by the older divisions of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*’. I take Janet Coleman’s remarks (COLEMAN, *The science of politics*, pp. 181-86) also to imply a lack of clear disciplinary distinctions within the medieval arts faculties. Cf. too her comment on Buridan’s quaestiones on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, ibid., p. 201.
Oxford, required not only knowledge of a certain minimum of texts (which by the early fourteenth century included ‘Books 1 to 4 of the Ethics, together with Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophiae* 220), but a varied and testing series of student oral exercises (disputations) which could, presumably, range over a wide area, and test informally material not necessarily contained within the prescribed books (in the course of which remarks were undoubtedly made on subjects outside strict relevance to the text in question, for example, on rhetorical, ethical and quadrivial matters). Early students of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* were no doubt impressed by his remark that rhetoric lay midway between ‘dialectic, and ... that study of Ethics which may properly be called “political” ’ 221, and seem to have been impressed by Aristotle’s emphasis upon what Lewry calls — in regard to Giles of Rome’s interests — ‘the refinements of human emotionality’ 222. No doubt, too, early commentation concentrated on the matter in hand, i.e. Aristotle. To argue that such a figure as Giles of Rome would not have known the discussion of rhetoric in Cicero and Boethius when he commented on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* seems absurd. His shorter treatise must have seemed the obvious place to include generalised remarks from all the authorities 223. The very fact that lecturing on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* commenced at all at Paris, argues the important place that rhetoric occupied as a subject. It also cautions us to beware of the conclusion that texts not in the statutes were not studied, for Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* does not appear in the statutes until very late in the piece. Presumably too, the lectures of recent bachelors 224 might well focus on the range of texts thought of as introductory to the serious lecturing that constituted the required basis for determination.

We may, nevertheless, take Murphy’s basic point that interest in Aristotle’s rhetoric was kept alive, within the university, by its relationship to ethics and politics — just as Cicero’s rhetoric was kept alive in the eleventh and twelfth-century cathedral schools by their

223. See *Lewry’s* remarks, pp. 55-56.
224. *Leff*, pp. 147, 154, 159 etc.
interest in the problems of dialectic and logic. The association between rhetoric and ethics is made clear in the following passage from the works of Roger Bacon:

Rhetoric also uses this kind of arguing and it is a part of moral philosophy, along with poetry, which consists of words, as the remaining part of moral philosophy consists in deeds. From which it is clear that rhetoric is not in itself a principal division of science, like logic and grammar, which make up what is properly called the trivium.

That Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* did not always move in this company, however, is clear from such manuscripts as Vatican Lat. 2995, where a Latin work which Stroux identified as a master’s abridgement of the *Ad Herennium*, appears with Robert Grosseteste’s translation of Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics* (glossed), his *Politics* (glossed at the beginning), his *Rhetoric* (trans. Moerbeke), a translation of his *Yconomica* and of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Equally interesting from this point of view, though not for our present concentration on Paris and Oxford, is a volume from the Cathedral Library of Toledo, written in the late thirteenth-century which combines Ciceronian and Aristotelian rhetorical texts. Are we not entitled to assume that
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225. Cited in Ward, ‘Artificiosa eloquentia’, I, p. 509, using Baur, *Beiträge*, 18 (Hft. 4-6) p. 14 n. 3. A similar view is expressed by Nicolaus of Paris in his commentary on Boethius’ *De diff. top*. See Fredborg in Pinborg, *Buridan*, p. 49, and her unpublished paper *Dialectica Moralis*, citing Rogeri Baconis *Moralis Philosophia* ed. Eugenio Massa, Zürich, 1953 (Thesaurus Mundi) chs V-VII, pp. 250-67 (part of the *Opus Maius*), and (for the *Opus Tertium*) Rogeri *Baconis Opera*, I ed. J. S. Brewer, London, 1859, photog. repr. Kraus, 1965, p. 308: ‘rhetoric should not be placed with the trivium, but the rhetorical theory of argumentation should be dealt with along with that of dialectic, and rhetorical practice along with that of ethics’. Bacon classifies rhetorical arguments, according to Fredborg, into three groups: those concerned with the Church, the Bible, the Saints, miracles, reason and the consensus of Catholic doctors, and which have as their aim persuasion of the faithful and preaching to the infidel; judicial oratory (for which Bacon cites the study of Cicero’s rhetoric); edifying prose and poetry (citing Horace favourably, and Ovid unfavourably). See above at n. 117.

226. See *Arts Libéraux et Philosophie au Moyen Âge*, pp. 202-03; G. Lacombe, *Aristoteles Latinus, Codices, pars post.* (Cambridge University Press, 1955) no. 1234, p. 853; Ward, ‘Artificiosa eloquentia’, I, pp. 510-11. Commentators on Ciceronian rhetoric were also not averse to citing Aristotle’s *Rhetorica* from time to time, at least in Italy (see for example S. Werth in Viator, 10 [1979], p. 306). Fredborg (Ciceronian *Rhetoric* and Scholasticism) points out that ‘the theory elaborated in *Ad Herennium* IV concerning the three levels of style, with their
such linkages were made from time to time in the rhetorical teaching at Paris and Oxford?

Fredborg argues that the survival of so many manuscripts of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* indicates considerable study of rhetoric at the medieval university, even though the influence of Aristotle’s view of it comes to dominate. ‘Most of the content in the extant part of [Jean] Buridan’s *Quaestiones* to [Aristotle’s] *Rhetoric* is taken up with discussions of ethics and psychology’ 227, but he is also concerned with the customary ‘extrinsic’ aspects of rhetoric, its relationship to dialectic, its status as a kind of ‘moral dialectic’, its status as an art or science. Buridan’s questions on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (40-50 folios in the extant manuscripts) naturally focus on rhetoric as Aristotle saw it; nevertheless, this treatment did involve the commentator quite centrally in some rather basic rhetorical issues, even if the major emphasis remained the nature of the theoretical rules and procedures of rhetoric as an art 228. The close link between Ciceronian and Aristotelian rhetoric is well put by a comment of Margareta Fredborg, in connection with Buridan’s discussion of the *species rhetoricae*: ‘Cicero is never far off, when Aristotle gets knotty, and the *De inventione* is simply presupposed reading’ 229.

Leaving now the use of particular classical and late classical texts at the later medieval universities of Paris and Oxford, glimpses must be provided of the teaching of rhetoric itself. To hand are texts from Paris at the beginning and end of our period, and I propose to consider these briefly, before drawing a few tentative conclusions.

By the fifteenth century at the University of Paris, rhetoric seems to have come into its own as a full curriculum arts subject. Guillaume Fichet, for example, a Paris teacher of the liberal arts and
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229. ‘A Fourteenth-Century Commentary on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*’. 

the Bible, rector of the University of Paris in 1467, doctor in theology in 1468, and in charge of the Sorbonne library 1469-71, taught the liberal arts and the scriptures for eighteen years in the mornings and for almost as long taught rhetoric in the afternoons\textsuperscript{230}. According to Kennedy, Fichet’s \textit{Rhetorica}, which survives in one manuscript and a number of printed copies, ‘represents a system of rhetoric that we may compare and contrast to that of George of Trebizond or Laurentius Traversagni or others. It shows how the late medieval tradition of study of \textit{De inventione} and \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium} survived in France in the Renaissance and was given a new and fuller development, and it is an apparently unique presentation of rhetoric in scholastic form, consistently worked out in great detail...’\textsuperscript{231}. Fichet’s \textit{Exordia} (speech openings), composed before 1471 in his capacity of doctor of Theology, represent a genre common enough among the humanists of the day: ‘the classical \textit{exordium} had only limited relevance to the medieval thematic sermon and it was necessary to reinvent it in some fashion. Well before Fichet, the Italian humanists such as Gasparino Barzizza, Guarino da Verona and others, had judged it necessary to furnish their students as future orators with model \textit{exordia} that conformed to the canons of the new eloquence’\textsuperscript{232}. In fact, in Fichet’s case, the \textit{exordia}, covering ancient and contemporary circumstances, illustrate a wide variety of classical situations (\textit{exordia} drawn from topics appropriate to the person of the adversary or of the auditors, \textit{exordia} designed to win goodwill, compliance, attention from the audience, \textit{exordia} based on the types of indirect opening, and similar).

Less well known are the treatises and discourses of Pierre de la Hazardière (1400-1465), who was Master in Arts at the University of Paris around 1425 and later Professor of Theology at the Sorbonne. His rhetorical oeuvre represents a new interest in classical standards, suggesting some measure of discontinuity with his immediate past.


\textsuperscript{231} \textsc{Kennedy}, ‘The \textit{Rhetorica} of Guillaume Fichet,’ p. 411.

The large rhetorical corpus of Jean Serra (1400-1470), though his career illustrates the interests of the University of Toulouse, rather than the University of Paris, reflects the comprehensive practice of a professional rhetor of the day, and it is difficult to believe that the northern institution did not prepare those of its students who sought such instruction with the appropriate teaching 233.

Such treatises as those by Fichet, Pierre de la Hazardière, and Serra, however, do not compensate for the apparent absence at the Universities of Paris and Oxford of extensive surviving commentaries on the Ciceronian rhetorical texts so dear to the Italian schools. The best that can be done in the circumstances is to take a concluding glance at the gloss on the first two books of the pseudo-Ciceronian Ad Herennium to be found, partially, in two manuscripts, Oxford CCC 250 and Vat. Barb.Lat.20 (fol. 46v). This commentary is, I think, the closest approach we are for the present likely to have, to the kind of detailed teaching that must have been characteristic of the rhetorical magistri in the arts faculties at Paris and Oxford universities in the later middle ages, 234 even though it is situated chronologically on the cusp that divides the late medieval cathedral-school environment from the teaching ambience of the early universities 235. Despite our inability at present to date the manuscripts precisely, the gloss bears a stronger resemblance to the commentary type that Weijers feels was 'très courant à Paris dans la période 1230-1260' 236 than it does to the twelfth-century commentary type, in that it does present in prototype fashion the three features of the thirteenth-century commentary: the introductory divisio of the lectio, the 'expositio' or 'sententia in speciali', followed, sometimes by the 'sententia (in generali)', and, finally, the dubia, or quaestiones, 'les
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233. See BELTRAN, E. (ed.) Humanistes Français, pp. 8, 17 (for Pierre de la Hazardière), and 9ff, 57ff for Jean Serra. My remarks (WARD, Ciceronian Rhetoric, p. 196) need to be emended now in view of Beltran's discussion.

234. The following remarks are taken from WARD, 'Artificiosa eloquentia', I, pp. 460ff and II, pp. 310ff, where an extensive discussion of the commentary will be found.

235. On the same 'cusp' we may place the various versions of the Ad Herennium and De inventione commentaries by 'Alanus' (de Insulis ?) upon which Harry Caplan commented initially (WARD, Ciceronian Rhetoric, pp. 21, 29) and and upon which I hope to comment further in later articles.

236. WEIJERS, La 'disputatio', p 12.
questions ou points de doute soulevés par le texte'. The appearance of these features is not systematic (as would be expected from a mature thirteenth-century commentary), but they have a greater prominence than seems evident in other twelfth-century commentaries.

A notable feature of the commentary in question is its highly structured scholastic presentation of contemporary and antique debates on the rhetorical categories and their internal relationships. The mode of presentation of material within the Ad Herennium itself is rigorously analysed in connection with the gloss on each section of the text, and the commentary is periodically interrupted by quaestiones, introduced by the phrase hic solet queri, or some variant of it. These 'questions' discuss inconsistencies, overlapping and confused terminology and other problems associated with the rhetorical system of the Ad Herennium. The largest such quaestio, fols 12vb and following, is a mini-treatise on the rhetorical loci or topics of argument in the conjectural case, beginning with a discussion of the septem circumstancie ('quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando'). This discussion is drawn, in the main, from the fourth book of Boethius' De differentiis topicis. On fol.10vb, the divisions of the qualitative status are debated in a series of points and arguments, from which the following link phrases have been selected: 'sed obicitur...solvunt ergo...hec autem solutio parum valere videtur...unde concluditur...rursus opponitur...sed iterum obicitur...item opponitur quod queritur...huic respondetur...sed eam solvunt...hic solet dubitari...hic solet queri...'.

Generally speaking, these excursuses, or quaestiones, supplement, expand, and give background or depth to the textual commentary. Their presence suggests that the commentary is some kind of a

237. FREDHOFG, Ciceronian Rhetoric and Scholasticism: 'It is perhaps also significant that all medieval Ciceronian commentaries are literal commentaries, never cast in the form of the questiones commentary, which became the customary format for commentaries in the university milieu of northern France and England in the High Middle Ages'. Elsewhere WEBERS argues that the quaestio commentary form, while common in the schools of Theology during the twelfth century, became typical of the arts faculties only in the thirteenth: L'Enseignement du Trivium à la Faculté des arts de Paris: la 'questio' in Manuels, Programmes de Cours et Techniques d'Enseignement dans les universités médiévales, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994, p. 61.

238. Victorinus on the De inventione, ed. HALM, p. 207.
reportatio of ordinary rather than cursory lectures. A rough breakdown of the first book gives some idea of the relationship between the digressions and the commentary on the text of the Ad Herennium. The first book, in the transcription by Rev. N. Häring 239, contains 374 paragraphs, of which 154 are digressions, where the lemmata of the text are not directly in question. As a result, the first book of the commentary is about five times the size of the first book of the Ad Herennium.

The commentary opens with a short proemium in which the questions ‘an sit’, whether rhetoric is an art, and ‘quid sit’, its nature as an art, are discussed. The author’s opinion, based as he says upon the ideas of Plato and Socrates (in reality Quintilian’s Institutes of Oratory, which gave the commentator a handy synthesis of antique debates on the subject), is that it is an art, the art of speaking well. The first major digression represents, somewhat vaguely, the accessus ad artem, suggested to the author by ‘Cicero’s’ mention of the officium of the orator (Ad Herennium 1.2.2). The subject of the digression seems to be the clarification of the relationship between negotium (the treatment of the problem or controversy that the case represents), the causa itself; the constitutio or status or ‘issue’ at stake; the thesis or propositum; the quaestio or general proposition; the materia or substance with which rhetoric deals, and the finis or ‘goal’ of the art. Boethius had solved such problems by an almost ‘neoplatonic’ argument: rhetoric ‘becomes’ all these above things as its ‘form’ takes substance into itself. Our author adopts a composite position based on the De differentiis topicis IV and the Institutes of Quintilian.

Pausing a moment to explain causa repetundarum and to introduce the partes rhetoricae, the author continues the commentary down to the subject of insinuatio, the occasion for the second important digression from the text (Ad Her. 1.6.9). A smaller digression has preceded this, characteristic of the later medieval attitude towards rhetorical theory: it is no longer sufficient to explain the three major genera of causes and the four ‘types’ of causes; it has to

239. Kindly made available to me during my graduate studies in Toronto. I have compared Father Häring’s transcription with the original and cleared up some uncertain elements in it. For the idea that the commentary might represent ordinary rather than cursory lecturing, see Weisheipl, Mediaeval Studies, 26 (1964), pp. 153-54.
be pointed out that the three major genera are substantialia and the four ‘types’ accidentalia of these.

The digression on insinuatio is another illustration of the later medieval scholastic (university?) approach to rhetoric. The author of the Ad Herennium had discussed the ‘indirect approach’ solely from the point of view of the case situation that required it. This is ignored by the medieval commentator who gives a systematic classification of the genera and species of insinuatio. The types of insinuatio are discussed as conceptual entities in themselves; there is little attempt to relate them to the exigencies of opening a rhetorical speech.

A little later, the commentator notices that there is a similarity between types of exordia and a type of partitio, a type of conclusio and a type of insinuatio. He digresses to explore the differentia that exists between these types. On smaller points too, such as whether the ‘issue’ should be called the deprecatio defensoris or the insinuatio accusatoria, or whether ‘definitive’ issues are always concerned with controversies over the written word, the author betrays his concern for the exploration of the relationship between the interlocking parts of rhetoric. The modern reader receives the impression that the commentator cared little for the fact that rhetoric was once a practical science designed to enable an advocate to put together a speech to win a case, or a thinker to construct a text that would persuade on a point. Rhetoric has become almost an exercise in clear-thinking.

Not every digression, it must be admitted, is of this type. Some of the shorter ones are concerned with the definition of words or terms used in the pseudo-Ciceronian text. This habit of glossing difficult terms of a non-rhetorical nature is characteristic of the commentary, and is more prominent than, for example, in Thierry of Chartres’ Ad Herennium commentary. It may indicate the preliminary level of rhetorical education, within the arts curriculum.

The digressions in the second book of the anonymous commentary are again concerned with the problem of systematising and discussing the subdivisions of the art — this time the sources and types of argument that are used in the ‘conjectural issue’. We note little

inclination to discuss the value of pseudo-Cicero’s scheme for this issue; instead, a preoccupation with the details of his scheme and the points at which these conflict with or reflect the theories of other writers on the art, notably Boethius.

It is clear that some contemporary classroom background underlies many of the questions debated in the commentary. The author never uses the first person to introduce his own opinion in these controversies, in which respect his practice differs from that of Thierry of Chartres, who will often write, for instance, ego vero dico... The commentator’s usual method is this: sequitur, or perhaps a phrase such as hic solet queri (dubitat), or ambigitur (dubitat, queritur, investigatur), will introduce the point of debate. A possible solution will be suggested with dicas ergo, sic exponas, vel intelligas; an objection to this solution with sed obicitur or item opponitur, and the answer to such an objection with solvit ergo (or some other form of solvo), respondetur, or solutio est. The opinions of others are brought in by means of some such phrase as est ergo quorundam sententia, aliorum opinio est, unde ut Quintilianus. The author’s procedure is usually to balance one opinion against another and to work out a solution, either with another opinion, or with an elementary piece of reasoning, possibly his own.

The author’s sources are typical of the early scholastic classroom. Apart from citations of Quintilian and Boethius, the author quotes, mentions or alludes to thirty-four authorities, or groups of authorities, or works whose author he does not mention: Albutius, Apolodorus, Aristotle, Athenaeus, Cato, Cornelius Celsus, Cicero, Critolaus, Demosthenes, Diomedes, Donatus, Ennodius, Grillius, Hermagoras, Hermes, Horatius, Ovidius, Plato, Remigius, Socrates, Terentius, Theodestes, Theodorus, Theophrastus, Thrasymachus, Varro, Victorinus and Ulpian. The Eclogues of Virgil, the style of Sallust and certain characters from Terentian plays are also mentioned. Most of the references are derived from Quintilian and many are quoted also by Thierry of Chartres in his commentary on the De inventione.241. The author seldom gives the name of the book from which a quotation derives and only once does he refer to the book number within a work that he is citing. He has, in addition, over one-

hundred and twenty vague citations of nameless authorities, many from Quintilian, some from Boethius, and one or two from Victorinus; it is possible that some of these are to audience or magistri response in lectures or disputations. The author’s most commonly used authorities are Victorinus’ commentary on the De inventione (but far less often the De inventione itself), Quintilian’s Institutio Oratoria, and Boethius’ De differentiis topicis IV. Boethius, in fact, is cited by name twenty-four times and in all but two instances the reference is to De diff. top. IV. There are, in addition, a few unacknowledged borrowings, from Macrobius’ Saturnalia, a quotation from Aristotle’s Categories, and an occasional reference to the earlier books of Boethius’ De diff. top. or to his In Topica Ciceronis. Most of these are taken from earlier rhetorical glosses. Cicero’s Topica is indirectly quoted once, probably from Boethius and there are some references to the speeches of Cicero, most of which argue only a garbled reading of Quintilian and certain other authors, perhaps Macrobius.

This is a puzzling commentary. In the Oxford manuscript it is written out in fits and starts and its tone is by no means as magisterial as the commentaries ascribed to Thierry of Chartres and ‘Alanus’. Yet it seems to breathe the atmosphere of the northern university classroom far more certainly than do those commentaries. It represents someone’s attempt to capture the essence of a set of lectiones on the Ad Herennium, and it derives from a moment when the latter text had definitely superseded the De inventione as the base rhetorical lecturing text. Given its date, the milieu of Paris or Oxford seems compelling. The other works in the manuscript at Oxford are logical and grammatical and the whole impression is of cursory

243. The rhetorical commentary occupies the first 17 folios. On f. 18ra begins a logical treatise on ‘preceptio significancium’ and ‘inquisitio significatorum’, inc. ‘inde [?] nostre integritas doctrine in duobus consistit in preceptione significanci...’ On f. 24v begins an anonymous treatise on the Symbolum of St. Athanasius (identified by Rev. Häring as the work of Simon of Tournai). On f. 28vb there is a tractatus de figuris ad filium cum prologo inc. ‘solet aliquociens in scripturis ordo verborum...’. The treatise itself begins ‘prolemipsis, id est, preoccupatio sive presumption...’. On fols 30v-33v there is a tractatus de accentibus utilis valde, and on f. 34r begins a commentary on Priscian’s Ars grammatica, with a prologue beginning ‘omnis traditio doctrine celebrari digna aut vocibus fit aut scriptis. Ea propter arcium
lecturing on a base arts text, before a student went on to advanced arts subjects, and beneath the level of detailed statutory requirement. Is not this commentary our major clue to rhetorical teaching in the early universities? The puzzle is the paucity of remnants of such teaching. Were such texts not systematically kept? Did this form of rhetorical lecturing at Paris and Oxford lose its place in even the preliminary arts curriculum? These are questions to which answers would be of great assistance for those who may be anxious to render precise the degree of attention paid to rhetoric in the arts faculties of the pioneering later medieval northern universities. Schoeck’s 1968 assertion that ‘the role of rhetoric in scholasticism - to put the problem in its largest terms - has yet to be dealt with in its fullness’ is still valid.

### Conclusion

In view of the kinds of evidence surveyed in the pages above, it might be unwise to assume that the University played as slender a role in the dissemination of classical rhetorical theory, as is commonly supposed. It is even possible that the Paris university student of the thirteenth century might have known more rhetoric than the humanist of later generations, at least in the working sense, if not in terms of classical texts. Midst all the novelty of new subjects, texts and procedures that characterised the university environment in the later middle ages, the canon of ancient texts, with their ‘modern’ commentaries, formed the basis of expected knowledge within this framework. A text as venerable as the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* had thus a firm place, a circumstance that should give pause to those abolishers of the canon in our universities today. It seems also clear that as far as the statement by Jardine and Grafton with which this paper began is concerned, rhetoric cuts both ways. If the medieval university arts faculties were practically oriented, and if attention to rhetoric is a sign of such orientation, we may affirm the truth of Jardine and Grafton’s statement in regard to the open, or

---

245. A nice summary will be found in Coleman, *The Science of politics*, p. 200.
competitive aspects of medieval scholasticism. The continued emphasis upon a training in dialectical argument, the attention given to the arrangement of the classical rhetorical system in general and the tutoring provided in the *ars predicandi* at most medieval European universities certainly support such a view of medieval scholasticism. If, however, we note that the attention to rhetoric at the medieval universities, though thorough-going, was entirely theoretical in orientation, and that as such, it joined an overwhelming emphasis upon theory in the teaching of the other liberal arts, we may doubt the truth of the Jardine and Grafton statement, at least as far as it applies to the graduates of Oxford and Paris universities. We may suppose here that graduates entered employment able to argue theoretical points and issues on political or theological agendas in an academic manner, but not yet able to persuade audiences in particular social situations (pleading at law, eloquence in diplomacy or in battle, in parliaments, in general polemic and controversy). In Italy both popular and academic fields of persuasion were envisaged by the schools, but even there, in both late medieval and humanist times, and as on the other side of the Alps, the exigencies of literary employment might well have required a measure of linguistic conformity that would have naturally stressed euphuistic and epideictic rhetoric and oratory, and academic humanist scholarship, rather than the open persuasion of democracy and the market place. Indeed, the emphasis upon *dictamen* and, particularly in the German and Eastern European universities, on the *ars poetria*, within the *rhetorica*

246. Cf COBBAN, *The Medieval English Universities*, pp. 161-62: 'a rigorous training in logic and disputational techniques was widely valued in medieval society as an appropriate groundwork for the oral and written demands of many areas of professional life. In this sense the arts course was viewed as no less utilitarian, and no less socially applicable than disciplines such as law, theology or medicine'. See Cobban's whole discussion at this point. Valuable also are the remarks of Coleman pp. 187-88, 193, 203-09. It would be a mistake, however, to take the great political debate treatises of scholars such as Marsilius of Padua, William of Ockham, Giles of Rome, Nicholas Oresme, and John Wyclif, or a treatise such as the *De monarchia* of Dante, as typical of the fare provided for the arts faculty students in the later medieval universities; such texts were more the outcome of the application of sophisticated theoretical training acquired within the universities, or from university contacts, to themes and controversies encountered beyond student days. See also COLEMAN p. 195.

curriculum, suggests this; medieval universities too, trained for conformity and praise, as well as for argument and oral fluency.

In the end, however, whether the student at Paris and Oxford trained in logic, grammar or rhetoric, it is entirely possible that he took the training he received, with or without a degree, into the wide world and won for himself a place in a very competitive court environment, either in the service of the church or of the state, as a consequence of the rigorous training in language skills that he absorbed at the medieval university. If that is so, and it seems that it was, we can affirm the essential truth of Jardine and Grafton's statement, however many still unanswered questions it may raise in the minds of those who would follow it out to its logical conclusions.

APPENDIX
Remarks on rhetoric and cultural trends in thirteenth-century Paris
See n.122 above

That John of Garland's 'Grammar' included much that would normally have fallen under the heading of 'Rhetoric' is clear from his works, and from his own statements, for example *Parisiana Poetria* (ed. Lawler) pp. 2-3 'liber iste tribus speciebus philosophie suppontur: Grammatice...Rethorice, quia docet ornate dicere; Ethice, quia docet sive persuadet ad honestum, quod est genus omnium virtutum secundum Tullium' (cf. *De inventione* 2.53.159; Lawler p. 227 cannot find any precise reference). Since two of the three fields of relevance for John's 'Grammatical' works are integrally connected with Cicero and Rhetoric, we should be cautioned against expecting 'rhetoric' to appear in the arts faculty always as a separate art. John's *Morale Scolarium* is adduced to support the conclusion that 'during the first half of the thirteenth century, the ancient classics were well-nigh forsaking Paris. In the statutes of the university there is no trace of them' (*Paetow Two Medieval Satires* p. 17; *Haskins Studies in Medieval Culture* ch. 3). However, the drift of John's 'complaint' (*Paetow Two Medieval Satires* p. 154ff, pp. 166-68) is probably no more than the by now time-honoured twelfth-century goliardic complaint that the lucrative professions had driven out the popularity of the arts and belles-lettres (much as they again doing in our own day! Cf. too Janet Coleman's comments *The science of politics* p. 208). That John could even consider rectifying the Paris preference for 'modern' authors and subjects against the ancient

248. This is essentially the implication of Coleman's remarks and Buridan's expectations (*Coleman* p. 201, citing Buridan).
literary classics by reform petition and statute (PAETOW Two Medieval Satires p. 167 n. 371, pp. 224-25) suggests a situation somewhat healthier, in regard to the classics, than, for example, today. Again, the poem by Henri D’Andeli, needs to be set in the context of vernacular satire (Rutebeuf, Jean de Meun, Le Roman de Fauvel) and the destabilisation of truth that characterized all thirteenth-century scholastic endeavour; it would be overly restrictive to interpret the poem as a literal description of learning at Orleans and Paris. A recent thesis by Rachel Borny The ‘Roman de la Rose’: from quest to questioning Sydney University, History IV, 1995, makes the larger points well: “Just as Ward has argued [WARD, Rhetoric, Truth and Literacy] that the political economy of truth collapsed in the eleventh century, so, I would suggest, a similar collapse occurred in the second half of the thirteenth century [according to PAETOW Two Medieval Satires p. 34, Henri’s poem was written in the second quarter of the thirteenth century]. Paré has called the period when Jean [de Meun] was writing [1265-80], ‘la période la plus movementée et peut-être aussi la plus féconde du moyen âge, dans le domaine des idées’ [G. PARÉ Les idées et les lettres au XIII siècle: le Roman de la Rose, Bibliothèque de Philosophie, Paris, 1947, pp. 8-9]. Changes in both social structure and scholastic method saw a loss of faith in the ‘scholastic dream’ [see R. W. SOUTHERN Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe, Blackwells, Oxford, 1995 pp. 1-13], and truth was once again opened up as a category for dispute. In this context, Jean appears as a ‘universal intellectual’ [cf. WARD, Rhetoric, Truth and Literacy p. 139], and the Rose may be seen as an anti-discourse implicitly opposed ‘to the effects of the centralising powers which are linked to the institution and functioning of an organised scientific discourse within a society ... embodied in a university or, more generally, in an educational apparatus’ [Williams, cited in WARD, Rhetoric, Truth and Literacy p. 142]. His adoption of the tools of twelfth-century humanism may thus be viewed as a rejection of ‘truth’ as defined by Latin scholasticism — and a rejection of the domination of thought by dialectic and science ... Jean is attempting in the Roman de la Rose to entertain and delight the courtly audience for whom he writes, and at the same time he aims to give an insight into ‘truth’. For Jean, however, ‘truth’ is not an objective category able to be explained by any given scholastic theory or philosophical argument. Instead, ‘truth’ is obscured by the uncertain link between appearance and reality. Jean’s genius lies in his ability not only to provide an intensely humorous satire upon the uncertainties of life and knowledge, but to veil his own poetry with the same difficulties of interpretation as he sees in the world around him. His masterful use of the dream vision, allegory and integumentum combine to make the ‘meaning’ of the Rose obscure — but his is a deliberate obscurity, a mirror image of the uncertainties of courtly
life and scholastic thought in the late thirteenth century. Jean's Rose resists
definitive interpretation precisely because it is a reflection of 'truth' — and in
the second half of the thirteenth century, 'Lady Truth stood cowed, her
clothes in tatters, uncertain of her place and who was to defend her' (cited
by Michael Foot in Jonathan Swift Gulliver's Travels, Penguin Books,
Ringwood, 1967). There is no need, in fact, to adduce any special crisis for
the humanities in the thirteenth century: literature and eloquence teachers
were always under pressure in fast-moving Paris; indeed, it is likely, for
example, that all our early catena commentaries on the De inventione and
Ad Herennium, from the time of Abelard, derive from the slower-moving
provincial centres (Laon, Rheims, Chartres, for example) rather from Paris
itself (as I have demonstrated in the long version of a paper published sum-
marily as From marginal gloss to catena commentary: the eleventh-century
origins of a rhetorical teaching tradition in the medieval West, in Parergon
n.s. 13 : 2 pp. 109-20 [Scribe, Text, Artefact ed. B. A. Masters and V. B.
Jordan, Sydney 1996]). See PAETOW Two Medieval Satires pp. 20-21;
WARD (F4) as in WARD Ciceronian Rhetoric p. 347; WARD (1979) as in
WARD Ciceronian Rhetoric p. 48; J. A. YUNCK The Lineage of Lady Meed:
the development of mediaeval venality satire (Publications in Mediaeval
Studies of the University of Notre Dame, XVII), University of Notre Dame
Press, Indiana, 1963. For the second half of the twelfth century as a time of
relative peace at Paris see S. FERRUOLO The Origins of the University
p. 279.
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