SOME COMMENTARIES ON THE *DE INVENTIONE* AND *AD HERENNIIUM* OF THE ELEVENTH AND EARLY TWELFTH CENTURIES

I

The teaching of rhetoric in the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been much less studied than that of grammar, dialectic and the various branches of philosophy. The importance and function of school rhetoric in this period are still matters of controversy. We know that the subject was regularly taught: John of Salisbury studied it under Thierry and Petrus Helias. But how far did the classical tradition of rhetoric as a preparation for public life survive? Did the twelfth-century poets and *dicatores* owe anything to lectures on rhetorical texts?

I have studied five commentaries on classical texts, which are all most probably based on lectures actually given in the schools. These show how rhetoric was taught and reveal to some extent the aims behind its teaching. They also bring us into touch with two masters, as elusive as they were influential, Manegold of Lautenbach and Anselm of Laon; and with the better-known Thierry of Chartres. Four of these commentaries are on Cicero's *De inventione* and one on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the two basic texts of mediaeval rhetoric. Cicero's mature works, the *Orator* and *Bratus*, were unknown; his *De oratore* was seldom read. Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* was read and appreciated in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, but it was not popular as a teaching text.

First I shall describe the manuscripts that I have used; then I shall discuss the authorship of these commentaries and consider the relationship between them in order to decide whether they depended on one another or on a common school tradition or on both. The discussion will throw some light on teaching methods. In a second article I hope to discuss some points of doctrine arising from the texts, their attitude to, and the knowledge shown of, the Latin classics and contemporary studies, and to reach
some tentative conclusions on the place of rhetoric in the curriculum of the schools of Northern France.¹

II

(1) The Laudian glosses

A gloss on the De inventione in Bodleian Library, MS. Laud Lat.49.² This manuscript contains two translations of the Isagoge of Porphyry with the commentaries of Boethius, Alcuin’s De dialectica, Chapters 3 to 10, the Categories of Aristotle, Cicero’s Topica with the commentary of Boethius, and Cicero’s De inventione, followed by Victorinus’s commentary on the De inventione.

The text of the De inventione begins on fol. 137r, but the quires have been bound in the wrong order so that Book I is on fol. 137r to 144v, except for the end of the book which is on fol. 129va. Book II begins on fol. 129vb and runs to 136v, continuing on fol. 145r and ending on fol. 146rb. Then follows a brief summary of the rules and divisions of rhetoric.

The manuscript, which measures 345 x 280 mm., is written in a beautiful, rather small hand of the eleventh century, in three columns,³ probably in Southern Germany.

The text of the De inventione is accompanied by a marginal and interlinear gloss which appears to be also of the eleventh century.

The manuscript is one of those which Archbishop Laud acquired from Southern Germany and the Rhineland, and at the end is bound in the list of contents of a fifteenth-century Germany copy of the Speculum fontis vitae of the Carmelite John of Hildesheim (died 1375) written in Germany.

Although written in the margin and between the lines of the text, the glosses appear to be the work of a single redactor.

(2) The commentary of Manegold (see below, p. 9)

A commentary on the De inventione in a manuscript in the Cathedral

¹) I have to thank Dr. R. Hunt, Miss Beryl Smalliey and Mrs. Susan Hall for much help.
³) For this rare arrangement see A. C. Clark, The Descent of Manuscripts, Oxford 1918, pp. 163f.
Library at Cologne. I know of no other copy. It is thus described in the catalogue:1

“CXCVII (Darmst. 2170) membranaceus forma octava minori, foliorum 49, sed parte postrema perdita mancus; saeculo XI vel XII littera admodum minuta scriptus, mendis scatens. Commentarius in Ciceronis Rhetorica. Fol. 1 manu recentiori s.xv inscriptum est: M. Tullii liber Rethoricorum primus incipit. Sed ipsum Tullii opus libro non inest.”

The commentary begins:

“Quam Greci vocant rethoricam, latini dicunt artificiosam eloquentiam. Unde etiam liber intitulatur: incipit liber rethoricorum id est preceptorum datorum in artifidosam eloquentiam.”

The manuscript breaks off at the end of folio 49v with the words

“Et hos tres ornatus notat hic in communibus locis ubi dicit: In quibus et suavitatis, id est elegantie, et gravitatis, id est compositionis, plurimum consisit et omnia que in inventione sententiarum et verborum a. etc. [for "aliquid habent dignitatis" of Cicero]. Hic dignitatis intelligitur.”

An odd leaf from another manuscript of the twelfth century has been bound in between fol. 19 and 21.

It begins:

“temperat et aliter cum dicit”

and ends:

“quia liberant sibi studentem a curis securalibus.”

This is part of a commentary on Priscian’s Institutiones grammaticae, the same commentary as that in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, nouvelle acquisition 1623, fol. 1–56, where there is a similar passage on fol. 1ra–rb, though the wording is not identical.3

2) In fact it is probably early twelfth century.
3) I owe this identification to Dr. R. W. Hunt; cf. also his article “Studies on Priscian in the eleventh and twelfth centuries”, Medieval and Renaissance Studies 1, ii, p. 195, where the different MSS. of this commentary on Priscian are given. One MS. is at Cologne Dombibliothek 201, fol. 1–74.
(3) The gloss *In primis*

A commentary on the *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* contained in three manuscripts, the first in the library of York Minster, XVI.M.7 Saec. XII. From the Augustinian Abbey at Leicester.

fol. 1−51\textsuperscript{rb} contain a commentary on the whole of the *De inventione* beginning:

"Tullii C. liber rethoricorum primus incipit. Quam Greci vocant rethoricam, latini artificiosam eloquentiam."

It thus begins with the same words as the commentary now at Cologne. In fact the commentary as contained in this manuscript has two prefaces, the first of which is identical with the preface to the Cologne commentary, and continues until these words occur in red ink on fol. 1\textsuperscript{ra}:

"Hoc precedens secundum magistrum Menegaldum."

Then the second preface begins, written again in ordinary ink:

"Incipit liber rethoricorum. In primis materia et intentio huius rethoris, scilicet Ciceronis, quaerenda est. Sed quia quidam, nescientes differentiam inter oratorem et rethorem, materiam et intentionem oratoris rethori attribuunt. Videndum est prius quid orator, quid rethor et que materia, et que intentio utrique attribuenda sit, ut in nullo illorum decipiamur."

This commentary ends:

"Que reStant in reliquis libris dicemus quos forsitan fecit."

fol. 51\textsuperscript{rb}−69\textsuperscript{vb}.\textsuperscript{2} A commentary on the whole of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* beginning:

"Etsi in familiaribus negotiis. Cum Tullius de V partibus rethorice se tractatu(ru) in promiserat, inventione prima parte exposita ut et alias lex adiunctorum exigit."

The commentary ends on fol. 68\textsuperscript{vb} thus:

"Acute reperiemus. Hoc pertinet ad inventionem et alias partes ponit similiter. EXPLICIT."

\footnote{There are two leaves numbered 41, so that there are really 52 folios and it should end on 52\textsuperscript{rb}. I refer to the second leaf 41 thus (41)\textsuperscript{rb}−\textsuperscript{vb}.}

\footnote{A leaf has been missed after fol. 57 in the pencil numeration. I refer to this folio as (57).}
An epilogue follows beginning:

"[NI]on ignotum sit Marcum Tullium rectum genus accipere civilem rationem in designatione rethorice."

and ending on fol. 69 vb:

"Similiter translativa non est diversa in essentia a coniecturali. Immo quaecumque ipsa sit constitutio si differatur a causa illico translativa APPELLATUR [etc. added in hand of fifteenth century]."

There are occasional notes in the margin of this manuscript in a fifteenth-century hand.

These commentaries are also found in a manuscript in the library of Durham Cathedral, C. IV. 29, fol. 216.³ Saec.XII.

Fol. 1v (saec. XII-XIII). Liber sancti Cuthberti de Dunelmia. Note super Priscianum et super rhesoricam [veterem Tullii added later]. The title is copied in an early fifteenth-century hand at the top of fol. 2v, with the press-mark P. It is in the catalogue of 1391.

Only the last part of the manuscript concerns rhetoric:

Fol. 196r-215v [Note super rhetoricam veterem i.e. M.T. Ciceronis librum de inventione rhetoric].

"G. Materia Tullii est in hoc opere rhesorica . . . et hoc est contraria quoque."

It contains the commentary on the De inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium but begins with the second preface of the York manuscript:

"Incipit liber rhesoricorum" etc.

and has no epilogue to the commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium but ends with the words in the text:

"Acute reperiemus."

There is little difference between these two manuscripts. Single words, case endings, or the order of the words differ, but the meaning of the text remains substantially the same in both. A few passages in the York

---

¹) Space left for capital N which has not been filled in.
³) 215 folios according to the modern pencil numeration but a leaf was missed after fol. 9.
manuscript have been omitted in the Durham manuscript, but only one such passage is of any length. In two passages the Durham text agrees with slight corrections to the York text made in a contemporary hand (York MS., fol. 11vb, 12va. Durham, fol. 8rb, 8va). The scribe of the York manuscript for some reason lacked certain portions of the text since he occasionally leaves a line or lines blank in his copy. The scribe of the Durham manuscript cannot always supply the missing passages and even once remarks: "Spatium vacuum hic erat" (Durham MS., fol. 13ra) where a space occurs in the copy at York (York MS., fol. 19vb). On the other hand he supplies a couple of words (Durham MS., fol. 13va) where the end of the line is left blank in the York Manuscript (fol. 20vb). And twice (Durham MS., fol. 26vb-27ra and 47rb) the Durham scribe supplies a number of missing lines to the commentary on the Liber ad Herennium which corresponds to spaces left in the York manuscript on fol. 60rb-va and 67vs-68vs. Occasionally the words are quite different in the Durham copy, and so the meaning is different (e.g. Durham MS., fol. 13rb corresponding to York MS., fol. 20ra). Normally both scribes quote Cicero’s words in full, but once, when the scribe of the York manuscript refers to Cicero’s text by the first letter of each word instead (York MS., fol. 45va), the scribe of the Durham manuscript does the same (Durham MS., fol. 28vs). This suggests some link between the two manuscripts.

Clearly neither manuscript is a copy of the other since each includes passages not in the other and omits passages supplied by the other. The Durham copy is valuable where it supplies omissions in the York text, but, apart from these, I have used and refer to the York manuscript unless otherwise stated.2

The publication of the catalogue of the Borghese collection in the Vatican Library by Dr. Anneliese Maier3 has brought to light a third copy, which was formerly in the Papal Library at Avignon. It is: Vat.Burghes. lat.57, fol. 56–95v. Saec.XII. “Incipit liber rhetoriciorum. In primis materia…” Ends incomplete on De inv.II.54.

1) The passage omitted in the Durham MS. on fol. 2va at the end of line 4 begins in the York MS. on fol. 2rb with the words “Sciendum est quod deliberate denominatum est a libra” and ends “iam non cum adversario consentiet quia eloquentia habet se ad bonum”.
2) I refer to the York MS. under the letter Y and to that at Durham under the letter D.
3) Studi e Telli 170 (1952) 75.
I have only been able to check its text in a few passages, where it is in substantial agreement with the Durham and York manuscripts.

(4) **Thierry of Chartres** (see below, p. 18)

A commentary on the *De inventione* contained in the following manuscripts:

(a) British Museum MS. Arundel 348. Saec. XII.¹

It contains “M. Tullii Ciceronis Rhetoricorum, sive de Inventione Rhetorica libri duo”, on fol. 1.

“Ejusdem Rhetoricorum libri quattuor ad Herennium”, on fol. 51v.

“Veteris cujusdam Commentarius in M.T. Ciceronis libros de Inventione rhetorica” [ad finem nonnulla desiderantur] on fol. 102.

This commentary begins: “Ut ait Petronius, nos magistri in scola soli relinquimus, nisi multos palpebus et insidias fecerimus auribus” and ends: “Neque mutari hoc quantum ad necessitatem de praesenti” on fol. 179v.

(b) Royal Library, Brussels, 10057–62.

Commentary on *De inventione*, fol. 2–31.² The manuscript also contains on fol. 32–58 *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, and “Extraits remaniés par Guillaume de Conches”,³ and on fol. 59–129 Cicero *In Catilinam* and Sallust *Catilina* and *Jugurtha*.

The last part containing the speeches of Cicero and Sallust came from the Abbey of Egmond in Holland. The first sections containing the work of the masters from Chartres seem to have been bound with the last after the monastery was destroyed. F. Masai writes in an article on the manuscript, “C'est après avoir quitté la Hollande protestante pour gagner les régions catholiques de Flandre ou de France que le vieux codex du XIe s. s'est joint au groupe déjà constitué, on ne sais où, des mss des maîtres chartreens.”⁴

Another scholar, P. Thomas, thus describes the manuscript of the *De inventione*: “Il se compose de 30 feuillets de parchemin, format petit en -4⁰, à deux colonnes, couverts d'une écriture fine et serrée avec beaucoup d'abréviations. Il paraît dater du XIIe siècle.”⁵ On fol. 29v a second copy of the commentary begins, written in another hand which is in bigger characters and easier to read. This fragment ends on fol. 30.

---

⁴) Ibid. p. 123.
(c) Leyden University library, B.P.L. 189. “Annotationes in Rhetorica Cicerononis”,¹ fol. 42-7, XIII century, “quibus exhibetur initium commentarii admodum ampli in Rhetorica Ciceronis”, says W. H. D. Suringar who published this fragment.² The manuscript contains the beginning of the commentary until the words “in disceptatione hoc est” (corresponds to Brit. Mus. MS. Arundel 348, fol. 112v).

(d) R. Ellis under a note “Petronianum” refers to another manuscript, Phillipps 9672, and edits the prologue beginning “Ut ait Petronius” and ending “atque hinc inicium commentarii sūmat. Explicit prologus.”³

(e) P. Lehmann⁴ refers to another copy at Munich, Lat. 3565, fol. 174-219. According to the catalogue⁵ it is in a volume with an anonymous commentary on Aristotle’s Rhetoric and a part of Grillius’s commentary on the De inventione, all manuscripts being of the fifteenth century.

I have used and always refer to the manuscript at the British Museum and photographs of that at the Royal Library, Brussels,⁶ which I owe to the kindness of Père P. Delhaye.

(5) Ars rethorice

The beginning of a commentary on the De inventione in the Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat.201, written in Italy in the twelfth century. The preface begins: “Ars rethorice sicut et cetere artes duobus modis docetur, extrinsecus videlicet et intrinsicus.” It ends: “praecepta aliorum inscia”,⁷ on fol. 8vb.

I will refer to the commentary by its opening words “Ars rethorice”.

III

The first gloss is contained in a manuscript which probably came from

---

¹) *Bibl. Univ. Leidensis, Codices M.S. III*, 1912, p. 91.
³) *Journal of Philology* 9 (1880), 61. It is now Berlin, Lat. 8° 161.
⁴) “Die Institution Oratoria des Quintilianus im Mittelalter”, *Philologus* 89 (1914), 366, n. 42.
⁶) The British Museum MS. is referred to under the letter L, that from Brussels under the letter B. Quotations and folio references are taken from L unless otherwise stated.
Southern Germany. The commentator had connexions with Bavaria and Italy. On the other hand, as an illustration of *imperator* in Cicero's example: "Quidam imperator cum ab hostibus circum sideretur?" he mentions a French king: "Francorum id est Rex Ruodbertus" and adds between the lines: "id est ab Ottone vel uxor e sua''. He must be thinking of Robert the Pious, who succeeded his father, Hugh Capet, in 996 and ruled until 1031. I have been unable to discover to which Otto he is referring, but he probably had a French noble in mind and not Otto II, Emperor of Germany.

The probability is that the Laudian gloss was written in Southern Germany or Northern Italy in the eleventh century.

I have already mentioned one connexion between the second and third commentaries. The third, as contained in the manuscript now at York, begins with a preface which is said to be by "Menegaldus" and which is identical with the preface to the commentary now at Cologne. But otherwise the manuscripts at York and Cologne contain different works. This suggests that the commentary now at Cologne is the work of master Manegold. Fortunately, the author of the gloss *In primis* refers to Manegold by name, giving his opinion on various points in Cicero's text. Of some twenty quotations in the York manuscript eight cannot be checked because the Cologne manuscript is incomplete. All the rest correspond with one insignificant exception. I quote four typical pieces:

---

1) When Cicero suggests that the orator should relieve the opening to his speech by introducing some contrast "ut cibi societas et fastidium aut subamara aliqua re relevatur" (*De inv.* Bk. I, XVII.25; ed. E. Stroemer, Leipzig 1915), the glossator adds between the lines: "ut sub bauvario vino centaurea absinthio" (fol. 139v, 3rd col.). He clearly read "sub amara".

He knows how the Italians speak. Talking of the fable (*apologia*) he says: "apologi proprie dicuntur popodelle" (fol. 139v, rt. hand of 3rd col.) and "idem padeitelli quod rustice dicitur popodelle" (fol. 139v, bottom left-hand corner).

2) *De inv.* Bk. II, XXIV.72.

3) Fol. 132r, 3rd col., top rt. hand.

4) Fol. 33rb-49rb.


In primis, York MS., fol. 2va.

Per homines res privatas accipit, per civitates res communes et publicas. Civitas enim significat collectionem populi que habet tamam diffinitionem: civitas est multitudo hominum in unum collectorum ad iure vivendum, vel civitas quasi civilitas dicitur secundum magistrum Menegaldum. Unde civis dicitur non particeps eiusdem muri sed eiusdem iuris. Unde Paulus in Aëtibus Apostolorum civem romanum se dicit, non quantum ad cohabitationem sed quia pater eius ius civis promeruit. Res privata ita dividitur alia domesticia, alia familiaris. Domesticia propria uniuscuiusque, familiaris res amicorum.

Cologne MS., fol. 1v.


(2) De inv. Bk.I.V.7.

In primis, York MS., fol. 6va.


Cologne MS., fol. 8v.

Et sciendum quia materia vocatur iudicialis ab una parte, placitacionis scilicet, quia iudicialis causa ante iudices et expleta oratoria ratione [oratione cod.] sentencia a iudicibus datur. Et semper ad iustum vel inustum tendit cause hoc genus. Deliberativa autem quaestio dicitur a deliberando, scilicet, ubi a diversis diverse sentencie dantur. Et hec semper in Capitolio ante seniores agebatur. Demonstrativa vero questio dicitur in qua demonstratur aliquo honore esse digna persona absque iudiciali sentencia, que in marco [sic] Campo agebatur ubi a Romanis honores petebantur.

1) This definition is taken from Victorinus's commentary on De inventione, ed. C. Halm, in Rhetores latini minores, Leipzig 1863, ad loc.

Notandum est quod secundum magistrum Menegaldum superius in credibili inclusimus tantummodo attributa personae, signo vero continentia se cum negotio et ea quae sunt in gestione negotii et in gestione negotii continebatur locus. Modo vero ponit hic locum in exemplo credibile quod contrarium est ut locus duabus coequis speciebus credibili et signo supponatur. Sed est videndum quod signum tantummodo comprehendit ea quae cadunt sub aliquem sensum et ita poteat locus probare sub signo.

Vel secundum magistrum Menegaldum: vis accipitur in horrore vocabuli quia pariter horribile est interfectio patris et interfectio filii, sed non est par interfectio civis et interfectio filii.

The attribution of the authorship of the preface in the York manuscript is confirmed by these correspondences, and it seems reasonable to regard the gloss in the Cologne manuscript as the work of Manegold. The anonymous author of the gloss 

Inprimis

frequently borrows from Manegold’s work without acknowledging his debt. He knew Manegold so well that he uses even the briefest examples from his work. For instance, he suggests that the wise and eloquent man, who, according to Cicero, must have been responsible for persuading men to abandon their barbarous ways and form law-abiding societies, was Orpheus or Amphion.¹ He can quote Manegold’s exact words as follows:

¹) In primis, fol. 3v; Manegold, fol. 4v.
De inv. Bk.I.XIX.27.
Manegold, fol. 15v.  

Gloss In primis, fol. 13rb.

Sed tamen si bonus orator sit talia in narracionem ponit per quam [quem cod.] singula futuris rationibus aliquid prestruit.

Sometimes the commentator presumes that Manegold’s references are so well known that he need merely refer to them. Such passages are now inexplicable until compared with their equivalent in the work of Manegold. Manegold tells a story at length, beginning:¹

“In Stacio de Corebo quodam legitur quod monstrum ab Apolline immissum interfecit, propter quod Apollo magnam cladem in cunetum populum immissit ...”

The gloss In primis merely says:²

“Sicut de Corebo legitur”

without even mentioning its origin in Statius.

The author of the gloss In primis also quotes Manegold in his commentary on the Ad Herennium. Since these quotations from Manegold are closely connected with the text of the work, Manegold probably also wrote a commentary on the Ad Herennium.

This “magister Menegaldus”, author of the commentary on the De inventione contained in the Cologne manuscript, can only be Manegold of Lautenbach.³ Manegold was born between 1030 and 1040 and taught in France, where he made his name as a teacher, “modernorum magister magistrorum”. He taught Gerard of Loudon in France, while Theoger, later Bishop of Metz, became one of his pupils in Germany. By 1084 he had joined the Gregorian reform movement and was a regular canon at Raitenbuch. Though he wrote and worked for the papal cause during

¹) Fol. 39v.
²) Fol. 28rb.
³) See M. Manittius, Gesdh. III, p. 175.
later life, it was as a teacher that he was remembered. He was an authority on the trivium; he also lectured on scripture.

Manegold's rhetorical commentary probably belongs to the earlier period of his life when he was teaching. This is the more certain because there is no evidence in the work itself of any interest in the reform movement. It is difficult to believe that, had it been written later, he could have avoided all reference to the questions uppermost in his mind.

There is no clue as to the identity of the author of the commentary In primis, apart from his relationship to Manegold, except that he seems to have studied and taught in France. For instance, when commenting on the need for preserving the temporal order of events in description, he gives the example of a day's journey from Laon to Paris. Perhaps the author studied at Laon. Discussing the division of time into length of time and occasion he illustrates the point from studies there, and he is reminded of the canons of Laon later on. Angers is the only other town mentioned. The writer, in a curious passage, contrasts custom among the men of Angers with that among the French. When Cicero points out that to appear probable, actions described must be suited to the nature of those who perform them, the commentator compares the "timid Lombards"

1) Talking of how wisdom (sapientia) has been handed on from ancient times, Otto of Freising says, "ac post ad ultimum occidentem, id est ad Gallias et Hispanias, nuperrime a diebus illustrium doctorum Berengarii, Manegaldi et Anshelmi translatum apparet"; Chronica, ed. A. HOFMEISTER, Scriptores Rerum Germaniarum, Hanover &c. 1912, Bk. V, p. 227.
4) Fol. 14\*: "Ordo temporis servandus est ut quod dubium videtur per ipsum ordinem credatur, ut si volumus aliquem a Lauduno usque Parisius pervenisse una die, oportet determinare partes ipsius vie per diversas partes dici, hoc modo: a mane usque ad primum Susestionis venit, a prima usque ad nonam SilvaneAis, a nona usque ad vesperam Parisiens venit."
5) Fol. 18\*: "Per spacion, sicut si diceret: vere potuit legere Priscianum et rethoricam Lauduni quia fuit ibi per annum."
6) Fol. 20\*: "Probabile propter similitudinem, ut non est turpe Laudunesibus canonicis hospitia clerics locare, quia non est turpe clerics ea conducere."
and the French. It is unlikely that he would have made this remark to an 
Italian, but he might well have made it to a French audience. Yet he 
knows something of Lombard law, to judge by his comment on the word 
“religiosum”. For him the English or Scots are foreigners, and probably 
worthless ones.

The commentator was almost certainly a Frenchman, who knew some-
thing of Lombardy. He may well have been a pupil of Master Anselm of 
Laon. In several passages he contrasts “Master Anselm’s” opinion with 
Manegold’s:

(1) *De inv.* Bk. I.V.7: fol. 6va

Discussing deliberative, epideictic and judicial cases, the commentator 
says:

“He cause secundum Magistrum Anselmum, indiscrete ubique aguntur. Sed 
Magister Menegaldus certa et propria loca singulis causis attribuit.”

(2) *De inv.* Bk.I.XXX.48; fol. 20va.

Commenting on Cicero’s division of probable arguments into clues 
(*signum*), plausibility (*credibile*), points on which judgment has been given 
(*indicatum*), and parallels (*comparabile*), Master Manegold has listed these 
under the different attributes of fact:

“Sed Magister Anselmus nullam discrecionem facit sed iuxta exempla <incipit> 
considerare modum probabilitatis.”

(3) *De inv.* Bk.II.XXXVII.110; fol. (41)vb.

Discussing the way in which speeches vary according to the class 
(*genus*) into which they fall, the glossator says:

“Genus secundum Magistrum Anselmum dicitur finis ad quem tendit causa, quia 
ipse est principalis natura per quam diversum genus in causa. Formam vocat

---

1) Fol. 14vb: “Sicut alio modo agendum est de militia apud Langobardos, qui timidi sunt, et ideo 
non crederent si aliquis referret eis unum contra IIII pugnasse, et alio modo apud Francigenas.”

2) *De inv.* Bk. I, XXX.48; fol. 20va: “Judices Longobardorum sunt iuramento constricti et ideo 
quod judicant religiosum dicitur.”

Manegold also mentions Lombard law in his commentary on fol. 10v on the words “Qua lege 
Longobardica vel Romana.”

3) Fol. 31vb: “Ego nescio quid dicam quia quidam alienigena est, quidam pantunarius de Scotthia 
vel de Britannia.” See Du Cange, s.v. pantonarius.
proprietatem quandam agendi quam ex fine recipit. Alio enim modo agitur secundum finem recti, alio secundum finem utilis. Secundum Magistrum Menegaldum sic: . . .”

(4) De inv. Bk.II.LIV.165; fol. 49rob-vra.

To Cicero’s remark that some vices have their opposite virtues, while others seem akin to virtues and yet far removed from them, the glossator quotes Manegold:

“... Et hoc est sententia Magistrum Menegaldum. Secundum vero Magistrum Anselmum aliud est timidas, aliud diffidentias. Timiditas enim est timor pacendi aspera. Diffidentias vero est desperatio magna et honesta faciendo et impetrandi. Et non est verum unum contrarium habere duo contraria, sed timiditas est contrarium audatiae, et diffidentia fidentie; et audatia est finitimum vitium fidentie, quia sicut fidentia audiet, sic et audatia audiet sed immoderate et audenda et non audenda.”

Master Anselm was teaching at Laon for about thirty years until his death on July 15, 1117. His school won fame as a centre for the Artes, though it was even better known for the study of theology. Perhaps the author of In primis had heard both masters.

Internal evidence also indicates when the commentary was composed. I would date it about 1118 because the author of it seems at one point to be making a veiled reference to Abailard:

“Noli iacere cum monialibus quia ex huiusmodi negotio evenit hoc nuper quod quidam testes amisset.”

Abailard was admitted to St. Denis in 1118, soon after the above incident occurred. That the master concerned made this reference at all seems to show that he was no friend of Abailard’s. Possibly since he knew Laon, he had witnessed the quarrel there between Anselm of Laon and Abailard, and was a supporter of the former.

The author was very conscious of the Gregorian reform movement and the general condemnation of simony. In one imaginary example he argues that it is not surprising that a certain bishop committed perjury since he was not ashamed to enter his bishopric by simony. Elsewhere he

---

2) Fol. 20vb.
3) Fol. 16va.
asks why a man should give money to a bishop, and answers: either because the man wants an archdeaconry or because he is laying a trap for the bishop, in order that he should have grounds for accusing him, or because the bishop was his friend.¹ The words of the commentator remind one of the time when papal legates were touring France between 1076 and 1082 and were enforcing the reform programme wherever they went. This was the time when "la délitation partout encouragée devient un procédé normal. L'accusation portée contre un clerc ou un évêque est toujours accueillie de quelque source qu'elle émane. On trouve exemplaire que les moines dénoncent leur abbé, les chanoines leur évêque, les suffragants leur archevêque."² Scenes from those days seem to have been in the author's mind. Discussing the type of case which arises from contradictory laws he says:³

"Deinde maiorem vim habet que vetat quam illa que iubet. Vetat illa que dicit: nullus infamis recipiatur in accusatione. Iubet altera que dicit: omnis infamis recipiatur in accusatione simonie."⁴

And, earlier on, he has recalled the notorious case of the archbishop of Tours:⁵

"Vere symonia non est tenenda, quia Simon Magus invenit et multi impii postea comprobaverunt eam, sicut dominus archiepiscopus Turonensis."

While the legate Hugh was touring north and central France between 1076 and 1082 he called a council at Poitiers, where the archbishop of Tours, Raoul of Langeais, along with the bishop of Rennes and others, was accused of simony. Hugh himself wrote to Gregory complaining of the archbishop:⁶

"De simonia etiam aliter accusatus est, quia cuidam militi silvam promiserit, si

pro epistolatu [? episcopatu] eum iuvisset ... Longum est, pater, enumerare turbas et conflictus, quos et quantos, quomodo et ubi hic Turonensis nobis intulerit."

One day's meeting ended in uproar when the archbishop's servants burst open the doors of the church and almost killed one of Hugh's followers. Nevertheless, not Pope Gregory but Pope Urban (1088-1099) is the one to be mentioned by the commentator as the head of the movement for reform. For instance, there is the following passage:

"Sicut si quereretur utrum sit simonya vendere presbyterum [sic] quod erat prius incertum. Ecce constitutum est ab Urbano et Romanis quod amplius simonya dicatur et ut simonya iudicetur."

or this sentence:

"Vere tenenda est sententia quod non debent vendi praebende quia dominus Urbanus invent.

I have been unable to trace the canon referred to in the first passage, but Urban himself wrote to the canons of St. Martin of Tours about the selling of prebends, thus:

"Quia vero in eiusdem beati Confessoris ecclesia consuetudo pravitatis eiusmodi inoleverat, ut honores seu praebendae omnes pretio acquirentur, nos locum sanctum emundare ab hac peste excreabili cupientes; religiosos viros ad praeminentem nostram decrevimus praemittendos ..."3

It is curious that this master should have given his commentary about 1118 and yet that he should have referred to cases of simony taken not from the twelfth but from the late eleventh century, and that the Pope of whom he thinks is Urban. Apparently Frenchmen of that time had not yet forgotten the stirring events which had marked the opening of the investiture contest for them. It is also worth remarking that of the two masters whose work on rhetoric he mentions, Manegold made his name in the previous century, though the other, Anselm, had only recently died. The commentary on the Ad Herennium written by the same master has a few contemporary references which support the above conclusions: on fol. 52b, "Vel imitatione ut magistrum Roscelinum imitatur in loquendo

1) Fol. 10r.
2) Fol. 19r.
3) Mansi, op. cit., vol. XX, col. 658 a-b.
... depravatione, ut Roscelinus depravavit dialecticam, modo vult depravare nostras leges.” There is nothing in the commentary to show what these laws were. A provincial synod at Soissons, held in 1092, discussed the errors of Roscelinus. On fol. 57v, the writer of the Ad Herennium quotes from an unknown poet. The commentator mentions that Lanfranc misunderstood this verse and gives Lanfranc’s interpretation. On fol. 64v are the words “Soloe est quaedam civitas ubi multum corrupta fuit latina lingua unde omnis vitiosa comparatio orationis ab illa civitate sortita est vocabulum. Et dicitur soloecismus sicut quando Britones dicunt: ego vidi dominus meus.” This, presumably, is a reference to the Bretons.

The fourth commentary I have listed is known to be the work of Thierry of Chartres.

In his preface to the second half of the work, Thierry refers to himself by name: “Ecce Theodoricus, Brito, homo barbare nationis.” Otto of Freising, after his account of Abailard’s condemnation at Soissons, mentions that Abailard came from Brittany and says, “est enim predicita terra clericorum acuta ingenia et artibus applicata habentium, sed ad alia negotia pene stolidorum ferax, quales fuerunt duo fratres Bernardus et Theodoricus, viri doctissimi,” thus confirming that Thierry, with his brother Bernard, were Bretons.

Thierry seems to have succeeded his brother as master at Chartres, though his name does not appear with the title ‘scolarum magister’ until 1121. At this time, his brother Bernard was chancellor. Thierry was most likely that “Terricus quidam scholarum magister” who is credited by Abailard with interrupting his trial at Soissons in 1121. He was famous for his biting tongue. This aspect of his personality is shown by the prefaces to the first and second parts of his rhetorical commentary, in which he attacks his enemies.

---

4) Fol. 128v.
7) Fol. 102v and bottom of fol. 128v—top of fol. 129v.
From Chartres he went to Paris, where he made his name. Adalbert, who afterwards became archbishop of Mainz, was his pupil, and Adalbert’s biographer praises his teaching in grammar, rhetoric and dialetic.1 John of Salisbury says that he studied rhetoric under him.2 No doubt he refers to Thierry’s stay in Paris before 1141, for in that year Thierry returned to Chartres as chancellor, succeeding Gilbert de la Porrée. He died before 1155.

Judging from the circumstance of his life, his rhetorical commentary is probably an early work, possibly the fruit of his earliest teaching at Chartres or of his teaching in Paris.

The last commentary listed, the gloss *Ars rhetorica*, seems to be connected with the Italian schools or an Italian master. The author refers once to contemporary events when he mentions the people of Milan and Cremona in an example:3

"Veluti ista pax est tenenda inter Mediolanenses [Medio cod.] et Cremonenses, dicit alius ‘non est’, et ex hoc constituitur quedam causa quae dicitur deliberativa individualis."

Next to Pavia, Cremona was Milan’s bitterest enemy in the twelfth century, and victory rested with each in turn. In 1139 the Milanese captured the greater part of the army of Cremona under the walls of Crema, but ten year later, when Cremona and Parma were allied against Milan, Piacenza and Crema, the former triumphed and even captured the Milanese Caroccio. The commentator was familiar with these quarrels.

The author divides society into three groups:4

"Ergo eos traduceret diversas ad rationes vite, id est ad diversos usus vivendi; quosdam enim fecit milites, quosdam clericos, quosdam pelliparios."

The last term, meaning literally tanner or seller of skins, presumably stands

---


3) Fol. 8va.

4) *De inv.* Bk. I, II.3; fol. 4va.
for the merchants. They were an important class in Italy and the Netherlands at this time, but had little influence in the other countries of Western Europe. Manegold disliked merchants, and gives as an example of argument based on occupation:\(^1\)

"A negocio sunt ita fides, ut si diceretur, verisimile est hunc peierare quia mercator est."

Unlike Manegold, the commentator of the *Ars rhetorice* thought in terms of knights, clerks and merchants, not in terms of knights, clerks and peasants. It is probable that he was connected with Italy.

It is impossible to date the commentary from internal evidence. But, as I shall show, the writer knew both Manegold’s commentary and the gloss *In primis*, so that the *Ars rhetorice* was presumably written in the first half of the twelfth century.

### IV

Although the author of the Laudian glosses gives quotations from Victorinus contained in all the later commentaries, thus proving that already in the first half of the eleventh century teachers drew on a common stock of quotations from rhetorical writings, there is no clear link between the glossator’s teaching and that of Manegold, Thierry, or the authors of the glosses *In primis* and *Ars rhetorice*.

On the other hand, a link can be established between the other four commentaries. As I have already shown, Manegold strongly influenced the writer of the gloss *In primis*.

It is far more difficult to establish a link between Manegold and Thierry of Chartres, and it seems unlikely from the evidence that Thierry knew the other’s work personally, but, if he did, he was not strongly influenced by it. On the other hand, there was some connexion between their teaching, other than their use of the same sources, to judge from the following passages to which I have added equivalents from the gloss *In primis*.

---

\(^1\) Fol. 19r.
(1) *De inv.* Bk.I.I.2.  
Manegold, fol. 3v.  
Inter initium autem et principium hoc  
interest quod initium quidem in hoc  
loco dicitur origo eloquentie ex qua  
nascitur, quamquam horiginem Tullius  
sub quadam dubitatione ostendit.  
Principium vero dicitur incoatio eloquentie  
secundum actum.

Gloss *In primis*, fol. 3rb.  
Ostendi esse studendum eloquentie  
et adhuc ostendo si voluissemus considerare  
exordium huius artis; non  
exordium quo ipsa cepit sed quo cepit  
agere. Et nominat eam scientiam  
diversis nominibus quae sortitur per hoc  
quod diversis modis accipitur quae  
exposta sunt in principio.

(2) *De inv.* Bk.I.XVII.25.  
Manegold, fol. 15r.  
Apologus est quando aliquid exem- 
plum humane vite inductur ut in  
Oracio¹ de mure rusticano et urbano.  

Gloss *In primis*, fol. 13ra.  
Apologus est quando ad exemplum  
humane vite inductur ut fabule Hesopi  
ut in Horacio de mure urbano et  
rusticano et dicitur apologus sub logus.

The author of the Laudian glosses uses Victorinus’s commentary here, 
for he adds:²

¹) *Horace, Sermones* II, VI.80.  
²) Fol. 139v, left-hand margin.
"Apologi sunt ex rebus humilibus composite quedam forme ac species ad videndum <ut ex> tat illa de mure et leone."

Victorinus said: 1

"Apologi sunt ex rebus humilibus compositae quaedam formae ac species ad vivendum [al. videndum], ut extat illa de mure et leone."

While the author of the Laudian glosses quotes the same fable of "the Mouse and the Lion", which Victorinus had chosen, Manegold mentions the fable of "the Town and Country Mouse" instead, and the author of In primis and Thierry follow suit. The fable of "the Mouse and the Lion" was popular in the Middle Ages, so that it will not have been ignorance which prompted the other two to ignore Victorinus's suggestions. It seems rather that they knew this passage from Manegold's work.

I have thus found only two passages in Thierry's work which show some connexion with Manegold, and even the evidence from these is unsatisfactory. He may have learnt of them indirectly through the gloss In primis. Thierry clearly owed little to Manegold.

On the other hand, it seems that Thierry knew the gloss In primis. I quote passages, of little importance in themselves, to show the connexion between the anonymous teacher and Thierry.

Gloss In primis, fol. 3vb. 
Thierry, fol. 107r. 

. . . deinde propter rationem, id est sapientiam, et orationem, id est eloquentiam. 
Rationem autem et orationem appellat illius viri sapientiam et eloquentiam vel secundum Victorinum ratio ad sententiarum gravitatem refertur, oratio vero ad ornamentum verborum.

Thierry here seems to be contrasting the opinion of his anonymous predecessor with that of Victorinus, whom he quotes verbatim.

1) Ed. Halm, p. 199.
(2) *De inv.* Bk.I.III.4.
Gloss *In primis*, fol. 4\textsuperscript{rb}.

*Hinc.* Et quia multitudo plebis elegit impium non iniuria contingebant ei infortunia. Et *hinc* quia impius sublimatus est non iniuria sed iure siebant naufragia maxima secundum quantitatem, miserrima quia sine causa [c]on-temerarii id est improvisi in a[u]etu.

(3) *De inv.* Bk.I.III.4.
Gloss *In primis*, fol. 5\textsuperscript{ra}.

Tria enim ut diximus in principio facit docilem ut nominatum [?] materiam id est eloquentiam. Praelibatio enim materie facit docilem... Attentum vero fecit ubi obsolevisse dicitur. Notat enim per intermissionem et neglektum artis quod minus habetur in usu difficiliorem effectam [?]. Circa benevolentiam fere ubique immoratur dum eam commendat.

The use of the same mediaeval latin word, “praelibatio” in the first and “praelibando” in the second, in the same context, suggests there is some link between the two commentaries here. The need to make one’s audience attentive, docile and kindly disposed towards one is suggested by Cicero.\(^1\)

(4) *De inv.* Bk.I.XIX.27.
Gloss *In primis*, fol. 13\textsuperscript{vb}.

*In hoc genere.* In quo ostenditur proprietas personne quae proprietas per haec quae secuntur maxime dinoscitur. *Debet...*  

\(^1\) *De inv.* Bk. I, XV.20.
inesse multa festivitas, magnus ornatus verborum, et sententiarum, confecta ex varietate rerum, honestus tractus. Et est festivus ubi varie res interponuntur quia tediosum esset si circa idem semper versaretur. Et confecta dissimilitudine animorum. Hoc per partes ostendit. Et prius ostendit dissimilitudinem animorum hoc modo: gravitate ut in Demea, lenitate ut in Mitione, spe ut in aliquo iuvene de amica habenda, metu ut in Clinia qui timet de sua, suspicione ut in Trasone qui putat Emulum ante oculos adductum, desiderio ut in Cherea, dissimulatione ut Davus dissimulans se adiuverit Pamphilum, errore ut in Carino qui putabat Pamphilum amare Philomenam, misericordiam ut in Menedemus. Hoc usque ostendit dissimilitudinem [dissimulationem cod.].

Gloss In primis, fol. 13\textsuperscript{vb}.

Brevis. Dat praeceptum et de principio et de medio et de fine: de principio ut initium sumatur unde necesse est et non ab ultimo id est a prima extremitate quae ultima vocatur sicut et postremitas, ut ille qui incepit a gemino ovo.

Victorinus says in this context:

"Ut puta si nobis bellum Trojanum narrandum sit, debemus a raptu Helenae incipere, non a Leda quae Helenam genuit."

Both teachers mention Aristotle in the same curious context, but the
COMMENTARIES ON THE “DE INVENTIONE” AND “AD HERENNIIUM” author of In primis is really recalling the words of Boethius in De syllogismo categorico, while Thierry is referring directly to the Categories:


Gloss In primis, fol. 14r.  
Contorte dicit rem qui non narrat propriis verbis, rem sicut Aristotiles est turbator verborum et nominum.

Thierry, fol. 135v.  
Contorte vero quando etsi ordinem servat tamen oblique, id est obscure de uno ad alium procedit, ita ut non appareat quomodo ab illa ad hanc descendit; quemadmodum Aristotiles in Categoriis cum autem de divisivis differentiis loqueretur, postea ad constitutivas obscure transiens subintulit dicens: quare quaecumque praedicati differentiae fuerint etc.

The gloss Ars rhetorice reveals links with the works of three of the other masters, Manegold, the anonymous author of In primis and Thierry.  

The author of Ars rhetorice seems to have had Manegold’s commentary by him, or knew it well. He uses the earlier master’s phrases and words in the following passages:

Manegold, fol. 2f.  
Civitas differentia sic: multitudo hominum in unum colecta ad iure vivendum

Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 2vb  
Sed ut ait Victorinus in hoc loco videndum quid sit civitas et quid socius

3) From Boethius, prologue to Bk. I of De syllogismo categorico, Migne PL 64, col. 793 c: “Si quid suo more Aristoteles nominum verborumque mutatione turbavit, nos intelligentiae servientes ad consequentium vocabulum reducamus.”

2) Cat. lb. 21. Thierry is referring to the following passage from the Latin translation, Migne PL 64, col. 177a:

“Diversorum generum et non subalternatis positorum, diversae secundum speciem sunt differentiae, ut animalis et scientiae, animalis siquidem differentiae sunt, ut gressible, volatile, bipes et aquatile, scientiae vero nulla harum est, neque enim scientia a scientia differt in eo quod est bipes. Subalternorum vero generum nihil prohibet easdem esse differentias, superiora enim de inferioribus praedicantur, quae quaecumque fuerint praedicati differentiae erunt eadem et subjici.”

Boethius discusses divisive and constitutive differences at this point in his commentary on the Categories, but does not say that Aristotle is difficult to follow because of the switch in thought from one to the other. Thierry seems to be expressing his own opinion.

4) Definition of civitas taken from Victorinus’s commentary; cf. supra, p. 10, n. 1.
id est ad hoc ut secundum leges vivat. Vel dicitur civitas quasi civilitas, hinc civis dicitur non particeps eiusdem muri sed eiusdem iuris ut Paulus in Astibus Apostolorum civem Romanum se dixit, non quantum ad cohabitationem sed quia pater (quem patrem cod.) eius  ius civis promeruit.¹


Notandum quoque quod in ipsis exemplis servat ordinem bonorum. Nam prius urbes sunt constitutae; urbis constitutis, autem sunt res et in moribus et in possessionibus. Inde crevit invidia felicitatis semper noverca, ex qua bella  orta sunt.


Propagare dicimus prolongare et tractum est a propagine, et dicitur propago eo quod partem porro agat, id est disponent se in longam generationem.

(4) Sometimes the authors of the glosses In primis and Ars rethorice use the same passage from Manegold’s commentary. Manegold points out a metaphor in the text “bella restincta”² and quotes “Ardet Hesperia omnis bellis”, a line which he ascribes to Lucan.³ Victorinus illustrates the same words of the text with a similar quotation, but uses the word “Hispania”

¹) The author of the gloss In primis also refers to the above passage from Manegold; fol. 2v, quoted supra, p. 10.
³) Manegold, fol. 2v.
and does not ascribe it to Lucan. The two anonymous commentators follow Manegold and not Victorinus, using the same words as Manegold and ascribing the quotation to Lucan.

(5) They again quote from Manegold in the following passages:

Manegold, fol. 2v.

Amicus vero qui nobis usu vite consimilis pio ac fidei amore coniungitur ex consensu[-s cod.]. Qui nobis simili (amore) est in utilitate vite et ita similis ut iungitur nobis pio ac fidei amore dicitur amicus. Et est notandum non posse esse amicum in vero usu vite et piate ac fidelitate bono [sic] non sit similis. Nec enim dicitur vita uti sed abutii [-s cod.].

Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 2vb.

Amicus dicitur ille qui usu similis vite pio et fidei amore alicui coniungitur; quia ad hoc ut aliquis sit alii amicus oportet esse illum eiusdem vite et eiusdem moris cum illo. Non dicit usu similis vite et non lenocinio neque lencitate aliqua, et hoc dicit pio nec propter commodatem sui sed propter virtutes quas habet. Et hoc dicit fidei amore.

Gloss In primis, fol. 2vb.

Amicus qui usu vite similiter nobis pio et fidei amore coniungitur. Amici
cia enim non est nisi fidelis sit quod nullo modo quaerat decipere amicum, et pia sit, id est in bono non in lenocinio. Et inter bonos non scilicet usu vite dissimiles quia concordia inter malos factio vocatur.

The definition of amicus is taken from Victorinus, but the commentaries on the definition are the masters’ own.

(6) The same two masters again borrow from Manegold further on. I quote from the gloss Ars rhetorice. The relevant passages from Manegold’s work and the gloss In primis have already been given.

3) Ed. Halm, p. 158.
4) In primis, fol. 12vb; Ars rhetorice, fol. 2vb.
5) Supra, p. 10.
Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 8ra.

Et dicitur a quibusdam quod trahbatur olim in Campo Martio in quo homines commendabantur qui ad dignitatem erant promovendi, vel vituperbantur illi qui non erant promovendi ad dignitatem [cognitatem cod.]. Deliberativum etc. Deliberativa causa est illa in qua multe sententiae dicuntur ut tandem pocior eligatur, cum disceptatione, id est controversia . . . et dicitur trahri in senatu sapientibus quia prius trahitur [fol. 8rb] a sapientibus huiusmodi causa in senatu et pothea illa traheta veniunt in contionem et ibi quisque dat suam sententiam et ibi similiter pocior eligitur. Iudiciale etc., id est iudiciales causa, est illa in qua unus alium accusat et alius illum defendit et in qua similiter unus petit et alius recusat dare. Et huiusmodi causa trahetur in foro ante iudices, ut illa diu pertraactata ab oratoribus iudiciis posheca datur quid iustum est. In foro dicitur trahere hac ratione ut illi (qui) puniuntur exemplum aliis praestent correctionis et illi qui remunerantur circumstantes commoveant ad forcia facta agenda. Et versatur similiter circa praeteritum.

(7) One other passage of Manegold’s seems to have influenced the author of the Ars rhetorice.

Manegold, fol. 7v.

Et haec acipiendum est finis dup[l] iciter secundum quod Boetius dicit in quarto libro Topicorum1 scilicet: et in oratore et extrinsecus, id est in accidente. In oratore autem vocatur finis intencio quam habet ad haec ut talia verba proferat quibus ostendat aliquid factum utile vel inutile, iustum vel iniustum, honestum vel inhonestum et eiusdem faciat finem auditoribus. Et notandum est finem semper esse in oratore sive aliquid in auditori proficiat sive non, cum in eius intencione non remaneat. In audiente vero non semper est finis quia aliquando orator in eo (non) proficit.

Manegold is here quoting from the De differentiis topicis of Boethius.

———

1) De diff. top., Migne PL 64, col. 1208 d.
Although the fourth book of this treatise had an important influence on mediaeval rhetoric, it is not quoted as frequently in the glosses as is Victorinus’s commentary on the *De inventione*. Therefore, though the author of the *Ars rhetorice* may be quoting from Boethius independently of Manegold, this is unlikely since he is using the same passage from Boethius and commenting on the same words from Cicero’s text.

The writer of the gloss *Ars rhetorice* seems to be as familiar with the gloss *In primis* as with Manegold’s work. Comparison between the following passages shows this:

1. Gloss *In primis*, fol. 2vb.
   
   *Titulus autem talis est: Incipit liber rethoricorum. Iste titulus valet ad operis commendationem quasi diceret: Non est iste liber Ciceronis vel aliaius rethoris sed liber rethoricorum. Quasi quacumque alii rhetenores bene dixerunt omnia hic poterit lector (vel rhetenor D) reperire colletta in unum.*

   
   *Officium oratorie facultatis, id est scientie, est dicere. Hoc habet grammatica, dialectica, et ideo addit *apposite*, id est ornate. Apponit enim multa dum ornat verba, et quia poetae *apposite* loquantur *non ad persuasionem*, ut velint fabulis suis credi sed ad dele@tationem, ad remotionem eorum addit persuasionem.*

Gloss *Ars rhetorice*, fol. 1vb.

*Titulus huius libri talis est: Incipit liber rethoricorum. Non dicit: Incipit liber Tulii, sed ad maiorem commendationem huius operis dixit: Incipit liber rethoricorum, quasi dicat: incipit liber ille in quo continentur precepta que sunt necessaria ad quamlibet ypiothesin questionem probandam vel cognoscendam artificiosam eloquentiam.*

Gloss *Ars rhetorice*, fol. 6vb.

*Sed officium id est illud quod artifex huius artis debet facere secundum praecessa bene cognita i@tius scientie, que facit hominem facundum in dicendo, est dicere. Et per hoc removet officium oratoris ab officio pellipariorum et cerdonum quod consistit in factis solummodo. Et quia gramatici et dialectici dicunt, adeo adiunxit *apposite* ut per hoc remove*{(a)}t officium oratoris ab officio gramatici et dialectici qui non curant de ornatis verbis et quia poetae ornate loquantur in fabulis suis, ideo dixit ad persuasionem ut ostenderet differentiam [fol. 6vb] inter officium oratorum et officium poetarum, quia etsi poete ornate loquantur in fabulis
The writer of the *Ars rethorice* bases one long passage, beginning on fol. 6r, on the other work *In primis*, fol. 5r. I give the passages later when discussing the influence of the masters on each other’s rhetorical doctrine.¹

There does not seem to be as clear a link between the gloss *Ars rethorice* and Thierry’s commentary as there is between the former and the work of Manegold or the gloss *In primis*. Nevertheless, the author of the *Ars rethorice* and Thierry draw on a tradition ignored by the other mediaeval commentators I have studied, for they both quote from the preface of Grillius, another late antique rhetorician who, like Victorinus, commented on the *De inventione*. The author of the Laudian glosses knew Grillius’s commentary, but only these two repeat what Grillius says of Plato’s and Aristotle’s ideas on rhetoric:

1) *De inv.* Bk.I.I.1.

Gloss *Ars rethorice*, fol. 1r

... In quo prologo ipse exequitur morem bene scribendum [sic], purgando illa que sibi gravia videbantur, quia ut dicit Boetius:² quicunque debet scribere de aliqua re, oportet eum prius purgare ea que sibi gravia videatur si qua sunt. Et hoc fecit Tullius, scilicet purgavit ea quae sibi gravia videbantur. Tria enim era<n> que sibi gravia videbantur, videlicet mala illa quae rebus publicis et privatis per ipsam videbantur evenisse, et sententia Platonis et sententia Aristotilis. Sententia Platonis talis [etalis cod.] erat quia

Thierry, fol. 104r.

Sepe et multum haec mecum cogitavi. Studendum esse arti rethorice Tullius intendit persuadere, tum artem rethoricam commendando, in quo reddit attentos lectoris, tum eandem defendendo contra Platonem et Aristotilem, quorum Plato affirmaverat rethoramic non esse artem sed hominibus naturale insitam, Aristotiles autem artem quidem esse affirmabat sed malam eo quod per eam multomens veritas impugnaretur quia et falsitas pro vero in opinionem hominum inducetetur. Ideoque neccessarium putat Tullius


²) This is a mistake. The point is made by Grillius in his commentary on the *De inv.*; cf. Grillius. *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik*, ed. J. Martin (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 14, pts. 2–3), Paderborn 1927, p. 2.
dicebat illam non esse artem sed naturam, quia videbat quosdam homines bonos oratores non artifitio aliquo sed naturaliter. Sententia Aristotelis talis erat quia dicebat illam artem esse set malam quia plura [plurima cod.] mala quam bona videbantur evenisse rebus publicis et privatis per eloquentiam.

(2) De inv. Bk.IV.5.

Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 6va.

Hoc si forte non natura. Postquam Tullius commendavit eloquentiam diversis rationibus volens suo prologo finem ponere, in hoc loco vult ostendere de quibus sit tractaturus et quo ordine, captando benevolentiam et docilitatem; in quo etiam loco ponit quaedam verba per que plane esse videtur [esse] sententiam Platonis qui dicebat hanc non esse artem sed naturam.

(3) Elsewhere the author of the Ars rhetorice and Thierry quote from the same passage of Boethius on reaching the same point in the text of the De inventione.


Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 7vb.

Unumquodque illorum hoc modo dividitur, s<cilicet> a<lia> demonstrativa, alia specialis, alia individua<lì>s. Specialis causa demonstrativa est illa quae tractatur causa honestatis vel inhonestatis alicuius rei demonstrande sine interpositione alicuius certe personae, veluti habemus in hoc exemplo: vir fortis est laudandum. Dicet alius: non est, immo vituperandum est. Et ex hoc construitur quedam causa demonstrativa specialis, quia tractatur causa honestatis vel inhonestatis alicuius in hoc proemio et artem probare contra Platonem, et bonam esse contra Aristotelem in quo reddit auditores erga artem rthoricam benivolos qui ab ea alienati erant auctoritate illorum philosophorum.

Thierry, fol. 110v.

Hoc si forte etc. Usque ad hunc locum contra Aristotelem probavit rthoricam bonam esse ex efactu ipsius, scilicet eloquentia quae bona est, amodo vero contra Platonem qui dicebat rthoricam non esse artem sed naturam.

Thierry, fol. 113v.

Sed diligenter quaerendum est utrum causa esse possit sine ea circumstantia que dicitur persona. Et Boetius quidem in Quarto Topicorum dicit: causarum esse alia speciales alia individuas [sic] et hanc divisionem in omnibus generibus causarum ponit. Grillius vero in commentario super rthoricam affirmat demonstrativam causam esse non posse sine certa persona. Si vero certa persona non insit, non demonstrativum vocat sed appellativum quod ipse communem locum esse dicit. Quintilianus
rei, demonstrativa sine interpositione alicuius certe persone. Individualis causa demonstrativa est illa que tradatur causa honestatis vel inhonestatis alicuius rei cum interpositione (certe persone), ut ista: Cicero est laudandus. Dicet alius: non est. Et ex hoc constituitur quedam causa que dicitur individualis demonstrativa. Deliberativa causa hoc modo dividitur: deliberativa causa alia specialis, alia individualis . . .


Thierry had absorbed the rhetorical teaching of the different schools of his own and of the previous century, and summed up their work in his commentary. His preface, which I shall deal with in my second paper, is a synthesis of classical and mediaeval teaching. In some passages of his commentary he reports the different views of the Latin rhetors of antiquity, where earlier medieval masters quote the opinion of only one of them. In the passage above, he quotes from Boethius, Grillius and Quintilian, where the author of the Ars rhetorice uses Boethius only. It seems likely that Thierry’s commentary was composed later than the Ars rhetorice and that he knew the work of the school from which it came, though he may not have been familiar with the Ars rhetorice itself. It is difficult to believe that the author of the Ars rhetorice would have quoted from Thierry’s work and only have used the opinion of one authority where Thierry quotes three, or that he would, under such circumstances, ascribe a point to Boethius,¹ which is correctly noted by Thierry as taken from Grillius.

One other link between the two commentaries must be mentioned. In their prefaces, they both give not one but three definitions of rhetoric.

(4) Gloss Ars rhetorice, fol. 1ra.


¹) Cf. supra, p. 30.
rhetorice est illa scientia per quam scimus ornate loqui. Hoc alio modo apercius describitur: ars rhetorice est scientia bene dicendi [dicendum cod.] de apposita causa, id est ars rhetorice est illa scientia per quam scimus ornate loqui de proposita quaestione. Hoc autem tercio modo plenarius describitur: ars rhetorice est scientia bene dicendi in privatis et publicis causis, id est ars rhetorice est illa scientia per quam scimus plene et perfecta eloquentia in publicis et privatis questionibus.

The author of the gloss Ars rhetorice prefers his last definition, that of Victorinus.¹ Thierry uses the same definitions, but gives them in a different order. These two passages provide the best evidence for a link of some kind between the two works.²

I have shown that the masters knew each other’s work. It is more important still to find out how they influenced each other, for instance, in their methods of thought and criticism.

On the whole, each master has an individual point of view. Manegold, however, sometimes suggests a method of approach to the author of In primis, who not only accepted Manegold’s interpretation of words and sentences, but learnt from him to mention alternative readings of the text, not deciding between them but explaining both:

_De inv._ Bk.I.XXXIX.70.

_nec tamen_ Epaminondae permitteremus, _ne si_ extra _iudicium_ quidem _esset, ut_ _is_ nobis _sententiam_ _legis_ _interpretaretur._

Manegold, fol. 31r.

Gloss _In primis_, fol. 22vb.

_Nec tamen._ Si _scriptum_ non _exstaret_ illud _quaeremus_ et _tamen_ _non_ _permitteremus_ _Epaminonde_ _interpretari_ _ne_ _dum_
modo cum sit presens. Non permitteremus, dico, nisi ipse esset extra induicium, id est extra legem iudicii esset positus, quod sub nulla lege teneatur, id est nisi contra iudicium facere vellemus, vel nisi ipse extra illud iudicium esset quod Epaminundel illo iudicio non pertineret. Vel ita a maiorique quando littera haberetur: non si. Vere non permitteremus eum exponere cum ipse sit in causa quia nec etiam si ipse sit extra causam. Secundum hanc sententiam Stultus notatur Epaminundas.

Like Victorinus, Manegold frequently defines his terms and then stops to compare them in order to distinguish more clearly between them, and the anonymous commentator follows his example. For instance, after explaining Cicero’s definitions of “imago”, “collatio” and “exemplum” according to Victorinus, Manegold points out:

*De inv.* Bk. I. XXX. 49.

Differunt autem hoc modo: imago, collacio, exemplum. Imago ostendit qualitates in ipsis rebus et tantum in duas et ad hoc ut similes eas ostendat. Collacio ostendit non qualitates circa res sed ipsas res et multas, non tantum duas. Exemplum autem quod particulariter de aliquo proponitur ut Antenor posuit et his similia, ad hoc ut suadeat vel dissuadeat.

Elsewhere Manegold analyses his terms, and again the other follows suit. They write about the conclusion to a proposition:

---

1) A reference to an example in Victorinus, ed. Halm, p. 239.
De inv. Bk. I. XLVII.87.

Cum autem, his concessis, complexio ex his non conficitur, haec erunt consideranda: num aliud conficiatur; aliud dicatur; hoc modo: si, cum alicui dicit se profectum esse ad exercitum, contra eum quis velit hae uti argumentatione: Si venisses ad exercitum, a tribunis militaris visus esses; non es autem ab his visus, non es igitur ad exercitum profectus.

Manegold, fol. 26r.

Complexio duobus modis proponit vel disiunctive vel conjunctive per “si”, et que una proposition est disiunctive [-a cod.] probatur dividitur in duas, si conjunctive proferatur. Et notandum quod non universaliter hic describit complexionem. Ipsumet postea dicit quia vera complexio in nulla parte reprehenditur.

Manegold was fond of pointing out apparent contradictions in Cicero’s text in order to resolve them. For instance, Cicero lays down rules for refuting an opponent if he makes a wholly incredible statement, and he gives examples of inconsistencies between arguments used and the character or circumstances of the persons concerned. Cicero’s last example, however, is drawn from the place where the murder was committed rather than from the persons connected with the crime. Manegold asks why Cicero includes an argument from place, which is among the attributes of fact, among arguments taken from the attributes of persons. He replies that there are certain attributes of fact, such as place and time, which make an argument credible, just as on the other hand certain attributes of persons, such as their actions and words, are thought of as clues or signs (signum). For speech falls within the category of the senses, under hearing, and is therefore a sign. The other teacher raises and answers the same point.

Manegold did not have the same influence on the methods of Thierry or the author of the Ars rhetorica. Indeed, apart from the examples just given, what is common in the method of approach of the commentators

2) Fol. 33r.
3) Fol. 24v.
is due, not to their influence on each other, but to the influence of Victorinus and Boethius.

On the other hand, the masters did influence each other to some extent in their doctrines. Much that they copy from one another is of little intrinsic interest, but occasionally the masters make long digressions because of some problem suggested to them by the text, and these passages are important for the light they throw on mediaeval rhetorical theory. It gradually became the practice during the twelfth century, whatever the subject, to detach such digressions, known as “quaestiones”, from their commentaries and to publish them separately. All the rhetorical commentaries which I have studied have such digressions embodied in them. When tracing the influence of one master on another, therefore, it is important to see whether the quaestio of one is reproduced in the work of the other, for it is in such passages that the theory of the subject is worked out.

In two such digressions, Manegold shows the kind of oratory at which the schools were aiming. He believed that rhetoric should appeal to the emotions as well as to reason, and that repetition was also useful in persuading an audience. The author of In primis learnt these views from him. Cicero had included a summary of the facts among the attributes of fact from which proof was derived. Asking how the summary of a case could prove that case, Manegold suggests that it should be used to persuade through repetition, as valuable a means of persuasion as proof. The other raises the same point in order to give the same answer.

Elsewhere Manegold stresses that the orator should appeal to the emotions of his audience throughout his speech, and the author of In primis adopts Manegold’s opinion, quoting his very words:

De inv. Bk.I.LII.98.
Manegold, fol. 36v.

Indignacio est quod concitat animum auditoris ad iram contra adversarium. Conquestio vero commovet animum

Gloss In primis, fol. 26vb.

Indignatio movet animum auditoris ad iram contra adversarium. Conquestio movet ad misericordiam (pro)

2) Fol. 21v.
3) Fol. 17vb.
auditoris pro nobis ad misericordiam. Et he duetantum moventur. Enumeracio vero in hoc quia firmiora repetit docet. In hoc vero quod omnia ipsa similiter quasi sub uno ponit [i.e. in the conclusion] movet. Est etiam adtenendum quod hoc pars, enumeracio, semper ponitur in fine oracionis, id est in peroracione. Indignacio vero et conquistio interdum etiam ponuntur in superioribus partibus, scilicet in exordio, narracione, confirmatione, reprehensione.

The author of *In primis* and Thierry have something in common in their teaching. There are quaeestiones in the gloss *In primis* which suggested digressions to Thierry. They are based on a favourite theme of Thierry's, that topics vary according to the aim of the argument, even if the arguments are the same. He is fascinated by the mental process which leads to the creation of an argument, and analyses imaginary cases so that his pupils may learn how to construct a rhetorical argument to suit any desired end. Here are passages from the two works. They are commenting on the following passage from

*De inv.* Bk.I.XXVII.41.

Gloss *In primis*, fol. 18\(^v^a\).

Nota quod haec quae in modo considerantur diversa sunt ab his quae in habitu vel in affectione considerantur. Quando enim habitus fidem facit, ut habitus consideratur simplicer secundum suam proprietatem, non secundum qualitatem gesti negocii, ut bene credi potest illum percussisse quia facile irascitur. Secundum modum alter fit, ut vero eum malo animo percssit quia percutiens ita rubuit vel dentes strixit. Et iterum differit quia affectio et habitus in omni constitucione probant. Modus

Thierry, fol. 145\(^v^e\).

Queritur in quo differat argumentum a modo ab eo argumento quod est ab his attributis persone, a consilio, scilicet, ab habitu, ab affectione, et dicimus quod quando argumentum fit ab attributis persone, ostenditur qualitas ipsius personne. Quando vero fit argumentum a modo non qualis fit persona, sed quomodo facit ostenditur. Similiter inter causam et modum hoc differet quod in causa propter quod consideratur, in modo vero quale ipsum factum sit ex animo facientis ostenditur. Maxime
vero in coniecturali ponitur ad augmentum. Accusator enim ait: hoc fecit et latenter vel atrociter ex aggravando, per factum non probando. Sed in generalni pro qualitate facti: vere malum est factum quia clam fecit. Si accipitur eadem affectio ut ira hic et ibi, non nocet. Quando enim ostendit personam idoneam est attributum persone. Quando ostenditur causa esse probat ut causa. Quando ostenditur esse modus probat ut modus, scilicet quod fecit hoc irato animo, non tamen significans per hoc iram esse causam.

Victorinus\(^1\) notes the similarity between modus and affectio, but does not show the distinction between them.\(^2\)

The authors of the glosses \textit{In primis} and \textit{Ars rethorice} settle the boundaries of their subject. The first influences the other to expand on the words of Victorinus in order to limit rhetoric, which Cicero describes as part of political science, to its own sphere as distinct from the other arts and from the study and practice of law. These are the passages; the phrases underlined are those inspired by Victorinus:\(^3\)

\textbf{Gloss \textit{In primis}, fol. 5\textsuperscript{rb}.}

\textit{Haec ita dividitur civilis scientia, alia in dictis, alia in factis, ut scientia fabrillis. Scientia in factis rethorice nihil attinet. Scientia in dictis alia cum lite, alia sine lite, sine lite ut scientia historiographorum vel poetarum. Utilia enim sunt dicta poetarum rei publicae. Magis enim romanum nomen scripta quam facta extulerunt. Magis incitaverunt ad virtutem homines facta antiquorum audita quam modernorum. Et haec scientia autem differentia locorum spectatur ex intentione argumentantis etsi idem argumentum abducatur. Verbi gratia: cum affectio animi in argumentum adducitur si (quid ostendere B) intendat quale sit factum, tum est a modo. Si autem propter quod tunc est a causa.}

\textbf{Gloss \textit{Ars rethorice}, fol. 6\textsuperscript{ra}.}

\textit{Civilis scientia alia consistit in dictis alia consistit in factis. In factis veluti scientia pellipariorum, cerdonum et aliorum, in dictis veluti gramatica, diatetica et alie scientie. De illa scientia que consistit in fac[fol. 6\textsuperscript{rb}]tis nichil [sed] ad opus praesens pertinet. Civilis scientia que versatur in dictis hoc modo dividitur: civilis scientia quae versatur in dictis, alia versatur in dictis cum lite, alia sine lite. Sine lite veluti scientia poetarum et}

\(^1\) Ed. Halm, p. 225.  
\(^2\) For other examples, see my thesis, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 74-5.  
\(^3\) Ed. Halm, p. 171.
fuit sine lite, non enim in relationibus suis disceptaverunt; cum lite ut scientia causidicorum. Scientia cum lite subdividitur ita: alia artificiosa, alia inartificiosa. Artificiosa cum lite ut oratorum qui utuntur argumentis in disputacionibus suis. Inartificiosa cum lite ut iuris peritis, id est in iudicibus quae inartificiosam vocatur quia cum inter se de sententia litigant non utuntur argumentis ut oratores sed solis auctoritate legum quae probatio est inartificiosa, unde locus ab auctoritate. Expers artis vocatur et inartificialis in topicis. Et quamvis civilis ratio sit quasi genus relatum ad speciem, tamen non tam vult ostendere quod illud est genus, illud est species quantum quid [?] qualitatem rei, ut dictum est superius. Nec accipit civelem scientiam hic large sed tantum in dictis de qua sic dicit: civilis ratio etc.

The distinction which they draw between rhetoric and law should be borne in mind when considering the influence of rhetoric on law in the Middle Ages. Their attitude contrasts with Cicero’s, whose De inventione has a strongly legal flavour, although already by Cicero’s time it was becoming less common for one man to combine the functions of jurist and advocate. Two speeches from his De oratore deal with the question whether an orator can be a jurist as well. One speech is by Crassus, who favours an extensive study of Roman public and private law by the orator; the other is by Antonius, who maintains that oratory and jurisprudence are separate sciences, each demanding the study of a lifetime. The two

1) Cf. A. Lang, “Rhetorische Einflüsse auf die Behandlung des Prozesses in der Kanonistik des 12. Jahrhunderts” in Festchrift Eduard Eichmann, ed. M. Grabmann and K. Hoffmann, Paderborn 1940, p. 69. He deals with a work written between 1160 and 1180, the Rhetorica Ecclesiastica. This writer gives his aim: “Intentio eius est, instruire personas in iudicio constituendas, partim secundum normam canonum, partim secundum artificiosam doctrinam rhetorum.” He thus uses the same word “artificiosa” of rhetoric as do the commentators in the above passages.

2) De or. I.198 and ibid. I.250-3; cf. A. Gwynn, Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian, Oxford 1926, p. 110.
mediaeval masters separate these functions and seem to imply that, strictly speaking, only the jurist is concerned with the study of laws.

Their attitude to the use of classical examples, as shown in the above passages, is also worth noting. The author of *In primis* believes "magis incitaverunt ad virtute homines facta antiquorum audita quam modernorum", and if the author of *Ars rethorice* is not quite so outspoken, he says much the same thing.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising to find that Manegold envisages oratory in a classical setting, nor that the author of *Ars rethorice* follows suit. The author of the latter comments on the division of rhetoric into epideictic, deliberative and judicial oratory. He reports that some masters have said\(^1\) that epideictic oratory had once been practised in the Campus Martius, deliberative oratory in the senate, and judicial oratory in the forum.\(^2\)

The author of the gloss *In primis* says that Master Manegold and Master Anselm held different opinions on this point, Anselm believing that all types of oratory "indiscrete ubique aguntur".\(^3\)

On the question of Roman oratory and its setting, Manegold and Anselm thus disagreed. The author of the gloss *Ars rethorice* adopts Manegold's opinion, while the author of *In primis* quotes both but does not decide between the two. In this lack of decision, the latter was typical of his period. It was a common practice in the twelfth century for writers or masters to set down varying opinions, and to leave the reader or student, if they so desired, to choose between them.

The first and last of the commentaries were written within about a hundred years of each other, the first, the Laudian gloss, in the early eleventh century, the last, that of Thierry, probably before 1140.

I have shown that some of the commentators knew the work of their immediate predecessors at first hand. The author of the gloss *In primis* knew Manegold's work, and Thierry knew the gloss *In primis*. The author of the gloss *Ars rethorice* knew Manegold's work and the gloss *In primis*. Even where they had no first-hand knowledge of each other's teaching,

---

\(^1\) The phrase is "dicitur quibusdam", a clear reference to Manegold, cf. fol. 8v, and possibly to the author of *In primis*, cf. fol. 6v.

\(^2\) Fol. 8ra-8b.

\(^3\) See above, p. 14.
their studies are connected in some way. Thierry was familiar with some of Manegold’s ideas and he and the author of the Ars rhetorice have their definitions of rhetoric and use of Grillius in common.

Occasionally they were influenced by another master’s methods. Already in the eleventh century Manegold adopted and emphasized the dialectical approach of Victorinus to rhetoric, an approach which was copied by the author of the gloss In primis. Of particular interest are the passages where they stress contradictions in the text in order to resolve them, because the resolution of contradictions in law, biblical exegesis and other fields, was one of the main themes of later eleventh and of twelfth-century scholarship.

Their influence on each other through the quæstiones was equally important. The masters who wrote In primis and Ars rhetorice agreed on the limits which should be set to rhetoric, while Manegold taught the former a balanced approach by insisting on the importance of appealing to both emotion and reason when pleading a case. Thierry and the author of In primis stress the importance of the aim in determining the type of case or the topics. Thierry was fascinated by the problem of how to create an argument out of any given material.

Nevertheless, in spite of such similarities, it would give a false picture if one over-stressed the extent to which these commentators influenced each other. Only one master, the anonymous author of the gloss In primis, borrowed extensively from another, Manegold, and even this anonymous scholar, in spite of long derivative passages, retained a highly individual approach to his subject.

The masters liked to be familiar with the views of other mediaeval schoolmen, but generally retained their own ideas and point of view.

Bedford. 

Mary Dickey

(To be continued)